

## ***MINUTES-ESSAC Meeting #3 Aix en Provence, 25-26-11-2004***

Start : 12:00, 25 November 2004  
End: : 17:00, 26 November 2004  
Location : CEREGE main building, Room 207

### **List of participants:**

#### **ESSAC:**

|                      |                                    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Jeroen Kenter        | ESSAC-chair, NL                    |
| Valentina Zampetti   | ESSAC Science Coordinator          |
| Werner Pillek        | delegate-Austria                   |
| Kathy Gillis         | delegate Canada                    |
| Paul M. Holm         | delegate Denmark (only 26-11-2004) |
| Kari Strand          | delegate Finland                   |
| Gilbert Camoin       | delegate-France                    |
| Benoit Ildefonse     | alternate France                   |
| Hermann Kudras       | alternate Germany                  |
| Brindys Brandsdóttir | delegate-Iceland                   |
| Rolf B. Pedersen     | delegate Norway                    |
| Fatima Abrantes      | delegate-Portugal                  |
| Menchu Comas         | delegate-Spain                     |
| Eve Arnold           | delegate Sweden                    |
| Judith McKenzie      | delegate-Switzerland               |
| Paul Wilson          | ESSAC-UK                           |

#### **INVITED OBSERVERS:**

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Teresa Bingham    | ECORD-net, Switzerland |
| Dan Evans         | ESO-UK                 |
| Patricia Marvejol | EMA-France             |
| Catherine Mevel   | EMA-France             |

#### **ABSENT:**

Camerlenghi (Italy) with notice

**25<sup>th</sup> November      Time: 12.00 -17.30**

## **1. Welcome/introduction and objectives of the meeting**

Kenter welcomes the participants both in Aix en Provence and the third ESSAC meeting. Kenter officially welcomes Austria, which joined ECORD and ESSAC, and the Austrian ESSAC delegate Werner Piller. The meeting starts with a round-the-table introduction of those present. Kenter announced that Angelo Camerlenghi, delegate of Italy, will not attend the meeting. However, Camerlenghi will officially inform with an e-mail to ESSAC and EMA that Italy is going to double its present contribution for IODP. Due to his move to Spain, Camerlenghi will also announce a solution for the ESSAC Italian representative. Kenter thanks Gilbert Camoin for hosting the meeting.

## **2. Discussion and approval of the agenda**

The draft agenda is approved.

Kenter stresses that it is unfortunate there is no Danish representative, especially because Denmark signed as a funding agency but is deficit with regards to sailing scientists. However, Holm (ESSAC Danish delegate) joins the meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

Mevel announces that, last October, IMI organized a review committee for Acex and that on the 9-10 of December a committee will review the Juan de Fuca expedition. Therefore, she is searching for ECORD scientists, who will participate in the upcoming meeting. Arnold and Kudras have potential candidates, this will be arranged by Mevel, Arnold and Kudras.

## **3. Approval of the Bremen ESSAC #2 meeting minutes** (Encl.1)

Draft minutes of ESSAC#2 meeting in Bremen are approved.

## **4. ESSAC Vice-Chair (temporarily) replacement**

Kenter introduces the UK position for Chris MacLeod's (temporarily) replacement. Paul Wilson will collate preferred UK nominations for Leg participation, outreach work and liaison with the UK IODP Scientific Coordinator and Programme Administrator. Paul Wilson and Julian Pearce will share the ESSAC Vice-Chair role. Both are willing to attend ESSAC meetings (one as observer/alternate). This allows both improving their understanding of the ESSAC business and enabling them to contribute to committees, and other necessary work. Into autumn-time 2005, Julian Pearce will keep the job on until MacLeod is able to take on the role of Chair, if necessary because based in University of Cardiff. Gillis points out that the chair position of MacLeod is person-based and not country-based. Wilson replies that the chair will be kept in Macleod's name and Pearce will only be a temporary replacement. In addition, the possibility of keeping the chair in the UK is strategic at this stage because IODP funding decisions are currently taking place in the UK. Kenter suggests accepting the UK proposal and presents the following motion:

**ESSAC 041126-1:** *ESSAC welcomes the UK solution to fill the position of the ESSAC Vice-Chair by the combination of Julian Pearce and Paul Wilson, who will jointly share the UK national and international responsibilities of the Chair position, up to the moment that Chris MacLeod will resume his ESSAC activities.*

Furthermore, Paul Wilson explains UK position for SPC duties. Wilson or Pearce will attend SPC meetings in accordance to their appropriate expertise. McKenzie remarks that UK had offered a good solution.

## **5. Report on National Office meeting, Albany 24/10/2004**

(Valentina Zampetti, 15 min)

Zampetti (ESSAC Science Coordinator) presents an overview of the main items discussed at the First National Office in Albany. The presentation is attached as pdf file in Encl. A. The following discussion focuses on cruise/postcruise activities. Mevel suggests that each ECORD country must collect information on the type of activities and the funding spent on them in order to highlight heterogeneities among ECORD countries. Kudras and Mevel raise the issue of co-chiefs vs. scientists for quota balancing. Mevel reports rumors that IMI plans to consider co-chiefs as part of the scientific party. Kenter proposes to bring it as an item of discussion for the upcoming Management Forum and Retreat meeting, and stresses that ESSAC's position implies that co-chiefs will not be considered as part of the scientific party.

## **6. Report on SPC meeting, Corvallis 25-27/10/2004**

(Jeroen Kenter, 20 min/ Encl. 2A & B)

Kenter presents a short summary of the major items discussed at the SPC meeting in Corvallis. Kenter's presentation is attached as Encl. B. Gillis proposes to circulate short reports on the motivations for ECORD proposals that are not ranked or scheduled at SPC. This would help proponents of active proposals and scientists who are planning to submit/write new IODP proposals.

## **7. Report on ACEX expedition #302 and overview on Tahiti.**

(Dan Evans, 15min)

Presentation is attached as Encl.C.

ACEX expedition was recently reviewed by a committee (REVCOM) in Washington D.C.. Kenter states that REVCOM will (as promised) provide the report to ESSAC. Kenter feels that such analysis will help the upcoming Tahiti expedition and prevent inconveniences experienced during the ACEX expedition. Kenter will send an e-mail to the Chair of REVCOM (Tom Janecek) in order to receive the report and make it available to the ESSAC delegates before the start of expedition #307. Evans outlines ESO position explaining that the problematic

relationship between the operator and the scientific party was mainly due to the fact that they were located on different ships and that the scientific party was not completely aware of the limitations of the equipment. Even more, he suggests that ESO must exert a closer control on the outreach of the future MSP. Awaiting the REVCOM report, Kenter appoints Kudras to present the following motion:

**ESSAC 041126-2:** *ESSAC congratulates and complements ESO on the impressive accomplishment of the Artic Coring Expedition (ACEX). This success of the first and very important MSP expedition organized by ECORD has been made possible by ESO and its partners who have taken the responsibility of these complex operations in a highly hostile environment. For future MSP operations ESSAC hopes to see a continuation of this high level of coring operations, but at the same time, expects an improvement in the communication and cooperation between the scientific and ESO partners.*

ESSAC will post on the website Brinkhuis's video of ACEX expedition, as soon as it will become available.

## **8. Report on Outreach & Education**

(Eve Arnold, 10 min)

Arnold's presentation is available as Encl. D

## **9. New ESSAC website and ECORD/ESSAC newsletter**

(Patricia Maruejol & Valentina Zampetti)

Zampetti displays the graphics for the new ESSAC website.

Arnold and Ildefonse suggest that the actual ECORD website and the future (under construction) ESSAC website must make more visible the connection of ECORD and ESSAC with IODP.

Maruejol presents the new edition of the ECORD newsletter. The new format includes an extra enclosure, which focuses on IODP scientific results/issues, this will be coordinated by ESSAC. Kenter stresses the necessity of having a more eye-catching and colorful layout or cover for the Newsletter Taking the J-DESC brochures as examples). Next edition of the newsletter is April 2005.

**10. ESSAC in ECORD-net WP-1 (*towards a scientific information database*) (Minutes from ECORD-net WP-1 meeting, Paris/ Encl.3)**

Zampetti explains ECORD-net Work Package 1 and summarizes ESSAC actions for it. ECORD-net WP1 aims to establish the state of art and best practice in Europe and internationally in establishing a system of mutual exchange of information between science management. ESSAC will develop and maintain an ECORD "information" database (cruise planning, participation, post-cruise results, proposals, status of site survey data, required surveys to complete proposals, scientists and institutions involved or interested in IODP).

ESSAC Office will send an e-mail to the delegates listing all the information necessary for the database ESSAC is appointee to, in the ECORD-net WP1 framework.

**11. ESSAC in ECORD-net WP-2**

(Minutes from ECORD-net WP-2 meeting, Stockholm/ Encl.4)

Zampetti explains ECORD-net Work Package 2 and summarizes ESSAC actions for it. ECORD-net WP2 aims to open ECORD to other EC and European countries and to investigate means of efficiently building on ECORD. In particular to investigate means of including the NAS and other European States in ECORD. ESSAC will identify ECORD scientists and institutions that collaborate with Newly Associated States (NAS) and organize workshops to promote development and to identify promising new scientific objectives and research opportunities. These workshops will encourage a wider scientific community involvement (particularly the target countries) to bring a broader and multidisciplinary approach to standing hypotheses and to explore new directions for research.

## **12. Nomination of ESSAC scientists for outreach team**

(Catherine Mevel/ Encl. 5)

ESSAC delegates will be directly in contact with Mevel in order to provide names and institutions connecting with NAS countries.

## **13. Distribution of information in the ECORD scientific community**

Kenter closes the first part of the meeting and asks the delegates to reconvene the day after at 9.00 am and announces that the meeting will start with a short presentation on the scientific goals of Tahiti expedition.

Gilbert Camoin opens the meeting with a short presentation on the scientific goals of the Tahiti expedition (Encl.E). Pederson proposes to regularly include scientific presentations of ECORD active proposals during meetings. Kenter agrees and suggests having short presentations on scheduled or highly ranked proposals in the next ESSAC meeting. Presenters will be notified in advance. Kenter adds that ESSAC Office will communicate it to the IODP-MI in order to avoid confidentiality issues. Kenter stresses that presenting and discussing IODP proposals that are prioritized by SPC (i.e. proposals that are part of possible future scenarios) offers the opportunity to make the scientific community aware of future expedition possibilities and the scientific directions of IODP. Kenter will provide the ESSAC delegates with SPC possible scenarios for future expeditions. Consequently, ESSAC delegates can start "an unofficial call for applications" to prepare the scientific community.

#### 14. Shipboard staffing balance (Encl.6)

##### Sail Applications and Balance version 6 November 23 2004)

| Member               | Contribution | 2-yrs berths | #545 | #533 | #572-I | #512-I | #512-II | #543-II | Slots #     | Real Slots %  | Total if full staffing (40 for 5 projects) Slots % |  |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|------|------|--------|--------|---------|---------|-------------|---------------|--|--|
| New expedition codes |              |              | 301  | 302  | 303    | 304    | 305     | 306     |             |               |  |  |
| Notes below          |              | (1)          | (2)  |      |        |        |         |         |             |               |  |  |
| France               | 24.0%        | 26.9         | 0.0  | 2.0  | 1.0    | 3.0    | 3.0     | 1.0     | 10.0        | 21.28%        | 25.0%  |  |
| Germany              | 26.1%        | 29.2         | 3.0  | 2.0  | 2.0    | 2.0    | 1.0     | 1.0     | 12.0        | 25.53%        | 30.0%  |  |
| UK                   | 24.0%        | 26.9         | 1.0  | 2.0  | 2.0    | 3.0    | 1.0     | 2.0     | 11.0        | 23.40%        | 27.5%  |  |
| <b>Sum</b>           | <b>74.1%</b> | <b>83.0</b>  |      |      |        |        |         |         | <b>33.0</b> | <b>70.21%</b> | <b>206.3%</b>                                      |  |
| Austria              | 0.6%         | 0.7          |      |      |        |        |         |         | 0.0         | 0.00%         | 0.0%   |  |
| Canada**             | 1.3%         | 1.5          |      |      | 1.0    |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| Denmark              | 4.2%         | 4.7          |      |      | 1.0    |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| Finland              | 0.6%         | 0.7          |      |      |        |        |         |         | 0.0         | 0.00%         | 0.0%   |  |
| Iceland              | 0.3%         | 0.3          |      |      |        |        |         |         | 0.0         | 0.00%         | 0.0%   |  |
| Italy#               | 1.2%         | 1.3          |      | 1.0  |        |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| The Netherlands      | 1.9%         | 2.1          |      | 1.0  |        |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| Norway               | 4.8%         | 5.4          | 1.0  | 1.0  |        |        | 1.0     | 1.0     | 4.0         | 8.51%         | 10.0%  |  |
| Portugal             | 0.8%         | 0.9          |      |      |        |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| Spain*               | 2.4%         | 2.7          |      |      |        |        |         |         | 1.0         | 2.13%         | 2.5%   |  |
| Sweden               | 5.6%         | 6.3          | 1.0  | 1.0  |        |        |         |         | 2.0         | 4.26%         | 5.0%   |  |
| Switzerland          | 2.4%         | 2.7          |      |      | 1.0    |        | 1.0     |         | 2.0         | 4.26%         | 5.0%   |  |
| <b>Sum</b>           | <b>26.1%</b> | <b>29.2</b>  |      |      |        |        |         |         | <b>14.0</b> | <b>29.8%</b>  | <b>87.5%</b>                                       |  |

\* ECORD Contributions 2003-2007 average (3 years)

\*\* Canada funding is not secure

\*money moved forward from FY05, or in kind contribution

#Italy is trying to increase the funding

(1) 2 years with 14 expeditions (12 non-riser and 2 MSP; riser starts in FY07?) in 2-year period with 8 ECORD scientists each

(2) Jenkins not counted here (only when basement is reached) (3) Since total number invited scientists is now 40 these columns are similar

(4) See excel file with all applications and invited scientists



Kenter presents the quota balance spread sheet. Holm expresses confidence in the Danish situation and believes that staffing balance must be considered as a long term process. Kenter highlights that Denmark, Sweden, Spain, The Netherlands, France and UK are countries in deficit, but that the balance should not be used as the only guide line in the nomination process.

#### **15. Nomination scientific party for Tahiti expedition #519** (Encl.7)

Kenter proposes a procedure for the nomination of the scientific party for the Tahiti expedition. He suggests selecting 4 scientists from each of the so called bigger countries (France, UK and Germany) and 4 scientists from the smaller countries. Two applications for each of the above groups will be starred. He stresses to focus on the expertise without overlooking quota balance. He also highlights the need to consider young promising candidates. McKenzie promotes to select more candidates in case of withdrawing. Kenter leaves the room during the staffing. He has a conflict of interests because his PhD student applied as a Dutch scientist. Wilson, as stand-in Vice Chair, proposes to start with the nominations of French, British and German candidates. Consequently, Kenter will leave the room only afterwards, during the staffing of the "smaller countries". Wilson proposes to excuse Evans during the staffing because of possible conflicts. ESO will be responsible together with the co-chiefs for the further selection of the scientific party. Ildefonse points out that Camoin was nominated co-chief for this expedition and therefore he has conflict of interests, too. However, he believes there are not any conflicting situations and it would help the nomination of the scientists. Consensus is returned and Camoin and Evans are invited to stay. Wilson lists the British applications, starting with "starred" applications. He nominated Tudhope because he is a highly-experienced sedimentologist and

Thomas because he is a PhD student who works in one of the most famous UK dating Institute. Third and fourth British nominations are Hathorne (inorganic geochemist) and Wilson, respectively. Wilson, even though she is a well-experienced sedimentologist and paleontologist, submitted a weak application.

French applicants are introduced by Camoin. Starred French nominations are Cabioch because he is a carbonate sedimentologist with experience on carbonate drilling and was already involved in the first Tahiti project and Deschamps, a brilliant young postdoc whose research focuses on dating. Third and fourth French nominations are Thouveny and Reijmer. Lericolais was excluded because he was interested on the seismic acquisition, meanwhile Colombie did not submit a convincing application.

Kudras nominated Della Porta and Westphal as first and second starred applicants, respectively. Both have good experience in carbonate sedimentology and belong to Institutes which have never staffed scientists in the IODP program. Third and fourth German nominations are Felis and Gischler for their expertise and experience in the field. Eisenhauer was not selected because he is a scientist from Geomar and Germany must keep staffing balance between the different Institutes. Camoin points out the high expertise of Eisenhaur. Kenter suggests to nominate an additional German candidate. However, Kudras confirms the previous German nominations. Kenter leaves the room due to conflict of interests and Wilson chairs the meeting.

Wilson suggests having an overview of the applicants of the smaller countries and addresses the starred candidates at the end. Comas introduces Braga, the Spanish candidate. She highlights the high expertise of Braga and stresses the Spanish interest in staffing him. Zampetti introduces the Italian applicant Dinaris-Turell. She points out that the candidate has high expertise. But the institute (INGV) is not strongly involved in sedimentological research of carbonates. McKenzie promotes Samankassou for Switzerland. Ildelfonse stresses that Vasconcelos must be taken into account because he is the only microbiologist and his expertise represents a priority.

Arnold introduces Veres the Swedish candidate as a very talented PhD student. In addition, he is half way through his PhD project and he is supported by an interested supervisor at a good institute. Camoin introduces the Dutch candidates and strongly recommends Verwer because of his expertise (petrophycist).

McKenzie proposes to star Braga and Veres because of the combination of balance and expertise and Verwer and Samankassou as third and forth candidates for their expertise. Consensus is returned. Wilson invites Kenter to reconvene.

Camoin suggests adding Vasconcelos and Eisenhaur as contingent nominations because of their expertise. Particularly, Vasconcelos is the only microbiologist. In addition, Camoin stresses that at the moment there are no microbiologists among the Japanese applicants and such expertise could be fundamental. Mevel concludes the staffing process stressing that ESSAC fulfills the condition of experience scientists, young people and a variety of expertise.

Nominations for Tahiti expedition#307 is summarized in the table below.

| Name                   | First        | Country (work)  | Nationality     | E-mail                            | Institute                               | Field of Expertise   |   |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Cabioch                | Guy          | France          | New Caledonia   | cabioch@noumea.ird.nc             | IRD                                     | sedimentologist  | 1 |
| Colombe                | Claude       | France          | France          | clau.de.colombe@univ-lyon1.fr     | University of Lyon                      | sedimentologist/stratigraphic correlator   | 2 |
| Deschamps              | Pierre       | France          | France          | deschamps@cerege.fr               | CEREGE                                  | inorganic geochemist   |   |
| Lericolas              | Gilles       | France          | DZA             | Gilles.Lericolas@ifremer.fr       | IFREMER                                 | geophysicist, sedimentologist  |   |
| Reijmer                | John J.G.    | France          | The Netherlands | jreijmar@ifm-geomar.de            | University of Marseilles                | oceanographer, sedimentologist, stratigraphic correlator   | 4 |
| Thouveny               | Nicolas      | France          | France          | thouveny@cerege.fr                | CEREGE                                  | paleomagnetist, physical properties specialist   | 3 |
| Della Porta            | Giovanna     | Germany         | Italy           | della.porta@geo.uni-potsdam.de    | Institut fuer Geowissenschaften         | sedimentologist, coral reef specialist   | 1 |
| Dittmers*              | Klaus Hauke  | Germany         | Germany         | kdittmers@awi-bremenhaven.de      | University of Bremen                    | logging scientist, geophysicist, physical prop specialist, sedimentologist                       |   |
| Eisenhaur              | Anton        | Germany         | Germany         | seisenhaur@ifm-geomar.de          | Geomar                                  | inorganic geochemist   |   |
| Felis                  | Thomas       | Germany         | Germany         | tfelis@algeo.uni-bremen.de        | University of Bremen                    | inorganic geochemist, paleontologist (megafoossil)   | 3 |
| Gischler               | Eberhard     | Germany         | Germany         | gischler@em.uni-frankfurt.de      | Geologisch-Palaeontologisches Institute | paleontologist (Foraminifer-Benthic)-paleontologist (Megafoossil)-sedimentologist                | 4 |
| Kunhert                | Henning      | Germany         | Germany         | hkunhert@uni-bremen.de            | University of Bremen                    | inorganic geochemist, sedimentologist  |   |
| Schulz                 | Hartmut      | Germany         | Germany         | hartmut.schulz@uni-tuebing.de     | University of Tübingen                  | paleontologist (foraminifer-benthic-planktonic), physical properties specialist, sedimentologist |   |
| Westphal               | Hildegard    | Germany         | Germany         | westphal@pat.uni-erlangen.de      | University of Erlangen-Nurnberg         | physical properties specialist, sedimentologist  | 2 |
| Dinares-Turel          | Jaume        | Italy           | Spain           | dinares@ingv.it                   | INGV                                    | logging scientist, paleomagnetist, downhole measurements   |   |
| Braga                  | Juan C.      | Spain           | Spain           | jbraga@ugr.es                     | Universidad de Grenada                  | sedimentologist, paleontologist (coralline red algae)  | 1 |
| Veres*                 | Daniel       | Sweden          | Romania         | daniel.veres@natgeo.su.se         | University of Stocholm                  | sedimentologist, paleomagnetism, organic geochemist  | 2 |
| Kindler                | Pascal       | Switzerland     | Switzerland     | Pascal.Kindler@terre.unige.ch     | University of Geneve                    | petrologist, sedimentologist   |   |
| Samankassou            | Elias        | Switzerland     | Cameroon        | elias.samankassou@unifr.ch        | University of Fribourg                  | sedimentologist  | 4 |
| Vasconcelos de Olivera | Crisogono    | Switzerland     | Brazil          | cris.vasconcelos@erdw.ethz.ch     | Swiss Federal Institute of Technology   | microbiologist, inorganic geochemist, sedimentologist  |   |
| Verwer*                | Klaas        | The Netherlands | The Netherlands | klaas.verwer@falw.vu.nl           | Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam            | physical properties specialist   | 3 |
| Zinke                  | Jens         | The Netherlands | Germany         | zjin@geo.vu.nl                    | Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam            | oceanographer, geochemist, foraminifer paleontologist, sedimentologist                           |   |
| Bassett*               | Sophie E.    | UK              | UK              | s.e.bassett@dur.ac.uk             | University of Durham                    | geophysicist   |   |
| Chappel*               | Alexander    | UK              | UK              | alexander.chappel@liverpool.ac.uk | University of Liverpool                 | geophysicist   |   |
| Clarke                 | Leon John    | UK              | UK              | l.clarke@bangor.ac.uk             | University of Wales Bangor              | inorganic geochemist, physical properties specialist, sedimentologist, stratigraphic correlator  |   |
| Hart                   | Malcolm      | UK              | UK              | mhart@plymouth.ac.uk              | University of Plymouth                  | foraminifer and pteropods paleontologist, stratigraphic correlator                               |   |
| Hathorne*              | Edmund       | UK              | USA             | E.C.Hathorne@open.ac.uk           | Open University                         | inorganic geochemist   | 3 |
| Schmid                 | Susanne      | UK              | Germany         | susaschmid@yahoo.de               | University of Liverpool                 | Inorganic geochemist, petrologist, sedimentologist   |   |
| Thomas*                | Alexander    | UK              | UK              | alexander.thomas@earth.ox.ac.uk   | University of Oxford                    | inorganic geochemist   | 2 |
| Tudhope                | Alexander W. | UK              | UK              | sandy.tudhope@ed.ac.uk            | Edinburgh University                    | sedimentologist, coral reef scientist, palaeoceanologist, paleoceanographer                      | 1 |
| Wilson                 | Moyra E. J.  | UK              | UK              | moyra.wilson@durham.ac.uk         | University of Durham                    | paleontologist (megafoossil), sedimentologist, petrologist, stratigraphic correlator             | 4 |

PhD student      received after 10th of November  
 starred preference  
 not starred preference  
 contingent application if lack of such expertise  
 numbers indicate order of preferences

## 16. Workshops for drilling proposals in/for Europe #1 (selection topics/identification key scientific team/ organization) (Encl.8)

Mevel starts the discussion confirming that EMA officially appropriated 15.000 euro for workshop organization, which will be coordinated by ESSAC. Wilson suggests using PPG protocol to identify locations that have not been drilled, yet. Kenter responds that PPG can be used as protocol, but it is better to focus on scientific themes than on geographical areas. Consensus is returned to Kenter's proposal. He also stresses that the goal is to stimulate the European scientific community to write and develop IODP proposals focusing on scientific themes that are underestimated in the active IODP proposals. In addition, these workshops could be used as a means of developing international collaborations with ECORD leaderships. Because of the budget, it has been agreed that two workshops will be organized. Consequently, two scientific themes must be identified. Kenter and

McKenzie propose GEOMICROBIOLOGY as a first theme. Ildelfonse stresses that SAS Panels express a strong interest towards this topic. Consensus is returned for geomicrobiology.

Kenter proposes Wilson and McKenzie as a working group for this workshop. They accept. They will deliver for mid-January a clear proposal with scientific targets, organizing teams and plans for the workshop. This planning proposal will be passed through the ESSAC delegates for approval and comments. Ildelfonse proposes the Mediterranean Sea as a theme for the second workshop also because of the strong Japanese interest in bringing the Chikyu in Europe. Comas stresses the need of a joint proposal for the Mediterranean. Pederson does not agree on geographical themes. Comas proposes a theme such as "PROCESSES APPLIED TO ACTIVE BOUNDARIES" which would indirectly implies the Mediterranean Area. Ildelfonse suggests a workshop that involves drilling in the Mediterranean. Kudras prefers to focus on scientific themes. McKenzie suggests SEISMOGENIC ZONES. Camoin shows a slide to emphasize that the workshop themes must be chosen in accordance with SSEPs' requirements. Arnold proposes to focus on a regional transect on Europe that will include various scientific topic. Kenter proposes to organize a task force to develop scientific themes for the second workshops. These proposals will focus on extreme high-resolution paleo-oceanography and active plate boundaries. Comas and Pihnero are appointee for this task force.

#### **17. SPC ECORD co-chiefs nominees for potential FY05 additional expedition schedule (Encl. 9)**

Kenter shows a slide with a list of ECORD co-chiefs for the possible scheduled expeditions and stresses that the deadline for nominations is passed. Some objections are raised because Henriët is from Belgium and Belgium is not an Ecord country. Mevel points out that Henriët is working hard to make Belgium join ECORD and there is a possibility that Belgium will be part of ECORD at the time of the expedition.

Kenter concludes stating that these are possible scheduled expeditions and that a discussion will be held when necessary.

## **18. IODP Science Advisory System**

(Judith McKenzie, separate encl. & discussion)

McKenzie shortly introduces SAS review Final Report. The SPC established a working group to evaluate the current IODP SAS. The SPPOC appreciated the efforts. The results of this review are summarized in the separate enclosure of the agenda book.

In addition, McKenzie concludes stressing that a basic principle of this report is that the SAS structure should be as flexible as possible to maximize its efficiency and transparency.

## **19. Nominations of SAS-COI**

(Benoit Ildefonse)

A more general discussion on SAS follows Ildefonse's presentation (Encl. F). McKenzie stresses that despite the COI expertise must be consider as priority. Kudras raises the issue of industry-IODP liaisons. TAP and ILP need stronger and clearer directions from SPPOC. Camoin proposes that SSEPs, in the proposal reviewing, highlights proposals that can attract industry. Kenter states that the implementation of SAS will be definitely one of the main issues discussed during the upcoming Management Forum and Retreat and therefore he wishes to have an ECORD opinion on the rejuvenation and simplification of the actual system, especially as the riser expeditions it will lead to further complications.

## **20. SSEPs meetings-Reports**

(Gilbert Camoin)

The presentation is attached as Encl.G.

Consensus is returned regarding the fact ESSAC must supervise ECORD proponents for a joined scientific work in order to avoid separated proposals on the same theme (i.e. Gulf of Cadiz).

## **21. Nominations for SAS panels** (Encl. 10)

Ildefonse points out that the actual "alternate" system does not work. Mevel suggests gathering a meeting between ECORD delegates and alternates of SAS Panels. Zampetti stresses that the alternate system works when the Panel responsible personally contacts the alternate. She suggests that the selected contact person is responsible and that the ESSAC office will support the process. Camoin announces the upcoming rotation of the 3 chairs of SSPEs. He suggests nominating Stein as his replacement. Consensus is returned.

ESSAC nominates STEIN as ECORD chair for SSEPs.

## **22. IODP Management Forum and Retreat 2005 Europe?**

Kenter asks ESSAC delegates for comments on issues that could be discussed in the upcoming IODP Management and Forum Retreat. ESSAC comments and suggestions for IODP structures will be channeled by Ildefonse and McKenzie (as member of the SPPOC and SPC working groups on SAS).

## **23. EuroCODE pre-cruise site survey proposal**

Kenter announces that there is not an official agreement for this program. However, he will provide the delegates with the latest version and announces the upcoming EuroCODE meeting, January 17-18, in Bonn.

## **24. Post-cruise activities**

There is not an official program of activities for ECORD/ESSAC

ESSAC delegates will notify the office (via e-mail) of the national program activities.

## **25. Undergraduate student trainee programs**

Ildefonse stresses that there is no an official program at IODP level, therefore this activity is organized at National Office levels. McKenzie indicates that Switzerland offers a course for under graduate students about IODP science.

RECOMMENDATION: ESSAC Chair will question IODP-MI.

## **26. Upcoming Meetings (Encl. 11)**

## **27. Date and Place of the Next Meeting**

Gillis proposes to have a protocol for the meetings. She suggests to organize them at locations close to the main airports, on days adjoining the weekends (i.e. Friday or Saturday) and to start early in the morning. The next meeting is hosted by W. Piller in Graz (Austria), 31<sup>st</sup> March-1<sup>st</sup> April, 2005. Date of the meeting can be moved or adjust following nominations deadlines.

The meeting is adjourned.