

# ***JOIDES* Executive Committee**

**July 10 – 11 2003**

**Bermuda**

**MINUTES**

Prepared by the *JOIDES* Office  
RSMAS, University of Miami, 4600 Rickenbacker Causeway, Miami, FL 33149  
<http://joides.rsmas.miami.edu>

**JOIDES EXCOM –BERMUDA**  
**JULY 10 – 11 2003**  
**PARTICIPANTS**

**Executive Committee – EXCOM**

---

Chris Harrison (Chair)	Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, Univ. of Miami, USA
Robert S. Detrick	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA
David Falvey	British Geological Survey, United Kingdom
Dennis V. Kent	Department of Geological Sciences, Rutgers University, USA
Mary von Knorring	Swedish Research Council, Sweden
Hermann Kudrass	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Germany
John Orcutt	Scripps Institution of Oceanography, USA
Neil Opdyke	Department of Geological Sciences, University of Florida, USA
Robert M. Owen	Dept of Geological Sciences, University of Michigan, USA
David Prior	College of Geosciences, Texas A&M University, USA
Michael Purdy	LDEO Columbia University, USA
Eli Silver	Earth Sciences Department, University of California, USA
Hidekazu Tokuyama	Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan

**Associate Member Observers**

---

Benoît Ildefonse	Department Sciences de l'Université INSU., Paris, France.
Richard Hiscott	Memorial University of Newfoundland, St John's, Canada.

**Liaisons**

---

Keir Becker	(SCICOM), RSMAS, University of Miami, 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
Niklas Pias	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA

**Guests**

---

Jamie Allan	National Science Foundation (NSF), USA
Jennifer Anziano	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Steven Bohlen	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Bridget Chisholm	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Susan Humphris	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, USA (Chair PEC VI)
Jimmy Kinoshita	Japan Marine and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), Japan
Ted Moore	University of Michigan, (iPC Co-Chair), USA
JoAnne Reuss	University of Michigan, USA
Kasey White	Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI), Inc., USA
Minoru Yamakawa	Japan Marine and Technology Center (JAMSTEC), iSAS, Japan

**Guests from JOI BOG**

Mark Abbott	Oregon State University, Corvallis, USA
Eric Barron	Pennsylvania State University, USA
Neil Lundberg	Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA
Brian Taylor	SOEST, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, USA
Mark Zobak	Stanford University, USA

**JOIDES Office**

---

Elspeth Urquhart	International Liaison, RSMAS, University of Miami, USA
------------------	--

**ODP Council Members**

---

Menchu Comas	CSIC and University of Granada, Granada, Spain
Sören Dürr	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Germany
Judy McKenzie	ETH-Zentrum, Switzerland

**ODP Council Guests**

---

Sandra Toye	The National Academy of Sciences, U.S.A.
-------------	--

**JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Bermuda 10-11 July 2003**

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-1:** EXCOM approves the meeting agenda.

*Orcutt moved, Detrick seconded. 12 in favor, 2 absent (Kudrass and Stoffa).*

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-2:** EXCOM approves the minutes of its June 2002 meeting in Granada, Spain.

*Silver moved, Opdyke seconded, 12 in favor, 2 absent (Kudrass and Stoffa).*

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-3:** EXCOM approves the revised ODP Policy Manual in principle and authorizes Harrison and Silver to make minor amendments as necessary. The revision is to be posted on the web site.

*von Knorring moved, Prior seconded, 12 in favor, 2 absent (Stoffa, Kudrass).*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-4:** EXCOM approves the transferal of Proposal #522 (Leg 206) from the JOIDES Office to the iSAS Office to facilitate the review of a second part of this complex proposal.

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-5:** EXCOM considers that it would be a great advantage, both in real and in symbolic terms, to ensure that Europe is a full member of IODP by the start of the Program on October 1 2003. EXCOM therefore urges the participants involved in this difficult process to do to all possible to ensure that an MOU between the IODP lead agencies and ECORD is signed as close as possible to this date.

*Purdy moved, Orcutt seconded, 10 in favor, 3 abstentions – conflicted (Falvey, Kudrass, von Knorring), 1 absent (Stoffa).*

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-6:** EXCOM approves the FY 2004 Program Plan as developed by JOI.

*Detrick moved. Opdyke seconded. 11 in favor, 2 abstentions (Purdy, Prior), 1 absent (Stoffa).*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-7:** The ODP Executive Committee congratulates the Planning and Science Committees of JOIDES. The Chairs of the Committees reach far back into the history of ocean drilling and include:

José Honnorez, Roger Larson, Nicklas Piasias, Ralph Moberly, Jamie Austin, Brian Lewis Robert Kidd, (with Jim Natland, and Julian Pearce substituting once each), Susan Humphris, Bill Hay, Keir Becker.

These Chairs, and the manifold, hard working, imaginative, and determined members of the Planning and Science Committees have served ODP and JOIDES exceptionally well. We offer our deepest thanks

*Presented by Orcutt*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-8:** EXCOM thanks JOI Inc. for the wonderful location at which its last meeting took place. The arrangements were excellent and the evening event close to the *JOIDES Resolution* allowed us to meet many old friends. Thank you Steve Bohlen, Bridget Chisholm, Maureen Sang, Kasey White, Jennifer Anziano, and Amy Castner.

*Presented by Harrison*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-9:** At this last meeting EXCOM wishes to recognize that sustained international collaboration has been the fundamental strength of the Ocean Drilling Program. A common vision of scientific, technical and organizational cooperation has been shared by scientists, technicians, students and administrators from many different countries, institutions and agencies. International participation has been led by, but not limited to, the 22 formal ODP members. All aspects and phases of the program-governance, administration, planning, ship-board operations, workshops, symposia and publications have benefited from continuous, multi-national commitment and participation. Myriad scientific and organizational challenges have been successfully addressed, not least because of the richness and diversity of perspectives brought by all program participants. In this respect the present members of EXCOM wish to pay special tribute to all international colleagues who have served as former EXCOM members during 90 meetings over more than 20 years. Looking ahead to IODP, EXCOM considers that the spirit and reality of international synergy are the true, compelling legacies of ODP.

*Presented by Prior*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-10:** EXCOM wishes to thank our present Chair, Chris Harrison, and all previous EXCOM Chairs, Alan Berman, John Knauss, Douglas Caldwell, Charles Helsley, Arthur Maxwell, Arthur Nowell, Jim Briden, Bob Detrick, Helmut Beiersdorf, for excellent leadership of the Executive Committee in the best interest of the global ocean drilling community.

*Presented by von Knorring*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-11 :**  
Recognizing the Accomplishments of ODP

Since its beginning in 1985, the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) has produced unparalleled advances in our understanding of fundamental Earth processes. Knowledge of the changing Earth's climate and the active tectonics of the solid Earth is substantially advanced today because of ODP research activities.

Recognition for the intellectual quality and vitality of ODP is owed to the proponents of individual drilling legs who have, throughout the program, maintained a highly competitive spirit, producing high quality innovative proposals for drilling targets tackling topical scientific problems.

Program priorities and directions have been guided by hundreds of volunteer panel members serving on the many tens of advisory panels, working groups and committees.

The successful implementation of these plans has been achieved effectively, safely and economically because of the quality of the many contractors responsible for carrying out all the programs complex operations (see Footnote 1).

Over its lifetime substantially more than half a billion dollars have been invested in ODP operations. That a fiscal commitment of this magnitude could be sustained for 18 years is a testament to the skill and dedication of the many representatives serving on the ODP Council from all the supporting nations (see Footnote 2).

The Ocean Drilling Program, since the first hole was drilled in 1985 has stood as a magnificent example of the power and effectiveness of international cooperation in science. Throughout its life funding sources from over 20 nations have provided support, and when the program ends in September 2003 more than 1700 holes will have been drilled, 215 km of core will have been recovered and over 2700 scientists from over 40 nations will have sailed.

ExCom recognizes and applauds the great contributions to the natural sciences made by the above mentioned research proponents, members of the advisory structure, the leaders and staff of all the implementing organizations, and the representatives of the funding sources. ExCom urges that all these groups now focus upon the future, and work cooperatively and selflessly with all interested international parties to bring to the new Integrated Ocean Drilling Program the same record of quality and accomplishment that has so fully characterized ODP throughout its magnificent 18 year life.

**Footnote 1:** The Ocean Drilling Program at Texas A&M University; The Borehole Research Group at Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO) of Columbia University; and in Leicester, Montpellier, Aachen and Tokyo; the Site Survey Data Bank at LDEO; the core repositories at Scripps, Lamont Doherty and Bremen; the ship's crew and the drilling crew onboard the *JOIDES Resolution*;

**Footnote 2.** United States National Science Foundation; Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and Natural Resources Canada; the Australian Department of Primary Industries and Energy; National Taiwan University; the Korean Institute for Geology, Mining, and Materials; the European Science Foundation; Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique Belgium; Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen Belgium; Statens Naturvidenskabelige Forskningsrad Denmark; Suomen Akademia/Finlands Akademi Finland; National Hellenic Research Foundation Greece; Institute of Geology and Marine Exploration Greece; Rannsóknarráð Islands Iceland; Enterprise Ireland; Geological Survey of Ireland; Marine Institute Ireland; Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Italy; Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Netherlands; Norges Forskningsråd Norway; Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Spain; Oficina de Ciencia y Tecnología Spain; Instituto de Cooperação Científica e Tecnológica Internacional Portugal; Vetenskapsrådet (*funding formerly came from NFR*) Sweden; Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung Switzerland; Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey; the Federal Republic of Germany's Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; German Federal Ministry for Research, Education, and Technology; Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer and Institute National des Sciences de l'Université-Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; Japan's Ocean Research Institute, the University of Tokyo and Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology; the Marine High-Technology Bureau of the State Science and Technology Commission of the People's Republic of China; the Natural Environment Research Council of the United Kingdom; and, in 1991-1992, the Institute of Lithosphere of the Soviet Union.

# **JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

## **BERMUDA**

**July 10 – 11 2003**

## **MINUTES**

THURSDAY

JULY 10

09:00 AM

### **1. Welcome and Introduction**

Harrison called the meeting to order at 09:00 hrs. and welcomed the participants who then introduced themselves. Bohlen then welcomed the participants on behalf of the meeting hosts, Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI) and introduced Bridget Chisholm, the JOI travel co-ordinator. Chisholm outlined the logistics and social events of the meeting.

### **2. Approval of Agenda**

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-1:** EXCOM approves the meeting agenda.

*Orcutt moved, Detrick seconded. 12 in favor, 2 absent (Kudrass and Stoffa).*

### **3. Minutes and Matters Arising**

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-2:** EXCOM approves the minutes of its June 2002 meeting in Granada, Spain.

*Silver moved, Opdyke seconded, 12 in favor, 2 absent (Kudrass and Stoffa).*

### **4. Country and Consortium Reports**

The French country report which had not been included in the agenda book was distributed during the meeting (see Appendix 1). Ildefonse briefly discussed the contents reporting that France will be part of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) in 2004 and had applied to be the European Management Agency (EMA) for the European Consortium. The agency would be based in Paris and chaired by Catherine Mével in the beginning. The logging group in Montpellier, currently working for the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) under a contract from Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO) is interested in participating in a European network for borehole geophysics.

## **5. Management and Operations Reports**

### **5.1 ODP Council Report**

Malfait commented that the ODP Council had not met since its meeting in Granada in June 2002. The major item at that meeting was discussion of the legacy and phase out plans. Malfait could not recall any major issues with this topic and he reiterated the intention of the National Science Foundation (NSF) to support the phase out operation during a four year term without additional international contributions. He then reported that during the last year all ODP members have continued with their financial contributions with the exception of the European Science Foundation (ESF) who have increased their contribution to full membership level. The PacRim consortium remains at associate member level. Malfait noted that the ODP Council would meet jointly with EXCOM on Friday morning, July 11<sup>th</sup> and then meet as the ODP Council on Friday afternoon to discuss financial and audit business. Silver asked if the fluctuations in the currency exchange rates favored the Canadian membership contribution and Malfait answered that it did not as contributions were payable in \$U.S.

### **5.2 NSF Management Report**

Allan reported that the National Science Board (NSB) had approved the FY 2003-2007 ODP Program Plan, including the Program phaseout. With regard to the demobilization of the current drill ship, the *JOIDES Resolution* will be off ODP contract by October 1 2003 and a great deal of pre-planning for this event had already taken place. This planning also includes preservation of the scientific equipment, which is onboard. The intention is to have this equipment available for the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP). Also included in the planning is the transfer of ODP data and knowledge and NSF will ensure access to data and samples during the transition to IODP.

Allan continued by saying that NSF had received the United States Science Advisory Committee (USSAC) conference report on U.S. participation in IODP (the CUSP Report). Important information contained within the report includes guidance to NSF for pre-, post-project science support, and emphasizes the importance of education and outreach. Also emphasized is the fact that the more complex future program requires more science support, especially in the planning process and in the post-cruise research. Production of comprehensive knowledge and data sets are essential.

Fox commented that the science operator would have staff sailing the next day without any clear idea of their future employment prospects. He asked Allan if he could give him any idea of when their future might be decided. Allan replied that NSF intended to identify the System Integration Contractor (SIC) this summer and that August had been set as a target date.

## 5.3 JOI

### 5.3.1 Approval of revised ODP Policy Manual

Pisias reported that in the summer of 2002 the ODP Policy Manual was revised and then sent to NSF for their comments. In January 2003 the policy manual was then forwarded to the Chair of EXCOM to review with the intention of seeking EXCOM's approval of the revised manual.

Harrison then asked Silver to comment on this policy document. Silver reported that a committee consisting of himself, Dennis Kent and Hidekazu Tokuyama had found the revised manual to be acceptable and that they had no further significant comments to make. Harrison asked the panel if anyone else had comments to make. von Knorring asked if she could have access to the missing text on page 78 (Amendments) as she was preparing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the ESF Consortium for Ocean Drilling (ECORD) and wanted to ensure that she was following a compatible format. Pisias replied that he would have to pass the query to Farrell who had been in charge of this project and who was currently in the adjoining room at the USSAC meeting.

Harrison referred to page 2 of the policy manual where the final environmental impact statement is mentioned and asked Pisias for more details about this issue. Malfait offered that this referred to the governmental impact statement. Harrison clarified that EXCOM were not required to take any action regarding this issue at the moment. Malfait then referred to the policy manual and said that it had been approved as presented and the amendments were intended for any changes that might take place during the year and that these changes, if any, would exist as amendments for that year and then be approved in the policy manual.

Harrison commented that on page 19 there was no mention of detailed planning groups and on page 21 there are reports about the rotation of the *JOIDES* Office that refers to the timing in fiscal years whereas at the moment it is in calendar years. He also added that the description of the function of the *JOIDES* Journal on page 52 was not quite adequate. It stated that the journal was a record of *JOIDES* activities and Harrison felt that the publication reported rather more than that. Additionally, on page 64, the description of the preparation of the Program Plan was not up to date. Harrison suggested that EXCOM should approve the manual in principle and license Harrison and Silver to make minor amendments. The revised manual is to be posted on the web site.

<p><b>EXCOM Motion 03-1-3:</b> EXCOM approves the revised ODP Policy Manual in principle and authorizes Harrison and Silver to make minor amendments as necessary. The revision is to be posted on the web site.</p>
--

*von Knorring moved, Prior seconded, 12 in favor, 2 absent (Stoffa, Kudrass).*



## 5.4 ODP Operations

Fox summarized the operator's report in the agenda book and pointed out some of the highlights. These included points where he considered the program had succeeded in maintaining innovation in its operations.

Firstly he referred to participation statistics for the Program over its life – 220 Co-Chiefs, U.S. 51%. Fox thought participation justly reflected the input into the Program. The Program had had 2630 participating scientists. Of these 46% had been U.S. scientists and the leading partners had accounted for the remainder. Fox added that if anyone would like electronic versions of the figures he could supply these after the meeting. Another leading statistic indicating the health of the Program is the web-use statistic as recorded at the TAMU website. When the web site was first posted there were less than 10,000 visitors per month and the figure is now well over 120,000. Fox thought that the impact of the Program was demonstrated in these data. Malfait asked if these visitors were short term temporary “log- ons” or whether they were visitors actually using the site for a period of time. Fox affirmed that they were the latter and Malfait commented that he thought this was a very impressive number. Harrison asked if a comparison of web site use had been made to any similar programs and Fox answered that no comparisons had been made as yet. The use of the web site was distributed over the membership and not restricted to the U.S.

Fox went on to discuss recent operations on Legs 202 – 208. Three of these legs were typical in operation except for the notably higher recovery. Two of the other legs were devoted to emplacement of observatories. Leg 204 was probably the most exciting leg which recovered gas hydrate cores under pressure and also deployed a diverse array of downhole sensing tools. These tools included the development tools of HYACINTH and Fugro, which were highly successful and are now available to ODP as the project was seen as a joint development. Leg 206 was successful in drilling 500m into basement and casing the hole for re-entry in the future. A new under reamer tool was used which proved very successful and will be used in future legs. Leg 209 had just ended successfully despite the fact that it was technically challenging as it was designed to spud into bare hard rock. Eight sites were Rotary Core Barrel (RCB) cored over 19 holes in water depths that range from 1564m to 3939m water depth. Hole conditions were often unstable because of drilling through mylonite and one bottom hole assembly had been lost. Coring had totaled 1182 m. That is the most the Program has ever successfully cored in hard rock basement. Recovery amounts to 355m of material (c. 30% recovery). Two holes were logged when conditions permitted. The resistivity at the bit was tested and while this worked well the coring system will require some modifications. Harrison asked what Fox thought the great success of Leg 209 was. Becker commented that he considered the fact that the operations didn't “fight” the hole when there was a problem but merely drilled another hole had been a successful philosophy. Ildefonse (also a leg participant) added that he thought they had drilled most of the planned sites of the leg and had conducted a transect which studied the different structures and chemistry related to along-axis variations in mantle upwelling along the ridge. Allan commented that he though there had been some very interesting science accomplished and he predicted that some important publications would result but he wanted to stress that he was most

impressed by the way that the confidentiality of the shipboard scientists had been maintained, especially now that there was now 24/7 Internet access. Harrison asked why there was a confidentiality policy in ODP and Ildefonse explained that there was a one-year moratorium on the data to protect the scientific publication opportunities of the shipboard party. Detrick added that it was perceived that periodicals such as *Nature* were less inclined to publish articles which had received a great deal of pre-publication publicity. Harrison asked how press conferences fitted into this scheme and White answered that the science reported at these conferences was intended for the general public and was at a very basic level. She added that the shipboard scientists appreciated that the Program required this type of visibility. Taylor pointed out that the moratorium policy does not prohibit publication in the first year. Pisiis agreed and commented that the policy is flexible but requires any publication in the first year to include the shipboard party (with individuals approval) to be included in the list of authors. Tokuyama asked what the maximum bottom temperature recorded during the leg was. Ildefonse answered that he couldn't remember exactly but it wasn't remarkable. Tokuyama asked if there was a microbiologist on board. Ildefonse answered that there had been 2 microbiologists on board, one who collected daily samples of dust (airborne westwards from Africa) from the top of the derrick and one who collected rock samples. Ildefonse offered to discuss this further with Tokuyama after the meeting.

Fox then went on to discuss the ODP's final leg, Leg 210 which was due to sail that week to record the rifting history of the North Atlantic as recorded in the sediments. The primary site is to penetrate over 2000 m of sediment and over 100 m of basement in a water depth of 4559 m. If successful this will be the deepest hole ever achieved by the Program and involves complex engineering with respect to the casing plans.

Leg 210 will end in St Johns and after a short port call will begin an 11-day transit to Galveston, where the ship will be demobilized, finishing at the end of September and concluding operations. Taylor asked what would happen to the lab stack during the demobilization plan. Fox answered that the present model left the lab stack on the ship but allowed for the removal of all the equipment with the exception of the permanent wiring. The equipment would be evaluated for lifetime properties, refurbished and stored ready to be passed on to the new Program as required.

### **5.5. LDEO Borehole Research Group (BRG)**

Goldberg reported on the recent logging results from Legs 203-209 and gave an updated account of database and legacy activities of the BRG. Leg 203 was logged using standard logging techniques. An array of tools and techniques was used on Leg 204 (Gas Hydrates) including Logging While Drilling (LWD), Magnetic Resonance while drilling (MRWD), Resistivity at Bit while drilling (RAB/RAB-C), Pressure Coring plus the Drill-String Acceleration (DSA) measurement tool, Standard logs, the Schlumberger multi-comp. Geophone (VSI) and offset VSP. Goldberg illustrated some of the features identified. Leg 205 was logged using standard tools. Leg 206 was logged using standard tools, the Ultrasonic Borehole Imaging (UBI) televiwer, Vertical Seismic Profiler (VSP) and a 3<sup>rd</sup> party Magnetometer. The magnetometer had failed. Harrison asked who the third party was and Goldberg answered that it was a German institution. Goldberg used

images to demonstrate how the logging during this leg had identified stress-induced breakouts. He commented that the logging images acquired during the last few legs had improved dramatically and that recovered data were now approaching the goals set by COSOD II, i.e. observation of breakouts and stress orientations in the oceans using these kinds of imaging tools. Leg 207 used standard logging tools and a third party Multi-sensor Gamma-ray Tool (MGT). Leg 208 used standard logging tools, third party MGT and the recently installed VSAT connection. This VSAT connection, enabling shipboard Internet access was being used fairly regularly now for communication between LDEO and the ship and it is possible to process images in real time. These two legs (207, 208) were paleoceanographic legs and logging has recorded critical boundaries. For example during Leg 207 the K/T boundary was recorded. Difficulties encountered involved chert layers and black shale horizons. Leg 209 used standard logging tools, RAB-C coring and RAB tools together with the VSAT connection. On the upcoming leg, Leg 210 it is intended that standard logging tools will be used together with the Schlumberger in-line Geophone (QSST) in conjunction with the VSAT system. The coring while drilling tool was tested. This tool is basically an imaging tool that was designed and constructed jointly between LDEO, Schlumberger and TAMU. Recovery was good, c. 68%. In sediments, with this hybrid system there was a huge success on hydrate ridge (Leg 204). The tool was deployed again on Leg 209 that had a hard rock, bare rock spud in. Goldberg showed an image of successful coring, some image highlights of fracture zones. The barrel latched in and recovered the core and there was less than 1% recovery. This was due to lithology and a mismatch between the core catcher and the logging tool. For the upcoming Leg 210 the logging would be done in two phases. This would be the deepest hole drilled to date by ODP. The new wireline check-shot tool (QQST) would be used. This is an inline tool that will be time-efficient as it is designed to be left at the bottom of the hole. On a leg such as Leg 210 seismic correlation is a key issue.

Goldberg continued by discussing the legacy sites and the ongoing legacy activities. Harrison asked if a message was displayed advising users who were downloading data from the LDEO BRG web site to also refer to the NGDC database. Goldberg answered that the attribution statement was on the web site but that it could be improved.

Harrison asked Goldberg and Fox to comment how the development of new tools etc. had been affected by the recent stable funding situation. Goldberg replied that there had been instances, particularly regarding downhole tools, where development had been carried out with external funding. The funding cycle has not been in phase with development needs. More development could be done with higher funding but a lot has been done with existing funds and Goldberg felt that they had at least been able to stay up to date regarding standards. Harrison commented on the admirable way the Program appeared to have kept pace with new technologies and Goldberg commented that many commercial, off-the-shelf tools had been employed and it was the new development that had been most affected. Fox commented that the funding profile for the Program shows flat funding since 1995. Inflationary growth has been fortunately relatively low over that period. Sub contractors costs have grown which, although incompressible have been minimal. Fox considered that the technical innovations of the Program have been remarkable despite the disadvantaged funding level. One problem has been that at the beginning of any fiscal year the budget has had to be conservative to allow for the unpredictability of fuel prices or inflationary growth. Piasias commented that he would

refer to the funding issues in his report on Friday but would just like to comment here on the development process. He identified one of the main problems as the expectation that development tools will work immediately and no allowance is given for development time.

## **5.6 JOIDES**

### **5.6.1 JOIDES EXCOM Public Affairs Subcommittee**

White reported on public affairs activities during the last year together with upcoming events. JOI activities are being guided by the ODP/IODP transition plan as approved at the last EXCOM meeting in Granada 2002, i.e. ensuring that ODP has high visibility during the last year of operation and ensuring a seamless transition to IODP. White announced the completion of the hard copy publication of *ODP Highlights*, a follow up to *ODP's Greatest Hits*. She briefly referred to the submission and review procedures that had been followed together with the additional explanatory material included to appeal to the target audience of non-scientists. Approximately 7,000 copies had been printed and to date about 5,000 copies had already been distributed via mailing to country offices, direct mailing to international scientists and by distribution at international scientific meetings.

White continued by recounting the press releases issued and highlighted a few of these. Leg 204 (Gas Hydrates) had been the biggest success in terms of media activity, not withstanding the fact that two journalists actually sailed on the leg. An additional method of attracting media coverage has been to work with the organizers of scientific meetings to arrange press conferences featuring the Co-Chiefs of legs. Examples of this were interviews with Tarduno (Leg 197, Hot Spots) at the AGU Fall meeting and with the Co-Chiefs of Leg 204 (Gas Hydrates) together with some of the ODP scientists at the EGS/AGU/EUG 2003 Joint Assembly in Nice. These interviews received wide coverage in the media including reports by *Nature* and BBC Radio.

JOI has also been working on a number of events to mark the end of the Program and these include celebratory events such as that held during Capitol Hill Oceans Week in Washington D.C. In Bermuda a barbeque is planned to celebrate the advisory structure and its contribution to the Program. White has also been working with the media in Bermuda that has resulted this week in reports in the local newspaper, the radio and T.V. At the end of Leg 210 in September more events are planned in St Johns, Canada and also in Galveston at the end of September when the ship is demobilized. Becker has submitted a session on the Ocean Drilling Program for the Fall AGU meeting which will also celebrate the Program and provide further visibility. A dinner where all the participating scientists are invited to attend is also being planned for AGU.

White stressed that all steps are being taken to ensure that the link between ODP and IODP is emphasized and continuity is maintained. This has been addressed in a number of ways. For example the booths at recent scientific meetings have been joint ODP/IODP exhibits with material from both Programs being distributed. The informational video about the Program that is distributed to the media has been updated with footage from Leg 204 showing some of the latest technology together with footage of the *Chikyu* launching.

Harrison asked why reporters did not sail on each leg and White answered that it was both a matter of the time journalists were willing to spend at sea, a cost issue of transporting them to and from the ship during a leg and also a question of berth availability. Fox commented that 27 transfers had been made during Leg 204, both by helicopter and by boats involving engineers, politicians and media but this was possible because the operations were not too far offshore. He added that in the new Program there were plans to dedicate facilities to education and the media.

## **6. Relationships with Other Organizations**

### **6.1 Post ODP Prospects for *JOIDES Resolution***

Pisias reported that efforts to work with ChevronTexaco or with government funded projects in the Gulf of Mexico had not come to fruition. He understood that Transocean had the potential for using the *JOIDES Resolution* in the Nankai Trough for 105 days.

Pisias also went on to comment that Leg 204 benefited the Program significantly and Rack would like to emphasize that it was the only program which has ever drilled *and* recovered hydrates. Pressure containers were used to ship the samples to TAMU.

## **7. IODP Planning**

### **7.1 International Working Group (IWG)**

Harrison reported that the first meeting of the International Working Group (IWG) since the last EXCOM meeting had taken place in Nice, France in January 2003. He directed the committee to the short report in the agenda book pointing out that the Europeans would join the IODP with the equivalent of 2 participation units for the first 4 years of operation of IODP and would provide additional funds for Mission Specific Platform (MSP) operations for 2004. Harrison also stated that with these 2 participation units the Europeans could elect 2 members of the Board of IODP Management International Incorporated (IMI Inc.) but that they first had to be members of IMI Inc. before they could be elected to the Board. At the moment there were no European members, the current membership (which costs \$5k p.a.) consists of 15 U.S. institutions and 7 Japanese members. von Knorring pointed out that this was because the IMI Inc. by-laws stated a member of IMI Inc. had to come from a country that was a member of IODP. Membership of IODP required the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between a European country and the lead agencies and, as this had not occurred then no European candidates were able to join IMI Inc..

Harrison then went on to report on the second IWG meeting in 2003 in Capri in June, and he referred the committee to an update of the agenda book presented as Item 7.1.1. (see Appendix 2). An important issue discussed during the IWG meeting was the request from ECORD in relation to the proposed MSP to drill in the Arctic. Harrison did not have a written request from ECORD but he recalled that it was basically to ask IWG to agree

that the Lomonosov Ridge drilling program should be part of IODP operations in 2004. The answer was that IWG itself was not going to approve an operation because it was not the correct body to do this, it should be referred to the Science Planning Committee (SPC). IWG did not want to make an exception to the normal rules of operation. The IWG response is documented in Item 7.1.1, Appendix 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of these minutes.

Harrison then invited questions. Opdyke inquired as to the provenance of funding for the MSP drilling of the Lomonosov Ridge, i.e. were the platform operating costs (POCs) to be provided entirely from Europe. Harrison replied that yes, the POCs would come entirely from Europe. von Knorring confirmed that the POCs funds were supposed to come entirely from Europe and that the Science Operating Costs (SOCs) would be provided from co-mingled funds.

## **7.2 IODP Management International Incorporated (IMI Inc.)**

Austin introduced the concept of IMI Inc. in the absence of Paul Stoffa. He relayed apologies from Stoffa who was unable to attend the meeting following medical advice. Austin reported that Stoffa was the current interim President of the corporation and that he himself was the interim Director for the remainder of this calendar year.

The IMI Inc. Board had its inaugural meeting in March 2003. It is a non-stock corporation incorporated in Delaware as an U.S. Corporation and the Central Management Organization (CMO) is essentially the same as IMI Inc., the latter being the corporate entity. IMI Inc. will be the central management organization of IODP. It will essentially be located in the U.S. although parts of it will be in Japan and potentially also elsewhere in the future.

The by-laws have been approved (see <http://www.ig.utexas.edu/imi/>). The corporation is beginning with 22 members, and currently there are only Japanese and U.S. members. Austin showed the founding members of IMI Inc. (see <http://www.ig.utexas.edu/imi/>) and stated that the issue raised earlier by von Knorring about non-US members and non-Japanese members of IMI Inc. is appropriate. Although currently the by-laws prevent European membership Stoffa wished to spread information about the corporation and make it clear that IMI Inc. and the central management organization are the same entity and therefore it is important for an IODP member to belong to IMI Inc.. Stoffa has circulated a letter to potential European members to this effect. Associate members do not have to come from member countries but can be educational organizations. The next meeting of the IMI Inc. Board of Governors will be in Seattle on September 9-10.

Stoffa has been asked to initiate some interim planning regarding the functional responsibilities of the CMO in the expectation that a permanent office would be in place by early 2004. This was contingent on lead agency support of interim planning and a proposal was submitted to NSF on May 6 and was funded on July 8. IMI Inc. now has an official mandate to engage in interim planning for the remainder of 2003. This planning will be carried out without adding additional personnel or developing any new organizations.

Austin continued to discuss the activities that would go on during the interim-planning phase and he referred to the list of tasks and responsibilities, (see <http://www.ig.utexas.edu/imi/about/tasks.htm> or Appendix 3). All of these activities have to be consolidated in the expectation that a permanent office will be functioning in early 2004. Preparation of the FY2004, and anticipation of the FY2005 annual Program Plans were of primary importance. FY04PP must be completed by early December 2003. The candidates for that annual program plan will come from proposals that will be prioritized by the Science Planning Committee (SPC) in Sapporo in mid September 2003. The transition from the interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS) to the permanent SAS will be addressed. There may be non-riser capability in place by mid 2004. There are MSP programs that have been prioritized by the interim Planning Committee (iPC) and will be reviewed again by SPC. One of these, the Lomonosov Ridge proposal, is a possible operational candidate for the summer of 2004. Non drilling activities in support of *Chikyu* operations, non drilling operations and riser operations that will happen in 2004 and 2005 have to be considered and sent from IMI Inc. to the Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee (SPPOC) and then on to the lead agencies for implementation. It is anticipated that non riser capability will be available by mid 2004 but the U.S. operator, the Systems Integration Contractor (SIC) has not yet been chosen and a platform for non riser operations is not yet known. It is hoped that the SIC decision will be made soon. More should be known about technical feasibility and operational capability of the summer 2004 Arctic MSP program, (ranked #1 amongst MSP programs by iPC in August 2002) by August 2003. The proposal will be re-prioritized by the SPC in September.

After the September prioritization of proposals by SPC then IMI Inc., with some consulting help, will assemble a 2004 plan that will include a small number of non-riser programs that can be implemented by 2004. Austin assumed that by this time the SIC will have been chosen but 2004 programs will still have to be those which do not require huge lead times in technology and operations. Harrison asked if that meant that 2004 was going to be fairly simple types of drilling. Austin agreed that they would be non-technically challenging. An important event will be the signing of an MOU between IODP and ECORD for a programmatic commitment. The Arctic summer 2004 program could well be included in the FY04 PP. During 2005 the *Chikyu* will be outfitted and sea trials will begin. A number of riser-based support activities, such as surveys will be underway and all have to be incorporated into the Program.

Harrison asked how many personnel would be required. Austin replied that the personnel would include himself, Stoffa and probably two consultants. Harrison offered the opinion that this was a huge task to complete in a short time. Austin agreed and commented that it will be a provisional plan without budget guidance until a permanent office is established.

Austin then referred to the mandate for the Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee (SPPOC) (see Appendix 4). Austin commented that this committee was generally analogous to the Executive Committee of ODP in that it was the executive authority, i.e. it is the top of the science advisory structure. The mandate has been approved by IMI Inc. with one possible exception "that it is a committee created by IMI Inc. in accordance with terms and conditions of IMI by-laws". This is a suggested addition which has not yet been approved by the IMI Inc. Board but one which has been

suggested as a suitable addition to clarify the position of SPPOC in the overall structure. SPPOC would approve the Program Plan that would go forward for implementation by the lead agency. There is representation by the IMI Inc. Board of Governors on SPPOC, one member from the U.S., one member from Japan and one member from each future lead agency as relevant. There should be corporate representation on SPPOC but the level should be controlled. Harrison commented that in this structure there was no budget committee similar to the Budget Committee (BCOM) in the *JOIDES* structure. Austin answered that there was currently no such committee but one could be established if necessary in the future.

Austin continued by saying that a process had to be established to examine the existing mandates of the iSAS committees to see how iSAS has been functioning for the last 18 months and suggest changes if necessary. That also has to be forwarded to SPPOC eventually for their approval as part of the executive authority's responsibility. SPPOC will not meet officially until December in San Francisco but they do need to approve the SPC Chair and Vice Chair by September because these Chairs have to chair the SPC in September. Approval will be sought electronically during the summer 2003. SPPOC will exist and the United States Science Advisory Committee (USSAC) have been nominating U.S. members for SPPOC during their meeting this week. A similar process has been happening in Japan. The committee will be formed soon and will conduct the electronic selection of the Chairs.

There is a meeting scheduled for August 18 – 21 in Montana to begin to consider the host of cross platform integration issues. It is impossible to discuss program-wide engineering development until it is known what the international operators anticipate providing on a day to day basis. It is hoped the SIC will be known by the date of the meeting. Agenda issues include databases, staffing, Complex Drilling Programs (CDP), the latter which could, in many cases be multiple platform projects.

Through the summer and Fall of 2003 there are a number of other responsibilities to be addressed by the central management, e.g. core storage and sampling, databases and management, engineering development, education and outreach. Preliminary meetings will discuss these issues and ideas will be conveyed to the permanent office once it is established.

The position of IMI Inc. President has been advertised and the advertisement for the position of Vice President will be in EOS this week. IMI Inc. will help with the interview and selection processes as necessary. Seven applications have been received for the position as President and two applications have already been received for the position of Vice President. The top four candidates for President will be interviewed by the Board of Governors in September in Seattle and it is anticipated that a decision will be made at that time. IMI Inc. will then work with the designated President to set up a permanent central management office, the location of which will be decided by the President, in consultation with the Board of Governors. It is intended to transfer the planning activities from the University of Texas Institute of Geophysics (UTIG) to the new central management office by January 1<sup>st</sup> 2004.



Harrison asked if a proposal had been submitted to NSF for funding for a permanent office. Pias commented that he had been asked to help prepare such a proposal and he understood that an RFP would be released after the science board of NSF approves it at their meeting in mid October. It was hoped that the RFP would be a sole source RFP. Malfait commented that NSF have approved the solicitation and there will be a contract in place by mid 2004. It will not be the same as the ODP contract but it will be operational by mid 2004. Austin commented that with only a provisional Program Plan in place by January 1 2004 it is difficult to perceive the start of operation by June 1 2004. Pias added that the RFP for the SIC describes direct submission from the contractor to NSF so as long as that contract is in place operation will be possible. Falvey asked how the new contract would differ from the ODP contract. As a representative of the European Science operator he would have to prepare material for the Program Plan and they had been working on the format of ODP Program Plans. Malfait answered that the format as such would not necessarily be different but he had meant that whereas under ODP all funds flowed, based on the Program Plan, under one contract this would not be the case in IODP. The format of the Program Plans would otherwise probably remain.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12:15 PM.

### **7.3 iPC Activities**

Moore presented a brief report on the interim Planning Committee (iPC) and its activities since EXCOM last met in Granada in June 2002.

The iPC was charged by the IWG to select a Chair and Vice Chair who would rotate. Each of these positions will last a total of 4 years and follow a 2 year rotational schedule where the Vice Chair will move up to the position of Chair and be replaced by a new Vice Chair. The first Chair will therefore only serve 2 years.

At the last iPC meeting a working group, led by Keir Becker as executive secretary, put together a mandate via email for the Operations Committee (OPCOM). The complex scheduling and staffing procedures of multi-platform operations had to be addressed. The new components for scheduling include such factors as resource allocation amongst multiple operators, long term projects such as projects that take a long lead time to plan, e.g. riser drilling projects, and a certain amount of commitment from the scientific structure to follow through the total project plus the multi year financial and facility commitments that are involved in this type of scientific activity. The new OPCOM will have to address this type of issue. Also discussed was the review and structure of IODP management, the membership size in relation to expertise and the mandate itself that is included in the handout of iPC activities which was distributed earlier (see Appendix 4). This mandate has been voted on and approved by iPC. The new OPCOM can be viewed as the communication link between the science advisory structure and the operational program.

In a complex program which undergoes a series of logistical and safety reviews any significant changes to the science that can be addressed by this program that are based on

these reviews. Results are channeled through the Science Planning Committee (SPC) and SPPOC in order that they have knowledge as to how the program is proceeding. With the imminent establishment of the SPPOC the iPC will have completed the initial setup for the IODP advisory structure. The OPCOM and the SPPOC were the final bodies which iPC considered absolutely necessary to start the program and the SPPOC mandate and terms of reference are also in the handout referred to earlier (Appendix 4).

There are several transition issues such as IODP policies and procedures during the transition and year 1. In the transitional phase the iPC has been receiving recommendations from the various interim Science Advisory Structure (iSAS) panels and most of these recommendations have been accepted by the iPC without prejudice. These have been collected and will be passed on to the SPC who can implement them.

One of the urgent policy tasks concerns the Ancillary Program Policy (APP). This APP is going to become even more important in IODP because of the multiple platform nature of the program and because space limitations may be more flexible on the various platforms and the associated support ships. For example the Arctic program may have space available on the ice-breakers for participants who might want to come for scientific reasons other than drilling the Lomonosov Ridge. The iPC was asked to approve a policy providing guidance for accepting such super numerates on the other platforms. Traditionally ODP has encouraged co-operation in scientific and educational programs that could accompany a drilling project. The policy presents a recommended application and evaluation procedure that indicates that such ancillary programs should be at no cost in either time or money to the IODP drilling project. It places the control over these ancillary programs in the hands of the project manager of any of these operations and not the chief scientist because the project manager has the overall responsibility of drilling and safety. Harrison asked whom that would be on, for example, the *JOIDES Resolution*. Fox answered that in the past it had been the project manager, the staff scientist but in the future it might be different. Moore commented that for example in the case of the Arctic project there would be a Commodore of the Fleet who would oversee the whole operation of the ice-breakers and the drilling and he/she would assume that responsibility. Moore added that they wanted to ensure that the person in charge of the operation knew about any events that may impact on the objective of the main IODP project. Piasias asked if detailed costing analysis would be required or whether subsistence etc. onboard would be classified as minimal cost. Moore replied that a general policy would be set and details would be negotiable. Falvey commented that ultimately this would be in the hands of the science operator so iPC would only be making recommendations about ancillary programs. Falvey also suggested that the term "project manager" probably referred to the operations manager. Fox commented that a good example of an Ancillary Program was on the last leg, Leg 209 when a microbiologist sailed from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) who was interested in transmission of airborne, dust-carried diseases relevant to potential terrorist activities. In this instance the only impact on the program was to determine if there was a space available once the science party was fully established. There were also some biologists onboard some of the ice-breakers during the Antarctic legs.

Moore continued by reporting that a number of working groups had been established. The iPC established ad hoc working groups for procedures for scientific advice and

management, planning for drilling proposals, a database working group which met in June, a project management working group which met by email and a Project-Scoping working group that has yet to meet.

The database working group has been charged with overseeing transfer of data from ODP to IODP and for recommending improvements and additions to data management procedures. They are due to make a report via iSciMP in July.

The project management working group was charged with recommending a system for efficient passage of drilling proposals from the project scientific review to the execution and completion of drilling objectives using existing industry project management strategies as a model and fitting that model to the IODP advice and management structure. This report has been received by iPC in June and is now under review. This was done by email and iPC received a written report from Harry Doust, Chair of the group. Moore and Kinoshita have read the report and passed it to iPC for their consideration and discussion at their final meeting in September. Although industry are talking about very expensive wells in which there are many considerations to be taken into account, in a lot of ways it is comparable to the integrated ocean drilling program at a riser site. Industry obviously have a lot of experience of riser drilling which is why they were consulted. A project manager for BP talked to the technical advisory panel (iTAP) and put forward the outlines of a model of how industry operated. Doust was charged with adapting that model to the IODP structure. It involves a stage review of drilling plans, including safety reviews and an operator safety review but in a more detailed form than that currently employed by ODP. This detail will be needed for the new riser operations, as will risk evaluation procedures. These latter procedures are concerned not only with safety but also with the risk of not achieving the objectives. This has not been comprehensively addressed in ODP in the past but it will be addressed in the future program.

The Project-Scoping working group is an attempt to put together a small group of people including the riser ship operator who is concerned that plans for the first riser site proceed as smoothly and as rapidly as possible. A representative from British Petroleum (BP) was consulted as to what the present pre-operational tasks should be for IODP and to help to evaluate these processes, as at least 3 years lead-time is desirable. The BP representative suggested that a general idea of potential problems involved should be discussed, i.e. the operator, the scientists, an independent risk assessment analyst and a well engineer should meet together to discuss the issues of the proposed drilling. Moore was asked to explain what he meant by “project-scoping” and he answered that he meant exploring the issues around a drilling site, e.g. what are the risks that the target objective will not be achieved, what do you need to know in order to minimize those risks? He used as examples the scenarios of drilling in a splay fault or on a convergent margin. Currently the Program does not have adequate seismic data to fully evaluate how to design a specific strategy to penetrate through such splay faults. That would be one example of information required before proceeding to the next step of evaluation. The initial scoping will be identifying information needed in order to move forward to the next phase of planning. Harrison suggested that by definition science did very risky things and that a plan modeled on industry and not on science was not the best route. Moore explained that it was not an inflexible format but a number of the procedures followed by industry could

be valuable, of which risk assessment was one. He added that IODP would be in drilling positions and drilling depths which they had no experience of, and it was important to take considered view of experts who have had that experience. Silver commented that he thought it was a really excellent idea, adding that the present Program could probably have used more of this type of advice and planning. Taylor expressed concern that there would be a conflict between the scientific and technical advice. Moore thought that the approach would be that the Japanese and JAMSTEC, as operators of this platform would be going through a phase of training in drilling using the *Chikyu*. Moore considered that the plans for the system were well thought out for getting experience with riser drilling from the operations view. Once the SPC has committed to a complex drilling project, each of the individual phases and elements will be evaluated from a scientific point of view.

Tokuyama asked if the Project-Scoping working group was a SAS structure. Moore replied that it was in the transition between the SPC, SAS and the operators. Tokuyama said that Moore mentioned the JAMSTEC CDEX group and he wondered how the demarcation of the task between the Project-Scoping working group and the CDEX group was defined. Moore replied that it was similar to the demarcation between the TAMU safety panel and the PPSP. Both of those panels review every site proposed for drilling and decide whether or not it is safe to drill. Ultimately its TAMU who has the responsibility of saying whether it will be drilled. In the new program it will be CDEX who will have the ultimate responsibility for making the final decision as to whether to drill or not. Just as in ODP, the scientific advisory structure prefers to have the opportunity to review potential operations. If changes are proposed which may affect the science the SPC need to be advised as decisions have to involve both the technical and scientific groups.

Moore reported that only one proposal was reviewed at the last iPC meeting and it needed some revision. Five additional proposals were being considered by the interim Science Steering and Evaluation Panels (iSSEPs) for possible iPC review in September. A maximum of 17 proposals would be ranked by SPC in September. The iPC had recommended a change in the SPC review policy. The current recommendations say the SSEPs determine when the proposals need to go to the SPC. That means that if external reviews are returned indicating weaknesses in the proposals the SSEPs have the opportunity to decide whether revisions need to be made to that proposal before it can be forwarded to SPC. Moore was asked what the distribution of platforms was in these proposals, i.e. were any of them riser platforms? Moore answered that 5 were mission specific platforms (MSPs), and Yamakawa would discuss the detailed distribution in his iSAS Office presentation. The iPC would review all the recommendations at the meeting in September and review and discuss the working group reports. They would review and group the proposals passed on from the SSEPs and make sure the iPC considered them ready for ranking. The iPC would also prepare a summary of recommendations for transmittal to the SPC and complete the guide to IODP. Directly after the iPC meeting the SPC will meet and consider the recommendations. This back to back meeting of the interim structure and the new IODP structure will help the Programs' transition. Harrison asked if many proposals had been submitted recently and Moore said that Yamakawa would present these detailed data in his report in agenda item 7.6 but there had been approximately 10 or 12 proposals submitted for each deadline.

Orcutt sought clarification on the discussion relating to “project-scoping” for drilling. He commented that currently a safety panel, the Pollution Prevention Safety Panel (PPSP) does many of these things for riser-less drilling although the ultimate decision has to be with the operator, and he wondered if the role of the new project-scoping working group would be any different. Moore replied that currently with non-riser drilling the science advisory safety panel (PPSP) is primarily concerned with issues such as site location, the presence/absence of hydrocarbons and the risks of environmental pollution. The Project-Scoping group will be concerned with much broader issues for the new program. Becker commented that the science in the new Program will be modified and so the safety assessments also have to be modified. Moore agreed and added that there will potentially be times during the new Program when decisions will have to be made, both scientifically and operationally, to terminate drilling in a particular hole. Falvey commented that the operator may decide to terminate the hole for safety reasons but there is the other consideration that whether the scientific objective is fulfilled. Falvey summarized the question as to whether there should be much greater interaction between the operations organization, the science advisory structure and the proponents who have the license to carry out the operation from the advisory structure. Falvey thought that some mechanism to formalize the interaction between these 3 parties should be in place and added that it had not been formally structured in ODP at panel level. Harrison suggested that the committee should return to this issue later to make a recommendation after they had had time to discuss the issue at greater length.

#### **7.4 MEXT Report**

Tokuyama summarized the main points of the MEXT Report as included in the agenda book. These included the signing of the IODP Lead Agency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the U.S. in April 2003; the progress of the construction of *Chikyu*; the organization of CDEX, the operator for *Chikyu*; the new Japanese core center at Kochi and a summary of recent activities within the Japanese science community. He made special reference to a newly established consortium of forty-one Japanese universities and institutions, Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC). He said the task and responsibilities of J-DESC would be similar to that of USSAC in the U.S.. IODP represents only one section of J-DESC. Other sections, yet to be established, would be concerned with drilling on land (in association with the International Continental Scientific Drilling Program [ICDP]) and ice drilling (in association with the Japan Polar Research Institution). Each section would have a Chair and Tokuyama is the Chair of the IODP section. Within this section the structure is similar to that of IMI Inc. with 3 scientific steering panels, the Earth’s Interior panel, the Earth’s Environment panel and the Deep Biosphere panel. In addition there were to be four technical support panels.

Tokuyama illustrated his report with pictures of *Chikyu*, and the new, huge core repository at Kochi University. A film of the signing of the MOU was scheduled for showing on Friday morning.

Harrison invited questions and Kent asked how much storage space would be available in the new core repository. Tokuyama answered that there was space for approximately 10 years worth of coring material.

## **7.5 JAMSTEC Report**

Kinoshita gave a detailed account of recent Japanese IODP related activities illustrated by an excellent Power Point presentation. Notable recent events include the founding of CDEX at JAMSTEC in October 2002, the signing of the IODP Memorandum of Understanding with the United States of America on April 22<sup>nd</sup> 2003 and the opening of the Center for Advanced Marine Core Research in May 2003.

### **Center for Deep Earth Exploration (CDEX)**

This center is housed in the Japan Marine Science and Technology Center (JAMSTEC). CDEX contributes to the accomplishments of the IODP scientific goals through the safe and efficient operation of the *Chikyu*. Professor Asahiko Taira, a marine geologist, has been appointed as the Director General of CDEX. Other officials included in the management structure are Kimiaki Kudo, Advisor to the Director General; Yoshihisa Kawamura, Administration Manager; Shomel Kobayashi, Operations Manager; Tadashi Okano, Site Survey Manager; Shin'ichi Kuramoto, Science Service Manager and Uko Suzuki, Health, Safety and Environment Manager.

### **IODP Management International Inc.-Japan Advanced Earth Science and Technology Organization (IMI Inc. - J/AESTO)**

This office is located at Hokkaido University, Hokudai and is currently under construction. The office will provide:

1. The science planning function of IMI Inc.
2. A full range of support functions to the Science Advisory Structure (SAS)
3. Publication services for IODP Cruise reports etc.

### **Center for Advanced Marine Core Research (CMCR)**

This center was established at Kochi University in March 2003. The purpose of the facility is long-term storage of core samples taken by the *Chikyu* together with the curation and the distribution of samples to researchers. The center also provides onshore analysis, QA/QC and technical training in the use of their sophisticated equipment. Kinoshita showed slides of the building, the core racking system and the X-ray CT core scanner.

### **Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium support office (J-DESC)**

The main functions of this office are:

1. Participation in IODP Management International Inc. and its management.
2. Participation in the IODP Science Advisory Structure activities in order to promote IODP. This includes recommendation and dispatch of IODP international science committee members; establishment of domestic IODP science promotion committee, Science Planning Committee, panels, working groups etc.
3. Encouragement of domestic studies and research related to scientific Earth drilling.

Kinoshita continued by giving an update on the progress of the construction of the *Chikyu*. The initial sea trials in the Seto Inland Sea had been completed including the Dynamic Positioning System (DPS) etc. and further outfitting will start in July 2003 at the Nagasaki shipyard. The construction of the *Chikyu* will be completed by the end of 2004 and integrated equipment tests will be carried out in mid 2004. The latter part of 2004 until mid 2006 will be devoted to “Practice and Crew Training Cruises”. In late 2006 the *Chikyu* riser operations will begin.

Finally Kinoshita showed impressive pictures of:

1. The new cruising Fuel Cell Underwater Vehicle (FCUV), the *Urashima* which is powered by a closed cycle fuel cell power system. This vessel will be used for exploration under ice sheets and for the studies of submarine volcanoes and is capable of travelling 1000km without refuelling and of operating at depths down to 6000 m.
2. The new Hole-re-entry system.

## 7.6 iSAS Office Report

Yamakawa reported on two main issues concerning the iSAS Office, 1) The scheduling of proposals, and 2) Proposal submission. He briefly summarized the schedule of upcoming meetings. The joint iTAP and iSciMP meeting will be held in Rhode Island on 14-16 July. In addition to the schedule of iSSEPs meetings these panels would also have an email review in August to discuss external review results in order to forward them to iPC before 13-14 September. SPC will meet jointly with iPC. Since the iSAS Office had been established there had been 4 proposal deadlines. iSAS has a total of 101 proposals, including those transferred from the *JOIDES* Office. Of these 101 proposals more than half were categorized into the IODP theme of “Environmental Change, Processes and Effects”, with the remainder being divided almost equally between the themes of “Deep Biosphere and the Subseafloor Ocean” and “Solid Earth Cycles and Geodynamics”. He discussed the number of lead proponents by country, the state of readiness of active proposals and the locations of the drilling sites proposed. Details are recorded in the agenda book. Yamakawa reported that 25 proposals would be transferred in September. Taylor asked if there was a proposal under review that addressed the second phase of the drilling, the first phase of which was completed by ODP Leg 206. Harrison commented that the old Program (ODP) could not commit to any drilling in the new Program (IODP). Bohlen added that there were practical considerations involved in this second phase, for example it was not known exactly when the ship would be drilling in the Pacific. Practical considerations will need to be taken into account. Harrison asked what the solution to this was, i.e. was any EXCOM action necessary. Becker suggested that the proponents should be encouraged to submit a proposal to SAS. Malfait asked if the proposal could be transferred from *JOIDES* Office to iPC. Becker commented that the original proposal, which described the two drilling phases was not transferred to the iSAS Office as it was technically a scheduled proposal even though only the first phase was scheduled. Becker agreed to transfer the proposal from the *JOIDES* Office to iSAS. Harrison thought this sounded a reasonable suggestion but asked if the proposal should now be passed back to the proponents for upgrading. Harrison further commented that it was inappropriate to discuss individual proposals and only general principles should be

addressed. He pointed out that although there was only one proposal under discussion at the moment there could be a future situation where the question applied to other proposals and therefore there should be a general policy in place. Becker commented that generally in ODP multiple proposals required updating for each phase and asked if the same procedure would be followed in IODP. Moore answered that there had to be an overarching theme and at least one of the phases must pass the review, i.e. the first part. This would allow for the updating of the remainder. Harrison thought that each phase should be re-evaluated and Moore agreed, if it was relevant to the Program.

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-4:** EXCOM approves the transfer of Proposal #522 (Leg 206) from the *JOIDES* Office to the iSAS Office to facilitate the review of a second part of this complex proposal.

### **7.7 OD21 Report – Intentionally Omitted**

### **7.8 European Initiative**

von Knorring reported that all components of the European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling (ECORD) were set up. The Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) are almost complete between the individual countries and the European Management Agency (EMA) and the final parts will be presented to the ECORD interim Council in August 2003. This means that the first MOUs between the individual IODP participants in Europe and the ECORD management agency can be signed in September 2003. As soon as that takes place the European Management Agency (EMA) should be ready to sign a MOU with the two lead agencies of IODP. The management agency for ECORD has been selected as INSU-CNRS in France and the director of EMA will be Catherine Mével. ECORD has also nominated a science operator, the British Geological Survey (BGS). The ECORD Science Support and Advisory Committee (ESSAC) is also ready and the terms of reference are adopted. The office for ESSAC will rotate with the Chair. The Chair will be selected for 2 years and the office will rotate amongst the ECORD countries. ECORD is also trying to find external funding for operating the management of the European Consortium. There are two ways of funding the European Management operation and science advisory structure, to take it out of the participation fees of the members or to seek funding from the European Union (EU). An application to the EU has been made, under the “European Research Area Network”, for 2.375 million Euros to cover the administrative costs of the consortium for a period of four years. The previous record of the European Union’s funding to the European initiative in ocean drilling is not a very successful record and ECORD cannot predict how this new application will be treated.

An important component of the proposal to the EU is that the new member states, i.e. those joining the EU within the next year are included in the Program. The Program is therefore being promoted in countries such as Poland and Slovakia that will become members of the EU. To date a number of people have been approached in these countries. Russia has also been contacted and is being kept advised. The consortium has also been



approached by Canada who is interested in becoming a member of ECORD. Canada will apply to their research Council later this year for funding for Canadian participation in IODP that can be realized through ECORD.

ECORD has a new Chairman, José Monteiro who is the national representative of Portugal on the ECORD interim Council. There are two Vice Chairs, Chris Franklin (Natural Environmental Research Council, U.K.) and Raymond Schorno (Netherlands Research Council). These officials have been elected for the remaining period of the Program and so in August new officials will be elected for the European Consortium.

Falvey then reported on science operations in Europe. The BGS consortium as Science Operator consists of the BGS Edinburgh office together with the present European participants in the wireline logging consortium, Montpellier, Aachen, Leicester Universities plus Bremen University, the latter being responsible for core curation. Bremen University will also host shore-based analyses of Mission Specific Platform (MSP) operations where the whole scientific party cannot be on board the platform. The Edinburgh office will be responsible for the management of the science operator and the operations manager will be Alister Skinner and the science manager will be Dan Evans. There will be a small support team, which at the moment are all part-time as there currently is not a full-time requirement for them. The requirement is growing quite rapidly however. Currently there are studies on three separate legs which have already been ranked by ODP, i.e. the Lomonosov Ridge, Tahiti Great Barrier Reef and the New Jersey Margin. These are all being evaluated from the operational perspective. The current plan is to drill the Arctic Lomonosov Ridge in August 2004 and to that end there has been a call for proposals to the industry. The revised deadline for submission is July 18<sup>th</sup>, it having been extended by four days at the request of one potential contractor. Falvey could not comment on proposals received to date as they were still sealed, except to say that proposals had been received.

Falvey went on to say that there was now a process for getting commitment for the funds for 2004. There has been a substantial “sign-up” from European funding agencies to this pre-commitment for next year although Falvey currently had no details of these intentions but he expected that they would be revealed in August 2003 for planning expenditure in the calendar year 2004 and the costs of the Arctic operation.

Harrison asked if there was potential for operating more than one MSP leg in 2004. Falvey answered that the Lomonosov Ridge drilling would be very expensive in comparison with any other leg drilled by ODP and so it was unlikely that if there were sufficient funds for this Arctic project to be carried out in 2004 that there would be funds for additional projects in the same year. It was not impossible to carry out more than one operation in one calendar year but it is dependent on the funding level. Harrison asked if an operation in 2005 would be feasible. Falvey answered that it would depend on the ongoing commitment to the funding level of the platform operating costs (POCs) and the balance of money available through IODP Management International Inc. (IMI Inc.) for the science operating costs (SOCs). The Program would be budgetary driven and this would apply to all platforms that were able to deliver IODP programs and would come

under the same level of constraint as JAMSTEC and the U.S. operator. von Knorring commented that ECORD has made an offer to the International Working Group (IWG) to become the MSP platform operator of IODP and Europe has stated that the intention is to continue MSP drilling every year according to the ranking by the IODP Science Planning Committee (SPC). At the IWG meeting in June it was considered possible that in 2006 if the fee to IODP was dramatically increased it is possible that Europe may not be able to afford to carry out MSP drilling operations in that particular year but currently the intention is to drill MSP projects each year and it is a long term commitment. Purdy asked what the best estimate was of when Europe would be able to sign a MOU with the National Science Foundation (NSF) and MEXT. von Knorring replied that it is subject to the number of internal MOUs that have to be in place before the EMA can sign a MOU with the lead agencies. As there were quite a number of countries which had already signed the pre-agreement of the Lomonosov Ridge drilling project she expected that those countries were also ready to sign the other MOU in September. She suspected those negotiations between the management agency and IODP lead agencies should start as soon as possible so that it can be signed as close to October 2003 as possible.

von Knorring stated that different countries had different rules of bureaucracy and the signing of the MOUs would take varying amounts of time to complete. Falvey agreed and said that he could not confidently state that all 15 potential members of the consortium would be able to sign the MOUs before October 1<sup>st</sup> and that it may take a little longer. He added that the door was also open to anyone else who wished to join the consortium, i.e. membership was not geographically restricted to Europe. Potential candidates for membership include those countries in Eastern Europe and those countries scheduled to join the European Union (EU) in the short term. The total amounts to 10 countries in the short term and many more in the long term. Harrison invited questions and Kent asked if there was any indication of how many academic institutions were likely to join IMI Inc. once ECORD had signed an MOU with the lead agencies. von Knorring said she understood that Harrison should have received a list of about 10 names from Franklin. She also suggested that IMI Inc. should circulate an explanatory email explaining the benefits of becoming a member of IMI Inc. to those institutions mentioned in Franklin's list. Purdy commented that he considered that it would be a great advantage to the Program if Europe were a full member of IODP.

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-5:** EXCOM considers that it would be a great advantage, both in real and in symbolic terms, to ensure that Europe is a full member of IODP by the start of the Program on October 1 2003. EXCOM therefore urges the participants involved in this difficult process to do to all possible to ensure that an MOU between the IODP lead agencies and ECORD is signed as close as possible to this date.

*Purdy moved, Orcutt seconded, 10 in favor, 3 abstentions – conflicted (Falvey, Kudrass, von Knorring), 1 absent (Stoffa).*

von Knorring thanked the Executive Committee for these sentiments.

## 7.9 U.S. Plans

Allan summarized the U.S. plans as follows:

1. The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Systems Integration Contractor (SIC) was approved by the National Science Board (NSB). This is a strategy where there is to be one contractor that manages virtually all aspects of the U.S. science program.
2. NSF issued a Request for Information (RFI) for the SIC in November 2002. The strategy for that position is to first identify the SIC who would then work with NSF to procure a non-riser drill ship.

Complications that have delayed this process include the facts that :

- a) NSF is operating under “continuing resolution” without a specified budget for the current fiscal year of operation.
- b) New NSF budget starts, such as the ship conversion, cannot be approved while operating under continuing resolution. In addition, the FY2004 budget was based on the FY2002 budget, due to the lateness of the FY2003 appropriation

To avoid a hiatus in drilling time NSF re-evaluated the strategy and a new “Acquisition Plan” was devised that has three phases. Phase 1 being to identify the SIC and Phase 2 is for the SIC to acquire an “acceptable vessel” to resume drilling operations in mid 2004. An acceptable vessel is defined as one that requires no significant modifications to fulfill basic IODP science requirements. Phase 3 requires the SIC (in association with NSF) to acquire and modify a suitable non-riser vessel in FY2005 or FY2006 to meet the long term IODP needs.

A RFP synopsis was released in early March and the RFP was released on April 3 with a proposal due date of May 5 2003. NSF is presently evaluating the response to this RFP.

Concerning activities supporting international access to ODP cores, data, and publications NSF is committed to providing this access during the transition period. Eventually these activities will be transferred to the SIC. The ODP assets will be transferred to IODP as part of ODP phase-down activities. Solicitation for U.S. science support activity associated with IODP will be released soon. The proposal for IODP planning was funded on July 8 and is for \$530k therefore making resources available for this planning stage.

Hiscott asked if there are any other acceptable vessels, other than the *JOIDES Resolution*, under consideration for drilling in 2004. Allan replied that he would like to think that the *JR* was not the only ship in existence that would allow scientific drilling to take place. Hiscott asked if there was money available to refit a ship that did not already have an existing lab stack. Allan replied that this money was not available. Orcutt asked if the announcement of the SIC would be made in July and Allan replied that it would be announced during the summer of 2003. von Knorring commented that it appeared to be waste of money to remove fixtures and fittings from the ship during demobilization in the nine last days of September if there was a chance that the *JOIDES Resolution* would be the acceptable vessel and therefore require refitting of this same equipment. Allan replied that no matter what happened the drill string had to be removed together with most of the engineering tools such as drill bits, drill collars etc. Harrison commented that presumably there were sensitive instruments in the laboratory that may

be damaged by removal. Allan agreed that it would be better not to move instruments such as the cryogenic magnetometer and the inductive coupled plasma instrument.

Pisias stated that there was a definite demobilization plan. The ODP contract for the drill ship ended on September 30 2003 and all ODP activities must end then. JOI have negotiated with NSF a list of the items that will be transferred to Transocean. The lab stack will stay on the ship and become property of Transocean. NSF property will be removed from the vessel by September 30 2003. The plans are based on that assumption. As soon as it is known who the SIC is and whether or not the *JOIDES Resolution* is the acceptable vessel to be used in the future, then the demobilization plan will be modified accordingly. Transocean is open to discussion about options for leaving some materials on the vessel and how they will do that and protect it while they are doing contract work cannot be discussed further until more information is available. If the *JOIDES Resolution* is not the acceptable vessel then the plan of removing everything from the ship will go ahead.

**Meeting adjourned 16:13 hrs**

**(Joint meeting—EXCOM and ODP Council)**

Council members present: Comas, Dürr, McKenzie  
Guest: Sandra Toye

Harrison called the meeting to order and welcomed the ODP Council members and guests.

Harrison announced that the draft minutes for this EXCOM Meeting (July 10-11 2003, 1-03) would, as usual, be posted on the *JOIDES* Office web site at <<http://joides.rsmas.miami.edu>>. He suggested that, since this would be the final meeting, the Executive Committee members should vote electronically to approve the minutes, after they had had time to review the draft.

The meeting continued with the showing of a short movie recording the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on 22 April 2003 (Earth Day) between the two current lead agencies of IODP, Japan and the United States of America.

**8. JOI Report for FY2004****8.1 FY2004 Program Plan**

Pisias presented the ODP FY 2004 Program Plan from the perspective of the final ODP Director and reported on the following points:

**Highlights of ODP Accomplishments**

1. Changes in data recovery and distribution via Web (amount and management) (JANUS)
2. Engineering development (those that reflect direct input from community and *JOIDES*, and developments from the program on how we can do things better).
3. Steady increase in Rotary Core Barrel drilling (RCB) and Advanced Hydraulic Piston Core (APC) coring recovery rates
4. Borehole innovations—logging
5. Seafloor observatories in global ocean

**ODP FY04 PROGRAM PLAN****Goals**

1. Continue publication and data activities for final legs of ODP
2. Data migration and archiving
3. Demobilization and transfer of ship equipment to IODP
4. Legacy materials concerning engineering development and ODP procedures

## **JOI Legacy Activities**

### **Goals**

- To create a permanent archive of all digital data
- To catalogue, maintain and archive all equipment and records that could be utilized by IODP
- To document and annotate designs of drilling and scientific equipment pertinent to IODP
- To create a record of the analytical procedures used during the acquisition of data aboard the *JOIDES Resolution*

### **Status of ODP data**

- The *JANUS* database will be supported by the ODP Science Operator until the end of FY07, independently of any decisions about the IODP non-riser operation
- The Site Survey Data Bank will be supported for IODP activity until these tasks are supported by the new program management

The status of the Data Migration Project can be checked on the Web at <http://www-odp.tamu.edu/database/migration.htm>

### **Data Archives**

- NGDC will act as a permanent repository of all ASCII data tables
- All data from the online log database (documentation, ASCII, binary, and image files) will be included in the NGDC archive
- The data archives include:
  - Meta data –
    - 1) Summary of “Explanatory Notes”
    - 2) Technical Notes
    - 3) Laboratory Procedures documentation

### **Review of Data Archive**

- Committee of JOI headed by Divins of NGDC
- First set of tables and metafiles (MST data) were reviewed and summary from Divins is pending
- Reviews will be prioritized in the same order as that used by the Data Migration Project

Pisias continued by summarizing the demobilization of the *JOIDES Resolution*. This will start on September 7 2003 and continue while the ship transits to Galveston, ending on September 30. These demobilization plans may be subject to modification depending on the selection of the Systems Integration Contractor (SIC) and the non-riser vessel selected for the IODP. With regards to the equipment archival Pisias reported that all relevant equipment will be inventoried, refurbished and stored for use in IODP. All these tasks would be completed in FY04 with anticipated transfer to IODP in calendar year 2004.

A list of legacy documents has been presented to the U.S. Science Advisory Committee (USSAC) and to SCICOM for input. This list will also be reviewed by the Performance Evaluation Committee VI (PEC-VI).

## PEC-VI

Members were invited in April 2003 and the committee consists of seven members, Chaired by Susan Humphris. The first meeting was conducted by conference call in June 2003. The final report by PEC-VI is due in December 2003 so that action on recommendations can be taken in FY04. The report will include:

- an assessment as to the extent the goals set up in the Long Range Plan have been achieved.
- an examination of all aspects of the phase-out program and how it impacts the commencement of the new IODP drilling program.
- an assessment of the effectiveness of the JOI program management and the *JOIDES* scientific advisory structure.

A discussion followed. Dürr referred to the composition of the PEC VI committee and pointed out that all members been participants in ODP for many years. He suggested that perhaps the committee should include a member(s) who has not been involved in ODP in order to provide an outside perspective. Piasias replied that PEC VI composition was determined largely by the desire to focus on issues of the legacy of ODP

McKenzie asked the committee if they felt that adequate advance planning and predictions far enough into the future were being put into place for preparation for IODP, i.e. Can we really forecast what we need? Piasias answered this point by saying that the community has to focus on goals of science and operations and as to how the laboratory can be set up to achieve goals of operations. Determination of how to match science needs with operational needs is required. McKenzie then asked if space was a problem. Piasias answered that, yes, adequate space was essential to conduct analyses in an efficient manner, especially those tasks that have to be done at sea. Harrison commented that given the example of the rapid changes in our understanding of the deep biosphere, one cannot predict too far in advance. Piasias agreed stating that the goal is to maintain as much flexibility as possible in order to be able to respond to unforeseen needs. Allan commented that various studies like the Conceptual Design Committee (CDC) Report (2000) identify the need for much more space and much more flexibility in the new non-riser vessel.

Bohlen commented that a major driver for the future would be the connection between IODP and related activity in other scientific disciplines. Other large-scale projects in physics, chemistry and astronomy are using the Earth as a natural laboratory. It is essential that IODP establish robust connections with other programs. Harrison asked how these connections would be established. Bohlen replied that it is within the leadership responsibilities of operators and managers to be proactive in reaching out to other communities to identify potential collaborations and overlap. He anticipated that some of this type of outreach would be a large role of USSSP in the future. Orcutt stated that one important connection in the last five years has been the *JANUS* database, although the development of the database has been expensive and difficult. What has happened through all that is the development of the database schema. There is a tremendous need for this in other science communities, such as *Earthscope*. It is inefficient to redevelop the database schema over and over again. Piasias added that it was going to take leadership to make that successful. One example is that we have a

computer-oriented community now, but that has not always been the case, and also may not be the case in other science communities. We need to recognize the requirement to educate database users in efficient ways to use the data.

**EXCOM Motion 03-1-6:** EXCOM approves the FY 2004 Program Plan as developed by JOI.

*Detrick moved. Opdyke seconded. 11 in favor, 2 abstentions (Purdy, Prior), 1 absent (Stoffa).*

## 9. LEGACY Plans

### 9.1 *JOIDES* Journal

Becker reported that the ODP FY04 Program Plan includes a provision for the *JOIDES* Office to continue in existence until June 2004 solely for the purpose of producing two final issues of the *JOIDES* Journal, each with four leg reports.

A new journal series for IODP will be produced by the SAS Office.

### 9.2 SCICOM Report

Becker stated that as there would be no future meetings of SCICOM the approval of the minutes for the final meeting in Austin, Texas in March 2003 had been sought by Email. Although 3 U.S. votes are still outstanding there were both a quorum and unanimous approval among those voting.

Becker reported that an important matter to consider was the progress on the EXCOM Motion asking SCICOM to produce an ODP Legacy document focusing specifically on:

1. Tool summary
2. Achievements and Opportunities
3. Greatest Hits
4. How Well have we done?

This SCICOM report is in the EXCOM Agenda Book.

Harrison stated that the *JOIDES* Office would forward notes on “How Well Have We Done” to JOI to make them available to the Performance Evaluation Committee VI (PEC VI) to assist in their evaluation process.

Harrison reported that a one-day session on ODP had been held at the recent International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG) meeting in Sapporo, Japan. About 50 people attended this meeting and learned about ODP accomplishments, and plans for IODP.



### **9.3 JOI Legacy Web Site**

Anziano, the ODP Legacy Coordinator with JOI outlined the plans for this project. The goal is to develop a web-based product containing ODP documents and records that is unified, stand-alone and comprehensive. Examples of legacy documents to be included, together with a portal to the *JANUS* database, are ODP publications, technical documents and historical documentation.

JOI will gather, organize and assemble the information in order to distribute and maintain the legacy. Specific issues to be addressed are technology developments and items currently only in hard-copy such as DSDP logs etc.

JOI will coordinate the effort and be responsible for assembly, distribution and maintenance of the legacy. Liaisons from the Operators will provide contributions in defining the legacy and in providing documents. Cooperation will also be sought from the scientific community. Anziano went on to discuss financial resources and the numbers of personnel who would be involved.

The project has been divided into four phases:

- 1) Definition and implementation (current phase)
- 2) Collection and organization of material
- 3) Construction and distribution (2 years)
- 4) Maintenance (long term).

When asked if there were plans to scan ODP Initial Reports and make them available in electronic format Fox answered that TAMU were already working on this project through the university scanning service.

Harrison inquired as to the limitations of copyright restrictions on scientific papers in the legacy documents. Anziano replied that JOI have citations, and other information regarding publications, not the papers themselves.

Pisias commented that, with regard to legacy material, JOI was focussing on the inclusion of material that is otherwise not easily accessible, but is in the public domain. One example of this is the records of anyone who ever received an ODP sample. This information is relatively unique to the Program and not available in any other information source. Decisions must be made as to what material has value and what is either accessible otherwise, or of no particular value. Purdy asked for clarification of the meaning of “long-term” and wondered if advice should be requested from experts whose mandate is to keep data forever. Pisias agreed and said that JOI was requesting guidance from the National Geophysical Data Center (NGDC).

### **9.4 Have any legacy objectives been overlooked?**

Harrison asked if anyone is aware of any information that has been overlooked in documenting ODP legacy. There were no further comments or suggestions. Harrison

reported that he is working on a celebratory issue of *Science*, to commemorate the record and ending of ODP.

## 10. SCICOM Science Report

Becker gave illustrated reports on the activities and preliminary accounts of the achievements on Legs 202 – 209.

## 11. Any Other Business

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-7:** The ODP Executive Committee congratulates the Planning and Science Committees of *JOIDES*. The Chairs of the Committees reach far back into the history of ocean drilling and include:

José Honnorez, Roger Larson, Nicklas Pias, Ralph Moberly, Jamie Austin, Brian Lewis Robert Kidd (with Jim Natland, and Julian Pearce substituting once each), Susan Humphris, Bill Hay, Keir Becker.

These Chairs, and the manifold, hard working, imaginative, and determined members of the Planning and Science Committees have served ODP and *JOIDES* exceptionally well. We offer our deepest thanks

*Presented by Orcutt*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-8:** EXCOM thanks JOI Inc. for the wonderful location at which its last meeting took place. The arrangements were excellent and the evening event close to the *JOIDES* Resolution allowed us to meet many old friends. Thank you Steve Bohlen, Bridget Chisholm, Maureen Sang, Kasey White, Jennifer Anziano, and Amy Castner.

*Presented by Harrison*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-9:** At this last meeting EXCOM wishes to recognize that sustained international collaboration has been the fundamental strength of the Ocean Drilling Program. A common vision of scientific, technical and organizational cooperation has been shared by scientists, technicians, students and administrators from many different countries, institutions and agencies. International participation has been led by, but not limited to, the 22 formal ODP members. All aspects and phases of the Program governance, administration, planning, ship-board operations, workshops, symposia and publications have benefited from continuous, multi-national commitment and participation. Myriad scientific and organizational challenges have been successfully addressed, not least because of the richness and diversity of perspectives brought by all Program participants. In this respect the present members of EXCOM wish to pay special tribute to all international colleagues who have served as former EXCOM members during 90 meetings over more than 20 years. Looking ahead to IODP, EXCOM considers that the spirit and reality of international synergy are the true, compelling legacies of ODP.

*Presented by Prior*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-10:** EXCOM wishes to thank our present Chair, Chris Harrison, and all previous EXCOM Chairs, Alan Berman, John Knauss, Douglas Caldwell, Charles Helsley, Arthur Maxwell, Arthur Nowell, Jim Briden, Bob Detrick, Helmut Beiersdorf, for excellent leadership of the Executive Committee in the best interest of the global ocean drilling community.

*Presented by von Knorring*

**EXCOM Consensus 03-1-11 :**

Recognizing the Accomplishments of ODP

Since its beginning in 1985, the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) has produced unparalleled advances in our understanding of fundamental Earth processes. Knowledge of the changing Earth's climate and the active tectonics of the solid Earth is substantially advanced today because of ODP research activities.

Recognition for the intellectual quality and vitality of ODP is owed to the proponents of individual drilling legs who have, throughout the program, maintained a highly competitive spirit, producing high quality innovative proposals for drilling targets tackling topical scientific problems.

Program priorities and directions have been guided by hundreds of volunteer panel members serving on the many tens of advisory panels, working groups and committees.

The successful implementation of these plans has been achieved effectively, safely and economically because of the quality of the many contractors responsible for carrying out all the programs complex operations (see Footnote 1).

Over its lifetime substantially more than half a billion dollars have been invested in ODP operations. That a fiscal commitment of this magnitude could be sustained for 18 years is a testament to the skill and dedication of the many representatives serving on the ODP Council from all the supporting nations (see Footnote 2).

The Ocean Drilling Program, since the first hole was drilled in 1985 has stood as a magnificent example of the power and effectiveness of international cooperation in science. Throughout its life funding sources from over 20 nations have provided support, and when the program ends in September 2003 more than 1700 holes will have been drilled, 215 km of core will have been recovered and over 2700 scientists from over 40 nations will have sailed.

ExCom recognizes and applauds the great contributions to the natural sciences made by the above mentioned research proponents, members of the advisory structure, the leaders and staff of all the implementing organizations, and the representatives of the funding sources. ExCom urges that all these groups now focus upon the future, and work cooperatively and selflessly with all interested international parties to bring to the new Integrated Ocean Drilling Program the same record of quality and accomplishment that has so fully characterized ODP throughout its magnificent 18 year life.

**Footnote 1:**The Ocean Drilling Program at Texas A&M University; The Borehole Research Group at Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO) of Columbia University; and in Leicester, Montpellier, Aachen and Tokyo; the Site Survey Data Bank at LDEO; the core repositories at Scripps, Lamont Doherty and Bremen; the ship's crew and the drilling crew onboard the *JOIDES Resolution*;

**Footnote 2.** United States National Science Foundation; Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and Natural Resources Canada; the Australian Department of Primary Industries and Energy; National Taiwan University; the Korean Institute for Geology, Mining, and Materials; the European Science Foundation; Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique Belgium; Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen Belgium; Statens Naturvidenskabelige Forskningsrad Denmark; Suomen Akatemia/Finlands Akademi Finland; National Hellenic Research Foundation Greece; Institute of Geology and Marine Exploration Greece; Rannsóknarráð Islands Iceland; Enterprise Ireland; Geological Survey of Ireland; Marine Institute Ireland; Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche Italy; Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Netherlands; Norges Forskningsråd Norway; Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas Spain; Oficina de Ciencia y Tecnología Spain; Instituto de Cooperação Científica e Tecnológica Internacional Portugal; Vetenskapsrådet (*funding formerly came from NFR*) Sweden; Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung Switzerland; Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey; the Federal Republic of Germany's Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; German Federal Ministry for Research, Education, and Technology; Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer and Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers-Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; Japan's Ocean Research Institute, the University of Tokyo and Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology; the Marine High-Technology Bureau of the State Science and Technology Commission of the People's Republic of China; the Natural Environment Research Council of the United Kingdom; and, in 1991-1992, the Institute of Lithosphere of the Soviet Union.

## Appendix 1

### 4.2 France Country Report

#### French participation to IODP

From IODP in 1975, France has supported and participated to scientific ocean drilling throughout the years, either with DSDP or ODP.

In 2002 and 2003, the french scientific community has declared in a national survey a strong interest in joining to the upcoming IODP. France is thus committed to continue along the same line in the european context provided by ECORD (“EUROPEAN CONSORTIUM FOR OCEAN RESEARCH DRILLING”).

In order to contribute to and secure drilling in the Arctic as part of IODP in 2004, the ministry of research has recently agreed to maintain the ODP budget (2.0M\$) in 2004. Beyond 2004, we will aim to increase the french financial contribution to IODP.

As part of ECORD, France has recently moved forward to set-up the EMA (“EUROPEAN MANAGEMENT AGENCY”) at IPG in Paris, as part of CNRS and with Dr. Catherine Mevel as chair. As in ODP, France with the University of Montpellier is also interested in participating to a network for borehole geophysics, both at european (for MSPs) and worldwide level.

#### Cruise participation and meetings

After two years of reduced participation of French scientists on ODP cruises, in 2000 and 2001, ODP-France succeeded in increasing the number of applications. 13 scientists have sailed since April 2002, on Legs 202 to 210.

#### Leg French Participants

202	Philippe Martinez (Université Bordeaux I)
203	Julie Carlut (CNRS, ENS Paris) Sidonie Revillon (Southampton Ocean. Inst.)
206	Christine Laverne (Université Aix-Marseille)
207	Laurence Le Callonnec (UPMC, Paris) Taniel Danelian (UPMC, Paris)
209	Monique Seyler (IPGP, Paris) Marguerite Godard (CNRS, Montpellier) Benoît Ildefonse (CNRS, Montpellier)
210	Jean-Claude Sibuet (IFREMER, Plouzane) – co-chief Silvia Gardin (CNRS, Paris) Bruno Galbrun (CNRS, Paris) Gianreto Manatschal (EOST, ULP Strasbourg)

The November 2002 iSSEPs meeting was hosted in Montpellier by ODP-France and CNRS, and organized by Benoît Ildefonse.

## Appendix 2

### 7.1.1 Action Items from June 2003 IWG Meeting

1. IODP members, and potential members, to be notified of the dates for:
  - a. Future SAS meetings
  - b. IODP Council Meetings
  
2. CNRS and PRC representatives to respond to Draft of Membership Memorandum and Associate Membership Memorandum.
  
3. ECORD Request.

The IWG recognizes the significant efforts of ODP, JEODI and ECORD in planning for IODP drilling of the Lomonsov Ridge.  
The IWG believes that when ECORD, as an IODP member, has a commitment of sufficient resources and SAS approval for this mission specific platform program, it should proceed with the drilling operation.
  
4. The IWG believes that IODP Council level recommendations should be restricted to the tasks and responsibilities previously agreed to by IWG and should not be extended to include endorsement of specific drilling activities.
  
5. If a MSP proposal has been approved by the IODP Science Advisory Structure for 2004 drilling and the organization providing the platform has sufficient resources to undertake the program, then the lead agencies will work to ensure that such a program has every chance of success.

## Appendix 3

### 7.2.1 CMO Tasks and Responsibilities

#### **Develop:**

- Annual Program Plan
- Budget plan for Science Operation Cost of the program
- Budget plan 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

#### **Ensure the efficiency of:**

- Detailed annual Science Operating Plan
- Detailed annual Platform Operation Plan
- Detailed Science Operation Cost
- Detailed drilling plan prepared by IO and DPG
- Platform Operation Cost of the Program
- Detailed Pre-drilling site survey plan prepared by IO

#### **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
- New members for IODP

#### **Conduct:**

- Promotion of the Program

#### **Execute:**

- Contracts with IOs or IODP subcontractors for Science Operation Activities
- Contracts with IOs or IODP subcontractors for technical/engineering development
- Contract (or other agreement) with NSF/MEXT for science operations and management of IODP
- Other contracts/agreements which may be required

#### **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

#### **Support or Assist:**

- Appropriate pre-drilling site survey standard for each platform to meet adequate HSE requirements
- IO to secure drilling permit from the country of jurisdiction
- DPG and IO in creating detailed drilling plans

#### **Support SAS Activities and Operations:**

- SAS Support and Logistics
- Proposal Administration
- Publication and Outreach

## Appendix 4

### 7.3 iPC Co-Chairs Report

#### **IODP interim Planning Committee (iPC) Co-Chairs Report to EXCOM July 2003**

This report summarizes iPC and iSAS actions since January 2003. The 4th meeting of iPC took in Austin, Texas on March 18-20, 2003. The 5<sup>th</sup> and last meeting of iPC will take place September 15-17 in Hokkaido, Japan.

**IODP Operations Committee (OPCOM)** iPC received the recommendations of its OPCOM Working Group (K. Becker, H. Ito, P. Pezard, N. Piasias, A. Skinner, and A. Taira) concerning the OPCOM mandate. Issues that the OPCOM Working Group addressed included:

- Processes for scheduling and staffing which take into account the added complexity of multi-leg, multi-platform projects in IODP
- New program components that impact scheduling (resource allocation among multiple operators, long-term projects, multi-year financial and facility commitments)
- Structure of the Committee (review and reporting pathways in SAS and IODP management)
- Membership (size, representation, expertise)

The proposed OPCOM Mandate charges OPCOM with identifying the most logistically and fiscally effective means to achieve IODP scientific objectives, suggests that voting be by consensus at two meetings per year, specifies that the Chair be appointed by the SAS Executive Authority, and requires that membership be composed of representatives from SPC and IODP management (IO's and CMO).

iPC approved the OPCOM Mandate as proposed and hereby submits it to IWG for consideration.

(see proposed mandate, Appendix 1)

#### **IODP Science Planning Committee (SPC)**

The iPC recommends that the Chair and Vice Chair of the SPC serve a total term of four years, and follow a two-year rotation schedule. The first Chair of SPC will serve only two years, and will be replaced by the first Vice-Chair at the end of two years. A new Vice Chair will be named at this time.

#### **iSAS/SAS Ad Hoc Working Groups**

iPC recommends the formation of several ad hoc working groups designed to facilitate the transition from ODP to IODP and to establish initial scientific review and advice procedures in IODP:



## *Database Working Group*

At the request of iPC, iSciMP reviewed database issues and requirements in ODP and IODP and developed recommendations for assuring adequate oversight of ODP data during program transition and for achieving database consistency and availability in IODP. iSAS panels identified the following as primary issues for consideration:

1. ODP/IODP sample and results data must have constant oversight and protection, particularly during the transition and initial phases of IODP.
2. A comprehensive IODP database must be functioning and ready to receive data at the beginning of the first IODP drilling project, conceivably in summer, 2004.
3. The transition from ODP to IODP is an opportunity to review database components and management procedures, and identify areas where emerging technology allows improvements and additions in types of data collected and methods for data storage, management, and dissemination.

iPC approved the establishment of an ad hoc Database Working Group under iSciMP to oversee transfer of data from ODP to IODP, and recommend improvements and additions to data management procedures in IODP, and that this group be constituted as follows:

- 8-10 members, chaired by iSciMP member
- International representation from iSAS panels and other non-ODP scientists with relevant expertise
- 1-2 day meeting timed to develop a draft report to iSciMP in July, 2003

### **Project Management Working Group**

The tasks of the interim Technical Advice and Industry Liaison panels have included consultation with industry colleagues on the development of proposed project assessment and development strategies, particularly in light of the likelihood of multi-leg, multi-platform drilling operations in IODP. iTAP recommended, and iPC approved the establishment of an ad-hoc working group to develop a project-based management planning system, using existing industry project planning strategies as a model.

**Charge:** to develop a system for efficient passage of drilling proposals from the project scientific review to the execution and completion of drilling objectives.

**Membership:** representatives from iTAP, iILP, iPPSP, iSSEPs, and iPC/SPC, OPCOM, CDEX, and industry.

The Project Management WG will report to iPC by June, 2003.

## Project Scoping Working Group

To facilitate preliminary planning, including technology needs and risk assessment of initial riser-based complex drilling projects in IODP, iTAP also recommended and iPC approved the establishment of a Project Scoping Group for CDPs.

**Charge:** begin the scoping process for existing CPD's, to include project description, risk analyses, and project planning. [Similar to a Detailed Planning Group (DPG)].

**Membership:** proponents, representative from I.O.s, consultants from industry.

### Proposal Review and Assessment

One proposal was transferred from SSEPs to iPC for grouping:  
 # 610-Full2 – Environmental Change, Processes, and Effects.  
 Assessed as not ready for ranking.

### Interim Science Advisory Structure--Status Reports

IWG approved the recommendation that present co-chairs of all iSAS panels except iPC continue as co-chairs in IODP at least through 2004. At the start of IODP in October 2003, panel membership will be adjusted by SPC to reflect IODP member countries/consortia, and/or to maintain panel size and breadth of expertise.

Below is a summary of iSAS panel activities and concerns.

PANEL	MEETING DATES	ACTIVITIES/ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS
iPC	29-30 August 2001 20-22 March 2002 27-29 August 2002 18-20 March 2003 <i>14-17 September 2003 (with SPC)</i>	Develop interim SAS (panel members and mandates) Develop recommendations for IODP/SAS structure and functions IODP project/proposal development and evaluation procedures Multi Platform, Multi Leg Projects (CDPs) IODP Principles of Scientific Investigation Guide to IODP Sample and Data Distribution policy OPCOM-Proposed mandate Project planning working groups
iSSEPs	13-17 November 2001 6-9 June 2002 17-20 November 2002 22-25 May 2003	Proposal review and evaluation of scientific merits Guidance to proponents Complex Drilling Projects Environmental Changes and Forcings Deep Biosphere and the Subseafloor Ocean

iSSP	25-27 February 2002 22-24 July 2002 24-26 February 2003 28-30 July 2003	Proposal site data evaluation and project readiness assessments Site survey requirements for drilling projects IODP Data Bank-requirements and procedures
iPPSP	11-13 June 2002 2-3 December 2002 16-17 June 2003	Review MSP proposals Develop multi-tiered safety review process to accommodate greater number and wider variety of drilling projects in new program Develop IODP Safety Manual to include riser drilling tools and technologies
iSciMP	17-19 December 2001 17-19 June 2002 12-14 December 2002 14-16 July 2003	Laboratory needs of riser, non-riser, and mission-specific platforms Sample imaging options and recommendations Measurement capabilities and standards for all platforms IODP Sample and Data distribution policy Working group on microbiological issues Working group on IODP database structure
iTAP	8-10 July 2002 21-22 February 2003 14-16 July 2003	Identify, assess options, and prioritize technological developments needed by IODP Develop processes for advising IODP managers, operators and proponents on technology-related issues Assess measurement tools and capabilities (with iSciMP) Develop project planning and management processes in consultation with industry colleagues
iILP	20-22 February 2003	Prepare list of IODP science objectives that may be of interest to industry Develop procedures to facilitate IODP-industry partnerships (project development & evaluation, collegial linkages, workshops, etc.) Data-sharing between IODP and industry
OPCOM	<i>Not yet established</i>	Schedule and staff drilling projects

### Other iPC Activities

The iPC and iSAS panels continue to consider issues associated with the increased complexity and expanded goals of the new program. We anticipate submitting recommendations in these areas after our final meeting in 2003:

1. Proponent mentoring, proposal preparation, and project evaluation for multi-leg, multi-platform projects (Complex Drilling Projects)
2. Evolving program procedures for ship and shore-based laboratory, measurement, and curation capabilities and standards
3. Industry-academic partnerships and collaborations
4. Pro-active engineering/technology development for site surveys, safety surveys, and sampling strategies
5. Safety guidelines in drill site selection and drilling operations.
6. IODP Policy for Ancillary Programs

## Appendix 1

### Proposed Mandate for IODP OPCOM

- 1. General Purpose:** *The Operations Committee (OPCOM) is an independent committee within the Science Advisory Structure whose general purpose is to recommend the most logistically and fiscally effective means to achieve IODP scientific objectives as defined in the long-range IODP science plan and prioritized by the Science Planning Committee (SPC). OPCOM reports to SPC and, through SPC, to the SAS Executive Authority.*
- 2. Mandate:** OPCOM is responsible for recommending the optimal means to implement IODP drilling projects that are highly ranked and prioritized by SPC. Following IODP project management principles, OPCOM should consider, in addition to SPC prioritizations, (a) capabilities of IODP drilling platforms, (b) budgetary and logistical constraints, and (c) advice from SAS service panels on safety, environmental, and technological factors. Following the annual SPC prioritization and ranking of proposed IODP drilling programs, OPCOM will specifically recommend options for the schedules of IODP drilling platforms for the appropriate year(s) (as defined by the annual IODP program plan) and will also project a longer-term schedule for future drilling operations. In addition, OPCOM must monitor progress toward achieving the longer-term drilling schedule and therefore is also responsible for recommending any modifications to both the short- and long-term drilling schedules that may be necessary as developments occur or constraints arise after SPC has prioritized relevant IODP science projects.
- 3. Consensus and Quorum:** The Operations Committee will reach all decisions by consensus. In defining consensus, a quorum shall be required consisting of 2/3 of the scientific participants and 2/3 of the management representatives as defined in Section 4.
- 4. Participants Counting Toward Consensus and Quorum:** The Operations Committee will be chaired by a knowledgeable scientist who is non-conflicted in both scientific and operational matters and is appointed by the SAS Executive Authority. Participants from SAS shall include the SPC chair and as many additional representatives from the SPC as there are Implementing Organizations. Participants from IODP management shall include one designated representative from each Implementing Organization (IO), and one designated representative from the Central Management Organization (CMO). The terms of the Chair and representatives from SPC should extend no longer than three years, and rotations should be staggered.
- 5. Liaisons, Observers, and Guests:** Each Lead Agency is expected to nominate one liaison to OPCOM. Lead Agencies, the CMO, and IO's may send additional observers as needed. A chair of each of the SSEP's, SciMP, PPSP, SSP, TAP and ILP will serve as liaisons to OPCOM. When necessary to provide additional expertise, guests may be invited at the discretion of the Chair. Approximately one year before the end of the Chair's term, the next Chair should be identified and he or she should attend that year's meetings as a guest.
- 6. Meetings:** OPCOM shall meet at least twice per year. One of the OPCOM meetings will be coordinated with the annual SPC ranking exercise, in order to construct the appropriate year's schedules of the IODP drilling platforms. The other meeting will be held about half a year apart, to recommend adjustments to the drilling schedules if needed. If drilling schedules or modifications recommended by OPCOM are not approved by SPC and/or the SAS Executive Authority, then additional OPCOM meetings may be required to recommend alternative schedules.

## Appendix 2

### Draft Terms of Reference for the Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee

*Mandate: Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee (SPPOC) for the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program*

1. This committee is the highest-level committee of Scientific Advisory Structure (SAS), and shall formulate scientific and policy recommendations with respect to the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP). It shall conduct IODP planning, as well as evaluation and assessment of the Program as to its accomplishments as compared to the goals and objectives which have been established. It may be assigned managerial and operational responsibilities for appropriate tasks, and will provide for scientific liaison to other scientific programs. The IMI Sapporo Office (IMI-J) will support the SPPOC's activity.
2. The SPPOC may establish subcommittees for cognizance of certain components of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program. Areas of cognizance and the Terms of Reference for each subcommittee shall be defined by the SPPOC. In particular, a Science Planning Committee (SPC) shall be established. The SPPOC will determine the chair and vice-chair of SPC based on IODP member nominations.
3. The SPPOC will review and approve the annual IODP program plan and budget prior to forwarding it to the IMI Board of Governors for corporate approval and contractual submission to the Lead Agencies.
4. The members of SPPOC shall be representatives from oceanographic and marine research institutions or other organizations, which have a major interest in the study of the sea floor. Members of SPPOC shall be from the United States, Japan and other countries or consortia that have signed a Memorandum for IODP participation with MEXT and NSF, with representation based on IODP participation units. As a committee established under the auspices of IMI, the IMI Board of Governors must approve membership of the SPPOC. The Board of Governors on the recommendation of the SPPOC or in the event of a country or consortium member ceasing to have a valid Memorandum in existence may cancel membership of any member. The IMI BOG will appoint two of its members to the SPPOC, one from Japan and another from the US. In the event another Lead Agency joins IODP (e.g. Europe), the IMI BOG will appoint three members of SPPOC.
5. The SPPOC shall reach all its decisions by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of all members. A quorum shall constitute two-thirds of the Committee. If a member of the Committee is absent from a duly called meeting of the Committee, a designated alternate with full authority to act for him or her in his or her absence may replace him or her.
6. The Chair of SPPOC will rotate initially between Japan and the United States with a term of office of two years. The IMI Board of Governors based on IODP member nominations will determine the Chair of SPPOC.
7. The Committee, and all subcommittees thereto, shall keep written records of their proceedings.
8. Members of this Committee, and members of subcommittees duly appointed thereby, while acting within the Terms of Reference, shall be indemnified, and held harmless by the corporation from and against any and all liabilities, damages and demands, losses, costs and expenses arising from acts or omission related to performance as committee members.
9. These Terms of Reference, upon ratification by the Board of Governors of IMI, will supersede all previous agreements.

### Appendix 3

#### **IODP Policy Statement on Ancillary Projects**

iPC has approved a statement detailing the recommended policy concerning the inclusion of ancillary projects in IODP drilling expeditions:

Scientific and educational programs are encouraged to develop projects that are ancillary to the IODP Annual Program Plan, and apply for permission to execute such projects as part of IODP research expeditions. Proposals for such ancillary programs must be approved by the Science Planning Committee Chair in consultation with the Co-Chief Scientists of the drilling project(s) affected, the IODP Science Policy and Planning Oversight Committee, and by IODP Management International Inc, prior to the development of the annual program plan. For the purposes of assessing proposals for ancillary projects, it is understood that:

1. Ancillary projects must be conducted at no extra cost (in time or money) to IODP scientific operations,
2. Ancillary projects will in no way interfere with, or require the alteration of, drilling plans approved by IODP
3. Sufficient space must be available on the project drilling platform(s) to accommodate needed personnel, equipment, and/or laboratory facilities without interfering with primary IODP drilling, sampling and related operations;
4. Permission to undertake at-sea activities required by ancillary programs must be obtained from the on-site operations manager of the IODP project on a day-by-day basis. Such permission can be rescinded at any time as required by operational considerations.

The procedure for proposal submission will be part of the "Guide to IODP" Instructions and will be included in the IODP web page.

## Appendix 5

### 7.4 MEXT Report

#### 1. MEXT

NSF and MEXT officials reached an agreement on an IODP Lead Agency memorandum at the end of March, and the NSF Director and the MEXT Minister signed the memorandum on April 22, 2003 in Tokyo, Japan. With the memorandum signed, the IODP international cooperation will officially start in October 2003.

#### 2. “Chikyu” Construction

Accommodation and laboratory outfitting activities for “Chikyu” were completed in Tamano, Japan this spring. The vessel is now undergoing the sea trial of the ship hull part including evaluations of the vessel’s Dynamic Positioning System (DPS) off the coast of Shikoku. The vessel will move to Nagasaki this summer to install the vessel’s drilling systems, and after the installation is completed, the vessel will undergo the sea trial of the whole system. The vessel’s construction will be completed in 2005. The vessel will undergo the training cruise for about a year to be ready for IODP international cooperative activities in late 2006.

#### 3. CDEX

CDEX, established within JAMSTEC last October as an operator of “Chikyu” and headed by Dr. Asahiko Taira, has been conducting various activities for the safe and efficient operations of “Chikyu”; (1) establishing an HSE management system, (2) developing drilling plans, including those for the training cruise, based on site survey data collected, and (3) building science support systems for research activities both onboard “Chikyu” and onshore. CDEX, as the vessel’s operator, supervised the vessel’s machinery construction activities and will supervise the vessel’s drilling systems installation activities.

#### 4. Japanese Core Center

The Center for Advanced Marine Core Research at Kochi University completed the construction of its new research laboratory in March 2003. The laboratory will have capabilities to store core samples collected by “Chikyu” in refrigerator and freezer storage areas, and will provide measurement and analysis capabilities for technicians and researchers. The center celebrated the laboratory’s opening on May 24, 2003.

#### 5. Japanese Science Community

Forty-one Japanese universities and institutions interested in the earth science research officially established the Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC) on February 22, 2003. The number of the consortium’s members is expected to increase. Dr. Ikuo Kushiro of the Institute for Frontier Research and Earth Evolution (IFREE) was appointed as the consortium’s chairman. The IODP committee was created within the consortium to deliberate and support Japan’s IODP participation, including (1) recommending Japanese IMI governors and SAS committee/panel member nominees, (2) supporting Japan’s scientific drilling proposals, (3) recommending onboard research scientist nominees, and (4) delivering IODP science results to the general public in Japan. The committee’s chairman is Professor Hidekazu Tokuyama of the University of Tokyo’s Ocean Research Institute (ORI).

## Appendix 6

### 7.5 JAMSTEC Report

#### Japanese IODP activities

- A) IODP Planning Committee was established by JAMSTEC on 1<sup>st</sup> of Nov., 2002  
B) Launching the Japan Earth Drilling Science Consortium (IODP Section) on 22<sup>nd</sup> of Feb. , 2003

The Consortium is an association formed by Japanese scientists whose purpose is to develop a new earth/life science by taking advantage of IODP activities.

<i>The roles and duties</i>
-----------------------------

1) Establishment of IODP international planning management section (CMO) and participation in its management.

\* Selection and assignment of foundation members and board members.

2) Participation in IODP scientific project planning activities.

\* Recommendation and assignment of members of IODP Science Advisory Structures (SAS).

Establishment of IODP domestic scientific committee, panels, working groups and other organizations.

3) Domestic research development

\* Planning and support of drilling projects and relevant research plans (such as site survey).

\* Securing operating/research budgets for Earth Drilling Science Consortium activities.

4) Review of consignments from the IODP and proposals for them.

\* SAS, Site Survey Data Bank, Core Center, Microfossil Reference Center, and Logging Analysis Center.

5) Miscellaneous

\* Information exchange among participating organizations.

\* Public relations activities

\* Collaboration with East Asian countries

Founders of the Consortium are Ikuo Kushiro (Head, IFREE), Itaru Koizumi (Professor Emeritus, Hokkaido University), Tomoro Hirasawa (Professor Emeritus, Tohoku University), and Tetsuya Hirano (Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo), who helped us by writing prospectus for the establishment of the Consortium. We would like to appreciate their corporation.

#### By-Laws of Japan Earth Drilling Science Consortium, (IODP Section)

##### Article 1: Organization of IODP Section

As stated in Article 11 of Japan Earth Drilling Science Consortium -hereafter called CONSORTIUM- regulation, IODP Section -hereafter called BUKAI- is organized within CONSORTIUM.

##### ARTICLE 2: Purpose

The main purpose of IODP Section shall be to provide science planning and support to facilitate Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, hereafter called IODP, projects and plans.



### ARTICLE 3: Activity

IODP Section shall undertake the following activities to fulfill the above stated purpose. To undertake activities, except as may be otherwise stated below, approval by the consent of the members at the membership meeting is required. Recommendation of the candidate for IMI governors elected by IODP Management International – hereafter called IMI.

- 1) Recommendations of the candidates for IMI governors elected by IODP Management International – hereafter called IMI.
- 2) Recommendations of various panel and committee members of IODP/SAS (IODP Science Advisory Structure)
- 3) Support and suggestions for scientific drilling proposals initiated by Japanese scientists.
- 4) Recommendation of platform scientists for IODP drilling Programs.
- 5) Promotion of IODP research results, public relations, and outreach activities.
- 6) Coordination and organization of committee and special groups, as necessary, for addressing the IODP related scientific matters detailed above.

### ARTICLE 5: Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall consist of a President and several officers, who shall be Nominated by the members of BUKAI, and subject to approval by the Board of Governors. Final approval will be confirmed by majority vote at the membership meeting of BUKAI.

- 2) The term of the Executive Committee will be 3 years, and the members shall be eligible for re-election one more term only.
- 3) The President will be the Chief Executive Officer of BUKAI, presiding over all activities of the Executive Committee.

### ARTICLE 6: Organization of IODP Section

BUKAI will operate the organization stated below.

- 1) Board of Governors : The Board of Governors will consist of a President and other governors. BUKAI shall pass a resolution to operate this group, which will include selection of the Executive Committee, recommendation of various panel and committee members, recommendation of platform scientists of IODP drilling programs, and etc. Moreover, BUKAI will request recommendations of the IMI Governor candidate, selected by the IMI membership organization, at all membership meetings.
- 2) Executives : Executives will consist of a President and a few members appointed by the president and shall prepare draft proposals and/or execute the decisions of the Board of Governors.

### ARTICLE 7: Call for the Board of Governors' Meeting

- 1) Board of Governors' Meeting will be called by a President and the President him/herself will serve as the Chairperson.
- 2) Board of Governors' Meeting will be effective if attended by the majority of members of the Board of Governors.

- 3) The proposal in question shall be decided by consent of the majority of the governors. Voting may be in person or by proxy –email vote is acceptable.
- 4) The members of CONSORTIUM, regardless of whether an associate member, an individual member, or a supporting member, may attend the Board of Governors' Meeting and may give his/her opinion. However, approval of the Executives is required for the attendance in advance.

#### ARTICLE 9: Administration

The Administration Office will be set up and will be responsible for administrative matters. The Administrative Office will be composed of Executive division / the Clerk in charge of the organization subject to the President, and Clerk in charge of AESTO. And shall be set up under the organizations subject to the AESTO IODP Promotion Room and the President belongs.

#### ARTICLE 10: Amendments to the By-Laws

All By-Laws in question shall be subject to amendment by proposal of the Executives, and shall be effective only after the approval by the majority of all members present at the all membership meeting.

#### Supplementary Clause

##### 1) Effectiveness

This By-Law shall be in effect as of February 22, 2003.

- 2) By-laws of AESTO says the Administration Office of BUKAI, stated in ARTICLE 9 of these By-laws in question, shall come in effect by the conclusion of the protocol between CONSORTIUM and Earth Structure AESTO as stated in the additional Clause 3 of the CONSORTIUM LAW

AESTO : Advanced Earth Science Technology Organization