***JOIDES* EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

OXFORD UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, U.K.

28-29 JUNE 2001

PARTICIPANTS

Executive Committee – EXCOM

Chris Harrison (Chair)	Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami, USA
Helmut Beiersdorf	Bundesanstalt fur Geowissenschaften Und Rohstoffe, Germany
Maria C. Comas	Instituto Andaluz de Ciencias de la Tierra, Universidad de Granada, Spain (ECOD)
Robert S. Detrick	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
David Falvey	British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Richard Hiscott	Earth Sciences Dept., Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada (PacRim)
Dennis V. Kent	Department of Geological Sciences, Rutgers University, USA
Roger L. Larson	Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, USA
John Mutter	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO), Columbia University, USA
Neil Opdyke	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Florida, USA
John Orcutt	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, USA
David Prior	College of Geosciences, Texas A&M University, USA
Eli Silver	Earth Sciences Department, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA
Paul Stoffa	Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, USA
Hidekazu Tokuyama	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan

Associate Member Observers

Mathilde Cannat	Laboratoire de Géosciences Marines, Universite Pierre at Marie Curie, Paris, France

Liaisons

John Farrell	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Jeff Fox	Ocean Drilling Program (ODP), Texas A&M University, USA
Dave Goldberg	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO), Columbia University, USA
Bruce Malfait	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Alastair Robertson	Dpt. of Geology and Geophysics, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom (SCICOM)

Guests

Steven Bohlen	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Elizabeth Boston	Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), Canada
Jim Briden	Oxford University, UK
J. Paul Dauphin	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Mary von Knorring	Swedish Research Council, Sweden
Yoshiro Miki	Japan Marine and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Ted Moore	Dept of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
Kiyoshi Suyenhiro	Japan Marine and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Mike Tricker	National Environmental Research Council, United Kingdom
Kasey White	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Minoru Yamakawa	Japan Marine and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), iSAS, Japan

Guests from JOI BOG

Alan Mix	College of Oceanic & Atmos. Sci., Oregon State University, USA
Arthur Nowell	School of Oceanography, University of Washington, USA
Robert M. Owen	Dept of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA

JOIDES Office

Elspeth Urquhart	International Liaison, RSMAS, University of Miami, USA
Aleksandra Janik	Science Coordinator, RSMAS, University of Miami, USA

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

OXFORD UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, U.K.

28-29 JUNE 2001

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

EXCOM Motion 01-2-1: EXCOM approves the agenda of this meeting.
(Orcutt moved, Beiersdorf seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-2: EXCOM approves the minutes of its January meeting.
(Beiersdorf moved, Silver seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-3: Upon review, EXCOM recognizes that the ECOD Consortium has met the following three conditions of membership:
- achieved contributions equal to or greater than 5/6 of a full membership,
- made a firm commitment to work towards full membership,
- made significant progress towards full membership during the past year.

Accordingly, ECOD Consortium qualifies for full privileges on committee and panel membership.
(Orcutt moved, Beiersdorf seconded; 14 in favor, Comas abstained)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-4: Upon review, EXCOM recognizes that the PacRim Consortium has met the following three conditions of membership:
- achieved contributions equal to or greater than 5/6 of a full membership,
- made a firm commitment to work towards full membership,
- made significant progress towards full membership during the past year.

Accordingly, PacRim Consortium qualifies for full privileges on committee and panel membership.
(Falvey moved, Silver seconded; 14 in favor, Hiscott abstained)

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-5: EXCOM recommends that in the process of waiting for the remaining contributions to the Achievement and Opportunities Legacy Document, chapters with the articles submitted up-to-date, after thorough editorial review, should be posted on the web.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-6: EXCOM approves the revised JOIDES Terms of Reference.
(Beiersdorf moved, Larson seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-7: EXCOM advises SCICOM that the ODP JOIDES Science Advisory Structure will terminate in Sept. 2003. EXCOM recognizes that JOI may continue to require scientific advice during the ODP phase-out period through FY2007, and recommends that JOI seek advice, as appropriate, during this period from the IODP SAS to ensure a smooth transition from ODP to IODP.
Detrick moved, Falvey seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-8: EXCOM asks JOIDES Office to contact iPC Chairs and ICDP chair to jointly consider a strategy for future cooperation.
Beiersdorf moved, Comas seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-9: All tasks not completed by IPSC will be passed to iPC as soon as it is formed. IPSC ceases to exist with the establishment of the iPC.
(Stoffa moved, Hiscott seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-10: We owe IPSC a great debt for their extremely successful work on setting a strong basis for the development of IODP, especially its Initial Science Plan. Ted Moore and Jimmy Kinoshita and the other members of IPSC served and worked hard for 2.5 years with great dedication and enthusiasm. Our sincere thanks also go to Joanne Reuss assisting IPSC so skillfully and efficiently. We wish them all the best in the future.
(Beiersdorf moved, Silver seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-11: EXCOM recognizes the exciting science and new technology achieved on Legs 193-196.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-12: EXCOM recommends that SCICOM and TEDCOM Chairs and IPC Co-Chairs seek continued development of promising new experimental tools.
(Kent moved, Hiscott seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Motion 01-2-13: EXCOM approves FY2002 Program Plan.
(Falvey moved, Detrick seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained [Orcutt and Silver])

EXCOM Motion 01-2-14: EXCOM recommends to IPC and IWG that the Arctic drilling proposal (JOIDES proposal 533 – Lomonosov Ridge) be given a high priority in the first year of IODP.
(Falvey moved, Stoffa seconded; 15 in favor)

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-15: EXCOM recognizes that the rotation of representatives for two ODP Consortia, ECOD and PacRim, means that we must bid farewell to Menchu Comas and Richard Hiscott. EXCOM wishes to express its sincere appreciation for both Menchu's and Richard's skilful and comprehensive advocacy for a total of 16 ODP member countries. The enthusiasm of Menchu's contributions and Rick's precise attention to editorial detail have been special features of their service! EXCOM thanks both Menchu and Rick knowing that this is not really a farewell but simply 'au revoir'.

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-16: EXCOM thanks Jim Briden, Chris Franklin, Andy Kingdon, Tricia Philpot, Elisabeth Sabey, and Dave Falvey for putting on a meeting in such an historic location and also thanks all those who provided entertainment. It rained only briefly and it was also hot.

JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
OXFORD UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, U.K.

28-29 JUNE 2001

MINUTES

THURSDAY	28 JUNE 2001	09.00 AM

1. Welcome and Introduction

Chris Harrison called the meeting to order at 09.00 AM.

2. Approval of Agenda

EXCOM Motion 01-2-1: EXCOM approves agenda of this meeting
(Orcutt moved, Beiersdorf seconded; 15 in favor)

3. Minutes and matters Arising

3.1 Approve Jan. 2001 EXCOM Minutes

Harrison reported that the January EXCOM 2001 minutes were sent out electronically and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. He added that there were some minor changes made to the draft minutes following suggestions of attendees. Harrison then asked if there were any other corrections and in the absence of comment he called for a vote to accept the minutes. The vote was carried unanimously.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-2: EXCOM approves the minutes of its January meeting
(Beiersdorf moved, Silver seconded; 15 in favor)

3.2 Electronic approval of minutes.

Harrison proposed that there should be a system for electronic approval of the minutes and invited discussion on this matter. Beiersdorf proposed that there should be a set procedure, i.e. that a deadline should be set for receipt of proposed changes and then the revised version should be sent out so that it could be approved. Harrison agreed that this was the method he intended to use if there were no objections to the proposal. Falvey commented that in his opinion the method would streamline the system, but that the formal and final acceptance of the minutes would have to be carried out at the next meeting in order for them to become absolute. In the absence of any other comments Harrison said that a trial of this method of circulation and approval of the minutes would be done.

4. Country and Consortium Reports

Harrison introduced this section and stated that normally there were no verbal reports unless anyone wanted to add anything to the written report.

4.1 ECOD Comas had nothing to add

4.2 France Cannat apologized for failing to send the country report on time and promised to try to send it promptly next time.

4.3 Germany Beiersdorf commented on an item regarding the German review system that now requires all applications for funding to be submitted in English so that non-Germans can be included as reviewers.

4.4 Japan Tokuyama had nothing to add to their report but mentioned a workshop for IODP in the Oceanic Research Institute on August 10th – 12th. This workshop plans to discuss the Nankai Trough preliminary proposal within an international framework, including Japan, U.S., and France etc. If anyone is interested in participating they should contact the Japan ODP Office.

4.5 Pacific Rim Consortium Hiscott reported that a small part of the country report is included in item 5.3 in the agenda book and concerns the relocation of the PacRim Secretariat Office from Sydney Australia to Halifax Canada on January 1st 2002 and at that time the panel assignments will also change. Hiscott stated that this current meeting was his last and that the PacRim replacement on the EXCOM will be Trevor Powell.

4.6 The Peoples Republic of China No Chinese representative was present.

4.7 United Kingdom Falvey had nothing to add to the report.

4.8 U.S.A. Malfait reported that additional funding had been made available to support Kastner's equipment for CORK Holes on Leg 203.

5. Review of membership Status

5.1 EXCOM motion 98-2-8

Harrison explained that it was necessary to discuss membership of countries that had not contributed fully, namely the ECOD consortium and the PACRIM consortium.

5.2 ECOD

Comas referred to the letter reproduced in the agenda book. The ECOD contribution for the current year is 99.5% of full membership and has increased from last year. Austria has been invited to join the consortium but it is still unclear whether they will to do so immediately or at some time in the future.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-3: Upon review, EXCOM recognizes that ECOD Consortium has met the following three conditions of membership:
- achieved contributions equal to or greater than 5/6 of a full membership,
- made a firm commitment to work towards full membership,
- made significant progress towards full membership during the past year.

Accordingly, ECOD Consortium qualifies for full privileges on committee and panel membership.

(Orcutt moved, Beiersdorf seconded, 14 in favor, Comas abstained)

5.3 Pacific Rim Consortium

Hiscott presented the status of the PACRIM Consortium membership. Although the consortium has maintained a membership contribution of 5/6, they have been adversely affected by changes in currency rates. Korea has applied to the government for increased funding and expect to have an answer in September. There is a lot of optimism in the Chinese Taipei scientific community but as yet there is no knowledge of a formal proposal by Chinese Taipei to increase their contribution. Therefore, although there are some prospects of increased contributions there is no actual increase from the 5/6 contribution this year.

Harrison asked for questions and highlighted the currency exchange position. He also commented that it would be undesirable to reduce the PACRIM membership at this stage when Canada is contemplating full membership of IODP. Falvey agreed, commenting that it was not a result of disinterest by the scientists and moved that PACRIM should remain full members. Malfait referred to a letter stating that Australians were seeking supplementary funds and that if these were not forthcoming then they intend reduce their contribution by 20-30%. Malfait then asked if this would only apply to a reduction in Australia's contribution or to contributions from all the PACRIM countries. No one present at the meeting had seen the letter but the general opinion was that it would only refer to Australia's contribution & not the other members in the consortium.

Harrison commented that if there was a significant reduction in contributions next year EXCOM may have to reduce PacRim's membership but for the moment 2 of the 3 criteria have been met. With regard to the third criterion, the consortium has increased its funding in local currencies. Malfait agreed for the moment but pointed out that the MOU would need to be signed in October. Harrison concluded that decisions could only be made on the information available and invited a vote on the motion.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-4: Upon review, EXCOM recognizes that PACRIM Consortium has met the following three conditions of membership:
- achieved contributions equal to or greater than 5/6 of a full membership,
- made a firm commitment to work towards full membership,
- made significant progress towards full membership during the past year.

Accordingly, PACRIM Consortium qualifies for full privileges on committee and panel membership.

(Falvey moved, Silver seconded; 14 in favor, Hiscott abstained)

6 Management and Operations Reports

6.1 ODP Council Report

Malfait reported on the last ODP Council when program reports from JOI and JOIDES were received. He discussed the phase out of the program and the various activities such as scientific legacy issues and provision for access to ODP assets such as databases and cores. He reported on a discussion concerning funding of the phase down period over approximately 4 years (2004-2007). At the moment it is NSF's intention to fund the activity without other contributions beyond 2003.

6.2 NSF Management Report

Malfait gave a summary on the FY01 ODP budget stating that it was basically unchanged from that reported in Kamakura. He detailed how shortfall in fuel purchases in the program had been handled. For the fiscal year 2001 NSF purchased fuel directly (making a saving of c. $50,000 in tax) in Guam. He also reported that there was carry-forward money from last year.

The total program budget for FY2001 at the moment stands at about $46.5M. The program is funded through the end of July and NSF is waiting for remaining contributions to come in. In terms of FY2002 the program plan budget target was initially $46.1M but there have been a few discussions related to both ODP and IODP planning and the budget has been increased with a target now of $46.2m That is the budget that is in the Program Plan that EXCOM needs to approve before it is officially submitted to NSF. Two primary concerns remaining are the cost of fuel and the letter NSF received about contributions from PACRIM. Malfait also reported that they were preparing for a final, internal NSF review of the ODP program. The National Science Board, which provides the ultimate funding approval, at the moment has approval through the end of fiscal year 2002 although the program was approved over a longer term. Malfait will be reviewing a five-year plan, i.e. the last year of drilling in 2003 and then the phase out period. The plan will need to be submitted to NSF by 1 March 2002. A target budget has been established through 2003 of $45M, which reflects a shortening of the operation period. The goal is to have maximized use of the *JOIDES Resolution* in 2003 but to have it and the logging contract off budget by 2003. There have been some modifications to the original budget targets for the phase out program (2004-2007) that were discussed at the Kamakura EXCOM meeting. Malfait then invited questions. Harrison asked for more information about the NSF internal review, i.e. would NSF personnel carry it out? The answer was that no, it would be a panel of outside experts convened to look at the five year plan, as had been done in the past. Harrison asked if JOIDES had any role in giving advice. Malfait replied that NSF was open to suggestions but JOIDES would not be asked formally. Harrison asked when this review would take place. Malfait replied that the panel would be formed in April or May 2002. It is probable that the main focus of the review would be from a scientific and technical point of view.

6.3 JOI

6.3.1 JOI Response to EXCOM Motions

Harrison reported that JOI BOG did not approve two motions from the Kamakura meeting and consequently they had made slight alterations (these are given on page 33[1]). The Board motion is the first and the Executive Committee motion is the second. Harrison invited Bohlen or Stoffa to comment. Stoffa stated that they did not want to address" most cost effective" and thought it would be better to rephrase as "cost effective". With regard to the second motion concerning "Greatest Hits" he asked Bohlen to comment further. Bohlen said that he got a sense in Kamakura that there was a need not only for "Greatest Hits" but really to prepare a wide range of documents that could be used by member countries for a variety of purposes such as dealing with their funding agencies, governments etc. In dealing with this issue broadly and in discussions with John Orcutt (Public Relations Committee) JOI refocused their activities and decreased emphasis on the newspaper and print media and

[1] NB: All page numbers given in the text refer to this agenda book.

increased emphasis on preparing documentation that could be used and modified to specific purposes in both defense of existing program and in justification of the new program. JOI identified resources and hired Kasey White (present at this meeting). The intention is to work with the JOIDES Office to get up on the web "Greatest Hits" in language appropriate for educated but not scientifically or technically literate people. Graphics etc. will be included so that these can be downloaded, modified slightly for individual specific purposes and therefore be a more useful set of documents both in justifying the value of ODP and in justifying funds for the new program. White was present at the meeting to liaise.

Harrison invited comment from the EXCOM Panel and emphasized that it was not a common thing for JOI BOG to disagree with what EXCOM has done. Harrison commented that with regard to the second motion in question that JOI BOG had done what EXCOM asked them to do. Falvey thought that the "Greatest Hits" volume could only be produced within appropriate resources. Falvey went on to say that regarding the first motion the rationale was to find a truly cost effective alternative as contingencies to the process of phase out rather than the convenience of just "business as usual". Beiersdorf asked if the issue would be revisited in a year and Harrison replied that it would be revisited in the normal course of events anyway. Briden thought that this was an unprecedented situation and that it was a question of trust between the international partners and the U.S. Harrison asked if anyone wanted to say anything more about this issue. There were no more comments.

6.3.2 Legacy and other phase out plans

There were four EXCOM Motions for discussion. The first concerned a written legacy EXCOM (00-2-5), the second was phase out for the operation of ODP (01-1-3); the third (01-1-4) concerned the material legacy, i.e. Janus database, core repositories and other ODP legacy and the fourth (01-1-8) was the "Greatest Hits" item already discussed. There is a comprehensive SCICOM report on the ODP legacy in the agenda book written by Becker. Harrison proceeded to go through this report pointing out the major items of interest. This report is a draft because science is still evolving until the end of drilling in 2003 and beyond.

Farrell reported that the database of publications relating to ODP should be completed and distributed internationally by the summer 2001. With regard to the AGI database JOI has solicited additional contributions from the international community via the web. They have received an additional 700 citations previously excluded because of the way they were categorized. A final database will be on the web and will also be available to download into personal bibliographic databases.

Farrell then continued by discussing the Phase Out Plan, the first review document of which is due at NSF on 1 March 2002. All major subcontracts have to be closed by 30 September of 2003 although JOI is predicting that NSF will extend contracts for the primary subcontractors beyond 2003. The operations of *JOIDES Resolution* will end before 21 September 2003, probably in the Gulf of Mexico. Phase out of ODP will be completed within the fiscal year 2007. Other assumptions are that assets of ODP and IODP will be carried forward together (such as cores, data etc.) to the new program.

Farrell reviewed items such as the maintenance and transferal of the *Janus* database and other ODP databases; the four core repositories and some of the other legacies, e.g. publications, equipment, tools and other hardware, engineering development projects and

the Micropaleontological Reference Collections (MRCs). Re-entry holes, borehole installations etc. are also part of the legacy. Documentation of holdings was mostly completed last year and there has been recent evaluation with the help of the JOIDES panels. An action plan for the final phase out will be included in the EXCOM agenda book for the January 2002 meeting. At this meeting in Santa Cruz (NB: and not the June meeting) EXCOM will be asked to approve the 2003 program plan for the last year of operation as well as the phase out plan (2004 – 2007). Harrison noted that this would mean extra effort by everyone in order to be prepared for the earlier approval. Farrell noted that the specific activities concerned with data alone had consisted of several meetings including a data transfer and archive meeting, meetings at TAMU, and meetings with various other groups. Rack gave a report to the National Academy of Sciences and also reported on *Janus* and other ODP database issues at a workshop at Scripps. There have been some substantial discussions held at the SciMP level about legacy issues and data. Images from the new digital imaging system will be part of the new database. JOI is working with JAMSTEC and OD21 to transfer the data in *Janus* for use in IODP. With regard to the repositories– the total capacity is 330,000m and the total stored so far is 290,000m. Based on the program's average coring year the stores will be full in about 3.5 years. TAMU retains these repositories throughout 2004 with an option to continue beyond or transfer to the new entity. Farrell referred to the acknowledgment issue in that authors are requested to use key words in their publications, (e.g. ODP), for GEOREF and he encouraged communication of this message throughout the scientific community. Harrison asked if this were, or could be, part of the formal instructions given to scientists participating on legs. Fox stated that as soon as a paper is sent to a journal a copy is sent to TAMU who check it for such things as citations. The procedure for the use of key words is in the agenda book under the TAMU report and also online. Falvey noted that oral conference presentations that refer only to ODP sites by number are a problem for those not familiar with ODP. Falvey also promised to make clear in the UK that anyone with funding from NERC under ODP grants has to use the correct reference in publications. Harrison assumed that the other countries were doing this too.

Farrell moved on to discuss improvement to ODP online resources, e.g. constant updates on the web site, implementing digital core imaging and the progress which has been made in the collection and recording of data for cores, logs and seismic data. A new system has been piloted this year on Leg 194 and Leg 196, which will be necessary for the new IODP and the 3D seismics. Rack has taken the initiative to establish a web based ODP collaboratory. This involves distribution not only of data but of tools and technology development, e.g. from physics and medical research communities to support ODP research. There is a lot of information in the *Janus* database but methods of retrieval and analyses of these data to utilize fully the potential will need improvement. JOI is working with scientists who are interested in these collaboratories to understand how the process of science works, how these centers without walls function and what the impact on ODP activities would be. At the next meeting there will be a progress report on these activities.

Harrison asked if IODP were prepared to accept the legacy responsibilities i.e. is the new program willing to accept all the core repositories and the databases etc. It was suggested that it would be very appropriate to discuss the JOIDES legacy plans, i.e. the types of data etc., with the IWG. Larson was especially concerned about what would happen to the geophysical site survey data bank or the material in the LDEO site survey

databank. Farrell replied that Weill had proposed that the databank will be fully staffed and fully funded through the end of 2004 and the understanding is that the databank will serve as the databank for the iSAS. The potential of a seamless transition was queried and Farrell replied that provision has been made to have personnel in place to supply the required services.

Larson referred to previous discussions concerning digitizing and also the IESX *Geoquest* software initiative enabling the viewing of the 3D databases. He asked how these would be affected during the transition. Farrell replied that a programmer would be hired to help so that the facility would exist during and after the transitional period. In 2004 it will still be open as a fully functional database. Harrison asked Farrell if he was going to make reports about this regularly to EXCOM. Farrell answered in the affirmative.

6.3.2 Legacy and other phase out plans

Robertson referred to two remaining SCICOM issues referenced on page 35. Motion 00-2-13 relates to tools and technical items. The key idea is to have one page summaries for each tool. Skinner has taken this up very enthusiastically and has established a plan for developing this. As far as is known this is going ahead and will be passed down to IODP. The summaries will include an illustration of each tool and a clear explanation of how all the technical specifications can be obtained from the published literature.

The second item concerned SCICOM Motion 00-2-14 relating to a legacy document entitled *Achievements and Opportunities of Scientific Ocean Drilling* (AO*).* There has been substantial progress in submission of the articles with 11 articles received and four outstanding. Becker is making efforts to get the remaining articles and requests EXCOM's advice on how to proceed, i.e. whether to wait for remaining articles or to split the document into two parts and proceed with Volume 1 immediately. Harrison noted there are four basic sub groups with missing papers from three of them so it would be difficult to put together a coherent volume. Larson suggested that two volumes was not a good idea. He added that one way to help would be to provide assistance for the over-worked authors. Moore advised caution in trying to close out the program before it is over because there are some very critical upcoming legs, which could make valuable contributions. Robertson asked what the critical timescale was. Harrison replied that one of the aims is to give people information for getting the new program going and so it was essential that this edition came out quickly.

It was suggested that it might be possible to put the completed articles on the web and then add subsequent articles as they came in, i.e. an evolving legacy document. Robertson commented that if a balanced document was required then editing was required and there was a danger of posting articles too rapidly thereby producing a series of not very well produced and disparate articles. Mutter asked if an overview was planned as he was concerned that the articles were going to be heterogeneous and with little coherence. Probably the more important issue is for each article to be edited before it goes on to the web to make sure it covers the subject in a balanced way and particularly highlights the opportunities. Kent expressed concern about putting discrete articles on the web as part of an ongoing legacy document without integration, at least at some level. Harrison asked if he meant that the articles should only go on the web when one of the relevant four sections was

complete. Kent thought that this would be a minimum requirement and it would also apply some pressure on authors to get the other articles submitted.

Mix asked if there was a problem with submission of the articles because they were considered gray literature. Robertson thought submissions were delayed because people are extremely busy but anxious to do a good job. Beiersdorf thought that the book was tremendously important throughout the community so that everyone could put their science into a global context. He did not think it should be referred to gray literature, as this was a custom document designed to serve a purpose.

Harrison concluded that a decision should be made as to whether to put them on the web in groups or individually. Harrison thought that the decision should be left to Becker. Harrison's own opinion was that he thought the articles should be put onto the web in groups as soon as they were ready.

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-5: EXCOM recommends that in the process of waiting for the remaining contributions to the Achievement and Opportunities Legacy Document, chapters with the articles submitted up-to-date, after thorough editorial review, should be posted on the web.

6.3.3 Plan for producing ODP Final Report, including contents, writing responsibilities, and timeline for completion (EXCOM Motion 00-2-3)

Harrison invited comments regarding the production of an ODP final report. Farrell replied that the final report, as with any other big NSF contract, would be written for ODP. There would be another Performance Evaluation Committee (PEC) in 2003 which would be built into the budget and probably be an agenda item at the next EXCOM meeting. Based on some initial discussions with NSF the contents of this report will have two major headings, a scientific and technical report and a contractual and financial report. The report will be written by JOI in the lead with substantial assistance from the sub-contractors and members of the scientific ocean drilling community. The timeline is to be determined by NSF. The scientific and technical report can be written first whereas the contractual and financial report cannot be submitted until all contracts have been finalized. The scientific and technical report could be submitted significantly before that with the caveat that there would be some significant science in the last 2 or 3 legs that would take 2 or 3 years to mature. In terms of content of the final report it may include reference to the substantial body of work in the ODP publications, the various legacy products previously discussed today, documentation of the engineering and development tools etc. It will be made clear in this report how assets are stored and how they can be accessed. It is probable that there will be an audit in 2004, which will take the program through to conclusion of the operations and then another sometime in 2008. There will be a full incurred cost, financial and contractual closeout at the end of the program. Farrell invited questions. He was asked what the purpose of a PEC at this stage was, as obviously anything that they recommended for 1998 –2003 did not apply for this different stage, i.e. a wind down program. Farrell replied that, for example, the PEC could be charged with reviewing phase out plans and activities towards the transition to IODP.

6.4 ODP Operations

Fox referred to the TAMU report on page 42 and highlighted some items, including testing and implementation of the Hard Rock Reentry System (HRRS) on Leg 193 and the Advanced Diamond Core Barrel (ADCB) on Leg 193 and Leg 194. The deployment on Leg 193 was in a hydrothermal deposit in a back arc basin. The use on Leg 194 was in a stable carbonate in a platform environment and TAMU would like to employ these tools in basalt or igneous terrain. Fox was asked if this was different to the tool used on Leg 185. Fox replied that the tool used on Leg 185 was the old system. Fox was then asked to explain the difference. Fox explained that the difference was that they used a larger diameter bore, thinner kerf so that 30-40% less material was cut than in the old barrel, but a significantly larger percentage of hard rock was obtained. Fox was asked if the tools had been used in basalts and he replied that they had only been used in hard carbonate terrain. Both these tests were where normal technological capabilities were failing and the scientists wanted to try the new tools. On Leg 193 the HRRS essentially allowed achievement of the scientific goal. Fox stated that these tools would be available on future legs.

Fox continued with a report on Leg 195 during which a successful CORK experiment was conducted into a serpentinite diapir on the overriding edge of the Marianas Trough. In addition the new methane head space tool was deployed 6 times and ran successfully and will be tested one more time in preparation for the upcoming gas hydrate leg. Fox continued with an update from the currently drilling leg, Leg 196, giving a brief outline of the problems encountered while installing the ACORK.

Regarding other matters Fox reported that there is strong application pressure for upcoming legs now that the program has returned to more traditional themes. There has also been a very large growth in the web site visitors to 50,000 hits a month. This increase has also been recorded in the mirror sites. Finally there is a higher staff turnover and new solutions for HR are being used and will continue to be used e.g. on Leg 197 the staff scientist position was filled with Dave Scholl, a participant of the leg, with 3 days training at TAMU.

Cost for fuel in December was $300 per tonne as opposed to the projected $250 per tonne resulting in a funding shortfall. However, less fuel has been used on the last few legs for a variety of reasons, e.g. good weather, new fuel energy management system on board, repair of automatic station positioning system etc. In addition, fuel costs decreased from a predicted $300/$330 to $280 per metric tonne resulting in a saving of $239,000 of the fuel money that NSF made available. It is predicted that there will be another $50k to $100k saving before the end of the year. JOI and NSF have advised TAMU to ring-fence money saved to provide a buffer if fuel prices change. Any residual monies could be spent on fuel in the next year or used to buy high priority science equipment for the Costa Rica ACORK leg.

Harrison asked for an estimate of the annual percentage turnover rate of staff. Fox couldn’t quote an actual percentage figure but said it had increased lately. Fox explained that it was difficult to fill vacancies at a senior level when there are only a few years left of the program and that TAMU are attempting to manage these vacancies in new and different ways.

Larson commented on the loss of the 1000m string and asked if TAMU had considered using a tapered string. Fox replied that the string is tapered from 20” but for packer experiments in order to get the size of the packers the 10.75” system has been used.

Tokuyama asked if the ADCB would be used in the forthcoming OD21 trials in the Nankai Trough. Fox replied that it had been used in an accretionary setting on Leg 193 but offset from the active hydrothermal site for temperature reasons. Employment of the tool in other environments will be dictated by the science plan that is recommended by SCICOM in August.

A question was asked with reference to the web site hits. Could TAMU determine the nature of the information that people were requesting? Fox replied that the routes taken could be tracked, e.g. whether the user goes to the *Janus* database or to publications etc.. As to whether TAMU could ascertain whether data had actually been downloaded, Fox would have to refer to the web master.

6.5 LDEO Borehole Research Group.

Goldberg referred to his written report and said he was prepared to answer questions about any issues. He presented two of the current projects, the seismic integration project and the heave compensator project. The pilot projects taking place this year have to date involved two legs, Legs 194 and 196, where the capability was deployed on the ship to evaluate these products. The salient point of the IESX *Geoquest* software is that essentially a seismic section is up on a screen at sea and data from core or log can be overlaid and visualized in that time section along the seismic mega sequences together with other selected data. If successful then this will become part of the site survey databank operation in future. The other news from the ship is that the longest LWD tool string to date has been employed, a bottom hole assembly (BHA) that is close to 100ft long. The results of the data from this tool on Leg 196 were successful at two sites and were particularly spectacular at one of the two sites in the Nankai prism toe site just west of the trench axis. It was drilled to 5600m depth including water depth and recorded images around the borehole. When asked where the position of the casing was right now, Goldberg answered that it was about 150 meters below the sea floor. Fox commented that the present ACORK string was approx 932m. Goldberg continued by saying that in the end the first half of the operation of the leg did succeed in drilling this hole and getting good data to the bottom. One other piece of interesting information concerned a screen shot from the LWD/MWD acquisition system that pulses data in real time from the bit at 6 baud. When asked if this sort of data was gathered by industry Goldberg replied that the technique came from industry.

6.6 JOIDES

6.6.1 Revision of EXCOM Terms of Reference

Harrison stated that it was necessary for the committee to approve new EXCOM terms of Reference. After some additional suggestions, discussion and comments from the sub committee formed in Kamakura (Stoffa and Beiersdorf) the wording was amended and the revised terms of reference were approved by vote. (Note: These are now on the JOIDES web site).

EXCOM Motion 01-2-6: EXCOM approves the revised JOIDES Terms of Reference.
(Beiersdorf moved, Larson seconded; 15 in favor)

6.6.2 JOIDES EXCOM Public Affairs Subcommittee

Orcutt commented that Bohlen had spoken earlier during the morning about public affairs. Orcutt himself is Chair of the committee and Beiersdorf, Falvey, Prior and Becker are members. JOI has hired Kasey White to develop a "Greatest Hits" document. As White was present at the meeting Orcutt suggested that it would be a good idea if the Public Affairs Committee had a meeting with her to discuss proposals for the next period. He went on to reiterate White's experience and qualifications and the future "Greatest Hits" development plans. Orcutt also emphasized the importance of laying the groundwork for public perception of the drilling program and of locating additional funds for the IODP. He asked White to comment on the current state of "Greatest Hits" and she replied that it was in the very early stages but she was looking for volunteers to contribute articles.

6.6.3 Draft Plan for phasing out JOIDES Science Advisory Structure.

Harrison commented that EXCOM has already agreed with SCICOM Motion 00-2-15 (page 80). He passed the floor to Robertson who commented that the details are laid out on pages 80-81 and that Moore was available to give advice. The plan of continuing the existing panels and the format of ODP is currently going smoothly but the question as to what happens beyond September 2003 should be considered. SCICOM have only discussed what should happen up until that date. There will be some functions that will continue beyond that date and so a) should JOIDES, SCICOM, OPCOM etc. continue beyond September 2003 to advise on the ODP legacy issues? and, b) should the iSAS panels share the same Chairs and if not, will motivation be an issue for JOIDES chairs? There are clearly some issues on how the two systems will work together and the watchword has been "seamless transition" to maximize efficiency and minimize time wasted. Robertson then handed the floor to Moore, the iPC Chair designate, to comment on panel structures.

Moore commented that the idea of iSAS panels sharing the same Chairs as JOIDES panels is an excellent way to maintain motivation and pass continuity between ODP and iSAS structures. He also noted that it has been agreed that over this calendar year and into early next calendar year the JOIDES Office will be setting up key meetings, primarily the SCICOM meetings and the SSEPs meetings which iPC will also attend. There should just be a transition as membership from one panel morphs into the membership of the other. They will be jointly meeting starting with the November SSEPs meeting. The business of the iSSEP will probably dominate most of the time because they will take over review of incoming IODP proposals. Moore reported that they have addressed the membership issue of some of the iSAS panels and that Harrison is going to report on the IWG decision concerning membership.

Discussion then moved to the other question of whether or not the JOIDES structure should continue beyond September 2003 to advise on the ODP legacy issues. Falvey suggested that the reason that the JOIDES structure should come to an end is because it is linked with JOI Board of Governors. JOI is not necessarily going to be the prime contractor of the American component of the new program and it will not have any mandated authority for the international community. Therefore JOI committees have no mandate beyond 30 September 2003 in relation to anything to do with the new structure and the new program. This was agreed except for the legacy issues and the wind down. Falvey agreed and commented that there has to be an additional series of terms of

reference that pick up legacy points. These can then be presented to IWG because they will have to ultimately pass it down to the new SAS and the new operators. It was agreed that JOI would have the responsibility for the wind down of ODP.

The question remained as to whether or not any committees that have been created in the present JOIDES structure have a responsibility that extends beyond 2003 and any responsibilities in terms of the wind down of the present program. The motion being currently discussed suggests that those responsibilities would be transferred. The point was clarified that JOI was going to get funds only from NSF through 2007 for these operations. Falvey commented that JOI had to decide how it was going to deal with the closing out of those operations.

Discussion ensued as to whether or not JOI should be advised by a JOIDES advisory structure or from elsewhere during the wind down phase from September 2003 – 2007. Harrison asked for Briden's comments as he thought that there had been a modest precedent in the DSDP - ODP transition where *de facto* the ODP committees were responsible for the inherited DSDP legacy and JOIDES was a continuous organization throughout the transition. Briden agreed but pointed out that there was a discontinuity in membership and that there were still residual issues between NSF and DSDP. Therefore the statement that after September 2003 all ODP issues are between JOI and NSF may not be accurate. Harrison suggested that a motion be drafted for discussion tomorrow morning and continued by saying that the key message was that EXCOM agrees that the present advisory structure is terminating in 2003 and lets the community know this.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-7: EXCOM advises SCICOM that the ODP JOIDES Science Advisory Structure will terminate in Sept. 2003. EXCOM recognizes that JOI may continue to require scientific advice during the ODP phase-out period through FY2007, and recommends that JOI seek advice, as appropriate, during this period from the IODP SAS to ensure a smooth transition from ODP to IODP.

(Detrick moved, Falvey seconded; 15 in favor)

7. Relationships with Other Organizations

7.1 ICDP

Mutter suggested that the ICDP reports should be annual rather than at each meeting. Harrison asked Mutter to comment as to how the liaison should be made between JOIDES and ICDP. Mutter replied that the general issue is the extent to which ICDP and ODP or IODP engages in a joint planning and management effort. To date there has been much discussion of the optimal level of joint planning and management that is appropriate for the two programs but no resolution has been reached. Harrison suggested that there should be at least some connection scientifically, perhaps liaison at the scientific level and not at the management level, or maybe in addition to the management level. A comment was made that in the ICDP the Assembly of Governors (AOG) actually make decisions about proposals that they are going to fund whereas that is more a SCICOM activity for the ODP program. The equivalent committees, EXCOM and SCICOM, cannot be identified in the ICDP. The only place to liaise, apart from personal interaction, would be at the AOG level. Harrison asked why ICDP did not send a liaison to JOIDES. Beiersdorf suggested a meeting with representatives from ICDP AOG and Chairs of EXCOM & SCICOM to

discover ways in which better liaisons could be established. Moore reported that this issue has been discussed at IWG. It was concluded that, as both ICDP and ODP are science driven programs, one of the reasons that the liaison hasn't grown more in the distant past is that ICDP has moved into paleoenvironmental regions. Moore thought it was most appropriate for liaison to take place at the entry level, i.e. when proposals are first considered. At the SSEPs level for example there is adequate time for really useful liaisons and cooperative efforts. It was suggested that even meeting with ICDP at a SSEPs meeting once a year would capture every proposal. Harrison clarified the suggestion that ICDP send representatives to SSEPs meetings. Harrison asked what the SSEPs equivalent was in ICDP. It was the general opinion that they did have an equivalent but no one knew much about it.

Beiersdorf suggested that there has now been a change in attitude and that IODP is better equipped to drill land-to-sea transects. There has also been a change of attitude in ICDP and they have the opportunity now to deal with ODP in terms of transects. Beiersdorf agreed with Moore, that the best way to achieve cooperation is at the SSEPs level. He went on to say that some kind of approval would be needed from ICDP AOG and he suggested a meeting of ODP, IODP and ICDP Chairs to come to an agreement of how to proceed in the future. A firm agreement on cooperation is needed rather than loose liaisons and this would probably be, at least in Germany, politically viewed as a very positive step.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-8: EXCOM asks JOIDES Office to contact iPC Chairs and ICDP chair to jointly consider a strategy for future cooperation.

(Beiersdorf moved, Comas seconded; 15 in favor)

7.2 Industry

Beiersdorf had nothing to report except material that had already been reported in Kamakura i.e. the workshop on alternative platforms to be the third leg of IODP. This linkage was to be with the present program, future program and with industry. This would have a major impact on industry, as it was common sense that they were participants and he hoped that more of these contacts would be established as soon as IODP Planning was further developed.

7.3 Other organizations

No reports were made.

7.4 Distance Learning

Harrison then moved on to distance learning. Prior reported that there was little to report except to say that the leg with the schoolteacher on board had been completed and was considered to have been a successful exercise. Much had been learned about how to construct the modules. Prior also reported the existence of some very embryonic plans to involve other partners in the next phase of this project. Beiersdorf commented that contact had been established in Germany between the Institute for Pedagogy in Natural Sciences in Kiel and ODP.

8. IODP Planning

8.1 IWG

Harrison gave a brief report of the IWG meeting and distributed a set of documents called "A Report of the IWG Meeting, Ottawa 12-13 June 2001." These documents are included here as Appendices 1 and 2. The IODP document on Management Structure was approved. The other document gives the characteristics of the central management office that is committed to IODP science, that is unbiased, independent and a legal entity. Additionally there is a brief account of the details of what the central management office will do in terms of tasks and responsibilities. The funding for the non-riser implementing organization and the riser implementing organization comes directly from NSF and from MEXT without going through the central management office. There was a great deal of discussion at IWG as to how this is actually going to work in practice and there was also a discussion about this issue at the JOI BOG meeting yesterday. The idea is that the central management office should administer all the funding apart from the platform operation costs. The following figures are very flexible as the thinking proceeds but currently the funding would be about $21M in FY04 with a participation unit of about $1.4M rising to funding of about $145M in 2006 with a participation unit of about $5.6M. This would be the entry level amount that each country/consortium would need to subscribe to be a full member. As regards the country reports the two significant items are i) that Canada is still planning on becoming a full member and ii) that there has been very large and significant progress in the European countries deciding to participate as a unit with the idea of getting substantial funding from the EC. Larson asked if the thinking now in European countries is that the European participation would encompass all current European participants including UK and Germany and France, i.e. countries that had previously operated as separate entities. It was agreed that this was the plan.

Beiersdorf had intended to present the following material later **(**Item 8.6) but agreed to explain it at this point. He referred to the previous discussions in Kamakura and added that new plans for a "Euro JOI" were being considered instead of the new entity EuroCORE. It is clear that financing of the major facilities is the responsibility of the lead agencies. So far the lead agencies are MEXT and NSF and a European consortium hopes to become the third lead agency. The former European consortium has to consider 3 levels of responsibility and concern. i.e. the funding agencies in Europe. Larson asked for more precision as to the funding sources. Beiersdorf replied that it would be from individual funding agencies in France, Germany, UK and the other European countries which are now under the umbrella of ECOD and ESF and that the EC sources are not considered in the same category as the individual countries.

Monies coming from European sources, including the EC will be accumulated into a trust fund and from there money would be distributed to NSF. Beiersdorf stated that the pivot will be the scientific community, similar to USSAC in the U.S., who would give scientific advice to an advisory structure within Europe. Funding agencies will have to be advised and therefore a "JOI type" organization is being formed that has temporarily been named EUROCORD (NB: since the meeting this name has been declared invalid as it is already a registered corporate name). The European Steering Committee on Ocean Drilling (ESCOD) is already in existence. Falvey commented that the European Commission had already given a collective grant to form a complete plan for European participation in IODP. The Joint European Ocean Drilling Initiative (JEODI) has been formed and this

initiative aims at establishing a network of the European funding agencies and communities.

8.1.1 iSAS Staffing

The recommendations regarding the makeup of the iSAS committees are summarized in a letter dated 4 May 2001 from Harrison, Kinoshita, Becker and Moore to Drs Leinen and Otsuka (co-chairs of IWG). This is reproduced in the agenda book on pages 85 – 87, and the reply from Drs Leinen and Otsuka dated 17 May is on page 90. In summary it was decided that China and Australia would be invited to regular membership and that the iSAS would consist of 5 members from Japan, 5 members from the United States, and one member each from Australia, Canada, China, France, Germany, ECOD, and the United Kingdom.

The panel nominations are included on pages 88 – 89. The names in brackets are those who would have been the sixth members from the US and Japan if the IWG Co-Chairs had decided to go for the 6-6-7 rather than the 5-5-7 route, therefore those people in parentheses are not in fact part of the iSAS. There was a great deal of effort made by Becker, Moore and Kinoshita to make sure that the committees had broad coverage of the various issues with which they would be faced when dealing with the new science in IODP. Harrison thanked them for this effort. Cannat asked why on page 88 the French and Chinese representatives are listed as observers while the Australian is listed as a full member. Harrison stated that this was not correct. Harrison reported that when the Chinese sent in their nomination they only sent it for one committee (iPC) and Harrison and Kinoshita thought that they should have representations on all the committees. (Note. We have had a report from China saying that they will do so, but no names have yet been submitted). Also notable is that the Australians have nominated people for only two committees.

8.2 IPSC activities

Moore referred to the original IPSC tasks listed on page 93 and gave a status report saying that the first 4 items had been completed, and the fifth and sixth items have been considered and discussed at some length but as yet no final conclusions and recommendations have been reached. The more specific tasks are listed in the second table. ODP asked IPSC to look at the preliminary designs of the Japanese riser vessel particularly with respect to laboratory space and, with the help of JOIDES SciMP, IPSC reported back to ODP in July 2000. The main task, and one that consumed the most time and effort was to write, review and produce the Initial Science Plan, which was completed in March 2001. IPSC were also asked by the NSF to conduct an international evaluation of the report on the non riser vessel. This was completed and the results presented to NSF in January 2001. IPSC looked at the cost estimates for IODP included in the initial science plan and also addressed and discussed the science advisory structure and the management structure. To date IPSC has populated the interim Planning Committee, the two interim SSEPs and the interim SSP. Selection of the iSciMP and Detailed Planning Groups for the riser vessel are still to be addressed through OD21, JOIDES and iPC. He mentioned briefly the charges made by the IWG committee after their review last December and the IPSC response. IWG then met in the following year and charged IPSC with several changes to make in the fifth version of the initial science plan. IPSC met in February and with the help of all those

present including Becker, changes were implemented and sent to Kappel in time for production of the final edition in May 2001. This version is now on the IODP web site and paper copies are available at national offices.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-9: All tasks not completed by IPSC will be passed to iPC as soon as it is formed. IPSC ceases to exist with the establishment of the iPC.
(Stoffa moved, Hiscott seconded; 15 in favor)

Moore then stated that he wanted to take this final opportunity to give credit where credit was due in the development of this well reviewed and well received science plan. In addition to the very important workshops that preceded it, primarily the CONCORD and COMPLEX workshops, there are a host of people who contributed directly and a bunch of heroes who are highlighted in dark print (pp. 94-95) in the science plan working group chaired by Mike Coffin.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-10: We owe IPSC a great debt for their extremely successful work on setting a strong basis for the development of IODP, especially its Initial Science Plan. Ted Moore and Jimmy Kinoshita and the other members of IPSC served and worked hard for 2.5 years with great dedication and enthusiasm. Our sincere thanks also go to Joanne Reuss assisting IPSC so skillfully and efficiently. We wish them all the best in the future.
(Beiersdorf moved, Silver seconded; 15 in favor)

8.3 MEXT Report

Tokuyama proposed a change to the agenda concerning items 8.3 and 8.4 in terms of the MEXT report. Suyehiro is fully occupied in management of the budget related to the IODP project and he could not attend this meeting. Mr. Miki will give the report for 8.3 and Dr. Yamakawa will give the report for item 8.4.

Mr. Miki first reported on the status of construction of the riser drill ship. The construction was started on 25 April at Mitzi ship yard in Okayama prefecture. There was a ceremony with politicians, local government and JAMSTEC officials and Mr. Miki showed pictures of the event. Construction has proceeded well since then and he showed diagrams of the structure of the multi-cellular hull, some of which are complete. 18 January 2002 is the launching ceremony and the Japanese princess will attend. The next IWG meeting will be held in Kobe on 16-17 January. 17 January is the date of the 6th anniversary of the Kobe earthquake when >5000 people died. Mr. Miki invited attendees to join IWG and the launching ceremony. The name of the drill ship will be announced very soon. A committee met last week chaired by Professor Noriyuki Nasu to discuss the name. In the next two weeks the president and the members of the board will finally decide on a name and it will be made public on 20 July, a national holiday. The name will be closely related to the Earth.

In order to support IODP and strengthen activity in Japan the OD21 Science Advisory Committee was set up in February and have held two meetings. There are 17 members, all scientists with no engineers or industrial representatives and most of them are from universities. Under the OD21 Science Advisory Committee (SAC) there are five sub

committees: environmental change; deep earth dynamics; deep biosphere; drilling and downhole measurement; data handling.

The Japanese government was completely restructured early this year and all National Research Institutes became privatized on 1 April. It also involved restructuring of public corporations including JAMSTEC and this may have financial implications. Budget requests have to be made by the end of August 2001. The new cabinet (Prime Minister Mr Koizumi) was formed in April 2001. Within the next two years JAMSTEC will set up a shipboard operation technical center and this will be one of the focal issues for the next fiscal year. Harrison asked if this was a science center and Mr. Miki replied that it was a technology centre for ship operations. Since the last EXCOM meeting there have been some personnel changes within JAMSTEC. On 30 June Mr. Fujita, director of the OD21 office at JAMSTEC will leave and the new director will be Mr. Matsuzaki. The Japanese IWG support office representative Mr. Shinano has returned to Japan to MEXT and the new representative will be Dr. Sakamoto who will arrive in Washington DC in July.

Mr. Miki continued with a report on a Japanese promotional campaign to encourage participation in IODP by Asian countries. To date the campaign has visited Malaysia, Phillipines, China, Thailand, Indonesia and Taiwan. Three seminars were held in Indonesia and all were well received by audiences in excess of a hundred and including scientists, engineers. Japan is making its best effort to encourage them to join IODP.

The second JAMSTEC office in the U.S. was opened in June in Seattle. In JAMSTEC the Institute for Research on Earth Evolution (IFREE) was set up on 1 April 2001. The full time director is Dr Kushiro. Currently there are 50 scientists at IFREE and at the end of this fiscal year there will be more than 100 scientists and engineers. JAMSTEC would like to welcome applications from international scientists as, to date, there are only Japanese investigators.

8.4 JAMSTEC Report and iSAS Office

Yamakawa gave a brief iSAS office update. The iSAS office has been established in the offices of JAMSTEC on 10 May 2001. A major mandate of the iSAS office is to provide an administrative office for iSAS structures. There are two major administrative issues. One is to handle the science proposals for IODP and the second is to promote a smooth transition from ODP to IODP. Yamakawa showed a photograph of the iSAS office staff: Noriko Tsuji, office assistant; two science co-ordinators, Jeffrey Schuffert and Nobuhisa Eguchi and himself as administrator. He then gave the contact details for the office (http://www.isas-office.jp). Finally he stressed that they will make every effort to push forward in their work and asks for collaboration and assistance.

8.5 OD21 Report (See item 8.3)

8.6 European initiative

Beiersdorf commented that, unless there were any questions he did not wish to add anything further than points already discussed in item 8.1. Farrell referred to the IWG meeting when Chris Franklin spoke on behalf of Europe and said that there was a desire that in 2004 Europe would provide the means for a mission specific expedition in the first year of IODP. Beiersdorf asked if he meant a full year and Farrell answered yes, the first full fiscal year of 2004. Beiersdorf and Falvey agreed that so far this was the plan. Beiersdorf said the intention was to submit a proposal 2 years from now to the EC and

hopefully the money would be available by 1 January 2004. Farrell asked for clarification on the submission date and Beiersdorf said that it had to be within 2 years at the latest. Falvey agreed and said it was more like 21 months. Harrison clarified that the proposal would be submitted early in 2003 and would hopefully get funded at the start of calendar year 2004. Falvey assented and added that they would be seeking funding for the Platform Operating Cost component. Beiersdorf said that by that time an organization would need to have been established that could send out tenders and receive bids. Larson clarified that the issue was about mission specific platforms but as a proposal had to be submitted to operate something specific did they have any idea about what platform(s) they were talking about? Beiersdorf hoped that they would learn early enough which were the highest ranked proposals and iSAS would come forward with technical consideration as far as platforms are concerned. Falvey commented that the point of the APLACON conference was that it was the first step in bringing the technological requirements and the science together but there was still time over the next 18-24 months to consolidate plans. Falvey reported a very high level of commitment between the funding agencies, the scientific community and the EC.

8.6.1 APLACON Conference

Beiersdorf mentioned that the APLACON conference was attended by approximately 100 scientists. APLACON was sponsored by ESF, ESCOD and the Institute of International Science and Technology Cooperation, Portuguese. The conference was held in Lisbon between 10-12 May as a logical continuation of CONCORD and COMPLEX and had the objective of accumulating science programs in polar regions, shallow water sedimentary environments and in deep water where specialized drilling technology is required for more effective core recovery. At the conference there were reports from other initiatives in earth science, InterMargins, Images, ICDP, InterRidge and Nansen Arctic Drilling. Of particular interest was the proposal by ICDP for lake drilling. They have a program called Lake 800 which might be of particular interest for merging with technologies from ICDP and IODP. `The conference then split into four working groups and worked on position papers for extreme climates in earth history, rapid climate change, sedimentary basin formation and processes, and Earth processes. The papers from the various working groups will be published in a full conference report , which will be available in August or September. The conclusions from the conference were put into the following statement:

The Arctic remains the principal unexplored frontier on Earth and obtaining cores in this hostile region can only be achieved through an expensive strategy involving vessels with ice-breaker capability. Europe along with other partners, such as Canada and Russia, has an important role to play in opening this frontier to oceanic drilling. The APLACON meeting demonstrated the need for Mission Specific Platforms to achieve many of the objectives outlined in the IODP Initial Science Plan. These platforms must be used in conjunction with the other two coring facilities of IODP in integrated drilling programmes that involve land to sea transects, sea-floor observatories and would, for example, provide the global coverage required in high-resolution climate-change studies.

Beiersdorf concluded that he considered the conference a great step forward in identifying those targets which need mission specific platforms.

Farrell asked if the report would include proposals. Beiersdorf said it would approximate the COMPLEX report but detailed proposals would still have to be prepared. There are already a few proposals, e.g. New Jersey Transect proposal and others that could be submitted easily. Robertson commented, as one of the APLACON participants, that it was broadly based, process orientated, and that it tied in very well with the existing science plan. All types of platforms were considered. As a result the published document was expected to reveal a very interesting series of alternatives of which the Arctic could be seen as the flagship although there were other options. Harrison asked if it was specific in identifying places to drill. Robertson said that the fundamental idea was to look at science plans and consider options as to which platforms, or combinations of platforms may be necessary and to stimulate and encourage new proposals to be written.

8.7 U.S. Plans

Malfait stated that in terms of U.S. activities a lot of the items had been covered in the discussions about IWG and IWG planning and the lead agency activities. In terms of overall ODP planning support MEXT and NSF have agreed to continue supporting the IWG support office, currently co-located with JOI, through September 2003. U.S. science planning has been supported from the U.S. Science Support Program (USSSP) up till now and this will continue through 2003. NSF asked USSAC a year ago to identify a U.S. science program for IODP. The next meeting of USSAC (12-13 July) will be continuing with that activity. NSF expects that an RFP or a program solicitation activity will consider the support of future U.S. science activity in IODP. Malfait continued by commenting that IWG have been asked for comments by September 2001 on the operational framework. Harrison had also shown earlier the tasks and responsibilities defined by the CMO. IWG has been also asked to comment on that. NSF is beginning to look in more detail at how a CMO is formed. On the U.S. side NSF has written to the Consortium for Ocean Research and Education asking for their comments on organizational framework, management structure and framework for the future program. Malfait expected a reply by the end of the summer. In terms of international agreements NSF is beginning to define the content for those agreements that will be built on the IODP principles which have now been accepted by IWG members. NSF is now having discussions with the U.S. Department of State and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan with reference to the framework and the wording of agreements. The hope is to begin drafting very soon. In terms of the non-riser vessel acquisition NSF are still on schedule to do an RFP sometime in early 2002. The other activity that NSF has been involved in is an analysis of the transition costs between ODP and IODP from the U.S. side. The 2003 ODP target figure would be $45M and Malfait identified the various levels of support according to the present level of use. In the period 2004-2007 NSF would finance that phase down period. Malfait also gave one scenario for support in terms of ramping up the IODP program. This acknowledges the desire of the European Planning Division to become a lead agency. Lead agencies are presently defined by ODP as those contributing equally to the total program costs. These numbers don't include resources if mission specific activities were run as a major core activity in future programs. What that would mean would be adjusting the lead agency contributions to reflect those total costs for mission specific platforms.

US activity in 2004 when drilling activity drops is something in the order of $16-20M. 2004 is the year that the U.S. will convert the non-riser ship. Europe drops from a

total drilling contribution of about $11M in 2003 to $6.5M in 2004. That is one of several financial scenarios. Harrison asked if ship conversion costs were shown here. Malfait answered that the ship conversion costs were not shown nor the Japanese costs for shakedown. Malfait was asked for clarification of the ramp up costs, i.e. are the platform costs included. Malfait answered that the platform costs were included for the two vessels but not the mission specific platform. Harrison clarified that the implication was that if the mission specific platform were included then these numbers would go up significantly. Malfait said that as presently accepted anyone could bring in a mission specific platform activity if they were willing to pay for it. He believed the European proposal was for a core activity within the program similar to the non-riser and riser vessels but that a MSP activity was not included in these figures. Comas asked for clarification of future plans and Malfait said the program would go to sea in 2005 spending some money in 2004 for engineering site surveys, geotechnical site surveys for riser drilling. Comas clarified that it didn't include scientific costs for MSP. Malfait answered that an advisory structure will be needed which will have to be supported as will engineering activities. Comas asked him if he could consider the SOCs for the MSP or not. Malfait said it depended on how much MSP activity was required. Franklin clarified that there was some element of MSP SOCs in those numbers. Malfait stated that there could be but it would mean doing less of something else in the present figures. Malfait was then asked how the numbers had been arrived at when there is not a definite list as to what was included, i.e. the total of $21M. Malfait replied that these were current estimates, which were going to change. It is possible to guesstimate what a science support advisory office is going to cost based on past experience. Some other guesstimates of various costs are also possible. Malfait was asked why the cost was $21M with no drilling yet $45M runs the current program with drilling. Malfait answered that in that pre-cruise year the scientific technical support on the ship needed to be hired. Cannat asked for clarification of site survey costs.

MEETING ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY

FRIDAY	29 JUNE 2001	09.00AM

9. SCICOM Report

9.1 Achievements on Legs 193 – 195

Robertson gave a brief summary of the highlights of the recent drilling starting with Leg 193 Manus Basin.

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-11: EXCOM recognizes the exciting science and new technology achieved on Leg 193-196

9.2 proposal activity

Urquhart gave an update of proposal activity (page 104). Cannat asked if this was less than usual and the answer was yes. Robertson commented that it was a natural reflection of the end of the program and that previously everyone had made a huge effort to submit proposals a few years ago before the last phase and now it is too late for new proposals and so this is a natural tailing off. He thought that this was only because the

community is pausing to take breath and as they see opportunities in the new program a splurge of new proposals is forecast. Beiersdorf enquired whether or not the IPC Chairs could be asked to present a view of the incoming proposals for the new program to see if there is a real drop in interest. Harrison asked if Moore had received any proposals. Moore reported that no proposals had been received but that the iSAS office had only recently been set up. They had however been in close contact with Becker regarding incoming proposals and some of these are clearly aimed at IODP.

9.3 SCICOM Motion 01-01-03

SCICOM has endorsed the recommendations from TEDCOM (# 002-2 and 002-4) so EXCOM have a responsibility to examine how this request can be satisfied. Harrison invited suggestions. Robertson commented that these recommendations came from TEDCOM and were clear indication that momentum was going to be lost if the development staff disappeared. Fox put the issue in perspective by explaining that, for example, TAMU have stopped at the first stage of development of the ADCB, i.e. development of a new bit and core barrel recovery system. Essentially TAMU have stopped all engineering developments at a point where the technology could be used during the current program. TEDCOM's view is that development should continue if resources are available. Silver commented that it seemed like a very worthwhile approach and the bottom line is availability of resources. He asked if it were possible for TAMU and TEDCOM to define a budget necessary to keep development going and approach NSF for special case funding. Harrison suggested that EXCOM recommend to the SCICOM Chair and the iPC Chair that they seek a method whereby these technologies can be kept alive and moved to the new program as appropriate. Falvey asked if the existing phase out plan of JOI specifically includes looking at the technology development status of the ODP technology and its future. Falvey mentioned that he knew that the plans for taking equipment off the ship and putting it into storage were in place but what would happen, for example, if TAMU were not involved in the new program. Fox replied that every piece of technology TAMU had developed will have a technical document behind it and that it will be designed to be fully comprehensible to a new generation of engineers to recreate a tool and to take up the technology where development left off. Harrison asked if EXCOM needed to take any action, possibly suggesting that Becker works with Moore. There was further discussion and comments were made including "that it sounds like the answer was no to development and yes to documentation" and 'that there are two separate problems, one is to document what we've got and the other is trying to continue development". Harrison suggested that a motion or resolution should be passed asking the SCICOM chair to get together with the iPC chair

EXCOM Motion 01-2-12: EXCOM recommends that SCICOM and TEDCOM Chairs and IPC Co-Chairs seek continued development of promising new experimental tools.

(Kent moved, Hiscott seconded; 15 in favor)

10. FY 2002 Program Plan and Budget

Harrison read an extract from the conflict of interest statement which was ratified by EXCOM in 1997 and pointed out that this actually involved four people in the meeting, Orcutt, Moore, Mix and Silver.

Harrison reported that in Kamakura EXCOM approved the science plan and it is now EXCOM's job to approve the program plan. Harrison then invited Farrell to speak.

Farrell commented that the science had already been discussed and members have had a chance to read it in the agenda book (page 106 and page 159). The main focus of his presentation here was the budgeting process involving identification by the advisory structure of the highest priority science and engineering needs. This year the funds are being allocated against specific needs of the leg, for example the CORKS and the casing, hanger expenses etc. to accommodate a possible chert layer in Leg 200. Fuel costs are an additional consideration and there is a contingency plan, which is that if fuel goes above $250, then NSF will be prepared to consider additional funding.

In terms of external funding c. $0.5M was received from DOE and also components from Woods Hole and ORI who have contributed significantly to the microbiology initiative. ORI have been very generous, as have JAMSTEC, in supporting a variety of projects. There has also been support from Schlumberger in terms of software discounts. There are currently two proposals pending, a gas hydrate proposal from JOI, representing the entire program, and a proposal to NSF for the collaboratory mentioned yesterday. In terms of FY 02 there are no other clearly identified sources of external funds at this point apart from JAMSTEC. Farrell then showed a 3 year comparison of the budget (page 132). Harrison asked for a prediction breakdown for the $24M with reference to FY03 in ship operations. Fox said that there was an inexorable upward trend as long as prime economic factors continue to increase. The program is tied to a contract and the day rates are trapped as it grows through a 2% interest. Each time there is a fuel increase the day rates increase by about $40,000 a month. Apart from fuel and day rates some other contractual parameters are also affected, for example between 2001 and 2002 about $450,000 growth in the contractual day rate costs alone.

Fox was asked if the rapid reduction in the drilling services costs included the ending of certain engineering development efforts. Fox answered that it was due to a more aggressive use of inventory. Farrell continued by saying that the average cost of a leg is around $5M to $5.5M. The more expensive legs, such as gas hydrates are high in SOE costs and heavy on engineering. Boston asked the question – "on the previous slide the Arctic project manager was under JOI and will that happen regardless of whether the Arctic leg is scheduled or not?" Farrell replied that it was dependent on the outcome of the SCICOM meeting in August.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-13: EXCOM approves FY2002 Program Plan.
(Falvey moved, Detrick seconded; 13 in favor, 2 abstained [Orcutt and Silver])

11. FY 2003 Preview

11.1 Prospectus for 2003

Janik gave a preview of the proposal prospectus for the SCICOM meeting in August. Proposals (see page 203) will be ranked by SCICOM and scheduled by OPCOM. They are arranged into groups A, B, C. Group A is proposals that are carried over from last year. These were ranked by SCICOM last year but were not scheduled. At the top of the list is Arctic drilling. Group B includes proposals that were externally reviewed after the last SSEPs meeting. Group C consists of 4 Ancillary Program Letters for possible scheduling. The proposals marked MSP (mission specific platform) are Arctic drilling-

Lomonosov Ridge 533; New Jersey Shelf 564; Sea Level Rise 519; Chixulub Crater 548 and Late Pleistocene Drowned Reefs 581. SCICOM feels that those MSP proposals also deserve ranking although it is not possible to drill them with the *JOIDES Resolution*. Proposals marked with 2 stars are outside the area of drilling for FY2003. There are certain restrictions imposed on the area of operation of the *JOIDES Resolution* for this year, partially restricted by the SCICOM motion that in the calendar year 2002 the ship should be in Atlantic. There are also some restrictions from the contractor that the track should end in the Gulf of Mexico for demobilization.

11.2 Arctic Drilling (SCICOM Motion 01-01-06)

Harrison opened a discussion specifically about progress of Arctic drilling as it had generated a lot of interest and a certain amount of controversy. Robertson began by saying that OPCOM initially had a lengthy discussion about the Arctic in March 2001 and the resulting OPCOM Consensus is on page 206. Their recommendation was considered by the SCICOM and, for the first time, SCICOM took the view that the Lomonosov Ridge program is technically feasible. When SCICOM ranked proposals last August it was unclear whether or not it would be technically feasible. SCICOM was anxious that momentum should be fully maintained and requested that the ODP management continue to investigate the costs of Arctic drilling.

JOIDES formed the Program Planning Group (PPG) and the Detailed Planning Group (DPG). The PPG reported on all aspects of the Arctic and the scientific opportunities. The goal of the DPG was to investigate the logistics, technical and budgetary requirements for drilling on the LR in relation to one specific proposal, JOIDES #533- Lomonosov Ridge. The DPG had an extensive mandate and is chaired by Jan Backman, together with 11 other members from a wide range of international interests. Also involved were liaisons from TAMU, Lamont and JOIDES. The first meeting was in February 2001 with a report in March. The last meeting was in June and the final report is due at SCICOM/OPCOM in August. The mandate asked the group to assess the drilling platform type, configuration, and drill system, and to consider the weather windows and the type, configuration and number of ice breakers and an ice management plan in defense of the drilling system as has been done in the Beaufort Sea, Canada. Their preliminary draft was well received and led to the motion referred to above. The only window for this as a purely ODP operation would be August – Sept 2003. It is a narrow weather window for such an expedition and the whole operation would take about 35 days plus ten transit days. Another possibility would be to consider the project in 2004 (ODP is still a program until 2007). Operations of the *JOIDES Resolution* end in Sept 2003 but there will still be a prime contractor, subcontractors and access to equipment, personnel etc.. Another possibility is a joint project, conducting this as the first MSP expedition in IODP and yet with the planning process that has begun in ODP. This might be a suitable project to help ensure the smooth transition from ODP to IODP. The latest cost estimate is $8 - 9M.

Larson queried the predictability of the narrow August weather window i.e. was it more predictable than his experience of Prydz Bay in the Antarctic? Farrell referred to the fact that experts on the weather and the ice monitoring had been under contract during the initial assessment of the logistical feasibility study. This study had involved experts from the Nordic countries, Canada and Russia and JOI now have extensive plans for long term, short term and the day to day operations for the expedition. Another option is that the

drilling objective stretches between 82º to 87º N and if there is one area that is particularly hostile the operation can move to another area. In answer to another query Farrell confirmed that drilling in 2004 is a cost issue. He was then asked how long it would take to raise $8 or $9M and what was broadly included in this cost and he answered by showing a budget breakdown.

The ODP contribution to such an expedition in terms of POCs and SOCS would be approximately $5M with $3M needed to charter the vessel. The other $2M would be leg based costs for the standard services, ranging from costs of staff scientists to publications etc.

Falvey ascertained from Fox that the contract for the JOIDES Resolution involved giving 90 days notice of termination to the subcontractor and that there was no obligation to pay the day rate through to 30 September 2003. Falvey asked if the money saved by ending the contract 3 months early would save enough funds to fund the MSP Arctic operation. Farrell replied that he thought that at least two legs and possibly 3 would have to be cancelled to provide sufficient funds. Farrell thought it would be extremely difficult to run the operation in 2003 unless there was a huge infusion of cash.

Robertson commented that in August SCICOM would review the whole issue again and consider the total financial package and the other attempts to find funding. When SCICOM has all the facts it will make a recommendation to EXCOM in January. Falvey asked if enough time was available to plan this as part of ODP if the decision was made in January 2002. Farrell thought that it would be possible if a project manager had been identified and started to work late in 2001.

Larson suggested that the MSP operation should be promoted as a European project. Falvey agreed that this was a useful suggestion and could be proposed at the forthcoming meeting he and Beiersdorf had arranged with the European Commission in August.

Hiscott mentioned an initiative that is in progress in Canada at the moment and is likely to come up at the SCICOM meeting in August. There are meetings going on between the Canadian Secretary and oil companies interested in APL-17. The proposal involves the deepening of one of the Laurentide ice sheet sites to do a stratigraphic test in a Cenozoic section. The oil companies are sufficiently interested so that there is at least some discussion of them being willing to contribute $3M to the leg.

Farrell asked if Europe had considered drilling in 2004, i.e. Europe contributes about $11M per year to ODP. Falvey commented that the presentation from the IWG said in 2004 the first year budget was a total of $21M excluding POCs, although it was probably just an indicative budget. Malfait agreed that it was. Falvey commented that the timing of drilling could vary depending on whether there is a delivery system available for our ODP MSP in 2004. He continued by stating that the proposal has to be prepared and ready to submit in approximately 21 months from now. Malfait pointed out that there are going to be IODP costs in 2004. Harrison agreed and reminded the committee of the long lead time this project needs. Beiersdorf suggested that there should be at least some money available by the beginning of 2003 for possible drilling in the weather window in August 2004. Farrell pointed out that if Europe is a member of IODP in 2004 and if they buy 4 units at $1.4M then the cost is $5 or $6M against the present contribution of $11M. The difference is $5M that could be a POC contribution to this expedition. Falvey agreed, i.e. that irrespective of what IWG has proposed for the budget the European funding agencies

may see it entirely differently. Falvey then commented that the MSP capability as a contribution to IODP is based on the premise that it is a European research initiative and should be considered by the commission as a major facility like CERN. This is essential to get that commitment at the level of the order of $15-20M a year. The commission will expect matching funding from the contributing agencies from the current 15 members at least. This provides the financial capability for Arctic drilling and possibly, the New Jersey transect.

Falvey agreed with Detrick that SCICOM would be less than enthusiastic about losing two legs in 2003, particularly if there is a possibility of drilling the Arctic leg 12 months later.

Falvey suggested that EXCOM should recommend to the iSAS that it become a priority in the first year of IODP. Harrison asked Moore to comment. Moore confirmed that the interim committees would not be ranking proposals. However this is a specific and very special case and he thought that there should be a recommendation to SCICOM that it is a top priority drilling target.

Further discussion continued as to the wording of the motion, i.e. encompassing issues such as which committee to address it to; how the committee might react; whether "Arctic drilling" was a generic term or whether it referred to one specific proposal; when would be the best time to run the operation in terms of preparation and funding and funding sources.

EXCOM Motion 01-2-14: EXCOM recommends to IPC and IWG that the Arctic drilling proposal (JOIDES proposal 533 – Lomonosov Ridge) be given a high priority in the first year of IODP.

(Falvey moved, Stoffa seconded; 15 in favor)

12 Future Meetings and Other Business

12.1 Santa Cruz

Harrison referred to an email he had sent out suggesting the 29-30 January 2002 and suggested that the meeting dates now be moved to either 28-29 or to 30-31 January. The preferred dates are 28-29 meaning that the managers meeting would be on 27 January, a Sunday. He asked if any one had any objections to those dates. He made a proposal that the meeting would be on 30-31 January and the managers meeting will be on Tuesday 29 January. No one objected to these proposed dates. Harrison invited Silver (the proposed host) to comment on the logistics of the meeting. Silver briefly described the location and said the planned hotel did have space and that the timing was good.

12.2 Europe

Harrison invited Comas to outline the plans for the EXCOM meeting in June 2002. Comas said that ECOD wished to host this meeting in Spain, in Granada. She described the location as having interesting geology, being located on the boundary of the interior and external zones of the Betic Cordillera. Comas extolled the delights of Granada in terms of hotels, university resources, culture, Moorish history etc. and also offered to organize a geological field trip. Because the area was popular with tourists Comas recommended that reservations should be made as soon as possible. Harrison asked if the end of June was satisfactory for every one. It was agreed that the meeting would be held on 25-26 June.

12.3 Frequency of future meetings

Harrison commented that as the program was winding down that it might not be necessary to have meetings twice a year in future. The main business of the next meeting would be to plan for 2003. It was noted that June 2003 was the last possible meeting as the committee was part of the JOIDES advisory structure and EXCOM had moved during this current meeting that the JOIDES advisory structure would come to an end in September 2003

12.4 Other business

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-15: EXCOM recognizes that the rotation of representatives for two ODP Consortia, ECOD and PacRim, means that we must bid farewell to Menchu Comas and Richard Hiscott. EXCOM wishes to express its sincere appreciation for both Menchu's and Richard's skilful and comprehensive advocacy for a total of 16 ODP member countries. The enthusiasm of Menchu's contributions and Rick's precise attention to editorial detail have been special features of their service! EXCOM thanks both Menchu and Rick knowing that this is not really a farewell but simply 'au revoir'.

Presented by Harrison

12.4.1 Mahlon Ball from the University of Miami was the first representative on the then Planning Committee. When the DSDP started and he has just stepped down as being chair of the Pollution Prevention and Safety Panel after many years of service to ocean drilling programs and Harrison, on behalf of the executive committee would like to send him a letter of thanks for his long and dedicated service. There was unanimous agreement with this proposal.

EXCOM Consensus 01-2-16: EXCOM thanks Jim Briden, Chris Franklin, Andy Kingdon, Tricia Philpot, Elisabeth Sabey, and Dave Falvey for putting on a meeting in such an historic location and also thanks all those who provided entertainment. It rained only briefly and it was also hot.

Presented by Harrison

MEETING ADJOURNED

APPENDIX 1

Brief Report of IWG Meeting, Ottawa, 12-13 June 2001
(Agenda Item 8.1)

Prepared by Chris Harrison

(1) The iSAS staffing proposals presented to IWG by JOIDES and OD21 SAC were accepted on the basis of representation of 5 US, 5 Japanese and 7 other members (from Australia, Canada, China, Europe, France, Germany, and UK). This will be discussed later.

(2) The IODP Principle on Management Structure was approved (appendix A). Other documents delineating the management and specifically the Central Management Office are presented in appendices B-D.

(3) Country Reports. Canada is still planning on becoming a full member. The European countries are planning on participating as a unit, with a significant share of funding hopefully supplemented by EU funds.

(4) A rough timetable of implementation has been worked out, which calls for expenditures rising from $21M (Participation Unit = $1.4M) in 2004 to $145±5M (PU = $5.6M) in 2006.

APPENDIX 2

Appendix 2A

IODP PRINCIPLE ON MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

1. A Central Management Office (CMO) will develop and manage the implementation plans for the IODP science program. The CMO will have a formal arrangement with IODP Lead Agencies for this activity and will operate in the best interest of the IODP and all member organizations, without preference.

2. The principal task of the CMO is to receive advice on priorities and plans from the IODP Science Advisory Structure, to **request** plans, which are responsive to this advice from the IODP implementing organizations, and to submit an annual IODP plan to the Lead Agencies. The CMO will negotiate with the implementing organizations and the Science Advisory Structure to produce an annual IODP plan, which is consistent with budget guidance from the Lead Agencies.

3. Implementing organizations will have primary responsibility for the management of the Program's facilities, operational capabilities **and services** as identified in the annual plan. JAMSTEC will carryout the role of the implementing organization for operation of the riser platform. NSF will determine the implementing organization for the non-riser platform. Other implementing organizations **will** be established as appropriate and required. Those organizations supported by science operations costs will be selected by processes agreed to by the IWG or its successor, **and the CMO as required.**

4. The annual IODP plan will include presentation of science operations costs and platform operations costs.

5. The annual IODP Plan will be approved by the executive **authority** of the Science Advisory Structure (which represents all international members) prior to its consideration by the Lead Agencies.

6. Significant changes in the annual plan will be approved by the CMO and the Lead Agencies prior to implementation, **in consultation with the executive authority of the SAS when appropriate.**

7. NSF will provide commingled funds to the CMO, which in turn will provide funds to implementing organizations for science operation costs through appropriate formal arrangements.

8. An IODP Council will provide governmental oversight for all IODP activity. All countries, as well as member organizations representing countries, participating in the IODP will be represented on the Council.

Appendix 2B

CHARACTERISTICS
OF
CENTRAL MANAGEMENT OFFICE

- **COMMITTED TO IODP SCIENCE**
- **UNBIASED**
- **INDEPENDENCE**
- **LEGAL ENTITY**

Appendix 2C

CMO Tasks and Responsibilities

(Based on Recommendations from SAS and Implementing Organizations)

Develop: • Annual Program Plan • Budget plan for Science Operation Cost of the program • .Annual Plan and Budget for technical/ engineering development • Downhole logging plan and budget • Annual publication and information service plan, budget, and guidelines for the Program • .Annual plan and budget for education, outreach, and promotion	**Execute:** • Formal funding arrangement with NSF/MEXT for science operations and management of IODP • Contracts with IOs or IODP subcontractors for Science Operation Activities • Contracts with IOs or IODP subcontractors for technical/engineering development • Other contracts/agreements which may be required
Ensure the efficiency of: • Detailed annual Science Operating Plans to be finalized by IOs • Detailed annual Platform Operation Plans to be finalized by IOs • Detailed Science Operation Costs to be finalized by IOs • Detailed drilling plan prepared by IO and DPG • Platform Operation Cost of the Program • Detailed Pre-drilling site survey plan prepared by IOs	**Secure or Maintain:** • .Necessary funding for Science Operation of each platform • Financial controls for the Science Operation Cost of the Program • Necessary funding for publication and information services • Fiscal activities of CMO operations • .Quality control for sample and data archives
Seek or Promote: • International cooperation to provide timely and useful site survey information for the proposed drill sites. • .Advice from the drilling industry on operational/technical solutions	**Support or assist:** • Appropriate pre-drilling site survey standard for each platform to meet adequate HSE requirements • I0 to secure drilling permit from the country of jurisdiction • DPG and I0 in creating detailed drilling plans • SAS activities
	Conduct: • Promotion of the Program