

## MINUTES OF THE 1ST ESSAC MEETING IN AMSTERDAM

Location: *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*  
Time: *Friday, November 14th, 10:30 to Saturday 15th, 13:00*

### Present:

Jeroen Kenter (Chairman The Netherlands)  
Chris MacLeod (Vice-Chairman United Kingdom)  
Gilbert Camoin (France)  
Benoit Ildefonse (France)  
Judith McKenzie (Switzerland)  
Angelo Camerlenghi (Italy)  
Dan Evans (UK - ESO)  
Andy Kingdon (UK - ESO)  
Eve Arnold (Sweden)  
Kathy Gillis (Canada)  
Kari Strand (Finland)  
Raymond Schorno (Chairman ECORD Council; NWO The Netherlands)  
Catherine Mevel (France - Director EMA)  
Fernando J.A.S. Barriga (Portugal)  
Antje Voelker (Portugal)  
Rolf Birger Pedersen (Norway)  
Hermann-Rudolf Kudraß (Germany)  
Susanne Egelund (Denmark)  
Harry Doust (Netherlands - ILP)  
Sam Purkis (Interim Science Coordinator The Netherlands)  
Xavier van Lanen (Interim Science Coordinator The Netherlands)

### Unable to attend:

Menchu Comas (Spain) was unable to get to Amsterdam as a result of flight delays. Iceland, Ireland and Greece were not represented at the meeting.

#### **Item 1 Opening remarks by Jeroen Kenter and Chris MacLeod**

Kenter and MacLeod welcome the delegates to both Amsterdam and the first ESSAC meeting and begin with a round-the-table introduction of those present. The logistics for the next two days are outlined and Kenter proposes that we commence discussions without delay.

#### **Item 2 Adoption of the Draft Agenda**

The draft agenda is adopted with consensus

#### **Item 3 Minutes from previous ESSAC Meetings**

No comments are returned.

#### **Item 4 Update on ECORD Council negotiations**

4A Draft minutes of ECORD Council Meetings, The Hague (26-27 August 2003) and Paris (23-24 October 2003) (Encl.)

Kenter hands the floor to Schorno, who proceeds to explain that it was agreed during the ECORD Council Meetings, The Hague (26-27 August 2003), that the ESSAC office will reside in Amsterdam for a minimum of one year. Furthermore, during the Paris meeting (23-24 October 2003), the representation of ECORD and its voting rights was extensively debated. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the ECORD partners should be finalised prior to 25 December, which Schorno feels is plausible, since the text is in place and the majority of partners are now in a position to sign. Schorno anticipates that the signing of the MOU will be accompanied by an official ceremony, marking the formal incorporation of ECORD into IODP.

#### **Item 5 News on Science Planning Committee (SPC) Activities**

MacLeod and Ildefonse open the discussion and explain that they attended the SPC Sapporo meeting, although they were excluded from voting. Both delegates were concerned that they were unable to vote, since important matters such as the Science Plan for FY 04 (i.e. the Arctic Proposal), were discussed. To this end, MacLeod requested that they be able to participate in the voting regardless, but the request was rejected. However, it was decided that although the ECORD representatives could not participate formally, they would be included in all discussions, with the exception of those in which voting took place. MacLeod and Ildefonse agree that this gesture affirms that the science community is supportive of ECORD involvement in the program. Both delegates were concerned that since they were not in a position to vote, they would not be able to act if it transpired that the Arctic Proposal would be demoted. Responding to their concern, Mike Coffin agreed to include a motion stating that the proposal would not be re-ranked and can now be considered as in its "implementation phase". The motion was subsequently passed. Ildefonse reported that he believes that SPC fully supports ECORD's continued effort with the Arctic Proposal. MacLeod goes on to explain how the Japanese and U.S. delegates voted on numerous proposals forwarded by the SSEP's, including Gilbert Camoin's Tahiti proposal, which incidentally, is now the top-ranked MSP proposal following the designation of the Arctic as under implementation. He adds that the ODP drill ship, the JOIDES Resolution (JR) will be retained for a further year (2004-05) since there is a delay in finding a replacement vessel. Considering this, SPC voted on five JR-type legs, which were re-ranked and scheduled for drilling. Ken Miller's proposal for the New Jersey Shelf is currently ranked 4th and has been forwarded to OPCOM for potential scheduling. The operator can consider such proposals ready for drilling, pending the finalisation of the legs logistics. MacLeod adds that it is the science that is important in the upcoming IODP operations and that delegates should now understand that proposals can be implemented, even if they require more than the standard sixty days of ship time. In this way, two legs can be included within a single drilling proposal and the community must not be restricted by the limitations of the old strategy. Gillis and Ildefonse discuss, that in such situations, the initial leg can be dedicated to the preparation of the holes, which can be subsequently drilled on the second leg. However, they believe that the staff at College Station recognise that scientists participating on the initial and preparatory leg, would be bored and it would be a more realistic strategy if active drilling were conducted on both legs. Gillis concludes the discussion that the issue shouldn't distract us, since it is bound to be raised later. MacLeod agrees and proposes to wait and see how these matters unfold, since the present discussion from the operators can only be considered provisional.

#### **ECORD Report SPC Meeting Sapporo 03 meeting**

Kenter asks if there are any questions on this enclosure and since none are returned, takes the opportunity to update Angelo Camerlenghi and Raymond Schorno, who have just arrived.

#### **Item 6 ESSAC Terms of Reference**

6A Implications for SAS panel and shipboard staffing procedures (Encl.)  
Kenter initiates discussion on enclosure 6A (Implications for SAS panel and shipboard staffing procedures) and cites its importance in the context of the ramifications that the discussion will have

on how ESSAC will handle staffing in the future. He draws the delegate's attention to a sentence he feels is particularly important:

*"The IODP assigned quota of Leg participants granted to ECORD shall reflect the financial contributions of each member country and specific interests of each participating country over a rolling three-year period.."*

McKenzie responds by stating that in her opinion, it is important to monitor the staffing quota on a yearly basis and not just wait and see to how well the numbers balance every three years. Kenter agrees and details a second important point:

*"The delegates and alternates on IODP Science Advisory Structure (SAS) panels shall be designated by ESSAC based on national nominations, authorised by ECORD Council and reflect the financial contribution of each participating country: for the first four years the contribution specified in the MOU and thereafter the contribution over a rolling three year period. Normally all ECORD representatives on SAS bodies shall serve for a three-year period and may not be re-appointed for a second consecutive term."*

Gillis asks how such matters have been tackled in the past? Kenter explains that at this stage the staffing discussion is somewhat difficult, since the ECORD Council are yet to release the required numbers. While acknowledging this fact, Gillis explains that in Canada, discussion with TAMU on the quantity of berths that will be allocated per year, have already been initiated. McKenzie believes that the situation is simple, with eight positions being available per leg? Camerlenghi goes on to query how the division of membership benefits will be distributed, considering the small countries disparity in financial contribution? Kenter agrees that these are important issues, but discussion should be postponed until Item 7.

Moving on, Kenter expects that the ESSAC delegates will live up to their obligations as panel members and MacLeod re-affirms that in Sapporo, ESSAC were under represented. His concern is principally that if ESSAC had been granted voting rights, the lack of delegates present would have severely disadvantaged our potential influence on important decisions. MacLeod states that it is now paramount that if delegates find they are unable to attend a meeting, an alternate must be found. ESSAC must make effective use of its members. Kingdon adds that if an alternate is sent, they must be fully briefed on the relevant issues that will be discussed. MacLeod agrees, while acknowledging that the situation is becoming ever more complex as the volume of material in the system grows. In his opinion, we need to rapidly establish a pool of people who are both up to date with the program and available to attend meetings. Alternates, he envisages, should gain experience by attending meetings as observers. Kenter continues that we must now start acting as ESSAC members and not as national representatives. MacLeod agrees that this is very important and Kudraß adds that it is the science that is important and there is no room for national politics in the new program. Kenter agrees with both MacLeod and Kudraß that from here on in, national politics should not be pursued.

Gillis asks if there is a science plan available for ECORD? Idefonse understands that one is available on the Bremen web site, to which MacLeod is surprised. Kudraß confirms that a science plan is available, but at this stage it is vague and broad and does not represent a summary of European initiatives. Kenter feels that it is now time to make an inventory of the science interests in Europe but believes that at specific European science plan is largely irrelevant in the context of IODP. McKenzie agrees with Kenter that we should not promote the science interests of Europe in this way. However, Idefonse maintains that it is important to promote the visibility of the program, a feeling shared by Kenter who feels that it would be more efficient if the subject is tackled later on in this meeting.

Kenter turns the delegates attention back to the enclosure and highlights:

*"The Secretariat shall be determined by the ECORD Council and located with the ESSAC Chair. It will be funded from the budget of the EMA. It shall rotate, on a two-yearly basis, with the Chair of ESSAC. The budget shall be sufficient to provide for a science coordinator with a scientific background, the full cost of maintaining an office and resources to compensate the Chair."*

Kenter believes the key point to take home from this is that ESSAC should be driven by consensus, which in the case of ESCO, has always been sufficient. He can only remember one case where an ESCO matter had to be solved using voting. Kenter turns the delegates attention to the proposed tasks for ESSAC, which he considers are too numerous to be completed by the ESSAC office alone. He

envisages that the formation of specific working groups will be required to provide the necessary expertise. Kudraß questions whether funds are available to support the working groups, to which Kenter replies that no money is presently available beyond that allocated for the running of the ESSAC office. MacLeod agrees with Kenter and proposes that funds may become available at a later date through ERAnet (European Area Network). MacLeod asks Evans to what degree he'd want to liaise with ESSAC regarding staffing? Evans is happy with the wording of the enclosure and agrees that we have sufficient breadth of expertise in the group to handle the issue. Besides, in the past he has received advice from Jan Backman, and so contact between ESO and ESSAC has already been established. Kingdon agrees in principle, but foresees that situations will arise where specialist advice is required and has no doubt that ESSAC will be called upon. Proposing that this subject has been adequately covered, Kenter asks if there are any further questions? None are returned.

#### **Item 6B ESSAC and ECORD Council delegates as of 13 November 2003**

Kenter asks if anyone can provide an update on the status of his or her ESSAC delegates? Egelund opens discussion by explaining that for the case of Denmark, it is proving difficult to find scientists who are willing to commit to becoming an ESSAC representative. In Canada, Gillis is likely to be the ESSAC delegate with Dominique Weis as her alternate, but this is still under discussion. Kenter reminds the room that ECORD Council requires letters from perspective delegates and alternates, a copy of which will be filed by the ESSAC office. Kenter adds that letters have been received from numerous countries but not all. Italy and Sweden say that their letters have been mailed and will arrive shortly. Members in the German scientific advisory structure are pending, Kudraß explains, but will be resolved within two weeks, at which point the official letter will be mailed. Kenter acknowledges that the German schedule is sufficient.

#### **Item 7 ESSAC Shipboard Staffing**

Although Schorno explains he cannot speak on behalf of the ESSAC Council, he outlines the status of the membership units (MU). As an example The Netherlands will contribute 7% of an MoU, but exact calculations are not possible given the present uncertainty with the German budget. However, it has been agreed that ESSAC will be allocated 8 berths per leg. McKenzie stresses the importance that as many scientists as possible from the smaller countries become involved in the Arctic drilling proposal, since the national science representatives from these countries will then have something to show their funding agencies at the close of the first year of the program. Kudraß agrees but foresees that both the larger and smaller countries are going to have to be flexible over the staffing issue. Kenter reckons it's not the responsibility of ESO to balance the staffing quota, but the responsibility of ESSAC. His past experience with ESCO highlights how difficult it can be to maintain a national balance. In MacLeod's opinion, it would not be wise if ESSAC submits a huge list of perspective scientists to each upcoming leg, as this will impinge our chances of getting the right people onto the ship. Instead, a concise list pre-edited by the ESSAC community would be more strategic. Evans questions Kenter's staffing strategy and reminds him that science must first and foremost, drive the staffing procedure. Kenter explains that is not even to be discussed that a good scientist would be replaced by a less-experienced one, it should just be recognised that balancing the quota for the smaller countries will not be trivial. Kudraß and MacLeod agree that staffing nominations should initially go to the ESSAC Office and not directly to the operator. During the subsequent ESSAC meetings, the names from the list of applications who will be nominated can be decided. Kenter agrees, but highlights that the nominations need to be made shortly, either in an additional ESSAC meeting in December or January, else via email, which is likely to be complex (at best). To summarize the situation, McKenzie predicts 6 legs to sail in 2004-05 (including the Arctic), which equates to approximately 14 Germans, 14 British and 14 ESSAC scientists. Taking the present level of Swiss membership, this is only equivalent to 1.4 scientists. Taking this example, she urges the smaller countries to be very strategic to whom they put forward to sail, since they won't have an opportunity to make a mistake. Kudraß believes a strict rule should be imposed on the number of people who can join a shore-based scientific party, to prevent the numbers spiralling out of control. Camoin responds to Kudraß stating that, in his opinion, flexibility is

required in the staffing numbers in order to cater for the more complex techniques such as fluid-analysis and microbiology that are more frequently appearing in proposals. Kudraß agrees, but reckons that the number of required scientists will have to be defined case by case, depending on the mission. Ildefonse draws attention to matter of the advertising required for a call for applications, which he believes, should be centralized as well as being promoted at the country level. Also, through what mechanism should people apply? Kenter believes that applications should be routed through a single web page / Email address. On reflection, this is not possible since the Americans already have a web page, but at least ESSAC should operate through a single page, so as to avoid confusion.

Kenter talks through enclosure 7C4 (ESSAC DRAFT PROPOSAL TO J-DESC, USSAC), drawing attention to the summary by John Farrell:

*"In summary, the national or consortium member receives applications from scientists in their own countries/consortium and forwards candidates to IMI, which coordinates staffing with the IOs".*

Considering this, Kenter explains that he is worried that there will not be an opportunity to negotiate and resolve conflicts in interest with staffing issues. Kudraß wonders if involving the IOs excessively will cause serious delay and will make staffing conflicts difficult to resolve? Evans is confident that since the IOs met earlier this year and will continue to meet on a regular basis, there is a mechanism to facilitate discussion and Ildefonse suggests that an ESSAC representative should be invited to these meetings. Camoin asks how the problem of balancing the national quota will be handled at this level and Kenter explains that this is separate issue, to be handled at the ESSAC level, which Camerlenghi believes can be done through Email. To summarise, Kenter asks if consensus has been reached whereby we can live with the first point of contact for staffing issues to be ESSAC (which precludes the need for an IMI office)? McKenzie asks why applicants don't send their applications initially to their ESSAC representative, who in turn will forward them on to the ESSAC office? Kenter agrees, stating that this is a matter for the national offices to decide. Ildefonse recounts the frequency with which French scientists in the past would apply to TAMU without informing the national office of their intention. Purkis and Kenter agree that this often occurred among the ESSAC community. Kenter believes a portal on the ESSAC web site would solve the problem, as once the 'submit' button is pressed; the application is automatically emailed to both the ESSAC office and national representative. Kenter takes the opportunity to inform the delegates that the ESSAC web site is under construction and will be activated shortly. So not to lose sight of the matter in hand, Kenter again asks the delegates if we have agreed that staffing applications can be handled through the ESSAC web site and therefore without the input of IMI? The advantage he points out, would be that it takes the responsibility out of IMI's hands for meeting the internal staffing balance. MacLeod believes that IMI's involvement is a sensitive issue, as there would be no control on who sees the list of who applied for each leg, a point to which Gillis is not worried, since she points out that IMI would have access to the information somewhere down the line. Kenter again presses the question of what the influence of an IMI staffing coordinator will be? This goes against the suggestion of John Farrell, MacLeod adds, to which Kenter agrees. It is agreed with consensus that Kenter will reply to John Farrell, acknowledging a role for IMI in staffing issues, but less active than proposed in Farrell's letter.

Camerlenghi and Camoin agree that situation will arise where scientists of a particular speciality will be required to sail on short notice and presently there does not exist a mechanism to facilitate such 'fast-track' applications. Evans reads the mail that he and Kenter have put together regarding the call for applicants for the Arctic proposal. MacLeod, queries the text, in particular classification about the difference between on and offshore scientific party? Evans explains the terminology and Kenter considers that mailing an internal ESSAC call for expression of interest in upcoming legs is not a big job. The internal call can be followed by a full official formal call. Kenter announces that he has already received multiple applications and believes that selecting the nominees just through Email, will be extremely problematic and in his opinion, we need a meeting. Evans would like to see the Arctic applications submitted to ESO by **31st January 2004**, to which Kenter adds that the internal ESSAC deadline should be **January 1st 2004**. Kenter confirms with Evans that the US and Japanese should have the same deadlines for applications but highlights that we don't yet have deadlines from JOI for the FY04 JR-type legs. Kenter asks McKenzie, whether in her opinion, applications for both the JR-type and Arctic legs can be handled solely through email? McKenzie and Kingdon agree that it

would be impossible, considering that the UK, Germany and France have no experience with ECOD-like negotiations. Kenter sets a tentative deadline of **Friday January 23rd 2004** for a day meeting in Amsterdam to conclude the staffing decisions. With no further questions, Kenter closes discussion on staffing.

#### **Item 8 ECORD delegates and alternates on the SAS panels**

Kenter opens discussion by explaining that it has been negotiated between ESSAC, NSF and MEXT that the Tokyo voting rules will apply (6 US, 6 JAPANESE, 3 ESSAC). Although not yet on paper, ESSAC should have 3 voting and 1 non-voting member on the SSEPs (6,6,3+1). Kudraß is pleased with this allocation as put simply, we have 20% of the voting power while paying only 10% of the total contribution, which is a good deal, especially considering we have access to a third of the berths per expedition. The breakdown will be finalised in the MOU, but is already known and accepted by our counterparts. Kenter asks how we want to populate the panels; since it is time we submit nominations and set a deadline on the process? MacLeod corrects Kenter as a deadline has already been set and in fact, expires today! McKenzie queries which positions need to be filled? Kenter believes that at this stage it is sufficient to know that Canada will be contributing financially, without knowing exact figures. McKenzie and Camoin agree that the non-voting position should not be considered less important, since the group of four will discuss the issue and speak as a single voice. Again, Kingdon feels that experience will count for everything and taking the scenario that MacLeod would not be able to attend a meeting, his voting replacement should not necessarily be British, but the next most experienced delegate, regardless of their national affiliation. Kenter agrees entirely and further proposes that we strive for a situation where the delegate and alternate are of different nationalities. Kingdon has observed that the US are already very well organised with regard to this and have started to tune their approach to benefit their national interest. Camoin reaffirms the need for a broad scientific representation on the SSEP's. Raymond Schorno now arrives, apologises for his delay and is updated on the matters discussed so far. Arnold is concerned that the 3+1 voting strategy should not be populated by 3 of the larger countries and 1 smaller. Kenter and MacLeod assure her that this is absolutely not the case and MacLeod proposes that we should from now on consider we have 4 voting members, leaving the detail of which 3 will vote, to be decided in the meeting in question. MacLeod envisages that the ESSAC voting power will be of critical importance when it comes to the matter of proposal ranking, since, we want to ensure that European science is not neglected. McKenzie introduces the principle of 'floating' alternates, where there is not a principle alternate who would be favoured above the others. In essence Kudraß agrees, but points out that he would like to know who will be attending each meeting from Europe in advance. He would recommend nominating 4 principle ESSAC representatives and support their inevitable absence with an adequate pool of alternates. McKenzie reckons that indeed, at least 1 alternate should attend each meeting as an observer; therefore Europe would have 5 (4+1) members present. Kenter asks if 1 permanent alternate would be sufficient, considering the financial burden on alternates country? MacLeod responds by stating that it is important that to prevent conflicting situations, the alternate does not necessarily take on the role of the delegate, once the delegate rotates out of the system. Continuing down the lines of Arnold's previous statement, Kenter asks Schorno how the cumulative financial contribution of the smaller countries will compare with that of the larger countries? Schorno postulates that it wouldn't match that closely, but is of course dependant on the future status of Canada. With financial contribution in mind, Kenter and Camerlenghi question that for the critical panels, the 3 members should be Britain, Germany and France, providing that their expertise matches that of the smaller countries? Consensus is returned that the decision of who fills the 3+1 positions should be left to the meeting in question, but providing that their expertise is appropriate and a conflict situation is not created, the 3 should be taken by the 3 major countries and the +1, by the minor countries. Kenter adds that any country can also send an observer, but as Camoin points out, for the case of proposal ranking, SAS will not provide the observer with a copy of the proposals in advance as this would breach the confidentiality of the system. Ildefonse remarks that members who do receive the proposals should not forward them to anyone else. Kenter ensures that the minutes contain reference to the fact that ESSAC meetings are always open to the presence of observers and

Gillis adds that Canada may not have sufficient finances to send observers to numerous meetings. Kenter aims to conclude this section by agreeing with Kudraß that the nominations to the technical panels are another story, but asks the floor if consensus has been reached on how the scientific panels should be populated? Consensus on the issue is returned. Kenter proposes that a deadline of **Friday 28th November 2003** should be set for the submission of panel nominations, which should be mailed to the ESSAC office with a CV and cover letter.

Pedersen questions whether the smaller countries should strive to submit nominees for each of the 10 panels? Kenter responds by citing that they should submit nominations to as many panels as they have scientists with expertise. Doust adds that the technical panels will also require expertise and this should be borne in mind, to which Barriga agrees. Kudraß questions whether each country should submit multiple applicants for each position? Kenter believes this it is up to each country how they handle this and he would advise that it would be only worth promoting candidates who possess the required expertise. Gillis believes that it would be sensible to restrict the number of panel alternates as they are unlikely to be called upon more than once during their 3 year service. Instead fewer, highly qualified alternates would be most effective, an opinion shared by McKenzie, who thinks that a signal alternate for each delegate is sufficient and a maximum of 2 should be imposed. Kenter agrees that every delegate should have an alternate and ideally they should frequently attend meetings under the capacity of observers.

Doust foresees that the optimum situation would be that the alternates are members that will be attending the meeting anyway, as delegates to another panel. MacLeod adds that this makes financial sense and was discussed in Sapporo, but should only be initiated as an exception and it should not become the norm that one person sits on multiple panels. McKenzie questions whether panel members on SSEP's should all rotate off simultaneously at the end of their membership period, or rotate off in a staggered manor, so as to maximise the retention of expertise in the group? Camoin agrees that the staggered approach is preferable and Kenter adds that it would be sensible to re-nominate members back onto the panel. Kudraß asks how the list of hundreds of panel nominations be slimmed down? Kenter explains a ranking procedure will be followed and Gillis wonders if the smaller countries will be adequately represented? Kudraß suggests that the chairs make a proposal on this issue and Kenter agrees. Arnold proposes that the smaller countries should be allowed to rank their nominees, prior to submission, since they don't have sufficient diversity in their science community to have panel nominees for all the panels. This would maximise the representation of the smaller countries on the critical panels (SPC, iSSEP, ESSEP and SSP).

Following lunch, Evans and Kingdon give a presentation on ESO (ECORD Science Operator), during which Kenter announces that he has withdrawn his membership from the European Petrophysics Consortium, as it would represent a conflict of interest. A colleague at the VU fills the position. Kingdon explicitly demonstrates that the number of offshore participants on the Arctic MSP drill will be limited to approximately 10, since the majority of the science will be conducted retrospectively onshore. McKenzie proposes that for bio-chemical analysis, the lag-time between core acquisition and analysis should be kept to an absolute minimum. This action is particularly important for investigation into the status of the bacterial assemblages. McKenzie asks if it possible to conduct pore-water geochemical analysis on the support vessel Oden? In theory this should not be a problem, Evans agrees, but some thought will have to be given to the logistics. Kenter asks how the ESSAC delegates can become involved in the decision making process? Evans explains that ESSAC should be represented in the numerous upcoming, planning meetings. Following the presentation MacLeod, draws the delegates attention to the suite of emails that have been circulated regarding costs for the Arctic Scoping Group and for the large part, their confidentiality at this stage. Evans adds that an complete breakdown of the costs is provided in ESO's IODP program Plan 2004.

Kudraß takes the opportunity to congratulate the ESO group for staying committed to the Arctic proposal and seeing it through to this stage. MacLeod thanks Kudraß and asks at what point we will know that the Arctic can be considered an absolute definite for drilling? Evans says that this will be for certain once SCOP have given their approval. He outlines that at this stage there remains a slight financial shortfall, but contingency plans are in place in the UK to deal with this. Kingdon states that an early round of signatures on the MOU, would be of great comfort to NERC. Rounding off the

conversation, Kenter asks if the ESSAC community can have a copy of the Evans's PowerPoint presentation, once sensitive information such as the ships names have been deleted. This is agreed. Evans hands the floor to Kingdon who continues with the ESO presentation by outlining the key points to IODP staffing, namely; No centralized IODP staffing structure has yet been agreed, but there is consensus that one is required. J-DESC (equivalent to the Japanese ESSAC) however, have come up with a proposed staffing model but Kingdon identifies the major drawback to be the lack of resources allocated for its implementation. Additionally, ESO have produced an 'ESO preferred staffing system'. Kenter explains why ESCO was less flexible than the US, UK and Germany with regard to staffing as it was a consortium of 12 smaller countries and predicts that ESSAC will operate in a similar fashion. Regarding the Arctic proposal, MacLeod wonders what can be done if it transpires that the members of the shore-based party are not meeting their tasks. He foresees that members of the party may be distracted and not work with the same degree of energy as if they were aboard a standard JR-type leg. Kingdon reminds the delegates that something equivalent to the ODP initial reports will be produced and this will place a deadline on the researchers, but acknowledges that the work should be treated in the same way as an offshore leg. Arnold adds that scientific output should be monitored by imposing rigorous deadlines for the publication of results. Kingdon feels that it is the responsibility of the national ESSAC offices to install in stark terms how they perceive their scientists to perform. Camerlenghi agrees, but feels that as is sometimes found with offshore science crews, non-performers will be identified in the shore-based party. Kenter aims to wrap up discussion and proposes ESO come up with a set of recommendations, ready for discussion at the next meeting. As a last point, Kingdon stresses that the real privilege is to be part of the shore-based science party and participation comes with the associated privileges and obligations outlined under the IODP principles. Kenter thanks Kingdon for his presentation and suggests that we direct discussion onto staffing, as this will take considerable time and without delay, turns the floor to Schorno.

#### **Item 9 Update from JEODI TN Work Package Groups**

Kenter explains that the JEODI report is in progress and will be delivered on **15th December 2003** at the ECORD MOU signing ceremony, followed on the 16th by the inaugural meeting of ERA\_NET. No further discussion followed.

#### **Item 10 News on IODP Science Steering & Evaluation Panel Activities**

Kenter invites Camoin to give his presentation summarising the outcome of the last iSSEP's meeting in Niigata - Japan. Camoin begins by explaining that the meeting was purely electronic, which can at best be described as inefficient! In summary of the 26 proposals discussed, 14 were revised, 6 were full- and 6 pre-proposals. Of these, 18 were sent back to the proponents for revision, 2 were accepted but not sent for external review, 3 were sent for external review and 2 were forwarded to IPC. Camoin highlights the next SSEP's meeting will be in Granada, Spain, **24-27th May 2004**. Of the 109 active proposals, 62 have ECORD participation (27 ECORD first proponents), 65 with ECORD and/or Canadian participation (31 ECORD or Canadian first proponents). Evans, asks Camoin approximately how many proposals would be suitable as MSP's? Camoin believes out of the 109 active proposals, approximately 10 would be MSP compatible. Additionally he perceives that 3 pre-proposals may have MSP potential. Kenter thanks Camoin for his presentation and following no further questions, suggests that the first day of the meeting should be adjourned.

#### **Item 11 News on IODP Service Panels Activities**

Mevel comments on Camerlenghi remark that all guarantees on individual country contributions are received and the signing of the agreement will take place early December. The CNRS will perform, after the signing, as the general banker and will have to receive the guaranteed country contribution before June 2004. Mevel continues that organization of Mission Specific Platforms will run through ESO.



Kenter opens discussion on how ESSAC can active stimulate scientist of member countries to apply for future IODP activities and write proposals for future legs. Ildefonse proposes an ECORD mailing list. Kudraß finds that the distribution should take place via the national delegates. Arnold thinks it will be efficient to make an internet link that contains all the information. Kenter agrees and aims to wrap up the discussion and proposes to use the national delegates promote applications and new ESSAC developments in their respective countries. Furthermore ESSAC will make a pro-active website for this purpose with contains all the necessary forms and information.

Ildefonse opens the discussion on maintaining continuity in the panels and proposes a rotation system where no more than 1/3 of the panel members are replaced at once. Camoin and Kenter agree that maintaining knowledge in the panels is necessary. Mevel states that the deadline for panel nomination is **28 November 2003**.

#### **Item 12 News on IODP Scoping Activities (Dan Evans)**

Kenter explains the item is discussed under item 7, in the presentation of Evans and Kindon.

#### **Item 13 News on IMI Inc. Activities and ECORD member memberships**

Kenter initiates the item with the following lines from the enclosure 13A:

*"SPPOC is committee created by SciMP..."*

Kenter explains that it is ESSAC's task to give the ECORD council our nominees for SPPOC members. McKenzie stresses that it should be a scientist which holds a senior position at an oceanographic institution. Kudraß advices SPPOC member nominees should have an ODP background. Kingdon states that it has to be the ECORD council problem. Mevel comments that the SPPOC nominee deadline will be within 3 weeks, than the ECORD council will discuss the matter.

Following this explanation, Kenter requests nominations for SPPOC (preferably persons who will be able to attend the upcoming meeting in December):

Kudraß nominees for Germany are Gerald Wefer and Jörn Thiede; McLeod nominates Dave Falvey (for one year only; no additional UK nominee available, yet); Kenter nominates McKenzie; Camoin nominees for France are (Prof, Paris/Villefranche sur mer; president of "commission Geosciences Marines") and Yves Lagabriele (DR CNRS/Montpellier; Chairman of GDR Marges); Pedersen nominees for Norwegian is Olaf Eldholm; Arnold nominees for Sweden is Jan Backman; Camerlenghi nominees for Italy is Iginio Marson. Additional information on these nominees, a short CV (0.5 A4) and addresses, is expected by e-mail. Also, new SPPOC nominees can be submitted to ESSAC. Kenter will submit nominees to the ECORD council for approval.

#### **Item 14 ESSAC support for the IODP Conference in Greece (scheduled for March 2004)**

Kenter describes Sakellariou's request for ESSAC supports to promote a workshop for the IODP conference in Greece. Sakellariou has requested the Greek government to join ECORD. There is general support for ESSAC assisting Sakellariou with support in organizing and contributing to the Greek conference.

#### **Item 15 ESSAC support for the European Ocean-Drilling Community Meeting, 17-19 March 2004, Bremen University, Germany (Hermann Kudraß, Encl.)**

Kenter invites Kudraß to introduce the item due to his involvement in the organisation of the European Ocean-Drilling Community Meeting. Kudraß thinks that the meeting can be a good opportunity for ECORD, ESSAC and EMA to introduce themselves to the European Ocean-Drilling community and have an ESSAC meeting. The meeting will have the following themes: sub-seafloor oceans, gas hydrates, paleo-environments and cycles. McKenzie comments top scientists like Bo Barker and Siprianca will be in Germany during the Community Meeting. They can be invited to give a lecture. Kenter and Kudraß will together set up the program in Bremen between 12-15 December to get ESSAC actively involved in the Community Meeting. The program will be forwarded to the

ESSAC delegates. MacLeod proposes to set up a proposal writing workshop to stimulate and improve proposal writing. Camoin states time should be left to allow people to meet, discuss and to get them involved. Mevel notes no overlap is required between the workshops and the proposed ESSAC meeting. Arnold and Kingdon will get involved in setting up a proposal writing workshop. Ildefonse raises points concerning the workshop; the communication and the funding. Evans proposes ESSAC should be responsible for the European Ocean-Drilling Community meeting, but should it be called an ESSAC meeting? Kingdon agrees and emphasizes ESSAC and ECORD should mark the meeting. Kudraß comments both communities IODP and ICP should be stated in the title due to sponsor commitments. After some discussion the delegates agree on the following title of the meeting: **“IODP and ICP EuroForum 2004” with the sub-title “Organized by ECORD and hosted by the university of Bremen”**. Kudraß comments the university of Bremen has a website for the meeting.

**Item 16 ESSAC Business various (Encl.)**

Kenter and Macleod request an approval to extend the appointment for ESSAC Chair and Vice-Chair to 2 years. Kenter explains it is hard to find a science coordinator for a period of 1 year. Ildefonse agrees and states that it will be better for the continuity and more can be achieved. Arnold and Mevel point out Vice Chair have to become Chair after the 2 years period for the continuity. Gillis comments on the long commitment period that has to be made. Mevel agrees and asks MacLeod about the 4 year commitment? MacLeod answers he has to be released of teaching and that will be no problem. McKenzie states that the Science Coordinator can reduce the work load. Kenter and MacLeod agree but respond that research may not suffer. Kenter continues that compensation should come from the national science foundation and/or faculty country but reminds the delegates that the Dutch Science Foundation is already supporting the ESSAC Office with funding of 60 kEuro and it cannot be expected to add compensation as well. Kenter and MacLeod leave the room to give the other delegates an opportunity discussing the proposed extension. McKenzie opens discussion and states it will be good if they are willing to commit themselves. Gilles wants to know how the current chairs were selected? McKenzie and Ildefonse answer selection took place during the last meeting. Ildefonse aims to wrap the discussion and asks if there is consensus? The delegates all agree. Kenter and MacLeod re-enter the room and Kenter concludes MacLeod will take over the Chair October 2005 and the search for his Science Coordinator will be done in consultation with the ECORD council.

**Item 16C Liaisons to USSAC and J-DESC, ECORD Council (Empty)**

Kenter concludes ESSAC will have no liaisons with USSAC and J-DESC.

**Item 16D Letters of support by ESSAC and J-DESC to JOI application managing USSSP-IODP (Encl.)**

Kenter states ESSAC supports the application and ESSAC would seek similar LoS when needed from J-DESC and JOI.

**Item 16E ESSAC input requested on the issue of publications – letter by the Chair of the Publications Subcommittee of the Science Planning Committee (SPC) of IODP, Ken Miller (Encl.)**

Kenter lets McKenzie initiate the discussion on Ken Miller’s letter. McKenzie puts it to the meeting if there should be an ODP journal and Special Publications on legs. Barriga comments the ODP quality research can be recognized with a journal and will have the needed citation index. Mevel states the problem of publication is discussed in the past and decided people could publish in all places, for the reason that special issues are not being read. McKenzie opposes the question if there is need for a new journal and should it be electronic or paper copy. Kenter aims to wrap up the discussion and proposes a working group consisting of McKenzie, MacLeod, Kudraß, Ildefonse and Camerlenghi, they will

provide a draft report summarizing arguments for out-sourcing the publication of ODP material as discussed in the letter of Ken Miller (Encl. 16E). Deadline for the report is December 24th.

**Item 16F Minutes of the U.S. Science Advisory Committee Meeting (USSAC), Hamilton, Bermuda, July 9-11, 2003 (Encl.)**

Kenter advises that the enclosure contains all necessary information.

**Item 16G Minutes of J-DESC – <http://www.aesto.or.jp/j-desc/index.html> (Empty)**

Kenter contacted J-DESC because available minutes and website were in Japanese. ESSAC anticipates that J-DESC will make an effort to provide English translations of their meetings in the future.

**16H ECORD (EMA or ERA Network) support for ESSAC (one per year?) and SAS panel meetings in ECORD countries (Empty)**

Kenter initiates the discussion national support is needed, because there is no support from ECORD. Mevel will mention it next meeting, as Kenter thinks J-DESK and USSAC have arranged their panel support better. Camoin states ESSAC will need support for organising workshops like USSAC; their workshops are going very well. Camoin continues bringing scientists together to write proposals will be very effective, as they never will submit one alone and it will give them the possibility working together with skilled proposals writers. Mevel agrees, but states ESSAC should actively seek out support, otherwise the workshops will be unnecessary postponed. Kenter wraps up and asks Mevel to request advice from the ECORD Council on how ESSAC can obtain financial support for the organisation of workshops.

**16I ESSAC input requested to JOI/USSAC “U.S. IODP Education Workshop” and student trainee program ([www.joiscience.org/USSSP/Ed\\_Wksp/Ed\\_Wksp.html](http://www.joiscience.org/USSSP/Ed_Wksp/Ed_Wksp.html)) (Encl.)**

Kenter invites Arnold to introduce the item. Arnold summarises the goals of the U.S. IODP Education Workshop, they looked how many people are needed for the development of education material to give the non-ODP world inside what ODP does for science. The primary results consisted of lectures and courses provided by scientists and special teachers programs. The conclusions on the student trainee program were positive and will be continued, but will not be available for every leg. Kingdon comments on the complications on offshore possibilities for students. Mevel stresses problems will be inevitable, implementing one educational program to the different educational systems throughout Europe. Kenter wraps up and proposes a working group consisting of Arnold, Kingdon and Mevel, they will provide a brief summary of how they envisage the ODP system to be promoted amongst students. Deadline for the report is December 24th.

**Item 16J ESSAC/ECORD speaker requested at the IODP Town meeting at the Fall AGU meeting in San Francisco, December 8 (Encl.)**

Kenter accepts Mevel willing to take up the responsibility of providing a talk on ECORD at the IODP Town meeting at AGU.

**Item 17 ESSAC Communication and PR (Encl.)**

Kenter states that the ESSAC website (<http://www.geo.vu.nl/~essac/>) is being modified and asks for advice what it should contain. Ildefonse stresses the importance of a simple accessible and adjustable website and proposes not to work with the Xdrive FTP system. Kenter response the problem with Xdrive is due to firewall settings and asks for advice on other FTP option. Ildefonse has found another FTP option and will discuss it with Van Lanen. Strand states there should be links to the national ODP

related sites. Kenter wraps up and states there should be one general ECORD website, as for the time being ESSAC will create their own.

Kenter opens discussion on the need of a newsletter. Ildefonse proposes to make a simple electronic newsletter that people can subscribe to. Mevel stresses the need of one uniform newsletter from ECORD. Kingdon replies that the ECORD Council should discuss a general structure of the newsletter that the national offices can copy to preserve a similar style. Kenter proposes a working group consisting of Mevel, Kingdon and Ildefonse, WG on ECORD Newsletter, they will provide a brief investigation into the need and publishing medium of an ECORD newsletter, cc communications to ESSAC, and report before years end.

**Item 17C ESSAC Distinguished Lecturer Series (like USSAC) (Empty) (check [http://oceandrilling.coe.tamu.edu/curriculum\\_modules/](http://oceandrilling.coe.tamu.edu/curriculum_modules/))**

Kenter states it will be good for us and overall not that expensive to send ESSAC lecture delegates over Europe, but funding will be needed. It is agreed that the initiative should be started once funding is in place. Mevel will discuss the matter in the ECORD Council.

**Item 17D PECVI, SciMP (geochemistry) questionnaires (Encl.)**

Kenter stresses the disappointing response from the ESCO community. Macleod adds Susan Humphries visited Europe to get more support.

**Item 17E Activities related to the celebration of the start of ECORD/IODP**

Mevel explains that no concrete plans are made, the signing date is not known and ESSAC will be updated when information is available.

**Item 18 ESSAC support to ESO Lomonosov Ridge (proposal #533, forwarded and South Pacific Sea Level (IODP proposal #519, ranked #1) ) planning (Andy Kingdon, Empty)**

Discussed under Item 7

**Item 19 ODP Legacy documents: Achievements and Opportunities of Scientific Ocean Drilling (<http://joides.rsmas.miami.edu/legacy/>) and ODP Highlights ([http://joides.rsmas.miami.edu/files/ODP\\_Highlights.pdf](http://joides.rsmas.miami.edu/files/ODP_Highlights.pdf)) (Empty)**

Kenter mentions the websites and advises the delegates to check out the content.

**Item 21 Upcoming Meetings List of relevant upcoming meetings (Encl.)**

- Second ESSAC (staffing) meeting is tentatively planned for January 23rd 2004 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands (for convenience).
- The third ESSAC meeting is scheduled for March 15th 2004, pending further discussion.

Enclosures:

- *Updated list of ECORD Council delegates and alternates*
- *Reply to John Farrell, concerning ESSAC view on staffing procedures*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE 1ST ESSAC MEETING IN AMSTERDAM, 14-15  
NOVEMBER 2003**

Location: Faculty of Earth & Life Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

Action points and consensus decisions (**Persons** responsible for actions highlighted):

**6B** *ESSAC and ECORD Council delegates as of 13 November 2003*

- **Kenter** will provide an up to date list of ECORD Council delegates and alternates. **Delegates** will send letters from their national IODP committee confirming nominations to EMA with cc to ESSAC (Enclosure with update 3 December 2003).

**Item 7** *ESSAC Shipboard Staffing*

- **Kenter** will formulate a reply to John Farrell, concerning the decision that although ESSAC does see a role for IMI in staffing issues, they feel that it would be sufficient if staffing is directed solely through a portal on the ESSAC web site (Enclosure). The web portal has been opened and the community has received a message to apply for FY05-05 expeditions (<http://www.geo.vu.nl/~essac/>).
- **Kenter** sets a tentative deadline of **Friday January 23rd 2004** for a day staffing meeting (flying in and out the same day) in Amsterdam to conclude the staffing decisions for possibly 2 JR-type expeditions (recent information from TAMU) and the MSP Arctic expedition

**Item 7E** *ECORD Nominations for FY04 shipboard and shore-based science parties*

- The **ESSAC** office has posted an informal call for expression of interest in the upcoming IODP legs on its web portal (<http://www.geo.vu.nl/~essac/>) and will inform USSAC and J-DESC of the action.

**Item 8B** *ECORD delegates and alternates on the SAS panels*

- **Kenter** will send out an email requesting nominations for panel membership, which should be returned by December 5<sup>th</sup> (was moved and announced by e-mail). The nominations will be approved when the ECORD council meets December 15-16<sup>th</sup>.

**Item 11** *News on IODP Service Panels Activities*

- To retain expertise, when panel members rotate, no more than one third of the members should be replaced at one time.

**Item 15** *ESSAC support for the ICDP-IODP EuroForum 2004 Meeting, 17-19 March 2004, Bremen University, Germany (Hermann Kudrass)*

- **Kenter, Arnold, Gerald Wefer and Kudrass** will meet on December 18 to discuss Education and Public Outreach (March 16) as well as organizing the ICDP-IODP EuroForum 2004 Meeting and setting up a proposal-writing workshop.
- It is agreed that the 3rd **ESSAC meeting** can be combined with the ICDP-IODP EuroForum 2004 Meeting; the only possible date would be the 15<sup>th</sup> of March.
- **Arnold and Kingdon** will draft a paper on the proposal-writing workshop.

- **Delegates** will provide the ESSAC Office with science themes and names of possible speakers before December 18<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Item 16** *ESSAC Business various*

- The request that the appointment of the ESSAC Chair (Kenter) and Vice-chair (MacLeod) should be granted for two years is approved with consensus.
- Future nominations for the ESSAC Science Coordinator should be conducted in unison with the ECORD Council.
- ESSAC establishes a working group (WG) consisting of **McKenzie, MacLeod, Ildfonse and Camerlenghi** on Publications. The WG will provide a draft report summarizing arguments for out-sourcing the publication of ODP material as discussed in the letter of Ken Miller (Encl. 16e), and cc communications to ESSAC. Deadline for the report is December 24th.
- ESSAC establishes a working group (WG) consisting of **Arnold, Kingdon and Mevel** on Education and Outreach. The WG will provide a brief summary of how they envisage the ODP system to be promoted amongst students, and cc communications to ESSAC. Deadline for the report is December 24th.

#### **Item 17** *ESSAC Communications and PR*

- ESSAC establishes a working group (WG) consisting of **Mevel, Kingdon and Ildfonse** on Communication/Newsletter. The WG will provide a brief investigation into the need and publishing medium of an ECORD newsletter and report to ESSAC before years end.

#### **Item 23** *Date and place of next meeting*

- Second ESSAC (staffing) meeting is tentatively planned for January 23rd 2004 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands (for convenience).
- The third ESSAC meeting is scheduled for March 15th 2004, pending further discussion.

#### **Enclosures**

- *Update 3 December 2003 ESSAC and ECORD Council delegates*
- *Reply to John Farrell, concerning ESSAC view on staffing procedures*