

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Introduction

1.1 Welcome and Logistics

Introduction, logistics and domestic arrangements and a round of self-introductions was followed by an explanation by MacLeod of voting entitlements. Although neither the official Delegate (Pedersen) nor the official Alternate (Koç) from Norway was present, the Committee accepted Kleiven as an official Norwegian representative and accorded her full voting rights for the duration of the meeting. There were no delegates, alternates or any other representatives from Belgium and Canada, meaning that there were only 15 voting members present. MacLeod nevertheless emphasised that he hoped that all business could be achieved by consensus and that voting should not be necessary.

1.2 Discussion and approval of agenda.

The agenda was approved by consensus.

1.3 Approval of 6th ESSAC Minutes.

Brinkhuis would like to amend some of the points recorded in the minutes which he regards as inaccurate. MacLeod said he would however accommodate these points and asked Brinkhuis to produce written amendment for Friday morning (3rd Nov) including particularly his interest in Summer Schools.

MacLeod noted that the nomination of Warner Brückmann as a member of the STP panel had been omitted but since then his nomination had been included in the report to ECORD Council in August. ECORD Council approved the nomination and Brückmann is now formerly a member of the STP panel from July 2007.

Action Item: Minutes of 6th ESSAC Meeting will be amended by taking into consideration points to be submitted by Brinkhuis. The revised minutes will then be circulated for approval.

1.4 Matters Arising from 6th ESSAC Meeting.

- MacLeod referred to the list of action items on pages 7 and 8 of the agenda book and noted that the first item which had previously been outstanding regarding the sending of personalised letters to SAS panel members had now been completed. MacLeod summarized the contents of the letters and templates are included in the agenda book in Appendix 2. Erba requested that alternates should also receive similar letters and MacLeod agreed.

Action Item: ESSAC to send personalised letters to SAS panel alternates.

- Brumsack requested that reports of the ship schedule should be circulated to delegates with special reference for example to the proposed schedule for Atlantic and Mediterranean tracks. He feels that this region is of particular importance to the European scientific community. Information on the ship track schedule is of major importance for future planning.

Action Item: Reports of the ship schedule will be circulated to ESSAC delegates.

- MacLeod assured the meeting that the issue of even more effective dissemination of items important to Europe was being addressed. Further information on IODP future planning would be discussed under item 2.4 and details could be found under this heading in the agenda book. In

addition all SAS panel members have been asked to produce written reports summarising respective meetings attended.

- Science Advisory Structure (SAS) panel members have all been approved by ECORD Council.

- Engineering and Development Panel (EDP) MacLeod highlighted the outstanding issue regarding problems in finding small country members. Currently there are two people on this panel from the UK but one of these is due to rotate off. MacLeod asked for nominations

Action Item: Delegates to make nominations for EDP ‘small country’ member.

- Site Survey Panel (SSP) Holger Lykke-Andersen from Denmark has been approved as a member from February 2007 and is a ‘small country’ representative.

Workshops

MacLeod briefly mentioned the issues of workshop members and mission teams. These issues would be discussed later in Agenda Item 5.

Summer Schools

A budget of €50K per annum for a programme of Summer Schools has been provisionally agreed by ECORD Council . MacLeod proposed that as the mechanism was now in place that ESSAC should come up with a financial plan to be discussed at tomorrow’s meeting.

Distinguished Lecturer Programme

It is proposed that ECORD should support a ‘Distinguished Lecturer’ programme and ECORD Council have approved this idea subject to production of a detailed plan. This will be discussed further during item 7.3.

Action Items from 6th ESSAC Meeting

MacLeod reported that most of the action items arising from the 6th ESSAC Meeting had been addressed.

1.5 ESSAC Office news

There has been a change in Science Coordinator with Elspeth Urquhart replacing Federica Lenci in August 2006. Federica has relocated to Australia. Julian Pearce, the acting ESSAC Chair who stood in for MacLeod during his recent illness has now stepped down and is no longer playing any active role in ESSAC affairs.

1.6 Principal goals of the meeting

MacLeod itemised four major items in this section:

1. **Nominate appropriate new ECORD SAS representatives:** There are three SAS panel positions to fill and nominees must be offered to ECORD Council for approval at their next meeting in Bonn on 27th November 2006.
2. **Review and group applications for NanTroSEIZE expeditions:** This is a major item to be discussed during this meeting and could prove to be a difficult task owing to the complexity of the Program. Applicants for the expedition must be prioritized and the list submitted to the US and Japan by the beginning of next week. There will be a first staffing meeting at College Station on Monday 6th November 2006.
3. **Derive an action plan for ECORD summer school 2007**
4. **Agree a plan for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme.**

2. IODP News

2.1 Operator news: SODV (USA)

The refit of the *JOIDES Resolution* is under re-evaluation as shipyard costs have risen dramatically during the last few months. Originally it was planned that the ship would go into a yard in Asia, probably Singapore, and have an extended, 10m long, section inserted mid-ship to provide extra laboratory and accommodation facilities. Because of rising shipyard costs there is now a budget shortfall of tens of millions of US dollars. The issue has recently been discussed in the press and a copy of the *Science* article in question was circulated amongst the delegates during the meeting. MacLeod suggested that these financial issues may mean that the preparation of the SODV will not be complete for the planned expedition in November 2007 and consequently there would be serious implications for planned schedules.

2.2 Operator news: - Chikyu (Japan)

The ship has recently finished sea trials and the riser operation has been tested. The plan to drill to 2200 mbsf. had not been achieved but a successful riser hole had been drilled to 647 mbsf. The ship will now continue with the trial programme off Kenya and NW Australia, now in collaboration with industry. The aim is to use riser drilling to a depth of 4500 mbsf. in water depths of up to 2500 m. MacLeod noted that the availability of industry support for these trials was welcome. The scientific expeditions using *Chikyu* are scheduled to begin in September 2007.

Ildefonse suggested that delegates should subscribe to the free *Chikyu Hakken* online newsletter to receive updated bulletins on the ship's progress. He also reported that the ship had experienced problems with the Blow-Out-Preventor (BOP) during a recent trial. The BOP had been left on the seafloor and a damage evaluation exercise was now in progress but as yet there had been neither reports of their findings nor any predictions about delays to operations.

2.3 Operator news: MSPs (ECORD)

McInroy reported on ESO activities. He commented on the four *Nature* articles, the paper by Stein and the Japanese contribution to *Diatom Research* all of which have been published. The Scientific Results for Expedition 310, (Tahiti Sea-Level) are in the final review process and publication of the Expedition Report is expected in March 2007. The planning for Expedition 313 (New Jersey Shallow Shelf) is advanced and the proposed rig belongs to the contractor DOSECC, although the contract has not yet actually been signed. Three major issues need to be resolved before the contract is signed - a geotechnical survey is needed that will satisfy insurance for post-Katrina regulations and hazard survey (magnetometer); permits regarding MMS and coastguard approval need to be obtained; confirmation of platform availability is needed. A few problems are envisaged due to the lift-barge (jack-up) nature of the platform regarding space for the mobile laboratory containers and accommodation space. The logistics of the expedition are still being finalized regarding issues such as visas. Slim-line open hole logging is proposed as Logging-While-Drilling (LWD) is not suitable for the specific requirements of this expedition. The onshore science party is planned for January 2008 and the staffing is almost complete (9 Europe, 10 USA, 6 Japan, 1 Korea, 1 China).

Future Expeditions:

Great Barrier Reef (Proposal #519) – The site survey is planned for Nov-Dec 2007 when there will be a suitable weather window. This could be delayed to the same weather window in 2008 but hopefully not delayed until 2009. A meeting with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority is scheduled for January 2007.

New England Hydrogeology (Proposal #637) – This planned Expedition still requires a site survey and resolution of various technical issues. IODP-MI is forming a scoping group.

Engineering Development:

IOs are to create their own engineering development road maps. Developments will be compared and possibly acted upon by IODP. ESO's contribution is the development of the through-pipe camera successfully used in Tahiti. A feasibility study for ESO's through-pipe camera has been given the go-ahead by the Science Planning Committee (SPC).

Other ESO Developments:

- Visual Core Description meeting was held at TAMU in September 2006.
- ESO is working with IODP-MI and the other IOs to standardise data entry and nomenclature across the three individual database systems used by the IOs.
- There is an idea to complete web based tutorials for invited and potential scientists before onshore and shipboard operations begin. This will be a comprehensive guide to pre-, syn- and post-expedition activities.

McInroy then invited questions. Brinkhuis asked about confirmation of the expected platform for the New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition, i.e. would a change of platform result in a change in the science party. McInroy replied that there would not be an overall change in participants although there may be changes to the platform party.

Brumsack raised the issue of participants being invited onto an expedition and subsequently becoming "uninvited", as happened in the case of New Jersey. Brumsack requested better liaison between all parties involved and stressed that this situation must not happen again. McInroy assured the delegates that he would take back their comments to ESO.

MacLeod commented that the inability to predict the exact timing of MSP expeditions complicated the staffing issues. Brumsack suggested that potential participants should be warned that they may not be required if the schedule is changed. McInroy agreed to also take this issue back to ESO to ensure optimal methods are in place for keeping applicants informed of any developments in the expedition planning process.

2.4 IODP Science Advisory Structure panel reports

MacLeod presented a summary report from the SPC meeting in Bergen in August 2006.

Mission Proposals

IODP is instigating a new super-proposals plan under the title 'Missions' on themes from the global science plan. These Missions or large scale multi-expedition proposals should run in parallel to normal schedules. It is an updated "Complex Drilling Proposal" (CDP) idea and SPC have recommended that CDPs be abandoned. The Mission plan has already been reviewed by most of the SAS panels. Details of the concept and implementation plan are included in Appendix 4 of the ESSAC 7 Agenda.

The first call for these Mission Proposals is for the 1st April 2007 deadline. Essentially there is no material difference between CDPs and Mission Proposals. Each proposal must have been arrived at after consultation amongst a group of scientists in a particular field. Ideally workshops should lead to a mission proposal, although this is not a requirement.

Recently approved 2008 schedules

FY08 ship schedule - *Chikyu*

NanTroSEIZE ('*Chikyu-1*'): Logging-While Drilling Transect *Sept—Oct 2007*

NanTroSEIZE ('*Chikyu-2*'): Mega-Splay Riser Pilot Hole *Nov—Dec 2007*

NanTroSEIZE (' <i>Chikyu-3</i>): Thrust Faults <i>Maintenance</i>	<i>Jan—Feb 2008</i> <i>Mar—May 2008</i>
NanTroSEIZE (Stage 2): Mega-Splay Riser	<i>June 2008—TBD</i>

FY08 ship schedule – SODV (approved by SPC)

Equatorial Pacific Transect 1	<i>Nov—Dec 2007</i>
NanTroSEIZE ('USIO-1'): Subduction Inputs	<i>Jan—Feb 2008</i>
NanTroSEIZE ('USIO-2'): Kumano Basin Observatory Bering Sea	<i>Mar—Apr 2008</i> <i>May—Jun 2008</i>
Juan de Fuca Hydrogeology 2 (Expedition 301 follow-up)	<i>Jul—Aug 2008</i>
Equatorial Pacific Transect 2	<i>Sept—Oct 2008</i>

MacLeod discussed the approved ship schedules for 2008 (also documented in the ESSAC 7 Agenda). He highlighted the fact that the possible consequence of a delay to the upcoming refit of the SODV for more than 2-3 weeks would be the rescheduling of the Equatorial Pacific Transect 1 to Sept-Oct 2008, and the postponement of Equatorial Transect 2 to FY09-10. SPC had advised that a 2 or 3 week delay could be accommodated. A delay of more than 3 weeks would mean that sites such as the Bering Sea would shift out of the weather window. Equatorial Pacific Transect 1 could be postponed, taking the Equatorial Transect 2 time slot and so on. However nothing has been decided at this juncture. Staffing of the expeditions is going ahead though and the scientific community must be informed as soon as plans are definite.

Ildefonse announced that he plans to tell people now that the schedule is subject to uncertainties and not wait to tell them later. MacLeod agreed that potential participants should be kept casually informed but he advised against publishing this on the web sites for the moment.

SODV scheduling beyond FY08:

SPC desire to schedule drilling of the Canterbury Basin (New Zealand) and Wilkes Land (Antarctica) to start at the end of 2008 following the completion of the Equatorial Pacific transects. However, potential shallow gas has been identified in some of the Canterbury Basin sites. This complicates the situation, as the scientific objectives of the proposal are severely jeopardised if even only one of the sites were deemed unsafe to drill with the SODV. A hazards survey has been commissioned, and if results show that any sites cannot be drilled by non-riser drilling then the whole Canterbury Basin expedition should be postponed. In this case the Wilkes Land expedition may likely also be postponed because the huge transit time to the southern oceans means that it is not cost effective to drill only one expedition.

The long term ship track was also discussed during the SPC meeting. Although the panel has long wished to schedule a programme of drilling in the Indian Ocean, at the present stage there are not sufficient mature proposals in the system to warrant an Indian Ocean programme for the SODV in FY09-10. However, *Chikyu* could potentially transit to the Indian Ocean and drill some of the proposals that are ready in this time frame. SPC finally decided that the SODV should return to the Pacific in 2009-2010, approving a preliminary plan in which the SODV follows a clockwise path around the Pacific Ocean during this period. It follows that the ship could potentially pass through the Panama Canal and into the Atlantic in about 2010. It is now highly unlikely that any Mediterranean drilling, or drilling in ECORD territorial waters, will take place on any faster timescale.

MacLeod suggested that scientific committees should be informed that proposal pressure is the only way to influence ship schedule in the next few years. Ildefonse suggested that proposals should be submitted by April 2007. MacLeod agreed and noted that this deadline does not apply to MSP proposals.

3. ECORD News

3.1 EMA Report

MacLeod presented a report sent by Catherine Mével (see Item 3.1 of the agenda book).

In 2007 a planned increase in operational activity, such that 3 platforms may be operating simultaneously, will result in increased costs of SOCs and POCs. ECORD currently contributes 3 participation units and Japan and US each contribute 7 units. Each unit will increase from \$3.5 million to \$5.6 million. EMA intends to maintain our contribution at the current number of participation units, and increased funding is therefore required. ECORD Council is currently exploring national and European Commission routes for extra funding and the ECORD Evaluation Committee is due to present an interim report to Council in Nov 2006. The final report is due by end of the year and will be used by members of ECORD Council to seek national funds. ESSAC delegates too have an important role to play in conveying a positive message to national funding agencies.

MacLeod said he was hoping for a positive report at the ECORD Council meeting at the end of November and asked ESSAC delegates to pressure funding agencies and to present a positive image of ECORD. He emphasised that this is a critical phase as many countries' commitment is due to expire. MacLeod reminded the meeting that ECORD received no money from EC Framework 6 funding and only a small amount of funding from ECORDnet. Negative signals for funding from EC Framework 7 have been received and ECORD Council have therefore initiated a collaborative programme involving ECORD, HERMES, ESONET, IMAGES and EuroMargin to submit a mega proposal – "Deep Sea Floor Frontier Initiative"

Brinkhuis asked why signals from EC Framework 7 are negative. Ildefonse suggested that it is because as Framework 7 progresses there are fewer projects. MacLeod recounted a visit from an MEP to Cardiff University whom he lobbied for funding. The MEP asked Chris for more information and this is an issue that needs addressing forthwith. Ildefonse agreed that we need to start now for later stages and he urged political lobbying.

Action item: ESSAC to provide MEP with more information
--

MacLeod reported that ECORD Council and ESF have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to facilitate communication with regard to Magellan and EuroMARC programmes. In summary this MOU states that:

⟨ The Magellan Steering Committee and the EuroMARC Management Committee are the decision-making body, responsible for the management of, respectively, the ESF Research Networking Programme Magellan Workshop Series, and the EUROCORES Programme EuroMARC

⟨ In order to ensure maximal synergy and optimal integration of the future activities in Magellan and in IODP, ESSAC is invited to nominate a member in an advisory capacity to the Magellan

Steering Committee; reciprocally, the ESF Magellan Steering Committee is invited to nominate a member in an advisory capacity to ESSAC

⟨In order to ensure maximal synergy and optimal integration of the future activities in EuroMARC and in IODP, ESSAC is invited to nominate a member in an advisory capacity to the EuroMARC Scientific Committee (when formed); reciprocally, the EuroMARC Scientific Committee (when formed) is invited to nominate a member in an advisory capacity to ESSAC

MacLeod reported that he himself had been identified as the ESSAC member who would act in an advisory capacity to the Magellan Steering Committee and Teresa Bingham-Müller would act in a reciprocal advisory capacity to ESSAC on behalf of ESF. MacLeod also reported that, as of yet, similar arrangements were not yet in place with regard to the EuroMARC Scientific Committee.

3.1.2 Report submitted 12th December 2006 by Teresa Bingham-Müller

Magellan Workshop Programme information for the ESSAC meeting Naples

The ESF Magellan Workshop Series Programme was established to serve as a mechanism to stimulate and nurture the process of developing new and innovative science proposals to support European leadership in the planning of marine drilling expeditions and execute European proposals for use of drilling platforms and hence ensure the effective exploitation of research opportunities.

The Magellan Workshop Programme began with the first Steering Committee meeting in February 2006. The second Steering Committee will be held in Zürich Switzerland on Jan. 12 2007. Chris MacLeod Chair of ESSAC and Marcel Kullin Vice Chair of ECORD Council have been invited to attend this meeting.

A formal agreement in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between ESF and the ECORD Council Chair Marcel Kullin on 28th September 2006.

The first call for proposals, which closed on May 19 2006, resulted in the submission of six excellent workshop proposals. The following three workshops were selected to fund for 2006. All three workshops have successfully taken place.

1. Workshop on “Capturing a salt giant” 13-15 October 2006 - Hamburg, Germany
Convenor: Professor Christian Hübscher

2. Workshop on “Scientific Ocean Drilling behind the assessment of geo-hazard from submarine slides” 25-27 October 2006 - Barcelona, Spain
Convenor: Dr. Angelo Camerlenghi

3. Workshop on “Drilling through an active caldera, offshore Campi Flegrei, Eastern Tyrrhénian margin” 13-15 November 2006 - Naples, Italy
Convenor: Dr. Marco Sacchi

In addition Magellan Workshop Series provided funding for a number of Short Visit Grants for the “IODP Drilling Proposal Writing Workshop” within the EuroForum 2006, Cardiff, UK, 8-9 May 2006.

The second call for proposal applications closed on 15 November 2006. The Executive Steering Committee and a number of external reviewers are reviewing the following 8 proposals.

1. Exploring Escarpment Mud Mound Systems and Mud Volcanoes with new European Strategies for sustainable mid-depth coring, submitted by Silvia Spezzaferri
2. Marine Impacts and Environmental Consequences, submitted by Henning Dypvik
3. Evolution of the Ocean Silica Cycle and Biosiliceous Organisms, submitted by David Lazarus
4. Paleoproductivity dynamics and marine-terrestrial linkages during past regional and global climatic changes, submitted by Oscar Enrique Romero,
5. Drilling for Seismic Hazard in European Geosystems, submitted by Maria Ask
6. Climate-Tectonic Drilling in Southeast Asian Marine Basins, submitted by Volkhard Spiess
7. SAFARI, submitted by Ian Hall
8. Past Extreme Climates, submitted by Henk Brinkhuis

It is anticipated that the ranking and funding decisions will be announced on 15th January 2007 at latest. The next Call will be announced on 15th May 2007.

3.2 EuroMARC

MacLeod explained that the EuroMARC programme was established to facilitate pan-European marine coring research, especially with regard to IODP site surveys. At present Europe is disadvantaged with respect to the US because the level of funding that individual ECORD nations, especially the smaller countries, can commit to such activities is not normally sufficient to run a site survey cruise. A mechanism that would allow national funds within Europe to be pooled to run such site surveys jointly would, in theory, greatly increase ECORD's ability to contribute to the site survey requirements of IODP proposals.

In response to the recent proposal call for EuroMARC (with a deadline of 25 June 2006) twenty six outline proposals and fourteen full proposals were submitted. The Review Panel will meet on 10th Nov 2006, make recommendations to the Management Committee and the final decisions will be publicised in early January 2007.

ESSAC is supposed to provide strategic input to the EuroMARC programme. However, it has never been allowed to do so. MacLeod referred the committee to the ESF and ECORD MoU regarding EuroMARC and the Magellan Workshops (discussed in the EMA report earlier), which specifically agreed that two-way liaison with EuroMARC should occur. In order to effect this, and to seek information about the EuroMARC planning and evaluation process, the ESSAC Office repeatedly contacted Bernard Avril at ESF. No response was received.

ESSAC remains unaware of the constitution of the EuroMARC Review Panel and Management Committee, except that Rachael James (UK ESSAC Alternate) has been asked to serve on the former (though not in her capacity as a member of ESSAC). The next meeting of ESF is on 10th

November 2006, and so it is unlikely that ESSAC will be able to be represented formally. It was agreed that more information was required regarding the management of EuroMARC. Brinkhuis asked who would be a source of information. MacLeod said he would raise the matter at ECORD Council.

Action item: ESSAC to seek further contact with EuroMARC to improve communications.

Liaison with EuroMARC is still needed. The situation with the Magellan Steering Committee is somewhat better. Teresa Bingham-Müller had been invited to the present ESSAC meeting and had intended to be here, but had had to cancel at the last minute because of illness. MacLeod has been invited to the next meeting of the Magellan committee in January 2007. It was noted, however, that some 8 ESSAC delegates were also members of the Magellan Steering Committee, and they should already be acting on ESSAC's behalf in ensuring our strategic input to Magellan was made.

4. Expedition Reports

4.1 Policy for future ESSAC Meetings

MacLeod reminded the meeting that ESSAC are obliged in the Terms of Reference to include reports from completed IODP expeditions in its meeting agendas. This has previously been overlooked and the issue should now be addressed. MacLeod considered that it was unrealistic to invite co-chiefs to give presentations as ESSAC has no budget for their expenses. MacLeod said he thought it was not acceptable to ask national offices for funds to invite the co-chiefs to present and suggested that one solution may be to task individual ESSAC delegates to act as watchdogs and give brief (15-20 minute) reports to Committee for future expeditions. These tasks to be apportioned fairly by the ESSAC Chair and the purpose of presentations would be primarily to inform ESSAC members about what is going on operationally.

MacLeod continued by reporting that the SPC have 15 minute reports from of expeditions from the relevant co-chiefs but in his opinion these are not particularly informative. MacLeod suggested that a more cost effective way of maintaining ESSAC's info. on expedition reports would be for one of the ESSAC delegates to prepare a report and present it in 15 minutes during the ESSAC meeting. MacLeod asked for comments.

Ildefonse thought it was a good idea and also thought that the IODP Preliminary reports are good both for self-evaluation and/or this exercise.

Brinkhuis did not think it was a good idea although he appreciated the rationale and stated that he preferred to hear the real scenario from the actual co-chief.

MacLeod said that ESSAC did not have a sufficient budget to invite co-chiefs to give a 15 minute report. Ildefonse said that he also enjoyed not only these talks but also the discussions afterwards although he does appreciate the cost implications. MacLeod also pointed out the differences in motive, i.e. IODP and SPC need justification of IODP funds whilst ESSAC wants only the information.

Brumsack suggested a compromise in that only European co-chiefs should present their expedition reports at ESSAC meetings.

Camoin state that France has no budget to invite co-chiefs.

Brumsack stated that funding was no problem for Germany. MacLeod noted the disparity between the funding abilities of different countries.

Erba thought it was good for co-chiefs to present the reports themselves.

MacLeod suggested that the respective national offices should be approached for the funding of co-chiefs presentation visits.

Camoin thought that delegates should take all opportunities to be informed.

Abrantes suggested that one of the European scientists on the expedition could give the presentation.

Ildefonse said ESSAC could not invite people or demand that they attend without paying their expenses.

MacLeod concluded that ECORD should be asked for funding for this kind of activity adding that it would be a step towards Pan European funding. However he added that ECORD Council are wary of this type of commitment and prefer the proportional funding model. MacLeod asked the delegates for approval of this suggestion to ask ECORD Council.

Brinkhuis said he would second this and there were no objections to the idea. Brinkhuis also mentioned the example of the ACEX report which later transpired to be significantly different from the co-chiefs report. This example illustrates the fact that it essential to have first-hand accounts of the expeditions.

Ildefonse agreed with Brinkhuis regarding ACEX. Ildefonse then commented that France were struggling on their budget and if there was any surplus money he would rather use it to disseminate IODP information at AGU and EGU than use it to invite co-chief presentations.

Camoin thought that the budget needed to be increased before ESSAC could invite presentations at their meetings.

MacLeod reported that there was not even a budget for ESSAC meetings and that member nations had to be relied on to host these events.

It was concluded that MacLeod should ask ECORD Council for a budget for this activity and if this was not approved or if the co-chiefs were unable to attend then ESSAC would still go ahead with the watchdog idea, i.e. ESSAC members should themselves prepare brief reports on each expedition. The purpose of these presentations is primarily to inform ESSAC members about what is going on operationally.

Action Item: ESSAC Chair to ask ECORD Council for money for co-chief participation in ESSAC meetings and, additionally, for funds to support ESSAC meetings in general

5. Workshops

As mentioned at the previous ESSAC meeting, there had been the threat that invitations to ECORD scientists to attend IODP-MI workshops would be restricted by the 7:7:3:1 quota – i.e. that ECORD

could only participate at a level of 3/18ths). The same restriction had been suggested for participation in Mission Teams. ESSAC had requested that the matter be raised at IODP Council in July 2006. Mével informed us (in her EMA report) that IODP Council had affirmed that the 3/18ths quota applied to financial support (from co-mingled funds) for scientists attending IODP-MI workshops (and Mission Teams) rather than restricting the number of invitations. IODP Council confirmed that invitations would not be made on the basis of nationality but purely on merit. If ECORD wished to have a greater proportion of its scientists participating in such activities it could do so but would have to provide financial support for the individuals concerned.

Action Item: ESSAC Chair to ask ECORD Council for money to support ‘over-quota’ ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops
--

5.1 Reports from recent workshops

The report by Judy McKenzie for the January workshop, *Exploring the Deep Biosphere with Scientific Ocean Drilling* is posted on the web. Workshops recently attended by ESSAC delegates included *Mission Mohole* in Portland, Oregon, attended by MacLeod and Ildefonse and *Submarine Slides* in Barcelona attended by Comas. MacLeod asked if anyone else had attended any workshops and there was no response.

Comas reported on the *Submarine Slides* workshop. She concluded by stating that the organisers were planning to write a Mission proposal on the topic of the workshop, for the 1st April 2007 deadline. MacLeod asked whether they were aware of the specific requirements that had to be met in a Mission proposal, and cautioned that they needed to be aware that Mission proposals had to be more than just a collection of proposals on a related theme. There needed to be a single overarching first-order objective, and individual components that would not succeed in the IODP proposal system individually. If the individual components could stand alone, and one was not directly contingent upon another, then it would probably be better to submit the proposals separately rather than under a Mission umbrella. Because IODP plan only to approve one or possibly two Missions at any one time, and a Mission would inevitably run for many years, the *Submarine Slides* proponents would potentially face more competition by going down the Mission route than by simply submitting a number of conventional proposals.

Ildefonse added that other essential aspects of a Mission proposal included consideration of the public interest and societal relevance of the science, and that outreach needed to have been demonstrated in advance. He went on to say that it was necessary to involve people from the beginning to ensure that all the required technology was available, and asked if there had been discussions at the *Submarine Slides* workshop specifically about the technological issues that would be needed for the planned expeditions.

MacLeod summarised by saying that, despite the now-published guidelines, in fact no-one had any real idea as to what to expect until the first round of Mission proposals had been submitted and reviewed. Having himself been involved in one of the working groups (on SPC) who developed the Mission concept, he offered to provide advice to anyone requiring help with Mission proposal submission.

Ildefonse then gave a presentation about the *Mission Moho* workshop.

MacLeod used the *Mission Moho* workshop as an example of why the new Mission concept was instigated by IODP-MI, and was necessary to have in addition to the normal proposal system. To

drill to the Moho would require sustained allocation of resources over a long period of time, require development of new technologies, on too large a scale to be readily approved by the SSEP/SPC 'bottom-up' proposal system.

Ildefonse asked about the constitution of the Mission Team, and whether the leaders should be people who are also involved in the individual proposals, or whether they would be deemed to have a conflict of interest. Extensive discussion had ensued at the Oregon meeting but no consensus was reached. Ildefonse asked ESSAC for their comments.

Erba commented that it would be difficult to find people who had the time, commitment and expertise but who were not directly involved in the proposal already. Ildefonse agreed that the idea was good in theory but difficult in practice. Erba thought that there may be potential candidates amongst the reviewers, which might therefore constitute a conflict of interest. Sacchi suggested that an internal mechanism which fulfils the requirements should be sought. Ildefonse used the example of the Continental Breakup workshop as one where the group are very proactive and have already identified names for the authors of a Mission proposal.

MacLeod commented that the Mission umbrella does add an extra level of complexity and emphasised once again that the Mission route might not always be the best one. He put forward the question of what would happen if one individual component were to receive a poor review or be immature (e.g. lacking site survey etc.), and whether that would jeopardise the Mission proposal as a whole. He noted that Susan Humphris (erstwhile Chair of SPPOC, and responsible for the Mission Plan) had been asked at the *Mission Moho* meeting how many proposals she envisaged constituting an individual Mission, to which she responded that she thought it would be of the order of 5 or 6, although this was (deliberately) not fixed.

Ildefonse suggested that 'shopping lists' were not desirable and that focus was needed. Erba asked how it would work if only one proposal under the umbrella was good. Ildefonse thought that the components would be evaluated individually although good proposals could be delayed or even fail because of its involvement in a mission program. Missions could be terminated at any time by SPC.

MacLeod concluded the discussion by suggesting that anyone interested in Mission proposal submission should read the Mission Plan as it is now very detailed.

5.2 Policy regarding receipt and dissemination of workshop reports

MacLeod reported that there had been complaints in IODP days that the reports of planning groups or workshops had never been properly disseminated or publicised. MacLeod proposed that ESSAC should do what it could to aid the dissemination of formal workshop reports by requesting them from the organisers and IODP-MI and posting them on the ESSAC website.

Ildefonse noted that there should be less of problem in obtaining reports from the workshops funded by IODP-MI as production of such reports is a requirement of funding. The Magellan programme has similar requirements for the workshops it funded.

5.3 Future Workshops

It was agreed that the ESSAC–Magellan link was still not functioning optimally. ESSAC had not been informed of the results of the previous funding round nor what had been submitted for the

current round [*N.B. Teresa Bingham-Müller's report in section 3.1.2 was not received until after the ESSAC meeting in Naples*]. For example, ESSAC was unaware of Magellan's support for the Hübscher salt workshop.

Brumsack further commented that one workshop that had been funded by Magellan, on the Mona impact crater, was linked to an IODP proposal that had been very poorly received by the SSEP and was unlikely ever to be drilled by IODP. He was very critical of the Magellan Steering Committee for having funded this workshop proposal, cited this as an example of why ESSAC, and the ECORD scientists on the SSEP and SPC, needed to have input to Magellan Steering Committee deliberations. Erbacher responded by saying that the Steering Committee could only judge the proposals in front of it and rely upon the proposal reviews, even if they didn't feel they were in full possession of the facts. MacLeod noted that one of the prime responsibilities of the ESSAC members who also sit on the Magellan Steering Committee is to inform themselves of the broader strategic importance of the topics (and, in particular, of the status of the associated IODP drilling proposals)

Brinkhuis noted that ESSAC had identified six specific topics that it thought would be suitable subjects for Magellan workshop support. He said that these were listed in the Minutes of the 4th ESSAC meeting in Graz (in Spring 2005). However, the Minutes of that meeting were not available, and the Committee were unable to remember all of the topics by name. Piller asked why these six topics, previously been agreed by ESSAC, had not been forwarded specifically to Magellan. MacLeod asked why the ESSAC members-in-common that sat on the Magellan Steering Committee had not communicated the topics to Magellan itself.

After extensive discussion it was agreed that, after consulting the earlier Minutes to see exactly what had been said, the ESSAC-Magellan liaison (MacLeod) should request that the Magellan Steering Committee include those specific topics in its next Call for Proposals (deadline 15th May 2007). It was suggested they may wish to include a form of words for the Call along the lines of: "Applications on any topic covered by the IODP Initial Science Plan will be considered, but those on subjects X, Y and Z are particularly welcomed".

MacLeod informed the ESSAC that the SSEP and SPC had given their endorsement to two topics that IODP-MI had indicated they were unable to commit to funding at the present time. These were 'Ultra-high Resolution of Palaeoclimate' and 'Extreme Climates and Abrupt Climate Change during the Cretaceous and Palaeogene'. SPC had urged the relevant national organisations of each of the main IODP members – i.e. Magellan, in the case of ECORD – to consider whether they could support workshops on these themes instead. Erba noted that the Arctic Palaeogene and Cretaceous are already included in other proposals currently in the system.

MacLeod informed the Committee that IODP-MI had not yet announced either the number of subject of the workshops it would support in FY07 and beyond. It was thought that IODP-MI were planning to support no more than 1-2 workshops per year from now on. It was known that workshops on the themes of 'Geohazards' and 'Large Igneous Provinces' were actively being considered by SASEC for 2007 but these had not yet been formally approved.

<p>Action Item: ESSAC liaison to Magellan Steering Committee to request that they include named topics in the forthcoming call for proposals, and look favourably on workshop proposals on the subjects of the themes endorsed by SPC</p>
--

Erbacher commented that although ESSAC was free to make such a request, the Magellan Steering Committee still has to abide by ESF rules, and that the Magellan programme was not exclusively tied to IODP.

The specific topics identified by ESSAC members as potential Magellan workshops were in fact listed in the Edinburgh ESSAC meeting Minutes (meeting #5, November 2005). Note that some of these have since been held, variously under IODP-MI or Magellan banners. The topics originally proposed by ESSAC were:

1. *Continent-ocean interactions*
2. *Evaporites and salt tectonics*
3. *Arctic studies*
4. *Continental Breakup*
5. *Extreme Climates*
6. *Costa Rica Seismogenic Zone*

In further discussion of future workshops, Sacchi outlined the programme for the forthcoming Campi Flegrei combined ESF Magellan and ICDP Workshop in Naples on 13 -15th November 2006. Two of the main topics to be addressed at the workshop are i) a discussion on the state and nurturing of the IODP volcanic margins theme; and, ii) new ideas for new IODP proposals relating to the volcanic mantle issue. Sacchi explained that this was to be a joint meeting supported by co-mingled funds. The ICDP workshop would be linked to an ICDP proposal. Brinkhuis asked about funding allocation. Sacchi replied that ICDP have provided \$30k, and Magellan and CNR have each provided some additional funds.

Brinkhuis asked how many people were involved. Sacchi replied that there were 20 invited speakers and 30-40 participants. Brinkhuis asked how these participants were being funded and Sacchi replied that there was ESF money for ESF participants and ICDP money for ICDP participants. Brinkhuis asked if it was joined with another workshop for economic reasons and Sacchi confirmed that this was the case. Brinkhuis commented that €11.7k was close to the maximum that Magellan would commit to an individual workshop. MacLeod asked if €20k was the maximum. Brinkhuis thought that €20k would fund 20 people. Brinkhuis questioned how much funding had been required for the workshop in Barcelona and Comas said that it had been more expensive.

Ildefonse calculated that 100 participants would cost €100,000 and perhaps only even support 80 fully involved participants. Erbacher was able to provide the exact budget figures numbers and reported that the usual funding level was €18k plus €6k from ESF making a total of €24k.

Erbacher gave a summary of upcoming workshops and MacLeod asked him to provide a report for inclusion in the minutes. Erbacher agreed. (see section 3.1.2 herein, provided by Teresa Bingham-Müller).

MacLeod suggested that potential themes for future Magellan workshops should be discussed over dinner, reminding delegates about the lists and nominations needed for the Agenda items for meeting the following day. He closed the first day of the meeting at 17:30.

Friday November 2nd 2006

6. Staffing

6.1 Nominations for new SAS panel members

SAS representative replacements:

Science Planning Committee (SPC)

A replacement on the SPC panel is needed for MacLeod after August 2007. As MacLeod will be at sea during the next SPC meeting in March 2007 it would be sensible for the new member to attend this earlier meeting. The steering committee have proposed Hugh Jenkyns who has considerable past experience with DSDP and ODP and has previously served on PCOM. Other, and less experienced applicants who were considered would be conflicted on proposals. Involvement in a proposal excludes the proponent from a large part of the SPC meetings. MacLeod asked if there were any objections and stated that silence would be considered as acceptance. There were no objections and so Hugh Jenkyns will replace MacLeod as SPC panel representative commencing with the next SPC meeting in March 2007.

Engineering Development Panel (EDP)

A replacement on the EDP panel from June 2007 is required, preferably from a “small country”. Abrantes said she had an idea for a nominee but she would like to consult them first. MacLeod agreed but stated that we must have the name as soon as possible as they need to be approved by ECORD Council on November 27th. Strand said he also had a nominee but was in the same situation as Abrantes in that he should consult the person first. Strand asked what sort of qualifications would be needed. MacLeod thought the representative needed to be from a generally technical background, not necessarily an engineer but operational rather than scientific, e.g. borehole stability. Arnold suggested Daniel Ask who is a borehole scientist working for an energy company in Sweden. His projects include the study of rock mechanics regarding the potential storage of nuclear waste.

Ildefonse reported that the Chair of EDP, Peter Flemings, had stressed that one important area of expertise required on the panel was that of borehole stability. It was decided that the three delegates would approach their nominees and report back to ESSAC. If there was more than one acceptance then ESSAC would vote and the remaining candidates would be offered the role(s) of permanent alternates. MacLeod thanked the delegates for their efforts in this nomination process.

Scientific Technology Panel (STP)

A new panel member, preferably from a small country is needed from December 2006. MacLeod quoted from STP Chair Mike Lovell as to the required profile of the new member: “the areas we lack expertise in are as follows: biochemistry and microbiology, chemical oceanography, sedimentary and organic geochemistry, tectonics and application of geophysics, sedimentology and (to a lesser extent) databasing... What we are already strong on is micropalaeontology, igneous, observatories and downhole logging”

Silvia Spezzaferri wishes to stand as a member of STP, but her expertise (micropalaeontology and palaeo-environment) is not one required by the panel. MacLeod therefore asked the Committee if they could come up with the names of additional candidates. If one or more came forward then the ESSAC delegates would vote for their preferred candidate. Kleiven thought that she could provide the name of a suitable candidate but she would need to approach them first. Weissert reiterated that Judy McKenzie strongly recommends that Spezzaferri remain as a permanent alternate if she is not

selected as the standing delegate. Camoin suggested that there may also be a resource pool in the sedimentology or microbiology units at Zürich. Weissert will investigate this avenue for potential candidates.

MacLeod reported that Doug Schmitt (Canada), who is currently a permanent alternate on STP had been approached and asked whether he wished to be considered as a candidate for the ECORD small country delegate position on STP. He declined the invitation but indicated that he wished to continue as a permanent alternate.

Action Item: MacLeod asked the delegates to return all nominations for the EDP and STP panels together with the agreements of the nominees to the ESSAC Office by Monday 13th November 2006. This allows time to circulate the information to all ESSAC delegates and provide them the opportunity to vote on their preferred nominees before submitting the names to the ECORD Council for approval on November 27th 2006.

6.2 Report on final staffing of Expedition 313 (New Jersey MSP)

MacLeod showed the tabled applications for this expedition including the star rankings given to each applicant. All applications, whatever their star rating, had been forwarded to the Operator (here ESO). He noted that Heimhofer was suggested by the co-chiefs although he didn't initially apply. MacLeod then explained that the staffing process was iterative, and that the star rating was indicative rather than prescriptive. He gave the example of McCarthy, who was only allocated one star because Canada are so far over-quota, but who had unique and essential expertise. On behalf of ESSAC MacLeod had agreed to the request from the co-chiefs and Operator that McCarthy be invited on the expedition, as selecting the best science party is always paramount. MacLeod said he intended to follow the same format for the NanTroSEIZE staffing. Brinkhuis asked for an explanation as to the significance of the stars in the ranking column. MacLeod explained that these were only a guideline for the Operators. Brinkhuis asked about the criteria used to select the co-chiefs for this expedition. MacLeod replied that he had no details but that co-chiefs are selected from a list of nominees forwarded to the operators by SPC. Although some of the nominees are drawn from the proponents, not all are usually put forward, and more names are provided by the SPC members. The Operator is responsible for selecting the co-chiefs from this list. MacLeod commented that he was uncomfortable with this system, because it acted as a disincentive to proposal proponents if they had no guarantee of even being considered for the co-chief position.

Ildefonse added that allocation of co-chiefs is strictly controlled by the quota agreed in the IODP MoU, and hence that the number of ECORD co-chiefs is 3/17ths of the total. MacLeod concurred but said that he had been informed that, as for normal scientific berths, ECORD actually have 1/3 of the co-chiefs. He had checked the co-chief allocations for the IODP expeditions to date and this 1/3 figure is correct.

Ildefonse thought it would be unusual to have a co-chief who is unaware of the science. Brumsack thought that the final decisions about co-chiefs should be approved again by SPC after the Operator's selection process. He also commented that ECORD nominees do not have to be from Europe, e.g. US members of SPC can nominate Europeans and vice versa. MacLeod agreed and pointed out that ESSAC should be prepared to act quickly when nominations were sought, as the window of opportunity for suggesting names was small. MacLeod also pointed out that in IODP the intellectual property rights, or ownership of the proposal, do not stay with the proponents as is the case with conventional national level grant proposals.

6.3 Review of NanTroSEIZE applications, and grouping of nominees

MacLeod informed delegates that 84 applications had been received for the five NanTroSEIZE expeditions on *Chikyū* and the SODV. He reviewed ESSAC's normal evaluation process, whereby ESSAC evaluated the ECORD candidates and gave each a 'star' rating based on experience and national balance, before forwarding all the applications on to the Operators (in this case the US and Japan).

The 84 ECORD applications are from the following countries: Austria 0; Italy 18; Belgium 1; The Netherlands 1; Canada 1; Norway 1; Denmark 0; Portugal 4; Finland 2; Spain 2; France 18; Sweden 2; Germany 14; Switzerland 3; Iceland 0; UK 16; Ireland 1.

ESSAC needs to group the applications according to national- and ECORD-level strategic priorities, and ECORD internal quotas, and then forward the applications to the relevant Implementing Organisations (USIO & CDEX). The IOs, together with the NanTroSEIZE Project Management Team and expedition co-chiefs, will make final choices based upon scientific expertise and ESSAC grouping.

With the agreement of the Committee, MacLeod determined that, as with previous staffing exercises, a priority grouping (High, Medium, Low; or else 3-star, 2-star, 1-star and 0-star) should be assigned to each application, taking into account the quotas based upon financial contribution. This equates to (on average) 2 France, 2 Germany, 2 UK, + 2 small country berths per expedition.

The full applications (with CVs) were sent to each ESSAC national delegate prior to the meeting, and are also available for inspection at the meeting. ESSAC delegates should therefore have already reviewed applications from their own country (at least) in advance of the meeting.

MacLeod referred the delegates to Appendix 8 which describes the five NanTroSEIZE expeditions and summarised their task of grouping the applicants into categories before forwarding to the Operators and co-chiefs for selection. At this stage the Operators have to consider the Japanese, US and Chinese and Korean applicants.

Brumsack asked how many berths were available on *Chikyū*. MacLeod answered that we have to base the science party on an allocation of 24 berths. MacLeod informed the delegates that the first staffing meeting for the two SODV NanTroSEIZE expeditions would take place in College Station on Monday 6th November, and therefore ESSAC needed to send off the details as soon as possible.

Erbacher stated that some applications were only suitable for one of the expeditions and could be highly recommended for this but not recommended at all for the other expeditions. MacLeod agreed that this might be the case for some candidates but stated that the staffing exercise would become impossibly complicated if ESSAC were to attempt to assign different priority groupings to an individual candidate for each of the five expeditions. Not all candidates had indicated which expedition they were interested in. It was agreed that ESSAC would simply prioritise the ECORD candidates once, regardless of expedition, and would leave it up to the Operators which candidates they felt most suitable for each expedition. It was felt that the Operators, co-chiefs and project management team would appreciate being given the flexibility.

MacLeod then summarised the applications from each country. Whereas the number of applications from the big three countries (UK, France and Germany) were roughly in proportion to their financial contribution, the range of interest from the small countries varied widely. The number of

applicants per country varied from 0 to 18, and this did not correlate at all with their individual financial contributions. This demonstrates a marked imbalance between political interest/financial capacity and active scientific interest from country to country. Some countries – ESSAC representatives and/or national offices – are clearly more effective in motivating their scientific communities than others. MacLeod suggested that the Committee discusses motivation methods later in the meeting. He then explained the chart on page 17 of the Agenda Book which relates to staffing/quotas. France Germany and the UK are allocated 25% of the berths each and the remaining 25% are allocated to the remaining countries. The number of berths to which each country is entitled, taking account of staffing up to and including Expedition 313, is calculated for each individual country.

Referring to the chart, Brumsack raised the issue of Expeditions 307 and 308 being under-subscribed and the fact that Germany provided scientists to fill these positions. He asked if this was recorded and whether it would now count against Germany's allocation quota. MacLeod answered that this had indeed been recorded and that it would not count against Germany's quota. Italy was also in this same position.

Brinkhuis asked who the participant for the Netherlands was on Expedition 310. Ildefonse answered that it was Claus Verver from Amsterdam. Brinkhuis then asked who the participant for the Netherlands was on Expedition 308 and the answer is Valentina Zampetti.

Weissert stated that country allocations were complicated because scientists, particularly Ph.D. students, are transient and move from one country to another. Ildefonse agreed but said this was a common phenomenon. Before sending a student on an expedition a guarantee would be needed that work will be done on the samples after the expedition. It would be preferable to have the support of a geographically stable person or laboratory. Reference was made to the French applicant for NanTroSEIZE currently based in Santa Cruz, US. The case of a scientist who has applied both as a US participant and an Italian participant was also discussed. The USAC Chair, Holly Given, had suggested that the Italian/US application should be considered as being from ECORD as the person will soon return to a position in Italy. McInroy questioned whether it was fair to prioritise scientists on the basis of their laboratory support, as this works against the younger, not yet established scientists. MacLeod and others expressed their sympathy with this view, but MacLeod was of the opinion that it was best that the young scientists have a mentor or guarantor in their laboratory. Arnold supported this view. Kleiven asked if they were referring to lack of experience or lack of scientific ambition. MacLeod reported that more students had applied than was normal and the task for ESSAC was to distinguish the 'geotourists' from the scientists who would be most likely to make a useful scientific contribution to the expeditions. Ildefonse also supported the view that students without adequate laboratory support should not be selected as these expeditions are not training exercises.

Arnold stated that Sweden had been very co-operative with regard to transient students, citing an instance in which a student moving from Sweden to Southampton UK had been counted as a Swedish applicant. However, she said that in future such an applicant would be counted as a UK scientist. MacLeod noted that usual practice was for scientists to count against the country that supported them during the cruise and for their post-cruise research.

Ildefonse opined that, despite ECORD having more applications than either the US or Japan, the number of applicants from ECORD is way too low. He explained that the new director of CNRS was not impressed by the French application numbers. Camoin asked about the applications from the US and Japan. Arnold reported that the situation was much the same as Europe. The time

schedule is the major problem with six months notice not being long enough. The lack of definite cruise dates was also likely to be a factor in deterring people from making applications.

MacLeod returned to the question of motivation within the ESSAC delegates' own countries. He considered that mass emails emanating from the ESSAC Office were not effective enough and asked for ideas on other possible strategies that could be employed: e.g. flyers, direct phone calls etc. He conceded that NanTroSEIZE is a special case but in general more effort must be put into outreach activities. Camoin agreed with the point about the overly short notice of time schedules and cited Tahiti and New Jersey as examples. Ildefonse also thought that more effort should be put into seeking applicants of the right calibre. If the application rate remains at these low levels there will be serious implications for survival of the program in the next few years. Camoin said that only the three MSP expeditions plus two North Atlantic expeditions had had enough ECORD applications in his opinion. Weissert suggested that the program is not succeeding in contacting the young communities. Brinkhuis suggested that there would be many more applicants from the Netherlands if the country's available quota of berths was higher. Ildefonse countered that all potential applicants from the Netherlands should apply regardless of the quota. MacLeod stated that the quotas are for guidance only and essentially the program needs more money at Council level and more berths at ESSAC level.

MacLeod referred to the Agenda appendices where a summary of applications is included in Appendix 9 and the applicants' web form data are included in Appendix 10. The full CVs and reference letters are not included in the agenda appendices but are available for download or viewing on the password protected pages of the ESSAC web site. MacLeod discussed how he proposed to organize the methodology of the grouping of applicants and suggested that the delegates first sort the applications into groups and then that all the applications should be forwarded to the operators. He asked the delegates for their opinions on how much flexibility should be allowed to the operators in their selection. At Arnold's suggestion it was decided to leave this question until the respective delegates had given their countries' reports.

MacLeod proceeded to ask each country in turn for their appraisal of their own applicants. A lengthy but constructive discussion ensued, making reference to the intra-ECORD quota balance when necessary.

McInroy suggested that the initial web form filled in by the applicants should clearly state that letters of support are required. The web form currently gives instructions for uploading additional documents but does not classify them as mandatory.

Brinkhuis thought there should be a plan to accommodate undergraduate trainees. MacLeod said that he would forward this request to the Operators and said that he knew of other interested parties. He thought it was possible to sail such trainees if vacancies occurred in the staffing party. Ildefonse said that there was an undergraduate programme in the US but it is financially driven therefore making this a question for ECORD Council. MacLeod had no objections to a trainee programme as long as it is over and above ECORD's science quota.

MacLeod then commented about the wonderful level of interest from Italy (with 18 participants), adding that there is clearly more interest from the science community than from the funding agency. The problem is for Italy's funding agencies to achieve a higher funding level as Italian applicants are well qualified but hampered by Italy's low quota of berths.

Ildefonse asked for clarification of procedure, i.e. will all the applicants with stars be forwarded to the operators. MacLeod answered that all the application would be forwarded.

MacLeod totalled the grouping allocations following the discussions and announced that there are 30 high priority applicants (3-star), 18 middle priority applicants (2-star), 14 low priority applicants (1-star), 19 unclassified (zero star), and 3 applicants who wish to be shore-based only. All 84 applications would now be forwarded to the operators with the ESSAC grouping recommendations.

Ildefonse suggested that ESSAC write a consensus letter to accompany the list. MacLeod agreed that a comprehensive letter should accompany the applications. ESSAC will draft a letter explaining the procedure and also ask about undergraduate training possibilities. This will be sent to the operators. MacLeod does not propose to circulate a copy of the letter to ESSAC unless there are changes to be made to the iterative process as discussed today. Delegates gave the ESSAC Chair authority to proceed in this manner.

Action Item: ESSAC will draft a comprehensive letter to the operators to accompany the NanTroSEIZE applications which explains the grouping procedure and also asks about undergraduate training possibilities.

6.4 Call for applications for Equatorial Pacific expeditions

USIO are promoting two Equatorial Pacific expeditions and have released a call for both with a simultaneous deadline for applications of 18th December 2006. The expedition dates are provisionally Nov-Dec 2007 and Nov-Dec 2008. This call does not allow much time for applicants especially as the second expedition Equatorial Pacific 2 is two years ahead and there are the additional problems associated with the SODV2 proposed refit. MacLeod commented that the early call may result in fewer applicants and suspects that based on New Jersey experience that USIO will reopen the call at a later date. He recommends that applicants should be informed that the schedule is due to change. Ildefonse was in favour of advising all applicants at this stage that the ship schedule can be changed. He suggests that candidates apply now regardless of this fact as they have the option to withdraw at a later stage if necessary, i.e. if the final dates are unsuitable. Their applications would be more a 'statement of interest' rather than a commitment. Arnold thought that if the ship went into the shipyard before the end of December then the present schedule could be maintained. She advised against making a formal announcement that the schedule may change. Ildefonse agreed that care would be taken when discussing this issue with potential applicants. MacLeod was in favour of a carefully crafted announcement on the ESSAC web site. A date for forwarding the applications to the operators has not been advised yet but if it is sooner than the next ESSAC meeting in May 2007 then a similar prioritization exercise as to the one performed here today will be conducted by email. Ildefonse asked how many of the meeting attendees would be going to AGU in San Francisco in December. There were very few positive responses so Ildefonse suggested that everyone asked their colleagues who were attending AGU to promote the Equatorial Pacific Expeditions on their behalf. It was agreed that although no official announcements could be made regarding any possible rescheduling or delay to the proposed Equatorial Pacific Expeditions that potential participants should be advised informally that there may be delays. Participants should be encouraged to apply even if they are unsure of their future status in 2 years time.

6.5 Reflection upon best practice for future calls for applications

MacLeod made the general point that one of the main roles for ESSAC delegates is to go out and solicit nominations for expeditions, not just forward mass e-mails. There is a specific need for delegates to go out into their own communities, give talks and presentations and in addition to

target national bodies such as geological societies, research councils and their newsletters etc. Probably different strategies are needed in different countries and for different audiences. Delegates should adopt a salesperson role.

Camoin suggested advertising country quotas in newsletters, society publications and EOS. Erbacher commented that only personal contact works in the end and that he thought 'small group' meetings were effective.

MacLeod suggested pooling PowerPoint presentations for people to give talks. The ESSAC Office would like to collate a pool of such presentations for general distribution. He asked delegates for their approval.

Ildefonse commented that there were already some on the IODP website and added that ESSAC should post these presentations on the password restricted pages of the website. He thought that some of the presentations should not be publicly available for download. MacLeod agreed to provide supporting information as to which material can or cannot be published.

Arnold said that the Swedish NSF would include calls for applications and suggested that all delegates do the same for their own countries. MacLeod agreed saying that all calls should be tailored for the specific country as funding procedures differ between countries. Weissert argued for a pool of Pan-European funding for scientists, but it is clear that the politics is not yet there for this to happen in the short to medium term. MacLeod noted with regret that the status quo was that not only scientific merit but one's home country plays a significant factor in affecting one's chances of being invited on an IODP expedition.

Brinkhuis suggested that online information about the Chikyū, e.g. life on board etc. would be helpful. Ildefonse said he would suggest this idea to Nancy Light. Arnold said she would contact Japanese colleagues and ask if they could provide material along these lines.

Ildefonse suggested that the website should include an information section for school children and be available both in English and in French. MacLeod thought ESSAC should cater for different audiences e.g. the general community at large and the scientific community. He suggested that there might be an open part of the website and a restricted section. MacLeod went on to say that ESSAC's primary outreach task is to get more applicants. He considered email floods as being sometimes self-defeating and stressed the fact that more effort from individual ESSAC delegates is required.

Ildefonse replied saying that emails alone are not enough but that they are a necessary step. Ildefonse's mode of working is to first send out general emails and then to email target individuals by name. He is building up a network in France of people in different disciplines. Ildefonse added that he appreciated the cultural and political differences between countries but that ESSAC should focus on how help can be given at a European level. Help such as this would be particularly useful for small countries.

7. Education and Outreach

7.1 ECORD Newsletter #7 (October 2006), and #8 (April 2007)

Maruéjol gave a report on the latest ECORD Newsletter, ECORD Newsletter No. 7. She commented that at the moment there is no precise mailing list of newsletters to ESSAC delegates

for distribution but that she would send each delegate their own copy. If the delegates required additional supplies for distribution then they should contact her directly. She added that she welcomed contributions for the next newsletter (no. 8). This is due for publication in March 2007 but contributions would be welcome until the end of January 2007. A report from Kopf and/or Lallemant about life onboard *Chikyu* had been solicited and would be especially welcome.

MacLeod asked Maruéjol if she could please also send the newsletter to all ECORD SAS panel members routinely from now on.

7.2 GIFT/ECORD teachers' conference (EGU Vienna 2007)

Arnold outlined her plans for the next GIFT (Geophysical Information For Teachers) workshop on 16th – 18th April during the 2007 EGU meeting in Vienna. She showed programmes from the previous two years. The workshop is scheduled for 2.5 days and the planned speakers for this year will give presentations on the theme 'Geoscience and the Cities – Natural Hazards'. Arnold showed the planned speakers list and gave examples of the various types of proposed exhibits of natural hazards in cities, including the Coliseum in Rome, earthquakes in Istanbul and Rome, flooding in France and atmospheres re Milagros. The focus of the workshop would be on the work of high level scientists and on natural hazards from the IODP viewpoint. She asked for volunteers to give talks on natural hazards. Topics relating to the Arctic regions are not included as these have been the subject of focus during past meetings. Camoin suggested Hesselbo for a talk on hazards relating to the New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition and McKenzie for a talk on the deep biosphere.

Arnold will send out application calls for teachers. There is a budget of €10K provided by ECORD-net for teacher support. The EU allocates €400 per person for travel and accommodation. Registration to the whole of the EGU meeting (normally €350) is waived for invited speakers of the GIFT workshops. There will be a single application for both the GIFT and the IODP workshops. Attendance usually consists of c. 70 teachers from Europe. Both AGU and EGU are represented on the committee which allows Americans to attend. Japanese participants will also be invited. Arnold will reproduce the current CD produced by Brinkhuis and distribute them at the meeting. Camoin offered copies of the recent television documentary produced about the Tahiti Expedition. Arnold asked Camoin if he still had contact with teachers on Tahiti and if he thought they should be invited to the meeting. Camoin replied that he still maintained good contacts with these teachers but that he considered it uneconomical to invite them to EGU. Ildefonse recommended Kopf as an invited speaker and also thought a Japanese speaker should be invited. Erbacher recommended Behrmann as an invited speaker. Ildefonse was keen that the topic "Ocean Crust" should be included in the workshop programme. Arnold stated that there were 7 hours of programming and that simple and clear talks were required for a mixed audience. Sacchi asked Arnold if she had contacted Camerlenghi as a contributor to the workshop and Arnold confirmed that she had. Sacchi also suggested that she contact Emanuel Lodolo from OGS and Arnold agreed. MacLeod formally thanked Arnold for her efforts.

7.3 ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme

MacLeod introduced the issues of Summer Schools and a Distinguished Lecturer Programme (DLP) by recounting that Pearce had volunteered to organise such programmes during an ECORD Council meeting earlier this year. The Council agreed to a budget of the order of €75k per annum for outreach activities providing that ESSAC first produce a detailed plan together with costing for Council approval.

As regards a DLP, ECORD Council would like a plan plus budget in time for their meeting on 27 Nov 2006. The DLP could be based on the model of the US Distinguished Lecturer Series (DLS) which is run by USSSP. The US advertise for nominations of speakers and also request self-nominations. Once the lecturers have been selected the universities bid to host the talks. MacLeod emphasized that this would be good publicity for ECORD and may influence both potential expedition applicants and funding agencies.

MacLeod asked the meeting for their opinions and specifically whether ESSAC should follow the USSSP model and whether the programme should be advertised widely or whether specific people should be invited to apply. Arnold commented that in the US programme speakers are usually contacted by networks. MacLeod reported that this year there are seven lecturers in the US programme and asked if ESSAC could support as many as seven or should there be a trial year with only one speaker? Additionally should the speaker concentrate their lecture on an IODP theme? MacLeod invited opinions.

Erbacher suggested a trial year of one or two talks. MacLeod asked if the series should be assigned a name, for example the “Shackleton Lecture Series”. MacLeod suggested that ESSAC aim for three lecturers one on each of the three principal IODP themes plus each giving a general introduction to IODP provided by ECORD/ESSAC. There was a broad consensus on this being the correct scale.

MacLeod asked if the meeting would like to nominate speakers during this meeting or if they would like time to consider. Camoin suggested that nominees should be forwarded to the ESSAC Office after the meeting but within 10 days, i.e. by 13th November 2006. This would give time to prepare the case to present to ECORD Council at their next meeting on 27th November 2006. Brinkhuis asked if a 45 minute talk about IODP in general was required. MacLeod thought that a 15 minute common introduction to IODP should be followed by a case study on one theme. Arnold commented that the US lecturers commonly provided two talks per each university visit and that these were targeted at two different audiences, i.e. a non-specialist general public audience and a faculty level audience. Ildefonse volunteered himself for nomination and offered a talk at three different levels. It was agreed that self-nomination for speakers is acceptable and ESSAC will otherwise advertise via the web site and mailing lists for nominations, and/or approach individuals that delegates identify. A deadline of 13th November was agreed for ESSAC members to submit names to the ESSAC Office for the 2007 DLP. ESSAC would then select 3 lecturers for the first year of the programme.

MacLeod suggested that individual universities should also be able to choose the number and level of talks required thus avoiding micromanagement by ECORD. He suggested that the talks need general introduction to IODP and ECORD (in particular), they should be about 45 minutes in total length and should develop from the general introduction into detailed science on a particular theme. Alternatively it would also be feasible to give two different talks – one more general, with more about IODP in general, perhaps to general science audience, and then a more detailed research-based talk.

Ildefonse then instigated a discussion on the composition of the budget. This budget will need to be flexible as precise costs per lecture will be variable. MacLeod suggested approaching ECORD Council to ask for a block grant to ESSAC.

Brinkhuis suggested that the budget allowance would depend on the travel track. He thought an initial figure would be about €600-700 per talk which should then be adjusted accordingly.

MacLeod responded that ECORD Council had appeared content with a baseline figure of €1000 per talk, and he intended to use this for planning purposes hereafter to be on the safe side.

Action Item: ESSAC delegates should send nominations for the Distinguished Lecturer Programme, together with evidence of the nominee's agreement, to the ESSAC Office no later than Monday 13th November 2006. Voting will be organised as necessary.

MacLeod summarised by saying that once the DLP programme is approved by ECORD Council and fully organised the ESSAC Office will publicise the series. The USSSP model will be followed in general and a variety of advertising platforms will be used. Suggestions from delegates regarding advertising issues are welcome and ESSAC especially wish to include as targets those universities which have had little or no involvement with the Ocean Drilling Programs in the past.

7.4 ECORD Summer Schools

MacLeod reiterated that ECORD Council have agreed to fund a Summer School Programme to the extent of (the order of) €50k per annum, providing ESSAC supply them with an acceptable plan and budget at their November 2006 meeting. He mentioned the suggestion made by some ECORD Council members who were in favour of the idea of recreating a 'virtual ship' at the Bremen core repository, with attendees making a variety of observations and measurements on sediment cores from a particular section, exactly as if they were onboard *JOIDES Resolution*, with the aim of extracting time-series data they could interpret in terms of palaeo-environmental change.

MacLeod commented that he had no personal experience of Summer School programmes and therefore needed advice from the delegates. Brinkhuis said that he ran a similar programme every year in Urbino and MacLeod invited him to discuss this project.

Brinkhuis briefly outlined the programme saying that it was of 2.5 weeks duration and the cost per person at the moment is c. €550 for students or €900 for academics and industry. The deadline for applications is 15 March 2007. Past schools have accommodated ~50 students/yr but there is probably capacity for up to 75 students. Organisation of the study course is facilitated by a network of contacts which includes the hotel owner. Students consider topics such as proxies, stable isotopes, events, fossils etc. The students do both practical and literature exercises and the staff involve them in predictions as to what they should have found and discussions about 'why not' if they don't find anything. Brinkhuis said he could easily tailor the programme to an IODP focus and he could integrate activities with Ursula Röhl if the Bremen Core repository were to be used. Themes planned for the 2007 Summer School are sapropels and the carbon cycle.

Weissert reported that he, Erba, Brumsack and others currently also contribute to a similar but smaller operation (~1 week timescale) on Mesozoic palaeoceanography. The costs for that programme are €15k all inclusive.

MacLeod summarised the consensus view of the Committee that there was no point in starting again with the Bremen idea in competition with existing programmes such as Brinkhuis's, if the latter could be adapted to IODP.

A discussion ensued and it was concluded that Erba and Brinkhuis could potentially both offer Summer School proposals. MacLeod also noted that he and Ildefonse could potentially run a Summer School on the topic "Ocean Floor" in Oman during the cooler months some time in the future.

Brinkhuis suggested that ECORD should contribute to student scholarships and the expenses for speakers at the Summer Schools. MacLeod thought the former in particular was a possibility.

MacLeod concluded by saying that he intends to present ECORD Council an 'à la carte' menu of the ideas discussed here for supporting Summer Schools via the administration of ESSAC. He would present as many detailed proposals as potential convenors wished to submit. Such proposals are therefore required as soon as possible. Brinkhuis commented that existing sponsors for the Urbino School each pay €10k. MacLeod asked for written outline proposals, with costings, from Brinkhuis and Weissert/Erba. The aim is to have a sustainable funding programme and the ECORD banner needs to be prominent.

Arnold approved of the idea of rotating concepts. She suggested that maybe an annual deadline for organising Summer Schools would be a good idea. She envisaged operating on a smaller scale than the example given by Brinkhuis but stressed that a known deadline was essential. MacLeod asked how much lead time would be needed. Weissert thought 10 months to 1 year would be sufficient. MacLeod suggested that the deadline be set before one of the ESSAC meetings and suggested an April or May 2007 deadline for a Summer School in 2008. Brinkhuis stated that if a Summer School was required in 2007 in Urbino their organising committee would need to know by March 2007 or as early as possible if they are to get a grant from IODP. MacLeod answered that if the committee decides that the best procedure for 2007 is to use the adapted Urbino programme he will ask ECORD Council at their meeting in November to fund it. In subsequent years then May could be the deadline.

Brandsdóttir reported that Iceland run a similar programme with NSF sponsorship and that NSF would be willing to sponsor an appropriate summer school in Iceland if it were connected to deep drilling and it would be even better if it had an IODP link. Brandsdóttir has discussed the idea recently with Margaret Leinen who suggested that ECORD should be approached. MacLeod asked Brandsdóttir when she thought the project could take place and it was thought that it could occur in 2008. MacLeod commented that ECORD could potentially sponsor more than one Summer School at a time and asked Brandsdóttir to submit a summary in writing. Brandsdóttir agreed to do this for next year.

Brinkhuis asked which nationalities ECORD would support, i.e. would this be restricted to ECORD scientists.

MacLeod suggested that if Erba wanted ECORD Council support in 2007 she needed to submit the proposal very soon. Alternatively she should apply for 2008 funding by May 2007.

7.5 IODP promotional materials

Brinkhuis showed the IODP DVD he has recently completed which summarizes IODP. He gave copied to the meeting members and said that he could provide more if required and that the material is copyright free. It will soon be streamed on the internet. MacLeod asked if ESSAC could post it their web site. Maruėjol pointed out that it will be on the ECORD website. MacLeod formally thanked Brinkhuis for the production of the DVD and the contribution that this has made to Education and Outreach.

7.6 Information handling in ECORD: what is the role of ESSAC?

What is the main role of ESSAC? MacLeod referred delegates to the Terms of Reference (Appendix 13) and asked for comments. He also asked for comments on the ESSAC web site and explained how it was run. In general the delegates are satisfied with the web site. Erbacher said that he found no problems with the site. Ildefonse commented that it functioned as it was supposed to, i.e. it provided information. He further suggested that the current web designer/web maintenance contractor had done an excellent job but that ideally this should be done in-house. Advances in web authoring technology now make it much easier to maintain the web site in-house, or possibly provide training for Maruéjol to become the webmaster.

Although there is potential for dramatic improvements to the web site the general agreement is that a major review of how the ESSAC web site is run should only be attempted when the ESSAC Office moves from Cardiff to Aix-en Provence next year. Camoin will discuss issues and plans for the web site with Maruéjol.

Ildefonse suggested the dragon logo should be discarded as the ESSAC Office is not location specific and therefore should not have a logo which is identified with a particular location. It was decided to keep the ESSAC@Cardiff logo until the office moves to Aix-en-Provence, then design and adopt a non-generic permanent logo. MacLeod asked for clarification on whether and/or when they should change the web maintenance contract. Camoin would like to leave the issue for the moment and revisit it at the next ESSAC meeting.

With regard to information handling MacLeod suggested that there could perhaps be two different protected areas of ESSAC web site. One protected area for example could be used to post information for US & Japanese IOs to pick up ECORD Expedition applicants' details; and it may be that such an area is also suitable for ECORD DLP participants to access ppt resources for their presentation. A second and more exclusive protected area would still be needed to post other CVs, application statistics and other confidential information as with the current password protected area.

MacLeod reported that there had been recent discussions between EMA, ECORD Council and ESSAC regarding the material content of the website with special reference to databases and publication records. The publications database already exists at TAMU and is designed to include all DSDP, ODP and IODP publications. This database can be searched by co-chiefs, scientists online at will. Once a year, probably in February, TAMU will do detailed searches so that the statistics can be generated and then included in reports to the funding agencies. MacLeod stated that it is too much work for ESSAC to recreate a database. It was an ECORD-net task and Norway and Portugal have been tasked with this. Abrantes plans to establish the status of progress regarding activities for WP1 of ECORD-net with Portuguese leadership (José Monteiro). Maruéjol agreed that the database was an ECORD-net deliverable relating to publications, expedition participants etc. It is thought necessary as part of the EMA justification of activities to the funding agencies.

Action item: ESSAC Office to get TAMU to provide an extract of ECORD publications during their annual extraction exercise from the AGI/GeoRef database in February 2007

Ildefonse said that as there was already a publication tool it did not need doing again. If reports have to be written and statistic are needed then TAMU will help to generate them. Ildefonse has already done this for IODP France and TAMU were very helpful in getting appropriate search keys. Ildefonse will give copy of these keys to ESSAC. He further suggested that that ESSAC should ask EMA to be specific in their requests for data. TAMU used co-mingled funds to create and maintain their databases so ECORD has already paid for this facility. MacLeod offered to host any material

for WP1 but refused to allow use of ESSAC resources to carry out the tasks of WP1. It was generally agreed that it is folly to create an ESSAC publications database that reproduces an existing one (the AGI database of DSDP/ODP/IODP publications), which is now directly linked to ESSAC site.

It was agreed that Urquhart, Maruéjol and Bernal-Carrera would ascertain requirements regarding the overall ESSAC responsibilities for database aspects of ECORD.

8. Next ESSAC Meeting

8.1 ESSAC Meeting #8, May 2007

MacLeod announced that Brandsdóttir had generously agreed to host the next meeting in Iceland and invited her to outline the logistics. Brandsdóttir explained that after May 15th it was possible to host the meeting in the university in Reykjavik. Otherwise it was possible to host the meeting in another location near to a geothermal plant 30km from Reykjavik at any time from the beginning of May onwards. This latter location would be relatively less expensive. Brandsdóttir added that it would be possible to coincide the ESSAC meeting with the Arctic Holocene Climate meeting which was to be held from 3rd–5th May 2007. Brinkhuis said that he wouldn't be able to attend at this time and would prefer the meeting to be in the second week of May. MacLeod reported that he had received a request from Gillis (Canada) to hold the meeting at some time during the first two weeks of May and that he would like to accommodate everyone's timetables if possible. It was provisionally agreed that the meeting would run for 1.5 days, possibly 2 and would be scheduled during a weekend, e.g. Friday–Sunday. The delegates preferred the idea of a weekend meeting time to minimise flight costs. Brandsdóttir pointed out that most flights into Iceland arrive in the late afternoon, so suggests a full first meeting day and half second day rather than other way round. Brandsdóttir will email ESSAC members with more details in the near future.

9. Any other business

Panel Rotation Schedules

MacLeod pointed out that according to the Terms of Reference ESSAC members should rotate every three years. MacLeod himself is standing down from SPC and ESSAC in 2007/8. He commented however that rotation schedules are not so easy in practice. Each country should consider their own positions and review them every three years. Ideally at least one-third of the panel should rotate off every year. Arnold asked if ECORD Council should be informed and MacLeod answered that this is happening slowly. There is a need for corporate memory and originally it was suggested that the Chair should be for 3 years. This has now been reduced to two years. EMA is the one permanent office base. MacLeod said he would raise the rotation issue with ECORD Council and see if they wished to comment. He also mentioned that there is no obligation that a delegate's alternate automatically becomes a member when the delegate rotates off. This decision is up to each member country.

Action item: MacLeod to raise the issue of rotation schedules of panel members with ECORD Council.

Comas requested that a ten-minute summary of their own activities be given by each country and that these summaries should be included as an agenda item. Ildefonse supported this idea. MacLeod agreed to a five- or ten-minute summary from each country but agreed with the suggestion of Comas that it should not be included in the Minutes unless there is a consensus to note specific action items or recommendations. The item will be called "National Reports" and the goal will be to

share problems and solutions in achieving our main IODP goals. One to two hours maximum will be scheduled for this issue during the next meeting. Sometimes one country can assist another via personal networks.

MacLeod formally thanked Marco Sacchi and Patricia Sclafani for hosting such a well organized meeting.

Meeting closed at 16:15 on 3rd November 2006.