EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
OF THE SPRING 1996 IHP MEETING

The principal topics for discussion at the Feb./Mar. IHP meeting were problems regarding ODP publications and matters concerning the JANUS project and associated matters. The greatest concern of the panel is over the potential elimination of ODP publications. Jeff Fox briefed the IHP regarding EXCOM's Long Range Plan recommendations. The IHP supports the LRP and the recommendation of EXCOM to review the program budget in an effort to continue the ODP past 1998. IHP expressed concern over the mechanism for continued dissemination of scientific results of the program, hence its PCOM Recommendation 1 attached.

Discussion regarding the Information Services and the data migration plan prompted PCOM Recommendations 2 and 3. (attached).

Concern over aspects of curation particularly the increase in sample requests at ODP prompted PCOM Recommendation 4. Because of the increased number of dedicated holes and of the need for whole rounds for special projects (all a function of implementation of the LRP) the IHP will be revising in consultation with the Curator the sampling policy for ODP.

Other business of the panel encompassed the following:

The IHP reviewed recent developments at the Borehole Research group and noted the advances including ongoing projects for redesign of CD-ROM and home page and development of software packages (Dimage, CLIP and SLIP, BHTViewer (digitization of televiewer borehole images), WST data in SEG-Y format. It also noted the improvements in databases.

After discussions of Digital Image Formats IHP proposes that ODP scan 4'5 transparencies (of whole core) at 1100 dpi, and scan portions of core at 300 dpi. The purchase of a scanner that can produce these files efficiently be strongly endorsed.

In response to concern over what element of the publications should be cut back, IHP proposes that ODP reduce the hard-copy distribution of the Scientific Prospectus and Preliminary Report to four copies per ODP office. ODP should continue to distribute the publication on the Web. If members of the community need a hard copy of a report, they should request one from their ODP office or from ODP/TAMU Publications Department. Technical notes (about 1 per years) should be continued with a limited hard copy distribution depending on needs of group and contents of note, but also put these on the WWW. The panel supports the publication of The Cenozoic Radiolarian Report by Sanfilippo/Nigrini

The IHP discussed the nature of what data should continue to be considered "prime data" and suggests that the definition remain the same (including thin section descriptions and smear slide tables) and that smear slides and thin section tables continue to be included in the prime data section of the book when the new format IR is initiated.

The Panel received an SR Format Update and a new SR schedule. ODP/TAMU is concerned about the potential problem that may occur if the deadline for the initial submission of synthesis papers is before that for the revised submission of specialty papers. The IHP has several action items aimed at addressing this problem. there is also a problem with regard to the SR publication deadlines. During last 6 months requests for 2-3 month extensions to deadlines have come from 151, 157, and 162 co-chiefs. After due consideration the consensus of the IHP is that the panel should back up publication deadlines, and not grant exceptions (particularly if the extension recommended by PCOM [initial submission at 24 months] is put in place). Thus, IHP proposes SR publication deadlines and should be fixed regardless of pleas from shipboard authors or co-chiefs and the program (through IHP) should back up Publications Manager when deadline extension requests are refused.

The IHP received a TRACOR report, the results of Leg 165 from Jerry Burke, and a demonstration by Glenn Corser. The latter focused on "Corelog" and "Sampling." The progress and plans fro JANUS were described by Jerry Burke. Of particular concern were the potential options for Core description. It was recognized that there is a need to see if contract with Tracor can be extended. The panel felt

the Steering Committee should come up with a plan to present to BCOM to provide funds to continue JANUS. Need more concrete costs from Tracor for the extension of the project. The panel expressed concern over who would handle post-JANUS changes, but recognized that this would be up to the Steering Committee.

Several other items were discussed including disposition of cores requested for display and the IHP proposes that any ODP cores provided for display purposes be treated following the policy set for the display at the Smithsonian Museum. Disposition of new and existing MRCs was discussed and IHP endorses the creation of a satellite MRC at the Bremen Core Repository to include foraminifera and radiolarian samples that would be shipped from the Lamont MRC. Details of transfer and guidelines should be worked out by Pal/Strat subcommittee. IHP proposes: IHP endorse the creation of a satellite MRC at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro to include foraminifera samples that would be shipped from the Scripps MRC. Details of transfer and guidelines should be worked out by Pal/Strat subcommittee. The panel suggested that Brian Huber send reports about MRC's to NSF. With regard to the Moscow MRC, the IHP suggests that Huber requests the curator of the Moscow MRC to send a report of MRC activities since its inception. The IHP will reexamine the situation if there is continued inactivity and lack of institutional support.

The panel reviewed potential non-performers and a particular case regarding complaints from shipboard scientists with respect to accusations of breach of ODP publication policy and possible breach of ethical scientific practices by a shipboard scientist.

The next IHP meeting was proposed for Kiel, Germany. It is to be hosted by W. Brueckmann and held on 11-13 September with a Pal/Strat subcommittee meeting on 9-10 September.

IHP RECOMMENDATIONS TO PCOM

MARCH, 1996

Recommendation 1.: In its motion 96-1-14, EXCOM states the desire to estimate the costs of existing components of ODP and to consider ending some to accommodate new initiatives. Listed first among the targeted components is publications. Although IHP is sympathetic to the desire on the part of EXCOM, PCOM, and BCOM to pursue the innovations outlined in the LRP and although the panel accepts the need to reexamine budgets given a tight fiscal environment; nevertheless, IHP wishes to stress that the Program has accepted the fundamental obligation shared by all scientists--to publish. IHP reminds PCOM that the Program has entered an ethical contract with scientists who have sailed on ODP cruises (and whose publications will appear as much as three years hence) to publish their work. What is more, IHP is appalled at the prospect of ODP merely collecting and archiving data and cores without disseminating results. Furthermore, the panel cannot foresee how a 2.5% increase in the budget for innovations can make the Program more successful without a mechanism for disseminating the results of those innovations. No scientific funding agency would consider allocating research funds merely to
collect data. Therefore, IHP maintains that the publication of results must remain an integral part of the Program, else the Program will perish.

Believing the discontinuation of ODP publications would be disastrous for the program, IHP requests PCOM take a proactive stance and oppose any effort to end publications. Although IHP cautions that insufficient time has elapsed to see the effects of recent sweeping changes in publications, the panel believes that publications can benefit from continuing efforts at improvement. Therefore, IHP further recommends that the IHP/PCOM Publications Subcommittee be reinvigorated and asked to assist PCOM in finding innovative solutions to publications problems.

Recommendation 2. : IHP urges PCOM/BCOM to find the resources to complete the JANUS project as presently defined.

Recommendation 3.: IHP recommends that PCOM urge EXCOM proceed with the intended migration of existing DSDP and ODP data into the JANUS database, capitalizing on the recent large investment in JANUS development. Realizing that completion of the entire migration will be expensive and lengthy, IHP feels that there is a large subset of the data that can be rapidly and inexpensively migrated with the help of experts within the scientific community. Such readily migratable data sets include MST data which have been collected in electronic form by the previous database system. IHP recommends that PCOM urge JOI to issue an RFP for data migration projects.

Recommendation 4.: IHP recommends that PCOM urge BCOM not to accept the Science Operator's proposed budget reduction item eliminating the annual core maintenance effort (summer work force, approximately $50,000 annually). The present level of maintenance is the minimum acceptable to the panel, because dehydration damage is irreversible. Shrinkage impacts the scientific utility of the collection for high-resolution stratigraphic studies. Given the LRP's emphasis on the increasing importance of these studies to the Program, this particular cut appears to be an unwise choice.

SPRING 1996 IHP MEETING - Draft Minutes
28 February-1 March 1996

Panel Members in Attendance: Bill Riedel (Acting Chairman), Yoshiaka Aita, Warner Brueckman, Patrick Diver, Graham Glenn, Brian Huber, Bjorn Malmgren, Carla Moore, Henry Spall, Lynn Watney, Roy Wilkens

Liaisons & Guests: Lucy Edwards, Ian Gibson, Ann Klaus, Russ Merrill, Mary Reagan, William Sager, Phil Weaver, Annika Sanfilippo

Miscellaneous attendees from ODP/TAMU and Tracor: Jerry Burke (Tracor), John Beck (Publications), Glenn Corser (Tracor), Gigi Delgado (Publications), Kenneth Emery (IS), Jack Foster (IS), Jennifer Hall (Publications), Chris Mato (Curation), Rakesh Mithal (IS), Alexandra Moreno (IS), Gil Munoz (IS), Debbie Partain (Publications), Kathy Phillips (Publications), Aaron Woods (Public Information)

I. Approval of minutes of September 1995 IHP meeting

II. Report of action items

A. MRC home page and listserver discussion group are up and running.

B. IHP listserver and home page up and running.
-issue of whether or not the home page should be linked to ODP home page.
*suggestion to make home page public and linked to ODP home page, but a password would be needed to access listserver archives.
*add minutes in simple ASCII format and other pertinent documents to home page.
*responses to home page would be channeled through IHP chairman to listserver.

C. Purchase of scanner for ODP was supported by PCOM and JOI has given their verbal approval if ODP can find the funds to cover the cost of the purchase.

D. PCOM approved increase of ODP volume price to $60.

III. EXCOM's Long Range Plan recommendations (Jeff Fox)

A. LRP is very good, positive response regarding support for continuation of ODP past 1998.

B. Recommendations
1. Focus resources on finite themes and issues.
2. Redefining the program: support for innovative new technologies (e.g., JANUS, logging techniques), but these must be carefully prioritized given tight financial constraints.
3. Drilling proposals must be evaluated in the context of the LRP and should clearly identify how each leg contributes to the LRP goals.
4. Open up competition for specific services for Wireline Logging Services and Site Survey Data Bank Services to ODP.
-includes review of tasks taken on by ODP/TAMU such as phase II of JANUS. 5. Consideration of what components of ODP might be dropped or reduced (including publications, logging, and all other components) to enable development of new components that address high priority LRP goals.
* publications about 6% of total ODP/TAMU budget. (Actual: 5.93% of ODP/TAMU base budget; 4.82% of total Program budget.).

C. ODP action: Detailed review of what services cost and what could be cut to allow the rest of the program to survive.
-major step function in funding is needed to advance to next level.
-things are moving rapidly; PCOM directed to provide strategy for EXCOM review by June 1996.

D. Prospective new members: Brazil, Russia, China (endorsed at highest level initial 1/3 membership, but slow process because of large diplomatic bureaucracy), South Korea (possible fractional level), and Taiwan (stepped back for present).

E. IHP response--question of whether or not IHP recommendations would be listened to.
1. First order recommendation to preserve the SR volume.
2. Second order recommendation for how ODP could respond to mitigate negative consequences.

F. Beyond 2003, LRP supports idea of 2 platforms for drilling.

IV. Other ODP Operations News (Jeff Fox)

A. JOIDES Resolution Upgrade: Presently contract with SEDCO/FOREX is 2-3 times less expensive than other platforms of that kind, so should stay with that contract beyond 2003.
1. Enhancements to ship operations.
2. Enhancements to science done on the ship.
-request for prioritization of upgrades (esp. those w/ good cost-benefit ratio).

B. Semi-annual report: a "living document" on web page and as hard copy to provide focused, coherent message to user community published twice a year before EXCOM/PCOM meetings.

V. BRG Report (Mary Reagan) (Handout)

A. Ongoing Projects
1. Redesign of CD-ROM and home page
2. Software packages
   a. Dimage
   b. CLIP and SLIP
   c. BHTViewer (digitization of televiewer borehole images)
   d. WST data in SEG-Y format

B. Databases
1. On-line catalog for logging search data.
2. Oracle database, accessibility from WWW, development of a management plan.
3. Data migration of historical log database to be accomplished in three stages.

VI. ODP Curation Report (Chris Mato)

A. Overview of curatorial functions

B. Core repository report
1. BCR filled space orig. intended to last 5 years in 1.5 yr.
2. Visitation
a. Sample requests have increased for ship, leveled out at WCR, dropped at GCR and ECR, increased at BCR.
b. 68% increase in last 10 years, staffing (esp. students at GCR) recently cut.
-fewer visitor services, longer turn around time for sample requests.

C. Staffing and core maintenance
1. Re-wetting of sponges a constant process: need to find ways to streamline.
2. Summer work force and supplies is ~$50,000.
3. Loss of student to handle recall effort to keep inventory of thin section. PCOM

PCOM Recommendation: IHP recommends that PCOM urge BCOM not to accept the Science Operator's proposed budget reduction item eliminating the annual core maintenance effort (summer work force, approximately $50,000 annually). The present level of maintenance is the minimum acceptable to the panel, because dehydration damage is irreversible. Shrinkage impacts the scientific utility of the collection for high-resolution stratigraphic studies. Given the LRP's emphasis on the increasing importance of these studies to the Program, this particular cut appears to be an unwise choice.

D. Composite depths -dedicated holes no longer working because of recovery of unique intervals.
*large number of U-channel requests; need a new policy drafted.

E. WWW: sample request forms available on ODP home page.

F. In FY 97 ODP will be less well-equipped to support sampling parties unless SOE is funded.
-staffing cuts will strongly limit what can be done.
-possibly 3-4 per year, cost up to $15,000 each ($30,000 estimated for FY 97)
**IHP requested that Mato draft a set of recommendations for IHP to review. Mato to send an e-mail with a rewritten composite depth policy --Riedel will include in the minutes. Note: on 3/1 the panel decided not to submit a formal motion to IHP concerning this money. Later, they decided that this activity was "less necessary" than other financially constrained issues that would be addressed.

G. BCR working well; ODP needed to augment 1/2-FTE for supervisory position.

IX. PCOM Liaison Report (Will Sager)
A. NSF likely to remain level funded; ODP target budget $44.9M.

B. Aus-Can consortium not filled, NSF reduced budget by $0.5M. -reductions: JOI $40k, TAMU $400k, BRG $60k.

C. New member possibilities: Taiwan, Korea, Russia, Brazil, and China for 1/3 or 1/6

D. TAMU
1. Leg 162 record core recovery of 6.7 km overtaxed staff and overfilled reefer; Bremen repository now full.
2. Leg 163: five serious safety events; 27 days lost. Part of fallout is new guidelines:
(1) no drilling in water shallower than 75 m;
(2) special conditions for drilling in water 75-1000 m;
(3) only 1 high latitude leg/year;
(4) need to purchase shear-ram quick release for safety.

E. TECP: not happy with proposed reductions in IR volume.

F. SGPP: wanted reprints of articles published in outside literature reproduced in volumes, but just titles and abstracts will be likely.

G. SSP: worried that new IR volume will not have room for publication of underway geophysical data and feels that this data should be published if possible.

H. Long Range Plan
1. PCOM and EXCOM have essentially finished document; for selling program 1998+.
2. Gives guidelines for science and technological needs in Phase III (1998-2003 and Phase IV (2003+).
3. Phase IV is two-platform scenario with one ship having riser capability.
4. Main focus areas
   a. Dynamics of the Earth's Environment.
   b. Dynamics of the Earth's Interior.
5. FY 1997 operations schedule
6. PCOM motions
   a. IR volume motions accepted with some qualifications.
   b. SR volume motions: increase time post-cruise from 18 to 24 months to maximize data production and analysis and synthesize results.
   c. Deadline for revision of manuscripts following their initial acceptance will be increased to 10 weeks upon receipt by the first author.
   d. 4 weeks added for formatting of manuscripts by authors.
   e. Final SR volume distributed 45 months post-cruise. -JOI is concerned about ramifications of this motion.
      i. funding extension to U.S. scientists.
      ii. release of the moratorium. -in practice there is a 2 year moratorium presently in place.
   f. moratorium of 12 months post-cruise still in place.
7. Discussion on what proactive measures IHP should take. -Riedel suggests IHP/PCOM should form a Pubs subcommittee with one PCOM and one EXCOM member (Sager and Beiersdorf?).

X. Next IHP Meeting: Kiel, hosted by W. Brueckmann.
9-10 September -- Paleo Group
11-13 September -- IHP

XI. Digital Image Formats (Jennifer Hall)
A. TIFF images use a lot of memory; scan of core table transparency at 1100 dpi = 60 megabytes, whereas 300 dpi = 9 megabytes.

B. PDF format compresses 1100 dpi at 60 mega. to 4.5 mega. with minor loss of resolution.

C. JPEG compression algorithm apparently quite good.
Discussion:
-Riedel thought 300 dpi was good enough.
-To meet the needs of publication the 1100 dpi file image works well as a compressed image and the original 1100 dpi file can be stored for scientific work.
-Wilkens said the 1100 dpi method would be very expensive for a high recovery leg.
-Weaver said it would improve the quality of the data that scientists can get from ODP. Currently one can only get color transparencies.
-Loughridge said the overall process can be managed to control cost. Need to be careful of science needs and make sure it fulfilled them (whatever the choice).
-Klaus suggested that the lower resolution be used for scientists to do a preliminary analysis and later can request a high quality color image.
-Merrill stated that the process (Klaus suggestion) would take longer to send requests. -Consensus: to do 1100 dpi scanning for 4'5 transparencies.

IHP proposes:
1. ODP scan 4'5 transparencies (of whole core) at 1100 dpi, and scan portions of core at 300 dpi.
2. The purchase of a scanner that can produce these files efficiently be strongly endorsed.

XII. ODP Draft Budget FY97 (handout) (Russ Merrill)
A. PPI increases very fast; additional $360,000/year extra has to go to SEDCO.

B. Salaries will increase by only 1%/year, when normally given at least 2%/year.

C. $6-7M is left discretionary funds; where increases are absorbed.

D. Information Services Group's budget went up artificially from FY95 to FY96 with the transfer of MCS' from Logistics (payroll, travel, training etc.) and the addition of two new positions to support post-JANUS (manage database).

E. Special Operating Expenses are separate from the total budget.

F. To meet flat budget have had to eliminate projects and functions i.e., summer work force team in repositories, reduce student population -- refer to Tier 1 in handout. Tier2 (handout) is what can be offered if more items need to be cut.

G. Discussion evolved around saving money by cutting back on travel for panel meetings, but many commented that this would not bring money back for the program because many travel budgets are paid partly by other institutions. Need to use e-mail and list server.
-Sager and Loughridge say they barely have time to read e-mail -- would rather meet face to face.
-Brueckman asked about the $63,087 in the budget for WWW publications.
-Merrill explained that ODP wanted to go professional with a home page and were hiring someone specifically for that. Web technology growing fast, IHP should start looking at web page as an ODP publication.

H. Solution: release of Tier 1 and Tier 2 services; begin to cut at core services.
-Wilkens suggests that more meetings be held at College Station and reduce to 1 meeting per 9 months (much could be done through e-mail, listserver).
-Weaver said that there may be a significant change in panel structure that may affect this anyway.

XIII. Information Services (Russ Merrill)
See Information Services handout for departmental progress.

A. Data migration plan (in IS report): preferred plan is to contract this outside rather than having it done at ODP.
-project very large; ODP and DSDP data in a variety of formats. Not a part of JANUS.
-effort to share the pie for program development. -ideal for another science-research program to do it. They would understand the field.
- Gibson thought it would be good to have several institutions handle separate pieces and one managing institution to guide (make it get done the fastest).
-Wilkens said other institutions would fund half the salaries and other items.
-Merrill stated that certain guidance would have to come from ODP/TAMU. This project bigger than JANUS project.
-Merrill said the project is a cost choice (if you fund this you won't fund something else).
-Gibson: the investment into JANUS will not be utilized fully if older data not migrated.
-estimated cost of $2.4M for 3 years.

PCOM Recommendation: IHP recommends that PCOM urge EXCOM proceed with the intended migration of existing DSDP and ODP data into the JANUS database, capitalizing on the recent large investment in JANUS development. Realizing that completion of the entire migration will be expensive and lengthy, IHP feels that there is a large subset of the data that can be rapidly and inexpensively migrated with the help of experts within the scientific community. Such readily migratable data sets include MST data which have been collected in electronic form by the previous database system. IHP recommends that PCOM urge JOI to issue an RFP for data migration projects.

XIV. Publications (Ann Klaus) (Handouts)
A. Demonstration of ODP home page and new CD-ROM material.
1. CD: Viewable volume CDs in print IR--151, 156, 157, 158; SR--146-1, 146-2.
2. ODP considers Web publications as formal publications that will be designed and edited by the Publications Department. IS will manage the server.

B. Review of report sent to Panel members before the meeting:
1. FY 95: 11 books/ 14 leg-related volumes published: IR--150, 150X, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156. SR--137/140, 138, 141, 142/143. FY 96: 9 books so far: IR--157, 158 (to press Nov, Feb., 159, 160 (to printer in March.SR--146-2 (Oct), 145 (Nov), 144, 146-1 (Dec., 148 (at printer, distribution in April) Also: 147 and 149 about to go to printer.
2. 4 of last 5 SR volumes closed one month after original closing deadline.
3. Correction to report: 144 SR = 39 months post-cruise, not 46 months post-cruise.
4. 155 SR deadlines were originally set one month short. ODP has corrected their error and notified contributors of the schedule change.

C. Exchange with Antarctic Marine Geology Research Facility (Tom Janacek).
1. Offer to supply their publications to MRCs for exchange of ODP publications.
2. Tom will donate his DSDP and ODP volumes to AMGRF.
3. ODP will give AMGRF missing back issues for free, but charge for postage.

D. JOIDES Panel List:
1. ODP is mandated to publish this list once a year as a means of giving credit to scientific community. List is printed in the first IR and SR printed each calendar year.
2. Updating panel member lists takes a lot of work by ODP staff because JOIDES list is often out of date or contains errors.
3. IHP consensus is that this is an extraneous task that ODP need not do
- Ann said that they will consider publishing the list once a year via the World Wide Web.

IHP proposes: The JOIDES Panel List should be cut from volumes since they are reproduced in the JOIDES Journal.

E. Nomination of another member with earth-science publishing experience.
1. Klaus and Merrill recommended Trey Smith (USGS, Chief, Branch of Eastern Technical Reports).

2. Russ says that we need someone else with publications background especially with Henry Spall potentially rotating off IHP in a few years. Everyone recognized the importance of having an new pubs panel member overlap with Henry.
-IHP will review, but no action by IHP in interim.

F. Informal publications (Scientific Prospectus and Preliminary Report)
1. Survey done to see if OK with people not so send informal pubs.
2. 50% response allowed reduction to 200 copies.
3. ODP proposes publishing on WWW and only sending 4 copies to each ODP member office; potential savings of $15,000.

IHP proposes: Support the reduction of hard-copy distribution to four copies per ODP office. Continue to distribute the publication on the Web. If members of the community need a hard copy of a report, they should request one from their ODP office or from ODP/TAMU Publications Department.

G. Technical notes: should be continued with a limited hard copy distribution depending on needs of group and contents of note, but also put these on the WWW.
1. About 1 per year has been produced during last couple of years.
2. Discussion about whether to charge for these pubs; but most are given away free to co-chiefs, etc., to disseminate info; charging doesn't seem feasible.
3. Riedel suggests Sanfilippo/Nigrini document be added as future Technical Note. The Panel decided that the document should be reviewed by the Paleo Subcommittee and come up with a recommendation (see "XVI. Nigrini/Sanfilippo Technical Report").

IHP proposes:
1. The subcommittee decided that the Nigrini/Sanfilippo document would be a very valuable Technical Note. Yoshiaka Aita said he had used the guide extensively on his last ODP cruise and Annika Sanfilippo said she has used the guide to train paleontologists working in industry who are not radiolarian specialists but must work with radiolarians.
2. Ann Klaus will contact Cathy Nigrini to get electronic version of the material.
3. The subcommittee decided that this document would be valuable in three formats:
   a. Hard copy
   b. Web version
   c. CD-ROM (the Technical Note could be added to an IR or SR viewable volume CD to decrease publication manufacturing costs).
4. The document contains 170 photos (no electronic copies exists). If Nigrini will supply photos, either Bill Riedel or A. Klaus will arrange to have the photos scanned.
5. The subcommittee recommended that ODP advertise the availability of the publication on the internet (e.g., micropaleontology list server) and query recipients of Technical Note 24 (Lazarus et al.).
6. ODP Publications will set a goal to publish this document on all three media by the next IHP meeting.

H. Scanners (handouts on scanning equipment and digital cameras).
1. PCOM supported purchase of scanners if money could be found within ODP.
2. Can't go to new format volumes until they get this equipment; need delivery time (90 days) plus set up time.
* Where to find funds? Decrease amount of fuel put on ship at beginning of legs (defers fuel costs).
3. Target for new IR format is currently Leg 167 or 168.

I. IR Update
1. Prime data: avg. core recovery much higher than what can fit into 200 pages.
2. Estimated core recovery for Legs 166-168 would require more barrel sheets/hard rock sheets than can fit into an average of 200 pages per new format IR; current calculations indicate barrel sheet/hard rocks would take up an average of 470 pages/volume for these 3 legs. (166-168 will be published in FY97.)
3. Discussion about smear slides and thin section tables. Do they need to be printed in book or can they be produced as CD-ROM tables.

- Ian Gibson suggested running thin section descriptions as linear text rather than tabular format, but he does not want to eliminate t.s. and descriptions from hard copy.
*smear slides and thin sections still considered prime data.
*SMP should also be involved in this decision.
-Wilkens and Gibson spoke against making resolution further taking away from IR volume; particularly if SR goes away.

IHP proposes: that the definition of "prime data" remain the same (including thin section descriptions and smear slide tables) and that smear slides and thin section tables continue to be included in the prime data section of the book when the new format IR is initiated.

J. SR Format Update
1. Slated to start with Leg 161.
2. 500 pages maximum, files produced electronically by authors, no editors at ODP to check spelling, no galley proof edits.
3. Reduced editorial support:
   a. No editors looking at files other than to check for geology spelling.
   b. No initial edit or PERC.
   c. Will retain 20% editing to be used for non-English speakers.
4. Ann reviewed instructions to authors to be published on WWW; not going to publish booklet as in past; Sager questioned limiting access; Diver said put it on Web as Word (PDF/Acrobat) file, which can be downloaded with formatting.
5. New SR schedule
   a. Ann says that when the deadlines were set for the "new format" SR, the schedule did not include a one-month buffer between the final submission date of specialty papers and the initial submission date of the synthesis papers.
   b. Everyone felt that this buffer was important to retain.
   c. The revised "new format" schedule is outlined in the table below [see "Proposed "New Format" Deadlines (161 r)"]
   d. The latest revised schedule, incorporating the changes set forth in motions at the December 1995 PCOM meeting are also outlined in the table below [see "ProposedSubmission Deadlines (161 r)"].

Current Submission Current "New Format" Proposed "New Format" Proposed Submission Deadlines Deadlines (161 r) Deadlines (161 r) Deadlines (161 r) Based on PCOM Mandate (5/95) with one month buffer Based on PCOM Motion (12/95) Specialty initial submission 18 months 18 months 18 - 24 months
Specialty revised submission 23 months 24.5 months 24.5 months 30.5 months
Specialty final format submissionNA NA 31.5 months
Synthesis initial submission 24 months 24.0 months* 25.5 months* 32.5 months*
Synthesis initial submission 27 months 28.5 months 30 37 months
Synthesis final format submissionNA NA 38 months
Complete file preparation 29 months**NA NA NA
Volume printed/distributed 36 months 37.5 months 39 months 45 months
* ODP/TAMU is concerned about the potential problem that may occur if the deadline for the initial submission of synthesis papers is before that for the revised submission of specialty papers. Currently the initial submission of synthesis papers is one month after the revised submission deadline for specialty papers. ODP/TAMU requests IHP discuss this and potential of an extension requested for initial synthesis submission to 25.5 months, with volume distribution at 39 months. Proposed Submission Deadline include a one-month buffer between specialty final format submission and synthesis initial submission deadlines.
** This step is currently completed by ODP personnel. This position is slated to be eliminated with the onset of the new SR format; formatting will become the responsibility of the authors See "final format submission deadlines" listed above.
**IHP is requested to make a recommendation for ODP financial relief for editorial support to maintain quality levels.

K. Clarification of publication policy needed
1. Ann will redraft/ reorganize the policy guidelines.
2. A subcommittee (Spall, Sager) will review/approve Ann's draft electronically.

L. Electronic images (John Beck)
1. John Beck related that subcommittee looked at resolutions for images on CD. John says that group thought 300 DPI is OK, but warned that it is additional work to go back and rescan than to obtain image at higher resolution.
2. 300 DPI is printable and can be blown up a reasonable amount.
3. 300 DPI gives about 6.5 Mbyte per image; 770 DPI was the highest considered, but these are ~65 Mbyte.
4. Russ says ODP will use JPEG images; Carla says these may be smalle in size.
5. Panel decides there are two issues:
   1. photos of whole cores (i.e., reproducing 4x5 whole core transparencies);
   2. digital photos of core segments (approx. 30 cm of core).
      a. Consensus seems to be setting minimum image resolution shouldbe 300 dpi.
      b. Russ notes that JANUS UG set 75 dpi as OK for core images, but that this is not useful because it can't be printed.

IHP proposes: Resolution for all ODP electronic images should be a minimum of 300 dpi (note, see "XI. Digital Image Formats" for additional recommendation on resolution).

M. SR publication deadlines:
1. During last 6 months requests for 2-3 month extensions to deadlines have come from 151, 157, and 162 co-chiefs.
2. Flexibility vs. hard and fast deadlines
   a. It's easier for ODP to get it's job done if deadlines are followed.
   b. Firm deadlines are a lot cheaper because of more efficient use of staff time.
   c. Authors with papers submitted on time are penalized by extensions.
3. Consensus is that IHP should back up publication deadlines, and not grant exceptions (particularly if extension recommended by PCOM [initial submission at 24 months] is put in place).

IHP proposes: SR publication deadlines and should be fixed regardless of pleas from shipboard authors or co-chiefs and IHP should back up Publications Manager when deadline extension requests are refused.

PCOM Recommendation: In its motion 96-1-14, EXCOM states the desire to estimate the costs of existing components of ODP and to consider ending some to accommodate new initiatives. Listed first among the targeted components is publications. Although IHP is sympathetic to the desire on the part of EXCOM, PCOM, and BCOM to pursue the innovations outlined in the LRP and although the panel accepts the need to reexamine budgets given a tight fiscal environment; nevertheless, IHP wishes to stress that the Program has accepted the fundamental obligation shared by all scientists--to publish. IHP reminds PCOM that the Program has entered an ethical contract with scientists who have sailed on ODP cruises (and whose publications will appear as much as three years hence) to publish their work. What is more, IHP is appalled at the prospect of ODP merely collecting and archiving data and cores without disseminating results. Furthermore, the panel cannot foresee how a 2.5% increase in the budget for innovations can make the Program more successful without a mechanism for disseminating the results of those innovations. No scientific funding agency would consider allocating research funds merely to collect data. Therefore, IHP maintains that the publication of results must remain an integral part of the Program, else the Program will perish.

Believing the discontinuation of ODP publications would be disastrous for the program, IHP requests PCOM take a proactive stance and oppose any effort to end publications. Although IHP cautions that insufficient time has elapsed to see the effects of recent sweeping changes in publications, the panel believes that publications can benefit from continuing efforts at improvement. Therefore, IHP further recommends that the IHP/PCOM Publications Subcommittee be reinvigorated and asked to assist PCOM in finding innovative solutions to publications problems.

XV. JANUS Project updates:

A. Tracor Report: results of Leg 165 (Jerry Burke)

1. Installation of server at Miami port call.
2. Primary focus on core-log, core sampling, logging data, MST.
3. 1001B all data for geochemistry and logging uploaded successfully.
4. Demonstration (Glenn Corser).

- (Demo slower than on the ship because of networkingbandwidth--very little)
- Corelog:

a. Depths: uses Peter Blum' s depth workshop recommendations to determine different kinds of depths.

b. Sampling: simplified screen for entering catwalk samples.

c. Guards are set up to prevent deletion or changes to database, but allowance made to correct mistakes (but it does not allow relationship altering edits).

d. Built-in ability to mask flow-in and voids for the purpose of core analysis.

e. "Log Viewer" provides a record of what was done at what time, and what program was run, etc. Does not keep track of names. Rakesh Mithal said names would be mainly needed for shore activities.

f. Flexibility built in to handle unusual core recovery (expansion, voids, etc.).

g. Core tracking sheet can be pulled up.

h. Options to choose depths are not yet available in the preferences.

j. Core tracking sheets: These reports cannot be manipulated or changed. The fonts are defaults of Neuron data. Some screens have different fonts which make words sometimes not fit in all the columns. The reports can be printed as is and all page breaking and formatting will be handled automatically. Cannot put into a different program but may be able to manipulate as a post script file.

k. An IHP member felt it was necessary to be able to attach comments to the leg, site, hole, section in the core tracking sheets. Tracor said they needed to include this.

- Sampling:

a. The screen displayed was a standard sampling screen with bar code information.

b. Once data passes edits in the program, the data will get saved to the database and at the same time be left on the screen.

c. Chris Mato said there needs to be a way for people to know what data was changed and which was saved. Corser recommended using different colors.

d. Screens can be saved as templates.

e. Samples can be put in any order. Can do sample by site, hole, core.

f. Tracor looking at using "Bartender", a tool for printing labels.

B. Tracor Report: progress and plans (see attachment) (Jerry Burke)

1. Development environment: Neuron Data--runs on 3 different platforms.
2. The ship's database server (alpha 2100) was used to run database on Leg 165. MCS very helpful in setting up server.
3. Testing of software is non-trivial because of multiple platforms.
4. User manuals, on-line help being developed.
5. User groups: met with all except UG 6 (Underway).
6. Core description: options

a. Text entry-based: results drawn based on graphic; implementable under current contract. Would be like the current barrel sheet.

b. Based on digital images (preferred): display, correlate, annotate; unknown acquisition system and interfaces to other systems; could not be completed under current contract.

c. Merrill: need to see if contract with Tracor can be extended. Steering Committee should come up with a plan to present to BCOM to provide funds to continue JANUS. Need more concrete costs from Tracor for the extension of the project.

d. Merrill: should have different people meet from IHP, SMP, Publications Subcommittee, TAMU JANUS people, User Groups, and Steering Committee to finish the discussions.

e. Loughridge: Have Tracor proceed with option "b" and go as far as possible and hope that more funds become available. If money doesn't come, no worse off.

IHP proposes: Option "a" should be tackled in full to be sure information gets into database, and any subsequent improvements would be valuable if contract was extended/renewed.

6. Leg 166: chemistry tests will not be run in time; will be on transit Leg 166T.
7. Leg 167: paleontology tests.
8. Leg 169: new system on-line.
9. Post-Tracor changes discussion
   a. Wilkens asked who would handle post-JANUS changes, Tracor or ODP/TAMU?
-Merrill replied that this would be up to the Steering Committee. If new instruments are used then ODP/TAMU with the two new personnel would handle JANUS changes.
   b. - Loughridge asked who is responsible for designing the
interface to JANUS and who would state the requirements for new instruments.
- Merrill replied that the interface to JANUS is already stated, and steps would have to be followed for new instrument requirements. Possibilities would be that single instruments be handled in-house ODP/TAMU but more massive instruments collecting 20 measurements would be too big for ODP/TAMU to handle and would need SMP involvement.
- Loughridge also stated that one could propose that whenever a new instrument gets introduced, then the interface for the instrument with JANUS should come designed with it. The Steering Committee should make all the above decisions.
10. Tracor presented a revised time-line which shows a delay in Phys Props andChemistry.
11. Tracor will look at tool to handle reports to be published
in the IR volume. Wilkens suggested using the JANUS data to plug into tools already being used to plot the data and make the reports. Merrill stated that each user group has been asked to come up with requirements for the reports. A list already exists from Tracor showing how far down they will go down the list for FY96.
12. Moore: The data in S1032 needs to be saved in JANUS. The priority she has heard from all around is that prime data should be collected into JANUS first and then deal with publications issues second (reports).
13. Loughridge: need to ensure that JANUS is completed and that all data collected on the ship gets into the database.

PCOM Recommendation: IHP urges PCOM/BCOM to find the resources to complete the JANUS project as presently defined.

D. JANUS Web (JANUS on the WWW) (Gil Munoz)
1. Development.
2. Tools: HTML, C, Adobe's SiteMill, Netscape Live-Wire, Microsoft's FrontPage, Oracle Web Toolkit, Oracle Web System (best, but not very mature.-tool must be chosen 1 year before Leg 168.
3. JANUSWeb Power Query: programs that allow the user to define queries.
4. Goal is to provide JANUS web by Leg 169.
5. Data will move from database to intermediate tables when accessed by users.
6. Gibson: Will there be other options besides the web to access data? The web in Europe is slow. Perhaps FTP the data?
7. Merrill: IS is trying to find ways to automatically update mirror sites and have one in Europe.
8. Loughridge: Results of a query could be dumped into an FTP file.

XVI. Cores for Display (Aaron Woods, ODP)
Developing proposal for ODP displays in the following places:
A. Epcot: display of core samples, interactive links to ship possible; ~15 million visitors/yr
-NASA may donate some band width.
B. American Mus. Nat. Hist. is planning an Earth science display; very science oriented; similar. to the Smithsonian They will submit a request for core in about one year.

IHP proposes: Woods to follow policy set for the display at the Smithsonian Museum.

XVII. MRC Items
A. Proposals for establishment of satellite MRCs The following proposals were selected as the most viable from a larger group of proposals.
1. Bremen Core Repository (foraminifera and radiolarians from Lamont).
-IHP concern about potential lack of use of collections when specialists not physically at BCR; continuation of BCR MRC will depend on collection activity.
-IHP suggestion advertising and proactive measures to attract visitation.

-Facilities and equipment available. Walter Hale would supervise. Offer to prepare litho. smear slides or upgrade databases. Place at core repository.
2. Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (foraminifera from Scripps). Linked withPETROBRAS. Facilities and equipment available. Professor A. de M. Rios would supervise. Offer to improve biostrat. database for foram MRC collection. Brazil may be a potential member country.

IHP proposes: IHP endorse the creation of a satellite MRC at the Bremen Core Repository to include foraminifera and radiolarian samples that would be shipped from the Lamont MRC. Details of transfer and guidelines should be worked out by Pal/Strat subcommittee.

IHP proposes: IHP endorse the creation of a satellite MRC at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro to include foraminifera samples that would be shipped from the Scripps MRC. Details of transfer and guidelines should be worked out by Pal/Strat subcommittee.

Suggestion: Huber send reports about MRC's to Bruce Malfait to make him aware of them.

B. Moscow MRC: what to do with MRC samples not being mailed to Moscow.

Suggestion: Huber send letter asking curator of Moscow MRC to send report of MRC activities since its inception. Everyone agreed that IHP should not formally request return of the MRC samples at this time, but should reexamine the situation if there is continued inactivity and lack of institutional support.

XVIII. Nigrini/Sanfilippo Technical Report
A. Aita and Huber asked to review and provide recommendations.
B. ODP spent considerable money supporting production of this report with slides.

IHP proposes: The Nigrini/Sanfilippo Cenozoic radiolarian report should be published by ODP as a Technical Report. (For more information, see "VIII. Publications, Technical notes.")

XIX. Membership
A. Roy Wilken's last meeting will be Fall `96. He suggests replacement by Tom Janacek (Staff Scientist, and sailed as participant on Legs 160, 167), or someone that has recently sailed (decision deferred until next meeting).

B. Co-chief nominations:
1. The Panel agreed that a co-chief should be selected once a year, alternating U.S. and non-US.
2. Recommendations: Mark Leckie (Leg 165; on OHP, but off in Spring 1996); Mitch Lyle (Leg 167); Andy Fisher (Leg 168; but is on LITHP).

C. Before the next meeting, Will Sager and Patty Fryer will work out a scheme for panel rotation. Then replacements will be discussed.

Action: Sager and Fryer to go over IHP member positions and clarify them.

XX. Non-performers (Henry Spall)
A. List of 15 potential non-performers from past 2 years. Because IHP meeting was moved up a month, there was not time to complete investigations.
1. Only one author has submitted an excuse in writing (so far).
   a. Henry Spall will draft a letter (to be reviewed and forwarded by P. Fryer) saying that the record of non-performance will be put in the author's file.
   b. Discussion about whom to send copies of letters: JOI office, Baldauf, Ellen Kappel (for US); ODP secretariat (non-US).
2. For the cases that need further investigation, Henry Spall has drafted a letter saying that ODP's records show that they did not submit a paper to the SR volume and IHP requests that the author submit a letter of explanation.

B. Additional case regarding complaints from shipboard parties with respect to accusations of breach of ODP publication policy and possible breach of ethical scientific practices was discussed.

A letter of will be drafted by Henry Spall and sent to Fryer for review and forwarding to PCOM and appropriate other parties.