

The ship will be constructed as a general purpose oceanographic research vessel, the AGOR 26. To be eligible to operate the vessel, the offeror must be a member of the University National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) or meet the requirements and agree to apply for full membership if selected. In order to maintain the nation's oceanographic fleet at the optimum size, a current CLASS I or CLASS II UNOLS vessel must be retired or otherwise removed from service by the date the AGOR 26 commences operations. Thus, to be eligible for award, the offeror must be able to exchange or retire a CLASS I or CLASS II UNOLS oceanographic research vessel. In addition, the successful offeror is expected to (1) provide institution funds annually to defray part of the cost of ship operations; (2) provide technical assistance during the period covering design development through builder selection and vessel delivery; (3) enter into a renewable charter party agreement with the Navy; (4) maintain and operate the ship under sound maritime practices; (5) complete final outfitting of the vessel; (6) undertake a cooperative role in scheduling and operating the ship in the support of Navy research programs and the larger U.S. ocean science research community. Interested parties should request the RFP by 17 October 1997 to be considered further. Send written requests for the RFP to the above address, to the attention of Code 32IRF.

OPERATOR SELECTION

CBD issued - 15 September 1997
Must request RFP by 17 October 1997
Proposal due by 5 Dec 1997
Expect decision in January 1998

FUNDING

CNR requested use of 804 process (Feb 97)
Supported by NAVSEA 00, N096, ASN(RD&A), SECNAV
Need to resolve use of process with ~SCN funds
Exploring conversion of SCN to R&D (under Navsea)

SHIP DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

If SCN, refinement of requirements, similar to AGOR process
If R&D/804 process, development of performance needs
Inclusion of operator, ship design, and shipyard.
If R&D (FY 97 \$\$), the funds must be obligated before Oct 98.

APENDIX XI. CORE Report

NOPP Program Office Status

- Competitively Awarded to CORE, Jul 1997
- Handover from SCG: in progress
- Two of three additional positions filled
- Virtual Ocean Data Center Workshop

- NORLC Terms of Reference
- ORAP Charter and membership
- Annual Report to Congress

NOPP - Status

(as of mid-Sept. 1997)

FY 99 and outyears

- Ten agencies have indicated interest in supporting the Partnership Program in the outyears
- Agencies developing budgets (Navy, NSF, NOAA indications)
- Mechanism for budgeting: An NORLC Agenda
- Item at next meeting
- Congress working on "NOPA 2" - FY98
 - Same fundamental components, plus additional element - Ocean observations (\$ 1 OM)
 - Navy requested ~\$5M in the FY98 PRESBUDG
 - FY98 Defense Authorization provides Navy additional \$16M for NOPP in 6.2 and \$7.5M in O&MN for University ships to work on Navy operational surveys
 - NORLC Structure - in resolution
- Linkage to intn'l efforts - Year of the Ocean
- Next BAA: out in October

The National Oceanographic
Research Leadership Council

SECNAV

NSF Dir.

DEPSEC Energy

Coast Guard Comm.

MMS Dir.

OSTP Dir.

NOAA Admin.

NASA Admin.

EPA Admin.

USGS Dir.

DARPA Dir.

OMB Dir

7 others (NAS, NAE, IoM, State Gov.,
Academia, Industry, TBD)--Maybe.

APPENDIX XII. LOS and the Academic Research Scientist

LOS AND THE ACADEMIC RESEARCH SCIENTIST

J. Ashley Roach (1)

U.S. Marine Scientific Research Policy

The LOS Convention solidifies coastal State control over Marine Scientific Research (MSR) in waters subject to their jurisdiction, waters which now encompass considerably more of the globe now than in 1958 (2). Nevertheless, U.S. policy is to encourage freedom of marine scientific research. That policy was fostered by the U.S. decision, first stated in the President's Oceans Policy Statement of March 10, 1983, (3) and reaffirmed in October 1994 in the documents transmitting the LOS Convention to the Senate,(4) to not claim jurisdiction over MSR in its EEZ, a right provided for under international law reflected in the LOS Convention. The United States declined to assert jurisdiction in its EEZ over MSR because of its interest in encouraging MSR