

10 – ECORD post FY18 renewal

*(G. Camoin on behalf of
the ECORD Exec. Working Group)*

	MoU (AK-1)
Austria	> FY18
Belgium	> FY16
Canada	> FY15
Denmark	> FY16
Finland	> FY18
France	> FY18
Germany	> FY18
Ireland	> FY18
Israel	> FY16
Italy	> FY18
Netherlands	> FY18
Norway	> FY18
Portugal	> FY18
Poland	> FY18
Sweden	> FY18
Switzerland	> FY16
United Kingdom	> FY18

12 countries / 17 committed until FY 18

4 countries / 17 committed until FY 16

1 country / 17 committed until FY 15

> Need for an external review before renewal

Action ECORD Executive Bureau: to review the 2011 renewal procedures and organize the post FY16 review process for EMA and ESO. A proposal of the time-frame and procedures of the renewal process shall be presented at the 2015 Council Fall meeting.

Exec Working Group : G. Camoin, M. Diamant, R. Gatliff, G. Lüniger, M. Webb

> to work by email on :

- 1) the timing and procedures of ECORD's renewal and
- 2) to propose to the ECORD Council if the EMA and ESO renewals
should be combined with the ECORD renewal or not

> Issue #1 : Timing of the ECORD external review

Proposed timeline :

- January 2017

- * ECORD Evaluation Committee (EEC) appointed
- * (If necessary) pre-meeting (telephone/video conference call or 1 day face to face meeting)
- * Appropriate documents sent to the EEC members by EMA

- May 2017

2-3 days general meeting @ MARUM (EEC + ECORD representatives) : science, operations, management

- June 2017

Final report sent to EMA

> Issue #2 : Mandate of the EEC

- Documents provided to the EEC members will be prepared by the relevant ECORD entities : ESSAC, EFB, ESO, EMA)
- EEC Terms of Reference (*tbd*) should be rather flexible
- EEC mandate will primarily concerns the production of a high level review focused on three major items:
 1. Review of achievements of ECORD within IODP
(*has ECORD achieved high quality science and impact ?*)
 2. Review of the impact of MSPs in particular
(*have MSPs completed projects which are complementary to the JR and Chikyu, and how does the science output rank ?*)
 3. Review of the effectiveness/efficiency of ECORD entities
(*are ECORD entities properly designed to face IODP/ECORD challenges ?*)

> Issue #3 : Composition of the external committee

- The EEC should include high standing (but not currently involved in IODP activities) scientists (major Science Plan themes), specialists of subseafloor investigations(technology), managers/representatives of other international science programmes, i.e. 6 to 10 members
- Nomination and selection of the EEC members (by ECORD entities – Council + ESSAC)
- EEC members' nominations by the ECORD Council, ESSAC and EFB. EEC members' final selection by the ECORD Council based on their expertise and ESSAC/EFB recommendations

> *Issue #4 : Format of the external review report*

- Focused concise report that would largely be drafted by the end of the general meeting

> *ECORD Council consensus / action*