

MINUTES OF THE JOIDES IHP MEETING
BREMEN, GERMANY, 24-27 AUGUST 1994

Chair: Patricia Fryer

Members Present: Ian Gibson, Brian Huber, Mike Loughridge, Carla Moore, Gilbert Maudire, Bill Riedel, Henry Spall, Geoffrey Wadge, Lynn Watney, Roy Wilkens, Teruaki Ishii (for Yujiro Ogawa), Volkhard Speiss (for Warner Brueckmann),

Liaisons: Wolf Berger (for Will Sager, PCOM), Russ Merrill (ODP), Joann Stock (TECP), Ellen Thomas (SMP liaison),

Guests: John Saunders (UK), David Lazarus (ETH), Rusty Lotti (Lamont), Pat Diver (AMOCO), Walter Hale (BCR), Wolfram Brenner (GEOMAR)

I. MINUTES OF SPRING 93 MEETING

The minutes were not acted upon, because of non-delivery by the postal service to some members. Our recommendations regarding the importance of the computer upgrade were promptly passed on to the Planning Committee.

Action Item (from previous meeting): Non-performer letters were sent to the JOIDES Office with IHP recommendations.

II. PCOM REPORT (W.H. BERGER)

A. General budgetary problems:

Wolf Berger reported on the last PCOM meeting in Iceland in early August. He reported that 11 proposals were recommended to be included in the FY96 Prospectus and noted the watchdogs assigned to each. The prospectus for fiscal year 1996 covers 10 proposed legs around the North American margin (Caribbean, east Pacific, North Atlantic), from which 6 will be chosen for drilling. The inner sites of the New Jersey transect, not yet drilled because of doubts about safety, are still under consideration.

B. Budget for the immediate future:

- 1) The budget will remain flat until 1998 at \$44.9 million/yr.
- 2) No new member has been found for fiscal '95 increase the Canadian/Australian membership from two-thirds to full membership. In fiscal 1996 it is likely that the budget will decrease to \$44m/yr. Berger summarised the budget discussions held at the PCOM meeting and explained the possible options that JOI presented to PCOM regarding cutting costs by \$900K in FY95.

\$120K - Day rate

\$155K - Slow down DCS (pending land test)

\$240K - delay the publication of IR volumes

\$100K - reduce "non-payroll" support at ODP-TAMU

\$150K - slow down data management upgrade

Funding cuts of \$900,000 will be shared in fiscal '95 with the biggest hit in publications (\$240k). A "slowdown" of the computer upgrade (\$150k) and the diamond coring system (\$155k) are also

targeted. Under the circumstances, Berger emphasised that it is imperative that panels prioritise their recommended actions.

A discussion of attempts to solicit new members ensued. Possible new members, such as Korea and Taiwan have been approached. Lithuania has approached the program. Can/Aus are still actively making an effort to get another member of the consortium, but will be a 1/3 member short as of Oct.94. Can/Aus is projected to continue as a 2/3 member and NSF will not be able to make up the shortfall. Fixed costs will increase and there will be continued need to find means for reducing the budget. Budget prioritization is requested of all panels.

The IHP is dismayed that the largest cut in the budget is to come out of publications, as publications and data along with the drilled cores are the tangible products of the program.

A concern for continued membership of several partner nations beyond 1998 was raised and Wolf Berger was asked how concerned PCOM is with regard to the continuation of the program beyond that date. He noted that PCOM is concerned for continued membership and that beyond 1998 a real selling job is needed.

C. Computer Evaluation Committee:

Wolf Berger noted that members of PCOM in general do not have a clear understanding of the details of the need for the computer upgrade, and where this should fall in the short- and long-term budget priorities. Members of PCOM had questioned why the computer upgrade was so expensive. He asked the IHP whether they felt the money is being well spent?

IHP reminds PCOM that it is not in a position to respond on the nature of specifics as to how the money is spent for the computer upgrade and database development contract. IHP has not been privy to any of the deliberations regarding the computer upgrade and database development contract. These deliberations fall under federal codes of confidentiality and the panel has no jurisdiction over them. A serious review of the program as a whole is needed to determine what budget cuts should be made to absorb the \$900,000 budget reduction for fiscal '95. IHP does not have the information needed to recommend what cuts should be made to the computer upgrade. IHP suggests that the Computer Upgrade Steering Committee evaluate the most effective way to make cuts to the computer upgrade with the least damage to the overall goals.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE PALAEOLOGY/STRATIGRAPHY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING (21-23 AUGUST):

Bill Riedel chaired the subcommittee meeting Aug. 21 through 23.

A. Report on the Microfossil Reference Centres

1) Nannofossil and diatom collections from the Lamont MRC are being transferred to the University of Nebraska. That institution will prepare eight sets of nannofossil and four sets of lithologic smear slides.

2) The transfer of the Texas A&M MRC to ODP was accomplished smoothly, and that collection is already being used actively.

3) The Smithsonian needs a letter authorising accession of its MRC collection, in order to be eligible for resources needed to maintain it. In view of the special status of the Smithsonian as a Federal institution, IHP voted unanimously to approve accession of the Smithsonian MRC collection to Smithsonian Institution.

Action item 8/94-1: A letter will be sent by the Chair to the Smithsonian to that effect, 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.

4) IHP voted unanimously to permit California Academy of Science to become a semi-permanent loan institution for the diatom collection. IHP authorises 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.

Action item 8/94-2: Brian Huber, as Lead MRC Curator, will forward a letter to Cal. Acad. Sci. to this effect.

Action item 8/94-3: The Chair will write a letter thanking the Swiss Nationalfonds for their support of the Basel Museum Micropalaeontological Reference Centre.

5) The IHP unanimously endorses the concept of publishing an announcement of opportunity for receipt of portions of MRC Collections that are currently under-utilised as part of its continuing effort to get the collections where they will be better used. IHP authorises Brian Huber to publish announcements of the opportunity to re-locate the Lamont MRC collections of radiolarians, foraminifera, and lithologic smear slides.

Action item 8/94-4: Brian Huber and Bill Riedel will write a draft of such an advertisement and will circulate it to the panel for approval before looking into getting it published.

B. Lithologic Database Report (Carla Moore, Lynn Watney):

IHP discussed the existing problems of the Lithologic data base and recommends that ODP make information on its data structures available via the Internet and geosciences meetings - both existing structures and the new structures as they come on-line. Comments could go to the oversight committee. ODP and the computer upgrade contractor (Tracor) should be proactive in establishing communication with industry and the research community before decisions on software upgrades are finalised.

IHP suggests that ODP become plugged in to existing databases and that a meeting be held to help convergence of database structures between ODP and industry. Particularly useful contacts may be the developers of the Public Petroleum Data Model and the Petrotechnical Open Software Consortium.

The Public Petroleum Data Model was described by Pat Divers:

A proposed data model for palaeontological data used for exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbons. The Data Model will:

- 1) Promote an industry-wide standard for palaeontological data
- 2) Facilitate a common data exchange format between companies and vendors
- 3) Encourage vendor software development that integrates palaeontological data with other geoscience disciplines

IHP suggests that it may be useful to invite the chief data modeler for the PPDM (Ian King of ATS in Calgary) to the meeting of the Database Steering Committee in December.

Action item 8/94-5: Lynn Watney will pursue the possibility of organising a meeting.

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.

C. Report on FossilList software (Ellen Thomas):

IHP is very grateful for the rapid development since the last meeting. It appreciates the frequent updates on progress that have come from Rakesh Mithal and Lisa Patton. The program was sent to the ship for the last leg and was sent to various IHP panel members for review. IHP urges ODP to give high priority to continued development of FossilList so that the impetus will not be lost.

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

IHP recommends that ODP continues work on FossilList so as not to lose momentum.

IHP has identified several problems with the program that should receive attention:

- 1) There are major problems with relational format of database (see draft version of recommended structure).
- 2) Many of prime data fields previously listed and agreed on by IHP and SMP were not included.
- 3) Fossil dictionary too large; should be divided into subsets (age, latitudinal belt).
- 4) Must be able to import changes to database after exported from fossils.

There are several proposed changes (see handout; Pat Diver)

- 1) Shell of the program remains, much of internal program torn up, perhaps 2 man-months work (must be done to incorporate additional data fields).

- 2) Optimisation should improve the performance by using 5-6 times less memory.
- 3) Data codes for microfossil species and other prime data fields must be added.

IHP plans to perform a detailed review of fossils at the Spring '95 meeting.

Action item 8/94-7: Ellen Thomas will send a letter to Lisa Patton thanking her for her efforts toward finalising FossilList and prioritising suggested changes.

D. Etch-a-sketch programming: IHP is concerned that ODP has expressed that there are serious design problems in the program and a completion date is several years away.

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

IHP cannot endorse further work on Etch-a-sketch until it is known whether reworking of this program is to be included as part of the computer and database upgrade project (JANUS).

E. Rakesh Mithal sent a memo to IHP regarding a variety of data management issues. IHP is responding to each in kind.

IV. A REQUEST FOR A DEADLINE EXCEPTION FOR LEG 154 PARTICIPANTS TO DELAY THEIR POST-CRUISE MEETING BY SIX MONTHS:

Bill Curry sent a letter to IHP asking for a 6-month extension of the 154 second post-cruise meeting. After discussion of the rationale for this request the panel suggested permitting the extension, but reducing the deadline for publication by 4 months.

RECOMMENDATION TO PCOM:

IHP recommends permitting Leg 154 Scientific Shipboard Party to hold its second post cruise meeting Oct. 10-14, 1995, but shortening the publication deadline to 4 months after the post cruise meeting.

V. STRATIGRAPHIC DATABASE CENTRE:

The concept of establishing a Stratigraphic Database Centre that was introduced at the last meeting was presented formally to IHP by David Lazarus. Details of the proposed Database Centre are given in the appendix. The following is a summary:

A. Justification: DSDP/ODP stratigraphy data are hard to deal with because of major post-cruise changes; the research community needs a separate data centre for integration of post-cruise chronostratigraphic data to obtain the best possible age models.

1) Major functions: maintain/update chronology; maintain/update taxonomic lists; provide access to palaeontologic and stratigraphic data.

2) The Centre and supporting entities

a) Manpower and skills: estimate of 1.5 salaried personnel needed (suggest database/computer specialist, deep sea stratigrapher with DSDP/ODP experience, marine microfossil taxonomist with experience and connections to research community).

b) Hardware and software: server computer, Oracle, 4th Dimension, programming tools, Internet 'middleware', 2 or 3 personal computers, scanner and supporting peripherals.

c) Infrastructure: long-term commitment from host institution, support for computers, program development work, contacts with ODP users, palaeontologists and stratigraphers.

B. How to establish:

1) Interest was expressed by GEOMAR, in Kiel, and the Univ. of Bremen (letters of intent came from both).

-Environmental Research Centre to be started at Bremen next year; possibility of positions opening with that.

2) Requires a combined effort, network, set-up of structure, funding from outside.

The panel unanimously endorses the concept of establishing such a Centre, but recognises that no funds from the Drilling program are likely to be available to help establishing it.

RECOMMENDATION TO PCOM:

The IHP recommends that PCOM endorse the concept of specialised data centres associated with core repositories and readily accessible micropalaeontological reference centres. Such an endorsement would be useful for prospective Database Centre organisers in their efforts to secure funding. The IHP further recommends that north German institutions be encouraged to spearhead an international effort to develop an ODP Stratigraphic Database Centre associated with the core repository at Bremen University, in co-operation with other European laboratories participating in ODP activities. From presentations made to us during our meeting it appears that GEOMAR in Kiel is a likely location for a nearby Micropalaeontological Reference Centre.

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.

VII. PUBLICATION OF THE ETH NEOGENE CHRONOLOGIC DATABASE:

Possible publication of this report by David Lazarus as an ODP Technical Note was discussed. The document is 300 pages, 150 colour plots. Russ Merrill estimates publication would cost ~\$2,000-\$3,000 for hard copy in b&w. A subcommittee headed by Bill Riedel was assigned the task of reviewing the data and making a recommendation as to its appropriateness for publication if funds are available. The subcommittee reported later that it felt the report is publishable and asks Russ Merrill to consider publishing the report as an ODP Technical Note if funds are available.

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

Based on the review of the ETH Neogene Chronologic Database by Bill Riedel, John Saunders and Brian Huber, IHP recommends publication of the Lazarus et al. database as a Technical Report. Bill Riedel will follow up to ensure that this will get done.

VIII. SMP LIAISON REPORT:

A. Boyce Correction:

Ellen Thomas reported that SMP recommends the Boyce correction continue to be applied to the Grape data. The GRAPE Boyce correction is still not made in published form. The lack of this correction in the previous CD-ROM led to inconsistency between ODP and DSDP data.

The problem of what to do with all the data not corrected that is on the CD-ROM was addressed. SMP would like IHP to recommend that the Boyce correction be added to data that is to go on any CD-ROM made in the future. It was noted that no CD-ROM planned; lack of manpower according to John Coyne (not a priority for ODP because of database upgrade).

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

Any follow-up CD-ROM in future should include the Boyce correction to all ODP data.

B. Performance of Natural Gamma-Ray instrument

- 1) Peter Blum has written report to be published in IR volume
- 2) Kate Moran (SMP) is reportedly satisfied with performance
- 3) SMP has guidelines for Shipboard Handbook for the correct basic settings of instrument; any changes must be okayed by shipboard party

C

Ellen Thomas reported that the Core-log integration subcommittee of SMP is meeting this week. They would like input into the database structure as it is developed.

Action item 8/94-9: Ellen will ask the chair of the subcommittee, Joris Gieskes, for a copy of the subcommittee report to send to IHP

IX. PUBLICATIONS REPORT (RUSS MERRILL; SEE HANDOUT)

A. Core curation and repositories (see handout)

1. Core re-curation: continues very slowly; most cores badly need this, esp. at East Coast Repository
2. Rewetting of sponges and re-labelling w/ bar coded labels
3. Bremen Repository established and fully functional
 - database group had problems with sample entry software on Novell server
 - Leg 154 sampling party successfully completed sampling one day earlier than planned with no problems encountered.

He also presented the results of the Citation Index study. Journals citing the ODP proceedings include the top refereed journals. The ODP volumes compare well with other journals in the fields covered by ODP scientific participants.

A question was raised about the effect of limiting the size of the volumes.

B. Publications schedule:

Russ Merrill presented a summary of the Publications activities to the panel with the correction that the Leg 150 IR actually will come out in September this year. The volumes are generally on schedule.

C. Visibility of DSDP/ODP volumes:

ISI Citation search - 88% of the visibility of the program comes from the SR volumes. The citations since 1988 have continued to grow and show no sign of slowing down. The IHP appreciates the effort made to perform this analysis and Russ' intent to try to publish the results. This kind of data will help to dispel the impression on the part of the scientific community that the SR volumes constitute grey literature.

- 1) Cited in high visibility journals (e.g., JGR, Palaeo3, Mar. Geology, J. Sed. Petrology (JGR has the highest number of cites))
- 3) DSDP still highly cited
- 4) Citations by countries: highest in U.S., ESF, France, lowest in Japan
- 5) IR/SR citations
 - a) IR: Leg 111 had many citations, though only 45 m of core recovered
 - b) SR: very different set of numbers; Leg 113 highest
- 6) Russ Merrill et al. plan to publish summary of this in ODP, Geotimes or

EOS

D. Reduction in size of volumes (see attachment 12)

1) Continued efforts to reduce Proceedings volumes by 20%. There has been mixed success, but the effort is generally on track. For Legs 151-154 the only legs since the last meeting, the volumes have come in within the limit.

2) Leg 155 (Amazon Fan) co-chiefs want to exceed allowable limit by 400 pages (text and tables) because of amount of core recovered. This represents a

100% increase over the limit. They said they did their best to limit text while on board, but feel they cannot cut back.

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

The IHP appreciates the Leg 155 Scientific Shipboard Party's desire to be thorough, but feels this is excessive and that if the expansion of the volume is because of interpretation of the data that this be severely curtailed or another aspect of the volume be cut back in order for the volume to fall close to the accepted size.

E. Plan to meet budgetary constraints:

Russ Merrill reported that he was instructed by PCOM to save \$240K this year by delaying the publication of four IR volumes. PCOM did not indicate that there was a plan to provide a means for making up this shortfall in subsequent budgets. Russ Merrill presented the following alternative to the IHP. He suggested that the IR volumes from Legs 154-158 be produced on schedule up to the point that they would be sent to the publisher. At that point they would be Xeroxed (technically a form of publication) and distributed to Scientific Shipboard Party so that there will be no delay in submission of the manuscripts for the SR's. He commented that the shipboard party does not need the entire volume to write their report. He suggested that others could obtain a copy of the Xeroxed IR volumes at cost (\$55/copy) for photocopying. He asks how are non-US partners going to view this?

The IHP acknowledges the valiant attempt by Russ Merrill to comply with the PCOM directive while trying to provide the community with essential information from the IR's. However, IHP views with deep concern the action by PCOM to cut \$240,000 from the ODP publications budget, as this would seriously diminish the long-term quality and archival value of the publications, which have been the flagship of the deep sea drilling program. Delaying the publication of the IR volumes will increase costs by the cost of publication in the long run or may herald the end of the IR volumes. There are several easily identifiable problems with this plan:

- This plan will restrict not \$240K, but \$260K because PCOM has also cut \$20K from TAMU for xerography. Additional costs will be required to publish the IR volumes for the shipboard party by xerography.

- The money saved on this year's budget will have to be restored next year to allow for normal publication of these volumes.

- In addition, next year's budget will have to be increased by the amount necessary to publish not only the delayed volumes, but also the volumes already scheduled for publication for next year and whatever increase in costs of publications may be imposed by the publisher.

- There is no plan to reinstate the funds cut, nor to provide for the additional stop-gap costs, to the fiscal '96 and subsequent budgets. This implies a permanent one year delay in hard copy publication in the Initial Results volumes.

- The proposed cut represents only about 0.5% of the overall annual operational budget.

- Contractual obligations to member countries may have not been considered in this decision.

- This will lead to serious concern about the viability of ODP by the member countries.

IHP discussed several alternatives for cost savings. Thin-section descriptions could be reformatted so as to take less room. The data are important but could be put on a CD-ROM along with the smear slide data.

People wishing to sample need access to barrel sheets and core photographs. Russ Merrill noted that the core photographs are the largest data request received by TAMU. Teru Ishii suggested that high quality Xerox copies, which can be made for considerable savings after an initial outlay to purchase the Xerox machine could be substituted for photographic copies. The panel suggests that Russ Merrill look into purchase a high quality Xerox machine to determine whether this would indeed produce a long term savings.

The panel discussed the fact that the program seems driven by the lowest technology. Digital photos might be substituted. The panel noted that the community may be more technologically advanced now and that such an approach may be fruitful, although the biostrat members of the panel agreed that people in their field may not be as technologically advanced. Russ Merrill stressed that the hardcopy of the volumes etc. are superior archival entities. The panel agreed that IHP must think of the archival aspect of the data and the publications, but that data can be transferred from one format to another. The panel revisited the idea of doing away with the SR volumes and going to the outside literature.

Action item 8/94-10: IHP should notify (via listserver) 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.

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.

RECOMMENDATION TO PCOM:

Because, aside from the cores themselves, data and publications are the most tangible product of this large and long-standing research program IHP is concerned that actions perceived as required to fix a short-term budget problem would send an adverse message to the scientific community about ODP'S view of the worth of its publications. IHP strongly recommends to PCOM that it rescind its directive to ODP Publications to delay publication of the IR volumes.

X. BOREHOLE RESEARCH GROUP REPORT (SEE HANDOUT)

IHP is concerned that the chair was informed by JOIDES office that the BRG liaison was not a formal member of the IHP and therefore was not to be invited to IHP meetings without . Subsequent to this notification the BRG Liaison and the Chair determined that indeed the BRG liaison is a formal member of the panel. IHP anticipates no further difficulty in gaining permission for the liaison to attend the meetings.

XI. COMPUTER SERVICES GROUP (SEE HANDOUT)

XII. NGDC REPORT (CARLA MOORE AND MIKE LOUGHRIDGE)

XIII. TECP LIAISON REPORT:

Joann Stock reported the concerns of the TECP/Structural Geology Working Group regarding the inclusion in the ODP database of structural geology data:

A. TECP notes three levels of needs:

1. Immediate needs:

- recovering and archiving old cruise structural data
- standardise data collection, digitising, archiving, from future cruises

2. High Priority:

- Archiving images, graphics (structure drawings) in an accessible database
- scanning/digitisation of core onboard ship
- portable real-time entry into computer, to eliminate paper worksheets

3. Longer term needs:

- True searchable/extensible database, with

- Portable, run-time system, that can be taken home with the investigator and that will allow data manipulation, graphics

B. Specific recommendations were the following:

1. a nucleus of recommended structural measurements/ descriptions must be captured
2. the mechanism of data capture must be flexible (need to be able to add extra text or numeric fields on board ship)
3. graphic items (scaled photos, drawings) need to be fully integrated into the database
4. graphics should be scalable (whole hole -> part of core)
5. graphics should be able to be displayed with overlays and adjacent relevant data, e.g., core photos with overlain structural data, adjacent to phys. properties measurements
6. database and extraction programs should be portable and should allow selection of various subsets of data for plots, histograms, stereographs, etc.
7. database programs require testing during development and implementation; tests could be conducted with ODP data from previous cruises; tests could be done at a workshop where real core is described, entered into the system, archived, and extracted

C. Discussion:

IHP agrees that structural data should be considered prime data. It notes that not all of this data can be published on paper in the initial reports on a routine basis although it could be included in the CD-ROM of data from each cruise. It should be possible to add one column to the existing barrel sheet pages, for structural data, as this does not increase the number of pages published and therefore does not impact the budget. If the chief scientists on a given cruise require detailed structural barrel sheets published, this may be possible as long as the IR volume remains within the allocated budget.

Action Item 8/94-12: Ellen Thomas, (SMP liaison to IHP), suggested that someone from TECP present these same points of information 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.

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 palaeontologic 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.

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.

RECOMMENDATION TO ODP:

IHP recommends that another column be added to the VCD barrel sheet to accommodate structural geology information should PCOM agree to include structural data as prime data.

RECOMMENDATION TO PCOM:

IHP recommends that structural data be included in the database as primary data.

XIV. NEW MEMBERS

No present members rotating off

RECOMMENDATION TO PCOM:

IHP recommends that Pat Diver, a representative of the oil industry, joins the panel as a regular member.

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.

XV. SPRING 1995 MEETING

-Two options: Hawaii or College Station

A. Hawaii:

Roy Wilkens would host, cost not excessive for travel or lodging

B. College Station:

Advantage of possible joint meeting with SMP, get demonstrations of Computer Services Group's programming updates, possible meeting with Tracor representatives.

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

XVI: EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. Discussion of the role of the Computer and Database Upgrade Steering Committee:

The panel discussed the concern Russ Merrill had expressed on behalf of John Coyne about TAMU's receiving input from both the IHP and the newly established steering committee for the computer upgrade project. The concern was to the effect that a clear statement of policy with regard to the relationship between the Computer Steering Committee, the IHP and the SMP should be established in order to avoid potential delays in implementation of the computer and database upgrades. IHP thus establishes its position with regard to this matter in hopes of preventing delays that any perceived conflict might cause:

1. IHP fully endorses the mandate of the steering committee to act as the direct JOI/JOIDES guiding group for both TAMU's Information Services Group (ISG) and Tracor with regard to the computer/database upgrade project. IHP recognises considerable overlap in the mandates of the IHP and the steering committee with regard to data policy and data handling, but has full confidence in the ability of the steering committee to convey IHP's wishes to TAMU and Tracor with regard to the upgrade project. TAMU should in no way feel that it is circumventing the IHP by following the guidance of the steering committee during the upgrade process.

2. IHP recognises that close communication via designated liaisons to the steering committee from IHP and SMP is critical if the steering committee is to represent the wishes of IHP (and the scientific community through the JOIDES panel structure). Thus, it is important that both IHP and SMP be represented on the "user groups" formed for input during the upgrade project. Development of the parameters, metadata requirements, value ranges, etc. of the prime data types (as reviewed and reconfirmed by IHP/SMP during their joint meeting in 1993) has been a lengthy, deliberate process with extensive input from the scientific community. SMP has already requested that SMP members be present in these user groups. IHP requests that IHP panel members also be present on these user groups. It further requests that the IHP and SMP liaisons be kept directly in the information and approval loop for the upgrade. In this manner the considerable effort toward determining prime data types, parameters, and requirements by IHP and SMP will be more accurately represented in the final database.

A list of IHP representatives for user groups in the various data categories follows:

<u>Data Type</u>	<u>IHP representative</u>
physical properties	Roy Wilkens
chemistry	Ellen Thomas (SMP representative)
sediments (incl. xrd)	Lynn Watney
geophysics	Mike Loughridge
palaeontology	Bill Riedel
palaeomagnetism	Will Sager
petrology (incl. xrf, thin sec)	Ian Gibson
downhole measurements	Debbie Barnes
structure	Joann Stock (TECP liaison to IHP)

IHP understands that the exact mechanisms for interaction between TAMU/Tracor and the steering committee will be discussed at the September meeting in Austin. IHP's suggestion for information flow is two-fold. The panel liaisons should be responsible for gathering necessary scientific input from the user groups and both IHP and SMP. The steering committee should synthesise the input for TAMU/Tracor. It is hoped that this will prevent diverse input bombarding TAMU and Tracor, will prevent information overload on John Coyne's group, and will ensure co-ordinated scientific guidance to TAMU and Tracor during the upgrade.

The panel liaisons and the steering committee will be better able to sort out differing opinions and balance them against historical precedent and advice of the panels. An input flow pattern might look like:

User
group
input
/\

HP/SMP liaison/steering comm. <--review/guidance-->TAMU/Tracor

3. IHP is concerned that completed data dictionaries may not accurately represent agreed-upon parameters. In TAMU's ISG report to the IHP in August, John Coyne notes that several of the proposed data dictionaries for prime data types are "complete" and that TAMU is proceeding with the review and completion of data dictionaries for the remaining prime data types. Despite considerable direct interaction between the IHP Palaeontology and Stratigraphy Subcommittee and TAMU over the past two years on what parameters are required for a palaeontology database, the structure of the palaeontology database as forwarded to the IHP for review at the August meeting was missing several previously agreed-upon fields. The panel would like to ensure that these fields are reinstated in the final design for palaeontology, and that similar omissions are not inadvertently finalised in other data types.

To ensure inclusion of correct fields, IHP requests that TAMU/ISG immediately email electronic copies of all existing proposed data dictionaries to the IHP liaison (Carla Moore) for review by IHP. As new data dictionaries are proposed by TAMU each should be immediately emailed as well. If this procedure is followed, review time will be minimised and the final database will be sure to contain elements previously agreed upon, as well as items which may be suggested by the new user groups. The panel liaisons will be able to gather and synthesise panel input for TAMU and Tracor quickly.

IHP hopes that this expression of confidence in the steering committee and willingness to work closely with the committee through the appointed liaison will streamline the upgrade project. IHP hopes these suggestions will help ODP more effectively achieve its goal of a new database and computing environment that will serve the needs of the scientific community.

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.

B. Problems with Communications between IHP and ODP/TAMU:

The panel is concerned that some past recommendations of IHP have failed to be acted upon by the Computer Services Group and communications largely tend to be from the panel to CSG, but not from CSG to the panel in the time between panel meetings. IHP requests that the Information Services Group present their report to IHP well in advance of the Spring '95 IHP meeting and if matters arise that are of concern with regard to implementation of panel recommendations that IHP be notified.

Action Item 8/94-18: Brian Huber and Patricia Fryer will collaborate on minutes for the meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PCOM

I. Publications:

1. IHP recommends that PCOM continue to support the publication of the Scientific Results (SR) volumes.

IHP reaffirms its support for continuation of the Scientific Results (SR) volume for reasons stated in the minutes of the March 1995 meeting. Although IHP is concerned that significant changes in publications policy may have unintended negative consequences for the volume, the panel favors such changes if they are necessary to preserve the volume.

The IHP is concerned that despite recommendations of PCOM to continue publication of the SR volumes, a decision to discontinue the SR volumes was nearly reached by the EXCOM. The IHP reiterates that the publication of scientific results is a major product of the Ocean Drilling Program and that to discontinue it would represent a failure of the Program to serve the needs of the scientific community and the scientists who participate directly in the program.

2. IHP recommends the following changes in the publication policy regarding the SR in an effort to enhance the scientific impact of the SR and the Drilling Program's scientific results.

The PCOM draft motion from the August 1995 meeting recommended two significant changes in publication policy: 1) removal of the requirement that a scientist participating in a Leg must publish in the SR volume and 2) a lengthening of the manuscript submission deadline by six months (to 24 months post-cruise). The IHP does not support the lengthening of the deadline, believing that the current deadline allows sufficient time for a scientist to obtain initial scientific results after a Leg. The panel notes that PCOM has already lengthened the publications process by 6 weeks.

IHP supports the removal of the requirement that shipboard participants publish in the SR volume as a way of increasing the number of articles in the outside literature and of defusing complaints by those scientists who believe that publication in the SR volume is not in their best interest. However, the IHP maintains that shipboard participants be expected to publish results of their efforts as a criterion for performance as a participant in the Leg. In response to the PCOM draft motion, IHP recommends that the new publications policy be as follows:

- a. Until the second post-cruise meeting (approximately 10-12 months post-cruise) a scientist may publish an article in the outside literature with approval of the co-chief scientist and the scientific party. This policy is deemed necessary to protect the interests of the scientific party. (no change to the existing policy)
- b. After the second post-cruise meeting, a scientist is free to publish in the outside literature provided a copy of the manuscript be sent to ODP to be forwarded to the Leg Editorial Review Board. The article submitted to fulfill the publication requirement must be written in English. This will aid Co-Chiefs in making a synthesis and will permit the information to be disseminated to the remainder of the scientific party.
- c. A scientist's contribution will be considered to be the submission of a reviewable manuscript either to the SR volume or to another refereed journal. This means that a scientist need not submit an article to the SR volume. In order to assure timeliness, IHP

recommends that to fulfill the requirement to publish, the scientist must have submitted an article by the time that the SR volume closes. In other words, if a scientist does not submit an article to the SR volume by its submission deadline, or an article to another journal by the SR volume closing (when the ERB is disbanded, approximately 24 months post-cruise), that scientist will be deemed a non-performer. For archival purposes, the scientist is required to inform ODP of the acceptance and publication of articles in other journals, and must send an English abstract of the article to ODP. It is envisioned by the panel that a bibliography of these articles, including abstracts, will be published in the paper part of the SR volume. If the article is published prior to the closing of the SR volume then the scientist is required to send a reprint of the article to ODP. If permitted by resource constraints the article will be included on the volume's CD-ROM.

3. Initial Reports Volume

The IHP recommends that PCOM endorse the proposed plan for a new format for the Initial Reports (IR) volume formulated by ODP Publications for Leg 164. (Details are given below)

Miscellaneous

- 1. Recommends purchase of \$100 K barrel scanner in order to facilitate the new IR and SR publication procedures.**
- 2. IHP recommends the program raise prices of volumes to \$60 per volume.**
- 3. IHP recommends that the program send the additional 200 volumes that will result from a reduction in distribution (to panels etc.) to libraries and other sites not currently receiving volumes. This will increase the visibility of the program.**
- 4. With regard to the PCOM request to Russ Merrill that all underway data be sent to the ODP databank ASAP after a cruise, the IHP is concerned that these instructions represent the creation of an exception to the moratorium rules. The IHP recommends that the interests of the scientific shipboard party continue to be protected. The LDEO databank must be careful to refuse to release data from a given leg until 12 months post-cruise.**
- 5. The IHP recommends that the PCOM recommend a current or recent co-chief to sit as a member of the IHP. We asked Phil Weaver and he said he would be willing if PCOM would permit additional IHP members.**

Initial Reports Volume and CD-ROM

New format and policies regarding responsibilities suggested for Leg 164:

Page limit - 100 pages in the Book, additional material placed on the CD-ROM

Each site summary section will be given a page limit (to be decided by the Co-chiefs and the Staff Scientist) and be restricted to 1 or 2 figures or tables. Additional materials will be placed on the CD-ROM in the "Supplementary Material Section." Each site summary chapter will be about 4.5 typeset pages (Note: 1 typeset page = approximately 4 double-spaced pages, times, 11 pt.) (Note Frontispiece does not count as part of the 100 pages)

I. Introduction and Principal Results (~ 10 typeset page synthesis)

II. Site Survey paper - always peer-reviewed (optional)

III. Site Summary Chapters

- A. Principal Results
- B. Lithostratigraphy
- C. Biostratigraphy
- D. Paleomagnetism
- E. Physical Properties
- F. Inorganic Geochemistry
- G. Organic Geochemistry
- H. Logging
- I. In Situ Temperatures
- J. Geophysics
- K. Downhole Water Sampling etc.

The 100-page "book" material will be reproduced on the CD-ROM with identical layout and page numbers. If possible all hype links in the CD version will be indicated by a special marking in printed version so that the printed version will advertise the contents of the CD.

Book: Prime data (~200 PP)

I. Coring summary tables

II. Barrel sheets and whole-core photos (~ 2 /page)

III. Thin section descriptions

The prime data material will be reproduced on the CD-ROM in a viewing program with identical layout and page numbers and will be organized by site not by data type.

CD-ROM will contain

I. Explanatory Notes

II. Supplementary Material from Site Survey Chapters (optional)

III. Supplementary Material Section - excess material from site chapters

- A. Operations Report, contains mostly text, unlike all of the following sections:
- B. Lithostratigraphy
- C. Biostratigraphy
- D. Paleomagnetism
- E. Physical Properties
- F. Inorganic Geochemistry
- G. Organic Geochemistry
- H. Logging
- I. In Situ Temperatures
- J. Geophysics
- K. Downhole Water Sampling etc.

IV. Prime Data: Smear slide table

- Material prepared on the ship for the CD-ROM will be processed "as is" if the shipboard party does not make changes by the end of the first post-cruise meeting.
- Publications will format all Supplementary Material that will be produced only on the CD-ROM. the files will be saved into a viewing program using a layout that is complementary to that used in the book.
- All CD material will be paginated so that it can be referenced.
- Electronic files containing figures will be linked to callouts in the text.
- Post-cruise processed logging data will only be published on the CD
- Quicktime movies and digital video may be considered for the CD-ROM (space will be a limiting factor)

Book and CD-ROM general requirements:

- Shipboard Scientific Party will be responsible for the following:

- *Software: Wordperfect

- *Font: Times

- *Codes: the PCOM publications subcommittee recommended that shipboard scientists be required to insert formatting codes in the text for both the book and the CD-ROM materials. The Science Operations strongly urged the Publications group to omit this requirement because of a potential for a strongly negative reaction from shipboard scientists.

Figures (Book)

- Shipboard Scientific Party responsibilities:

- *Font: Helvetica

- *Figure Captions: list captions at the end of the text files

- *Save all electronic figures using ODP supported software programs

- *Print hard copies of all figures (electronic and drafted figure, seismic line, etc.)

- ODP Publications responsibilities:

- * Whole core photos, close-up photos, and photomicrographs will be scanned at ODP (\$100K scanner needed)

- * Electronic figures will be formatted by ODP Publications staff according to ODP style guidelines

- * Seismic lines or other large-format figures will be pasted up by hand to meet ODP style guidelines and shot at the printer.

- * Hand drafted figures will be scanned or pasted up by hand to meet ODP style guidelines

CD-ROM

- Shipboard Scientific Party responsibilities:

- * all figure materials except whole core photos must be submitted to ODP in electronic format

- * Figures must be formatted to fit on a 8.5 x 11 " page (portrait orientation required/preferred) figures may be more than one page long figures will only be viewable one page at a time

- * Captions should be placed above the body of the figures (in the same file)

- * Whole core photos will be taken by shipboard photographer

- * Final figure format should be either (1) ready for scanning on shore (e.g., past-up with scale bar and annotation) or (2) electronic file scanned on ship at 72 dpi with overlain annotation and scale bar.

- * Electronic figures should be saved in programs supported by ODP (Canvas, McDraw II, Adobe Illustrator, KaleidaGraph, Photoshop)

- * pertinent sections of seismic lines must be scanned on ship

- * hand-drafted figures must be scanned on ship
- ODP Publications responsibilities:
 - * Whole core photos, higher quality versions of close-up photos and photomicrographs will be scanned at ODP (Scientists will scan the close-up photos on the ship as the first step in creating the rest of the figure. ODP will re-scan the photos at a higher quality and place the scanned image into the scientists' figures.)
 - * Electronic versions of all figures will be imported into FrameMaker to Acrobat PDF files

Tables (Book and CD-ROM)

- Shipboard Scientific Party responsibilities:
 - * Produce tables in Microsoft Excel or WordPerfect
 - * Insert figure captions above the body of the table and footnote below body of table (in the same file)
 - ** Codes: If PCOM requires shipboard party to input formatting codes they will be input into tables as they are into text.
 - * to calculate the approximate number of typeset pages (1 typeset page = 4 pages, Times, 11 pt. double-spaced, 0.75-inch top and bottom margins)
 - * Convert Mac-formatted files to WordPerfect 5.1 format for export to PC
- ODP Publications responsibilities:
 - * tables will be converted into FrameMaker and typeset according to ODP style.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PCOM

1. PANCH recommends that the PCOM liaisons faithfully attend their designated panel meetings, function as accurate reporters of the sense of panel discussions, and be a clear channel of communication in both directions.

2. PANCH recommends that the PCOM recommend to JOI that they allocate a larger amount of funding (\$3500) for xeroxing and other functions of the panel chair. Individual institutions are currently heavily subsidizing the program.

3. PANCH recommends that there be a change in the review criteria for proposals as suggested by Bill Hay and Sherm Bloomer:

- 1) add a new category "A5. Could be relevant with major revisions" and renumber the present A5 to be "A6";
- 2) add a new category "D6. Possible safety problems, early review by PPSP recommended";
- 3) add a new category "E0. No deficiencies";
- 4) add F5 to read "of interdisciplinary interest."

4. PANCH recommends that each of the thematic panels designate one of their US panel members, with appropriate expertise, as ad hoc liaisons to SSP. They can then be called on by the SSP Chair to substitute for occasional US absentee SSP members. This substitution would take place no more than once a year for each individual.

5. PANCH recommends that the SSP workload be reduced by the following measures:

1. SSP will only consider the top 5 ranked proposals from each thematic panel during their meetings (rather than the previous 7 ranking).
2. Thematic panels will identify proposals ranked in the top 5 that lack adequate data and are thus unlikely to make it into the prospectus within two years time. SSP may exclude these proposals from consideration and may instead include, after consultation with the PCOM Chair, proposals ranked lower than 5.

Comments

1. PANCH does not endorse changing the planning cycle and schedule, but suggests instead that the ODP TAMU budgeting process begin once the prospectus has been assembled. PANCH suggests that a tighter prospectus be designated so SSP need consider fewer proposals. PANCH recommends that the "Gang of 4" continue to maintain communications in order to maximize effective progress toward this end.

2. PANCH supports the TEDCOM subcommittee's recommendation regarding the acquisition of quotes for the evaluation of the alternative DCS system.

3. PANCH expresses concern regarding the changes in publications and in the implementation of these changes. It suggests that strict monitoring of the outcomes take place and that in a year's time the publications be reevaluated and recommendations for further changes be made, if necessary