

IHP Recommendations for PCOM Action:

March 9 - 11, 1994

*** First Priority:**

Archiving of old data sets (resources required):

IHP recommends to PCOM that the ODP Operator prepare a detailed evaluation of the commitment in time and resources that would be required to revise the old data sets and incorporate them in the new database. IHP further recommends that an effort to incorporate the old data be carried out in parallel with the upgrade and RFPs to the scientific community be made for this task.

Computer Upgrade:

IHP is in favor of continuing with the computer upgrade despite the lack of consideration of the inclusion of older data sets and despite reservations with regard to potential underestimates of costs to be incurred.

*** Second Priority:**

1. Data and Software Development (resources required):

1. IHP recommends that the ODP RAWHIDE programmer go to Scripps as soon as possible to test the program in consultation with W. Riedel and A. Sanfilippo.
2. IHP recommends the Operator capture paleo data also from IR volume range charts not superseded by SR charts and from text information in both SR and IR volumes.
3. IHP recommends ODP issue the new CD-ROM in the most expedient manner and not worry at this time about making a sophisticated, clean data set.

2. Publications:

1. IHP comments that the pressure to reduce the volume size was recommended by IHP for the IR, but not for the SR volume and is another factor that may dissuade scientists from putting their best work into the SR volumes. IHP recommends PCOM drop the volume size reduction request for SR volumes.
2. The IHP recommends that PCOM add the name of the outside ERB member to the citation, that it drops the "et al." in reference to the scientific party (they play no part in editing the volume), and that the term "Eds." be added after the names of the four ERB

members. That is, the reference should be changed to : ..."In Proc. ODP, Sci. Res., ERB1, ERB2, ERB3, ERB4 (Eds.) ..."

3. After discussion of problems relating to the 18 month post-cruise deadline for submission of manuscripts to the SR volumes, IHP recommends that rare extenuating circumstances be considered, with R. Merrill given final authority regarding exceptions, and that the deadline remain fixed for now.

3 Membership of IHP:

1. Recent co-chiefs that have left the panel should be replaced. Recent co-chiefs suggested for the IHP are: Annik Myhre (Leg 151), Bill Curry (Leg 154), Roger Flood (Leg 155), Y. Ogawa (Leg 156).

2. There is a need to replace T. Saito, A. Richards, but these replacements will be chosen by member countries.

3. Industry contacts on the IHP would be useful. L. Whatney suggested John Petzlaff of Texaco, Paul Yarka of Marathon research as industry people with computing expertise.

IHP Meeting Executive Summary

9-11 March 1994

I. Micropaleontology Subcommittee Report:

Lead Stratigrapher: The Paleo-subcommittee continues to stress the need for a shipboard designation of a Lead Stratigrapher and will continue to work with Jack Baldauf to further refine the duties of this position and to ensure that Co-Chiefs are aware of the need.

Biostratigraphic Database Center: D. Lazarus and H. Thierstein propose to create a Biostratigraphic Database Center for Neogene data. The Center would provide a unified data set of biostratigraphic/paleontological results for quality (paleomag supported) data for the Neogene. External support would be needed for the proponents. The panel is generally supportive but suggested the issue go back to the Paleo-subcommittee for details.

Nannofossil CD-ROM: To-date 700 descriptions of genus and species taxon have been scanned and edited. A total of 2500 images have been created. The projected completion date is the end of May 1994. The data will then go to NGDC to be put on a CD-ROM; this will be a beta version to go to sea for testing.

Micropaleontological Reference Centers (MRCs): At the MRCs curators meeting in Basel, last June a new structure for the MRCs was proposed so that collections lacking a resident specialist could get to where they would be most useful to the scientific community. The curators suggested dividing the MRCs into three types. The primary MRC (A-type) would be a permanent loan institution, often a museum. The secondary MRC (B-Type) would be a semi-permanent loan institution, usually a larger institution with a history of paleontological research. The tertiary MRC (C-type) would be "subloan" satellite institutions and the collection would be tied to a specific researcher or group. The collection housed in such a locality would usually be a specialized subset (e.g., diatoms). A discussion of the 3-tier curation system followed. A curator at each type of MRC will report annually to IHP through a Lead MRC Curator (a member of IHP). This Lead MRC Curator will maintain coordination of the three-tier structure and monitor the collections. Widespread advertisement will be made for proposals and results will be monitored. Subloan institutions must be responsible for ancillary documentation and cover any costs. A formal letter of agreement between the subloan institution and the IHP is required, the material loaned must be acknowledged as the property of the US Government, and the curators emphasized that the collections can be recalled if the research emphasis declines. The IHP endorsed the establishment of the three-tier MRC structure. B. Huber was chosen for lead MRC curator, by acclamation. IHP endorses periodic MRC curators meetings to promote coordination. IHP made the following recommendations regarding moving of unused collections: 1) Nebraska is to be a subloan site as they have offered to prepare calcareous nannofossils for all 8 MRCs and will make 4 sets of accompanying lithology slides. The material is to come from the Lamont collection which has been unused. 2) The rest of the Lamont collection may go to Bremen (?). 3) The California Academy of Sciences has requested the diatom collection but the IHP will ask for a statement of contribution to the overall MRC effort before deciding on the request. If granted the diatoms will be sent from the Scripps collection. 4) IHP recommends moving the TAMU Oceanography collection to ODP and the return of the Russian collection.

II. Publication Deadlines:

Problems arising from the establishment of firm deadlines (18 months post-cruise) for submission of the manuscripts for the Scientific Results volumes fall into four categories:

1. The potential exists for loss of some manuscripts that have a fundamental and critical scientific impact on the SR volumes.

2. The potential for authors submitting "place-holders" by the deadline or not submitting any manuscript and thus for degradation of the scientific quality of the SR volumes is a real one.

3. Some research/manuscripts cannot be completed by the deadline and the deadline causes hardships for some partner nation participants (e.g. an author from a partner nation couldn't send in his manuscript because of the federal express charges required to get it there in time for submission). There may be a possible negative effect on the sampling on the ship (sampling will be heavier).

4. Consistency in handling the policy is a problem. Authors were told there would be no exceptions, but exceptions were given. Better communication near the time of the deadline are needed and establishment of authority for granting rare exceptions should be given to R. Merrill.

*** After discussion of problems relating to the 18 month deadline for submission of manuscripts to the SR volumes, IHP recommends that rare extenuating circumstances be considered, with R. Merrill given final authority regarding exceptions, and that the deadline remain fixed for now.**

III. Evaluation of ROCKY (Response to PCOM Directive):

The IHP felt ill-prepared to perform the evaluation directed by PCOM, lacking any input on ROCKY from the Co-chiefs of Leg 153, but asked J. Miller (ODP Staff Scientist) to present a report on the program. Miller reported that ROCKY successfully solved the problem of ease of data entry. Miller felt however that ROCKY does not provide the level of detail desired (limited as is HRVI/HRTHIN to description by section). The problem of a better data format regarding processing vs. archiving needs to be addressed by the community as a whole. Goals for the future would be to facilitate use of the data to interpret changes down-hole, a mechanism for describing pieces or intervals in detail. Users complained that they do not get the amount and quality of data they are used to getting in their own labs. Miller is canvassing the community to see what parameters are needed in a database format for types of data they are interested in recording. IHP commends the efforts of ODP/TAMU to address the immediate problem of improving the ease of data entry. IHP also encourages efforts to plan for an increase in the flexibility of ROCKY through interaction with the petrological community.

IV. ODP Publications Report:

Volume reduction effort: No legs have gone through the entire publication process under the new guidelines to reduce volume, however, in general, things seem to be working well. The target size reduction is 20% less than a previous similar leg.

*** IHP comments that the pressure to reduce the volume size was recommended by IHP for the IR, but not for the SR volume, and is another factor that may dissuade scientists from putting their best work into the SR**

volumes. IHP recommends PCOM drop the volume size reduction request for SR volumes.

It was noted that the publications staff at ODP are doing a fine job of keeping on schedule.

IHP recommends to PCOM that the manner of citations of the ERB in SR volumes be changed. Currently the outside member of the ERB is left off of the citations. Also currently the entire shipboard party is acknowledged as an et al. in the citations of the SR volume. While this is appropriate for the IR volumes it is not for the SR volumes, as the duties of editing the volume are the sole responsibility of the ERB. Therefore,

*** The IHP recommends that PCOM add the name of the outside ERB member to the citation, that it drops the "et al." in reference to the scientific party (they play no part in editing the volume), and that the term "Eds." be added after the names of the four ERB members. That is, the reference should be changed to : ..."In Proc. ODP, Sci. Res., ERB1, ERB2, ERB3, ERB4 (Eds.) ..."**

V. Curators Report:

A thin section recall is underway. A bar-code system is beginning which will involve end-caps on cores and all samples. The goal is for the system to be in place by the end of the year. There has been some wasted energy in curation efforts because of on/off closing of ECR. The contract is now signed for the Bremen repository, so construction and modifications are starting and it should be ready by 1 May. The first cores are to arrive in May.

VI. Database/Computer Report:

Data requests are on plateau with last year and the typical turn-around is down to several days. The database it is keeping up with current acquisition. Students are working on the paleontology database, hand-entering range charts from the SR volumes into Excel spreadsheets. Nine legs are finished.

*** IHP recommends the Operator capture paleo data also from IR volume range charts not superseded by SR charts and from text information in both SR and IR volumes.**

Data problems: The computer group is trying to migrate XRF data to new media (equipment exists, old PDP-11, but not personnel resources). They are almost finished with the Corelog (depth) editing project. Incorrectly recorded sample depths for some legs are being corrected and only a few bad legs are left. Shipboard scientists have changed parameters for the natural gamma data collection either on the machine or in the software, and there is a need for some review/update of procedure. This problem was caught on Leg 152 and calls into question prior legs (150-151). Also there is a problem with some sonic log data (shipboard scientists left out some calibration values).

It is about time to issue a new CD-ROM, but a source of funds is not clear. R. Mithal stated that for the CD-ROM for Legs 130 onward, there are many inconsistencies. He raised the question do we wait until all of the data is cleaned up (wait a year) or try to put it out fast?

* IHP recommends ODP issue the new CD-ROM in the most expedient manner and not worry at this time about making a sophisticated, clean data set.

RAWHIDE program: No. 1 priority for software applications development has been the RAWHIDE paleoprogram. RAWHIDE is currently in beta version. J. Coyne explained he has only one staff member (L. Patton) trained in 4D programming to pick up the task of developing the RAWHIDE program. The program did not make the Leg 154 goal. The computer group will possibly be sailing a programmer on Leg 156.

*** IHP recommends that the ODP RAWHIDE programmer go to Scripps as soon as possible, especially if the programmer cannot sail on Leg 156, to test the program in consultation with W. Riedel and A. Sanfilippo.**

VCD program: The computer group is trying to write the VCD program into an object-oriented environment in hopes this will make it easier to make rapid changes. The group is still working on the problem of high-detail descriptions and on the problem of getting sample depths. The Dec VAX 750's have been retired.

VII. Computer Upgrade

The best and final offers from potential vendors are expected in April. Subcontracts will be awarded in May. The upgrade will start this summer. It will take 9 months to get the necessary equipment and install software and a further 6 months of studying data to design data formats. Training for ODP personnel will be included. The target is to have some equipment and programs on ship by early 1995.

Coyne gave background on system architecture and philosophy. Lewis described the proposed computer upgrade oversight committee and explained the budget issues. There are \$1.5M budgeted in '94,'95 the rest must come in '96. If the project only runs until 1998, there will be 12 good legs of data, but 64 legs of disorganized data. When asked whether PCOM was interested in/committed to migration of old data to the new format, Lewis said that is a separate issue and IHP would need to present PCOM with a detailed budget and road map.

IHP is responsible for the archiving of data. The panel estimates the task of cleaning up the old data sets would take 3 people/year for 3 years, at a total cost of ~ \$450,000. ODP should go outside for expertise to assist with this task. The Panel consensus is that the necessary funds may have to come from reprogramming of the computer funds. IHP is in favor of continuing with the upgrade despite the lack of consideration of the inclusion of older data sets and despite reservations with regard to potential underestimates of costs to be incurred. However, as its highest priority request for PCOM action:

*** IHP recommends to PCOM IHP recommends that an effort to incorporate the old data be carried out in parallel with the upgrade and RFPs to the scientific community be considered for this task. To this end IHP recommends that the ODP Operator prepare a detailed evaluation of the commitment in time and resources that would be required to revise the old data sets and incorporate them in the new database.**

VIII. Membership of IHP:

IHP requests replacement of departing members. It was generally agreed that for IHP, which has an archival mandate, it is important to maintain a balance of individuals with

modern technological expertise and individuals that carry a "corporate memory" for the work of IHP.

* Industry contacts would be useful. L. Whatney suggested John Petzlaff of Texaco, Paul Yarka of Marathon research as industry people with computing expertise.

* Recent co-chiefs that have left the panel should be replaced. Recent co-chiefs suggested by the IHP are: Annik Mura (Leg 151), Bill Curry (Leg 154), Roger Flood (Leg 155), Y. Ogawa (Leg 156).

It was suggested W. Wise continue as a guest with in the Paleo-subcommittee. There is a need to replace T. Saito, A. Richards, but these replacements will be chosen by member countries.