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A. Berman, Executive Committee chairman, opened the meeting at 9:10 AM, 30 August 1983.

J. Bowman (UK) welcomed EXCOM members and guests to Swindon and to the National Environment Research Council.

A report on logging for the Advanced Ocean Drilling Program by R. Anderson (LDGO) was added to the agenda items. The amended agenda was unanimously adopted by a motion introduced by R. Heath (OSU) and seconded by J. Bowman.

The minutes of the previous EXCOM meeting at Easton, Maryland (19-20 April 1983) were unanimously adopted by a motion introduced by R. Heath and seconded by H. Durbaum (FRG).

J. Baker, JOI President, reported.

The BOG approved the AODP proposal on 8 July; the proposal was then sent to NSF on 15 July. The drilling ship RFP was delivered to NSF on 29 August. An NSF review panel is expected to convene on 21 September.

A JOI newsletter is being distributed monthly to keep the community aware of progress in the Advanced Ocean Drilling Project.

An award has been made to the University of Hawaii for site survey of the Peru-Chile target area. The closing date for the Bahamas RFP is 30 September.

G. Gross (NSF) reported that activity dealing with ocean drilling at NSF has increased since approval of the ocean drilling budget. Efforts have shifted from Explorer to a leased drilling vessel. Effective 1 October, ocean drilling will become a program in the Ocean Sciences Division, reporting to Division Director. S. Toye (NSF) will head the program.

Budget

S. Toye reported on ocean drilling. Much progress has been made since the April EXCOM meeting. The AODP has received Administration approval, as well as budgetary approval.
Additional funding in the amount of $4.5M has been released for FY 1983. $2.0M will go to DSDP for completion of work (publications, etc.) relating to the current drilling project, and $2.5M for AODP (US site surveys, planning, etc.).

The FY 1984 budget is intact at this time. The NSF appropriation has been signed by the President. Funds will be available in the fall for ship conversion, staffing, shakedown cruise, etc.

We estimate that $29.5M will be available for ocean drilling in FY 1984. Of that amount, $26.3M will be from the US and $3.2M from DARPA and IPOD members.

The FY 1985 NSF budget is under consideration in the Executive Branch, so details are not yet available. The ocean drilling budget for FY 1985, however, is planned at the same (FY 1984) level in both the optimistic and pessimistic budget models. A clear endorsement has been given for full support of the first field year of AODP.

Should an unforeseen financial problem arise, it could be accommodated by a late start in drilling or deferrance of some capital costs. Funding for subsequent years could be a problem, however, if the estimated costs for ship conversion and operation are substantially in error. The actual costs will be known when the responses to the RFP are evaluated.

Other items

NSF will review the JOI Proposal for management of AODP on 21 September. IPOD members have been invited to nominate reviewers.

DSDP is proceeding normally during the final legs. Some functions are phasing down whereas some (publications, etc.) will continue at the normal level. $0.75M recovered from Explorer contracts is being made available to the ongoing drilling program.

DARPA will reimburse NSF for the Tonga Trench leg; the funds will be available to DSDP for FY 1984 Challenger expenses.

International

Canada and the Foundation have agreed on the final language of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) leading to candidate membership in AODP.

Brazil has expressed increased interest in joining AODP. The "Interagency Council" which oversees ocean science in Brazil is considering creation of a committee to explore Brazilian membership in AODP.

NSF Personnel

A. McLerran, the NSF representative at DSDP, will retire at the end of September.

S. Toye will be in charge of the ocean drilling program.
A. Sutherland at NSF will be in charge of engineering/operations relating to AODP.

H. Zimmerman will be Program Associate for Science Coordination. He will represent NSF at the Planning Committee and JOIDES panel meetings beginning 1 September 1983.

Discussion:

A. Berman (RSMAS) - Is the ocean drilling program budgeted on a 5 year basis? S. Toye - NSF considers the budget on a 10 year basis for planning purposes, but the actual budget remains on a year to year schedule.

H. Durbaum (FRG) - When will we know how many responses to the RFP have been received? W. Merrell (TAMU) - The number of bidders will be known 8 November, closing date for replies.

A. Berman - What action will be taken if the bids are considered too high? S. Toye - It is not critical if the bids for conversion are higher than expected, as that is a one-time cost. A problem could arise if the operational costs are significantly higher than expected; a 10% increase over anticipated operational costs could probably be accommodated, but a 20% increase would pose a problem.

W. Merrell - An independent firm has been contracted to provide a cost estimate for the RFP so we will soon known what the bids should be. This information will also be used in negotiations with the bidders.

A. Berman - Future operations costs relate to how the ship is designed and built. Has this been considered? S. Toye - The operations costs are based on the class of ship - each class has specific manpower requirements. We are not planning any conversion which would alter the size of marine or drilling crew.

C. Helsley (U. Hawaii) - Future costs will be determined primarily by market conditions; it is more a profit cost than an operational cost.

M. Keen (Canada) - The bids will cover the first two years - what about later? S. Toye - The bid will be for 5 years as a "5 yr. initial charter" with a fixed escalation clause, followed by six one-year options.

S. Toye - The planning figure for vessel costs is $23.0M and $7.3M for joint science costs. The drilling program has a $30.3M base figure, not including the US science program. Thus the drilling program is not directly financially dependent on international participation. In reality, however, political and scientific considerations require that international participation be part of the program; it is doubtful if the US alone would support the program.
It is anticipated that the DSDP budget for this year will end in the black. The project plan was submitted to NSF in July, then resubmitted after consultation with NSF for a basic project cost of $6.7M in FY 1984. This is a phase-down budget with the number of DSDP personnel reduced from 100 to 57.55 persons. Some added functions would require an additional 10 persons at the end of the year. Engineering, operations and logistics will be totally phased out at the end of the year; science services and project management will continue. Approximately 36 months will be required for publication of the outstanding Initial Reports. The add-on functions mentioned earlier include: core maintenance; increasing the publication rate of the Initial Reports; data handling and increased computer input; compilation of a shipboard techniques handbook; and compilation of a comprehensive index of the Initial Reports.

**DSDP Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase-down budget - $6.7M</td>
<td>$235K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$7-10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$300K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index (Initial Reports)</td>
<td>$38K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Photography</td>
<td>$580K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total budget for next year - $7.292M. (The chief scientist will present this budget to the Planning Committee for comment.)

**Leg 95 (Northeast Atlantic Paleoenvironment)**

The glacially sensitive area off Newfoundland was successfully cored. The HPC (hydraulic piston core) gave a very high rate of recovery; about 3400 m of core were recovered. The advanced HPC was a success but it did fail on a run following a 100,000 lb. pull-out. The failure could have been related to the strain experienced on the pull-out, or to the bumper sub assembly.

**Leg 95 (ENA-3)**

Drilling will proceed quickly (without core recovery) in the section previously drilled. A new type of "diamond drag bit" is being used and will be evaluated. A ship belonging to Shell Offshore Incorporated (SOI) is also drilling in the same area. Scripps (SIO) expects some confusion in the press regarding drilling.

The wire-line reentry is ready for testing, but so far a test has not been scheduled.

**Demobilization**

The Challenger will be demobilized in the Galveston area. A shipyard has not yet been selected. Twelve days will be required to strip the vessel before delivery to Global Marine. DSDP and TAMU are currently deciding on equipment now aboard Challenger to be transferred to the new AODP vessel.

**Discussion:**

W. Nierenberg (SIO) - What caused the failure of the bumper sub assembly (Leg 95)? M. Peterson - Failure was possibly due to fatigue which means Global Marine may be responsible.
C. Helsley - What is the impact of the loss on the remaining drill string?

M. Peterson - We are a few thousand feet short of the Global Marine requirement. The difference may have to be made up in cash or equipment. The signal processing unit of the dynamic positioning system (US Government property) will be left aboard the Challenger; the value of this and other equipment will be determined during negotiations with Global Marine.

C. Helsley - A few comments on the success of a University of Hawaii downhole seismometer experiment. The downhole 3-component seismometer results covered 42 days in the North Pacific. The recorder was retrieved in June; the instrument package is still emplaced in the borehole. While attached to the wireline during equipment retrieval, the Hokaido earthquake was recorded. The recorder was reloaded and placed in the borehole for pick up next spring.

M. Peterson - A statement has been released to the press concerning Leg 91. It is the first long term borehole seismometer experiment.

250 PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Honnorez, PCOM chairman, reported.

Science Advisory Structure

J. Honnorez presented a diagram (Fig. 1) of the proposed JOIDES organization and Science Advisory Structure. He noted that the structure incorporated changes suggested by the Executive Committee at their 19-20 April 1983 in Easton, Maryland. The number of thematic panels, for example, has been reduced from five to three. Five regional panels with overlapping geographic boundaries are part of the new structure (Fig. 2).

Most of the Planning Committee members met as several ad hoc groups during the field trip after the 1-3 June 1983 PCOM meeting in Morpeth, England to compile a list of potential panel chairmen and members. The planning Committee expects to designate panel chairmen and most panel members at the September PCOM meeting in Seattle, Washington. Funds are available for phasing in the new advisory structure, and to support the existing structure until DSDP matters are completed.

The Planning Committee requests that the Executive Committee define PCOM terms of membership. (Other PCOM matters were discussed later as separate agenda items.)

Discussion (PCOM membership)

W. Nierenberg - Planning Committee members serve at the pleasure of the Executive Committee or the Institutions they represent.

C. Helsley - PCOM terms of membership are defined in Annex A (Terms of Reference for JOIDES Executive Committee for IPOD) which was appended to the 6-8 October 1982 minutes of the PCOM meeting at Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory: "(The PCOM) shall be composed of one member designated by each member of the Executive Committee."
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Figure 2. Regional Panel Areas
W. Nierenberg - A problem with PCOM membership is that the scope of scientific expertise represented is often unbalanced.

The Executive Committee discussed at length the problem of ensuring a scientifically balanced Planning Committee. A consensus was not reached, but the following points were made concerning PCOM representation:

- US PCOM representatives are selected by some institutions for their ability to represent science, and by other institutions for their ability to represent institutions, or for their ability to represent both the institution and science. (Most EXCOM members felt that PCOM members should represent science.)

- Non-US representatives usually represent the entire country and/or several institutions.

- The burden of ensuring scientific balance should fall on US members, as more scientists are available for selection.

- Rotation of members is desirable and should be enforced by US institutions. Frequency of rotation of non-US members would depend on the size of the scientific community available in each member country.

A. Berman, EXCOM chairman, appointed the following subcommittee to make recommendations concerning PCOM membership: B. Biju-Duval
C. Helsley
R. Heath

A draft statement of PCOM membership resulted and after discussion and modification, was introduced as a motion.

Motion introduced by J. Baker, seconded by N. Nasu,

Move that the draft PCOM membership statement be submitted to the Planning Committee for comments and suggestions for implementation:

"Draft – Membership of JOIDES Planning Committee
Committee Advanced Ocean Drilling Program

Each member of the Executive Committee shall designate one member of the Planning Committee and an alternate to serve in the absence of the designated member. Commencing January 1, 1984, one quarter of the Planning Committee members shall rotate off the Committee annually, so that its membership is replaced every four years. Reappointment shall be made only in exceptional circumstances. All appointees to the Planning Committee shall satisfy the fundamental criteria of having the ability and commitment to provide mature and expert scientific direction to the program. Balance of fields of specialization on the Planning Committee shall be maintained, as far as possible, by informed consultation amongst the U.S. member institutions prior to selection of their appointees. The chief scientists of the science operations and wireline logging contractors and an appointee of the NSF are non-voting, liaison observers.

VOTE: 13 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain."
Discussion (Science Advisory Structure)

R. Anderson (LDGO) - It is not clear how logging fits into the Technology and Engineering Development Committee. Logging must have the technical advice of the petroleum industry. A separate logging development committee may be required.

T. Mayer - Will the AODP and DSDP advisory structures overlap? J. Honnorez - Yes. JOI has sufficient funds to maintain both structures for a limited time to ensure completion of the DSDP and continuity during the phasing in of AODP.

S. Toye - How many present panel members will be incorporated into the new advisory structure? J. Honnorez - Approximately 50% of the membership will not change.

B. Biju-Duval - How many scientists will be required to staff the regional panels? J. Honnorez - The panel size has not yet been determined. It may be difficult for non-US members to provide representatives for five regional panels.

J. Bowman (UK) - The United Kingdom would prefer to suggest members for the various advisory panels (as opposed to the members being suggested by the existing Planning Committee). J. Honnorez - Each non-US PCOM representative was requested at the last meeting to confer with his national committee to provide a list of names for consideration at the September meeting in Seattle.

R. Heath (OSU) - Does the Technology and Engineering Development Committee also recommend drilling targets? J. Honnorez - No, it does not; it is purely a technological committee.

C. Helsley - Regional Panels are responsible for too large an area. The original idea for having regional panels was to ensure that important regional targets were considered even if they were not mentioned in a proposal. J. Honnorez - This was considered by PCOM but it was felt that too many regional panels would be required and hence, communications would become difficult or impossible. Regional targets will get consideration through various sub-groups which will meet to discuss more specific (smaller) regions.

R. Anderson - What is the frequency of meetings of panels in the new advisory structure? J. Honnorez - About the same as in the DSDP structure.

Continued discussion revealed no major faults with the proposed AODP advisory structure. The following motion was introduced by C. Helsley and seconded by R. Heath:

The Executive Committee accepts and approves in concept the science advisory structure presented by PCOM and illustrated in Figure 1.

VOTE: 12 yes; 0 no; 1 abstain.

Core Repository

J. Honnorez requested that the Executive Committee consider PCOM recommended actions dealing with core curation. (The following six PCOM recommendations appear on page 78 of the June 1983 issue of the JOIDES Journal.)
PCOM recommendations:

1. The existing sample distribution policy should be adopted without substantial change.

2. One core curator should be in charge, regardless of the number of repositories.

3. One core repository having a convenient location should house all existing and future cores.

4. Initial Core Descriptions should be reinstated.

5. HPC cores should be routinely x-radiographed and videotaped.

6. Sample distribution should be accomplished within 2 months of receipt of request.

Discussion:

R. Heath - Problems with core curation have surfaced in the past. A consensus appears to be that a) the core curator should be at the science operator institution; b) the post-cruise meeting for each leg should be at the science operator institution; and c) the post-cruise meeting is the time at which the cores are revisited by the scientific party to clear up any outstanding problems - after that meeting, the actual location of the cores is less important.

Regarding core curation for AODP, JOI received offers from five institutions; four would provide core storage facilities at no cost, and one institution would ask NSF to cover costs.

R. Anderson - In reference to PCOM recommendation #3 (number of core repositories), the existing system functions very well. The repository at LDGO has had 60 visitors vs. mail requests for about 130,000 samples.

J.-G. Schilling (URI) - One repository is more efficient and more cost effective.

N. Nasu (Japan) - (PCOM recommendation #4) The Initial Core Descriptions (ICD) are being used more and more, and the demand for ICDs will increase in the future. The former ICD style is the most convenient. ICDs should be reinstated. M. Peterson - The cost to reinstate ICDs is only about $17,000/yr.

Consensus: Reinstall the Initial Core Descriptions.

R. Anderson - (PCOM recommendation #5) What is being done now with x-ray and videotape? M. Peterson - At present only color and black/white photography are being used.

K. Bostrom (Sweden) - X-ray is especially important for hydraulic piston cores.

M. Keen (Canada) - An x-ray monitor could be used to examine cores in real time and make decisions whether x-ray documentation is required.
J. Honnorez - Recommendation #6 is due to a shortage of personnel at DSDP as a result of budgetary restrictions. (A lack of funds also exists at SIO to curate and maintain the core collection.) Special sample requests require NSF approval.

S. Toye - Special sample requests are acted upon within a few days after NSF is notified.

J. Honnorez - The PCOM resolution should be viewed by EXCOM as a message concerning how core curation could be improved in the drilling program.

J. Steele (WHOI) - EXCOM agrees in principle with points 1, 4, 5 and 6 and should let PCOM work out the details of implementation. Point 2 has general support that the core curator should be at the science operator institution and, hence, there should be only one core curator. Point 3 requires no action, as the present arrangement with JOI appears satisfactory.

J.-G. Schilling - Core curation and related functions are among the first to be cut when financial difficulties are experienced. The message from PCOM to both NSF and the science operator is that these are important functions.

A. Berman - It is likely that budget problems will continue to exist. EXCOM must consider the implications if it is willing to say that core curation should be immune from cuts.

(Discussion continued without reaching a consensus regarding the PCOM recommendations. The EXCOM then followed the recommendation of R. Heath that each item to be voted upon separately.)

Motion introduced by R. Heath, seconded by J. Steele.

Recommendation #1 be adopted by the EXCOM.

VOTE: 13 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain.

Motion to adopt item 2 introduced by J. Steele, seconded by J. Bowman, and amended by J. Baker to read:

One core curator should be in charge, regardless of the number of repositories, and the core curator is to be located at the science operator institution.

VOTE: 7 yes; 3 no; 3 abstain. (Motion not adopted.)

Motion introduced by R. Heath, seconded by J.-G. Schilling.

Recommendation #3 be adopted by the EXCOM. (Note: this motion was not adopted - see vote.

Discussion:

C. Helsley - Having more than one core repository appears to function well. It would be a mistake to change the existing situation.
VOTE: 1 yes; 10 no; 2 abstain. (Motion not adopted.)

Motion to adopt recommendation #4 introduced by J. Baker, seconded by W. Merrell and modified by C. Helsley to read:

Initial Core Descriptions should be reinstated in published form.

VOTE: 13 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain.

Motion introduced by C. Helsley and seconded by R. Heath.

Item #5 is referred back to the Planning Committee for reconsideration.

VOTE: 11 yes; 0 no; 2 abstain.

Motion introduced by J. Steele and seconded by W. Merrell.

It is desirable that routine sample distribution should be accomplished within 2 months of receipt of request.

Discussion:

C. Helsley - The motion is not needed as the item is covered in present policy.

W. Nierenberg - The motion should be amended by deleting the word "routine" (amendment accepted by the proposers).

Amended motion:

It is desirable that sample distribution should be accomplished within 2 months of receipt of request.

VOTE: 11 yes; 1 no; 1 abstain.

Motion introduced by R. Anderson and seconded by H. Durbaum (Item #2 as originally adopted by PCOM, without the EXCOM amendment).

One core curator should be in charge, regardless of the number of repositories.

VOTE: 6 for; 2 no; 5 abstain. (Motion not adopted.)

Summary:

The Executive Committee adopted the following modified PCOM recommendations:

1. The existing sample distribution policy is adopted without substantial change.

4. Initial Core Descriptions should be reinstated in the published form.

6. It is desirable that sample distribution should be accomplished within 2 months of receipt of request.
PCOM recommendations 2, 3 and 5 were not adopted by the Executive Committee.

251 MEMBER COUNTRY REPORTS

France (B. Biju-Duval reported.)

Not much to report since the April EXCOM meeting. The final phase of IPOD is underway in France and the annual meeting to discuss IPOD results has been scheduled and will be held in Brest. The science community in France is pleased that the new drilling program appears to be well underway. A committee has been asked to review and coordinate science for the new ocean drilling program (proposals, site surveys, etc.). Part of the 1984-85 ocean science activity in France will be related to the AODP. The R/V Jean Charcot, for example, will circumnavigate the globe and may survey target areas.

A problem in France is membership in AODP. The problem is not with the science or with 1984 funding; the problem is with possible funding difficulties beyond 1984 (FY=January). These issues are now under consideration. Membership will first be considered by the French IPOD committee next week; then examined by a separate committee; then by the CNEXO scientific committee. A final decision will come after recommendations by the various committees; until that time, membership is not assured. Other internal expenses relating to AODP (geophysics, shore-based laboratory studies, additional equipment, etc.) will also be considered before a final decision is reached.

Germany (H. Durbaum reported.)

Germany is optimistic that it will join the AODP. Minor issues to be resolved before signing the MOU were discussed at a meeting in Bonn last week. The various interest groups (funding agencies, research societies, Ministry of Research and Technology, etc.) all endorsed membership in AODP.

Last month geological and geophysical studies were carried out in the South China Sea area. These studies have led K. Hinz and others to reconsider accepted ideas about subduction. A potential problem is the availability of survey ships. Meteor may be removed from service. A decrease in the use of vessels by industry will result in higher costs to be born by government agencies.

United Kingdom (J. Bowman reported.)

The AODP ship bidders meeting was attended by a UK representative. An IPOD meeting has not been held in the UK since prior to the April EXCOM meeting. It is expected that activity will soon increase in both science and funding considerations. As a rule science funds are protected in the UK, but some difficulty is expected. The UK is reasonably optimistic that it will join the AODP. It is hoped that the MOU will be signed within a few days.

Japan (N. Nasu reported.)

Not much has changed since the April EXCOM meeting. The Japanese IPOD committee hopes to continue as part of AODP. Japan is optimistic but a final decision
by the Japanese Government has not yet been made.

DSDP results have received much publicity in Japan. The widely circulated and respected journal Kagaku (Science) recently devoted a special issue to DSDP results. Other government agencies are made aware of the scientific achievements and importance of ocean drilling through such publicity.

Observer reports:

European Science Foundation (B. Munsch reported.)

Membership in AODP was put before the ESF Executive Council at the end of June. The Council unanimously agreed to proceed toward eventual membership. After an initial survey of ESF members, each country was asked for a formal declaration of interest. A deadline of 20 September was set for receipt of the statements of interest. The Executive Council will meet again that same week. A final decision is expected by 10 December.

Possible member countries include:

- Sweden
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Switzerland (Parliament unlikely to agree to AODP membership)
- Italy (no response)
- Denmark (uncertain interest)
- Belgium (uncertain interest)
- Finland (uncertain interest)

Discussion:

S. Toye (NSF) - What has been the response to the request for a formal statement of interest? B. Munsch - Only the Irish Research Council has replied to date (negative reply).

Sweden (K. Bostrom reported.)

Interest in AODP is increasing among Swedish scientists. Interest in Norway appears to be at about the same level as before. The response from Finland has been low and generally not positive. Denmark is showing some interest and is considering sending an observer to JOIDES meetings.

Netherlands (J. Stel reported.)

Discussion in the Netherlands about AODP and potential membership have increased since the April EXCOM meeting. There is an interest to join AODP, but a decision would be influenced by the level of interest among other non-US countries.

Involvement through ESF needs more definition of the role of the smaller European countries.
Discussion:

S. Toye (NSF) - The Foundation wishes to clarify that the AODP is an international program. Although the US can fund the initial phase of AODP, the continuation of AODP is dependent on non-US participation.

Canada (M. Keen reported.)

An application to spend existing money for candidate membership is pending with the Treasury Board of the Canadian Government. If and when that is received and MOU will be signed. I am hopeful that will happen within a few weeks.

A Canadian Planning Committee is in existence and beginning to function. It will produce an "Australia" type planning document. A sub-set has just produced a draft proposal for the Labrador Sea which will go via Charlotte Keen to the Passive Margin Panel this week. A lot of work is in progress off the west coast which could lead to a proposal.

Mel Peterson (DSDP) and Yves Lancelot (DSDP) hosted David Strong and Chris Barnes (Memorial University) and M.J. Keen on Challenger in St. John's, Newfoundland. This was useful because D. Strong is a member of the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (the equivalent of the US NSF) and C. Barnes is interested in seeing a Canadian AODP headquarters at Memorial University.

It is worth pointing out that our Dr. Hutchison spoke generally about a consortium with both Australia and the European Science Foundation.

New Zealand (F. Davies reported.)

Attempts to involve New Zealand in the Advanced Ocean Drilling Project were turned down by the New Zealand Cabinet. It is unlikely that membership will be reconsidered until a general improvement in the economy occurs. Reconsideration may not occur for 4 or 5 years. New Zealand hopes to continue to be involved in the ocean drilling project through its individual scientists. New Zealand thanks the Executive Committee for its invitation to participate as an observer.

252 AODP MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

J. Baker, JOI President, reported.

The JOI management proposal was distributed to all EXCOM members. It was sent to NSF on 15 July, and some comments from NSF have been received. During the past 2 months the major activity has dealt with drilling vessel RFP. It was delivered to NSF this week (29 August).

253 AODP SCIENCE OPERATOR REPORT

Texas A & M University

W. Merrell, AODP Principal Investigator, reported.
The drilling vessel RFP was assembled by TAMU in consultation with Doty Associates, a private firm.

The request covers 10 years, a 1 year startup and 9 years of drilling.

The scientific and technical requirements were based on many sources including various JOIDES and JOI reports, and input from JOIDES via the PCOM chairman. The RFP schedule is:

- 7 September: Mail RFP
- 29 September: Bidders Conference at Houston
- 8 November: Bids Due

The RFP states the different weight levels for criteria of acceptance. The RFP has also been advertised in the Commerce Business Daily, Wall street Journal, trade journals, etc. The time required for the selection process will depend on the number of bids received.

L. Garrison, JOIDES Safety Panel chairman, has been appointed Deputy Project Director for AODP at TAMU.

The AODP building at TAMU will have 36,000 sq.ft. of assignable space. An actual building plan will be available within a few months. (An information sheet was distributed and is included as Appendix A.)

J. Honnorez, JOIDES PCOM chairman, has been asked to convene an Information Handling Panel meeting so that the required space can be planned for.

U. Texas facilities at Galveston have been made available to DSDP for Challenger demobilization.

Figure 3 indicates the project organization at TAMU.

Discussion:

S. Toye - Was a pre-RFP conference held? W. Merrell - A conference was held at the Houston airport and was attended by 7 or 8 potential bidders.

H. Durbaum - Was the conference attended by non-US bidders? W. Merrell - The UK, France and the Netherlands were represented.

A. Berman - What is the anticipated staff size? W. Merrell - The proposed staff size is 110.

25% AODP LOGGING PROPOSAL - LDGO

R. Anderson reported.

LDGO has formed an Institute of Borehole Geophysics with R. Anderson as head.
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As recommended by PCOM, standard tools will be operated by a commercial logging firm. Schlumberger has been selected because of numerous benefits to the project. Schlumberger has a huge research budget and is the leader in advanced logging technology. The same standard tools used on Challenger will be employed on the new ship. A difference between DSDP and AODP is that a logging engineer will be on permanent assignment to LDGO.

The Schlumberger contract price is non-negotiable. The cost is $1.183M/yr. with the price tied to their Africa scale costs and recalculated on 31 December.

Specialized tools planned for AODP include:

- borehole televiewer (almost operational at this time) with digital image enhancement.

- 12 channel sonic logging tool for small refraction experiments.

A shipboard logging computer will give real-time analyses. Scientists will be able to visit the LDGO analysis center for further logging studies.

It is felt that AODP should eventually operate its own standard logging tools. The EXCOM should set up a logging advisory panel so that AODP can keep up with the latest logging technology available in Germany and in numerous oil companies (ARCO, EXXON, Shell, etc.).

Discussion:

M. Peterson (DSDP) - Will the Challenger shipboard computer be used? R. Anderson - No. A $80K dedicated minicomputer will be used.

N. Nasu (Japan) - The Challenger produces good logging data only if the seas are calm. Will this situation be improved? R. Anderson - Yes. We plan to tie the logging cable directly to the heave compensator.

J. Steele (WHOI) - Discussions at JOI revealed a need to separate routine logging from downhole measurements work, that is to separate routine work from development work. WHOI has a proposal with JOI to coordinate and supervise the development of downhole measurements for the US community.

M. Peterson - There may be a problem with liability for loss of logging tools; the science operator and logging contractor may share joint responsibility.

R. Anderson - JOI has set up an Interface Working Group to examine this problem. TAMU will insure the tools as part of the insurance package.

H. Durbaum - How are new tools incorporated into the program; e.g. a 3-D magnetometer is available in Germany? R. Anderson - The proposed logging panel would consider new tools.

J. Honnorez - The logging panel could be a panel by itself or a subgroup of the new Technology and Engineering Development Committee.
Consensus:

Logging differs from the concerns of the Downhole Measurements Panel. A logging panel should be part of the advisory structure. The Planning Committee should determine the status of the logging panel.

The panel would consist of geologically competent and technologically expert people capable of advising the AODP wireline services contractor regarding future program plans and existing technological problems. The group should be drawn from all facets of the worldwide logging industry (e.g. mining, petroleum, geothermal, etc.).

Motion introduced by R. Anderson and seconded by R. Heath.

The JOIDES Executive Committee authorizes the Planning Committee to reinstate the Logging Advisory Panel as a component of the AODP advisory structure.

VOTE: 13 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain.

255 AODP DRILLING SCHEDULE - 1ST YEAR

J. Honnorez presented the first year proposed drilling plan formulated by the Planning Committee (Table 1).

The October 1984 start date requires that the initial targets are selected now, so that preliminary work (site survey, safety, etc.) can be completed in time for drilling. The plan starts from the east coast of the US.

The Gulf of Mexico target does not yet have a formal proposal because Leg 96 results are not yet available.

The Bahamas has been considered under the DSDP program. A site survey RFP has already been issued.

The Mid Atlantic Ridge site is technically difficult and the science operator is therefore under some pressure to develop the technology for bare rock drilling.

Discussion:

J. Bowman - In view of the Weddell Sea as a target, what is the status of vessel ice capability.

W. Merrell (TAMU) - Ice strengthening applies to vessels in transit. Ice capability remains a technical problem.

J. Bowman - The UK plans to have the Discoverer in the area during the Austral summer of 1984/85.
Table 1

**PROPOSED FIRST YEAR DRILLING** and
**SHIPTRACK 1984–1987**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Mediterranean Sea (or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equa. Fracture Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>NW Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Barbados (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Costa Rica/Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>/Columbia (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Mid Atl. Ridge (T+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Hole 504B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Labrador Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Peru Trench (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Norwegian Sea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Chile (triple junction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Weddell Sea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: First 6 legs are definite. First 18 months require consideration.
C. Helsley - What percentage of drilling time is available for purely regional targets? J. Honnorez - Regional targets may be included as the legs are not yet finalized.

A. Berman - Does a contingency plan exist in case of time readjustments? J. Honnorez - Yes. The plan will accommodate slippage.

Motion introduced by J.-G. Schilling and seconded by R. Anderson.

The Executive Committee endorses the 1st year AODP drilling plan of PCOM shown in Table 1.

VOTE: 13 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain.

256 EXCOM TERMS OF REFERENCE

J. Clotworthy (JOI) reminded the Executive Committee that the EXCOM Terms of Reference were sent to each member as part of the meeting package (included here as Appendix B). He then distributed a revision of Annex B (included here as Appendix C).

Discussion revealed that additional changes to Annex B may be required. EXCOM requested that J. Clotworthy reexamine the document and make any required changes. **ACTION**

J. Clotworthy also distributed a list of errata for the JOI AODP Management Proposal submitted to NSF (Appendix D).

257 FLOW OF AODP PROPOSALS

J. Honnorez presented the schematic flow chart (Fig. 4) for consideration by the Executive Committee.

Consensus:

Figure 4 is somewhat confusing. It is important that the procedure for submitting drilling proposals be made widely known to the scientific community.

J. Honnorez should compose a statement explaining the proposal and planning process, and solicit input from the community. The notice should be published in EOS and Geotimes. ***ACTION***

Members of the Executive Committee will try to have the notice published in their respective countries or institutional newsletters.
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258 JOIDES DSDP PANEL RECORDS

J. Honnorez requested that the Executive Committee decide on the fate of records belong to JOIDES panels.

Discussion:

J. Steele - The records should be maintained, as they may be needed as documentation for unforeseen legal problems.

R. Anderson - LDGO would benefit from having the original DSDP logging data.

M. Peterson - Space is probably available at SIO to warehouse all the documents.

R. Berman appointed J. Clotworthy (JOI), M. Peterson (DSDP/SIO) and J. Honnorez (PCOM chairman) to determine a policy for the records and to report their recommendations to the Executive Committee at the next meeting. ***ACTION***

259 BRAZIL - POTENTIAL AODP MEMBER

A. Berman informed the EXCOM that NSF requires some guidance in pursuing Brazilian interest in becoming an Ocean Drilling Program member. The requirements for membership are stated in Annex A:

"The members of this (Executive) committee shall be representatives of oceanographic and marine research institutions or other organization which have a major interest in the study of the sea floor and an adequate capability in terms of scientific manpower and facilities to carry out such studies."

Consensus:

Brazil qualifies as a potential member of the AODP. NSF is reminded that membership is limited to civilian (non-military) organizations.

260 FUTURE MEETINGS

9-10 November at Texas A & M University.
6-7 March 1984 in Washington, DC
19-21 June 1984 in France (includes 1 day for JOI-BOG meeting)
16-18 October 1984 at the University of Rhode Island

261 OTHER BUSINESS

The Executive Committee thanked the UK hosts and NERC for the excellent meeting facilities and interesting tours to the surrounding area.

A. Berman adjourned the meeting.
A. GENERAL

In March, 1983, the JOI Board of Governors selected Texas A&M University to be the Science Operator for Advanced Ocean Drilling Program (AODP). The drilling program will be headquartered on the campus of TAMU, and the university has agreed to build the headquarters facility.

The AODP will have a rather wide range of administrative, scientific and operations responsibilities, and will require a staff of 100 to 130 scientific, technical and support personnel. The space needs can be summarized as follows:

1. Refrigerated core storage and curatorial facilities
2. Office space
3. Laboratories and shops to support scientific, operational and logistical activities
4. Data bank and archive facilities
5. Conference rooms and other facilities, and space for visiting scientists.

Because AODP operations at sea will begin in the Fall of 1984, the headquarters facility must be constructed as soon as possible.

B. PHYSICAL FACILITIES

To meet its responsibilities as Science Operator for the AODP, the project will require a facility including approximately 35500 sq. ft. of assignable area and about 9000 sq. ft. of covered, exterior storage and staging area.

Much of this space will be dedicated to the storage and maintenance of cores; a freezer, refrigerated repositories and curatorial complex will occupy 11100 sq. ft. An interior shipping and receiving facility of about 1100 sq. ft. will be needed to support logistical aspects of the program (moving equipment and supplies to and from the ship) and approximately 1000 sq. ft. of shop space will be required to support engineering and scientific operations.

In the course of the project, it will also be necessary to handle or store numerous large items, such as drill pipe and cases of 10-meter core liner. A covered, exterior, staging area of 8000 to 10000 sq. ft. equipped with a suitable crane, should be located adjacent to the repository and warehouse.

The technical and professional (scientific and engineering) staff of the project will number 100 or more. Thus, the greatest space need will be for offices and other working spaces; 14500 sq. ft. of individual offices and an 1100 sq. ft. drafting and illustration area will be needed.
Because the drilling program represents an international effort, scientists from U.S. and overseas institutions will visit the facility for Advisory Panel meetings, pre-cruise and post-cruise meetings, etc. 100 meetings per year may be anticipated, and many will convene simultaneously. Further, individual scientists will visit the project repository frequently to study or sample the cores. Consequently, space for visitors must be provided, including two conference rooms (which will also serve the project staff) and four visitor's offices, which will also serve as small conference rooms.

The scientific, engineering, and planning aspects of the program will require a good technical reference collection and computer support. The reference collection is also needed for visiting scientists, and the computer will be required for the data bank, which the Science Operator is obligated to maintain. A reference room and computer laboratory are therefore included.

Other support facilities are a photographic laboratory, two core analysis laboratories, an electronics shop, a communications center, and a document storage room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rm. No.</th>
<th>Summary of Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>Core Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1a</td>
<td>Refriger. Storage 2 @ 4000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1b</td>
<td>Freezer 1 @ 720 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1c</td>
<td>100% Humidity Room 1 @ 80 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 8,800 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3</td>
<td>Science 1 @ 1000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3c</td>
<td>Curatorial 1 @ 780 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling 1 @ 150 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2,080 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-5</td>
<td>Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-6</td>
<td>Carpentry 1 @ 500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-7</td>
<td>Machine 1 @ 500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument 1 @ 200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1,200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4</td>
<td>Warehouse 1 @ 900 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 900 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3a</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4a</td>
<td>Curatorial 1 @ 150 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipping 1 @ 200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 350 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3b</td>
<td>Other Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curatorial File Room 1 @ 150 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 150 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Floor Total Assignable Area 13,480 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY OF AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST FLOOR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rm. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Exhibits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Staff</td>
<td>35 @ 150 SF</td>
<td>1-1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 @ 150 SF</td>
<td>1-1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 @ 120 SF</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 @ 130 SF</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4 @ 195 SF</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 @ 235 SF</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>4 @ 157 SF</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>1 @ 325 SF</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 @ 140 SF</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14,573 SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1 @ 1000 SF</td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>1 @ 225 SF</td>
<td>1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkroom</td>
<td>1 @ 180 SF</td>
<td>1-17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>1 @ 210 SF</td>
<td>1-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,615 SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Room</td>
<td>1 @ 380 SF</td>
<td>1-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td>1 @ 500 SF</td>
<td>1-16a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Storage</td>
<td>1 @ 380 SF</td>
<td>1-16b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,260 SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg. Conference</td>
<td>1 @ 600 SF</td>
<td>1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. Conference</td>
<td>1 @ 400 SF</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>1 @ 520 SF</td>
<td>1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>1 @ 450 SF</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration</td>
<td>1 @ 1100 SF</td>
<td>1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>1 @ 1250 SF</td>
<td>1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1 @ 265 SF</td>
<td>1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4,585 SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST FLOOR TOTAL ASSIGNABLE AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,033 SF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 22, 1983

TO: JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

FROM: John H. Clotworthy

SUBJECT: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE JOIDES PLANNING AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

At the last meeting of the PCOM (June 1-3, 1983, Morpeth, England) I was asked to prepare draft language for the Planning Committee's Terms of Reference - Section 3.4, Membership.

I propose the following language for your consideration and note especially that only the first sentence is mine; the remainder of the paragraph is the same as that embodied in the June '83 revision of the draft Terms of Reference:

3.4 Membership

Planning Committee members will be designated by the Executive Committee. All appointees of the Planning Committee shall satisfy the fundamental criterion of having the ability to provide mature and expert scientific direction to the program. Appointees must satisfy the additional requirement of being able to speak for their parent bodies in the formulation of scientific plans. The chief scientist of the science operations contractor and an appointee of the NSF are non-voting, liaison members of the committee. Alternates to the Planning Committee shall be designated by the member organizations.

In dealing with the membership question, it is therefore necessary to consider as well the Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee. Under IPOD, the terms of reference were embodied in the document designated Annex A, a copy of which is attached. For AODP, I propose for your consideration a somewhat revised document designated Annex B, a draft of which is also attached. The significant difference between the old and the new Terms of Reference is in the membership section. In Annex B, I have tied non-U.S. membership on the Executive Committee to the existence of an active memorandum of understanding with the National Science Foundation and provided a mechanism for dropping an Executive Committee member should that action become necessary.
I should also call your attention to an inconsistency between the June '83 revision Draft Terms of Reference for PCOM and Annex A & B. In Annex A, substantive issues decided by the PCOM in formal voting require an absolute majority for passage. The PCOM June '83 revised draft, page 2, Section 3.7 - Vote and Quorum, specifies a two-thirds majority for passage. Under Annex A (and proposed under Annex B) the two-thirds majority requirement is restricted to substantive issues decided by the EXCOM. This inconsistency should be resolved at Swindon.

cc: Sandra Toye, NSF
1. This committee shall formulate scientific and policy recommendations with respect to the Deep Earth Sampling Programs. It shall conduct Deep Earth Sampling Program 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.

2. The members of this committee shall be representatives of oceanographic marine research institutions or other organizations which have a major interest in the study of the sea floor and an adequate capability in terms of scientific manpower and facilities to carry out such studies.

3. The initial membership of this committee will be the same as the existing JOIDES Executive Committee. The appointment of additional members will be determined by the Governors on the recommendation of the JOIDES Executive Committee for IPOD.

4. Each institution or organization designated for participation on this committee by the Board of Governors shall provide one voting member, normally the director or senior deputy thereto.

5. The Executive Committee shall reach all its decisions by two-thirds majority vote of all members. A quorum shall constitute two-thirds of the Executive Committee. Notices of meetings and agendas will be sent to members 60 days prior to the time of the meetings. If a member of the Executive Committee is absent from a duly called meeting of the Executive Committee, he or she may designate an alternate from his or her institution, with full authority to act for him or her in his or her absence.

6. The Committee may establish subcommittees for cognizance of certain components of the Deep Earth Sampling Program. Areas of cognizance and the terms of reference for each subcommittee shall be defined by the Executive Committee. In particular a Planning Committee shall be established. It shall be composed of one member designated by each member of the Executive Committee. The vote in this committee shall be on the basis of absolute majority.

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, on approval by all members of the existing JOIDES Executive Committee, will supersede all previous JOIDES agreements.
(Revision)

ANNEX B

Terms of Reference for
JOIDES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FOR THE ADVANCED OCEAN DRILLING PROGRAM

1. This committee shall formulate scientific and policy recommendations with respect to the Advanced Ocean Drilling Program (AODP). It shall conduct the AODP 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.

2. The members of this committee shall be representatives of oceanographic and marine research institutions or other organizations which have a major interest in the study of the sea floor and an adequate capability in terms of scientific manpower and facilities to carry out such studies.

3. The initial membership of this committee will (comprise) be comprised (representatives) of one representative of each of the four non-U.S. countries participating in IPOD under active MOU's with NSF (France, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom) and one representative of each of the 10 existing U.S. institutions (institutional members of JOIDES) (University of Miami, University of Washington, Oregon State University, University of Hawaii, University of Rhode Island, University of Texas at Austin, University of California, San Diego, Texas A&M University, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and Columbia University) which are currently participating in the JOIDES Executive Committee for IPOD. The appointment of additional members will be determined by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Committee. In the case of (non-U.S. country candidates,) representatives of non-U.S. country participants, the existence of a valid MOU with NSF is a prerequisite to membership.
(Cancellation of membership will be determined by the Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.) Membership of any member may be cancelled by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the Executive Committee in the event of a non-U.S. country participant ceasing to have a valid MOU in existence, or a U.S. participant ceasing to be active in the Advanced Ocean Drilling Program.

4. Each institution or organization designated for participation on this committee by the Board of Governors shall provide one voting member, normally the director or senior deputy thereto.

5. The Executive Committee shall reach all its decisions by the vote of at least two-thirds (majority vote) of all members. A quorum shall constitute two-thirds of the Executive Committee.

6. The Committee may establish subcommittees for cognizance of certain components of the Advanced Ocean Drilling Program. Areas of cognizance and the terms of reference for each subcommittee shall be defined by the Executive Committee. In particular a Planning Committee shall be established. (It shall be composed of one member (and alternate) designated by each member of the Executive Committee. The vote in this committee shall be on the basis of majority.) It shall be composed of one member (with an alternate) designated by each member of the Executive Committee. This Committee shall act on the basis of a vote of a majority of all members.

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. (The terms of reference, on approval of all members of the existing JOIDES Executive Committee as defined above, will supersede all previous JOIDES agreements.) These Terms of Reference, on approval by all members of the existing JOIDES Executive Committee for IPOD and adoption by JOI as an amendment to its By-Laws, will supersede all previous JOIDES agreements.
Page 8, Figure 3 - The figure is representative of a class dynamically positioned drilling vessel under consideration, but is by no means complete. Others not mentioned include NEDDRILL 2, POLLY BRISTOL, and PELICAN, the owners or operators of which were represented at the pre-proposal conference hosted by Texas A&M University in Houston on June 28, 1983.

Page 65, paragraph E - Eliminate the first sentence. The second sentence should read as follows:

"Data from the AODP (IPOD) Data Bank at L-DGO will be required in order to ensure that the staff scientists are familiar with the geology/geophysics of the candidate drill sites and to ensure that real-time operational decisions can be made from AODP headquarters during the cruises. The science operator will also reduce and store the underway geophysical data collected aboard the drillship. These data will be routinely transmitted to the AODP (IPOD) Data Bank and the NGSDC and upon request to the shipboard scientific party."