

# UNIVERSITY - NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of Institutions  
for the coordination and support  
of university oceanographic facilities

UNOLS Office  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

## ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting, November 15-16, 1979  
Byrd Hall, Small Conference Room  
Virginia Institute of Marine Science  
Gloucester Point, Virginia

GENERAL. Dr. Zeigler welcomed the group to VIMS and extended an invitation to lunch at his home. He also announced that a reception was planned that evening for the group at William and Mary College in Williamsburg. The VIMS vessels would be available for visits at noon on Friday.

Brief comments were made by Lois Mercado about Tom Stetson's recent accident. Concern was expressed by the group along with wishes for his speedy recovery.

The following were present:

G. Anderson, Ch.	
R. Fisher	****
G. Keller	L. Clark
J. Martin	D. Frankenberg (16th)
B. Robison	K. Johnson
T. Rossby	M. Jhrde
J. Schubel	K. Kaulum
T. Treadwell	L. Mercado
J. Zeigler	C. Tollios (15th)

The attached agenda was adopted and the items are reported on as follows.  
(See Appendix I).

1. Minutes of August 2-3, 1979 Meeting. These minutes were adopted without change.

2. Appointment of 1980 Nominating Committee. Capt. Treadwell will undertake to appoint a nominating committee for 1980. This Committee will receive nominations for replacements for three Council members whose terms will expire this coming spring as well as candidates for UNOLS chairman and vice-chairman. (Subsequently, Drs. Keller, Maxwell and Schubel agreed to serve, with Dr. Keller acting as chairman).

3a. RVOC Annual Meeting. Capt. Treadwell offered a report on this meeting which had been held at Scripps' Marine Facility in San Diego, October 22-23. He felt RVOC showed increased vitality after a low point of a few years ago. Main areas of concern were crew problems as before and the newer fuel problem. Of prime consideration is what options operators face in regard to the money shortage and escalating fuel prices. Ms. Johrde gave estimates of fuel costs and Mr. Kaulum offered information on the defense fuel supply and how to access it.

The consensus appeared to be that we need a unified approach to the fuel problem. Ms. Johrde mentioned her office has already forwarded to upper echelons within NSF an appeal relative to fuel cost overruns. Capt. Treadwell requested the record show that NSF (Ms. Johrde) and Navy (Mr. Kaulum) are doing a good job under adverse circumstances.

3b. Technology Assessment Committee (TAC). Mr. Tollios, this Committee's Chairman, presented a summary of their organizational meeting, October 24th, at Scripps' Marine Facility. See Appendix II for his notes on this meeting.

Further discussion was centered on TAC's mission as visualized by the Advisory Council and involves equipment concerns, new technology, and the problem of disseminating information. For the next several months the task of the group is relatively clear; the areas to be defined and documented are listed in the report of the initial meeting (App. II). Two formal meetings per year of the group plus others as necessary for TAC subgroups appeared to be a reasonable request. Mr. Tollios felt a letter of introduction for use by members of his Committee which also set forth TAC's objectives would be useful in securing institutional cooperation. Capt. Treadwell agreed to write such a letter for use by Committee members.

4. Coordination of International Research- The Implication for UNOLS. At a recent meeting of the Ocean Policy Committee a discussion of law of sea problems resulted in a draft paper entitled "Summary of Bilateral/National Group Discussions and Recommendations" which was distributed by Dr. Anderson (Appendix III). Discussion ensued concerning arrangements to assure fulfillment of post-cruise obligations. The Council agreed with the recommendation that the scientific community a. monitor obligation compliance, and b. get organized immediately to meet certain obligations, i.e., providing cruise reports. An important recommendation was that UNOLS develop a monitoring procedure to assure that obligations are met. *"This was recommended at OPC/UNOLS workshop in January 1978 and UNOLS should review and implement the recommendations stated in the Proceedings of that workshop."* As yet the peripheral obligations are not clear.

Some changes were suggested in the wording on page 3 of the draft.

International research involves at least two problems: a. Pre-cruise = State Department clearance (pre-cruise problems for clearances may be complicated by previous defaults of other PI's), and b. Post-cruise = Reporting to host country (PI has obligation to fulfill



data handling and transmission requirements).

Somebody is needed to keep track of compliance with the terms of agreements and to enforce compliance; this individual could ask the Institutions for progress reports and/or a compliance report when the obligations have been met. There is a question about the best location for this person, i.e., State Dept., UNOLS, other. Ms. Jahrde noted that the State Dept. has power with regard to clearances, funding agencies, etc., UNOLS does not. The consensus was that a UNOLS representative should not be placed full-time at D.O.S.

Capt. Treadwell suggested that the UNOLS staff compile a roster of foreign contacts as a spin-off from the cruise reports. This would allow the community access to those PIs who had been most recently to an area under question, their contacts and any possible problems.

It was also suggested that the Grant Letter include reporting obligations and requirements.

5. Role of UNOLS in Forecasting Ship Operations. The question of what UNOLS as an organization should do or could do to facilitate forecasting ship operations was raised. Emphasis seemed to be on the actual structure of ship forecast meetings or, as they were formally known, ship scheduling meetings. UNOLS has tried holding them early in the year, preceding the year in question and has also held regional sessions in different parts of the country.

In some quarters, there has been a desire to schedule the fleet from a single central office. This, it is argued would increase efficiency and limit "double bookings" by some PIs. There still is no means of dealing with the question of operator self-interest.

Some felt UNOLS should go beyond being a self-help society and become more involved in advising Federal agencies. The ship scheduling meetings, or reviews, have always been conducted as openly as possible, being well-advertized beforehand.

Dr. Frankenberg felt NSF could review their schedule of meetings from the point of view of meshing with UNOLS needs, but only could offer sympathy in reaction to their inability to provide proprietary funding information.

Ms. Jahrde said she would welcome greater activity from UNOLS members, for instance, how do they view the Council's views? Another problem at NSF is that program managers often have difficulty with decisions as to how much sea-time makes sense for a given project.

Discussion ranged widely, touching on maintenance, manning, CG certification, charter party agreements, and insurance of over-the-side-gear. Capt. Treadwell suggested it might serve a useful function to write the membership and solicit ideas on the subject of forecasting operations.

6. Role of Small Vessels in UNOLS FLEET. Small vessels, or vessels of any size, are very important to some institutions. In fact it is a

precept, in some quarters, that an institution has not yet "arrived" unless it operates a vessel. Capt. Treadwell and Dr. Fisher felt there should be no discrimination exhibited when it came to layups affecting the fleet.

Ms. Jhrde stressed that NSF was not putting any money into marginal vessels and that they relied on the results of the biennial material reviews of vessels as well as other factors when considering proposals for upgrading, etc.

Mr. Kaulum offered that "small" boat support should properly come from state sources and others agreed that those boats were often involved in training programs in addition to their research function.

#### 7. Other.

a. Research Submersible Facility Requirements Study. Dr. Keller, a member of the Science Assessment Panel portion of this study, gave a brief overview of developments to date. A meeting was held in October and another is scheduled for January, 1980. One concern, for which the group has turned to the ALVIN Review Committee for guidance, is whether the study should address the need for a "shallow" depth submersible. Dr. Keller felt deep ocean problems were more important by and large and that there were a great many shallow vehicles available. Their study is to be completed by September, 1980.

b. ALPHA HELIX Disposition. NSF had examined in detail each request for the ALPHA HELIX with a view to the type of program run by the requesting institution and with reference to the vessel's capability; at present, it appears that the University of Alaska might qualify as the recipient as ACONA is approaching twenty years of age and is due an extensive refit. It was noted that this was the first occurrence of a university (California) returning a vessel to NSF for which they held title. The vessel is due to wind up operations as a National Oceanographic facility about January 6, 1980.

There was considerable discussion on the eventual assignment of the second of the two coastal vessels. The University of Miami has been selected to oversee the construction of both at a U.S. yard, yet to be designated. Ms. Jhrde mentioned the University of Washington, Woods Hole and Duke are still under consideration as a result of their original proposals, which were based on serving regional needs.

The polar vessel design studies continue, with personnel from several institutions involved, but her eventual disposition is even further from a decision than that of ALPHA HELIX.

Capt. Treadwell offered the following motion: *The Advisory Council recommends the transfer of ALPHA HELIX to the University of Alaska.*

This motion was seconded by Dr. Fisher who also called for a show of hands. The Council Chairman brought it to a vote. There were eight in favor and the Chairman declared the motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 1148, 16 November 1979.

Upcoming Meeting Dates, 1980

28-29 January, Research Submersible Study, Harbor Branch, Ft. Pierce,  
Florida

28-29 February, Advisory Council, UCSB, Santa Barbara, California

15-16 April, Technology Assessment Committee, Denver, Colorado

Lois Mercado  
Staff Assistant

Thomas Stetson  
Executive Secretary  
UNOLS



## UNIVERSITY - NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of Institutions  
for the coordination and support  
of university oceanographic facilities

UNOLS Office  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

### ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

0830, November 15-16, 1979  
Byrd Hall, Small Conference Room  
Virginia Institute of Marine Science  
Gloucester Point, Virginia

### AGENDA

1. Accept Minutes of 2-3 August Meeting at Newport
2. Appoint 1980 Nominating Committee  

The charter calls for such to search for candidates  
for Chairman and Vice-Chairman of UNOLS as well as  
replacements for retiring Council members
3. Report on Committee Meetings
  - a. RVOC
  - b. Technology Assessment Committee
4. Coordination of International Research- The Implication for UNOLS
5. Role of UNOLS in Forecasting Ship Operations
6. Role of Small Vessels in the UNOLS Fleet
7. Other

## UNIVERSITY - NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

An association of Institutions  
for the coordination and support  
of university oceanographic facilities

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution  
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 01543

9 November 1979

To: UNOLS Technology Assessment Committee  
From: Gus Tollios *Gus*  
Subject: Overview of San Diego Meeting

I have summarized below the decisions made during the first UNOLS Technology Review Committee held on the 24th of October.

First of all, I would like to clarify the name of our committee since there appears to be two names being used in correspondence: Technology Review and Technology Assessment Committee. Capt. Treadwell's letter to each of us on the 14th of August specifically named the committee "Technology Assessment Committee" while Tom Stetson subsequent letters calls it the "Technology Review". In order to avoid confusion by outsiders, and since I have already received a survey from Al Driscoll using the name "Technology Assessment" in his cover letter to recipients, I would like to settle this matter and officially call the group: Technology Assessment Committee (TAC). If someone feels strongly about this, please let me know.

The subgroups decided upon at the meeting were:

1. Winches, wire, handling equipment and associated accessories.

Chairman: Al Driscoll  
Contributing member: Sam Gerard

2. Cranes and associated equipment.

Chairman: Bob Williams

3. Communications

Chairman: Jim Stasny  
Contributing members: Lynn Abbott, Gus Tollios

4. Navigation

Chairman: Lynn Abbott

Contributing members: Rod Mesecar, Gus Tollios, Jim Stasny

5. Ship Lab space & facilities

Chairman: Sam Gerard

6. Shipboard Instrumentation (minimum requirements)

Chairman: Rod Mesecar

Contributing members: Lynn Abbott, Gus Tollios, Jim Stasny

7. Information Disseminating

Chairman: Rod Mesecar

Contributing member: Gus Tollios

The chairmen have the responsibility of providing a summary of the goals and objectives in their assigned category. This summary should include some known problem areas, a plan of attack in pursuing these objectives, and possible outside contacts that will be explored within the next year in formalizing plans for upgrades and retrofits.

The chairman should contact those members contributing to their category for inputs. Of course, non-contributing members should also provide inputs if they feel it necessary.

Please submit all summaries to me by November 15th if possible. Any extraordinary expenses other than the ones mentioned during the meeting should be included. We had agreed on 28 trips, 14 for the two general meetings, and 14 to be used by the members as they see fit. I will circulate these summaries to the other members for information. If you feel you need more time beyond the 15th, please let me know.

If members wish to send Xerox telecopy to me or to Tom Stetson, they may use the following telephone numbers which are monitored by my group:

(617) 540-4476 Private line next to telecopy machine.

(617) 548-1400, ext. 2726 also next to telecopy machine.

If there are no answers on these lines, please call my extension (2276) and I can have the call transferred directly to the Xerox machine.

I felt that we should agree on some general goals and objectives for the group. I have listed these below. If there are any objections or modifications to these, please contact me otherwise they will stand as they are.



DRAFT  
9/11/79SUMMARY OF BILATERAL/NATIONAL  
GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## I. Bilateral

- A. Definition: Government-to-government arrangement ranging from a formal treaty to informal discussions. It was recognized that bilaterals have a great variety of forms, i.e., institution-to-institution, government agency-to-government agency, etc.
- B. Purpose and Objective of a Bilateral
- A bilateral should:
1. ~~provide~~ <sup>facilitate</sup> meaningful scientific cooperation;
  2. provide access to do marine scientific research in foreign nations claimed waters;
  3. improve clearance procedures; and
  4. specify conditions, i.e., participation requirements, data/sample exchange, etc.
- C. Things to strive for in bilaterals: Any bilateral negotiated should be as flexible and as informal as possible. A bilateral should always improve the conditions stated in the ICNT or at minimum clarify them. It should also provide:
1. timeliness (requirement for prompt response from coastal state and tacit consent);
  2. operational flexibility;
  3. set standards; and
  4. predictability.
- D. What are the benefits of a bilateral for a developing country?
1. provides an opportunity for cooperative scientific research. Cooperative and collaborative research should be a major goal and requirement;

2. permit certain research to be undertaken in their waters, and they get the results, at no cost; and
3. provide an opportunity for their scientists to work with U.S. scientists, which could result in additional training and education.

## II. National Arrangements for Bilaterals

### A. Initiation Phase

1. Recommend that scientific community has opportunity to review conditions (obligations) of bilateral before they are negotiated;
2. Recommend that cognizant federal agency consult with oceanographic community, <sup>e.g.</sup> ~~i.e.~~, NAS Committees, UNOLS during the formulation and negotiation of bilateral; and
3. Recommend that one federal agency negotiate bilaterals.

It is recommended that the Department of State serve as the focal point for the development of bilaterals.

### B. Arrangements to Assure that Post-Cruise Obligations Are Fulfilled

1. For Academic Community: It was agreed that a new mechanism was needed to assure compliance of post-cruise obligations.
  - a. Recommend that the scientific community itself rather than a federal agency monitor obligation compliance;
  - b. Recommend that scientific community get organized immediately to meet certain obligations, i.e., providing cruise reports;
  - c. Recommend that UNOLS develop a monitoring procedure to assure that obligations are met. This was recommended at OPC/UNOLS workshop in January 1978 and UNOLS should review and implement the recommendations stated in the Proceedings of that workshop;

- d. It was suggested that a UNOLS representative could be located in OES at DOS to monitor the obligation compliance. This individual could institute a tickler system to remind the researcher of his obligations. If pressure needs to be applied, it should be at the institution level, *i.e.*, the Director. In extreme delinquency cases, funding agency should be contacted and pressure could be applied by them.
2. For Federal Agency
    - a. Recommend discussions amongst federal agencies, *i.e.*, Navy, NOAA, NSF, and DOS, concerning the audit procedure; and
    - b. It was suggested that the UNOLS representative at the Department of State could also monitor federal vessel activities.
- C. Renewal: Recommend that scientific community be involved in review of bilaterals for termination, modification, or extension.

During the discussions, it was recognized that there will be increased costs associated with bilaterals. It was also noted that if marine science bilaterals are negotiated, they must be supported by the scientific community. This support should be ascertained before discussions are held with the other country.