

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**THE RENAISSANCE SYDNEY HOTEL
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA**

29–30 JUNE 1999

Executive Committee – EXCOM

Helmut Beiersdorf (Chair)	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Germany
James Briden	Environmental Change Unit, Oxford University, United Kingdom
Maria C. Comas	Universidad de Granada, European Science Foundation (ECOD)
Brent Dalrymple	College of Oceanic & Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, USA
Robert Detrick	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
David Feary	Australian Geological Survey Organisation, PacRim Consortium
Chris Harrison	Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami, USA
Margaret Leinen	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
John Mutter	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, USA
Arthur Nowell	School of Oceanography, University of Washington, USA
John Orcutt	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, USA
David Prior	College of Geosciences, Texas A&M University, USA
Mrinal Sen*	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Asahiko Taira	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan
Brian Taylor	School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology, University of Hawaii, USA

*Alternate for Paul Stoffa

Associate Member Observers

Catherine Mével	Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France
Zhixiong Wang	Marine High Technology Bureau, Beijing, China

Liaisons

Kathryn Moran	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
Jeff Fox	Science Operator (ODP-TAMU)
David Goldberg	Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO)
Donald Heinrichs	National Science Foundation, USA
William W. Hay	SCICOM Chair, JOIDES Office, GEOMAR Research Center, Germany

Guests

J. Paul Dauphin	National Science Foundation, USA
John Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.
Masaya Fukuhama	Science and Technology Agency, Japan
Mikihiro Kato	MONBUSHO, Japan
Dennis Kent	Rutgers University, USA
Hajimu Kinoshita	JAMSTEC, Japan
Tom Loutit	SRK Consulting, Australia (PEC-V Member)
Bruce Malfait	National Science Foundation, USA
Dietrich Maronde	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Germany
Ted Moore	IPSC Chair, University of Michigan, USA
Michael Purdy	National Science Foundation, USA
Takeo Tanaka	JAMSTEC, Japan
Michael Tricker	NERC, United Kingdom
Shigehito Uetake	JAMSTEC, Japan
Philippe Vidal	CNRS, Paris, France

JOIDES Office

Jeff Schuffert	U. S. Liaison
----------------	---------------

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

AT

**THE RENAISSANCE SYDNEY HOTEL
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA**

29–30 JUNE 1999

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

EXCOM Motion 99-2-1

EXCOM approves the agenda of its June 1999 meeting.

Harrison moved, Detrick seconded; 15 in favor.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-2

EXCOM approves the minutes of its January 1999 meeting.

Orcutt moved, Prior seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained (Sen, Taylor).

EXCOM Motion 99-2-3

EXCOM congratulates the organizers of COMPLEX for an exciting and highly successful conference at the University of British Columbia. COMPLEX clarified the exceedingly important future role that ocean drilling will play in understanding earth processes. EXCOM would like to give special thanks to Kate Moran and JOI for the logistical arrangements that allowed the conference to proceed so effectively, and to Nick Piasias, Asahiko Taira and the rest of the steering committee for encouraging such good discussion of innovative science.

Orcutt moved, Harrison seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Taira).

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-4

EXCOM endorses the IPSC plan to form working groups for science planning, industry liaisons, and technology.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-5

EXCOM recommends that IPSC recruit working groups for industry liaisons and technology with care taken to avoid possible conflicts of interest.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-6

EXCOM recommends that IPSC recruit a working group for science planning in consultation with SCICOM, while considering the concerns of EXCOM about the breadth of experience and knowledge of the members as well as potential conflicts of interest.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-7

EXCOM endorses the review process proposed by IPSC regarding development of a new long-range plan by the working group for science planning.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-8

EXCOM establishes a subcommittee to identify better options for integrating ODP with other scientific drilling programs. This group should prepare a concept document and present it to EXCOM at their next meeting. The subcommittee will consist of Taylor (Chair), Mutter, Orcutt, and Beiersdorf (*ex officio*).

EXCOM Motion 99-2-9

EXCOM revises the Terms of Reference for Program Planning Groups, as requested by SCICOM. See SCICOM Motion 99-1-7.

Orcutt moved, Harrison seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Briden).

EXCOM Motion 99-2-10

EXCOM approves the FY 2000 program plan.

Nowell moved, Detrick seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained (Mutter, Prior).

EXCOM Motion 99-2-11

EXCOM approves the membership status of ECOD and PacRim.

Leinen moved, Taira seconded; 12 in favor, 2 abstained (Feary, Comas), 1 absent (Orcutt).

EXCOM Motion 99-2-12

As we sit within singing range of the Sydney Opera House, the Three Tenors come to mind. In ODP we have an equivalent in the Three D's, Don Heinrichs, Dietrich Maronde, and David Feary. EXCOM expresses immense gratitude to these three persons who have provided leadership to the Ocean Drilling Program, to EXCOM, and to the ODP Council. We can hardly remember ODP before Don. He has served as the keystone of the ODP structure for almost its entire existence. We thank Don for his leadership and patience in dealing with the advisory structure. And to Dietrich Maronde who has been an enthusiastic supporter and stalwart advocate of ODP for as long as Hans Dürbaum, former EXCOM member from Germany. You will soon join Hans in retirement—perhaps we will see you on PEC-VI. And we thank David Feary for his resolute effort to keep PacRim as a full member and for his hard work to make this meeting so enjoyable. We look forward to seeing him in Washington, D. C.

Approved by acclamation.

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

**THE RENAISSANCE SYDNEY HOTEL
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA**

29–30 JUNE 1999

FINAL MINUTES

1. Welcome & Introduction

Helmut Beiersdorf called the meeting to order promptly at 0900 hrs and the attendees introduced themselves. David Feary explained the meeting logistics and introduced his assistant, David Ewyk of the Australian Geological Survey Organisation.

2. Approval of Agenda

Beiersdorf proposed two minor changes to the agenda: Item 9.1 moved ahead to precede Item 4 and Item 6.3 moved down to follow Item 6.7. No one else commented on the agenda.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-1

EXCOM approves the agenda of its June 1999 meeting.

Harrison moved, Detrick seconded; 15 in favor.

3. Minutes and Matters Arising

EXCOM Motion 99-2-2

EXCOM approves the minutes of its January 1999 meeting.

Orcutt moved, Prior seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained (Sen, Taylor).

Selected ODP achievements

Bill Hay gave a brief presentation on recent noteworthy scientific achievements related to ODP. He referred initially to general evidence for alternating warm and cool modes of climate over the last 600 MY, then he noted a particularly exciting new paper by Pagani *et al.* that had just appeared in *Paleoceanography*. This paper on Miocene CO₂ levels relied directly on samples from several DSDP and ODP sites, and it argued that ocean circulation exerted more control on climate over long time scales than CO₂ and silicate weathering. Hay also mentioned that a very favorable review of this paper had just appeared in *Nature*.

Brian Taylor asked if Hay intended with this presentation to emphasize the legacy of the ODP core collection and database. Hay answered yes and pointed out that the analytical techniques used in this study did not yet exist when the cores were collected.

4. NSF/ODP Council Reports

Don Heinrichs delivered the NSF management and ODP council reports. He explained that NSF had provided JOI with a target budget of \$46.1 M for FY 2000. This included a modest increase from NSF funds. ECOD and PACRIM remained slightly short of full membership. France had signed an MOU to participate as an associate member (2/3 level) for the remainder of the program, and the People's Republic of China remained an associate member (1/6 level). Heinrichs noted that other items in the management report fell elsewhere on the agenda.

Heinrichs outlined the agenda for the ODP Council meeting that would immediately follow this meeting. In addition to the usual reports, the Council meeting would include an open discussion of membership issues and a closed session to audit or review the organizational funds. After noting that the NSF personnel structure had remained stable with regard to ODP over the last several years, Heinrichs announced that he would retire at the end of this year and that Bruce Malfait would head the ODP Council and serve as the NSF liaison to EXCOM.

Beiersdorf thanked Heinrichs for his report and said that EXCOM would miss him.

5. Country Reports

5.1 ECOD

Menchu Comas reported that ECOD now had only eleven member countries, but they hope to get Turkey back on board, and efforts to recruit Ireland continue. EMCO held several meetings to discuss future planning for post-2003 and explored the possibility of France joining ECOD. A workshop was held in Grenada one week ago to discuss drilling in the Mediterranean, and another workshop would occur this fall in Amsterdam to discuss post-2003 drilling initiatives.

5.2 France

Catherine Mével reported that Phillipe Vidal attended a joint EU/ESF meeting in Brussels in March to discuss executive level coordination of European participation in scientific drilling, and John Ludden met with the ECOD Management Committee in March to talk about future partnership.

5.3 Germany

Dietrich Maronde reported that DFG had accepted 58 proposals for ODP-related funding in FY'99, totaling about 5.5M DM. These figures could appear misleading, however, because DFG project funding covered the period from July 1 – June 30. Germany's annual contribution to ODP stood at \$2.95M. DFG was trying to be as flexible as possible in funding ODP-related research projects. The DFG board of governors had written a letter of intent to IWG regarding the future program. Progress continued in the ICDP program with respect to various European meetings as already mentioned in other reports. Germany remained optimistic about science budgets, but had to recognize the current weakness of the Euro currency and possible expenses related to the war in Kosovo.

5.4 Japan

Asahiko Taira reported on the Yokohama portcall following Leg 185. The portcall activities received widespread media coverage in newspapers and on television. A total of 151 VIPs, including five members of the Diet, visited the ship and attended an evening reception. An open house the next day drew 1353 visitors to the ship, a single-day record. Over 100 volunteers assisted with the open house.

Beiersdorf congratulated Japan for the successful portcall and good public relations.

5.5 Pacific Rim Consortium

David Feary reported that Korea continued to increase its involvement and had instituted a program for shore-based support. Canada expected soon to submit a letter of intent for the future program, but Australia would most likely delay in submitting a letter of intent for post-2003 because of current restructuring and a change in representatives. AGSO had experienced a 20%

cut in staff with some impact on ODP activities, but they would continue to support ODP through the end of the current program. On the personnel front, Feary noted that Neville Exon would replace him, Trevor Powell would replace Chris Pigram, and Canada would supply the EXCOM representative as of next January. In examining the issue of how to satisfy the requirements of full membership, PacRim had recently decided to increase the contribution of all current members rather than recruit a new member. Unfortunately, Chinese Taipei subsequently announced that they would reduce their input from a 1/6 to a 1/12 member.

5.6 The People's Republic of China

Zhixiong Wang reported on the success of Leg 184 in the South China Sea, the Hong Kong portcall following that leg, and initial post-cruise activities of Chinese scientists. Wang finished by saying that Chinese scientists looked forward to ocean drilling in the new century and hoped to contribute.

Beiersdorf thought this represented a good example of how portcalls could have a strong positive effect on scientific activity within even a large country such as China.

5.7 UK

Jim Briden reported that the U.K. had recently awarded several large ODP special topics grants for paleoclimate and paleoceanography studies. He mentioned the success of the industry/academic forum held at the Sunbury offices of BP-Amoco in March and noted that he would discuss the outcome later in this meeting. NERC expected to get final approval soon for the LINK margins program, a research initiative for co-funded work with industry partners.

Briden announced that NERC had submitted a letter of intent for IODP, signaling that the U.K. would like to become a substantive member of IWG and have significant involvement in IPSC planning activities. Briden also informed the committee that Professor John Krebs would retire from his position as Chief Executive of NERC effective 30 September 1999. Professor John Lawton from London University will succeed Krebs at NERC, and Michael Tricker will represent NERC at this ODP Council meeting and until further notice.

Bob Detrick said that he felt pleased to hear this report, especially considering the limited U.K. participation at COMPLEX. Briden replied that the U.K. sent 10-15 scientists to COMPLEX, but they had difficulty getting more people to go because of a time conflict with the final exam period. He emphasized that it was not a budgetary problem.

5.8 USA

Don Heinrichs reported that NSF did not know its final budget until March, or halfway through the fiscal year. Last year's budget increased about 8% overall, mostly in science projects, while facilities funding remained constant. The MARGINS program, led by Brian Taylor, received substantial support. NSF had started planning the ODP budget through 2006, which would include the phase-out of the old program and spin-up of the new one. Heinrichs also noted that the author of the paper discussed earlier by Hay was a USSAC fellow.

Kate Moran noted that the very first undergraduate student trainee was now onboard the ship and supported by the USSSP. She also reported that USSAC had established a conceptual design committee (CDC) for a second drilling platform, based on the outcome from COMPLEX. John Farrell listed the CDC members as Peggy Delaney (chair), Tim Byrne (USSAC), Steve Clemens (ESSEP), Susan Humphris (SCICOM), Tom Janacek (SciMP Chair), Roger Ingersoll (Mobil), Brian Taylor (consultant), and Jamie Austin (liaison from IPSC).

David Prior inquired about the nature and timing of CDC deliberations and the distribution of their final report, and Beiersdorf questioned whether the international community would have input to the CDC. Malfait noted that NSF had asked the CDC to focus on a non-riser type drill ship, and Moran emphasized that funds for the CDC would come from the U.S. alone. Heinrichs stated that the U.S. had made it clear for several years that it would commit to developing a second platform, but he added that the CDC would not remain a closed-shop operation indefinitely. Beiersdorf requested that the CDC at least circulate its reports to the international community. Moran asked to delay further discussion of this issue until the IODP planning portion of the agenda.

6. Management and Operations Reports

6.1 Update on industry and other partnerships

Kate Moran reported that DOE would contribute \$70K toward a new shipboard laboratory for microbiology and gas hydrate research. Other industry technology projects underway included the advanced diamond core barrel (ADCB) project with JAMSTEC (\$350K), the HYACE pressure sampling tool with European industry and academia, and the CONOCO deep-water site investigations project for using APC technology to obtain the geotechnical information needed for placement of production facilities. Moran noted that industry collaborations on science issues had proved harder to establish than those on technology. John Armentrout was planning another Houston workshop to bring together industry and academic scientists, but EGI had put the South Atlantic database migration on hold because of uncertainties over lease sales off Brazil. JOI planned to discuss industry partnership efforts at a September meeting with representatives of the various ODP member offices.

John Mutter could see how CONOCO would benefit from learning how to get shallow cores, but he wondered how ODP would benefit. Moran replied that ODP would benefit primarily from the availability of core material, but we'd also need financial support. Mutter thought the outlook for industry/academia collaborations seemed more optimistic than the picture just presented. Moran said she didn't mean to give that impression, only that collaboration occurs much more easily from the technology standpoint. Loutit commented that oil prices had in fact risen to favorable levels, but industry budgets remained uncertain for the future. Briden added that BP-Amoco had a strong interest in forming academic partnerships.

6.2 International efforts

Kate Moran reported that efforts to recruit India would continue, with Shiri Srivistava planning to visit Goa and ONG. Brazil could not join now, and JOI was investigating the possibility of Russia joining as an associate member.

Briden asked what Russian institutions were involved. Heinrichs mentioned that the Institute of Lithosphere had expressed interest, but unfortunately this was not a strong institute within Russia, and he explained that it previously was a matter of pride for Russia to join as a full member instead of at the associate level. Heinrichs also noted that a group from St. Petersburg had attended COMPLEX.

6.3 Public Affairs Report

Kate Moran reported on recent public affairs efforts, noting that the Hong Kong and Yokohama portcalls had already been discussed in other reports. The updated ODP website was now online, ODP media press kits were now available, and a new press release procedure, adopted in response to criticism from the recent co-chiefs review, seemed successful.

Taylor noted that Legs 180 and 184 had real-time daily updates from the ship and wondered whether any plans had developed for more of this on a regular basis. Moran responded that they were looking into this but had not figured out how to do it yet. Beiersdorf called for another update at the February meeting.

6.4 Update on microbiology lab

Kate Moran reported on the progress of the new microbiology lab and the success of initial tests on Leg 185. The laboratory van was installed and worked well, and the microbiologists were very happy with it. Tracer experiments revealed minimal contamination when using APC and some contamination with RCB. ODP/TAMU hoped to convert the van for radiotracer studies after adding the new level to the lab stack. A summary article by Rick Murray would appear in the next JOI/USSAC newsletter.

6.5 Update on drydock

Jeff Fox gave an update on scheduled drydock activities. He briefly explained the process for selecting a shipyard and announced that Keppel FELS of Singapore had received the contract. NSF would contribute \$6M toward drydock activities, and ODL would pick up the excess costs, anticipated to reach \$300K. Major drydock activities would include an upgrade of the dynamic positioning and data management systems, installation of an active heave compensator, and addition of a new level to the lab stack. The lab stack modification would address long-term needs for enhanced downhole tool capabilities, a microbiology laboratory, and better conference space for the scientific staff. It would also improve the safety and manpower requirements for storing and offloading cores. Now that ODP had identified the shipyard and logistical needs, they felt ready to move forward with drydock activities.

6.6 Y2K compliance of shipboard and shore-based computer networks

Compliant: JOI/TAMU financial accounting, JANUS.

Non-compliant: TAMU shipboard e-mail, LDEO VAX system.

Detrick asked about shipboard systems like dynamic positioning. Fox responded that Schlumberger had been very proactive in this regard.

6.7 Status of PEC-V program review

Kate Moran outlined the structure and membership of PEC-V and asked Tom Loutit, a PEC-V member, to give an update on the current status of the review.

Loutit explained that he could not yet give a formal report because the review was still in progress, but he could at least offer his own preliminary insight. He described the review committee as a diverse group, without any recent involvement in the program. They noted first that the program had instituted many changes in the last few years, mostly for the good, though of course they saw lots of room for improvement, and any improvements made now could carry forward to post-2003. Their biggest concern was the transition and planning process. It looked like many groups were sitting around waiting for NSF to do something, and that was not the right approach. Things had started to happen, but it looked like the community had not yet clearly communicated the overall game plan or perhaps had not completely defined it in the aftermath of COMPLEX. PEC-V had also tried to determine how well the new advisory structure was working by meeting with various components, and they received over 80 responses to a questionnaire distributed at COMPLEX. Loutit said that concern existed across the community about a perceived gap between EXCOM and the rest of the advisory structure, particularly SCICOM. Helmut Beiersdorf had suggested holding

a joint EXCOM/SCICOM meeting, although others had suggested that too many guests and liaisons already attended certain meetings.

Briden expressed surprise at the comment about the advisory structure. Loutit responded that PEC-V would evaluate how well the advisory structure had followed the Long Range Plan, and he added that the new LRP for the future program looked pretty generic right now. Loutit also expressed pleasure in the report given earlier that morning by Hay in an effort to generate excitement about current science topics. Beiersdorf said that he had also heard from various sources that EXCOM was too far removed from science, and perhaps we could improve this by having a joint meeting.

7. Other Partnerships

7.1 ICDP

John Mutter said that he did not have much to update on ICDP since the last EXCOM meeting and turned the floor over to Brian Taylor, who had attended the recent DOSECC meeting in Hawaii. Taylor visited the borehole on Hawaii, where drilling proceeds at a fast rate and may reach a deeper objective than originally planned. He reported that good progress continues on a collaborative development of new drill-bit technology, as well as on a barge system with a containerized rig, transportable by helicopter, for drilling in remote lakes like those of the East African rift valley. Taylor thought that the potential for greater emphasis on alternate platforms such as these could allow for more future interactions around a common framework, especially considering that the thematic drivers for ICDP and IODP overlapped by perhaps 80% or more.

Fox noted that ODP/TAMU had loaned surplus equipment to DOSECC and had committed to lending engineering support at a 1/2 FTE level. John Orcutt mentioned that the NSF Earth Sciences group would seek funding this year for the SAFOD project to drill through the San Andreas Fault, but this had no connection with ICDP. Comas added that ICDP members were present when the Crete transect was discussed at the Grenada meeting last week. Hay noted that the SCICOM minutes contained a report from Ulrich Harms on ICDP. Hay also summarized the proposal input to ICDP and explained that they do not have an extensive proposal review mechanism like ours. He stated that several current projects had a component in both ODP and ICDP (e.g., Ken Miller had a joint proposal in the system now, and Comas already mentioned the Crete proposal), but we have no formal way to discuss these joint ventures. Maronde said that he attended a recent ICDP meeting and heard a lot of discussion on how to cooperate between the two programs. He also noted that contrary to what appears in the SCICOM draft minutes, China participates as a partial member of ICDP and France does not.

Beiersdorf felt that ODP had shown more initiative in approaching ICDP than they had in approaching us, perhaps because we have a stronger organization. He thought both groups could benefit from a stronger link but wondered if it made sense to try to establish an integrated management structure at this stage. Mutter, who attends meetings of the ICDP council of governors, believed that the proper route to achieve joint planning objectives should happen at the SCICOM level. Mével agreed that the momentum should come from the science community rather than from the top down, and she suggested that perhaps we should set up PPGs with members from both groups. Mutter asked if NSF wished to link these programs more closely. Heinrichs confirmed that NSF would like to see a process to define better the linkage between these programs. He stressed the importance of integrating things on an intellectual level rather than a management level because NSF had concerns about a unified management structure and the flexibility of belonging to one group or the other. Beiersdorf suggested that EXCOM charge

SCICOM with establishing a joint planning group and he asked Mutter and Taylor to craft a motion in this regard and present it later.

7.2 Industry

Jim Briden reported on recent developments in Europe and elsewhere, as described in an annex to the U.K. report. BP-Amoco sponsored a meeting at Sunbury this past spring with about 30 participants, many from high levels in academia and industry. Most of these people previously had no direct involvement in ODP, but they understood the importance of this meeting. They looked at areas of future interest where industry leads in capability and experience. The goals outlined in the meeting report mesh well with the outcome of COMPLEX and send a clear signal of enthusiasm from industry; however, a sense arose that ODP had spread itself too broadly and needed a better focus in the future. The meeting closed with several recommendations for the future, including a unified European involvement through EU mechanisms. The next European forum for ODP should involve academic and industry participation. Shell would sponsor another meeting in The Hague. In other news, Fugro had raised the possibility of timesharing a vessel in the early part of the next century. Briden stressed that we needed to articulate very clearly how industrial participation would promote European interests in the future, but we also had to assure that a purely European initiative would reinforce the broader goals of ODP mentioned earlier by Moran.

Beiersdorf said that that sounded very encouraging for the future and Germany would try to support that initiative. Next November Germany would present their future program plans to industry and try to educate them on our science mission and enlist their support. We need to avoid interference among industry groups and try to unite them as much as possible, and we need closely linked science and technology strategies. COMPLEX had a strong impact on the industry members of TEDCOM, and they had expressed a willingness to support such a strategy.

Mutter asked what tangible mechanisms we could optimistically foresee besides another meeting. Briden said it depends on what vessels we would eventually use and the associated technology issues. For example, we could use vessels of opportunity on individual projects. At the science level the important thing was getting maximum involvement of people around the table.

Beiersdorf noted that industry wants to drill fans, get high recovery and study diagenetic processes. Ted Moore asked what benefits the European community hoped to get from industry separately as opposed to our program as a whole. Briden explained that EU research funding goes exclusively toward applied science, such that the majority of academic funding depends on involvement with industry. No possibility existed under the current framework for an EU funded subscription or participation in the program. Tricker added that the U.K. government exerted pressure to show the relevance of science to economic competitiveness and the quality of life, so there was a political dimension to working with industry.

Beiersdorf suggested that the U.S., EU, Japanese, and other components of industry partnership must all have input flowing into IPSC. Taylor doubted that a purely U.S. component existed because of the international nature of most large corporations. Beiersdorf said that we still needed to make sure this would all come together in the new advisory structure. Moore agreed and predicted that IPSC would organize a working group to forge good partnerships. Taira said he would like to hear more about industry goals in the IODP part of this meeting.

8. IODP Planning

8.1 Status of OD21 Program

Asahiko Taira outlined the progress of the OD21 program since the last EXCOM meeting, noting that in March the government approved the initial budget increment for construction, JAMSTEC

requested design input from SCICOM, and IWG delegated this task to IPSC. In April JAMSTEC started the initial basic design work, while the U.S. and Japan had added the OD21/IODP program to their Common Agenda for Cooperation in Global Perspective.

Takeo Tanaka outlined the schedule of ship construction and testing and also the proposed budget for FY'00. He explained that the latest plans for a larger riser drilling ship (48-49 thousand tons) included a 21" riser instead of a 16" riser, better motion characteristics, more-spacious shipboard laboratories, larger storage capacity, and adaptability to future technical innovations.

8.2 IWG

Beiersdorf summarized the previous IWG meeting, where topics of discussion included technological developments, the formation of IPSC, commitments to and operating costs of the new program, OD21 and the riser drilling ship, the U.S. role in providing a non-riser drilling ship, and the possibility of a hiatus between programs. Fox provided an update from ODP on several technology issues, and Kinoshita said that he had nothing new to report on the joint JAMSTEC/Scripps project. Tricker noted that dialog on funding from individual European members would continue.

Detrick asked for more information on the question of MOUs. Beiersdorf explained that it takes years to negotiate MOUs because it depends on knowing financial commitments. Michael Purdy said that the IWG would continue with the plan developed at Leiden in 1997 for a staged increase in formal commitment. Germany, the U.K., and the EU have so far submitted letters of intent to remain formal members of IWG, well ahead of the 1 October deadline. Several committee members then expressed confusion about the relative authority of the EU (Brussels) and ESF (Strasbourg) to make financial commitments. Heinrichs answered that the models for sharing membership costs remained quite vague.

Several committee members inquired about what the anticipated \$120-130M annual budget would cover. Heinrichs replied that it would primarily cover the year-round operational costs for two ships. Chris Harrison recalled hearing a much higher budget estimate at the Houston workshop, but Feary noted that that estimate included the costs of site surveying and other expenditures. Heinrichs said that it was difficult to give a definite cost estimate now because we still did not know exactly what the ships would look like. Taylor asked whether funding would exist before the riser ship comes on line in 2006. Purdy responded that IWG currently hoped to begin in 2004, with a 4-5 year transition to a fully operational multi-platform program. He added that the IWG had a major task on its hands to figure this out, and the cost estimates could change dramatically as things proceeded.

Detrick asked whether IPSC was responsible for planning the transition between programs, and Prior wondered when EXCOM would see a timetable of who reports to whom, and when. Moore admitted that IPSC holds responsibility for planning the transition, but the question of timing remains unanswered. Heinrichs said that different groups would have different timelines, and it depends to a large extent on the letters of intent and MOUs. He also said that we need to have a clearer picture by 2001, or else we would have a significant hiatus; however, national funding structures just would not permit us to know any earlier. Certainly we must know before 2003. Detrick acknowledged this difficulty but said it still bothered the committee not to have a better sense of the timeline for making decisions. Prior noted that we apparently have different timelines for government, science, and technical capacity, and we have not heard anything yet about the latter two. Beiersdorf suggested deferring further discussion until after the IPSC report.

8.3 U.S./NSF

Heinrichs showed a timeline diagram of future planning activities and explained that NSF expects to put out an RFP at the end of 2001 to solicit bids on the prime contract for the new program. Fox asked when the last leg of science would end in 2003. Malfait said somewhat earlier than September 2003, and Heinrichs said that it might take 2-3 months to decommission the ship. After Fox noted that the ODP contract stipulates a 7-21 day decommissioning period, Heinrichs conceded that the last leg could end as late as 23 September. Fox asked whether NSF had a plan for the tail of ODP, for example with regard to core curation, publications, etc. Heinrichs stated that the new program would probably subsume those responsibilities, but the details remained unknown.

Moore expressed uncertainty about what ICOSOD would entail and explained that IPSC would not have a complete management plan until later. Briden feared that if the date of ICOSOD slipped too far into the future it would compromise the transition. Heinrichs said that NSF certainly understood this, but unfortunately they would not know which of several possible models for a new ship or other platforms would become reality until the competitive bid process. He also reiterated that NSF could not make binding budget decisions in 1999 for 2004. Japan had the firmest commitment in place for post-2003, but only since early this year. Mutter asked if NSF had set an objective to not have a hiatus. Heinrichs answered yes, ideally, but realistically we may have to use a year of operational money to capitalize the costs of outfitting a new ship. Purdy stressed the importance of distinguishing between a program hiatus and just a hiatus in drilling operations. He confirmed that NSF strived not to have a program hiatus, but a drilling hiatus looked likely if not certain.

8.4 COMPLEX report

Asahiko Taira outlined the results of COMPLEX, noting that 323 scientists participated, and he discussed a timeline for completion of the final report. He also presented a summary letter from Nick Piasias to EXCOM and commended JOI for its work to ensure the success of COMPLEX. Beiersdorf asked for a formal motion to that effect and commented that the COMPLEX report should provide a good basis for IPSC to move ahead.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-3

EXCOM congratulates the organizers of COMPLEX for an exciting and highly successful conference at the University of British Columbia. COMPLEX clarified the exceedingly important future role that ocean drilling will play in understanding earth processes. EXCOM would like to give special thanks to Kate Moran and JOI for the logistical arrangements that allowed the conference to proceed so effectively, and to Nick Piasias, Asahiko Taira and the rest of the steering committee for encouraging such good discussion of innovative science.

Orcutt moved, Harrison seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Taira).

8.5 IPSC activities

Ted Moore reported on the early progress of IPSC and presented the IPSC planning schedule through the end of 2003. He outlined a series of important tasks, including establishing a strong relationship with OD21, forging stronger relationships with industry, defining the non-riser drilling platforms, developing a new long-range science plan, and defining the advisory and management structures for a new multi-platform drilling program. IPSC also recommended establishing an international review committee for the new long-range science plan and approving a catchier name for the post-2003 program (e.g., ISIS rather than IODP).

Moore complimented SciMP for taking a proactive forward-looking stance on the new program, and he noted that OD21 had their own committee on shipboard laboratory needs. Moore referred to two end-member models for laboratory design, involving maximum versus minimum shipboard science. He noted that although IPSC agreed about the best approach, the rest of the community held diverse opinions.

Taylor noted that IPSC favored one end-member model for staffing the ship, whereas the Houston Workshop report favored the opposite end-member. According to Moran, however, the Houston Workshop involved only a 3-hour session on science labs, and everyone at the time recognized the discussion as incomplete and open to further comment. Moore assured that the ship would have enough space for science either way, whereas IPSC right now needed to identify the best, most-flexible way to conduct science as well as consider other critical design aspects of the riser ship. Heinrichs suggested that perhaps this question also applied to the non-riser vessel, while Taylor believed that IPSC should consider the broad spectrum of laboratory needs for riser, non-riser, alternate platform, and perhaps continental drilling, rather than plan each component separately. Moore replied that IPSC realized as much, but they also realized, for example, that to drill in the Arctic would require some other platform, and probably one that could not operate full time. Orcutt also expressed concern about the need for a full science party on the ship and whether enough manpower existed to accomplish that on multiple platforms at the same time. Moore acknowledged this concern but believed that the strength of the JR arose from its versatility, and that required a large staff. He could not say for certain now, but he thought the riser ship would carry fewer scientists at any given time and perhaps a greater total number for a given project.

Arthur Nowell wondered if IPSC brought their recommendations for the formation of working groups to EXCOM for approval. Beiersdorf reminded everyone that EXCOM had previously agreed that IPSC would report through SCICOM. Feary asked whether SCICOM could approve IPSC working groups by email to speed it up, and Hay replied that it was happening even as they spoke. Mutter asked if SCICOM would also hold approval over the plan developed by the science group, and Hay responded that SCICOM would comment on the plan. Orcutt commented that COMPLEX succeeded in illustrating the breadth of interest for new and interesting things that ocean drilling could accomplish, but it did not yield a very focused outcome, so the science group would have to develop a focused plan.

Margaret Leinen expressed strong concern about the process for appointing the working groups. She remembered that EXCOM had previously found itself in an uncomfortable situation when the funding agencies could not get behind the long-range plan, and she thought that EXCOM should ensure that IPSC identified the best people to accomplish the task this time. Orcutt generally agreed, though he mused on whether EXCOM held the same responsibility of oversight toward this group and plan, given that EXCOM would not exist in a few years. Mutter echoed the concerns about the mandate given to the working group for science planning. Moore did not feel so concerned about the membership of the science group and thought they could do the job. Hay remarked that SCICOM could not devote as much time as IPSC did in identifying the working group members, but he assured that SCICOM would not shy away from commenting on the working group report. Beiersdorf suggested that the ICOSOD meeting might provide a good opportunity for reviewing the new long-range plan. Moore said that at least three different groups from the science community would review the new long-range plan, but he agreed that he would not want to see it go up to IWG and fail to get their approval.

Briden thought it would be hard to incorporate all of the themes from COMPLEX in a new long-range plan and wondered if it would be better to focus on certain ones, such as the deep biosphere. Taylor argued that our scientific constituencies belong to many of those other groups and

initiatives. They want to use our tools in their programs, and they provide the support that makes it possible to consider this, so we have to set our priorities in the context of that broader interest. Mutter mentioned that many international funding agencies now strive hard to obtain some identifiable human benefits, and Mével asked whether IPSC had thought about a mechanism to interact with other international programs and initiatives. Moore believed that such interaction would come primarily through the proposal process, though IPSC could also consider documents from other groups. He added that as a SSEP chair he had seen how proposal pressure provided a driving force in setting new priorities. Moore also stated that we did not have time to finesse this now; we needed to start two years ago if we wanted to take a more careful approach at this.

Beiersdorf identified the important elements of the discussion regarding IPSC working groups as: 1) a need for working groups, 2) group membership, 3) internal communication among groups, 4) societal relevance of the long-range plan, and 5) timely progress reviews. He noted that although the role and product of ICOSOD remained undefined, it certainly could not resemble CONCORD and COMPLEX in size, so we needed working groups to bring things together first. Briden cited the importance of this issue and suggested discussing it in executive session. Detrick recommended adjourning for the day and returning to this issue the following morning.

Upon reassembling the next morning, Beiersdorf outlined the JOIDES advisory structure with respect to IPSC and noted that EXCOM would not meet again until February 2000, only a few months before ICOSOD. EXCOM should therefore act now if they wanted to comment on the IPSC planning procedures. Beiersdorf then presented a list of seven issues for immediate discussion, and Moore requested to eliminate one item from the list because it was not ready for discussion.

Briden asked what IPSC would do if a working group did all of the science planning. Moore responded that IPSC had a lot to do and could use some help in writing at least a first draft of the science plan, though of course IPSC would review and revise the plan accordingly. Harrison wondered whether IPSC had enough people giving it advice. Beiersdorf noted that EXCOM should first agree to establish the working groups and then worry about membership. Taylor said the committee needed to reach a consensus now and could not wait until the next meeting.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-4

EXCOM endorses the IPSC plan to form working groups for science planning, industry liaisons, and technology.

Moore appreciated the comments he had already received about particular nominees to serve on the working groups. Orcutt pointed out that a potential conflict of interest might exist with contracts going to members of the technology group. Moore asked if he should withdraw the nomination of the proposed chair, and Orcutt replied that Moore definitely should if any possibility existed that the nominee might enter into a contractual arrangement with OD21. Moore said that IPSC had asked the nominee about a possible conflict of interest, but EXCOM should not hesitate to express any further concerns.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-5

EXCOM recommends that IPSC recruit working groups for industry liaisons and technology with care taken to avoid possible conflicts of interest.

Moore explained that IPSC wanted to keep the science group small for efficiency, while still maintaining international representation. Mutter wondered whether the science group should

include a few scientists with no current involvement in the program. Moore believed that serving on another JOIDES committee or having a proposal in the system should not preclude someone from membership on this panel. Orcutt stressed that the science group members must have the breadth to look across the entire suite of science rather than represent narrow interests, and he warned about possible scientific conflicts of interest. Briden emphasized that we need a *new* science plan and suggested that contemporary interests might not apply to 2004. Leinen remarked that in developing the previous long-range plan, EXCOM made sure to have leadership from people with awareness of its concerns. Beiersdorf then suggested that having good liaisons could perhaps resolve those concerns. Detrick stated that the committee should trust Ted Moore to relay its concerns to IPSC and let them get on with the job.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-6

EXCOM recommends that IPSC recruit a working group for science planning in consultation with SCICOM, while considering the concerns of EXCOM about the breadth of experience and knowledge of the members as well as potential conflicts of interest.

Moore said that IPSC could provide an expanded early outline of the science plan to EXCOM by this fall to get feedback before going too far. Briden inquired further about the timing of the planning and review process. Moore explained that IPSC hoped to send a first draft by the end of the year to the CONCORD and COMPLEX committees and other independent scientists. Purdy thought that IWG would not want to comment on the science plan itself but only receive assurance that the process was proceeding on schedule. IWG would want to look more closely, however, at the next level of integration among the science, technology, and management plans so they could determine how to implement the overall plan.

Heinrichs expected the integrating phase of the planning effort to coincide with ICOSOD, in the middle of 2000, so IWG could wait until February 2000 to get the initial review of the individual plans. Briden asked for more details about the concept of ICOSOD, and Beiersdorf wondered who would participate in it. Heinrichs responded that ICOSOD would serve as the primary transition point between the ODP council and IWG. It would probably consist of a small group that integrates the science plan, technical requirements, and a first-order idea of staffing and overall costs. The JOIDES science community, through EXCOM, would look at how to do the science, and the government sponsors, through IWG, would look at management and finances.

Moore thought that IPSC could come forward by February with a model for an integrated program, but it would not have the benefit of a broad management review or a science plan with thorough community review. Heinrichs said that IWG would not need a final plan by then but only something they could use to start making short-term plans. Purdy noted that IWG would hear the IPSC report at the August SCICOM meeting and then decide the schedule of future IWG meetings.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-7

EXCOM endorses the review process proposed by IPSC regarding development of a new long-range plan by the working group for science planning.

Beiersdorf asked when IPSC would need to know the identity of the ICOSOD review committee, and Moore said it depended on how EXCOM wanted to do it. Beiersdorf then wondered if it should consist of an independent group or a subcommittee of EXCOM. Heinrichs said that EXCOM did not have to decide that today, but they should decide how to handle the earlier review of the draft outline. Briden wondered to whom the ICOSOD review committee would report, and Heinrichs answered that the JOIDES advisory structure represents the only science organization

we have in place. Beiersdorf noted that EXCOM would expect to discuss the review of the science plan at its February meeting.

Prior asked about the timetable for the technical working group. Moore said that he expected to have a report ready by 1 March 2000, but Taylor asked if IPSC could finish that report in time for the next EXCOM meeting. Moore explained that IPSC could not really produce a good technology plan or budget until they knew the boundaries of the second ship. Feary thought that real numbers would be necessary by the ICOSOD stage, and he asked if IPSC planned to establish a budgetary working group. Moore responded that OD21 would provide a budget estimate for the riser vessel, while the CDC would provide one for a non-riser vessel, and IPSC might use the same consultant as the CDC to get an estimate for alternate platforms. Moore added that the Japanese advisory structure still had to approve the design of a larger riser ship, and then IPSC would have to decide what remained for the third leg of the new program, so they could not get complete cost estimates before the end of this year.

Taylor expressed a strong interest in establishing stronger links with ICDP and other programs. Moreover, he called for an effort to create a unified program for drilling anywhere, not just in the ocean, though he feared that we had already followed a path that bypassed this possibility. Leinen agreed that we should at least articulate clearly to the funding agencies the role of ocean drilling in the context of lake, arctic, and continental drilling, while Dennis Kent noted the complementary nature of these programs and saw this as part of the “third leg” of the new program. Moore commented that other programs could already integrate into ODP and cited ANTOSTRAT as an example, plus the new Arctic PPG that would bring in people from the Nansen Arctic Drilling program.

Taylor argued that in the current framework we merely patch in these other programs, but surely we could do a better job of this in the next program. He predicted that by interacting with these groups we would encounter different scientific problems than we had in the past. Brent Dalrymple questioned where this topic fit on the agenda and whether this meant that we should change everything we had talked about up to now. Mutter thought that the committee should address this important issue, whether it appeared on the agenda or not. Mével agreed but wondered about the best time to do so.

Beiersdorf asked if Taylor thought that our group should take the first steps toward forming a larger group or coordinating committee. Taylor recommended that EXCOM make overtures to other drilling programs to form a joint committee for moving forward on this. He envisioned an opportunity to join with other organizations whose goals and plans resemble ours. Mével wondered how such a joint committee would relate to IPSC, while Moore thought IPSC could produce a broad enough science plan to include the aims of these other programs. Briden recognized the need for justifying the final IODP proposal in general earth science terms, but he could not see a definite need for a broader body to oversee things.

Taylor said that he would prefer to see an integrated proposal go forward to the funding agencies. He could see an integrated science community, but with management and funding structures working against the whole. Taylor recommended that a small group of EXCOM approach representatives of other groups about creating an integrated program, while Detrick said that he would rather see a subcommittee explore a range of options on its own. Beiersdorf agreed and proposed to form a subcommittee that would prepare EXCOM for addressing this issue at the next meeting.

EXCOM Consensus 99-2-8

EXCOM establishes a subcommittee to identify better options for integrating ODP with other scientific drilling programs. This group should prepare a concept document and present it to EXCOM at their next meeting. The subcommittee will consist of Taylor (Chair), Mutter, Orcutt, and Beiersdorf (*ex officio*).

9. SCICOM Report

9.1 Selected ODP achievements from recent legs

Leg 182 Great Australian Bight---discovered high-salinity, hydrogen-sulfide-rich pore fluids on the outer shelf and upper slope, perhaps resulting from evaporation on the shelf during times of lower sea level. Also discovered Bryozoan mounds.

Leg 183 Kerguelen Plateau---found that this large igneous province (LIP) had a long history of development, at times above sea level. This could explain the lack of evidence in the fossil record for development of an isolated fauna on the Indian continent.

Leg 184 East Asian Monsoon---obtained an 8 MY sedimentary record at the southernmost site and even longer records at the northern sites.

Leg 185 Izu-Mariana---deepened a hole into the oldest crust ever recovered in the Pacific to look at subduction processes. Also conducted the first microbiology studies and contamination tests.

9.2 Four-year ship track for *JOIDES Resolution* through FY 2002

Bill Hay reported that SCICOM had not altered the previous four-year ship track, so the *JOIDES Resolution* would continue to operate in the Pacific for now and almost certainly enter the Atlantic before the end of the current program.

9.3 Scheduling of remaining legs and phase-out of JOIDES advisory structure

Hay stated that SCICOM would consider 24 proposals this year, a 50% increase over last year, with only 16 legs at most remaining to schedule by the end of the program. Hay noted that the diagram shown yesterday by Moore outlined the phase-out of the advisory structure.

Briden asked what the JOIDES Office planned to do about the large stack of paper going to committee members for review. Hay answered that he could not do much about it at the moment. Fox wondered if operational constraints could limit the number of proposals, but Hay replied that he had to follow the procedures prescribed by EXCOM.

9.4 Establishment of Arctic and Hydrogeology PPGs

Hay reviewed the goals and mandates of the new Arctic and Hydrogeology PPGs, as established at the previous SCICOM meeting. Detrick felt that the specific mandate of the Arctic PPG did not adequately address certain concerns expressed in the SCICOM minutes. He supported the idea of a thematic focus, but not a regional panel, and hoped that the PPG would not believe they had a mandate to implement the NAD program rather than focus on ODP-related science. Hay tried to allay those concerns and Beiersdorf offered additional assurance.

9.5 Amend Terms of Reference regarding PPGs

Hay presented a request from SCICOM to amend several paragraphs of the Terms of Reference regarding Program Planning Groups. Taylor noted that the proposed changes definitely put the PPGs under oversight of the SSEPs rather than SCICOM.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-9

EXCOM revises the Terms of Reference for Program Planning Groups, as requested by SCICOM. See SCICOM Motion 99-1-7.

Orcutt moved, Harrison seconded; 14 in favor, 1 abstained (Briden).

10. FY 2000 Science Plan and Budget

10.1 Science plan summary

Kate Moran noted that EXCOM had already approved the science plan through Leg 193 (see EXCOM Motion 99-1-8), and she explained that Legs 192 and 193 had since switched places on the schedule. Orcutt inquired about the availability of LWD for Manus Basin. Moran replied that Manus Basin would now come under the next fiscal year's budget, with LWD operations included, and a chance still existed to get additional money for more sophisticated measurements. Orcutt questioned the sense of scheduling such a leg before knowing if we could do it. Hay said that SCICOM had discussed this issue thoroughly and decided it was still worth doing even without the more sophisticated LWD measurements.

10.2 FY 2000 final budget

Moran summarized the FY 2000 program plan, noting that it met the target budget while maintaining innovation. The ship would operate in the western Pacific and Southern Ocean for six science legs and one and one-half engineering legs. Moran also listed various targets for technology development including improved core quality, gas hydrates, advanced CORKs, large-diameter logging tools, and hard-rock re-entry. The FY 2000 budget would total \$46.1M.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-10

EXCOM approves the FY 2000 program plan.

Nowell moved, Detrick seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained (Mutter, Prior).

11. Review of Membership Status

11.1 ECOD Report

11.2 PacRim Report

Helmut Beiersdorf accepted the membership status reports of ECOD and PacRim as they appeared in the agenda book, and the committee offered no further comments.

EXCOM Motion 99-2-11

EXCOM approves the membership status of ECOD and PacRim.

Leinen moved, Taira seconded; 12 in favor, 2 abstained (Feary, Comas), 1 absent (Orcutt).

12. Future Meetings and Other Business

12.1 Winter 2000, 14–16 February, Washington, D.C.

Moran outlined the plan for the next meeting and possible interaction with government officials.

12.2 Summer 2000, College Station, Texas

Beiersdorf explained that the next summer EXCOM meeting should ideally occur in Japan, but Taira could not host the meeting because he would have a time conflict as a leg co-chief.

Beiersdorf therefore recommended College Station, Texas, as a venue and the committee concurred.

12.3 Other Business

EXCOM Motion 99-2-12

As we sit within singing range of the Sydney Opera House, the Three Tenors come to mind. In ODP we have an equivalent in the Three D's, Don Heinrichs, Dietrich Maronde, and David Feary. EXCOM expresses immense gratitude to these three persons who have provided leadership to the Ocean Drilling Program, to EXCOM, and to the ODP Council. We can hardly remember ODP before Don. He has served as the keystone of the ODP structure for almost its entire existence. We thank Don for his leadership and patience in dealing with the advisory structure. And to Dietrich Maronde who has been an enthusiastic supporter and stalwart advocate of ODP for as long as Hans Dürbaum, former EXCOM member from Germany. You will soon join Hans in retirement—perhaps we will see you on PEC-VI. And we thank David Feary for his resolute effort to keep PacRim as a full member and for his hard work to make this meeting so enjoyable. We look forward to seeing him in Washington, D. C.

Approved by acclamation.

Meeting Adjourned

12:25 PM