

**MEETING OF THE
JOIDES OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG
FREIBURG in BREISGAU, GERMANY**

MARCH 24, 1999

DRAFT CONSENSUS ITEMS & MINUTES

Operations Committee - OPCOM

Members

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| William W. Hay (Chair) | JOIDES Office, GEOMAR, Christian-Albrechts University, Kiel, Germany |
| Dave A. Hodell | University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA |
| J. Casey Moore | University of California at Santa Cruz, USA |
| Kensaku Tamaki | Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo, Japan |

Members unable to attend

Robert Carter
James Natland

OPCOM Liaisons

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Jack Baldauf | Science Operator (ODP-TAMU) |
| Bruce Malfait | National Science Foundation (United States) |
| Kate Moran | Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. |
| Mary Reagan | Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO) |

JOIDES Office

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| Warner Brückmann | Science Coordinator |
| Jeff Schuffert | U.S. Liaison |
| Bettina Rohr | Administrative Assistant |
| Emanuel Söding | Science Assistant |

Guests and Observers

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Keir Becker | Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami, FL, USA (Co-Chair of Long Term Observatories PPG) |
| Pamela Baker-Masson | Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. |
| George Claypool | Lakewood, CO (Chair of PPSP) |
| Paul Dauphin | National Science Foundation (United States) |
| David A. Feary | Australian Geological Survey, Canberra, Australia |
| Jeff Fox | Science Operator (ODP-TAMU) |
| David Goldberg | Wireline Logging Services (ODP-LDEO) |
| Tom Janecek | Antarctic Research Facility, Florida State University, FL, USA (Chair of SciMP) |
| Jock Keene | University of Sydney, Australia |
| Eiichi Kikawa | JAMSTEC, Japan |
| Ted C. Moore | University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA (Chair of ESSEP) |
| Frank Rack | Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. |
| Alister Skinner | Natural Environment Research Council, UK (Chair of TEDCOM) |
| Shiri Srivastava | Dalhousie University, NS, Canada |
| Shinichi Takagawa | JAMSTEC, Japan |
| John A. Tarduno | University of Rochester, NY, USA (Chair of ISSEP) |

**MEETING OF THE
JOIDES OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG
FREIBURG im BREISGAU, GERMANY**

MARCH 24, 1999

DRAFT MINUTES

A. Welcome and Introductions

Bill Hay opened the meeting at 0900. The attendees introduced themselves.

B. Approval of agenda

Hay asked for comments on the meeting agenda, received none, and assumed approval of the agenda by consensus.

C. Approval of minutes

It was moved that the minutes of the previous OPCOM meeting (August 21-22, 1998) be approved.

Moved by Dave Hodell, seconded by Casey Moore; 5 in favor.

D. Action Items

Hay stated that all of the action items from the August 1998 meeting had been done, except for OPCOM Action Item 98-2-1A. A letter was to have been sent by Susan Humphris to the German science community. Hay stated that the letter was no longer needed. There were no other comments.

E. Panel Reports

E.1. SSP

John Diebold noted that the previous SSP meeting was held in Perth, Australia, February 9-12, 1999 with a very straightforward agenda and the usual reports given. Diebold gave an update on panel membership. Gail Christeson will rotate off before the next meeting, and new liaisons have been named to other panels. SSP looked at highly rated proposals from the SSEPs and discussed site survey requirements for gas hydrate drilling in general, as recommended by the Gas Hydrate PPG.

Summary of upcoming legs

Leg 188 Prydz Bay—There is a problem with the legibility of seismic survey track maps sent to the databank.

Diebold suggested that the availability of digital navigation could improve this situation in the future.

Leg 189 and Leg 190 are in good shape.

Leg 191 needs better navigational charts of immediate drill area.

Leg 192 Manus Basin data appear to be in order.

Leg 193 Ontong Java-- Although the databank has received a lot of new site survey data, problems remain with interpreting these data.

Moran asked about Legs 181 and 182, where drilling encountered hiatuses not indicated by seismic data.

Diebold responded that seismic data do not always tell the whole story.

E.2 PPSP

George Claypool reported on the previous PPSP meeting in Rio de Janeiro, November 12-13, 1998. The panel discussed safety issues related to hydrocarbon occurrences on Leg 180 in the Woodlark Basin as well as H₂S

occurrences on Leg 181 in the Australian Bight. Claypool noted that PPSP has begun to revise the safety manual, last revised in 1992.

Hay asked whether the safety panel can anticipate H₂S problems such as occurred on Leg 181. Claypool said that there is no certain way to do so, but that in the future the panel may be able to anticipate this problem better. Jack Baldauf said that H₂S is not just a safety issue but an operations issue as well (e.g., through increased corrosion of drill pipe).

Casey Moore inquired about the decision that an ice boat was not needed for Prydz Bay, but discussion was deferred until during the joint SCICOM/OPCOM meeting the following day.

E.3 SciMP

Tom Janecek reported enthusiastically that SciMP had settled into a good rhythm at its fourth meeting and now seems firmly on track. They reviewed all science labs and services with regard to existing technologies and also for anticipated needs of a post-2003 program. Specific items discussed included the external beam XRF, industry techniques for studying BSR, sediment imaging technologies, ROV and submersible support.

Individual panel members are looking at these and other issues, including data migration and storage and core log-seismic integration. Janecek believes that SciMP now works as an effective watch dog for current and future issues.

SciMP recommendations:

The first two recommendations were considered together.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-1

SciMP recommends that OPCOM advise JOI to continue its evaluation of the efficiency of Wireline Services within the Ocean Drilling Program.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-2

SciMP recommends that OPCOM advise JOI to continue its evaluation of personnel and staffing within the Ocean Drilling Program.

Casey Moore asked what was meant by evaluation, what should JOI do? Janecek replied that there are still inefficiencies and personnel issues, although they are not as serious as they had been and conditions have ameliorated with the improved budget forecast. Moran commented that cutting the budget means cutting some tools. Fox asked for more specifics on inefficiencies.

Hay asked if there was a consensus for approval. There were no objections.

OPCOM consensus 99-1-1

OPCOM approved SciMP recommendations 99-1-1 and 99-1-2 by consensus.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-20

In the context of the current staffing levels, SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU restructure its shipboard technical staff to include a shipboard database administrator above and beyond the computer/IS staff. In addition TAMU should have a flexible system to deal with leg-specific technician needs (e.g. a seismic/log coordinator, paleontological sample preparation).

Jack Baldauf noted that ODP is sensitive to these issues and is actively working on them. Janecek stated that SciMP had some specific suggestions that could be discussed elsewhere.

Hay asked if there was a consensus for approval. There were no objections.

OPCOM consensus 99-1-2

OPCOM approved SciMP recommendation 99-1-20 by consensus.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-3

SciMP applauds the move toward electronic publication of the JOIDES Journal by the new JOIDES Office, but recommends that some form of the JOIDES Journal continue in printed form due to the varied audience of the journal.

Hay asked if there was a consensus for approval. There were no objections.

OPCOM consensus 99-1-3

OPCOM approved SciMP recommendation 99-1-3 by consensus.

SciMP recommendation 99-1-10

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU reiterate that it is the responsibility of the Co-Chief scientists to write or coordinate a leg synthesis paper for the SR booklet and CD-ROM as required by the co-chief agreement. The summary paper should provide an overview of the primary results of the leg. This recommendation does not preclude the submission of a separate synthesis in the outside literature, but should include as a minimum, a discussion of the results from various aspects of the leg based upon post-cruise science.

It was noted that there have been problems with a few legs, where Co-Chiefs have failed to write a synthesis article. It was agreed that ODP must enforce the policy. It was felt that this is a very important issue, and further discussion was postponed to the SCICOM meeting.

The next three recommendations concern BRG-LDEO and were handled as a group.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-4

SciMP recommends that BRG-LDEO use the TAP tool routinely for the purpose of acquiring acceleration data and testing the efficiency of wireline heave compensation under different cable length and heave conditions. The Co-Chief scientists must be informed at the pre-cruise meeting at TAMU of the potential use of this tool and the additional logging time that may result from the use of the tool. In addition, the Co-Chief scientists must have the option not to run the tool.

Janecek asked Goldberg about the readiness of the tool. Goldberg replied that the tool is ready to be used.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-5

SciMP recommends that BRG-LDEO evaluate the drill string heave compensation as soon as possible after dry dock using MWD technology (weight on bit and Torque measurements):

Baldauf expects integration of these measurements on Leg 186. Hay noted that he expects that TEDCOM will make a similar recommendation.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-6

SciMP recommends that BRG-LDEO begin the evaluation of possible targets for large diameter tool deployments with proponents of active ODP proposals and pursue the acquisition of technological information and costs of these deployments with ODP-TAMU and SEDCO, if the scientific need for the tools is demonstrated.

C. Moore inquired whether these will need a larger diameter drillpipe. Goldberg replied that these are standard industry tools, but they can't be used with narrow pipe. There is a bridging program until large-diameter pipe is available. Tamaki cited the recommendation of the Technical and Operations Workshop regarding the need to move to larger drill pipe (which will become the industry standard). Hay suggested that this is an issue for the future program

Hay asked whether there was a consensus on the 3 BRG-related SciMP recommendations.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-4

OPCOM approved SciMP Recommendations 99-1-4, 99-1-5, and 99-1-6 by consensus.

The next two recommendations concern ODP-TAMU and were handled as a group.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-7

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU continue to provide training for the JANUS paleontology application to scientists prior to sailing on the leg. This training should continue until it can be demonstrated by ODP-TAMU that the paleontologists can easily learn the program on the ship during portcall or transit to the first site.

It was noted that there is currently no manual for the program. Janecek hopes to see the manual ready before next SciMP meeting.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-15

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU develop and maintain a catalogue of the existence and characteristics of legacy holes and other holes potentially capable of being re-entered or equipped with instrumentation packages. This catalogue should be readily accessible to the scientific and engineering community.

It was noted that there are also related issues, such as problems with international jurisdiction, and Law of the Sea. Baldauf remarked that this is a segment of the larger issue of tracking sites through whole system, from proposal stage through drilling and beyond.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-16

SciMP recommends that the van recently acquired by ODP-TAMU be equipped for Leg 185 deep biosphere studies to as full an extent as financially and logistically possible, in consultation with the Deep Biosphere PPG, Leg 185 scientists, SciMP, and other interested parties.

Janecek noted that SciMP was asked to make a recommendation on permanent facilities but postponed this.

Hay asked whether there was consensus on the 3 ODP-TAMU-related recommendations.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-5

OPCOM approved SciMP Recommendations 99-1-7, 99-1-15, and 99-1-16 by consensus.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-8

SciMP recommends that JOI-USSAC support the travel of two US scientists involved in MRC curation to the proposed MRC meeting in the spring of 1999.

Moran noted that this recommendation is inappropriate because it asks only for a particular member country to act. Hay suggests this should be changed to general reference to all countries involved, not mentioning USSAC funds. The reworded recommendation is:

SciMP recommends that the national committees of the countries involved support the travel of scientists involved in MRC curation to the proposed MRC meeting in the spring of 1999.

Hay asked whether there was consensus on the revised recommendation.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-6

OPCOM approved the revision of SciMP Recommendation 99-1-8 by consensus.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-9

SciMP recommends that Michael Knappertsbusch take over as lead curator of the Micropaleontological Research Centers.

Hay asked whether there was consensus on the recommendation.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-7

OPCOM approved SciMP Recommendation 99-1-9 by consensus.

The following recommendations concerning core/log/seismic topics were handled as a group.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-11

SciMP recognizes the importance of maximizing the integration between core, log, and seismic data both on the *JOIDES Resolution* and in post-cruise research. Presently there are limited formal resources available on the *JOIDES Resolution* to integrate these data sets. To this end, SciMP recommends that the Borehole Research Group enable the seismic and sonic software presently installed as part of the GeoFrame system both on the *JOIDES Resolution* and at the Borehole Research Group at Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-12

SciMP recommends that BRG-LDEO should have as their baseline expertise the ability to do time-depth calibration (i.e. to tie depth data [core/log] to time data [seismic]). This capability should include the ability to integrate checkshot data with wireline sonic data and the ability to generate synthetic seismograms at sea.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-13

SciMP recommends site seismic surveys in the vicinity of ODP sites (w/in 2 miles) be released in digital form to the general scientific community via a long-term data archive, within 3 years of drilling. "Digital Form" is considered at this point to be both the raw and the final stacked seismic data in SEG-Y format.

Diebold clarified that the databank is not an open facility now. Moran mentioned the migration of South Atlantic data into a databank, but noted that some of the data that are requested are considered proprietary. Janecek stated that he recognizes that constraints still exist, but SciMP wants to take small steps now if possible. C. Moore recommends slightly different wording (change "stacked" to "processed seismic data").

Reagan noted that there is an agreement with Schlumberger to turn on certain modules of the GEOFRAME software package to enhance processing capabilities. Hodell asked if this will be routinely available. Reagan replied that it would be.

Hay asked whether there was consensus on these three related recommendations.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-8

OPCOM approved SciMP Recommendations 99-1-11, 99-1-12, and 99-1-13 by consensus.

The following four recommendations concerning engineering and tool development were handled as a group.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-14

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU and BRG-LDEO make drilling parameters, including mud flow rate, torque, weight on bit, and penetration rate, available in digital form to the scientific party during the leg.

Skinner noted that drilling information should be part of the archive, and that this data has been neglected for too long. Moran raised the issue of where we make measurements and their cost. The infrastructure is in place but the budget is still a concern. C. Moore asked whether modern drilling shacks have these capabilities as standard incorporation. Janecek reminded OPCOM that the science justification is there. Goldberg stated that preliminary tests have been quite interesting, just from the drill string information obtained at the surface. Hay noted that this information might be the only information available in some cases.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-17

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU continue its working arrangements with the HYACE consortium for development of a pressurized core retrieval system, while continuing with modifications of the extant PCS System. SciMP recognizes the essential importance of such systems for the Gas Hydrate and Deep Biosphere research programs.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-18

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU continue efforts towards finalizing the DVTP as a mature tool according to the Third Party Tool guidelines.

SciMP Recommendation 99-1-19

SciMP recommends that ODP-TAMU continue to maintain and develop the capacity to acquire simultaneous in-situ temperature data and interstitial water samples.

Baldauf said ODP is moving ahead on this, and Fox remarked that this is no longer a third party tool.

Hay asked whether there was consensus on these four related recommendations.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-9

OPCOM approved SciMP Recommendations 99-1-14, 99-1-17, 99-1-18 and 99-1-19 by consensus.

Coffee Break at 10:20-10:40

E.4. TEDCOM

TEDCOM made five recommendations at their 23rd meeting held on 19-20 November 1999 in College Station, TX.

1. TEDCOM recommends to SCICOM that the development programs for the Hard Rock Drilling system and the Hard Rock Re-Entry system (HDS and HRRS) proceed as outlined by ODP-TAMU and, in view of their potential to improve the drilling on Leg 192, that SCICOM give this sufficient priority should any budget review be necessary.

Skinner noted that TEDCOM believes that TAMU is making good progress. Fox gave a brief update on HDS & HRSS.

2. TEDCOM recommends to SCICOM that the development programme for the Advanced Diamond Core Barrel (ADCB) outlined by ODP-TAMU at the 23rd TEDCOM meeting be followed in two respects:
 - a. Offshore tests with the existing DCB to obtain further operational data
 - b. Land testing of the ADCB together with conventional bit designs one of which may be a 'retractable crown type'

TEDCOM does not recommend further expenditure at present on the Retractablebit design or fabrication for ADCB but does recommend (b. above) that a bit crown, of the design envisaged for the retractabit be fabricated as one of the conventional bits for land testing in order to test its coring durability.

Baldauf stated that a sea test of the ADCB would occur on Leg 185 and 186E.

3. TEDCOM recommends to SCICOM that ODP-TAMU be requested to proceed with the procurement of an active heave compensation (AHC) system for control of the Passive Heave Compensator which presently exists on the *JOIDES Resolution* as quickly as possible in order that it can be fitted during the 1999 dry-docking of the vessel.

TEDCOM also recommends that full-time domain simulation studies (Mathcad Simulink) be carried out to best configure the AHC system for the vessel and that passive heave compensator upgrading/servicing be undertaken in conjunction with AHC installation to allow the AHC to perform with best efficiency.

Skinner noted that TEDCOM wished to expressed concern that the program might rely solely on the active heave compensator and neglect fixing or improving the passive heave compensator.

4. TEDCOM recommends to SCICOM that the development program of Measurement While Coring (MWC) outlined by ODP-TAMU at the 23rd TEDCOM Meeting be followed and that TAMU should be instructed by SCICOM to ensure that they make every effort to include knowledge gained from downhole instrumentation and experimentation carried out elsewhere to further this work. In this respect TEDCOM has in mind equipment prepared for the German KTB project, experiments underway with ODP by LDEO, and opportunities which may be available through industry cooperation.

Baldauf noted that ODP is taking a slow approach to MWC so as not to duplicate industry efforts. C. Moore asked what logging tools MWC includes, if any? Goldberg explained that MWC is much simpler than LWD. Skinner pointed out that it is not absolutely necessary to get data in real time, even a time lag of several hours would still allow useful interpretation.

5. TEDCOM recommends to SCICOM that a facility to utilize the Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) be incorporated into the upgrade to the *JOIDES Resolution* Dynamic Positioning System interfaces and displays during the 1999 dry-dock.

Skinner noted that the ship needs a differential GPS navigation system (DGPS) that operates in conjunction with DP. C. Moore wondered if it would require shore stations? Skinner indicated that it would, but a worldwide network of such stations already exists.

Hay asked if there was a consensus for approval of TEDCOM's recommendations, with forwarding to SCICOM.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-10

OPCOM forwards TEDCOM's Recommendations to SCICOM by consensus.

With regard to other matters, Skinner noted that TEDCOM would like to have more members. He emphasized the importance of not reinventing the wheel after industry. He noted that problems exist with ODP/industry incompatibilities, i.e., tools, drill strings, bits. He outlined the responsibilities of TEDCOM and explained the Committee's future meeting strategy.

Tarduno asked if TEDCOM could look into development of hardrock orientation. Skinner said it could be done now but it's time consuming and not reliable. Moran said one-shot orientation can be obtained now for piston cores.

Skinner asked if we can get fracture orientation from logging. Goldberg answered that it could only be done after the fact, and maybe not routinely. Tarduno said he'd like to see a study of whether it could be done routinely on hardrocks. Fox noted that this would constitute a priority issue. Skinner added that retractor bits could provide a means for getting orientation data.

E.5 Discussion of issues – done concurrently with Items E1-E4

11:15

F. Scheduling

F.1 Proposed Scheduling Process

Moran explained that co-chiefs would like to see more flexibility in scheduling, and she outlined a proposed scheduling process that included a 56 day target leg length.

Malfait said that when a leg was shortened, predominantly science time would be lost, and not all that was lost would be gained back by scheduling more legs. How would the timetable look until the end of the program? Are more legs introduced?. What are the costs of port calls? Fox answered that a typical port call costs about \$100,000. (Note: after the meeting Fox revised this estimate upward to 350-379K). Tarduno said that more legs means more science, regardless of length, but T. Moore noted that the proposed plan would result in only one extra leg over the next three years. Hay said that the concept of a fixed leg length absolutely befuddles industry - they believe you should identify a problem and then take however long is required to solve it. He also noted that most proponents try to accomplish the most important goals as early as possible in a leg. Baldauf explained that leg length was initially an operational issue concerning the balance of work between two crews, but we see a willingness now to adapt more flexible scheduling. Hay thought it would be worth the effort to try to adopt flexible scheduling in the time remaining.

Hay asked if there was a consensus for approval of the suggestion to have more flexibility in scheduling. There were no objections.

OPCOM suggests that SCICOM should try to adopt greater more flexibility in scheduling.

OPCOM Consensus 9-1-11

F.2. Multi-Leg Proposals

Tarduno called for a continuing review of two-leg programs. He noted that right now the SSEPs don't demand that proponents make accurate estimates of drilling time, and the SSEPs have no further say on a proposal once they have forwarded it to SCICOM. Tarduno suggested that after obtaining external reviews and before sending proposals to SCICOM we must ask proponents to give specific information on expected leg length.

Baldauf expressed concern that it is not the proponents but ODP staff who must make the accurate estimates of drilling time. He was concerned about how much this would add to the workload on TAMU staff. ODP doesn't have enough resources to do this for every proposal. Most new paleoceanographic proposals require more than 56 days, but these can easily be pared down without losing science. We need to identify in advance which proposals will really need more than one leg. Tarduno wants the onus to rest on proponents, not TAMU, but noted there is no formal way to get consistent answers to these questions. Tamaki agreed with the general idea, but observed that the first test of this would apply to the Nankai legs and we must think about best way to manage it. Hay pointed out that we already have five possible second legs before us and only about fifteen legs yet to schedule. T. Moore said that Nankai represents a special case because it's possible to fail so badly on the first leg that a second leg wouldn't be prudent. Tarduno said we need a contingency plan in case the first leg of a two leg project fails.

Hay noted that the decision to drill Prydz Bay was made when it was already too late to get an ice vessel. It must be made sure that there is sufficient lead time to put complicated legs into operation. The question with regard to Nankai focuses on technology development. Tamaki noted that the SCICOM Motion listed four conditions for approval of a second Nankai leg, one of which was that the proponents attempt to find supplemental funding. Tarduno stated that there is no mechanism for reviewing whether sufficient external funds have been raised to meet goals.

Hay asked if there was a consensus to devise a way of identifying and tracking proposals for more than a single leg. There were no objections.

OPCOM asks SCICOM to devise a way of identifying and tracking proposals for more than a single leg.

OPCOM Consensus 99-1-12

Tarduno and Moore were assigned the task of preparing a draft motion for SCICOM.

F.3 Legs of uneven length

F.3.a Leg 193 (Ontong-Java) request for additional time

Tarduno noted that each of the Ontong-Java sites calls for penetration into basement. The plan fits the history of comments and reviews. Hay said that basically they have changed the priorities, deepened the holes, and cut out much of the logging, so that it is no longer the same plan as originally approved. Baldauf noted that there is time for this to go through SSEPS and be discussed again next August. Reagan expressed concern that the logging cut will hurt the science. Janecek wondered about the accuracy and update of the TAMU time calculation program for certain drilling operations. Baldauf remarked that they could need updating. Reagan saw some overlap in the past between TAMU and LDEO time estimates. Diebold stated that SSP was worried that depth to basement is not well identified at all sites.

Tarduno noted that the SSEPs are out of the loop once a proposal goes to SCICOM. He wondered whether the Ontong-Java sediment package will be logged or just the basement? Tarduno stated that the SSEPS had noted that previous legs on Ontong Java had already logged sediments so that it may not be necessary again. Srivistava expressed concern that there was a lack of velocity information from proponents.

It was decided to await the outcome of future discussions with the proponents/co-chiefs to make a decision on additional time.

Break for Lunch 12:08-13:18

G. Special Issues

G.1. Integrated Sampling and Publications Policy

Hay noted that changes to the policy since January involve mostly implementation issues. Frank Rack has completed JOI input and ODP will post the new policy on the website after final review.

G.2. Leg Syntheses and other Publication Issues

Janecek summarized problems concerning lack of planned synthesis papers for certain legs (SciMP Recommendation 99-1-10). Hay expressed concern about this issue, especially as the current program nears its end and people start to ask what we have accomplished. C. Moore noted that co-chiefs have always had to write synthesis papers as part of the co-chief agreement. Baldauf suggested that co-chiefs might consider the possibility of submitting either an overview paper as a summary or a guide to the science that has and will come out of the leg.

G.3. Leg 192 (Manus Basin) Industry Collaboration

Proponents have been seeking additional funding to support logging on Leg 192. Moran stated that we should not expect much money from the mineral industry. ODP would be lucky to receive \$10K from each of ten companies. She suggested that in response we accept having an industry representative on board. The question of proprietary of industry supported data arose.

It was proposed that we consider two exceptions to normal staffing policy: 1) Industry would choose its representative, and 2) the representative would be exempt from normal data/publication obligation.

C. Moore inquired whether there had been any feedback on this plan from industry? Moran replied that there had been none. Malfait inquired as to whom would task this representative to write a report. Moran replied that that would be an industry responsibility. T. Moore stated that from the industry perspective he didn't know whether one company would trust a report written by a representative of another company. Tamaki inquired how many industry representatives would be on board? Moran replied that there would be one. Claypool stated that it would be important to have a group of companies participating together, and it would be necessary to get a critical initial number so that others would feel compelled to go along. Malfait noted that this would be breaking new ground because proprietary work would be done onboard. Fox inquired how this differs from what is done now? Moran stated that we would allow them to maintain data as proprietary for one year, just as we do now. Malfait asked whether we would provide them only with data from their tool or with all data from the ship? Moran replied that they would have to have access to all shipboard data. T. Moore stated that industry has never been convinced of the benefit of involvement with ODP other than as training exercise for one or two employees. It would be difficult to devise a completely aboveboard scheme for data management because industry will want some advantage for participating. They could make measurements on samples and not report it. This happens now with scientists, but it would be more of a problem with industry academia/cooperation.

Tamaki proposed that we defer this matter to SCICOM for discussion

G.4. Authorization of Meetings

A new proposed policy for authorization of meetings (in the Agenda Book) was explained by Bill Hay. C. Moore remarked that scheduling meetings a year in advance could be a problem for the PPGs. Hay remarked that it can't hurt to try, although obviously we will have to make exceptions

H. Discussion with IPSC Chair

Hay introduced Ted Moore as the new IPSC Chair.

T. Moore outlined a schedule of planning activities for the immediate and near (one year) future. He noted that the naming of the other IPSC members awaits SCICOM discussion. He asked how IPSC can assist JAMSTEC in this next phase of planning. He pointed out that philosophy issues also will arise about how we operate. Many questions remain unanswered and we may have to make some decisions before we can get those answers. It is important to design flexibility into the system in terms of platforms and how they are used. Hay suggested that Skinner and Takagawa consult on what questions IPSC needs to address immediately.

Coffee Break 14:14-14:27

Takagawa gave an update of plans for the riser drill ship and said that the basic design phase is slated for completion by March 2000. For optimal planning of the basic design, JAMSTEC needs to hear recommendations about desired research facilities and capabilities by the end of July 1999.

Moran asked which decisions about ship design come early and which come later. T. Moore noted that the first question probably revolves around how many square meters of lab space are needed. Takagawa noted that the ship dimensions will be decided during the basic design phase. T. Moore noted that airflow heating/cooling is one of the most difficult aspects of design and construction. Hay asked whether the science will be predominantly shipboard or shorebased. Takagawa replied that current plans call for most science to be done on shipboard. Kikawa believes that IPSC must make recommendations regarding equipment. Fox noted that decisions about lab space and personnel greatly affect the cost of building and especially operating the ship. T.

Moore disagreed that even a factor of two difference in lab space wouldn't have a tremendous effect in overall the cost and design of the ship.

Moran queried whether input is required for sampling and core storage requirements? Takagawa responded that yes, it is absolutely necessary.

Malfait inquired whether the ship will be designed for the possibility of a 4000 m riser? Takagawa replied that the ship will have a 1000 m riser at first, this will then be increased to 2500 m by the end of 2004. Requirements for 4000 m riser are presently unknown. Skinner noted that obviously the ship must be designed to accommodate a 4000 m riser; whether or not it ever has one is another matter. He inquired whether the ship will also be used as a commercial facility as initially proposed or only for science. Takagawa replied that the ship will only be used for science.

Srivistava remarked that we must also think about recreation facilities for the crew.

T. Moore outlined the IPSC tasks to be completed by early 2001.

- Establish present status of planning effort
- Define schedule to merit needs of OD21
- Science plan
- Develop strategy for technical and operational issues
- Options for technical and operational capabilities
- Assess financial and managerial requirements
- Advisory structure

Fox inquired when IPSC will define the requirements for the second ship? He noted that this needs to happen sooner rather than later. T. Moore thinks outcome of COMPLEX will help to define what we need for other platforms. We can probably base designs on interest in technology such as active heave, hammer drill, etc. Moore hopes we can build from existing advisory structure. Fox stated that it looks as though nothing is being done as far as alternate platforms.

Feary inquired whether IPSC will rely on the existing advisory groups or form new ones? T. Moore replied that IPSC will need both.

15:00

I. Other Items

Tarduno asked how engineering legs fit into the idea of flexible length drilling legs? Baldauf reported that ODP will probably postpone further testing of the hammer drill.

J. Action Items to SCICOM

Hay will bring SciMP and TEDCOM recommendations to SCICOM.

SCICOM will be asked to discuss the problem of co-chief leg syntheses

SCICOM will be asked to discuss industry financial support for leg activities, but the specifics of Leg 192 will be removed from the discussion.

K. Future Meetings

K.1 August 1999 Santa Cruz

K.2. March 2000 -

C. Moore said Scripps agreed previously to host one of next meetings. Srivistava offers Dalhousie as a site for the August 2000 meeting.

Motion to adjourn, proposed by C. Moore, seconded by Hodell.

Meeting adjourned