JOIDES PLANNING COMMITTEE
AUGUST 1995 MEETING

APPROVED MINUTES

PCOM AUGUST 1995 MEETING PARTICIPANT LIST

Planning Committee - PCOM

W Berger	Univ. of California, San Diego, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
R M Carter	James Cook University, Australia, Australia- Canada Consortium
H Dick	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
J A Pearce	University of Durham, United Kingdom.
H P Johnson	School of Ocean Sciences, University of Washington
H Kudrass	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Germany
R Larson	University of Rhode Island, Graduate School of Oceanography
J McKenzie	ETH, Zurich, ESF Consortium
C Mével	Laboratoire de Pétrologie, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris
A Mix	Oregon State University, College of Oceanography
G Mountain	Columbia University, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
J Natland (Acting Chair)	Univ. of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences
T Shipley	University of Texas at Austin, Institute for Geophysics
W W Sager	Texas A&M University, College of Geosciences
K Suyehiro	Ocean Research Institute, Japan
B Taylor	University of Hawaii, School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology

Liaisons

T Francis	Science Operator (ODP-TAMU)
D Goldberg	Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO)
B Malfait	National Science Foundation
E Kappel	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.

Guests and Observers

M Comas	University of Granada, Spain (Leg 161 Co-Chief).
T Pettigrew	Science Operator (ODP-TAMU)
S. D. Scott	University of Toronto, Australia-Canada Consortium.
J. Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
J Mutter	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (EXCOM)

JOIDES Office

K Ellins	Executive Assistant and US Liaison
C Jacobs	Executive Assistant and Science Co-ordinator

PCOM MOTIONS AND CONSENSUS STATEMENTS

PCOM Motion 95-2-1

PCOM approve the agenda of the August 1995 meeting.

Proposed: Taylor , Seconded : Larson *15 For, 1 Abstention (Shipley)*

PCOM Motion 95-2-2

PCOM approve the minutes of the April 1995 meeting as a true record, subject to the above modifications.

Proposed: Sager, Seconded: Dick *Unanimous*

PCOM Motion 95-2-3

PCOM requests that SGPP and TECP, in consultation with Wireline Logging Services (BRG-LDEO) and the Leg 170 Co-Chiefs, evaluate and report through their Chairs at the December PCOM meeting the impact, if any, that LWD may have on the scientific objectives and drilling priorities of this scheduled leg.

Proposed: Mountain, Seconded: Berger *15 For, 1 Abstention.*

PCOM Consensus 95-2-4

PCOM requests JOI to advise ODP-TAMU to provide both digital electronic and paper copies of the processed underway seismic records collected by the JOIDES Resolution. These records should be provided as soon as possible following the leg on which they are collected. This transfer of data from ODP-TAMU to the ODP Site Survey Data Bank is not to be regarded as covered by the one year moratorium on the distribution of shipboard data.

Proposed Dick, Seconded Larson

PCOM Motion 95-2-5

PCOM notes with great interest the proposal of the Nansen Arctic Drilling Program for closer association with the JOIDES/JOI structure. We encourage further discussion and exploration of common interests and possible linkages. We recommend to EXCOM consideration of the status of "JOIDES Associate Organisation (JAO)" for NAD, as outlined in companion motion 95-2-6.

Such a status should only be conferred in response to a formal proposal from NAD outlining scientific goals, administrative structure, history of activity, participating institutions, sources of funding, existing facilities and infrastructure, and plans for the future, as well as services anticipated to be required from JOIDES/JOI/ODP.

Proposed: Berger, Seconded: Kudrass, *15 For, 1 Absent (McKenzie)*

PCOM Motion 95-2-6

PCOM strongly endorses closer ties with international groups involved in studying the Earth using drilling or coring platforms or proposing to use such platforms, including the JOIDES Resolution. Initiation and strengthening of such ties must be without prejudice to the scientific goals and legal mandates of the JOIDES enterprise.

PCOM recommends to EXCOM that formal ties be initiated in the following fashion:

1) JOIDES establishes the category of "JOIDES Associate Organisation (JAO)".

2) JOIDES and JOI confer JAO status on an organisation upon request and after discussion of a proposal to that effect, if close association is deemed desirable by both parties.

3) JAO status entails the following privileges;

a) one non-voting representative on each of the four thematic panel.

b) the option of liaising to PCOM.

c) the option of asking for proposal review by a thematic panel.

d) the option of asking for site survey review.

e) the option of asking for safety review on an advisory basis (that is, without liability for JOIDES, JOI, or ODP).

f) access to site survey background data and services (at cost where appropriate).

g) the option of asking for acceptance of data into ODP data bank on a case-by-case basis, at cost where appropriate.

h) the option of asking for acceptance of core materials into ODP repositories on a case-by-case basis, at cost where appropriate.

i) the option of asking for engineering and logging support and other operational support, including publication, on an ad-hoc basis, at cost where appropriate.

4) Granting of JAO status will be contingent upon negotiation of suitable JOIDES representation on the appropriate management committee or committees of the JAO applicant organisation.

5) JAO status is granted for a period of 3 years at a time upon request by the JAO and is renewed as long as the association is accepted by both partners.

Proposed: Berger, Seconded: Larson *13 For, 2 Abstain, 1 Absent*

PCOM Consensus 92-2-7

PCOM notes the reasons for, and endorses, in principal, the changes in the Long Range Plan that have been recommended by EXCOM.

Proposed: , Seconded: *Consensus*

PCOM Consensus 95-2-8

Cased, re-entry holes have great potential scientific value for seafloor observatories, future drilling, etc. In the past, the decision whether or not to complete a scheduled re-entry hole with casing has been left to Co-Chief scientists. Rather than lose potential important cased holes to expediency, PCOM directs panels, especially thematic panels, to identify potentially important "Legacy Holes", to be noted in the annual drilling prospectus. PCOM will review the list and decide whether to mandate casing of a possible "Legacy Hole".

Proposed: Sager, Seconded: Larson *Consensus*

PCOM Consensus 95-2-9

The FY97 Prospectus, based upon PCOM consideration of SSP readiness, Thematic Panel Rankings, and the 4-year plan will be constructed from the following proposals.

Proposal 300 (735B)	Proposal 348 (N J Margin)
Proposal 354 (Benguela)	Proposal 404 (Sed. Drifts)
Proposal 447 (Woodlark)	Proposal 457 (Kerguelen)
Proposal 461 (Iberia)	Proposal 462 (Blake Nose)
Proposal 464 (Sth. Ocean Palaeoceanography)	Proposal 468 (Romanche/Vema)
Proposal 480 (Cret. Caribbean Basalts)	

PCOM Motion 95-2-10

PCOM requests EXCOM review sub-section 11.04 of the JOI policy manual as this now defines conflict of interest sufficiently broadly as to preclude effective long range planning.

Proposed: Dick, Seconded: Sager *15 For, 1 Absent*

PCOM Consensus 95-2-11

PCOM thanks its member from Miami, Jim Natland, for serving as PCOM Chairman at this Portland meeting. As did the Light Brigade at Crimea and Custer at the Little Big Horn, he faced overwhelming odds on short notice, but unlike these unfortunate predecessors, he emerged unscathed.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-12

Brain Taylor's time on PCOM is at an end, and we extend our thanks for his dedicated service and substantial contribution to the committee. After honing his skills as chair of the western Pacific regional panel, at PCOM he assured that posed problems were solvable with the drill. In time we expect to hear Brian's quotes from afar, a sure sign of his continuing interest in JOIDES. We are expecting to see him back in an exotic back arc basin.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-13

PCOM thanks its member from Oregon State University, Alan Mix for hosting this meeting in Portland.

PLANNING COMMITTEE APPROVED MINUTES

Wednesday 16th August 1995 ***09:00 am***

A. Welcome and Introduction

1) Introduction of PCOM Members, Liaisons, and Guests.

Natland welcomed all to the meeting and asked Ellins to report the medical condition of the PCOM Chair (Rob Kidd). Natland introduced the new PCOM members, Paul Johnson, Roger Larson and Judy McKenzie, Julian Pearce standing in for Rob Kidd, and Menchu Comas the Leg 161 Co-Chief Scientist.

2) Logistics of the Meeting.

Mix outlined the logistics of the meeting and ran through the events of the week. Dick asked about field trip participants and outlined the activities.

3) Outline and approval of the agenda.

> PCOM Motion 95-2-1
>
> PCOM approve the agenda of the August 1995 meeting.

Proposed: Taylor , Seconded : Larson *15 For, 1 Abstention (Shipley)*

4) Approval of the Minutes of the April 1995 PCOM Meeting, Makuhari, Japan.

Scott asked that there be a correction to the Aus-Can report, so that it read that there were "three Canadian funding agencies, NSERC being the largest contributor". Sager will pass on some editorial corrections to the JOIDES Office.

> PCOM Motion 95-2-2
>
> PCOM approve the minutes of the April 1995 meeting as a true record, subject to the above modifications.

Proposed: Sager, Seconded: Dick *Unanimous*

B. Reports of Liaisons

1) NSF

Malfait reported that the NSF budget was reduced by $100M from the FY95 levels, with $26M from the science budget. He said that the political situation made it unclear what the future will hold. He then outlined the NSF FY95 field projects, and reported that the California Current and Middle Valley projects went very well. He reported that Taiwan was putting in significant funds to the Taiwan Margin study.

In terms of FY96, the target funding is $44.9M assuming 6 full international partners, at the moment there is likely to be 5 5/6 when Taiwan joins Aus-Can. NSF provided an administrative review to JOI which went to EXCOM who approved the plans that arose from that review. He reported that based on discussions at ODPC, the partial membership initiative will be tried on an experimental basis, ODPC felt that full partners was still the objective after 2-3 years of partial membership. The highest priority was still to return the Aus-Can to a full partnership. The co-operative technology initiative has problems with current contracts and the MOU's, and these may not be resolved in the short term.

NSF has 4 concerns in the FY96 plan. 1) growth in personnel, 2) no allowance in ship day-rate, 3) an increase in administrative/management costs and 4) concerns with technology development (no decrease in personnel despite a decrease in the available funds).

ODPC review. Malfait reported that this was originally identified as a mid-term program evaluation, but it has grown in terms of it's mandate and the areas to be covered, such that it will become a complete review of the program, looking at past accomplishments, whether ODP has met its targets from the previous long range plan, and the new long range plan, including the facilities the program will require. Membership of the review committee has been identified with the exception of an Aus-Can representative. The first meeting will be at Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory in September, looking at the history of ODP, its accomplishments and future plans. The second meeting, will be in Germany in late October will look at how the program is viewed by the international science community (other programs). The final meeting will be in California in early December and will report to EXCOM and the ODPC in late January. Malfait commented that a number of members also have their own internal reviews running at this time.

Larson asked for clarification if Taiwan didn't join the Aus-Can Consortia. Malfait said that the Taiwan contribution would be about $600K and it was unclear what would happen if they didn't join. Natland asked why the present international review was being planned having just undergone a PEC review. Malfait said this was a science and technical review, whereas the PEC IV was really more of a management review.

2) JOI

Kappel reported on behalf of Falvey. She began the detailed report saying that the current (FY95) budget was $45.8M. She said there may be some end-of-year savings and that JOI is following PCOM advice from the April meeting should there be chance for re-allocation. She said that there were expenses in the Communications Strategy that were not planned in the original FY96 Program Plan and that some of the savings from FY95 may be directed toward that goal following EXCOM approval of the plan in July. Kappel said that there may be the order of $300K available. She then outlined the budgets for FY95 and FY96 (Appendix 1) and the Special Operating expenses at ODP-TAMU and ODP-LDEO for FY96 (Appendix 2). Mountain asked if the savings in the publications budget were on target with the PCOM sub-committee recommendations and she confirmed that they were.

Kappel then outlined FTE (personnel) comparisons at the sub-contractors for FY95 and FY96 (Appendix 3). Taylor asked about the increase in the Publications services, Francis said that ODP-TAMU have recruited people for the JANUS project, but on short term contracts. Dick asked why the technical and logistic support that was cut by PCOM was not reflected in the figures presented. Francis said that there were savings of about $100K by employing technical staff on sea-going only contracts. Taylor reminded PCOM that this committee applauded this action by ODP-TAMU. Shipley reminded PCOM that there is an increase in workload with the JANUS project and we will probably re-visit this issue again.

Kappel reminded PCOM that a new international JOIDES liaison would be required from a non-US member for the next JOIDES Office. She then reported on two appointments at JOI.

Kappel then outlined the EXCOM motion and subsequent action on the delivery of science services to the ODP, and referred PCOM the letter sent out to members by the Program Director at JOI (Appendix 4). She reported that expressions of interest are expected at JOI by 1 November when they will be evaluated and reported to EXCOM in January. She said that if serious expressions of interest were received than a bidding process would begin. Larson asked for clarification of what functions would be up for bids. Kappel said it could be any function from publications or engineering development to the complete delivery of science operations. She said the tender board has yet to be formed.

On the internationalisation of ODP, she reported that Taiwan membership was expected on 1st August 1995 but although there were some complications as to who would sign on their behalf, it is expected imminently. Korea has expressed interest and Falvey will be following this up again with a visit. The Peoples Republic of China has also expressed interest, but the status is unclear. Brazil has expressed a strong interest (Petrobras). In response to a question from Carter, Kappel said

that new partner consortia will have to be constructed if partial members were to join, following a decision from ODPC. She reported that ODPC have said that partial consortia will be allowed to survive for only three years. Carter said that once the Aus-Can consortia is full it may prove difficult to attract new partial members to build a complete consortia.

As regards co-operative R&D, she said that EXCOM endorsed the JOI plan for joint developments with industry, but that ways still have to be found to work out details vis-a-vis the MOU's. Ellins said that Loutit had volunteered to help NSF with re-negotiation and amendment of the MOU's.

She said that EXCOM also accepted the Communications Strategy as presented by the Program Director and outlined the goals behind this, including the establishment of a communications post in Washington DC. She said that the Public Information Director post will be advertised soon. Funds for this will come from FY95 savings and a review of the FY96 budget. She then outlined the responsibilities of the new post and the proposed budget options (Appendix 5, 6). Taylor and Scott asked about individuals from ODP-TAMU doing this. Francis said that the one post there is not adequate. Kappel said that the funds would come from the ODP budget, not the present JOI budget. Taylor said that he was unclear if this was an absolutely necessary post, and that at a time of flat budgets PCOM (and EXCOM) should be looking very closely at this. Kappel said that the idea is to become more effective in communications and that this may help with, for example, the renewal process, despite the extra cost. Berger said that he thought it normal that promotion increases as budgets decrease and that PCOM should be aware of the size of commercial advertising budgets, and he said maybe we should have started earlier. Carter asked if we are duplicating with College Station. Kappel said that the plan was evolved with Aaron Woods so she thought not. Francis said that he spoke recently about this and that the functions would be complementary. Sager said that the "old" way of using one person at ODP-TAMU has not worked and we should try something different. Mountain said that he would like to see a prioritisation of where the money for this communications strategy should be spent. Kappel said that the initial target audience would probably be journalists.

Coffee Break *10:10 - 10:30*

3) ODP-TAMU

Francis reported that Jeff Fox became Director of ODP-TAMU as of 19 June 1995. He outlined the re-organisation of functions at ODP-TAMU (Appendix 7) and said the new manager of Publications will be Ann Klaus, an internal candidate who will start in post on 1 September. He then detailed the new structure of the Information Services and Curation (Appendix 8), however, he said that the recruitment of a new Manager for Engineering and Drilling Operations has not gone well, 2 of 8 interviewed were considered fit for the job, but neither took up the post. He said that the advertising approach had not worked and ODP-TAMU were now looking at head-hunters, internal candidates and industry secondments. Natland asked at what point will there need to be an appointment no matter what. Francis said that it has not been necessary up to now, the two supervisors' authority has been enhanced. In answer to Dick, Francis said that he will not continue with his acting manager role much longer and so a new appointee is definitely required.

Francis said two new staff scientists were recruited in June, Mitch Malone, and Paul Wallace. He said that due to high turnover, they will recruit a total of 8 staff scientists to bring them up to "effective" complement. In answer to a question, Francis said that there have not been any strong female candidates. Larson asked why Francis thought there was such a rapid turnover. Francis said it was because staff scientists in ODP were not paid to have a career in science, and that he is sympathetic that if high calibre scientists are employed, then it is likely that they will move on to further their research careers.

In terms of the Operations schedule, the first major change was to move the St. John's port-call to Halifax, with insignificant loss of operational time. The next task was to lengthen science time for Leg 167; this will be achieved by shortening Leg 166 and rotating the Sedco Forex crew and taking on the Leg 167 scientists in Acapulco. Taylor asked why Leg 163 was shortened compared with the others, Francis said that it was to get the ship away from the ice, and Leg 164 was shortened to get the ship to sea before Christmas. He said Leg 168 was not squeezed because it was a technically

complex leg, and that the Saanich Inlet 'scheduling' was actually a placer subject to the safety reviews.

Francis reported that a core liner burst on Leg 160 due to the sticky nature of the mud and the high gas content. Fortunately no-one was hurt. He reported that the core was from only 30mbsf. He reported that there were two approved sites on Leg 161 that were moved as they were too close to submarine cables. Mountain said that proponents are sometimes misled by looking at "disused" cables on the seabed, and that it was critical that ODP-TAMU stay on top of this problem.

He reported on Leg 162 (at sea presently). He said it was going extremely well with large amounts of core coming aboard (5200m of core already with 4 weeks to go !). He reported that ODP-TAMU have a contract with the Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Centre to provide ice coverage maps of the area for these northern legs. He said that synthetic aperture radar pictures have shown that site EGM4 was still within the sea ice when it should have been drilled so they drilled ICEP-3. As of 6 August, YERM2 may be clear but the other YERM sites may not be clear. If these sites cannot be reached then they will move to SVAL-1B and then deepen the Gardar site. An ice-support vessel has been provided free by the Norwegians, but it does have it's own research program and is only available for 7 days to ice-scout. Another vessel may be available toward the end of August to take over this role. He said that as regards Leg 163, SEDCO/FOREX asked for an ice-support vessel late in the day, and so ODP-TAMU have chartered a vessel for this leg. He said that 5 sites are close inshore in the E Greenland current and may have problems with calved bergs. The ice support vessel is a Canadian vessel, that should cost about $401K, for 44 days, and it will provide visual and radar ice surveillance, and may also move small bodies of ice and can act as an emergency tow-ship for the JOIDES Resolution.

He said that the ice-boat will be paid for out of ODP-TAMU FY95 savings, and said that savings had come from fuel price savings (maybe up to $500K), salary savings ($250K), travel savings (up to $300K) and the timing of a PPI increase (day rate of ship, $150K). He then outlined what other items the savings will be re-allocated to: purchasing a new cryogenic magnetometer, marine magnetometer, seismic streamers, plotter/printer, and spare pyncometer and new WSTP data-loggers are about to be purchased. Mountain suggested maintaining the old cryogenic magnetometer as a shore-based facility. Francis said that would imply staff for maintenance. Berger said that non-destructive tests could then be done at ODP-TAMU if this was kept, and that such tests are usually done by outside persons and not ODP-TAMU staff. Sager said that he could pass this question through IHP to SMP. But it takes several $000 of helium and it does require a dedicated person to run the system. Shipley said that the system is being replaced for a reason. Sager said that if it was not at sea the lack of vibrations would decrease the noise on the sensors. Sager agreed to write an item for transmission to SMP.

Taylor asked about the PCOM prioritisation for support of engineering development. Francis said he will discuss this at the engineering agenda item (Item I).

Francis then reported that the Leg 164 pre-cruise meeting was held in April, and the prospectus is available on the WWW. He reported that PPSP had recommended a specific order of drilling, but it did not fit conveniently with the second ship VSP experiment, but after a meeting with Mahlon Ball the PPSP recommendation has been relaxed.

As regards Leg 165, it transits the waters of 6 countries. Clearance can prove tricky, some south American countries may want two observers, otherwise clearance may not be given. ODP-TAMU is trying to identify appropriate people, switching observers in Jamaica and Venezuela. This has yet to be resolved. Larson asked if any clearances are wrapped-up. Francis said that there are no clearances in hand at present. Francis then reviewed the key personnel of legs 163-170.

Francis then updated PCOM on the JANUS project, reviewing activity from February 1995 to the present, and plans for the future (Appendix 9). He commented that there is a lot of training required for ODP-TAMU staff. He said that a demonstration of the database will be given at the palaeoceanography conference in Halifax in October 1995 and the system will be installed on the JOIDES Resolution in December 1995. Francis then outlined the order of priority of the data types and software development that was determined by the steering committee (this has been published by ODP-TAMU).

Francis then moved on to discuss publications. He referred PCOM to the tabled paper (Appendix 10) about what is happening in ODP-TAMU publications.

Shallow Water Drilling

Francis then discussed shallow water drilling, referring to the Oceanus surveys on the New Jersey margin in July 1995, saying that a report will be given at the November PPSP meeting. Mountain commented that the surveys were an unqualified success, and to his knowledge no hazards were encountered and that processing was on track. Francis reported that they had looked at emergency pipe-release capabilities and said that were two options; shear-rams that could be installed in 5 days and would cost of the order of $200K, another option was unproved technology, a quick-release joint, the costs for which have not been evaluated. Larson asked for clarification of "shallow". Francis said that is was really 200m water depth, but it also depends upon the depth of the hole. He said that SEDCO/FOREX had expressed concerns about EG66-1a and EG-66-1, which they consider shallow water and could damage the pipe-handling systems if bad weather and problems are encountered. In answer to Natland, Francis said the cost estimates were supplied by SEDCO/FOREX. Francis said that sonar monitoring of shallow-water drilling could be done with equipment already in-house. Taylor asked about the potential hazard to navigation of pipe sticking out from the seabed. Francis acknowledged that any pipe sticking out of the seabed would be a hazard. Larson said he thought it would not be capable of supporting it's own weight.

In terms of the Red Sea clearance (Proposal 481), Francis reported that there is very little chance of getting clearance to drill in the Red Sea. Larson said that attempts were made previously, and that proposal died because of clearance problems. Kudrass commented that a recent German sampling cruise had no problems.

Francis reported that there is a commitment to expand the Gulf Coast Repository if Texas A&M University wins the contract to continue the role of Science Operator from 1998-2003.

He reported on a market survey of commercially available drilling platforms that might be considered for the LRP. There are only 8 drill ships that could fulfil the needs of the program, and only 7 semi-submersibles. He said that no drill ship has been built since 1981 (the Resolution was built in 1978). He said the ODP-TAMU conclusion was that the JOIDES Resolution was the best vessel for the period 1998-2003, and maybe beyond.

4) ODP-LDEO

Goldberg presented this report. He began with an outline of recent operations. Legs 160 and 161 were extremely successful despite some difficult drilling conditions. The GHMT was deployed in two holes, the BHTV was deployed in one (basement)hole, and the processing software was also upgraded to Geoframe 2.0. He reported that on Leg 160, an evaporite layer was seen by the geochemical logs, though no samples were recovered. He also described logs from mud volcanoes drilled on Leg 160, showing inversions that would explain the high in-situ pressures. He said that stratigraphy identified in the logs in the upper parts of the volcanoes may relate to individual flows. He reported that in Site 976, a basement hole, the resistivity logs showed zonation within the rocks. In Site 976E, the site penetrated the sediment-basement contact, with sharp contacts seen on the resistivity and velocity logs. He said that un-recovered conglomerates could be identified from Leg 161 FMS data in conjunction with the standard logs.

Goldberg then outlined the plans for Legs 162, 163 and 164, including the upgrade of the wireline heave compensator and the CLIP "splicer" software package. He then showed an example of how (from MST data) the modified CLIP program can produce composite log data, commenting that it (the software) was transportable to many platforms, and relatively easy and efficient to use.

He then summarised the database activities; CD-ROM's have been completed for Legs 140-156, the ASCII data archive is complete for Legs 140-160, the historical ASCII data archive is 25% complete (Legs 101-129), an FMS database back-up on DAT has been initiated and a historical VSP/BHTV archive is under investigation. He then gave an overview of the scientific and educational initiatives, such as the Downhole Tools Guide, the WWW home page, AGU session and the LWD proposals submitted.

In terms of management issues, he reported that the ODP-LDEO FY96 Program Plan is completed, the budget is 1.4% below FY95 which will affect special operations and new initiatives. He reviewed the organisational structure of the WLS indicating new staff.

Goldberg then gave a brief summary of how FMS and Standard and Geochemical data are processed (overheads), saying that the processes had been developed carefully to share amongst the sub-contractors (Leicester and IMT) and works out at a 1/3 each time commitment.

Lunch Break *12:25 - 13:15*

Request for LWD during Leg 170.
Goldberg reported that this request resulted from a proposal to have a "mini leg" of LWD to reduce the original costings that were turned down by PCOM in December 1994. He said that he outlined two scenarios for cost purposes (see agenda book pp. 149-150). Natland asked if we need comment from thematic panels. Taylor said he thought so, but he added that as former TECP liaison, PCOM should note there is a separate proposal to do LWD on the Costa Rica margin from the same proponent. He continued, saying that in December 1994 PCOM acknowledged there were not the funds to do the original requests. He said there are 4 primary sites and the proponents are already considering down-grading one site as they may not have time to do all they wish, and yet now they are requesting to do more. He said that he is not sure if this is to replace some of the original objectives or is in addition to the current plans.

Shipley said that some small sections in Barbados would not be seen using conventional logs and that he thought the proponents wanted to use LWD, even at the expense of current plans. He said that LWD would prove essential in seeing small scale ephemeral features, and that the holes are inherently unstable. Natland said that to achieve the objectives, the proponents would still have to drill a hole first and then go in with LWD. Taylor said that he too would pair sites. Goldberg said that the proposal is divisible into a Costa Rica part and a LWD part, and it would be more cost effective to run two legs rather than sail with the LWD equipment on the JOIDES Resolution. Taylor said the issue is one of learning as you go, rather than throwing all your chips into one basket, especially as this area has not been drilled before. He said that PCOM have committed to have a pair of legs in middle America, and as it is so close to Panama PCOM have to consider if we have to do this now, or can we revisit this again in the future after the area has had some drilling. He saw no over-riding need to do LWD now. Berger asked for clarification of Taylor's comments. Taylor said it is both a budgetary and scientific matter; there is already a planned and scheduled leg that may be over-committed, and he posed the question whether it is right to reduce the objectives of that scheduled leg when there is a strong probability that the drill ship will be re-visiting that area. Shipley said that although it is true they are trying to do a lot, they have removed the CORKs from this leg now and so they have made a conscious choice about what they wished to do. He said the other issue is that it could be considered a two-stage program, LWD has been shown that it is a useful tool and that he considers that we should consider doing this "new"' thing, especially at the current stage in the renewal process.

Taylor said that the CORKs were removed at the suggestion of SGPP, and that TECP was really driving this proposal, they removed the CORK before the leg was scheduled. Goldberg said the LWD technology was actually now the "older" technology and that was why the costs had come down, so that we would get twice the logged depth as Barbados for the same cost. Natland reminded PCOM of motion 95-1-15 (PCOM prioritisation of any FY95 savings), saying that by the time of this leg we have no idea what, or if, any savings would be accrued to pay for this technology. Berger said that we have not traditionally denied these requests if they are important to the leg and there is the money available. Kudrass said that if we used the same equipment as was used in Barbados it would enhance the results of both legs. Kappel said this was a FY97 issue and PCOM would have to consider this as a SOE in FY97. Dick said that we must know what the other FY97 programs are before we can recommend this for an FY97 SOE. Also he said that we should use the newer technology, and that he agreed with Taylor that the area should be explored first. Taylor said this proposal could be given to TECP first, and PCOM should get the proponents to inform TECP of the LWD objectives, otherwise we are altering the objectives of a scheduled leg. Natland said we have time for this to be referred back to the thematic panels for comment and that PCOM too should make comment.

PCOM Motion 95-2-3

PCOM requests that SGPP and TECP, in consultation with Wireline Logging Services (BRG-LDEO) and the Leg 170 Co-Chiefs, evaluate and report through their Chairs at the December PCOM meeting the impact, if any, that LWD may have on the scientific objectives and drilling priorities of this scheduled leg.

Proposed: Mountain, Seconded: Berger *15 For, 1 Abstention.*

C. PCOM Liaison Reports

1) EXCOM

Ellins reported on behalf of Rob Kidd. She outlined the EXCOM resolutions that are of interest to PCOM, beginning with Conflict of Interest. She said that PEC IV also had a concern about this issue and that JOI has changed the JOI policy manual to avoid even the suggestion of conflict. She said that EXCOM have been urged to be careful who they select to serve on PCOM to avoid this problem.

Nansen Arctic Drilling (NAD) was discussed by EXCOM, who approved a proposal from NAD for a future co-operative relationship with ODP, in principle subject to further detailed negotiations. She said that some concerns were expressed by EXCOM as to whether NAD would be seen as a regional panel and it may encourage other countries to use this to their advantage. However it was pointed out that NAD would offer ODP a special opportunity in Arctic drilling, which would not be available with other "regional panels". Both EXCOM and PCOM Chairs believe that this could serve as a model for future co-operation with other programs. She said that EXCOM discussion suggested that this was different from CORSAIRES as it added, not duplicated, a capability to ODP.

In terms of the PCOM 4 year plan vote in April that was later declared invalid by JOI, EXCOM recognised the conflict, but noted that of the non-conflicted members, there was unanimous consent to the proposed track, and on that basis they endorsed the proposed 4 year plan.

Ellins said the Expressions of Interest to supply operational functions arose from a discussion about what science delivery functions could be supplied, in the light of the positive comments of the PEC IV report. EXCOM thought that this kind of competition for sub-contracts could only strengthen the program.

Ellins then reported that most comments from EXCOM on the LRP were positive, although the accomplishments were maybe overstated. She said that during the joint ODPC session deficiencies were brought into focus and EXCOM re-visited the plan, saying they endorsed the plan in general, with the proviso that there were specific changes made. Larson asked which EXCOM members were not happy, Ellins replied Orcutt and Mutter.

Ellins said that the PCOM publications sub-committee report was presented to EXCOM, some of whom tried to abolish the SR volume at the end of the present phase of ODP in 1998. This motion did not pass as most of the non-US members wanted the SR volume retained.

Ellins then outlined the position in France. She said that France had ratified the MOU for 5 years with a proviso for an evaluation after 3 years. She reported that the French review committee submitted a severe report, that they may withdraw in 1998 and that they cut their subscription to half its present level from 1996. This report was not accepted in full, and they will remain as full members until 1998. The French ODPC member said he felt it likely that France would withdraw in 1998. Mével said she was surprised that such strong comments were made about France leaving. Mountain asked what the French complaints were. Mével said that this information will be available very soon, one issue was the SR volume, another was the management of the program. Dick said that he believed that it may be a factional issue within France, and not just focused upon the SR. Mével said that a problem was the perception in France that the SR volume was grey literature. Mével said that if France pulled out then the subscriptions for ODP would disappear, it probably would not be re-distributed.

2) SSP

Mountain presented this report. He said he would identify readiness issues and detail would follow on Friday. He said there was concern about the length of the minutes of SSP, but this was due to the detail required so the Panel has put together a 'readiness' summary table. He said that there was an increase in the workload of both the Panel and the Data Bank, the workload has doubled over the last two years with no staff increase. He said the Data Bank are getting more electronic submissions but they do not have staff and systems that can cope, although they are developing a WWW home page. The development of the home page and electronic data filing and storage will require about $15K for a consultant and about $8K for student help. Mountain said that so far as he knew this was not, at present, a formal request for funds.

He said there were two recommendations to PCOM. The first was concerned with the delivery of processed seismic data to the Data Bank at the end of a drilling leg. Mountain said that the data can be processed on-board whilst drilling. This recommendation is that the Data Bank should not just get the paper rolls, but also get the data in processed electronic format. Francis said that he thought they could be ready to do this (from Leg 161), but that he didn't think that IHP had discussed this issue and maybe they should comment on this. Dick said that we do not have to consult IHP, PCOM can decide this issue. Mountain said that the data in the Data Bank is not published so the 1-year moratorium is not at issue. Francis agreed that ODP-TAMU will supply the data as requested. Mountain said that the processing at sea was a key as then processing would be completed to the satisfaction of the co-chiefs.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-4

PCOM requests JOI to advise ODP-TAMU to provide both digital electronic and paper copies of the processed underway seismic records collected by the JOIDES Resolution. These records should be provided as soon as possible following the leg on which they are collected. This transfer of data from ODP-TAMU to the ODP Site Survey Data Bank is not to be regarded as covered by the one year moratorium on the distribution of shipboard data.

Proposed Dick, Seconded Larson

Mountain then reviewed the mandate of the SSP, and commented on the evaluation of the readiness of scheduled legs;
Leg 160 - a large number of sites, but everything went well despite the differences in data submitted to the SSDB.
Leg 161 - there was a problem with seafloor cables and the sites were moved along existing seismic lines. SSP asked ODP-TAMU to report on these hazards before the safety review and not afterward so that all concerned parties have the data in front of them. Francis said that he cannot answer this now but will write to SSP, and that he thought there were many nuances to the judgement of drilling near cables. Francis said that he believed that he should discuss this with SSP before PCOM make a decision on the SSP recommendation. Mix asked if PCOM could note the SSP recommendation and Francis' response and get a report from Francis later in the year. Taylor said he thought that what was at issue was that the cable information is provided early as possible to PPSP, and asked if it was reasonable that if a cable or other hazards issue arose, it could be re-visited by PPSP.

In terms of identifying the site survey status of scheduled legs; Leg 165 needs some re-processed seismics, Leg 167 needs some re-processed seismic data to image a BSR better. A HRGB on Leg 163 is still an issue, as is the provision of all the documentation on alternate sites (11 have been proposed). Mountain said that the point to be made is that alternate sites need to be considered as seriously as primary sites. Francis said that the background to this began with the requirement for an ice support vessel, and a concern that the leg could be vulnerable as 5 of the primary sites could be affected by ice cover, and that as a back-up, alternate sites should be considered. Francis said that there were no problems with approval of the sites by the PPSP chair. Taylor said that the leg and co-chiefs have been approved and we must be careful how far back into the advisory loop PCOM wish to go when problems (or potential problems) are encountered. Mountain said that SSP recognise the need to be flexible, but a SSP recommendation was accepted by PCOM in December 1994

regarding the formal procedure for the addition of new sites to the program for scheduled legs. Mountain said that two issues were that data does not always go to the Data Bank and that the alternate sites do not get reviewed by the thematic panels. Dick said that we may be in danger of micro-management, and that these decisions should be made by co-chiefs and ODP-TAMU staff, he said that if new sites would endanger the science of the leg then it would become apparent very quickly. Berger said that there are the urgent "at sea" site changes, and others where there is enough time for review. He continued, if there is time, then changes should go through the advisory system or this procedure could be used to circumvent panel input and advice. Natland said that the mechanism is in place as it was accepted by PCOM last December, and proponents must be urged to follow the guidelines.

Leg 168 visual data are due to be deposited on 20 August 1995 and then the leg is ready to go.

Leg 169 the lack of precise navigation and visual markers could be improved. There was a problem in that the proponent may get a cruise funded to place markers, however, PCOM approved the leg without these, and SSP said the markers were desired, but not essential. Ellins said that in essence the proponents have not been as responsive as they may have to SSP.

Coffee Break *15:15 - 15:35*

D. Leg Report - Leg 161 Mediterranean Sea II

M Comas presented this report on the tectonics aspect of drilling. She began by outlining the scientific problems in looking at extensional basins in collisional settings, firstly by looking at their character.

She said that the basins are located on the sites of late Cretaceous to Palaeogene orogens generated by collisional stacking, and surrounded by highly arcuate thrust belts that were active before and during extension in the basins; the basins are largely floored by continental crust; these attributes essentially characterise the so-called "Mediterranean back-arc basins"; the directions of extension in the basins, and of relative convergence in surrounding arcs, vary markedly, and show no direct relationship to the overall relative motion of the African and Eurasian plates that bound these systems.

She then outlined some possibilities for the origin of the extensional basins; the role of anomalous mantle diapirism; similarity to the western Pacific back-arc model; a juxtaposed region of compression and extension, can be explained by a mechanism involving collision-induced delamination ("subduction") of continental mantle lithosphere; convective removal of a thickened lithosphere root on the site of a former collisional orogen.

She then explained the tectonic objectives for Leg 161, dividing them into thematic and specific. The thematic objectives were to better understand the dynamics, kinematics, and deformation of the continental lithosphere in collision settings by looking at the development of extensional basins generated on collisional orogens, the dynamics of the collapse of collisional ridges resulting in extensional basins surrounded by orogenic belts, and collisional processes. She said that there were two specific objectives, firstly, to investigate the nature of the crust and to develop a lithosphere model for the observed rifting system by looking at; models for Miocene rifting that would constrain the nature of the basement and the geometry of rifting; looking at the magnitude and timing of extensional faulting; the nature of syn-rift versus post-rift subsidence and the pattern of total tectonic subsidence; the timing and role of volcanism during extension. Secondly to investigate post-rift deformation by looking at; the late Miocene to Recent contractive re-organisation recent strike-slip tectonics; the role of volcanism; the recent collapse of the basin.

She reported that 6 sites were drilled (16 holes) during the leg with an average recovery of 84.4% (Appendix 11), and she reported the major tectonic results of the Leg by Site.

Site 976 (W Alboran Basin, on a structural basement high).

- The nature of the basement (sampling of 260m of continental metamorphic basement).
- The age of Miocene rifting (middle Miocene sediments on top of the basement).

- The character of the metamorphic basement (it indicates rocks of continental origin that have undergone high temperature metamorphism and melting at exceptionally low pressure after exhumation and decompression).
- Age of magmatism

Sites 977 and 978 (E Alboran Basin)

- The nature and age of post-rift sequence (post- late Miocene)
- The age and character of the M-reflector (lowermost Pliocene, erosional and angular unconformity).
- The age of later tectonic re-organisation (late Miocene to Pleistocene strike-slip faulting and pull-apart basins).
- Post rift (thermic ?) subsidence
- Age of volcanism (pre-Messinian).

Site 979 (southern Alboran Basin)

- The nature and age of the post-rift sequence (Pliocene to Pleistocene major angular unconformities).
- The age of later folding and uplifting of the Alboran Ridge (from late Miocene to Pleistocene).
- Late Pliocene to Pleistocene subsidence (coeval with uplifting).
- Age of volcanism (pre-Messinian).

She finished her report by summarising the operational successes and problems.

Successes

- Using FFF instead of re-entry system at Site 976 with similar results
- Long pieces of metamorphic rocks
- High quality FMS and BHTV images in basement, good use of logging filling-up intervals of low recovery
- Dedicated holes: Logging/re-sampling Site 976, interstitial waters
- Sequence of logging runs (Q-combo, FMS, BHTV)
- Core-Core-Core correlation (magnetic susceptibility)
- Adequate sampling and analysis for both sediments and basement
- No discrepancies between predictions and results
- No problems with cable and very good weather

Problems	
FFF	Loss of hole 978A
Recovery	Poor in basement rocks across alternating soft/hard lithologies
	(Hole 976B=19.5%, Hole 976E=33.69%, 0-5% across un-cemented sand and gravel's)
Penetration	No penetration of gravel's at Site 978
Logging	Problems related to washed out holes and differences in diameter
Cores	Highly biscuited in XCB (20% max.)
	Highly gassing (problems with physical properties)
	Re-magnetisation in APC and XCB (problems with magnetostratigraphic scale)

E. Global Geoscience Program Liaison Updates

1) InterRidge

Mével reported that InterRidge has been very active recently. Their primary activity is to disseminate information and organise workshops that discuss thematic priorities and design experiments.

A workshop took place in September 1994 on the 4D architecture of the Oceanic Lithosphere, which involves drilling. Two types of locations have been discussed; a fast spreading ridge study area is Hess Deep, ground truthing geophysical results by looking at the outcrops on faulted scarp slopes and continued offset drilling. Slow spreading ridges are more complex and not much is known about the slow spreading ridge segment environments. A sense of evolution with time is required for these studies, both at the centres and edges of the ridge segments. It will be necessary to have deep holes, but because of technology problems, these will not be on new crust, and a site has yet to be determined.

In early 1995 there were workshops that discussed biology, event detection and sea floor observatories. In June 1995 another workshop looked at hydrothermal fluxes, this was mostly a water column problem.

Future activities. The SW Indian Ridge is a very important area and an ad-hoc sub-committee will meet in August 1995 to look at this area as it has been selected for a case study. A further workshop (The Ocean Lithosphere and Ocean Drilling in the 21st Century) is being organised for April 1996, to look at thematic priorities and strategy.

2) NAD

Kappel reported on this item. She referred PCOM to the papers in the agenda book. She began by reviewing the NAD Executive, Science, and Technical Committees memberships and outlined ongoing and future planned NAD activities.

Kappel then presented the EXCOM Consensus on the NAD Proposal, suggesting that PCOM focus on the "Arctic Panel" and the "co-operative framework" that is proposed. Kappel reviewed the proposed ODP-NAD framework as in the agenda papers, and confirmed that the storage of samples, and cores would be handled through the ODP structure at cost. Francis commented that an ODP-TAMU engineer has been invited on a two-month drilling trip to the Arctic and asked if PCOM consider this worthwhile (the salary is from commingled funds).

Kappel said that PCOM should look at this as a potential model for co-operation with other programs. Dick said that he was concerned at how the communications would work between the NAD science operator and NAD science, technical and executive structure, and if they have their own funding why do they need to talk to ODP. Kappel and Natland said that this was really a proposed model, open for comment. Larson said he was enthusiastic about this, but ODP must be careful especially about a NANSEN Arctic Panel as a Regional Panel as ODP has evolved away from these. But he said that the complication was that NAD had their own money. Berger asked why NAD want to become involved with JOI as he couldn't see what JOI had to offer them. Kappel said that it was a method for them to avoid forming a new management and planning structure when JOIDES works well. Dick said that there are many structures that would overlap, possibly un-necessarily.

Mével said that as they had different funding they would not want to be ranked along with JOIDES ODP proposals. Dick said that it would be useful to see how various NAD proposals are ranked alongside other ODP proposals so that the quality of science can be assessed. Kudrass asked if NAD would also use the JOIDES Resolution, and Kappel said that NAD already consider some of the ODP drilling to be moving into the NAD "territory". Larson asked if NAD actually had the breadth of ODP so that there would be a requirement for four thematic panels. Kappel said that they did. Scott said that he was concerned where the Canadians at least, would be getting their money from, it may prove a competition in Canada. Taylor reminded PCOM that the LRP talks about using alternate platforms, but as yet ODP has not gone very far down this road, and he thought that this may have been the framework from which EXCOM took their stand. He said that PCOM must pass some advice to EXCOM on the potential implications for the JOIDES advisory structure and on operation implications (e.g. for NAD to use ODP-TAMU engineers). Berger agreed that PCOM must follow this up and outline a model which other groups can use, rather than be purely reactive to other groups' proposals. Mével said that PCOM should also consider initiatives such as CORSAIRES.

A sub-group to consider this are Johnson, Dick, Berger, Kudrass and Mével who will report back under new business on Saturday (see sections below).

PCOM discussion about the potential "Arctic Panel" as mentioned in the agenda books, gave a sense that PCOM were not comfortable with the idea of a "fifth" Thematic or Regional Panel, and that this aspect must be re-visited. Ellins read through a preliminary draft of the EXCOM minutes to enlighten PCOM as to the view of EXCOM, re-iterating that EXCOM thought that the other programs' panels would be more along the lines of DPG's. Taylor said that a standing Working Group may make a lot of sense to avoid things being split by a number of disparate themes, even if proposals are focused regionally, they may still need thematic review. Mével said that there is a difference between NAD and InterRidge, InterRidge will not bring any money into ODP. Natland

asked PCOM if they wished to tell the international groups that they have to use the ODP structure. Berger said that that is the case, especially if they wish to use the ODP services. PCOM gave assent to the idea that other programs will have to follow ODP procedures. Berger said that PCOM should tell EXCOM that they should have a template that will allow many other programs to link to ODP and not just do things on a case-by-case basis.

(N.B. The following discussion was from 19th August, placed here in the minutes for continuity). Berger said the basis of his tabled motions (95-2-5,6) are a method of introducing a formal mechanism for ODP interaction with other geoscience research programs. Once other programs have been given JOIDES Drilling Associate (JDA) status they have the right to ask for all sorts of things, but that their proposals will still be subject to review. Mével said that all proposals for using the JOIDES Resolution should be treated equally and not given preference. Berger said he agreed with that and that the 'privileges' were, for example asking for engineers to explain techniques or operations. He said that a group proposing to use the JOIDES Resolution can "plug in" to ODP in this way, but it does not mean that drilling proposals would be treated any differently from 'ordinary' proposals. Carter said that it is made plain that there are privileges including liaison, and that he suggested an amendment to motion 95-2-6, that association should be a two-way thing such that JOIDES representation should be granted from the associate program. Larson seconded the proposed amendment.

Berger said the idea is to show a positive response to the concept of a closer association with NAD, pointing out to EXCOM that there is not a proper mechanism for doing this and PCOM would like a full review before entering into such an association. This may then lead to associations with other international groups. Berger said that we have to get an estimate from other programs as to what they will require from ODP over a three year time scale. Scott and Mix suggested non substantive word changes that were accepted by PCOM. Kudrass had a problem with the words "Drilling Associate". He would like to use JOIDES Research Association. Carter said that was why he abstained from motion 95-2-6. He said that "Drilling" was too restrictive. Larson said we are the ODP, and drilling was just "making a hole", and the implication is that we actually recover core with putting coring in the title and that maybe we are worrying about unnecessary things.

Natland said that if we vote on Crater's amendment for the name-change it was implicit that the change would apply to the associated motion, and PCOM agreed this. The amendment was to change the wording to "JOIDES Associate Organisation", Seconded by Kudrass, the vote was 15 for with 1 absent.

PCOM Motion 95-2-5

PCOM notes with great interest the proposal of the Nansen Arctic Drilling Program for closer association with the JOIDES/JOI structure. We encourage further discussion and exploration of common interests and possible linkages. We recommend to EXCOM consideration of the status of "JOIDES Associate Organisation (JAO)" for NAD, as outlined in companion motion 95-2-6.

Such a status should only be conferred in response to a formal proposal from NAD outlining scientific goals, administrative structure, history of activity, participating institutions, sources of funding, existing facilities and infrastructure, and plans for the future, as well as services anticipated to be required from JOIDES/JOI/ODP.

Proposed: Berger, Seconded: Kudrass, *15 For, 1 Absent (McKenzie)*

Sager asked if in Motion 95-2-6 we should be specific to seafloor drilling or use the term "Earth". Mountain said that he did not think that we had to be so specific. Larson said that he thought, for example drilling the Cretaceous in the Alps was similar to drilling it under the oceans, so he moved to amend the motion to change "sea-floor" to "Earth". This was seconded by Sager. Mével said we should leave things as open as possible to see who is interested in communicating with ODP. Kudrass said that those interested will approach us, others will not. Taylor said that some groups are already infiltrated in the ODP system, but others such as NAD and ANTOSTRAT have their own infrastructure, and this is really about relating to those sorts of groups, so he supports the

amendment. Carter supported the amendment and suggested inserting "drilling or coring platforms". The amendment to change the word to "Earth" was voted upon, 12 for, 1 Against, 2 Abstentions, 1 Absent. Carter said that this means we have deliberately moved away from being specific about working at sea. The motion was seconded by Larson, and the vote was 15 for with 1 absent.

Malfait said that the references in section 2) of Motion 95-2-6 have to be "JOIDES and JOI", as a technical amendment. Scott suggested a wording change, for clarification, that was agreed by PCOM. Larson said he thought this was a very positive proposal and looked forward to seeing this moving forward, he called the question and was seconded by Sager. Vote to call the question, 2 in favour, there is no vote. Suyehiro asked how this motion applied to ION, he said that the observatories would like closer ties with DMP and ODP-TAMU. Larson said that he thought that as ION wanted to study the Earth through the use of drillholes, then they would qualify. PCOM agreed with this. Berger said that the JAO status would be important and would help some organisations to get funding, because ODP is then acknowledging the legitimacy of other groups. Francis reminded PCOM that the JOIDES Resolution can also be used to take heavy loads to the seafloor, and not just drill.

Scott moved to item 5, and suggested that the wording be changed to "3 years at a time upon request by the JAO and is renewed as long as the association is accepted by both partners" to make the 3-year membership period stronger, this was accepted by PCOM. Berger said that the 3-year period was based upon PCOM rotation, and that the funding cycles were not considered in depth. He said that many projects had 3-5 year funding and that a lower limit would not be strong enough. Sager moved to call the question and was seconded by Larson, 10 for. (see next page for full motion).

PCOM Motion 95-2-6

PCOM strongly endorses closer ties with international groups involved in studying the Earth using drilling or coring platforms or proposing to use such platforms, including the JOIDES Resolution. Initiation and strengthening of such ties must be without prejudice to the scientific goals and legal mandates of the JOIDES enterprise.

PCOM recommends to EXCOM that formal ties be initiated in the following fashion:

1) JOIDES establishes the category of "JOIDES Associate Organisation (JAO)".

2) JOIDES and JOI confer JAO status on an organisation upon request and after discussion of a proposal to that effect, if close association is deemed desirable by both parties.

3) JAO status entails the following privileges;

a) one non-voting representative on each of the four thematic panel.

b) the option of liaising to PCOM.

c) the option of asking for proposal review by a thematic panel.

d) the option of asking for site survey review.

e) the option of asking for safety review on an advisory basis (that is, without liability for JOIDES, JOI, or ODP).

f) access to site survey background data and services (at cost where appropriate).

g) the option of asking for acceptance of data into ODP data bank on a case-by-case basis, at cost where appropriate.

h) the option of asking for acceptance of core materials into ODP repositories on a case-by-case basis, at cost where appropriate.

i) the option of asking for engineering and logging support and other operational support, including publication, on an ad-hoc basis, at cost where appropriate.

4) Granting of JAO status will be contingent upon negotiation of suitable JOIDES representation on the appropriate management committee or committees of the JAO applicant organisation.

5) JAO status is granted for a period of 3 years at a time upon request by the JAO and is renewed as long as the association is accepted by both partners.

Proposed: Berger, Seconded: Larson *13 For, 2 Abstain, 1 Absent*

Adjourn *17:45*

Thursday 17th August 1995 ***08:40 am***

Natland opened this session of the meeting by reporting to PCOM the sad death of Cesare Emiliani.

E. Global Geoscience Program Liaison Updates (continued).

3) ION

Suyehiro reported on the activities of the ION group. The steering committee members are from France, Italy, Japan and the USA. An international workshop was held in Marseilles in January 1995, with over 60 attendees from 8 nations, the proceedings of which are now available. ION also held an IASPEI led inter-association symposium with IAGA and IAG on Long Term Seafloor Observatories and Networks at the 1995 IUGG.

ION also revised its charter (Appendix 12) in 1995, and re-iterated its goals and its institutional framework. ION is currently seeking formal linkages to IAGA and IAG. Suyehiro then outlined a listing of priority sites for ION (Appendix 13), reporting that the involvement of the various nations are becoming more focused and concentrated towards the ION goals, such that OSN-1 will be instrumented at the end of 1996 or early 1997. ION will discuss mechanisms for submitting proposals.

Sager asked what ION would require in terms of drill-holes, in the next 5-10 years. Suyehiro replied that 8 sites would be required and that there is already funding available for some of these. Francis asked if boreholes were actually needed, and Suyehiro said that has yet to be proven. Larson asked how important the specific locations were, could ION use existing re-entry holes. Suyehiro said that few, if any existing holes were useful. Taylor commented that ION need holes that are cased to basement. Mountain asked about linking the observatories with fibre-optic cables, and whether there has been discussion to use such cables to link sediment traps, CTD's etc. Kappel said that OSN and ION have had a lot of interaction with cable groups, including proposals currently with NSF. She said the Marseilles meeting was to see if different disciplines could use the same sites. PCOM discussed what communities would actually require boreholes apart from seismology and for stress/strain measurements, Mével said that fluids studies also require boreholes.

4) IMAGES

Mix reported that IMAGES is under the auspices of IGPP PAGES. The chair of the working group is Psias and their last meeting will be in Halifax, after which the planning office will move to Cambridge, UK. The first cruise on the Marion Dufresne II has been completed, with many cores over 50m in length.

Mével asked if IMAGES are interested in drilling. Mix said the drilling interest is really from the US MESH program, IMAGES are happy, so far, to continue with the Marion Dufresne, but he believes that may change with time. Carter said the problem was using the JOIDES Resolution in a specific geographic pattern, which was something that ODP would not realistically do.

5) ANTOSTRAT

Berger said this was a group especially interested in the Cenozoic and sea level changes through looking at sequence stratigraphy. It was formed from a committee of the IUGG in 1989, and is currently led by Alan Cooper at the USGS, Menlo Park, with 50 active workers in 20 countries. So far they have been compiling offshore seismic data looking at worthy places to target drilling. Each of the 5 groups involved (geographical) have submitted Letters of Intent to JOIDES.

Carter said that there is a difficulty with potentially five Antarctic proposals, and he has some concern that we must not discourage them, but also not to be flooded with proposals. Carter said they are not only using ocean drilling, drilling from the ice will begin next summer (1996). Sager asked how dependent are Antarctic legs on new drilling technology. Carter said that the technology may not be available at present. Berger said he wasn't sure what will be done with the samples once they are recovered.

Berger said they will have a symposium in Italy when plans for drilling proposals will be finalised and a Ross Sea Atlas will be presented. Countries represented include, Weddell Sea - Germany and Norway, Ross Sea - Italy, US and Germany, Indian Ocean - France, Russia, and Japan. Taylor said there is not a great deal of difference between this program and NAD, and ODP should not treat them any differently. Natland said that if we are devising a model for inter-program co-operation, we should consider ANTOSTRAT and NAD.

6) LIPS

Sager reported that it is a sub-group of IAVCEI. It has held a number of meetings and a thematic volume on LIPS will be published in 1996, and there were some LIPS sessions in the IUGG in Boulder. There is a newsletter and a WWW site. There will be a lava flow conference in Australia in 1996. LIPS is very tied to ODP.

7) MARGINS

Taylor said that this is a US program, with their planning office at Rice University under the chairmanship of Dale Sawyer. The initial science plan is available on the WWW. MARGINS deals with mechanics of deformation on large faults, magmatism and sedimentation (including the fluids aspects of all of these). The implementation plan is under development, and also under discussion are newsletters, workshops, short courses and possibly a lecture series. MARGINS definitely see a relationship to ODP as essential to accomplishing their goals.

Carter asked what the thematic focus was, Taylor said primarily continental margins, though it included island arcs. He said the intent is to understand processes regardless of the tectonic setting, though it was not looking at spreading centres. Mével asked if there was a plan to contact the French Marge Group. Taylor said there has been contact with France, UK, and Australia, but the contacts are yet to be formalised, the US system only started running this summer. Suyehiro asked how seismologists are involved. Taylor replied that there are many tools that seismologists can use in this program, the initial science plan discusses characterising regional areas by imaging the system under study with all kinds of techniques. Taylor told Pearce that this is a global program.

8) DOLCUM

Dick reported that this program is concerned with Drilling the Oceanic Lower Crust and Upper Mantle. The DOLCUM meeting was to ponder the future of crustal drilling in the light of the results from Site 735B. He said many participants at the meeting had no opportunity to study the marine rocks, and that about half the attendees were involved with continental drilling. He said that after the ODP drilling at MARK and Hess Deep there is an awareness of what can be done and so this group may now be merging back into the ridge community. There will be another meeting in Spring 1996 that will look at priorities and plans over the next 5 years and possibly beyond 2003, he said that DOLCUM will probably become a more formal part of the InterRidge community.

9) SUBCON

Dick said that this was a one-off meeting organised by the USGS with a focus on the use of drilling. The report has yet to be published. It was a closed meeting concerned with subduction beneath continents, and their interests seemed to ally with MARGINS though there were no MARGINS representatives present.

10) Continental Drilling

Natland said that there are a variety of initiatives, such as the Antarctic Drilling mentioned earlier, Hans-Christian Larsen's E Greenland program, the US Continental Drilling has 2 programs, looking at Hawaii and the San Andreas fault, although these are really pilot holes. Natland said it would be worthwhile for a formal PCOM liaison to be named and he volunteered. Malfait said there are attempts to get an international continental drilling program up and running, NSF and Germany have (or shortly will) sign a formal agreement. Natland said that there was a deep drilling workshop at College Station several years ago, which included the Russian and Swedish deep drilling groups, along with representatives from the German KTB. Francis said that the US continental drilling engineer is actually based at ODP-TAMU. Mountain asked whether ODP should encourage continental drilling to look at shallower penetration holes that can link with offshore ODP holes. Larson said that many people in continental drilling were interested in lower crustal processes. Suyehiro said there will be a deep-drilling (15 km depth) international workshop in Japan in 1996. Scott said that the Lithoprobe program in Canada may be worth contacting (John Clowes - contact), as they have both East and West coast transects.

11) IDEAL

Sager reported that this is to do with the International Decade of the East African Lakes, but contacts have yet to be pursued. McKenzie said that the IDEAL Program would like to drill deep holes in the E African lakes. The Program is an attempt to integrate developed and developing countries scientists, and an attempt to study the lakes in a holistic sense. The lakes may form one of the pole-pole transects for climate studies. McKenzie said the Program has funding and research projects are underway, she said it was a crucial area for looking at climate change and tying the records there to the marine record.

F. Revised Long Range Plan

1) As presented to EXCOM

Natland reviewed the process of the revision of the LRP for the benefit of the new PCOM members. He outlined the processes and thinking behind the revised LRP since 1993, developing a true Long Range Plan based upon the Thematic Panel white papers. He completed this review with activity up to and including discussions and actions at the last PCOM meeting in Makuhari, Japan (April 1995). He concluded by saying that the version of the LRP that we ended up with after all the sub-committee meetings and re-writes was in reality a good match for what ODP was actually doing, even though some may argue that some areas of ODP research could be difficult to readily identify. Ellins continued with a summary of events after the April 1996 PCOM, including the sub-committee meeting in Cardiff in early May 1996.

Carter said that he was unclear as to the function of PCOM at this point in the process. Natland confirmed that PCOM do not have time to make major revisions, but will be asked for comment. Carter then said that PCOM need to focus on certain items, and Natland said that Mutter would inform PCOM of these areas.

Coffee Break *10:15 - 10:50*

2) EXCOM Actions

Mutter presented a report of the discussions and actions taken at the EXCOM/ODPC meeting in July 1995. He said the EXCOM actions were primarily a response to the views of the ODPC members. He said that there are different science policies across all the JOIDES members and these varied views all had to be taken into account. He said that a number of the EXCOM members in US institutions held their own small meetings to review the LRP as they saw it after the PCOM meeting in Cardiff. He said that a number of EXCOM members that came to the EXCOM meeting with similar views; that it was generally written at too basic a level and that the achievements were grossly overstated. In terms of the future objectives, the problem was that there was a 'least common denominator approach', with about 65 problems that ODP would address. ODP could not make great inroads into all of these problems, there was a lack of focus. Mutter reported that at EXCOM the general discussion about what could be done lasted for an hour.

Mutter said that the ODPC/EXCOM meeting included senior members of the funding agencies who are charged with looking at the renewal of the program, and the most severe criticism came from the UK and French representatives, the latter of which said they would not renew, citing the LRP as one of the reasons.

The UK thought the introductory material was overstating what has been done, and that the future plans were simply business as usual, that a plan that doesn't make choices isn't really a plan. This was also true for France and to some extent the ESF. These are the criticisms that EXCOM felt they needed to respond to. Mutter reported that in three weeks the International Review Committee will begin to evaluate whether ODP renewal will be affirmed, and he said the LRP will go before knowledgeable people, and that a more general document will be produced for non-specialists.

Mutter said that EXCOM felt they had no choice but to produce a document that would be presentable to this review committee, based upon final revision approval by an EXCOM sub-committee of Larry Mayer, John Mutter, Jim Briden and Rob Kidd (Bob Derrick was also added as EXCOM Chair-elect). The EXCOM sub-committee suggested a list of people to write a new achievements section, which was accepted by Rob Kidd. A template was given to each of the suggested authors, and this is reflected in the tabled version of the LRP.

Mutter then moved to discuss how the future focuses were chosen. He said that one way to approach it was to look at things as though in an aggregate sense all science works to the benefit of society, but for an individual project you cannot predict what the actual benefits will be. Translated to the ODP LRP, EXCOM decided that they would have to focus on a few projects, but not in a prioritised manner, recognising that we do not have the finance or resources to be the very best at everything. Therefore the items highlighted were chosen so that they might satisfy the criticism of "business as usual". This is why the deep biosphere was one of the future objectives. The observatories section does not just mean ION. EXCOM wanted an objective that described deep riser drilling that described both continental margin drilling and deep drilling, and a contribution on rapid and polar climate change was also chosen as a future objective. Mutter said that due to personal circumstances of individuals, things had not been as speedy as possible. However, in large part EXCOM knows what they want to do and he wished to emphasise that the changes were done as a response to the ODPC, and EXCOM, in a way, felt that they were almost rescuing the program. He then said that the EXCOM group (Mayer, Mutter, Briden, Detrick, Ellins, Kappel and a science writer) will meet at JOI next week to finalise the draft that will go the international review committee the following week. Mutter reported that the methods for the LRP modifications and the timetable outlined here were agreed to by the PCOM Chair in Edinburgh.

Natland read to PCOM a communication from the EXCOM chair (Appendix 14) outlining what actions he wished PCOM to focus on. He then opened discussion.

Mével asked about the management and advisory structure sections. Mutter said that for the first review committee meeting, only the science plan is required and that if that passes review, then the management plan can be written. Dick said that he was concerned about the implementation sections, that he did not think there was a PCOM consensus. He read the document as saying that a large part of the program will be devoted to climate change. He referred to p68 of the LRP. Dick said that the PCOM chair did not do as he was asked by PCOM, and that was why no formal motion was made. Ellins explained that this was not the case, that the PCOM Chair had removed the contentious phrasing, but that it had been re-inserted by an EXCOM representative. It would be re-examined at the sub-committee meeting at JOI.

Natland said that it was the way the science content was treated that PCOM should focus upon. Sager commented that Mutters report was very positive and he liked the approach taken, but said that for many years ODP has taken the view that we do not focus as we will simply take the best science proposal that comes along, yet now EXCOM are saying we should focus. Mutter said that the objectives mentioned in the LRP are simply four highlighted things that are intended to highlight that it is not business as usual, they are in no way a vision that this is all the program will do. Sager said that at the present it reads as though ODP will focus on these four themes. He said that ODP's success is based upon the flexibility of taking new science and pursuing that. Mutter re-iterated that the there was no-way a simple 'more-of-the-same' message would be tolerated by the

UK, and also to a great extent in France, where they wanted to match the priorities of ODP and those of the French national programs/policies.

Carter said that maybe the four opportunities in this version of the LRP (that no-one here is an expert on) is the right approach, and that maybe we should now be driven by pragmatism. Taylor said that at COSOD II, ocean floor observatories were mentioned, to date we have only done one, and we may be up for criticism if we do not follow-up on what we say we are going to do. Larson said there are many un-addressed objectives from COSOD I, let alone COSOD II. Mével said that we have developed long term observatories and that is a first step to sea-floor observatories. McKenzie said that we have been studying the deep biosphere in off-hand ways, we have been looking at processes so far and that interest (e.g. Leg 164) will continue. Scott said that Leg 128 was a deep biosphere experiment, and McKenzie said that microbial studies samples are routinely being collected. Kudrass said that the four objective items are really technical things, he feels that we are fishing for highlights that are not really the objectives of the program. Suyehiro said that renewal is also a problem for Japan and that PCOM should not make assumptions based on OD21; that is a proposal from a different funding agency. He is in general agreement with the changes made by EXCOM, but he would like to see a few sentences to help Japan. He believes that the time is now right to implement seafloor observatories, at COSOD II it was merely a dream. Mutter said that the Germans commented that they liked the broad-brush style of the earlier version and that the sub-committee will be careful about clarifying that the four objectives are not all that will be done. Pearce said that he felt that the four objectives could become too much of a focus for the UK funding agency, the wording must be careful and the objectives be made more exciting. Mountain said that the 65 questions in the earlier plan were to enfranchise both a new community and retain old friends, and that it should be emphasised that these are only four highlighted new themes. He added that we should try and emphasise that the full balance of current ODP objectives will still be a goal.

Mével and Mutter reported that a lot of the US EXCOM representatives were also saying that the LRP was too unfocused. Dick said that this program does allow new science to enter and that so long as the wording is right then EXCOM have taken the right approach. Mix said he agreed with Carter, that so long as things are not precluded, for example using the phrase Major Objectives. Johnson and Shipley both said that are in general agreement with the EXCOM actions. Larson said that PCOM must understand what the LRP is and what it is not, he said that he thought it was a sales pitch, it is not a binding piece of terminology that will change the way proposals are prioritised. McKenzie said that ECOD was such a mixture that she could not comment specifically, but she too was in support. Natland said that so long as the four future objectives, or directions, were consistent with the body of the document, this validates them and riser drilling is after all the focus for OD21. He agreed with Dick that there was no reason for any statement about the proportions of ship usage for the two main themes. He was in support of the proposed changes and said that EXCOM had done a service in directing PCOM toward some prioritisation.

PCOM Consensus 92-2-7

PCOM notes the reasons for, and endorses, in principal, the changes in the Long Range Plan that have been recommended by EXCOM.

Office Note: This Consensus did not receive the formal support of PCOM and so a new resolution was proposed and passed at the December 1995 PCOM meeting.

Taylor asked how PCOM could make specific comments. Mutter replied that PCOM should forward specific comments to the EXCOM sub-committee via Ellins who will pass them, on behalf of Rob Kidd, to the EXCOM sub-committee for consideration at the JOI meeting.

Natland asked for any comments on the accomplishments. Mutter said that if PCOM wish they could make suggestions and pass these to Ellins too. As regards the "Opportunities", Natland asked that PCOM comment upon these and the accomplishments. Rapid and Polar Climate Change "Opportunity", also needs writing. It was agreed that individual PCOM members will act as the focus for PCOM comment on the various sections and pass these to Ellins.

(N.B. The following discussion was from 19th August, placed here in the minutes for continuity).

3) Status of revision to new parts of the LRP.

The Climate Change opportunity is finished and has been faxed to the EXCOM sub-committee. The Bacteria section is still being worked upon by Berger but will be passed to Ellins, and the Observatory section comments have also been passed to Ellins. Mével has yet to finish the Oceanic Crust section, but will pass her comments to Ellins. Taylor has passed the Rifted Margins accomplishment revisions to Ellins. Shipley added to the accomplishments section on Accretionary Prisms and handed it to Ellins. Carter said that it is vital that a science writer does the final draft. Scott corrected the ore deposits section and added to Table 1. Mountain is still working on the sea-level sections and will pass that to Ellins. Scott said that many PCOM members thought the end of the document was rather poor and needed some re-writing to make it more exciting to read. Mountain said that the four opportunities are very poorly explained and also needs re-vamping. Natland said he will write a general summary of PCOM discussion and pass that to the EXCOM sub-committee. Dick said that he will also pass a short note to Ellins. Taylor asked that PCOM be sent copies of whatever version of the LRP is sent to the International Review committee. Scott asked if he could get a copy as soon as possible for use in the Canadian review, and this was repeated for the UK and France. These requests will go to JOI. Carter said that it is essential that the next draft goes to all PCOM members.

Lunch Break *12:20 - 13:15*

G. Budget Items

1) Recent Events - Update

Francis reported on Engineering developments and their budget implications.

a) DCS Update

Francis outlined the progress to date with DCS (Appendix 15) concluding when in April 1995 Stress Engineering Services became the prime sub-contractor for DCS. He then outlined the development schedule (Appendix 16) reporting that the design and development of the controller is now underway, and a decision on feasibility will be made by TEDCOM in late 1995 - early 1996. He pointed out that if all goes well planning for a DCS leg can only happen in December 1996 for scheduling in FY98. He summarised the costs involved, Phase I cost $130K, Phase II is costing $320K, Phase III is estimated at $275K and Phase IV is $400K. Both Phases III and IV are not funded, the present stages have been funded by carry-over (Appendix 17).

b) Non DCS Engineering

Francis outlined events at ODP-TAMU since October 1994 (Appendix 18). He said that there are only funds to complete the first of PCOM's prioritisation in April.

He then gave an overview of the budget history since FY92 (including DCS) (Appendix 19) which showed there was only $110K proposed for FY96, and Pettigrew outlined the current status of engineering projects (Appendix 20). He said that he wanted PCOM support to carry-over savings from FY95 into the non-DCS engineering development budget although this still did not address the problem if DCS feasibility was proven. Kappel said that JOI will be working with ODP-TAMU and ODP-LDEO to fulfil PCOM's prioritisation once the level of savings are identified, as well as looking for funds for the Communications Strategy. Mountain said he thought there were limitations on the amounts that can be rolled-over into the next year. Kappel said that with unallocated funds JOI have to ask NSF permission. Berger said that he is worried that we are running on inertia so far as engineering is concerned, and there is no new money coming forward. He said that maybe ODP will have to re-examine the number of engineers at ODP-TAMU and their workloads. Malfait said that this was not the whole picture, once JANUS is completed then the expenses involved there will decline and there may be more funds available. Natland asked if ODP-TAMU will present the budgets next year under project management and that we will then be able to make a more informed prioritisation. Taylor said the issue for FY96 is that there will be less than for FY95 to start with, and that PCOM have been asked to simply follow-on from our April resolution.

2) Project Management

Kappel reported on behalf of the Program Director of JOI. She referred PCOM to the relevant EXCOM consensus, noting that the implementation plan is in the agenda books. She said at the moment ODP performs functional management and outlined an overview of how the Program works, saying that we focus our budgets and planning for each particular year. Each sub-contractor gets a budget that is then split between departments without determination of what is required leg by leg. She said that her perception is that each leg or theme (such as 'rifted margins') will become a project, such that science operations, engineering development, publications etc. would each be paid out of that project budget. If "themes" are used as projects, then each leg would be assigned a subset of the overall project budget (Appendix 21). She said the goal of this idea is to be more forward-looking and to allow better planning.

Berger said he foresees a problem where you try to assign themes to legs as there can be many themes to each leg, and there can be many problems assessing which portion of the legs cost the most. Natland said that he believed that it may be more realistic to look at legs, that themes may be too broad a term. He continued that with CORK's etc. we must have the figures available and the implications of cutting out parts of the leg so that PCOM can make informed decisions. Natland reminded PCOM that project management was one of the main recommendations of the EDRC. Francis said that for engineering development it was relatively easy, but that over 90% of the ODP-TAMU budget was for operations.

Berger asked if project management implementation would mean that extra personnel would be required once it was in place. Kappel said that it would not, of right, allow costs savings. Natland said that it was his perception that this was how the idea was sold to PCOM. Mével asked who was to be identified as project leader. Kappel said that was yet to be determined. Taylor said that there are some things that it will be easier to implement for than others, and that many PCOM members are still sceptical. Berger asked if this would remove the flexibility of ODP-TAMU. Francis said that he believed that it would, but that planning further ahead in time is a desirable goal because of the compressed time scale for budgetary compilation. Berger said another problem could be the temptation for micro-management.

Kappel reviewed for PCOM the recent USSAC Consensus (Appendix 22). Mountain said that he did not think that this would make ODP more efficient, unless it was used sparingly and appropriately. Natland said that without a presentation from the JOI Program Director it will be difficult for PCOM to respond. Francis said that ODP-TAMU will be progressing on a cautious basis, waiting to see the benefits before continuing with implementation. He said that it may be helpful if PCOM articulate their scepticism. Carter said that he couldn't see how partial implementation would work for each leg. He was also unclear on the procedure for testing project management. Carter said that the fact that project management works for JANUS is not proof that it will work for legs, and another key issue is the identification of the project leader. Natland re-iterated that he wanted the JOI Program Director to answer questions and that PCOM must ensure that the cautious approach is required, and really PCOM need more information before detailed comments can be made. Taylor asked if Kappel could ask the JOI Program Director to give examples of other projects within ODP so that PCOM could consider this in more detail. Natland said that this is an action item, to write to Falvey asking for a presentation and asking for examples. Pearce said there is a huge difference in a proposal driven system like this and a top-down management system where project management is the norm.

PCOM discussion was based around the scepticism that project management would actually lead to cost savings and that PCOM require explanation of what Dr Falvey actually means by project management. The motion below was presented, then withdrawn when Kappel said that she would pass this message to Falvey and he could them correspond with the PCOM Chair to see what kind of presentation is required.

> PCOM Motion
>
> PCOM requests that at its December '95 meeting Dr. Dave Falvey present plans for implementing Project management at all levels of the ODP. In particular, we ask

that he discuss examples of how multi-leg drilling "themes" would be more efficiently managed than they are at present.

Proposed: Mountain, Seconded: Larson

H. Performance Evaluation Committee IV

Kappel gave this report and referred PCOM to the papers in the agenda books. She made some specific comments about the positive reviews contained within the PEC report.

Mével said that a French criticism is that a number of recommendations are made by various review committees, such as in the PEC reports, and that not all recommendations have been implemented. Kappel said that this is being looked into by JOI at the moment, but there have been no specific complaints.

Carter said that he has never heard of bad reviews of ODP, most results are like those of the PEC, yet PCOM are feeling pressured about renewal. He said that a recent Australian review was very positive and he offered to circulate the document to PCOM members. He added that one of the Australian reviewers who was most positive was in the mining industry, and these are the type of people we need to win over.

I. Engineering

1) Leg Proposal

Pettigrew presented this item. He referred PCOM to the tabled copy of the proposal and outlined the four major objectives, each of which follows on from the other, although further development of ancillary drilling and coring tools would be scattered throughout the proposed leg. His report led PCOM through the tabled paper (Appendix 23), including the equipment and techniques to be developed and the drilling plan. He said the real 'meat' of the leg will be the establishment of the holes to give a comparison of four different systems. He reiterated that a diamond core barrel is not a tool to use for spud-in, but it will give better recovery once a hole is established.

He then led PCOM though his estimates of the proposed budget saying the figures were based upon past rentals and purchases, though some tools are still in concept and these figures may need refining.

Shipley said that some of the tools required still need development, and he asked when this leg could go to sea. Pettigrew said that assuming the funding for tool development was there, ODP-TAMU would need 12-18 months lead time. Natland said that based upon the present schedule, MARK could be reached in FY97 if those are the targets, that PCOM could make that scheduling decision in December this year, and asked if it is realistic to make a commitment at this stage.

Mével said that she was surprised to see this proposal without backup from a scientific proponent, and that an engineering leg should be prepared in conjunction with scientists. Francis said that there could be a number of targets at this stage. Taylor said that there was a discussion last December about including a generic engineering leg in FY96, but because PCOM were uncomfortable, that was the reason why this proposal was asked for. He continued, saying given the 4 year plan, the budgets for engineering development in FY95 and FY96, and the estimated cost of the hammer-in casing system, he did not see that we had the budget and the people devoting enough time to do this, in the right place in the Atlantic, in FY97. Mountain asked the minimum and desirable requirements Pettigrew would need. Pettigrew said he would need a minimum of 6 sites, though a hammer-drill-in system will allow drilling in slopes of up to 20°, and if he had targets that were on the order of 30-40m in diameter and less than 15° then too that would be good. Ideally though he would like to drill on increasing slopes to test the limits of the system. He said he would not need videotapes etc. from submersibles and ROVs. Pettigrew said that rubbled slopes are better than hard rock from a testing point of view. Mével asked if TEDCOM should rate this proposal, and was told that they would in October. Taylor re-iterated that this proposal is a concept test, to find the best available tools and alternatives, and at the moment we do not have all the alternatives, especially the potentially most exciting piece of equipment - the hammer drill-in casing system, and that we must get that developed. Therefore there are long time and budget lines, and that

maybe we cannot meet this schedule for FY97. Francis said that if scheduled, then 1/6 of the ODP-TAMU operational funds would go to the leg, and he felt that if the carry-over is approved then the development could be done from FY96 onward. He continued that by the December 1995 PCOM meeting there should be more information available. Taylor said that he is enthusiastic but he is concerned about the time-line.

Kudrass said that he is concerned about the concept of an engineering leg. He said that the hammer drill-in casing should be developed first and then if it does work you can forget about the rest of the proposed leg. Dick asked why this testing cannot be done on blocks of individual legs. Pettigrew said that traditionally this time has been unavailable, but he thought that that was the most efficient way to do things. Mével said that this "shared" leg method was a recommendation of the PEC IV. Natland said he shared the concerns of Taylor regarding the time-frame due to the availability of available sites. Dick said that perhaps we should ask for both 1/2 leg and full leg proposals for consideration in December.

Natland said that we have to consider what non-DCS engineering we wish to pursue with the roll-over. He asked if pursuing this will slow other development and Francis said that the items were all related, and that this would become the non-DCS project for FY96. Shipley suggested that we ask TEDCOM for advice on this as well as LITHP and SSP. Taylor asked about capital costs and where the money would come from, Pettigrew said that at the moment no decision had been made if the equipment would be bought or leased.

Mével said that we should not trap ourselves into the idea of scheduling a whole leg, we could do 1/2 a leg. Natland said there are still only 2 geographic traps, Hess Deep and MARK. He said that we would ask the panels mentioned above for comment but that SSP must have information as to the proposed site requirements. Sager said that given that we may need another place, PCOM could ask LITHP what areas may be suitable for such tests. Mével said there is a letter of intent that the proponents have, and said this LOI should be regarded in conjunction with an engineering leg and that the proponent may be contacted for ideas. Natland said that is not the usual way that engineering legs have been set up.

Coffee Break *15:15 - 15:35*

2) Choice of Re-Entry Structure

Francis said he wished to draw PCOM's attention to the way things work at present and referred PCOM to his letter in the agenda book. He said that often at sea the target drilling depth can be reached without full re-entry structures and this has implications for both cost and time savings. He wished this item raised as full cased re-entry holes, as a requirement, were raised at the ION workshop in Marseilles. He asked if the decision on full re-entry structures should be made by PCOM or co-chiefs.

Natland asked if the sites Francis mentioned were recommended by the Thematic Panels. Francis replied that they were, but conditions are usually unknown until drilling begins. Taylor said that to safely plan to reach the scientific target depth then re-entry cones are planned. Sager said that we need to decide if we need to leave a class of "legacy" holes. Natland said the value of the hole depends upon the place and the hole. PCOM needs a screening, say in December, when we can ask the panels if they wish certain sites to be re-entry sites. Also we could liaise with, for example, ION to establish decisions on the installation of re-entry holes. Natland said that we must look forward and ask the question long term. Johnson said essentially PCOM should raise the sensitivity of the panels to this question. Francis said that Site S-6 on Leg 165 is a case in point, they could get by with a FFF, but should ODP use a full re-entry system. Mountain said that certain survey needs may be required for re-entry sites, and that if sites are to be targeted by the thematic panels then those sites should be in the SSP evaluation process.

Natland said that PCOM will raise this issue with the Thematic Panels and allow SSP to look at these sites. Taylor said that with some of the scheduled legs then the co-chiefs will have problems as they already have very full schedules, and for example the Leg 165 co-chiefs may not be sympathetic. This may also be true on the California Margin Leg. Natland said we have to recognise that it may be too late for some legs. Sager said that PCOM has to act as a filter, but must

take a longer-term view. Taylor and Natland said that this could be flagged at the scheduling meeting in December, so the Thematic Panels must be made aware to consider this at their fall meetings. Suyehiro said that the other geoscience programs should also be aware of these sites for use by wireline re-entry for example.

> PCOM Consensus 95-2-8
>
> Cased, re-entry holes have great potential scientific value for seafloor observatories, future drilling, etc. In the past, the decision whether or not to complete a scheduled re-entry hole with casing has been left to Co-Chief scientists. Rather than lose potential important cased holes to expediency, PCOM directs panels, especially thematic panels, to identify potentially important "Legacy Holes", to be noted in the annual drilling prospectus. PCOM will review the list and decide whether to mandate casing of a possible "Legacy Hole".

Proposed: Sager, Seconded: Larson *Consensus*

3) Tool Development Update

a) Vibrocorer

Pearce reported on development of this in the UK. It is currently at the British Geological Survey in Edinburgh, but there has been no recent development activity due to lack of funds. However, there have been logistic developments, Prof. Amman from Berlin has suggested that the equipment could be taken to Berlin for work, and European funds would be sought for development.

Pettigrew said that there is an agreement about disclosure and that before it is sent to Berlin then ODP-TAMU has to be kept informed and abreast of all developments. Mix said he thought that it was originally sent to BGS for work. Pearce said they began the work, but then funding for another project was available so the Vibrocorer was put to one side as there were no specific funds for Vibrocorer development, and that the situation was the same in Berlin. Pearce said they had a good case for European funding, but there may be a problem with the time scale.

b) Others

Pettigrew gave a brief report and referred PCOM to the tabled papers. He said the Seafloor Template/Hard Rock Spudding is on-hold pending development of the hammer drill-in system.

Mix asked about the PCS test prior to Leg 164. Pettigrew said that it has not been tested and that will be done on the Leg. Pettigrew said that the tool has been improved, but he thought that more could still be done given the resources. He said that he needs further science input regarding the likely material to be cored, to date only soft mud's have been sampled.

PCOM adjourned to form into LRP comment groups.

Adjourn *16:05*

Friday 18th August 1995 ***08:50 am***

J. Saanich Inlet in FY96

Francis reported on meetings with SEDCO/FOREX concerning feasibility and hazards. He said the main problem was that the area is in a recreational zone and there may be problems with pleasure craft near the JOIDES Resolution. The present status is that as the leg only involves APC coring in soft sediments, an emergency pipe release is not required. However, ODP-TAMU are very concerned about public safety and would like a 300m exclusion zone around the JOIDES Resolution so they have asked the Canadians if that is possible. There will be a general discussion at PPSP in September before a formal review in November. Clearance involves both federal and provincial Canadian governments, and there may be only a 50% chance of clearance. Scott commented that this low chance may be due to popular objections. Johnson said that Greenpeace may cause problems, they have halted seismic work before now.

Taylor commented that the drilling days could be moved from a weekend, and asked how this could be accommodated. Francis said that could be done by using the oncoming ship's crew. Carter said that the Gt. Barrier Reef may be more environmentally sensitive, that care was taken to talk to the environmental groups first, and no problems were encountered there. Sager asked why there are now two holes, not three and if there is a time problem? Francis said they have planned for 48 hours, and the operations should only take 35-40 hours. Ellins commented that there is only one site, the second is a proposed alternate. Mountain asked if ODP-TAMU looked at the potential problems with a nearby firing range. Francis said that this will be looked into. Larson asked what OHP had to comment. Carter said that OHP are enthusiastic, their only worry is that they are double APC holes instead of triple APC. Mountain said there was good quality seismic data brought to SSP, but there was a lack of 3.5kHz data, although that was scheduled to be collected in the Fall of 1995. Larson asked what PPSP will be looking at. Francis said that he wanted PPSP to know this was potentially in the schedule and wanted to give them plenty of time to consider this unusual leg.

Berger said the sediments are very soft and he believed that these sediments would be unable to hold gas at overpressure, it could be the removal of the overburden that would release any gas and it would not be worse than the Santa Barbara basin drilling. Larson asked about potential recovery and disturbance of the samples. Berger said that he thought it would be very similar to Santa Barbara, and that there could well be significant disturbance. Scott said that the area has been piston cored with excellent recovery. Taylor commented that it was good to show the Thematic Panels and EXCOM, that PCOM can react fast to a proposal such as Saanich Inlet.

Natland summarised that this is an information item and that PCOM will make a decision after the PPSP review in the December meeting.

K. FY97 Prospectus

Natland opened this item by reminding PCOM of the recent EXCOM Motion and changes in the JOI Policy Manual regarding Conflict of Interest.

1) Four-Year Plan Affirmation

PCOM Motion 95-1-17, as endorsed by EXCOM in July 1995, still stands.

2) Discussion of Prospectus Contents

Natland announced that the following PCOM members are conflicted and will be excluded from all discussion and comment on the relevant proposals; Mountain, Berger, Natland, Dick, Shipley, and Taylor.

Ellins then outlined the process of Thematic Panel global rankings and how filters such as the geographic area (as defined by PCOM in their 4-year ship track), and the level of the global rank (top 7 ranked proposals only) are applied.

Sager said that he thought that Proposal 441 had been mis-plotted and it may actually be inside the geographic area. Carter acknowledged his conflict with that proposal and confirmed that it had been mis-plotted. Ellins said that SSP did not consider 441 as the SSP and PCOM Chairs considered 441 to be outside the area of operations. Natland said that we have to be careful with the conflict issue and the geography can be used to include some things and exclude others. He said PCOM can consider whether 441 should be included, and also consider whether technical advice (site survey readiness) will be used to guide and stream the contents of the prospectus.

PCOM discussion then centred around the idea that PCOM must agree on the boundary conditions for the prospectus before the SSP evaluation of the proposals. Dick commented that the proposed motion suggested that the PCOM and SSP Chairs had not communicated effectively; a notion that Ellins' report clearly showed was not true.

> PCOM intends to contact the Chair of SSP between July 1 and the summertime SSP panel meeting and specify the cut-off in thematic panel rankings and the boundaries of the geographic region defining the range of proposals to be evaluated for data readiness

> by SSP. PCOM requests that when discussing these limits that the PCOM Chair bear in mind the additional criteria of workload on SSP that this group of proposals will represent.

Proposed: Mountain, Seconded:

Ellins reported that the PCOM Chair had recommended a geographic cut-off short of what was actually done at SSP in July, and that the SSP Chair had included two proposals in addition to those suggested by the PCOM Chair. Dick commented that the proposed motion was insulting as it implied that the PCOM and SSP Chairs had not communicated effectively, a notion that was dispelled by the report from Ellins. The motion was not seconded and was withdrawn.

It was agreed to let the minutes show that care must be taken to define the boundary conditions for evaluation of proposals prior to the summer Site Survey Panel meeting.

Taylor suggested that the appropriate time to direct SSP as to which subset of proposals they should address is following the 4-year plan decided upon at the PCOM spring meeting, . Mountain said that 1 July is the deadline for proposal submission, and the workload is unknown before that time. Carter said that there is a need for some form of recording as to where the lines should be drawn up for exclusion of proposals for consideration. PCOM discussed this briefly but no suggestions were forthcoming.

Natland asked PCOM if they wish to apply a technical review of the proposals based upon SSP advice, as to which proposals will go into the prospectus. He said an alternate was for a 'binary vote', with PCOM voting either yes or no to each proposal being included in the prospectus, and the results then being normalised. Natland said he thought that Proposal 441 should be considered in the discussions. Pearce asked for clarification on the filters. Natland said that a geographic filter was not considered.

Coffee Break *11:20 - 11:50*

Ellins reported that since 1990 no proposals ranked lower than 7 got in the prospectus and that this seemed to be a practical number for SSP to work with.

Dick suggested a PCOM sub-group be given the authority to construct a prospectus. Sager said he was not in favour of that method and supported Natland's suggested binary vote system. Taylor said that if a lower limit was enforced it would restrict the proposals that each panel would be able to support. He said that PCOM should look at all the proposals to ensure that all highly ranked proposals (1's and 2's) have been included, and that the documentation is in place and the SSP readiness is appropriate. McKenzie said that if all of the proposals are looked at, then some of the conflict may disappear.

3) Review of Proposals

Proposal 447 (Woodlark) - Taylor left the room. Natland asked for discussion on this proposal. Dick outlined his perception of this proposal based upon a presentation he heard at SSP. The proponents are trying to look at the history of basin opening by drilling the sediments above the basement. Mountain said that some of the drilling conditions may be difficult and there is a bare-rock site to be addressed, but there may be a cruise over that area this year. Ellins said that there is also an Aus-Can cruise scheduled for the fall and site survey readiness is accurate. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 300 (735B) - Natland and Dick left the room, Taylor returned, and Pearce took the Chair. He reported that this was LITHP's No.1 ranked proposal, and that it was once scheduled. Two legs are proposed, but this will be considered in December. Mével said the objective is to deepen Site 735B and possibly drill into the MOHO, and do some detailed logging. Also proposed is drilling a second site and some hole-hole experiments. Sager said that it seems one leg is ready and one is not and he was unsure how this would be scheduled. Mountain said that SSP have had problems with this for a long time, if an offset of a considerable distance is required, then SSP advise that the area is not adequately surveyed. Pearce and Taylor said they believed that this is ready to go as a proposal, the details will be discussed in December. Mountain said that the slopes are still

unknown for suitability of a HRGB. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 354 (Benguela) - Berger left the room, Natland and Dick returned. Mix said this was a series of holes in the Benguela current looking at how the front moves around and at the high productivity systems. Mix said he was surprised to see a SSP 2B rank with only a small amount of data missing that will shortly be filled by a Meteor cruise. Mountain said that the 2B reflected the present state, but that the leg is still viable without the one site. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 354 (Iberia). Berger returned. Taylor said that this a 'return to' proposal to extend a transect. Taylor did not understand the SSP 2B rating. Mountain said that this was because the drilling strategy depended upon the outcome of Site 900 results, and that these have not yet been reported. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 480/411 (Cret. Caribbean Basalts). Natland said this was a new proposal, but based upon last year's proposal. Taylor said that if it was ready for last year, it is ready for this year, despite there being new sites. Dick said there is a letter concerning this proposal in the agenda book (pp.231). Mountain said there are 3 new sites yet to be reviewed by the panels, including bare-rock sites. McKenzie asked if it was appropriate to put a proposal into the prospectus before the panels had ranked it. Taylor said that it had happened before, and repeated it was based upon a proposal from last year. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 464 (Sth. Ocean Palaeoceanography). Mix said it was a transect of sites SW out of Cape Town, looking at high resolution palaeoclimate themes. The proponents have a site survey cruise funded for February 1996, and that re-occupation of Site 704 is one goal. Ellins said that all required data will be acquired by a US cruise. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 348 (N J Margin) - Mountain left. Taylor said this was a mature proposal and that PCOM can deal with this very quickly. Without further discussion, **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 404 (Sed. Drifts). Mountain returned. Kudrass said that this proposal was to look at the history of N Atlantic Deep Water, and focuses on the Blake Outer Ridge. It is high on the list of OHP, though SGPP interest has waned. Kudrass said that he thought there may not be enough for a complete leg, and there were some problems with the site survey in that the seismics lines are 7km away from the proposed holes. Mountain said he thought it may be a full leg. In terms of site survey readiness, he said there were no high quality seismics at the drill sites, but very good 3.5kHz, though not to great depth. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 462 (Blake Nose). Mix said that it is an innovative proposal for high resolution palaeoceanography, and that he considers it should be in the prospectus. Mountain said that operationally there is a history of manganese and phosphorite pavements in that region that may cause problems. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 468 (Romanche/Vema). This proposal was received after the deadline and with no data submitted to SSDB, but the proponent gave a presentation at SSP. The lateness of the proposal was due to late feedback from a thematic panel. Taylor said that TECP want to see this drilled, despite the late submission, and that TECP will likely add this to the prospectus anyway. The leg will sample the carbonate caps to look at vertical crustal movements, and one or more sites may go to basement to examine its origin. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 457 (Kerguelen). Natland said the proposal is to drill a series of transects along age progressions of the plateau, may be involved with continental rifting (plume head). LITHP consistently rank this highly. Mountain said that many sites are proposed (more than two legs), not all data in the data bank at present, but the data does exist. **PCOM agreed that this proposal is ready for inclusion in the FY97 Prospectus.**

Proposal 426 (Aus-Ant Discord). Natland said it was proposed to look at the geochemical history of the Pacific-Indian Ocean boundary. Sites are to the north of the Antarctic - Australian Discordance proper. Mountain said that there is a seismic cruise scheduled in 1996, and aeromagnetics are available. The sites will be dependant upon the new data to be collected. Taylor said that if the data has yet to be collected then it should not be considered for scheduling in December. Mountain said that no data have been deposited, but the data could exist, he was unsure. Taylor commented that LITHP can always put it back into the prospectus if they get the data submitted to the data bank by 1 November. **PCOM decided that this proposal was NOT READY for prospectus.**

Proposal 367 (Gt. Australian Bight). Carter reported that the seismics are of very good quality, but may not be deposited with SSDB. The target is to look at the presence of cold water (or warm period) reefs, and the sequences themselves for correlation with the sea-level curve. Mountain said that many sites had less than 200m water depth (some <40m). A January 1996 cruise will complete the survey requirements and if all sites are moved to >200m, he thought the proposal will still reach objectives. Taylor said that as the proposal is dependant on shallow water drilling and surveys have yet to be completed, it cannot be scheduled in December. Carter said the 40m depth had been discussed, the sites can be moved to >50m, but a difficulty would occur if they had to be moved to greater than 200m. He understood that shallow water surveys have been scheduled. Natland said that without the data being deposited then we cannot realistically consider this as ready or near-ready. **PCOM decided that this proposal was NOT READY for prospectus.**

Proposal 355 (Peru Gas Hydrates). Taylor said that he thought the SSP grading had been too hard. He said the data is there, with the possible exception of some heat flow measurements. He said just because it is not in the right form it should not be ranked by SSP as a 5, more like a 2B. Mountain said that for the BSR you need to look at the 3-D characteristics, and the Data Bank information does not have good 3-D control, and SSP felt that it simply was not ready. Taylor said that it is driven by TECP, and that the BSR is not necessarily the prime objective. Dick said that if a leg could address objectives of two panels then PCOM should ensure that there is full characterisation for all objectives. Taylor conceded this, but said he felt he had to make the point for TECP. **PCOM decided that this proposal was NOT READY for prospectus.**

Proposal 441 (SW Pacific Gateways). Carter left the room. Natland said the proposal was to look at the flow of Antarctic bottom water around New Zealand using a depth transect. Mix said OHP is excited about this proposal, but was unclear about site survey readiness. Ellins said that in April SSP considered it should be ready in 1998, but not 1997, but that SSP did not have a thorough look at this. Larson said that given we are using SSP guidelines, we should not put it in the prospectus, if OHP feel it is ready and the site survey data is available they can re-insert it into the prospectus. **PCOM decided that this proposal was NOT READY for prospectus.**

Carter returned and Sager said that he was troubled that SSP may have precluded highly ranked proposals from the prospectus by their interpretation of the area of operations. Taylor, as proponent, requested that Proposal 447 be removed from consideration for inclusion in the prospectus, as he believed it may be an inefficient use of the JOIDES Resolution. Taylor then however, said that he had co-proponents and, on reflection, he did not feel comfortable doing this and withdrew his offer.

4) Contents of the FY97 Prospectus

Natland said that procedurally the proposals were looked at one by one with proponents excluded, with, in each case, a vote of unanimous consent on whether or not to include the proposal in the prospectus. This was done with prior agreement that the technical criteria (SSP readiness) and Thematic Panel rankings be a part of the evaluation. Therefore he saw no reason for any further voting and the following statement accurately reflected the consensus of an unbiased PCOM.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-9

The FY97 Prospectus, based upon PCOM consideration of SSP readiness, Thematic Panel Rankings, and the 4-year plan will be constructed from the following proposals.

Proposal 300 (735B)	Proposal 348 (N J Margin)
Proposal 354 (Benguela)	Proposal 404 (Sed. Drifts)
Proposal 447 (Woodlark)	Proposal 457 (Kerguelen)
Proposal 461 (Iberia)	Proposal 462 (Blake Nose)
Proposal 464 (Sth. Ocean Palaeoceanography)	Proposal 468 (Romanche/Vema)
Proposal 480 (Cret. Caribbean Basalts)	

Dick suggested that PCOM ask JOI to draw up the final prospectus. The rest of PCOM disagreed with this. Natland said that at least two legs have critical weather window requirements, but as Leg 170 ends in Costa Rica in December, then there will not be an Austral summer available for scheduling. Natland said we are faced with constructing a prospectus that may contain two legs that could not be scheduled for operational reasons. Berger said that the prospectus inclusion can also be used to raise flags to funding agencies for site surveys etc. Taylor said that previously there have been problems with the potential of not having enough high-priority legs to schedule, and that PCOM will likely be facing a very similar scenario in December. Francis said that if New Jersey is scheduled it must be done in June-July.

Ellins reported that the new SSP scheme emerged as a consequence of discussions between the Program Director at JOI, JOIDES Office liaison and SSP Chair. The SSP rankings are to be used as guidelines for PCOM. She also said that SSP also regards them as a device to encourage proponents to get their data to the SSDB, especially with further encouragement from the Thematic Panels and PCOM.

Lunch Break *12:20 - 13:45*

Natland began with a resume of the FY97 Prospectus Contents. Taylor asked for a summary of past proposals and then just the latest version of 480 to be supplied in the prospectus by the JOIDES Office, including past proponents.

5) PCOM Watchdog Assignments

Natland outlined the idea from the PCOM Chair that the watchdog not be the thematic panel liaisons, and that they provide a totally independent critique of the science proposed.

Proposal Number and Area	PCOM Watchdog
Proposal 300 (735B)	H P Johnson (University of Washington)
Proposal 348 (New Jersey Margin)	G Moore (SOEST, Hawaii)
Proposal 354 (Benguela)	K Suyehiro (ORI, University of Tokyo)
Proposal 404 (NW Atlantic Sediment Drifts)	H Kudrass (BGR, Hannover)
Proposal 447 (Woodlark Basin)	R Carter (James Cook University, Townsville)
Proposal 457 (Kerguelen)	W Sager (Texas A&M University)
Proposal 461 (Iberia)	J McKenzie (ETH, Zurich)
Proposal 462 (Blake Nose)	H Kudrass (BGR, Hannover)
Proposal 464 (Southern Ocean Palaeoceanography)	R Larson (University of Rhode Island)
Proposal 468 (Romanche/Vema)	C Mével (Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris)
Proposal 480 (Cretaceous Caribbean Basalts)	T Shipley (University of Texas at Austin, Texas)

Coffee Break *15:05 - 15:25*

L. Old Business

1) Future Meetings

Planned meetings are;

4 - 9 December 1995 ***San Diego, California, USA.*** ***Hosted by W Berger***

The meeting will be at Scripps. Suggested dates are before AGU. DRILLOPTS (3rd December), PANCH (4th December), and PCOM Report day (5th December), Field Trip (6th December), PCOM (7-9th December). Note: Dates for AGU in 1995 are 11 - 15th December

22-25 April 1996 ***Marseilles, France.*** ***Hosted by C Mével.***

2-day Field Trip to see Geology and Wine Tasting before PCOM, we would stay in Aix-en-Provence, with the field trip before the meeting.

The pre-meeting venues offered for August 1996 were Switzerland, Canada and Australia. Woods Hole was offered at the meeting. A straw vote for the August 1996 was held and PCOM's choice was Townsville, Australia. Post August 15th to avoid NSF deadline, aim for 3rd week of August.

Lamont was offered as host for the PCOM annual meeting in December 1996, and the offer of Woods Hole was still on the table for spring or summer 1997.

2) Data Integration Working Group

Natland reported that the substance of the report is to be published in the June 1995 JOIDES Journal, and he read through that article (JOIDES Journal, Vol.21, No.2, pp.35-36).

3) Conflict of Interest

Natland said that this item had been discussed earlier in the meeting (Item C.1). He believed that there was not much to add at this stage. Kappel said that PCOM had taken the point well, and realised that they must be above reproach. She had nothing to add.

Dick said that if a 5 year planning cycle is considered, then there will be no potentially unconflicted PCOM members. He believed that point 11.04 of the new JOI Policy Manual was too broad and that it may preclude any serious long range planning such as the indicative 4-year ship track. Larson said that he understood Dick's concern, but he did not think it would prevent PCOM from long range planning. He said we should communicate to EXCOM that it forces us to break down any program plan into very small chunks to maintain a quorum, and that this will not really be a long range plan, it will be a series of small chunks of the program stuck together. Taylor said he thought that it was very specific to individual proposals and he was unsure what would happen if the area under consideration was expanded to themes or regions. Pearce said he supported the views as expressed by Dick, but so long as the interests are declared there should still be ways to continue. Berger said he considered that this could be an invitation for closet proponents. Kudrass said that if you are the proponent of a site survey then you could not vote too, and he considered that ridiculous.

Francis commented conflict of interest also occurred in leg staffing, saying that for Leg 160 ODP-TAMU ran into a problem in that one lead proponent had lost interest, and if the rules are too tight then PCOM maybe leaving themselves in a corner. Carter pointed out that it was ODP-TAMU who actually appointed, PCOM was only restricted in its nominations.

(N.B. The following discussion was from 19th August, placed here in the minutes for continuity).
Dick presented a draft motion asking EXCOM to re-examine the new section 11.04 of the JOI Policy Manual, and explained the rationale behind it, that he believed that it would preclude any active marine geoscientist from PCOM with all the implications that will have on the health and future planning in ODP.

Natland said that PCOM members should individually communicate with the PCOM Chair their views on this so that he can then write a letter to the EXCOM Chair and/or the Program Director at JOI outlining the PCOM concerns.

Dick then read through the proposed motion. There was no discussion.

PCOM Motion 95-2-10

PCOM requests EXCOM review sub-section 11.04 of the JOI policy manual as this now defines conflict of interest sufficiently broadly as to preclude effective long range planning.

Proposed: Dick, Seconded: Sager *15 For, 1 Absent*

Natland again said that he would write to the PCOM chair and encouraged others to do the same.

4) Implementation of Publications Sub-Committee Report

Dick said there are several issues to consider. There is some concern that IHP may interpret this report differently than PCOM intended. PCOM must consider whether they want a direct hand as to how IHP work out the details of the sub-committee report. Dick reported that his EXCOM member told him that the SR may be voted out at the next EXCOM meeting. Dick then said that the broader community consider the legacy value of the SR volume. He said that France has pointed out that there are relatively few outside publications and the volumes are not an optimal medium for publication for many scientists. Dick said that the principal change proposed was the relaxation of external publication to 12 months post-cruise so long as a paper has been submitted to the SR volume, thus changing the nature of the SR volume. Dick said that if individuals can publish 12 months post-cruise then they will probably begin research earlier and the papers (inside and outside of the SR) will likely be more polished. He said that PCOM need to ensure that IHP accepts this interpretation of the sub-committee report, and this may address one of the major criticisms from France.

Dick said there are number of ways to oversee the implementation of the publications report. Larson said he did like the present version of the SR, but he was unsure what the minimum standard acceptable for publication in the SR volume would be. Dick said that it could be anything, including submission of a 'placeholder', so long as it was scientifically sound and reviewable. Sager said that he thought Dick was mis-stating the case. He said the publications sub-committee had talked about putting "something" in the volume, but had not determined what that was. Mével said that she thought this could be abused because the quality would degrade rapidly. Carter commented that if the co-chiefs do not have the volume as an aim of the cruise, then the possibility of keeping the shipboard party together as a team will be lost, and that it was more a management issue than a publication issue. Taylor said he wondered if the PCOM chair could make the case to EXCOM that the SR is essential to the whole program, if, as has been said, the volume is to become even more grey. He said that if the second volume is to be retained, then the PCOM chair must put a strong case to EXCOM.

Dick said that if 'placeholders' are used it will not necessarily make the volumes greyer, there could be more syntheses, and the volumes could be used as data "mines" for the community. He said that the implementation is very important and that the definition of what should be submitted to the SR must be carefully defined. Sager said that the value of the SR increases with time, as journal publications age, and that some individuals need deadlines for publication or some ODP data will never reach any kind of literature. Taylor said that some people actually need a longer time scale to publish, not shorter. Dick replied that he wanted to see more time allowed for the volume papers so they are more polished.

Natland said that PCOM should consider how the sub-committee recommendations will be implemented and monitored, and how PCOM should respond to EXCOM's attempt to cease production of the SR. Taylor said that ODP-TAMU will oversee the implementation, monitored by IHP, and they will liaise with Sager. He said that he would like a re-statement of the vision of the program of the SR in the light of the sub-committee report. Sager said that PCOM or EXCOM should provide the vision, not IHP.

Taylor said PCOM has to consider if it will have created the volume required by the implementation of the report. Dick said that the issue of rapid and external publication must be addressed, whist at the same time producing the best SR that we can. Taylor said that he was concerned that from the discussions here at PCOM the SR will simply become a "leftovers" volume.

Dick said that individuals can submit one or more full papers to the SR volume, the 'placeholder' was simply a way of looking for a commitment, by placeholder he meant a reviewable manuscript.

Dick said that he, as sub-committee chair, with the help of other PCOM members and the publications sub-committee, could put together another paper that could be circulated by e-mail and re-visited by PCOM in December for consideration, then PCOM could forward an agreed paper to EXCOM. Taylor said that the rationale for a volume 'of sorts' is outlined in motion 95-1-10, but he was unsure exactly what kind of SR volume we will be left with. If the SR volume was to be a residue it would not be worthwhile. Sager said that it can be a worthy volume by accentuating what is good about the volume, for example the syntheses sections, and PCOM can still insist that reviewable manuscripts are submitted. Carter said that if we are considering losing the SR then we must come up with an alternate management strategy for the co-chiefs.

Natland said that he has the sense of responding to the EXCOM actions in a positive way, but first we have to decide what the vision of the SR actually is (or will be). He would like a group to meet here and see what can be done. Pearce said the crucial item is getting material into international journals and perhaps PCOM should look at this problem from that point of view. Carter agreed with Pearce's point of view and said he too thought PCOM should concentrate on that aspect. Pearce said that perhaps we should allow the first paper to go to an international journal with a proviso that it is re-printed in the SR volume.

Taylor reminded PCOM that this is the best meeting to put something together, and review any plan in December prior to the EXCOM meeting in January 1996, commenting that any sub-group should consist of both the supporters and sceptics of the SR.

(N.B. The following discussion was from 19th August, placed here in the minutes for continuity).
Sager said that PCOM should consider amending some of the recommendations of the sub-committee. He then outlined some attributes of the SR as below;

Positive:
1. A compendium of leg-related science encompassing work done within the first years afterwards
2. An archive of leg-related data, many of which would not be published elsewhere
3. Allows service science a place for publication
4. A tangible archive of the program legacy
5. A method of managing and marshalling post-cruise scientific research and a establishing a goal for performance

Negative:
1. Publication requirement requires authors to write the study twice if wishing to publish outside
2. Short submission deadline forces less than optimal articles
3. Uneven quality and negligible rejection rate gives reputation of "grey" literature

Sager then outlined some possible policy changes, below;

1. An author may publish at any time in the outside literature. This will increase the impact of ODP science in the scientific community and will ease the burden on those scientists to whom publication in the SR volume would not be attractive.

2. An author's minimum contribution shall be a published article in the outside literature or a reviewable submission to the SR volume. If the author chooses the former, the author will be required to send the citation and abstract for publication in the SR volume at or before the closing of that volume. The paper may be published in electronic form on the SR volume CD, if copyrights can be arranged and it is deemed appropriate by the editorial review board and ODP Publications. This retains the archival and compendium nature of the SR volume. Furthermore, this deadline also assists co-chief scientists in marshalling publications from the scientific party, as a scientist who does not meet this criterion shall be deemed a non-performer.

3. The manuscript submission deadline for the SR volume will be lengthened by six months to 24 months post-cruise. This will necessarily delay publication of the SR volume to 42 months post-cruise. However, it addresses the complaint that scientists require additional time to make high quality reports.

4. The restriction of numbers of pages in an SR volume to approximately 500, recommended by the Publications Sub-committee, will force the editorial review board to allow publication of only the better and most significant articles, thus addressing the complaint of lesser quality articles in the volume.

5. Because of the relaxation of the publication moratorium, it will be necessary for all scientists to adhere to strict ethical behaviour in the publication of data. If writing an article containing data which was produced by other scientists on board the ship, or in which the author was assisted in collecting, the author must allow those authors the opportunity to be co-authors or have the express permission of those scientists to publish the data. In such matter, the editorial review board shall be arbiters.

Taylor said he thought this was a very positive idea, and he believed that we should make this a draft motion asking all the panels to look at this in their fall meetings with comments coming back to PCOM in December. Taylor said this can be sent from the JOIDES Office as a draft policy change to all panel chairs. Pearce said that he fully supported this idea. Kudrass said that shortening the submission dates was discussed by subcommittee and he was unsure if we should move in that direction, and he welcomed the chance for the panels to comment. PCOM agreed that the above draft would be forwarded by the PCOM Chair, along with a preamble paragraph containing the attributes outlined above.

Adjourn *17:50*

Saturday 19th August 1995 ***09:00 am***

M. New Business

1) PCOM Correspondence

Executive Sessions - this was raised by Francis, referring to his tabled letter to the PCOM Chair. Taylor said that we should note ODP-TAMU concerns, but he did not think it was appropriate for PCOM to tie the hand of the various Panel Chairs. Dick agreed absolutely with Taylor's sentiments, and as a sub-committee chairs and it was an essential option. Sager sympathised with ODP-TAMU, but he is uncomfortable with a policy change because there are many things that can be said in executive session that would not otherwise be aired. Francis said the type of executive session he referred to was where the liaisons were asked to leave and then the panel could make decisions without informed comment. Malfait said that panel recommendations go to JOI, and that ODP-TAMU has a chance to comment on most of the recommendations. Francis said that it was a question of sustaining and raising the morale of ODP-TAMU staff and that executive sessions can cause damage. Shipley said that he thought executive sessions were needed occasionally, and that the fact that the letter from Francis has gone to the Panel Chairs should be enough to remind them of to use executive sessions sensibly. Berger said that PCOM should note ODP-TAMU concerns, and maybe pass comments on to panel chairs.

E-mail to the JOIDES Resolution - ODP-TAMU is beginning to institute policies to control this, for operational and the cost reasons. The policy will be (from Leg 163) to limit the amount of traffic from any individual to 100kb, and any one message will be 20kb; charges will be levied after these targets are exceeded. Francis re-iterated that this limit is for personal communications, and it is still being looked in to. Carter commented that he hoped ODP-TAMU were looking at broader bandwidth systems for future use. Mix said that the was a limit proposed on Leg 162 and some discussion regarding the cost proposed to charge for e-mail use. He said that maybe we should get a specialist technical review.

High Recovery Legs - ODP-TAMU are worried about overworking technical staff at sea on high recovery legs, and they may be at the stage where we have to think about slowing recovery as the labs cannot process core quickly enough. Natland said that this should be anticipated and more staff added. Mountain said what measurements are critical at sea could be identified at the pre-cruise meeting. Francis said that with the present leg ODP-TAMU estimate they are 2 people short. Natland said that we should wait until the end of the present leg and get a report for PCOM consideration.

Requests for Leg 160 and 161 archive sampling - these were made to get enough material for analysis. Permission was granted for the C and D holes for the E Mediterranean. Where the curator felt he could not make a decision, the request was been passed to IHP. Sager said that it may come back to PCOM.

2) PCOM Liaisons

Current PCOM Liaisons are shown below,

	EXCOM	LITHP	OHP	SGPP	TECP	DMP	IHP	PPSP	SMP	SSP	TEDCOM
Berger				X							
Carter			X								
Dick		X									
Johnson											
Kidd	X							X (non US)			
Kudrass										X	
Larson									X		
McKenzie				X							
Mével		X									
Mix			X								
Mountain										X	
Natland											X
Sager							X				
Shipley					X			X (US)			
Suyehiro					X						
Moore						X					
	EXCOM	LITHP	OHP	SGPP	TECP	DMP	IHP	PPSP	SMP	SSP	TEDCOM

PCOM rep to DMP in September 1995 will be Suyehiro.
Johnson said that he was not available as a liaison at the present time.

3) Panel Membership Actions

PCOM ratified the new panel membership, as discussed in executive session at the April meeting.

4) Call for Proposals for non-JOIDES Resolution and multi-leg drilling.

Natland said that this forms a part of the LRP and we must now begin to plan a strategy. Carter said that the JOIDES community has repeatedly asked for shallow water drilling, and so there is a requirement for using non-Resolution platforms. Mével said that part of this was dealt with under the NAD motions, and that we have already told other programs that they have an opportunity to use the Resolution in a multi-leg proposal. Natland asked if we should issue a specific call for proposals for multi-platform use. Carter said he thought not, despite the fact that a requirement was there. Carter suggested that PCOM should ask ODP-TAMU to provide PCOM or EXCOM with statements of cost for drilling in waters shallower than 50m. Dick said that if we deal with proposals from the community then we may need a different structure. Mével agreed with Taylor, Dick and Carter that we should not discuss this at this time of the meeting.

Natland asked what background is required before we can discuss this issue seriously. Taylor suggested that individuals present some draft ideas, to be circulated over e-mail, for discussion at the next meeting. Mével, Mountain, Natland and Mix would act as foci for this item.

N. Any Other Business

PCOM Consensus 95-2-11

PCOM thanks its member from Miami, Jim Natland, for serving as PCOM Chairman at this Portland meeting. As did the Light Brigade at Crimea and Custer at the Little Big Horn, he faced overwhelming odds on short notice, but unlike these unfortunate predecessors, he emerged unscathed.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-12

Brain Taylor's time on PCOM is at an end, and we extend our thanks for his dedicated service and substantial contribution to the committee. After honing his skills as chair of the western Pacific regional panel, at PCOM he assured that posed problems were solvable with the drill. In time we expect to hear Brian's quotes from afar, a sure sign of his continuing interest in JOIDES. We are expecting to see him back in an exotic back arc basin.

PCOM Consensus 95-2-13

PCOM thanks its member from Oregon State University, Alan Mix for hosting this meeting in Portland.

Meeting Adjourn *11:55*