

TERMS OF REFERENCE  
ODP Performance Evaluation, October-November 1985

I. Introduction

During the life of the Ocean Drilling Program, it is essential that JOI as the prime contractor have a method for periodically evaluating the performance of its subcontractors. In its proposal to the National Science Foundation in July 1983, the Corporation set forth its intention to conduct a performance evaluation of Texas A&M University, the science operator, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, the subcontractor for logging services, and other subcontractors and program activities on a biannual basis. This process is slated to begin in the fall of 1985.

The President of JOI, after consultation with the JOIDES Executive and Planning Committees and other appropriate individuals, has appointed the evaluation panel and chosen its chairman. (Appendix 1).

II. Panel Operation

The panel will be briefed by the Chairman of the Board and other officers of JOI in advance of the beginning of the performance evaluation. Following the evaluation, the panel will debrief officers and then Corporate members of JOI within the

general guidelines provided by these Terms of Reference. The panel will first develop and then transmit in writing to the subcontractors being evaluated the scope and procedures of the evaluation, together with any questionnaires or questions to be answered. The same information will be transmitted to the President of JOI. The panel will conduct its evaluation at the principal headquarters sites of the subcontractors and will visit the drillship during its St. Johns, Newfoundland port call in the later part of October 1985.

The panel will interview co-chief scientists and/or members of the scientific party as appropriate of Legs 101 through 104, which will have been completed at the time of the performance evaluation, as well as members of JOIDES committees and panels.

After the completion of the evaluation, the chairman of the panel will discuss the panel's findings with the President of JOI and the senior official of the subcontractors and/or the subcontractors' staff, as is mutually agreed.

Within one month of the evaluation, the chairman of the panel will submit a draft of the evaluation report to the President of JOI. The President of JOI or his representative will discuss with and transmit the report to the subcontractors and will ask for written comments, including plans for any action required. After receiving the subcontractors' comments and plans, JOI will discuss the report with and transmit a copy of it

to the Chairman of the EXCOM and PCOM and to the National Science Foundation.

The ultimate objective is to achieve a reliable and effective evaluation system that will best serve the scientific community, NSF and JOI. Panel members are encouraged to suggest to the President of JOI ways in which the process can be made more effective.

### III. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation should include an examination of the following program management elements:

1. Achievement of scientific objectives - The report of the Conference on Scientific Ocean Drilling, November 1981, established the blueprint for ten years of scientific ocean drilling. It was the document upon which a peer review was conducted and program approval awarded by the National Science Board. Recognizing that at the time of the evaluation, only five of an anticipated sixty or more legs will have been conducted, nevertheless sufficient plans will be in place so that the panel should be able to make some general observations with regard to the initial direction of the program and its consistency with COSOD objectives.

2. Program plan management and adherence - Each year, the principal subcontractors, TAMU and LDGO, provide to JOI a program plan for the following year which is based upon the scientific directions of JOIDES. Since two program plan years FY 84 and 85 will have been completed at the time of the evaluation, the panel should assess the subcontractors' success in meeting the plan objectives. (Appendix 2).

3. Budget preparation and adherence - Detailed subcontractor budgets, prepared as part of the development of annual program plans are available. The panel should review the budget preparation process, the budgets themselves, and the subcontractors performance.

4. Personnel policies and management - The success of a major program undertaking rests to a major degree upon management's ability to attract and hold capable individuals and to elicit a consistent, highly motivated attitude toward program execution. The panel should take a retrospective look at staffing, making a judgement on the subcontractors' success in developing the appropriate cadre and establishing an esprit de corps.

5. Engineering maintenance, development, application - The maintenance standards established by the subcontractors for all shipboard equipment, either directly or indirectly under their control, have a major bearing on the quality of scientific

results achieved. The development of enhanced technical capability to obtain information heretofore beyond the capabilities of GLOMAR CHALLENGER, and the application of those developments to the service of science are essential ingredients of the COSOD report. The panel should assess these aspects of the program engineering effort and make judgments regarding engineering staff adequacy, organization and performance during the initial phases of the program.

6. Attention to environmental conditions - The field portion of the Ocean Drilling Program is an inherently dangerous undertaking in which lack of adequate preparation or carelessness in execution can have serious environmental consequences. The review panel should assess the standard operating procedures for adequacy and assess subcontractors' adherence to these procedures and if possible make a judgment of contractor performance in the face of unforeseen developments.

7. Safety - Operations on board a drillship are inherently dangerous to personnel. The evaluation should include a review of safety procedures, adherence, and personnel training as well as the statistical measure of success in providing a safe environment.

8. Overall management effectiveness and efficiency - The evaluation panel should attempt to make a judgment of each of the subcontractor's success in this category as it may be reflected

in the cost consciousness of personnel, the management of subcontracts, the timeliness of reports internal to the subcontractor, as well as to the prime contractor, the dissemination of public information about the program and the general orderliness with which the business affairs of the subcontractor are carried out.

9. Relationships with JOIDES, JOI, NSF - Each of these bodies is an integral part of the total program management structure. The evaluation committee should assess the interrelationships with special attention to the fidelity of communications, working relationships and perceptions that suggest remedial attention.

10. Morale - The evaluation committee should make a judgment in each subcontractor organization as to morale, confidence in the future and the general outlook of individuals associated with the program.

#### IV. Financial Review and Audit

Concurrently with the performance evaluation, a financial audit will be conducted at TAMU by an independent public accounting firm. The general scope of work for the audit is attached as Appendix 3. This should be of assistance in identifying possible areas of overlap between the performance evaluation and the financial audit, thus limiting the scope of

the panel's activity where there might otherwise be doubt. There will be no concurrent audit at LDGO, unless of course DCAA elects to conduct an audit at that time.

The panel should not feel required to pursue the more financially oriented subject areas that are set forth in Appendix 3. At some future time the elements of that work statement will be examined by an appropriate audit authority.

#### V. Support

The Corporation will provide for direct reimbursement for panel members for travel and living expenses during the evaluation when they are away from their home institution. The Corporation will also provide an executive secretary to the panel, whose responsibilities will include the accumulation of documents requested by the panel, general arrangements attending visits to subcontractors and the ship, and service as rapporteur for plenary sessions of the panel. The executive secretary will also be responsible for developing the drafts of the panel's findings, the provision of editorial assistance, and production of the final report of the evaluation.

10-11-68

10-11-68

10-11-68