

Executive Summary of the IHP Meeting College Station, Texas, 8 March 1995

Paleontology subcommittee report:

Bill Riedel noted that they had a very successful meeting over the first two days of the week principally because of the opportunity for people from TRACOR and the subcommittee to interact and because of the valuable input from Marla Weston and Pat Diver. Because of the success of this meeting the Paleopeople can pass their results on to the steering committee.

A special request from the Smithsonian Institution. It wants to create a plate tectonics exhibit including a few archive halves showing sediments and rocks through the crust. After discussion the IHP forwards the following

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP recommends that PCOM permits the Smithsonian to display ODP samples in accordance with the stipulations that (1) the lender return samples to ODP if needed for study and (2) that the lender care for the samples using the same standards as ODP. Non-vital samples should be used where possible (out-of-context samples, wash cores, or triple hole APC cores where normal sampling rules don't apply).

Stratigraphic Database Center (SDBC)

Following a meeting with IHP in August 1994, the GEOMAR Research Center for Marine Geosciences in Kiel, FRG has put forward a detailed proposal for the establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center (SDBC). IHP has reviewed this proposal, which it considers to be of prime importance for collation and integration of present and future stratigraphic information obtained by Deep Sea Drilling. This effort will ensure that maximum use can be made of the drilling results after the Ocean Drilling Program ends. Thus, IHP forwards the following

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP requests that the PCOM more strongly endorse the establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center as the PCOM recommendation from the December meeting was too vague. The Establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center requires stronger statement of endorsement to find funding.

PCOM report: Will Sager explained the ship schedule and other matters of importance to IHP. Including the recommendations of the PCOM Publications Subcommittee

BRG liaison report was presented by Debra Barnes.

ODP Publications - The IHP thanks him for his years of service and dedication to ODP and wishes him well in his retirement. The recent literature search indicates that about 75% of citations are to the SR volume the rest are to the IR. Citations are reported from 138 journals. Annual citation rates compare well with those of comparable society-sponsored journals. Citation rate for ODP volumes has surpassed that of 96 DSDP volumes.

Special request - The IHP considered a special request from Steve Lewis that Leg 141 synthesis, published in outside literature, be recategorized as synthesis paper rather than "reprint." After discussion IHP voted to uphold the current policy with one dissenting vote. The table of contents will include under "syntheses" a reference to the reprints section to direct readers to the paper.

Curatorial report - Mato (see appendix 4): Changes will be made in sample-distribution policy to reflect the new Bremen repository and corrections to the MRC addresses and phone numbers. Mato requests permission to change the policy to request 5 copies of reprints from people receiving samples so that the Bremen repository can receive copies of reprints.

Computer database group (non-Janus) - Coyne (see appendix 5) The group is working on the data attribute list. The MST improvement is underway. Data corrections are proceeding at a steady state; keeping up with inflow. The group is waiting to see what comes from Tracor before making decisions about how to convert data to new database. The CD-ROM, must wait until all data are at

the same place before proceeding. Applications: FossilList is proceeding; Rocky and Etch-a-Sketch (VCD) development is on hold. Bremen Core Repository: lost programmer, looking for new one. VAX upgrade: bought new microvax; needed for S1032 which dictates operating environment until S1032 is retired; BCR system: core repositories are outside of Janus scope; Ship ops: placing more Sun stations on ship; upgrading Macs and PCs; replacing about 1/3 of Macs & PCs with Power PCs and Pentium PCs. Personnel: there have been problems filling database manager position and the group needs two - one for Janus (Oracle based) & one for ODP.

Next meetings: September 18-22 in Kona, Hawaii. February 26-28, 1996 in College Station.

PCOM Publications Subcommittee report - Sager presented the PCOM perspective on the budgetary constraints that prompted the recommendations of the subcommittee (see appendix 6).

Recommendation to PCOM: IHP recognizes that economies are possible in the publication process and that steps can be taken to enhance the scientific impact of ODP publications. Indeed, the panel supports many of the innovative approaches taken by the PCOM Publications Subcommittee. Nevertheless, the manner and depth of the proposed publications budget cuts are of grave concern. The Initial Reports and Scientific Results volumes are the program's scientific legacy to future generations of Earth scientists. Many of the proposed cost-saving recommendations can be enacted without great harm to this legacy, but to achieve the magnitude of savings mandated by PCOM, the PCOM Publications Subcommittee resorts to cuts that threaten the quality of ODP publications and will severely impair science onboard the ship. The present working system has developed through years of interaction among panels, but this delicate balance is now threatened. The IHP recommends, in particular, that PCOM reconsider the magnitude of the required cutback. IHP stresses that the ODP Publications department has provided for a \$300K cut as a consequence of the retirement of Bill Rose and the implementation of in-house composition of the IR and SR volumes. An additional approximate \$150-200K can be cut from the budget by length and format cuts in the IR and SR volumes following the recommendations of the PCOM Publications subcommittee. However the last required approximately \$100-150K impacts primarily the editing of materials produced onboard the ship and the production of related artwork. This reduction will severely impair the collection of prime data onboard the ship.

A Joint meeting with SMP focused on the following 4 topics:

- 1) ODP/TAMU depth Workshop: Peter Blum reported results of the depth conference of 21-22 January 1995. The group at the conference defined three different depth types: (1) drilling, (2) curation, and (3) logging, and recommended among other things that both the original depth datum and all algorithms for modifications be archived. IHP supports this recommendation. SMP supports the IHP recommendation that the shipboard party is overloaded as is and cannot be expected to do more without serious deleterious affect on the collection of prime data. Therefore the SMP agreed to support the IHP recommendation that the shipboard preparation of barrel sheets and production of full author prepared material for the IR not be pursued.
- 2) Proposal for a Database Commonality Meeting: Lynn Watney described the commonality meeting and asked for input regarding possible participants
- 3) DB Steering Committee: Terri Hagelberg described the report of the DB Steering Committee. Hagelberg presented lists of user groups it was suggested a structural person come from TECP.
- 4) JANUS: John Coyne presented the Current status of Janus. Group 1 data included in operational table (70 entries) - like dictionary. What remains to be included: known data types (paleomag, phys props, etc); Paleo - in process based on Paleo meeting 3/7; logging - research user input; VCD - being defined; Group 6 - further discussions (seismic, u/w, etc); Current draft data model covers essentials for group 1; Database report in progress and will include a model rationale and a versioning approach (sequential, concurrent). Things left to do: include known data types; complete database report; internal Tracor review of current draft model; Tracor/ODP model review; create database to support April 15 start of group 1 prototyping. The Data Base steering committee to

review data model in April. The application development approach that Janus will use is designed to minimize time by using dual databases

A description was presented: identify, isolate S1032 based applications; redirect data from application to Oracle; return for GUI improvements etc.; develop list of data dependent, independent applications; prioritization/development order based on (1) data dependencies (2) community input

The advantages of this approach was explained to be as follows: minimize time when S1032 and Oracle are operating simultaneously; less interim transition support methods to be developed; allow applications to be developed in parallel; eliminate S1032/Oracle data sharing; earlier in the program: (1) lessen backend distribution of data efforts (2) allow use of better tools, data methods

The activities planned for Janus are as follows: for the preliminary data model: (1) complete, (2) review, (3) load into Oracle; for applications: (1) identify according to approach used, (2) prepare application portion of transition plan; with regard to hardware environments: (1) prepare installation plan, (2) assemble development environments, (3) build sampling table prototype. The following miscellaneous aspects of the program were discussed: configuration of the management/version control processes; user review group processes; system and tool training; steering committee review.

Janus will begin prototyping April 15.

Rack proposal: Discussion of a Proposal from Frank Rack: the IHP notes that technology issues are the purview of the SMP, however it agrees that the coring of dedicated holes should be decided by the co-chiefs of Leg 162. As to the request for funds to support shore-based handling, storage and shipping PCOM is asking investigators to find extra funds for special projects themselves. The consensus of the panel is to say no to extra costs.

Minutes of the IHP Meeting

College Station, Texas, 8 March 1995

Members present:

Warner Brueckmann	Patrick Diver
Patricia Fryer, Chair	Ian Gibson
Brian Huber	Michael Loughridge
Gilbert Maudire	Carla Moore
William Riedel	Henry Spall
Geoff Wadge	Lynn Watney
Roy Wilkens	Tsuni Saito (alternate)

Guests

Michael Diepenbroek	DaRusty Lotti
Russ Merrill	Debra Barnes
John Saunders	Will Sager

The minutes of the last IHP meeting were approved as distributed.

Discussion of Action items

- Action item 8/94-1: A letter will be sent by the Chair to the Smithsonian to accession the MRC collection, with the proviso that collection be de-accessioned if ever the Smithsonian loses its ability to care for it and make it accessible to researchers. This will be done.
- Action item 8/94-2: Brian Huber will forward a letter to Cal. Acad. Sci., as Lead MRC Curator to permit California Academy of Science to become a semipermanent loan institution for the Scripps diatom collection. IHP authorizes Brian Huber to draft and send an agreement letter to the California Academy of Sciences for transfer of diatom collection from Scripps MRC; this letter would set out the same requirements as in the letter sent to the University of Nebraska. This was done.
- Action item 8/94-3: The Chair will write a letter thanking the Swiss Nationalfonds for their support of the Basel Museum Micropaleontological Reference Center. A letter was written and will be mailed when the address of the Nationalfonds is obtained.
- Action item 8/94-4: The IHP unanimously endorses the concept of publishing an announcement of opportunity for receipt of portions of MRC Collections that are currently underutilized as part of its continuing effort to get the collections where they will be better used. IHP authorizes Brian Huber and Bill Riedel to write a draft of such an advertisement and will circulate it to the panel for approval before looking into getting it published. This was done.
- Action item 8/94-5: Lynn Watney will pursue the possibility of organizing a data base commonality meeting. A proposal for such a commonality meeting was designed and a copy of the proposal has been distributed to the IHP for comment.
- Action item 8/94-6: The Chair will contact Brian Lewis to see whether Ian King of ATS (Calgary) would be welcome at a steering committee meeting to make such a presentation before things proceed too far with the database management upgrade. This was done however it was decided by the SC that Ian King would not attend the SC meeting.
- Action item 8/94-7: Ellen Thomas will send a letter to Lisa Patton thanking her for her efforts toward finalizing FossiList and prioritizing suggested changes. This was done.
- Action item 8/94-8: Volkhart Spiess will draft such a letter of endorsement for PCOM's consideration to be forwarded to the German, French and ESF PCOM representatives to take to the next PCOM meeting. This was done, however it is felt by IHP that a stronger endorsement is needed

by PCOM in order to facilitate possible funding by the FRG funding agencies. A recommendation will be made to PCOM to this effect. Warner Brueckmann will draft such a recommendation and present it to the IHP before the end of the meeting.

- Action item 8/94-9: Ellen will ask the chair of the Core-log integration subcommittee, Joris Gieskes, for a copy of the subcommittee report to send to IHP. This was done.

- Action item 8/94-10: IHP should notify (via listserv) the deep sea community about the planned delay of the IR volumes to defer expenditure of \$240,000; unless more money is found, this could lead to permanent demise of the IR volumes. Roy Wilkens and Lynn Watney will look into this. This was preempted by the decision of the PCOM NOT to delay the IR volumes.

- Action Item 8/94-11: A subcommittee chaired by Roy Wilkens will create a survey to assess the response of the community to the possibility of going to the outside literature rather than continuing to publish the SR volumes. This was pursued until the PCOM Publications Subcommittee was established and the actions of the subcommittee made this action item irrelevant.

- Action Item 8/94-12: Ellen Thomas suggested that someone from TECP present the points of information presented by Joann Stock at the next SMP meeting. If it is not possible for a liaison to attend the SMP meeting a written summary of the recommendations of TECP should be sent both to Ellen Thomas and to the SMP panel chair prior to the SMP meeting in late Sept. Terri Hagelberg did this.

- Action Item 8/94-13: IHP suggests that TECP prepare, in collaboration with SMP, a shipboard handbook for the collection of structural data, describing the set of procedures for collecting the data. TECP should also prepare a data dictionary for the structural data so that it can be incorporated into the new database structure. IHP notes that many of the TECP concerns regarding recording of structural data, and how this would be incorporated into the new computer database, including capturing images, annotation of data directly on images or overlays (etc) are similar to the concerns for recording paleontologic and stratigraphic data. Thus, TECP is not requesting anything unusual compared to the needs of scientists from other fields with regard to the redesigned database structure. This handbook was created.

- Action Item 8/94-14: IHP suggests that with regard to the new database structure TECP might look into getting a member of the TECP/Structural Geology Working Group onto one of the user groups that will be advising TAMU and the vendor as the database structure is designed. This was recommended by the SC.

- Action item 8/94-15: IHP requests that the NERC funding agency of the UK finance the travel and per diem costs of John Saunders for upcoming IHP meetings, as he adds valuable insight to many issues that come before the panel. Through the efforts of Geoff Wadge this was accomplished.

- Action item 8/94-16: IHP will draft a letter to Brian Lewis regarding the computer upgrade with an explanation of suggested relationships between the user groups liaisons, Steering Committee, and ODP/TAMU, and TRACOR. This was done and the recommendations were incorporated into the SC recommendations.

- Action item 8/94-17: Copies of these decisions will be forwarded to Brian Lewis as chair of the Steering Committee, and to John Coyne, TAMU, Joris Gieskes, Chair, SMP, Carla Moore, IHP liaison to ODP steering committee, Terri Hagelberg, SMP liaison to ODP steering committee.

Paleontology subcommittee report

Bill Riedel noted that they had a very successful meeting over the last two days principally because both people from TRACOR were there and because of the presence of Marla Weston and Pat Diver. Because of the success of this meeting the Paleopeople can pass their results on to the steering committee. During the last day the subcommittee was able to bridge the gulf between the desire on the part of shipboard scientists to limit the necessity to input detailed data on the ship and the desire to construct a detailed data base. Riedel explained work on a fossil description program

for the ship. He said it is hard to define minimum standard because of variation in recovery on different legs; high-recovery legs don't give time for in-depth description. He identified a problem in coding different description styles, e.g., lumpers vs. splitters. Tracor will work on this and make a prototype available to users. Pat Diver mentioned that program must have ability to add consistent detail onshore

Special request from Brian Huber on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution. Smithsonian wants to make plate tectonics exhibit including a few archive halves showing sediments and rocks through the crust. Sager suggested that IHP look at these requests on a case by case basis, but think carefully about good PR value. He also suggested that following conditions be met: (1) lendee return sample to ODP if needed for study and (2) that the lendee care for the cores with the same standards as ODP. Russ Merrill suggested that the problem is with the sample distribution policy which does not allow for lending except for scientific purposes. Other similar requests have been turned down. A policy decision or a case-by case treatment of such requests must be decided. Fryer suggested the principal concern is the maintenance of the core samples. She asked if there were comparable material not as important scientifically? Further discussion centered around non-vital cores that might fit request: (1) out-of-context samples, (2) wash cores, (3) triple hole APC (normal sampling rules don't apply). Sager suggested we have to consider each sample requested by Smithsonian separately. Wilkens moved that we approve all requested samples, except that we have to find an ooze sample that is not critical so that it may be dried out. The panel agreed by consensus to approve the request provided that suitable conditions of maintenance by the museum be met and that the lendee return the samples to ODP if needed for scientific purposes. Sager noted that the museum did not intend to provide for a refrigerated display. Riedel suggested that the samples do not have to be from the same site. Fryer suggested substituting some of the materials for those requested and that this should be worked out to the satisfaction of Russ Merrill.

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP recommends that PCOM permits the Smithsonian to display ODP samples in accordance with the stipulations that (1) the lendee return samples to ODP if needed for study and (2) that the lendee care for the samples using the same standards as ODP. Non-vital samples should be used where possible (out-of-context samples, wash cores, or triple hole APC cores where normal sampling rules don't apply).

Stratigraphic Database Center (SDBC)

Following a meeting with IHP in August 1994, the GEOMAR Research Center for Marine Geosciences in Kiel, FRG has put forward a detailed proposal for the establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center (SDBC) (see appendix 1).

IHP has reviewed this proposal which it considers to be of prime importance for collation and integration of present and future stratigraphic information obtained by Deep Sea Drilling. This effort will ensure that maximum use can be made of the drilling results after the Ocean Drilling Program ends. The panel feels that a very impressive offer that entails no cost for ODP has been made by GEOMAR and the high level, long-term commitment by this institution is an opportunity that should not be missed.

It is recognized that ODP is and will continue to be the repository of the primary (original) data. The SDBC will also include and integrate sample information from ODP, published literature sources as well as the MRCs. The SDBC will maintain close liaison with the taxonomic databases being prepared for several microfossil groups. It is understood that taxonomic revisions to the SDBC will involve the collective input of international groups of specialists. IHP believes that the group at GEOMAR has the necessary breadth of professional expertise and technical competence to carry out this program successfully. IHP recommends that close coordination between the SDBC and the ODP Database Upgrade Project (JANUS) be achieved by including a representative of GEOMAR in the Paleontology users group.

The University of Bremen has reaffirmed its interest in letter form and, should the SDBC be run from Kiel, it is expected that there would be close cooperation between the two institutions.

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP requests that the PCOM more strongly endorse the establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center as the PCOM recommendation from the December meeting was too vague. The Establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center requires stronger statement of endorsement to find funding.

PCOM report - Will Sager

The ship schedule for Legs 163-170 was presented to the IHP. The response to the IHP recommendations were to endorse all of the recommendations. Regarding the Boyce correction the PCOM endorses in principle IHP's wish to see the Boyce correction to GRAPE data on the future CD-ROMs, but not knowing the budgetary implications, decided the following: if it is not already being done, the Boyce correction should be made to future GRAPE data; if feasible, the correction should be applied to existing data before publication on future CD-ROMs; if not "READ ME" files or headers should be included to flag uncorrected data. The PCOM endorsed in principle the concept of specialized database centers. PCOM response to SMP recommendations were to upgrade the MST, and to develop "cook books" manuals for laboratories. PCOM notes SMP recommendation regarding utilization of existing commercial software for data capture and passes suggestion to Database Management Steering Committee. PCOM agrees with SMP consensus about acquisition of high quality XRF data and urges cooperation among technical staff and scientists. PCOM recognizes SMP concern about input to the Database Management Steering committee and recommends that JOI consider addition of non-US participants to committee and that committee increase email communication with Panel Chairs and PCOM. Database Recommendations were that PCOM reaffirms continued support for the replacement of the computer-based data management system and continued development of the DCS if judged feasible. PCOM recommends to JOI Inc. That they reaffirm and/or refine the mandate of the Data Base Management Steering Committee and that JOI Inc. take steps to insure that TAMU/TAMRF fully incorporate the Steering Committee into the DBMS project according to this mandate. PCOM will establish a Data Integration Working Group to oversee the development of a computer-based data integration capability. The membership should be constituted and the mandate drafted to assure that the working group works effectively with the JOI Steering Committee that is overseeing the development of the ODP Data Management System replacement project. PCOM Publications Subcommittee mandate was to investigate options for achieving 1/3 reduction in annual publications budget by FY 1998. The mandate also was to creatively restructure publications to expedite publication and enhance scientific impact. In response to the directives from the PCOM Publications Subcommittee ODP Publications found half the savings goal through moving composition in-house. this saves contractual costs (\$200K/yr). The retirement of Senior Manager Bill Rose without replacement (\$100K/yr). The remaining costs where to come from restructuring of the current publications formats for the IR and SR and from reduction in ODP editing of the volumes.

BRG liaison report - Debra Barnes (see appendix 2).

Have data up to Leg 157. Data requests have decreased to 1300 last year, probably owing to availability of CDs. The BRG are trying to backup original data on CD, but are having problem with FMS data in LIS format; still having to back that up on DAT. BRG have put out glossy booklet describing logging tools. Since December, they have had a World Wide Web home page and average 25-30 logins per week, eventually they want to have ASCII logging data online. This includes a USGS logging bibliography. The BRG page is slated to be more widely listed on Web to increase usage. Major upgrade of geoframe software (FMS processing).

TECP liaison - not attending; will reconsider the progress toward inclusion of structural data as prime data with SMP during joint session.

ODP Publications - Rose (see appendix 3)

Bill Rose announced that he will retire at the end of FY95. The IHP wants to thank him for his years of service and dedication to ODP and to wish him well in his retirement. Volumes are coming out on schedule and in part this is attributed to the establishment of the firm deadlines. The recent literature search indicates that about 75% of citations are to the SR volume the rest are to the IR. Citations are reported from 138 journals. Annual citation rates compare well with those of comparable society-sponsored journals. Citation rate for ODP volumes has surpassed that of 96 DSDP volumes.

The IHP raised the question of indexing of the volumes. It was explained that the in-house cost for making the index would be equivalent to 1 full-time position. We are currently using an outside contractor. Loughridge asked whether there are plans for a cumulative index. Merrill responded, no and that the cost to produce one would be about \$100K. Sager suggested that IHP consider recommending making an index if \$\$ could be found. The IHP agreed

Special request - The IHP considered a special request from Steve Lewis that Leg 141 synthesis, published in outside literature, be recategorized as synthesis paper rather than "reprint." After discussion IHP voted to uphold the current policy with one dissenting vote. The table of contents will include under "syntheses" a reference to the reprints section to direct readers to the paper.

Curatorial report - Mato (see appendix 4)

Changes will be made in sample-distribution policy to reflect the new Bremen repository and corrections to the MRC addresses and phone numbers. Mato requests permission to change the policy to request 5 copies of reprints from people receiving samples so that the Bremen repository can receive copies of reprints.

Computer database group (non-Janus) - Coyne (see appendix 5)

The group is working on the data attribute list. The MST improvement is underway. Data corrections are proceeding at a steady state; keeping up with inflow. The group is waiting to see what comes from Tracor before making decisions about how to convert data to new database; will be a big chore. With regard to the CD-ROM, the group is waiting until all data are at the same place before proceeding. There are limitations as a consequence of lack of student helpers. Data requests have stayed level with last 18 months

Applications: FossilList is going OK; Rocky development on hold because of discussion of what material and what level of detail of info to collect; Etch-a-Sketch (VCD) development on hold because (1) lost Mac programmer and (2) level of sophistication too high for ODP resources. SMP said to look at CAD programs, and Tracor is doing so, but the jury is still out on this suggestion. The Bremen Core Repository programs; lost programmer, but ODP looking for new one. With regard to the Computer/Network services: the VAX upgrade - bought new microvax; needed for S1032 which dictates operating environment until S1032 is retired; BCR system - core repositories are outside of Janus scope; Ship ops - placing more Sun stations on ship; upgrading Macs and PCs; replacing about 1/3 of Macs & PCs with PowerPCs and Pentium PCs With regard too personnel there have been problems filling database manager position and the group needs two - one for Janus (Oracle based) & one for ODP (lots of legacy work).

Next meetings: September 18-22 in Kona, Hawaii. February 26-28, 1996 in College Station.

PCOM Publications Subcommittee report - Sager presented the PCOM perspective on the budgetary constraints that prompted the recommendations of the subcommittee (see appendix 6).

Recommendation to PCOM: IHP recognizes that economies are possible in the publication process and that steps can be taken to enhance the scientific impact of ODP publications. Indeed, the panel supports many of the innovative approaches taken by the PCOM Publications Subcommittee. Nevertheless, the manner and depth of the proposed publications budget cuts are of grave concern. The Initial Reports and Scientific Results volumes are the program's scientific legacy to future generations of Earth scientists. Many of the proposed cost-saving recommendations can be enacted without great harm to this legacy, but to achieve the magnitude of savings mandated by PCOM, the subcommittee resorts to cuts that will severely impair science onboard the ship. The present working system has developed through years of interaction among panels, but this delicate balance is now threatened. IHP hopes that PCOM will consider these changes carefully before enacting them and proposes the changes listed in detail below.

Ann Klaus gave ODP view (see appendix 7). Although Bill Rose is retiring early, pubs notes that this won't save all the money because Bill's duties must still be covered. With regard to the IR volume the ODP editorial support is limited to printed pages. With regard to the SR volume this

will require camera-ready figures from scientists, "camera-ready" electronic text, will provide for no clean up of tables; no conversion to WP no PERC. The report doesn't address poor English papers-- more needed than help for papers that cannot be produced electronically and there is no provision for art review and clean up Pubs will bring indexing in-house, which will save \$200,000/yr. 4. Pubs comments: CD's not as inexpensive as represented; depends on level of work put into CD text preparations. the group had a brief discussion about pagination of text on CD: pubs says that ODP wants to retain normal page pagination; A suggestion from an IHP member was that traditional pagination is unnecessary, however others recognized that citation problems would ensue if pagination were different. this discussion was revisited later in the meeting. The "negotiation" of SR size was objected to by pubs because it is not viewed as good terminology; size cannot vary much, so there is little room for negotiation. The recommended level (20%) of editing required for the SR is probably low when English-language editing considered. The recommended desire to have "high resolution" images lacks a definition of what is "high" resolution. Pubs needs guidance on what goes in the "Summary" in IR volume IHP designated a subcommittee to define the contents of the Summary for the IR (Fryer, Sager, Wilkens, Wadge, Spall). Debbie Partain reviewed production of barrel sheets: ODP probably cannot produce barrel sheets with reduced staff. There is great potential for problems. Add to negative impacts "loss of quality control by ODP"

IHP Response to the recommendations of the PCOM Publications Subcommittee: The IHP recommends, in particular, that PCOM reconsider the magnitude of the required cutback. IHP stresses that the ODP Publications department has provided for a 300K cut as a consequence of the retirement of Bill Rose and the implementation of in-house composition of the IR and SR volumes. An additional approximate \$150-200K can be cut from the budget by length and format cuts in the IR and SR volumes. However the last required approximately \$100-150K impacts primarily the editing of materials produced onboard the ship and the production of related artwork. This reduction will severely impair the collection of prime data onboard the ship.

The IHP responded to each of the recommended changes as follows:

5.1.1. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications department should continue with implementation of in-house composition of the IR and SR volumes

5.1.2. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications department will need to be streamlined in a manner commensurate with progressive reduction in size and editing of the volumes. However, it feels that the publications department should be permitted to make changes in the staffing as it deems necessary and that it not be required to streamline management exclusively.

5.1.3. The IHP strongly disagrees with the recommendation that the editing at ODP/TAMU of the IR and drafting of the barrel sheets and other prime data be reduced and that the shipboard party be required to create author-prepared copy. The amount of work to accomplish this amounts to several man-months of effort for the ODP Publications staff. The Scientific Shipboard Party is widely recognized as already near its workload limit. Requiring the shipboard scientists to take on the job performed currently by the ODP Publications staff to create final author-prepared copy for the IR will result in a reduction of the collection of fundamental prime data by the program. IHP cannot in conscience condone this action.

5.1.4. The IHP agrees that the proposed reduction and reformatting of the barrel sheets and core photographs suggested will be acceptable.

5.1.5. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications should eliminate the distribution of the Preliminary Results in hard copy substituting electronic distribution via Mosaic and the InterNet.

5.1.6. The IHP agrees that the total length of the SR should be shortened by about 1/3 achieving an average volume length of about 500 pages. A strongly worded directive from PCOM to this effect was requested by ODP Publications to facilitate negotiations with co-chiefs during design of the SRs. The IHP also agrees that a change in the moratorium for submission of manuscripts to the outside literature will likely result in a reduction of the size of the SR volumes. IHP recommends that the ODP Policy on Publications be modified to permit submission for outside publication before

12-months post-cruise. This will also have consequences regarding what constitutes fulfillment of obligation to the ODP on the part of shipboard scientists. The IHP recommends that the ODP Publications policy be changed to state that, "Receipt by the deadline of a manuscript that is deemed by the ERB to be reviewable will fulfill the participant's obligation to the ODP,...." The IHP recognizes that this policy change will dilute the quality of SR volume contributions. Publications requires instructions as to what to do if an author submits poor manuscript to ODP and sends a better one outside. The IHP recommends that the ERB will decide upon 'reviewability' of manuscript; then author is free to publish in the outside literature. It should be clear that 'dual submission' is neither encouraged nor permitted. It should be noted that as a consequence of this policy change it is more likely that shipboard scientists will reject requests for samples by shorebased investigators because they won't want competition for SR space.

5.1.7. The IHP agrees that authors submitting to the SR should be required to submit author-produced copy in electronic format. However, in accordance with advice from ODP Publications IHP recommends that only those authors who require English language assistance will receive assistance from the ODP editing staff. Publications notes that this policy will require authors to encode page layout into manuscripts and there will be problems with table formatting, but publications will supply instructions for authors. This new policy will also require changes to the timing of request for revised copy from authors and IHP recommends that authors be given 6 weeks from the date the manuscript leaves ODP to get a revision post-marked for return to ODP. A question was raised as to whether we should allow an extra step for author-produced copy by permitting ERB members to review the manuscript before it returns to ODP. The consensus of the panel was no. Furthermore, the IHP recommends that should the ODP staff find any problems with formatting of a revised manuscript that the author be contacted by e-mail, fax, or phone and given two weeks (post-marked) only to submit a corrected version. If the author cannot be reached the ERB may be requested to assist in correction of the manuscript. If however, a corrected version of the manuscript is not received post-marked by two weeks from the date of contact the manuscript will be excluded from the SR. The IHP stresses that this will require a change in the scheduled publication date of the SR volume from the current 36 months to 38 months. These additional 2 months will come as a consequence of permitting an additional 3 weeks for revision and preparation of author-produced copy, two weeks contingency for correction of formatting problems, and a possible two to three weeks for delays in the post.

5.1.8. The IHP agrees that the print run for the ODP volumes should be reduced by providing copies to most panelists (except IHP) on CD ROM rather than in hard copy.

5.1.9. The IHP agrees that the total number of printed pages in the IR can be reduced to approximately 100 and that the core photographs and the barrel sheets would constitute the remainder of the printed volume. The full IR would be published on a CD ROM. The reduction in pages will require a careful examination of what should constitute the content of the printed IR. A subcommittee of the IHP was established to discuss the content via email (Fryer, Sager, Wilkens, Wadge, Spall) and report to the IHP before the next PCOM meeting (April 22).

5.1.10. The IHP disagrees with the subcommittee's priority given to reestablishment of the full site chapters if funds become available. The IHP recommends that the first priority for PCOM's consideration if funding should be available should be restoration of the editing and artwork required for support of the production of the barrel sheets and VCD's. The IHP notes that one cannot impose this load on shipboard scientists; therefore there are only two options either get rid of graphics entirely or leave the situation as is. The IHP notes that at the moment there are neither staff nor resources available to improve the barrel sheet software or production methodology.

Thursday 9 March
Joint meeting with SMP

ODP/TAMU depth Workshop: Peter Blum (see appendix 7) Peter Blum reported results of the depth conference of 21-22 January 1995. The group at the conference defined three different depth types: (1)

drilling, (2) curation, and (3) logging. The two main recommendations are related to the two depth types to be archived:

They suggested that all reference data based on drill string measurements, such as downhole or sea floor deployment of equipment, downhole measurements using the drill string, depth of core tops, and "bottom-felt" depth or mudline datum used to establish sea floor depth must be logged and archived as (D) mbsf. Logging data should be logged and archived as (L)mbsf. New depth data are (C)cmbsf, corrected depth below sea floor (from new corelog program) and (C)mcd, meters composite depth below seafloor, determined from study of multiple APC holes

Recommendation: shipboard depth-processed logging data should be archived along with the prime data and made available to the shipboard party without delay.

Recommendation: effort should be made to achieve as much shipboard log processing as possible, utilizing increased computing capacity; idea is to shorten turnaround between "preliminary" and "processed" log data.

Recommendation: conventional ODP procedure of establishing quasi-continuous depth scale by relating sample ID to corresponding core top datum in mbsf is adequate and useful as a quick depth reference; access to corrected depths must be made more quickly.

Recommendation: Users who integrate MSF data with split core data should be aware that core section segments (subsections) may move during splitting process and as a result, sample IDs measured and recorded by MSF may not match sample IDs.

Recommendation: Scientists should have only limited editing access to new Corelog to correct for changes taking place as a result of splitting and handling. This would mostly eliminate post-cruise Corelog changes. Ideally, Corelog data should be directly utilized in future core description template which would provide the most efficient means of checking and correcting Corelog data.

Recommendation: All rig floor depth data should be reported and archived consistently to the first decimal throughout shipboard calculations.

Recommendation: A modern, single, relational shipboard data base for all depth and related data is needed.

The question was asked whether depth corrections were mandatory. The answer was 'no'. The suggestion was made that we should not overlook the need for cross correlation of independently measured data sets, e.g., porosity vs. density; Hagleberg said perhaps that should be an individual scientist's decision, not SMP requirement; Blum said different scientists have different favorite routines; must have widely accepted method for this to be accepted

Discussion of the problem regarding editing and artwork support for the production of Barrel sheets and VCDs. SMP agrees that the shipboard party is overloaded as is and cannot be expected to do more without serious deleterious affect on the collection of prime data.

Specifically, with regard to the impact of PCOM Publications Subcommittee recommendations on SMP in terms of IR volume editing: Jamie Allan said that he has experienced no cruise that has been finished on the ship. T. Hagleberg said that on her hi-recovery legs that it was possible to finish with post-cruise meeting. Sager said that he is worried about lack of safety net for cruise that decides not to do the job. Huber said he is worried about reduction in quality; perhaps we should delete index instead; Sager said he did not like getting rid of index because we are unsure of archival nature of electronic copies. Gibson said he is worried that scientists have to take up reduced work load of making barrel sheets; Merrill said it normally takes 2-4 man months of time to do that work. Allan said that he is against moving printed pages to CD because CD are not archival. Sager said he is concerned that barrel sheets are prime data, but may be corrupted by lack of time and expertise. Gieskes says that slack should be taken up by having longer post-cruise meeting with more emphasis on barrel sheets

FossilList: John Firth Principal features of FossilList are to facilitate data entry (archiving) and manipulation. The objective is to have this available in version 1.0 for Leg 161. Any additional features will be added during the course of the JANUS project. John Firth demonstrated the program. Crashes of the program on the ship may have been caused by backing up the data with data fields open. A version of the program sailed on Leg 157 and the ODP staff are working on fixing bugs. One programmer has put 90% of her time into program; Firth has put 15% of his time into

program; The program is written in 4th Dimension relational database. The program will be next tested on Leg 161. They are now working to import Excel range charts into program

Proposal for a Database Commonality Meeting: Lynn Watney described the commonality meeting and asked for input regarding possible participants

DB Steering Committee: Terri Hagelberg described the report of the DB Steering Committee. Hagelberg presented lists of user groups it was suggested a structural person come from TECP.

JANUS: John Coyne presented the Current status of Janus. Group 1 data included in operational table (70 entries) - like dictionary. What remains to be included: known data types (paleomag, phys props, etc); Paleo - in process based on Paleo meeting 3/7; logging - research user input; VCD - being defined; Group 6 - further discussions (seismic, u/w, etc); Current draft data model covers essentials for group 1; Database report in progress and will include a model rationale and a versioning approach (sequential, concurrent). Things left to do: include known data types; complete database report; internal Tracor review of current draft model; Tracor/ODP model review; create database to support April 15 start of group 1 prototyping. The Data Base steering committee to review data model in April. The application development approach that Janus will use is designed to minimize time by using dual databases

A description was presented: identify, isolate S1032 based applications; redirect data from application to Oracle; return for GUI improvements etc.; develop list of data dependent, independent applications; prioritization/development order based on (1) data dependencies (2) community input

The advantages of this approach was explained to be as follows: minimize time when S1032 and Oracle are operating simultaneously; less interim transition support methods to be developed; allow applications to be developed in parallel; eliminate S1032/Oracle data sharing; earlier in the program: (1) lessen backend distribution of data efforts (2) allow use of better tools, data methods

The activities planned for Janus are as follows: for the preliminary data model: (1) complete, (2) review, (3) load into Oracle; for applications: (1) identify according to approach used, (2) prepare application portion of transition plan; with regard to hardware environments: (1) prepare installation plan, (2) assemble development environments, (3) build sampling table prototype. The following miscellaneous aspects of the program were discussed: configuration of the management/version control processes; user review group processes; system and tool training; steering committee review.

Janus will begin prototyping April 15.

II. Thursday P.M.

A discussion of the make up of user groups was held and generally approved by the IHP with a few suggestions for additional individuals to serve.

Continued a discussion of the PCOM Publications Subcommittee regarding the impact of the changes on the ODP publications .

Increasing Scientific Impact: The IHP notes with some concern the lack of acknowledgment in the report of the citation study summarized by Russ Merrill, however it agrees that the recommendations of the subcommittee for improvement are valid and endorses most of them. Thus the IHP suggests the following:

5.2.A. The IHP agrees with the recommendation to shorten the moratorium on outside publication of scientific papers to 12 months post-cruise. The implications for changes in the ODP publication policy were dealt with above.

5.2.B. The IHP agrees that the production of CD ROM's for the IR and SR volumes and distribution will enhance the visibility of the program. The possible cost of the CD's was discussed. The CD's of the volumes were suggested to be made available for somewhere between \$20 and \$35, with a half-price cost for students. A question arose whether we should charge libraries, however, there was no sentiment for changing the current policy of giving copies free to libraries. A request was made by T. Saito that the sale of the CD's (and the volumes) be permitted by credit card because the cost of certified checks is almost as much as the volumes or the proposed cost of the volume. IHP recommends that purchase by credit card be permitted.

5.2.C. The IHP agrees that it is appealing to make the IR and SR available on the Internet. Loughridge and Gibson warn that connectivity and bandwidth are problems with Internet access. Merrill noted that a stepwise approach can be taken and we can see what happens with Internet preliminary report effort. There is a resource issue associated with implementation and it will cost about \$25k/yr to do this and will require assistance from the Information Services (John Coyne's group), thus impacting that budget. With regard to publication of materials on the internet there was concern over the timing of publication of the volumes vs publication on the Internet. A suggestion was made that we should allow authors to deny publication of articles on Internet until the print version appears. Russ Merrill said we cannot allow a piecemeal approach because of significant problems with production. The problems of publication date and citability of the IR and SR volumes can be mitigated if the publication date of the electronic version is used as the official publication date. As this is permitted by paleontologic conventions the panel reached a consensus in agreement with using the date of electronic publication as the publication date for the printed volume as well. For the IR the timing will be almost coincidental because of the manner of production of the volume. The SR will probably be available in the electronic form several months before the printed version.

5.2.D. The IHP notes that the production schedule and flow of manuscripts suggested in 5.1.7. will in effect lengthen the total production schedule. It is recommended by IHP however that only 6 weeks be given to the authors for this purpose. This constitutes twice the current amount of time permitted rather the four times increase recommended by the subcommittee

**Friday morning
10 March 1995**

Rack proposal: Discussion of a Proposal from Frank Rack: the IHP notes that technology issues are the purview of the SMP, however it agrees that the coring of dedicated holes should be decided by the co-chiefs of Leg 162. As to the request for funds to support shore-based handling, storage and shipping PCOM is asking investigators to find extra funds for special projects themselves. The consensus of the panel is to say no to extra costs.

Publications discussions continued

The panel raised the question whether the index should continue to be produced. The consensus of the panel is strongly in favor as the index constitutes a major contribution to the legacy of the printed volume for the future.

5.2.E. The proposal that thematic synthesis volumes be encouraged was endorsed by the IHP. The panel agrees that making a salary available to prospective editors and the continuation of JOI funding for special workshops to encourage creation of such volumes is a good idea. The panel reached a consensus, however, that a special editorial board is not needed. It is likely only 1-2 thematic volumes will be produced per year and it is thought that providing salary for potential editors will be sufficient encouragement to potential editors to come forward from the scientific community.

5.2.F. The recommendation that ODP Publications provide high-resolution digital color core images was discussed. The problem IHP identified is with regard to the definition of high-resolution. What is needed is a cost-benefit analysis which is the purview of SMP. However the IHP suggests the establishment of an advisory subcommittee composed of Carla Moore, Debbie Barnes and Roy Wilkens from IHP and representatives of SMP to discuss via e-mail the possibility of acquiring the

recommended color digital imaging capability, defining the level of resolution possible/needed and advising ODP of their findings before the next IHP meeting (Sept. 1995).

The IHP addressed several questions raised by the ODP Publications staff. Regarding whether the post cruise meeting should be extended, the IHP recommends not burdening the shipboard scientists with the need to perform the work done on the barrel sheets currently done at ODP. The remaining work on text and figures takes several man-months of work at ODP. Therefore an extension to the post-cruise meeting may be needed if co-chief scientists do not demand a high level of finality for the shipboard text/figures. Members of the ODP publications staff asked what to do about editing the barrel sheets if no ODP capability is permitted by the budgetary cuts. Ian Gibson notes that one cannot impose this load on shipboard scientists; therefore there are only two options either get rid of graphics entirely or leave situation as is. The panel recommends that PCOM leave the situation as is.

The IHP was adjourned at 11:30 am on Friday, March 10, 1995.

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP recommends that PCOM permits the Smithsonian to display ODP samples in accordance with the stipulations that (1) the lendee return samples to ODP if needed for study and (2) that the lendee care for the samples using the same standards as ODP. Non-vital samples should be used where possible (out-of-context samples, wash cores, or triple hole APC cores where normal sampling rules don't apply).

Recommendation to PCOM: The IHP requests that the PCOM more strongly endorse the establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center as the PCOM recommendation from the December meeting was too vague. The Establishment of a Stratigraphic Database Center requires stronger statement of endorsement to find funding.

Principal IHP Recommendation to PCOM: IHP recognizes that economies are possible in the publication process and that steps can be taken to enhance the scientific impact of ODP publications. Indeed, the panel supports most of the innovative approaches taken by the PCOM Publications Subcommittee. Nevertheless, the manner and depth of the proposed publications budget cuts are of grave concern. The Initial Reports and Scientific Results volumes are the program's scientific legacy to future generations of Earth scientists. Many of the proposed cost-saving recommendations can be enacted without great harm to this legacy, but to achieve the magnitude of savings mandated by PCOM, the subcommittee resorts to cuts that will severely impair science onboard the ship. The present working system has developed through years of interaction among panels, but this delicate balance is now threatened. IHP hopes that PCOM will consider these changes carefully before enacting them and proposes the changes listed in detail on the attached pages.

The IHP recommends, in particular, that PCOM reconsider the magnitude of the required cutback. IHP stresses that the ODP Publications department has provided for a 300K cut as a consequence of the retirement of Bill Rose and the implementation of in-house composition of the IR and SR volumes. An additional approximate \$150-200K can be cut from the budget by length and format cuts in the IR and SR volumes. However the last required approximately \$100-150K impacts primarily the editing of materials produced onboard the ship and the production of related artwork. This reduction will severely impair the collection of prime data onboard the ship.

Detailed IHP Response to the recommendations of the PCOM Publications Subcommittee: The IHP responded to each of the recommended changes as follows:

5.1.1. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications department should continue with implementation of in-house composition of the IR and SR volumes

5.1.2. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications department will need to be streamlined in a manner commensurate with pregressive reduction in size and editing of the volumes. However, it feels that the publications department should be permitted to make changes in the staffing as it deems necessary and that it not be required to streamline management exclusively.

5.1.3. The IHP strongly disagrees with the recommendation that the editing at ODP/TAMU of the IR and drafting of the barrel sheets and other prome data be reduced and that the shipboard party be required to create author-prepared copy. The amount of work to accomplish this ammounts to several man-months of effort for the ODP Publications staff. The Scientific Shipboard Party is widely recognized as already near its workload limit. Requiring the shipboard scientists to take on the job performed currently by the ODP Publications staff to create final author-prepared copy for the IR will result in a reduction of the collection of fundamental prime data by the program. IHP cannot in conscience condone this action.

5.1.4. The IHP agrees that the proposed reduction and reformatting of the barrel sheets and core photographs suggested will be acceptable.

5.1.5. The IHP agrees that the ODP Publications should eliminate the distribution of the Preliminary Results in hard copy substituting electronic distribution via Mosaic and the InterNet.

5.1.6. The IHP agrees that the total length of the SR should be shortened by about 1/3 achieving an average volume length of about 500 pages. A strongly worded directive from PCOM to this effect was requested by ODP Publications to facilitate negotiations with co-chiefs during design of the SRs. The IHP also agrees that a change in the moratorium for submission of manuscripts to the outside literature will likely result in a reduction of the size of the SR volumes. IHP recommends that the ODP Policy on Publications be modified to permit submission for outside publication before 12-months post-cruise. This will also have consequences regarding what constitutes fulfillment of obligation to the ODP on the part of shipboard scientists. The IHP recommends that the ODP Publications policy be changed to state that, "Receipt by the deadline of a manuscript that is deemed by the ERB to be reviewable will fulfill the participant's obligation to the ODP,...." The IHP recognizes that this policy change will dilute the quality of SR volume contributions. Publications requires instructions as to what to do if an author submits poor manuscript to ODP and sends a better one outside. The IHP recommends that the ERB will decide upon 'reviewability' of manuscript; then author is free to publish in the outside literature. It should be clear that 'dual submission' is neither encouraged nor permitted. It should be noted that as a consewence of this policy change it is more likely that shipboard scientists will reject requests for samples by shorebased investigators because they won't want competition for SR space.

5.1.7. The IHP agrees that authors submitting to the SR should be required to submit author-produced copy in electronic format. However, in accordance with advice from ODP Publications IHP recommends that only those authors who require english language assistance will receive assistance from the odp editing staff. Publications notes that this policy will require authors to encode page layout into manuscripts and there will be problems with table formatting, but publications will supply instructions for authors. This new policy will also require changes to the timing of request for revised copy from authors and IHP recommends that authors be given 6 weeks from the date the manuscript leaves ODP to get a revision post-marked for return ot ODP. A question was raised as to whether we should allow an extra step for author-produced copy by permitting ERB members to review the manuscript before it returns to ODP. The consensus of the panel was no. Furthermore, the IHP recommends that should the ODP staff find any problems with formatting of a revised manuscript that the author be contacted by e-mail, fax, or phone and given two weeks (post-marked) only to submit a corrected version. If the author cannot be reached the ERB may be requested toa ssist in correction of the manuscript. If however, a corrected version of the manuscript is not received post-marked by two weeks from the date of contact the manuscript will be excluded from the SR. The IHP stresses that this will require a change in the scheduled publicatin date of the SR volume from the current 36 months to 38 months. These adidtional 2 months will come as a consequence of permitting an additional 3 weeks for revision and preparation of author-produced copy, two weeks contingency for correction of formatting problems, and a possible two to three weeks for delays in the post.

5.1.8. The IHP agrees that the print run for the ODP volumes should be reduced by providing copies to most panelists (except IHP) on CD Rom rather than in hard copy.

5.1.9. The IHP agrees that the total number of printed pages in the IR can be reduced to approximately 100 and that the core photographs and the barrel sheets would constitute the remainder of the printed volume. The full IR would be published on a CD Rom. The reduction in pages will require a careful examination of what should constitute the content of the printed IR. A subcommittee of the IHP was established to discuss the content via email (Fryer, Sager, Wilkens, Wadge, Spall) and report to the IHP before the next PCOM meeting (April 22).

5.1.10. The IHP disagrees with the subcommittee's priority given to reestablishment of the full site chapters if funds become available. The IHP recommends that the first priority for PCOM's consideration if funding should be available should be restoration of the editing and artwork required for support of the production of the barrel sheets and VCD's. The IHP notes that one cannot impose this load on shipboard scientists; therefore there are only two options either get rid of graphics entirely or leave the situation as is. The IHP notes that at the moment there are neither staff nor resources available to improve the barrel sheet software or production methodology.

Discussion of the problem regarding editing and artwork support for the production of Barrel sheets and VCDs. SMP agrees that the shipboard party is overloaded as is and cannot be expected to do more without serious deleterious affect on the collection of prime data.

Specifically, with regard to the impact of PubSubCom recommendations on SMP in terms of IR volume editing: Jamie Allan said that he has experienced no cruise that has been finished on the ship. T. Hagleberg said that on her hi-recovery legs that it was possible to finish with post-cruise meeting. Sager said that he is worried about lack of safety net for cruise that decides not to do the job. Huber said he is worried about reduction in quality; perhaps we should delete index instead; Sager said he did not like getting rid of index because we are unsure of archival nature of electronic copies. Gibson said he is worried that scientists have to take up reduced work load of making barrel sheets; Merrill said it normally takes 2-4 man months of time to do that work. Allan said that he is against moving printed pages to CD because CD are not archival. Sager said he is concerned that barrel sheets are prime data, but may be corrupted by lack of time and expertise. Gieskes says that slack should be taken up by having longer post-cruise meeting with more emphasis on barrel sheets

Increasing Scientific Impact: The IHP notes with some concern the lack of acknowledgment in the report of the citation study summarized by Russ Merrill, however it agrees that the recommendations of the subcommittee for improvement are valid and endorses most of them. Thus the IHP suggests the following:

5.2.A. The IHP agrees with the recommendation to shorten the moratorium on outside publication of scientific papers to 12 months post-cruise. The implications for changes in the IDP publication policy were dealt with above.

5.2.B. The IHP agrees that the production of CD Roms for the IR and SR volumes and distribution will enhance the visibility of the program. The possible cost of the CD's was discussed. The CD's of the volumes were suggested to be made available for somewhere between \$20 and \$35, with a half-price cost for students. A question arose whether we should charge libraries, however, there was no sentiment for changing the current policy of giving copies free to libraries. A request was made by T. Saito that the sale of the CD's (and the volumes) be permitted by credit card because the cost of certified checks is almost as much as the volumes or the proposed cost of the volume. IHP recommends that purchase by credit card be permitted.

5.2.C. The IHP agrees that it is appealing to make the IR and SR available on the Internet. Loughridge and Gibson warn that connectivity and bandwidth are problems with Internet access. Merrill noted that a stepwise approach can be taken and we can see what happens with Internet preliminary report effort. There is a resource issue associated with implementation and it will cost about \$25k/yr to do this and will require assistance from the Information Services (John Coyne's group), thus impacting that budget. With regard to publication of materials on the internet there was concern over the timing of publication of the volumes vs publication on the Internet. A suggestion was made that we should allow authors to deny publication of articles on Internet until the print version appears. Russ Merrill said we cannot allow a piecemeal approach because of significant problems with production. The problems of publication date and citability of the IR and SR volumes can be mitigated if the publication date of the electronic version is used as the official publication

date. As this is permitted by paleontologic conventions the panel reached a consensus in agreement with using the date of electronic publication as the publication date for the printed volume as well. For the IR the timing will be almost coincidental because of the manner of production of the volume. The SR will probably be available in the electronic form several months before the printed version.

5.2.D. The IHP notes that the production schedule and flow of manuscripts suggested in 5.1.7. will in effect lengthen the total production schedule. It is recommended by IHP however that only 6 weeks be given to the authors for this purpose. This constitutes twice the current amount of time permitted rather the four times increase recommended by the subcommittee

The panel raised the question whether the index should continue to be produced. The consensus of the panel is strongly in favor as the index constitutes a major contribution to the legacy of the printed volume for the future.

5.2.E. The proposal that thematic synthesis volumes be encouraged was endorsed by the IHP. The panel agrees that making a salary available to prospective editors and the continuation of JOI funding for special workshops to encourage creation of such volumes is a good idea. The panel reached a consensus, however, that a special editorial board is not needed. It is likely only 1-2 thematic volumes will be produced per year and it is thought that providing salary for potential editors will be sufficient encouragement to potential editors to come forward from the scientific community.

5.2.F. The recommendation that ODP Publications provide high-resolution digital color core images was discussed. The problem IHP identified is with regard to the definition of high-resolution. What is needed is a cost-benefit analysis which is the purview of SMP. However the IHP suggests the establishment of an advisory subcommittee composed of Carla Moore, Debbie Barnes and Roy Wilkens from IHP and representatives of SMP to discuss via e-mail the possibility of acquiring the recommended color digital imaging capability, defining the level of resolution possible/needed and advising ODP of their findings before the next IHP meeting (Sept. 1995).

The IHP addressed several questions raised by the ODP Publications staff. Regarding whether the post cruise meeting should be extended, the IHP recommends not burdening the shipboard scientists with the need to perform the work done on the barrel sheets currently done at ODP. The remaining work on text and figures takes several man-months of work at ODP. Therefore an extension to the post-cruise meeting may be needed if co-chief scientists do not demand a high level of finality for the shipboard text/figures. Members of the ODP publications staff asked what to do about editing the barrel sheets if no ODP capability is permitted by the budgetary cuts. Ian Gibson notes that one cannot impose this load on shipboard scientists; therefore there are only two options either get rid of graphics entirely or leave situation as is. The panel recommends that PCOM leave the situation as is.