

## 6<sup>th</sup> ECORD Council meeting

Stockholm, 11-12 April 2005  
Swedish Research Council (VR)  
Regeringsgatan 56, Stockholm

### **Participants**

#### **Council members:**

Austria	Reinhard Belocky	belocky@fwf.ac.at
Denmark	Anders Kjaer	akj@forsk.dk (ebe@gorsk.dk)
Finland	Anu Huovinen	anu.huovinen@aka.fi
France	John Ludden	John.Ludden@cnrs-dir.fr
Germany	Sören B. Dürr	soeren.duerr@dfg.de
Italy	Sergio Persoglia	spersoglia@ogs.trieste.it
Netherlands	Raymond M.L. Schorno	Schorno@nwo.nl
Norway	Olav Eldholm (BoG)	olav.eldholm@geo.uib.no
Portugal	José Hipólito Monteiro	hipolito.monteiro@ineti.pt
Spain	Benjamin Sanches, alternate	benjamin.sanches@min.es
Sweden	Jonas Björck	Jonas.Bjorck@vr.se
Switzerland	Marcel Kullin	mkullin@snf.ch
UK	Chris J. Franklin	cfr@nerc.ac.uk

#### **Observers:**

E.C.	Marco Weydert	Marco.Weydert@cec.eu.int
ESSAC	Jeroen Kenter	jeroen.kenter@falw.vu.nl
EMA	Catherine Mevel	mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr
	Svetlana Zolotikova	zoloti@ipgp.jussieu.fr
ESO	Dan Evans	devans@bgs.ac.uk
ESF	Martina Hilger-Hildebrandt	mhildebrandt@esf.org
Denmark	Lars Stemmerik (alternate)	ls@geous.dk
Germany	Amelie Winkler	amelie.winkler@dfg.de
Ireland	Eibhlin Doyle	Eibhlin.Doyle@gsi.ie
Portugal	Olga Dias (alternate)	olga.dias@grices.mces.pt
Sweden	Else-Marie Friis	else.marie.friis@nrm.se
UK	Helen Bell	hebe@nerc.ac.uk
UK	Dave Falvey (BoG)	dfalvey@bgs.ac.uk

## **Agenda**

**9h00-11h00 : ECORDnet WP3 meeting**

***Monday 11 April, 11h00***

---

**1. Welcome/Introduction and objectives of the meeting**

**2. Discussion and approval of agenda**

**3. Approval of the Bonn meeting minutes**

**4. Bonn meeting action points**

**5. Membership of ECORD**

**a) approval of the ECORD member list**

**b) membership situation**

- Italy
- Belgium
- Ireland
- Canada
- Portugal
- others

***lunch break (12h30 – 13h30)***

**6. ECORD chair and membership of the executive**

- a) Identification of new Vice Chair as of April. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006
- b) ECORD Council Executive

**7. Report on the IMI and IMI BoG meetings (Feb 2005) (Olav Eldholm)**

**8. EMA report (Catherine Mével)**

EMA activities: BGS contract, Townhall meeting in Vienna, booths, ECORD Newsletters, brochure, etc...

**9. Budgets<sup>1</sup>**

- a) Financial report on ACEX (Dan Evans)
- b) ECORD funding situation (Catherine Mével)
- c) Future funding sources
- d) Commission proposal on FP7 (Marco Weydert)

***coffee break (15h30-16h00)***

**16h00**

**10. ESO report**

- a) report on ACEX onshore party (Dan Evans)
- b) plans for Tahiti (Dan Evans)
- c) outreach activities for ACEX and for future MSP expeditions (Andy Kingdon)
- d) FY06 programme

**11. ACEX operations evaluation**

Presentation of REVCOM report (C. Mével)  
Evaluation of the onshore party by ESO (D. Evans)  
ACEX evaluation for ECORDnet WP5 (C. Franklin)

---

<sup>1</sup> Budget discussion is not included in the present report, but distributed among Council members as Annex 1.

**12. ESSAC report** (Jeroen Kenter)

**19h30 DINNER**

**Restaurant Gondolen**, Stadsgården 6.

By subway: from Hötorget station (Close to the Rica City Hotel) to Slussen (two stops). Or on foot: starting at 7 p.m. from the Hotel lobby – a walk through the Old Town of Stockholm.

---

***Tuesday 12 April, 9:00***

**13. Status of ESF proposals :**

- a) EUROCORE proposal (Chris Franklin)
- b) Magellan workshop series (Jeroen Kenter)

**14. EC reporting procedures – 18-month financial and management reports** (Marco Weydert)

***coffee break (10h30-11h00)***

**15. ERAnet activities**

Report from the Zürich meeting

**16. AOB**

Next meeting

***12:30, end of the meeting***

## **6<sup>th</sup> ECORD Council meeting**

**Stockholm, 11-12 April 2005**  
**Report**

**Monday 11 April, 11h00**

---

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

J.Björck, Chair of the Council, welcomed the participants of the meeting hosted by the Swedish Research Council, and participants introduced themselves.

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

The agenda was approved with minor modifications.

### **3. Approval of the Bonn meeting minutes**

Minutes of the Bonn meeting were approved with modifications.

**ECORD Council motion 05-01-01. ECORD Council approves the Bonn minutes with modifications.**

J.Ludden moved, S.Dürr seconded, all in favour.

### **4. Bonn meeting action points**

Action points from the Bonn meeting were discussed. Most of the action points were fulfilled.

S.Persoglia was nominated official representative from Italy in ECORD.

ECORD IMI governors are invited to Council meetings.

A letter was sent to Jean Francois Minster, President of IFREMER, and Kaisa Kononen from the Academy of Finland to ask for approval of the proposed official ECORD liaisons – R.Schorno for Marine-net, and J.Björck – for BONUS ERA-net. An approval was received from K.Kononen. No response from IFREMER has been received.

To be done in this meeting:

- EMA to report the results of the evaluation of the ACEX by REVCOM
- ESO to provide a revised budget
- EMA to present an overview of the budget evolution year by year

Action S.Dürr: on behalf of the Council to thank Susan Egelund for her efforts and dedication of more than 10 years in promoting ODP, IODP and ECORD.

### **5. Membership of ECORD (C.Mével)**

#### **a) approval of the ECORD member list**

#### **b) membership situation**

- Italy
- Belgium
- Ireland
- Canada
- Portugal
- others

#### **ECORD membership**

Annex H for FY05 signed :

Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK

**Italy** is a particular case :

In FY04, two Italian institutions signed the MOU : OGS (75,000 \$) and CNR (75,000 \$)

In FY05, two more institutions joined ECORD : INGV (Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia) for 75,000 \$ and CONISMA (Consorzio Interuniversitario per le Scienze del Mare) for 25,000 \$. In theory, the Italian contribution in FY05 is 250,000 \$

However, CNR has not yet signed the Annex H for FY05, as their provisional budget has not been finalised yet due to internal problems. *How does the ECORD council want to consider Italy in terms of financial contribution?*

**Portugal**

Annex H signed for FY05. The FY04 contribution has not been paid yet.

**Belgium**

An MoU is to be signed by the FWO (Flemish part) for 25 000 Euro i.e. 30 000 USD for FY05. A proposal is pending for FY06 and beyond, and contacts to bring the French part of Belgium are in progress. A Belgian scientist has been invited to sail on IODP expedition 307 (Porcupine carbonate mounds). J.P.Henriet has been nominated by FWO as a representative in ECORD. Nominations for ESSAC also needed.

**Ireland**

Ireland is in the process of signing the MOU for a level of contribution of 100,000 € (i.e. ~ 130,000 \$). The Minister Dempsey will announce the participation at the Dublin portcall.

*Two Irish scientists have been invited to sail on IODP expedition 307, as observers (the expedition is in Irish waters).*

**Canada**

Canada joined ECORD in FY04, with funding secured only for 1 year, at a level of 150,000 \$. Canada was therefore attributed the status of provisional member.

A new proposal was submitted by K. Gillis this year, for a three-year funding at a level of 200,000 Canadian \$ per year (150,000 US\$). At the last Council meeting, it was decided to maintain Canada as a provisional member till the next ECORD council meeting. The proposal has been funded for three years.

*Canadian scientists have been nominated by ESSAC to sail on the Cascadia margin expedition.*

K. Gillis is also investigating another way of funding where she hopes to be able to submit a proposal for a higher amount.

Will the Council still consider the limit of 300 000 \$ as a minimum contribution for non-European members in the case of Canada ? If so, one should be aware of the fact that Lead agencies consider creating a new status to allow smaller countries be part of IODP, and for LA this may be a chance to bring in Korea, Taiwan...

**Australia**

D. Falvey, who was given mandate by ECORD to conduct negotiations in Australia, met Helen Bostock (MARGO).

D. Falvey in his talks and private discussions was frank about advantages and disadvantages of Australia joining ECORD. For Australia, associate membership would perhaps be more interesting. A letter in support of Australia participation in IODP and offering Australia to become a member of ECORD was sent to H.Bostock. In addition, she was invited to this meeting (no reply received).

**Korea**

Following their attendance at the Bonn meeting, EMA invited Korean representatives to this meeting. They declined the invitation.

### **Baltic states**

J.Björck and C.Mevel attended a BONUS meeting in Helsinki last February to explain ECORD and IODP to representatives from the NAS (Poland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia).

The meeting was on program manager level, and not funding level, so not much could be achieved.

As a result, we have been invited to go to Estonia in the fall to present IODP to the science community. Jointly with ESSAC, we will organise a delegation.

### **Hungary**

J.Ludden was in Budapest recently and made some contact (Gábor Bada). There is clearly an interest, although from scientific community only. Possibility to organize a symposium?

D.Falvey proposed to write a letter to geological surveys of the Baltic states and asked to be supplied (by e-mail) with background information.

### **Discussion**

It has been agreed that consistency is needed: in case there is at least verbal commitment or signed Annex H for several years – the country is accepted as a member. Commitment for only one year gives the status of provisional member. The evidence of further commitment is the actual seeking for funding.

**ECORD Council Motion 05-01-02: ECORD welcomes the efforts made by Canada in securing funding, in principle for the duration of the IODP, and accepts Canada as a full member of ECORD with the following provisions:**

- 1) Canada commits to being a member of ECORD for the 3 years (2005-2007) of already secured funding;**
- 2) Canada continues to seek further funding to reach the \$300k per annum level originally presented by Canada as the contribution being sought to become a full member of ECORD;**

C.Franklin moved, S.Dürr seconded, all in favour.

**ECORD Council Motion 05-01-03: Council approves the list of ECORD members (MOU, Tabel H1 FY05) with the following modifications:**

- Canada and Ireland included as members**
- Belgium is provisional member**
- names updated for UK, Switzerland, Denmark.**

S.Dürr moved, C.Franklin seconded, all in favour.

ACTION EMA: Update the list and send it to Lead agencies. Remind the LA that at IODP Council meetings ECORD is represented officially by 4 people – Chair, two Vice Chairs and the director of EMA.

ECORD Council Recommendation:

If Portugal does not pay both contributions (FY04 and FY05) by the end of FY05 - October 2005 - Portugal is no longer member of ECORD.

ACTION D.Falvey – find out what the situation is in Australia and whether Australia might be willing to join ECORD.

ACTION Chair: Write a letter to Korea asking to clarify their position with regards to ECORD.

ACTION S.Persoglia – provide C.Mével with a list of representatives from Baltic and other East European countries that might be interested in cooperation with or joining ECORD.

## 6. ECORD chair and membership of the executive

- c) Identification of new Vice Chair as of April. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006
- d) ECORD Council Executive

**ECORD Council motion 05-01-04. ECORD Council nominates Marcel Kullin as Vice Chair from October 1, 2005.**

J.Ludden moved, C.Franklin seconded. All in favour.

**ECORD Council motion 05-01-05. ECORD Council proposes to nominate a representative of Norway as member of executive. ECORD executive thus consist of J.Börck (Chair), S.Dürr (Vice Chair), C.Franklin (Vice Chair), C.Mével (EMA), S.Persoglia and a representative of Norway.**

J.Ludden moved, C.Franklin seconded. All in favour.

ACTION C.Mével – find out if Are Birger Carlson (or Roy Helge Gabrielsen) accepts the position of executive.

## 7. Report on the IMI and IMI BoG meetings (Feb 2005) (Olav Eldholm)

IODP-MI:

- Not-for-profit, non-stock, U.S. Corporation
- International membership, committed to IODP, from member countries
- Acts as the central management organization (CMO) for IODP
- Receives advice from IODP Science Advisory Structure (SAS)
- In consultation with operators (“Implementing Organizations”, translates scientific priorities into annual program plans
- Submits an annual IODP Program Plan for review and approval first to, Science Planning and Policy Oversight Committee), then to IODP-MI Board of Governors (BoG), and finally to the Lead Agency who gives final budget approval.
  - Offices in Washington, D.C. and Sapporo, Japan
  - Responsible for program-wide science planning, and oversight of engineering development, publications, education and outreach, site survey data management, and core sample repositories
  - Most of these functions will be subcontracted to IOs and third parties as appropriate with advice from SAS and under supervision of IODP-MI
  - IODP-MI will arrange to provide continuous performance evaluation and assessment of all elements of IODP.
  - ODP-MI is open to non-profit educational and/or research organizations formed and operated in an IODP Member entity (i.e., country or consortia) that satisfy criteria, which have been provided by this entity and subsequently approved by the IODP-MI Members
  - Criteria: evidencing “a significant dedication to ocean geoscience research.”
  - Educational and/or research organizations, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and for-profit companies ineligible for membership, but having an interest in ocean geoscience research, may become Associate Members

IODP-MI Membership - currently 35 members

- US 15
- Japan 8
- Europe 12

Membership fee: USD 5000/yr

### **European IODP-MI members**

AWI	GER	J. Thiede
BGS	UK	D.A. Falvey
Cardiff Univ.	UK	J.A. Cartwright
ETH	SCH	H.R. Thierstein
IUEM	FRA	D. Prieur
IFM-GEOMAR	GER	P. Herzig
IPG-Paris	FRA	V. Courtillot
Univ. Bremen	GER	G. Wefer
Univ. Bergen	NOR	O. Eldholm
Univ. Leicester UK		M. Lovell
Univ. Southampton	UK	H. Roe
Free Univ. Amsterdam	NE	P. Vellinga

### **IODP-MI Board of Governors (BoG)**

R. Detrick	WHOI/US
O. Eldholm	EUR
D. Falvey	EUR
C. Harrison	Miami/US (treasurer)
D. Kent	Rutgers/US
G. Kimura	Tokyo/JAP
T. Nagao	Tokai U/JAP
M. Oda	Tohoku U/JAP
H. Okada	HokkaidoU/JAP (vice chair)
N. Opdyke	Florida/US
J. Orcutt	SIO/US
T. Ozaki	KochiU/JAP
E. Silver	UCSC/US
P. Stoffa	UTIG/US (Chair)
K. Suyehiro	JAMSTEC/JAP
J. Thiede	AWI/EUR
E. Tsukada	AIST/JAP
M. Talwani	IODP-MI (non-voting)

### **IODP-MI Executive Committee**

Robert Detrick	US
Dennis Kent	US
Paul Stoffa	US
Gaku Kimura	JAP
Hisatake Okada	JAP
Kyoshi Suyehiro	JAP
Olav Eldholm	EUR

### **IODP-MI Management Team**

M. Talwani	President	IODP-Washington DC
H.C. Larsen	Vice-president	IODP-Sapporo
T.R. Janecek	Vice-president	IODP-Washington DC
Y. Otsuka	Senior advisor	IODP-Washington DC
S. Murphy	Fin. & Adm. officer	IODP-Washington DC
J. Emmitte	Contacts officer	IODP-Washington DC
N. Light	Communication Dir.	IODP-Washington DC



### **Members meeting Feb. 17, 2005**

1. Welcome and logistics
2. Approval of minutes
3. Election of New Member
  - IUEM (University of Brest) elected
4. Approval of FY04 Audit Report
5. Funding Agency Contribution to Corporate Reserve Fund and Member Dues ; Target \$1 million. NSF \$300000 ( \$60000/yr for 5 yr). Projection end FY05 \$322k. Reserve fund covers funding hiatus, potential litigation, other costs not covered by NSF. Members fees will continue until 2008-09, thereafter only as needed to maintain the reserve.
6. Approval of FY05 Corporate Funds Budget
7. Review and Approval of By-Laws Changes
  - Official acronym changed from IMI to IODP-MI.
  - An electronic vote will be unanimous if no member objects to the proposed new member within a two calendar month period.
  - Selection of the BoG and ExCom alternates (EUR needs to propose BoG alternates). Alternate ExCom Members are selected from among the sitting Governors.
  - Member definition to include "geoscience research and/or earth system science research".
8. Election of Governors and alternate Governors
  - US** R. Detrick, WHOI; E. Silver, UCSC. Alternates: N. Opdyke, Florida; T. Moore, Michigan
  - Japan** T. Nagao, Tokai; K. Suyehiro, JAMSTEC. Alternates: M. Oda, Tohoku; E. Tsukuda, AIST; K. Takahashi, Kyusyu
  - Europe** O. Eldholm, U.Bergen: Alternates: **To be decided by ECORD**
9. Presentation of IODP-MI Annual Reports
  - Letter from the President
  - Staff Annual Report
  - Report from Sapporo office
10. Science Talks
11. Other items
  - There is one full meeting of the membership each year between 15.1 and 31.3 according to bylaws. Location will rotate between Japan, US and Europe. It was agreed that next meeting will be held in Europe. **ECORD will discuss possible locations and select some dates.**

### **BoG meeting Feb. 18, 2005**

1. Welcome and Logistics
2. Science Talk--Mark Zoback, StanfordU The San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Election of Officers
  - Chair – Stoffa; Vice Chair – Okada; Secretary – Suyehiro; Treasurer – Harrison
5. Election of Executive Committee Members and alternates
  - Detrick, Kent, Stoffa; Kimura, Okada, Suyehiro; Eldholm
6. Review of SPPOC Activities
  - A discussion ensued regarding the ill-defined mandate of SPPOC, the changes since IODP-MI was established, and the relationship with SPC.
5. Approval of FY04 Audit Report
6. Approval of Audit Firm for FY05 (Rubino & McGeehin)
7. Funding Agency Contribution to Corporate Reserve Fund and Member Dues
8. Approval of '05 Corporate Funds Budget (cfr members Meeting)
9. Review and Approval of By-Laws Changes (cfr members Meeting)
10. Appoint Additional Committees
11. Investment Committee: Harrison (chair), Okada, Orcutt, Suyehiro and Thiede.
12. Audit committee: Eldholm (chair), Harrison and Takahashi.
13. Other Items : Next meeting: June 17-18, Nagasaki, Japan

## Discussion

As opposed to JOI, IODP-MI is more open, and there is a mechanism for election and nomination. A decision on the SPPOC mandate is still to be taken – at the next meeting of BoG.

C.Franklin asked whether ECORD Council was involved in the process of the annual plan approval. O.Eldholm explained that an executive meeting was held together with AGU, but no answer received. C.Mével noted that an officially approved annual plan was never received by ECORD. J.Ludden reminded of the necessity of gender equity. Even though good scientists are on the list of the various committees, there is a problem with scientific guidance in IODP. O.Eldholm noted that IODP is a bottom-up program and decision should come from the bottom. D.Falvey remarked that the proposal generation concept is old-fashioned, and debates are going on. O.Eldholm said that European scientists and funding agencies should agree on a strategy for the European representatives of the BoG.

J.Ludden remarked that as far as SPPOC is concerned, there is a need for more consent between SPPOC members. J.Kenter added that ESSAC delegates are preparing their comments on the ways of better organisation of the programme, for the meeting to be organised in Rome 23-26 May for science management and IOs. ESSAC would like to receive advice from the Council.

### **ECORD Council motion 05-01-06. Science advice in IODP.**

**ECORD Council received a report from the European members of IODP-MI and are satisfied that Europe is now well represented on IODP-MI. The Council discussed the role of IODP-MI in science strategy and in policy development. In addition, the relative roles of IODP-MI and the SPPOC committee in this realm remain unclear. ECORD Council, and after discussion with the ESSAC chair, ESSAC, are concerned that :**

- 1) The flexibility of the IODP programme does not permit a rapid response to new and innovative, and often, “high-risk” science**
- 2) Proposals which require different types of drilling (MSP, non-riser, Riser), including Complex drilling proposals, are all treated in the same way by the IODP SAS structure. This may inhibit short legs, some MSP proposals and other drilling requiring tested infrastructure reaching the final ranking and scheduling stages rapidly.**

#### **Recommendations:**

- Accelerate the SAS evaluation process**
- Introduction of a fast track for timely and strategically appropriate proposals.**
- Increase the pool of MSP proposals.**

J.Ludden moved, S.Dürr seconded, all in favour.

### **ECORD Council Motion 05-01-07. ECORD Council nominates alternates for ECORD delegates to IODP-MI Board of Governors:**

**G. Wefer (Univ. Bremen) and H.R. Thierstein (ETH).**

S.Dürr moved, C.Mével seconded, all in favour.

ACTION EMA – C.Mével to attend the Management Forum Retrat in Rome where to discuss with the Leading agencies that EMA’s role and functions are not strictly those of a funding agency.

ACTION ESSAC Chair – for the pre-management committee on Eurocores (23 May) draft the call for EuroMARC (with the help of Martina Hildebrandt).

## 8. EMA report (C.Mével).

### 1) Status of BGS contract:

In the process to be finalised: EMA received a positive answer from NERC.

*Difficulty = uncertainty on the funding, therefore on the shortfall that the UK agreed to cover.*

### 2) Payment of SOC's to NSF

The agreement is in place, and the first transfer has been made.

*Arrangement with the NSF regarding travel (Fly America act) has been achieved – the amount for travel will be deducted from the 7 mln contract.*

### 3) Outreach activities

ECORD Newsletter N 4 published – will be distributed;

EGU meeting in Vienna : IODP booth , with focus on Europe and ECORD;

Townhall meeting: April 26th at 17:30 room 19, EGU Vienna

“Goodies”: a poster printed and is available at the EMA office; the ECORD poster, flyer, bags and pens will be distributed in Vienna

*Outreach event associated with the Dublin portcall (JR)*

April 27th, Press event in the presence of the Minister Noel Dempsey, Minister for Communications, Marine and Natural Resources

Seminar for the Irish science community

All ECORD council members have received an invitation to attend. The following presentations have been planned:

Presentation of ECORD (C. Mével)

IODP science (M. Bickle)

Results of mapping and imaging the Irish waters (GSI)

### *ECORD website*

We are in the process of merging ESSAC into the ECORD website. ESSAC will be responsible for preparing the ESSAC pages, but there is now only one website : [www.ECORD.org](http://www.ECORD.org)

J. Pearce (future ESSAC acting chair) will visit Paris next May with Valentina to organize the ESSAC part. We are in the process of simplifying the presentation, so that the information related to MSPs is easier to find. The website will present the ACEX photo gallery and a preliminary report.

### 4) IODP Council meeting

Will be held in Nagasaki, immediately after SPPOC meeting.

EMA provided the list of the ECORD council members to the Lead Agencies who will all be invited.

ECORD officially is represented by : J.Björck (chair), S.Dürr and C.Franklin (vice-chairs) and Catherine (EMA)

### 5) Management Forum Retreat

Will be held in Rome, 24 – 26 May and hosted by M. Talwani.

Invitees : IOs, Heads of national scientific Committees, chairs of SPPOC and SPC, IMI vice presidents;

Funding agencies are invited as observers. NSF is not attending.

Should EMA attend? To say that EMA's role is not strictly funding agency ?

## **Discussion**

It was decided that EMA should attend this meeting. Input is very much welcome from everyone, especially on innovative ideas. ESSAC has a working group to discuss the ideas, and as there is no agenda, all possible topics can be discussed.

## 10. ESO report (agenda items 10 and 13 moved forward)

### (a) Report on ACEX onshore party (Dan Evans)

Excellent scientific results have already been obtained, and our knowledge of the Arctic Ocean history will be hugely expanded as a result of ACEX.

32 scientists from USA, Japan, UK, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Sweden, The Netherlands and Norway participated. Science party lasted 13 days (8th - 20th Nov). 339 m of core analysed and sampled.

Analyses conducted at Bremen – IODP minimum measurements

- Whole core gamma-ray measurements

- Core photography

- Colour reflectance and digital line scanning of archive half

- Lithological description of split cores

- Smear slide analysis

- Shear strength measurements

- Thermal conductivity measurements

7320 samples collected

Discrete samples for individual scientist's studies

- Micropal, Geochemistry, Mineralogy, Grain size, IRD

- Physical properties

- U-channels for palaeomagnetic studies

All samples recorded in the Offshore DIS

All data will be transferred to Pangaea

### ACEX status

- Internal ESO assessment of Onshore Party completed and submitted to IODP-MI
  - Improvements identified, eg accommodation, timing of SAC, and a multitude of minor issues
- Preliminary Report finalised by TAMU; release imminent
- Expedition Results Post-Cruise Editorial Meeting to be held at College Station in early May, or perhaps June
  - Timing to be decided by USIO and IODP-MI

Next onshore party will be held **in the new core repository**, which will be easier for us and for scientists.

### (b) Plans for Tahiti

#### Tahiti Sea Level - IODP Expedition 310

05 Program plan and budget submitted in May 04 to IODP-MI. No contracts yet signed with EMA for POCs, although almost completed. The contract with IODP-MI for SOC is signed. No contracts yet issued to: EPC, Bremen, ship

#### HSE

- Ecological perturbations to the reef ecosystem should be minimized by adopting drilling practices that limit physical destruction of both live and dead reefs, wherever and whenever possible.
- The accumulation of drilling-related detritus on the seafloor should be minimized.
- Pre- and post-drilling environmental assessment of the reef drill sites should be made. The results of these assessments should be carefully reviewed from an ecological impact perspective.

### **Tahiti Sea Level – #650 APL**

- Was initially included in planning. After meetings with the proponents, SPC decided at Lisbon in March that the experiment should be self-financing and should not detract from the main aims of the expedition
- The Proponents informed us on 30th March that they do not have sufficient funds
- APL is therefore not scheduled

### **Tahiti Sea Level – planning**

- Planning for Tahiti is benefiting from the ACEX experience and is incorporating recommendations of ACEX REVCOM
- Provisional Scientific Prospectus prepared
- Project handbook in preparation
- Measurements plan submitted to STP, and agreed with minor modifications
- Co-chiefs appointed: Yasufumi Iryu (Japan) and Gilbert Camoin (France)
- Science Party formed:
  - Japan (8): Ryuji Asami, Kazuhiko Fujita, Yasufumi Iryu\*, Hideaki Machiyama, Hiroki Matsuda\*, Kaoru Sugihara\*, Tsutomu Yamada, Yusuke Yokoyama
  - ECORD (9): Guy Cabioch, Gilbert Camoin\*, Pierre Deschamps, Thomas Felis, Alexander Thomas, Alexander Tudhope, Crisogono de Olivera Vasconcelos\*, Klaas Verwer, Hildegard Westphal\*
  - US (7): Paterno Castillo, Anne L Cohen, Julia E. Cole, Richard G. Fairbanks, Terry Quinn, Kenneth Verosub, *Jody Webster\*- moved to Australia and can not now go as US*
  - ESO: Hendrik Braaksma\*, David McInroy\*
- Korean Observer : Kyung Sik Woo
  - \* Offshore team member
- EU Journal notice August-September 2004 distributed worldwide through trade journals
- Co-chiefs meeting October 2004
- APL Meeting end November
- EPSP briefed; environmental procedures approved
- Logistics meeting held with Tahiti Authorities in December 2004
- Co-chiefs and APL meetings 28 Feb-1st March 2005
- Ship tenders issued January, opened 5th March
- Currently assessing tenders
- Preferred operations window June-November
- Drilling permits have been obtained; vessel clearance awaits outcome of tender

### **Current position**

- 3 ships tendered
- 2 are fully compliant with tender, but due to costs will only allow c 20 days on site – therefore not feasible
- Ship 3 is not ideal but would allow c 40 days on site
- Need to check out the details of the Ship 3's capability – this is currently our first priority
  - Accommodation
  - Deck space
  - DP capability
  - Drilling capability
  - Endurance
  - Overall suitability for coral reef environment

**Options : If Ship 3 is acceptable**, carry out Tahiti in 05. The vessel will be viewed on May 15th at Abu Dhabi; ESO is simultaneously assessing a compliant vessel.

If Ship 3 is not suitable...

### **SPC consensus**

MSP Operations should concentrate on the most highly ranked projects, even if this means a blank year to accumulate sufficient funds for the next year.

**SPC Consensus 0503-4: As a first priority in scheduling mission-specific platform (MSP) operations, the SPC recommends implementing only highly ranked proposals, even if it means not conducting an MSP operation in a particular year so that the IODP can obtain sufficient resources to implement the highest ranked science in other years.**

Therefore we cannot do a cheaper project in FY 06 that is lowly ranked, eg Coralgall banks (which has not in fact been forwarded to OPCOM)

**Options: If Ship 3 is not acceptable, use expensive ship to:**

- Carry out Tahiti in 05 using 05 + 06 funds (Strongly preferred by Co-chiefs)
- This would also leave 06 with no MSP and few other IODP expeditions, and would allow New Jersey Margin if funds were available
- Carry out Tahiti in 06 using 05 + 06 funds (Not favoured by co-chiefs)

**Cost for Tahiti**

**Assuming 'expensive' ship**

	\$m
Mob/transit	2.5
40 days Tahiti	3.0
Other POCs (05 + 06)	3.0
Total	8.5
Currently available POCs (05 + 06)	8.6

**(c) Outreach activities** – to discuss in the end of the meeting

**(d) FY06 plans**

Can not depend on Great Barrier proposal as site-survey has not been done yet, so the opportunity is New Jersey

**Options FY06**

- Insufficient funds at present for another expedition eg. GBR (no site-survey yet) or New Jersey Margin
- Programme plan and costs to be submitted 15th April 05 [with some leeway]
- The current target is New Jersey, but.....
  - POCs cost ~\$7m (for 1 hole per site)
  - POCs available ~\$4.1m (assuming an 05 expedition takes place on cheap ship within budget)
  - SOC also exceed budgetary guidance from IODP-MI
  - Canterbury Basin probably comparable?
  - New Jersey unlikely until 07 or later unless additional funds are obtained by ECORD

The indicative budget was submitted to IMI, but the budget has become larger. Logging is defined as a SOC, but for safety it is a POC, half a million \$.

How much Tahiti will be compressed in terms of science programme? Co-chiefs can not prioritise for New Jersey which holes to drill first. For Tahiti, 3 transects were done, and 40 days are needed. If only 2 transects can be drilled – what the co-chiefs could say? ECORD Council should decide how much can be transferred.

**Discussion**

C.Mével: Tahiti can be done now as it stands. New Jersey can only be possible if a cheaper vessels is used for Tahiti. Mobilisation costs are the most important part of the budget. Can the same ship be used for the Barrier Reef?

D.Evans: It is a long period to wait before we know if the Great Barrier is ready for drilling.

J.Ludden asked about the Baltic proposal and any chances that it can be on the schedule.

D.Evans replied that there is still a lot of work to be done for the Baltic proposal. They were advised to separate the proposal; J.Björck says one part of it has been submitted.

J.Ludden: we are choosing from 3 proposals that have been approved 10 years ago. It looks as if the system is slowed down, we have nothing to choose from. If we as Europe had a joint call for proposal, we would have had dozens on the table.

C.Mével suggested that perhaps there should be faster evaluation processes for MSPs, which are different from JR and Chikyu.

J.Ludden stressed the need for more proposals to do the science.

J.Kenter: The proposal for Golf of Carpentaria has been submitted to SSEPs. As a result of ranking in Yokohama, 3 groups were selected and all forwarded to OpCom for scheduling. It was decided that if they are not scheduled by OpCom before Lisbon, then the proposals in the lower third will be re-ranked. And they were re-ranked. But only 3 proposals were forwarded by SPC to OpCom. The process is slow, but not slower than before. There are MSP proposals in the system, they have just started their procedure in the system. We have a specific programme, but perhaps not enough MSP proposals.

The difference with MSPs: the platforms can be sent where needed. It is not like planning for JR, when a proposal can be evaluated for 3 years, and then when the ship is in that part of the ocean, it will be ranked.

C. Mével noted that everyone agrees that MSPs should be different, but at the same time the evaluation process should be more or less the same.

S.Dürr said that we have to follow the principle of SPC according to which only the best-ranked proposals should be implemented. For a MSP proposal to be ranked highly, it should be very well prepared and ready to go.

C.Franklin noted that we have obligation of making best use of scheduling and that the funding agencies should look for best solutions.

### **13. Status of ESF proposals**

(Agenda item 13 moved forward)

M.Hildebrandt gave an update on Magellan workshop series. She noted that there was enthusiasm, but not enough responses. J.Kenter finalised the proposal, which was submitted and approved. A formal letter from ESF was sent out questioning the amount of funding and willingness to support, and two negative replies were received – from Luxembourg and from an organisation from Austria. ESF will need substantial funding for this. Any time of the year a smaller group of ESF can decide on it, and for this the funding should be in place.

S.Dürr said that it was surprising that the countries did not support the initiative when the question came from the ESF, although interest was shown when it came from ECORD.

M.Hildebrandt pointed out that an indication of interest by e-mail is not enough. Formal procedure is needed.

J.Björck indicated that in Sweden there will be a meeting in May 15, after which a formal reply could be made.

J.Ludden proposed that the meetings organised in the UK (one on biogeosciences) should be also called Magellan. NSF and MEXT are aware of those.

M. Hildebrandt informed that a Eurocore proposal, Euromarc, was submitted to LESC in February, was approved, and also approved by the board. However, there is no call yet. The call can be

prepared either by first asking the funding agencies for preliminary interest (and then again approaching them for final commitment), or by directly asking the funding agencies for the final commitment, as the proposal is almost ready, and there have already been two pre-management committee meetings. The call can be then published by the 1 of August.

Usually the ESF sends out the proposals to more organisations than initially mentioned. When the proposal is too broad, and if it is opened for preliminary, pre-management committee meetings, the discussion may start again. The main problem - if an institution is not mentioned in the call, they can not participate, and their scientists are not aware of the call. When we send it out – it is sent to all, but once it is published, the membership can not be changed. Usually there is a call every third year, and with a new call new organisations can be involved. In the first call we can not include everyone in advance.

S.Dürr proposed to organise another pre-management committee, at least to discuss the working of the call. M.Hilderbrandt agreed to organise a meeting on 23 May, but ECORD Council should make it clear that they do not want to change the proposal, but want to discuss boundary conditions. For this meeting a draft of the call will be needed, which can be extracted from the text of the guide/proposal.

ACTION ESSAC Chair – for the pre-management committee on Eurocores (23 May) draft the call for EuroMARC (with the help of Martina Hildebrandt).

## 9. Budgets<sup>1</sup>

### a) Financial report on ACEX, Dan Evans

See Annex 1

### b) EMA report

See Annex 1

### c) European Commission Proposal on FP7 (Marco Weydert)

The Commission adopted its proposal for the seventh Framework Program for RTD (2007-2013) last week (see overheads attached: *06-04-05 FP7.ppt*). It foresees a “doubling” of the budget, but also new aspects are brought forward:

FP-VII will be divided into 4 specific programmes:

Cooperation

Ideas

People – could be interesting for ECORD as a drill ship is a research infrastructure.

Capacities

In addition there will be the

Nuclear programmes

In cooperation there will be 9 thematic priorities: space and security research (outer space) is added to the existing 8. “Environment” is now again separate from Energy and transport.

**Coordination activities, including Article 169 (see overheads attached: *coordination\_fp7\_110405.ppt*)**

ERA-net schemes will be continued, further developed, and current projects can get extensions, but only for steps 3 and 4. “ERA-NET plus” implies that if there is a common pot, the Community can contribute 20% of the budget, although this figure is not specified in the FP yet. If there is a common programme in an ERA-net, EC can contribute into the common pot to fund research. It is not a module of the ERA-net, but an incentive to make common calls for proposals. The minimum number of participating states and minimum funds will be specified.

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussion of the budget and financial reports of EMA and ESO are not included in the present report, but distributed among ECORD Council members as a separate document (Annex 1).



Article 169 implies that member states bring together their programmes to create a joint programme. And then additional financial support can come from the EU. This would require the "no just retour" principle.

Nothing has been decided yet. Both Parliament and Council are discussing the proposals now and will have to take the final Decisions.

In FP7 we will be trying to identify potential topics for Article 169. They must be enough to ground a joint programme, there must be enough commitment from member states to fund the programme. FP7 starts in 2007, but nowhere is mentioned when Article 169 starts. There should be substantial amount, as 169 is a heavier structure than ERA-nets. Some ERA-nets are already quite substantial, if calculated as the amount of money put into common programme. Coordination can bring all those funds together. This is not pooling national funds, but coordination.

**European Research Council** will be made of high-level scientists, and will be supported by an executive agency. The basic research part will consist of a small team of individual scientists funded. The idea of ERC is to have competition at European level, and to contribute to Lisbon target of 3% PB that should be used for basic research.

## Discussion

J.Ludden: Timing is a problem. Now we know that in May there will be a selection, and in France in CNRS, there was no discussion about Article 169. Only a vague reply from some ministries could be assured by May. In terms of 20 mln a year we need to go further. But if we do not have any chance, perhaps we do not start at all.

L. Stemmerik noted that as he understood there will be opening at the first stage, and then there will be a possibility to join later.

S.Dürr asked how the Commission can propose something of that magnitude with the deadline so short.

M.Weydert replied that there was a list of more than 30 potential proposals, which was decreased to 13. Article 169 is a joint programme made by member states into which EC is contributing. But you have to be aware of the difficulties: you need commitment from member states ministries. If you want to have a meeting, it can be arranged in the next ten days in Brussels.

ACTION Executive and John Ludden - to visit Brussels within the next days to discuss the strategy of approaching the EC for additional funding.

---

**Tuesday 12 April, 9:00**

---

## Budget discussion

The participants discussed the budget situation (See Annex 1) and the following motion was proposed:

<p><b>ECORD Council motion 05-01-08: Council have decided that if feasible with a cheaper ship, ESO should proceed with Tahiti planning for 2005. If not, the final decision is to be taken by the Executive, after receiving more information from ESO.</b></p>
--

S.Dürr moved. C.Franklin seconded, all in favour.

## 11. ACEX operations evaluation

### **ACEX evaluation by REVCOM (C.Mével)**

IMI decided to have a systematic evaluation of the operations shortly after an expedition. ACEX REVCOM was the first committee to meet: these were *15 people, including the 2 co-chiefs and 2 representatives from ESO*. Discussion was based on confidential reports from the IO and the co-chiefs as well as questionnaires filled by the science party members. REVCOM reports are posted on the web, i.e. open to public. A policy has been established by IMI to ask the co-chiefs in advance to prepare their report for REVCOM.

In general, the report on ACEX is positive. Several issues were questioned: preparation, problems due to short lead time, role and responsibilities of people. ESO is advised to define the roles, including a drilling superintendent. Better communication is needed between ESO and scientists.

### **Evaluation of the onshore party by ESO (D. Evans)**

*Partly presented above in the ESO report*

### **ACEX evaluation for ECORD-net WP5 (C. Franklin)**

*Is continuing, and was partly presented at the ECORD-net meeting in Zurich.*

## **Discussion**

D.Evans noted that the report was instructive. C.Franklin added that the intention of NERC is to put together the “best practice”, and mention the evaluation of IOs and how to learn from them. This auto evaluation can be presented to the Council.

J.Ludden suggested that ECORD should be also evaluated in 2006. For this, an outside committee is needed, with experts outside IODP, to look at how ECORD is functioning in IODP. An evaluation of this kind is needed in France, and other European countries, to continue funding the programme. A mandate for such evaluation committee and potential names should be prepared.

The Council agreed that there will not be an evaluation *per se* of the ACEX expedition as it is done by the IODP Revcom. NERC and ESO will do auto evaluation on best practice.

**ACTION : Prepare a mandate for an evaluation committee of ECORD and propose potential names.**

## **12. ESSAC report (J.Kenter)**

ESSAC meeting was held in Graz on 8-9 April 2005.

**1. ESSAC Office moves to Cardiff** October 1, 2005; ESSAC nominated during its meeting in Graz (8-9 April) Julian Pearce as alternate Chair for Chris MacLeod (until he is fully recovered) and Gilbert Camoin as Vice-Chair and seeks endorsement by the Council, so that they could start advertising for a position of a scientific coordinator.

**ECORD Council motion 05-01-09. ECORD Council nominates Julian Pearce as alternate Chair for Chris MacLeod (until he is fully recovered) and Gilbert Camoin as Vice-Chair of ESSAC as of October 1 2005**

S.Dürr moved, J.Ludden seconded, all in favour.

**2. Approval several SAS Panel nominations**, most of which will follow by email for electronic approval; however, Rolf Pedersen (Norway) as “small countries” SPC member, and Rudiger Stein as Chair of the SSEPs from October 1st 2005 onwards, need endorsement from the Council today.

**ECORD Council motion 05-01-10. ECORD Council approves nominations of**

**R.Pedersen (Norway) as SPC member and R.Stein as Chair of SSEPs from October 1 2005.**

C.Franklin moved, J.Ludden seconded, all in favour.

**3. ESSAC DATABASE:** an inventory of ECORD scientists was already proposed during ESSAC#1 meeting, fall 2003

#### **4. SWOT analysis for ESSAC**

<b>Strengths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•ESSAC is working</li> <li>•Active science communication</li> <li>•High number of applications</li> <li>•Magellan workshop series</li> <li>•EuroCore-drilling science</li> <li>•ESSAC/EMA/ESO procedures written and operational (Global for the ECORD-Net)</li> </ul>	<b>Weaknesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Science community does not understand the role of ESSAC</li> <li>•Minimum support for too much work</li> <li>•Do not have money for incentives</li> <li>•Do not have a good European communication system</li> <li>•Information flow – SAS and other panels</li> </ul>
<b>Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•ESSAC can lead scientific thinking for Europe in IODP</li> <li>•Building funding opportunities</li> </ul>	<b>Threats</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Mobility of ESSAC – Chair and staff + scientists</li> </ul>

SWOT brought up problem of communication. Some countries do not have national IODP offices that would distribute information and help to reach out other communities, such as engineers, etc. Pressure on expeditions is low, etc. ESSAC should communicate directly to national communities and ask for the data base from countries – only 4 or 5 countries replied. ESSAC delegates decided to provide those data bases. Alternative ways to communicate with scientists is to create list servers, etc. If this does not work, ESSAC chair will need a stronger push from the Council.

#### **Discussion**

M.Weydert pointed out that a number of era-nets are creating similar data bases, for example, in BONUS they look at best practices, etc. to create a data base for marine scientists. Some data bases have been also funded by bilateral cooperation programmes also. You can learn from others, and try to get outside community. Linking and cooperating is necessary.

S.Dürr urged that a joint ECORD Council – ESSAC meeting be organised. The next ESSAC meeting is planned to be in Cardif on 24-25 November, however, the dates may change depending on planning of Tahiti expedition.

M.Weydert noted that a complimentary proposal can be prepared for ERA-net – up to 3 mln. But if proposing new participants – a new workpackage will be needed. This does not have influence on opportunities with era-net plus module.

#### **5. ESSAC Magellan WorkShops 2005 (endorsed by ESSAC):**

Palaeoceanography & Palaeoclimate Change (2-3 June 2005; organizers Paul Wilson (Southampton Oceanography Centre, UK alternate to ESSAC), Ian Hall (Cardiff), Mike Bickle (Cambridge) and Juergen Thurow (UCL);

Deep Biosphere Workshop (6-8 October 2005; organizers Judith McKenzie (Swiss Delegate to ESSAC), Sabine Kasten (AWI-Bremenhaven) and Crisogono Vasconcelos (ETH-Zurich)

The two workshops are organised to help initiate new proposals, etc., in the lines of the ESF workshop series. The Workshop in London (partly paid by the UK) will be part of the UK contribution into the Magellan workshop series.

**6. EuroMARC** (EuroCORES for European Collaboration for Implementation of Marine Research on Cores) – discussed (Tuesday)

7. ESF Magellan Workshop Series – discussed before

**8. IODP media policy:** ESSAC politely questions the new policy from IODP MI (Nancy Light) as being too bold and restrictive and will send a message. The policy is impossible to implement in reality, especially after the cruise.

### **Discussion**

D.Falvey said that centralistic approach is sometimes needed, as some scientists when interviewed fail to mention the name of the programme, etc., although they have been using public funds, etc. Negotiations are needed. Encourage greater policy engagement in pre-cruise build-up, to convince scientists to recognize the programme which is behind them and allowed them to do the science. In any case, a policy as it is written should not be coming as a policy, but through negotiations.

O.Eldholm said that the media question should be raised in Nagasaki.

**9. ECORD Shipboard staffing:** guidelines, balance (see below)

Swap berths question – could swap with the Japanese, which was not possible. Deadlines sometimes were changed without notifying ESSAC.

### **-DRAFT-**

### **SET OF GUIDELINES FOR STAFFING SCIENCE PARTY IN IODP (ESSAC initiative)**

This is a draft of a set of general IODP guidelines for science party quotas, following the need of National Offices to exercise some flexibility with respect to staffing.

- 1) Contemporaneous application deadlines and nomination submissions should be established and followed in Europe, USA, China and Japan, unless otherwise negotiated between the national offices.
- 2) Co-chiefs should not be counted in the science party quota (science party +2 co-chiefs).
- 3) Members are required to fill their allotment for each expedition and can not bank unused births for future expeditions. However, some flexibility can be arranged through negotiations between the national offices (guideline #4)
- 4) National Offices (ESSAC, USSAC, J-DESC, Chinese Office) are responsible for short-term (12 months) negotiations of unused births according to national/consortia preferences for different expeditions.
- 5) IODP-MI Sapporo Office will supervise National Offices negotiations and the long term balance of the consortia sailing quota.

These guidelines reflect ESSACs role in nomination procedures

Memorandum states some flexibility, and this is a possible way of how to implement. Points 3 and 4 are needed because in some cases the expeditions are understaffed. A balance table is being kept by ESSAC to show under- or over-staffing by various members.

#### Sail Applications and Balance version 1 April 2005)

Member New expedition codes Notes below	Contribution	2-yrs berths	#545	#533	#572-I	#512-I	#512-II	#543-II	#519	#573	Slots #	Real Slots %	Total if full staffing (40 for 5 projects) Slots %
		(1)	301	302 (2)	303	304	305##	306	310	307			
France	23.6%	26.4	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	14.0	22.95%	35.0%
Germany	25.7%	28.8	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	3***	14.0	22.95%	35.0%
UK	23.6%	26.4	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	15.0	24.59%	37.5%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>72.9%</b>	<b>81.6</b>									<b>43.0</b>	<b>70.49%</b>	<b>252.9%</b>
Austria	0.6%	0.7									0.0	0.00%	0.0%
Canada**	1.3%	1.5			1.0						1.0	1.64%	2.5%
Denmark	4.2%	4.7			1.0					1.0	2.0	3.28%	5.0%
Finland	0.6%	0.7									0.0	0.00%	0.0%
Iceland	0.3%	0.3									0.0	0.00%	0.0%
Italy	1.8%	2.0		1.0							1.0	1.64%	2.5%
The Netherlands	1.9%	2.1		1.0					1.0		2.0	3.28%	5.0%
Norway	4.7%	5.3	1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0			4.0	6.56%	10.0%
Portugal	0.8%	0.9						1.0			1.0	1.64%	2.5%
Spain*	2.4%	2.7						1.0		1.0	2.0	3.28%	5.0%
Sweden	5.5%	6.2	1.0	1.0							2.0	3.28%	5.0%
Switzerland	2.4%	2.7			1.0		1.0		1.0		3.0	4.92%	7.5%
Belgium#	0.2%	0.2									0.0	0.00%	0.0%
Ireland#	0.7%	0.8									0.0	0.00%	0.0%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>30.7</b>									<b>18.0</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>105.9%</b>

" ECORD Contributions 2003-2007 average (3 years)

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

\*\* Canada funding is still pending

#MOU not signed yet

#### 10. Nomination scientific party for Cascadia Margin Hydrates, expedition #311 (enclosure).

surname	name	country	expertise
Aksay	Irem	Canada	geotechnical engineer
BLANC-VALLERON*	Marie- Madeleine	France	sedimentologist
Camps*	Ameena P.	UK	geophysicist/oceanographer
Chen	Marc-Andre P.	Canada	geophysicist
Ellis	Michelle Helen	UK	geophysicist/physical properties specialist/sedimentologist
Enkin*	Randolph J.	Canada	paleomagnetist/physical properties specialist
Hellevang*	Helge	Norway	inorganic geochemist
Heuer*	Verena	Germany	organic geochemist/inorganic geochemist
Jackson*	Peter D.	UK	geophysicist/logging scientist/physical properties specialist
Lowe	Carmel P.	Canada	geophysicist/physical properties specialist
Pretzschner	Carsten	Germany	geophysicist/logging scientist
Roberts	John A.	UK	physical properties specialist
Schulteiss	Peter J.	UK	logging scientist/physical properties specialist/stratigraphic correlator
Teichert*	Barbara M.A.	Germany	sedimentologist
Wortmann*	Uli	Canada	inorganic geochemist
Zykov*	Mikahil M.	Canada	geophysicist

Nominated scientists and in \* showing preferences; 8 ESSAC scientists to be invited

## 11. IODP Management Forum and Retreat

(Rome, 24-26 May 2005))

Topics (incomplete list)

1. Discussion of the functionality and efficiency of the current structure of IODP.
2. Improvement of the transnational and transmember collaboration, communication and exchange.
3. Long term funding
4. National interest and program interest—is there a conflict?
5. Assessment of success
6. Concerns on the horizon—projects for Chikyu and (too few) microbiology projects.
7. Outreach

An ESSAC WG is discussing topics and may tune those with the ECORD Council. Ideas welcome from Council. Position papers welcome at least until May 2, and could be later. Ideas or papers should be channeled to ESSAC, and there also will be a possibility to discuss with Manik TALWANI in Vienna at the Townhall meeting.

**12. Date and Place of the Next Meeting:** Cardiff 24-25 November 2005 (pending Tahiti scheduling)

Scheduling

Expedition	Dates	Platform	Staffing	Applications
303 North Atlantic Climate 1	25 Sep - 17 Nov 04	Riserless		
304 Oceanic Core Complex 1	17 Nov 04 - 8 Jan 05	Riserless		
305 Oceanic Core Complex 2	8 Jan - 2 Mar 05	Riserless		
306 North Atlantic Climate 2	2 Mar - 26 Apr 05	Riserless		
307 Porcupine Basin Mounds	26 Apr - 31 May 05	Riserless	closed	
308 Gulf of Mexico Overpressures	31 May - 6 Jul 05	Riserless	pending	
310 Tahiti Sea Level	TBD	MSP	closed	
311 Cascadian Margin Hydrates	24 Aug 7 Oct 05	Riserless	pending	
309 Superfast Spreading Crust 1	6 Jul - 24 Aug 05	Riserless		30-avr-01
312 Monterey Bay Observatory	7 Oct - 24 Nov 05	Riserless		21-avr-01
313 Superfast Spreading Crust 2	24 Nov 05 - 8 Jan 06	Riserless		30-avr-01

Scheduling beyond previous Table (SPC Lisbon March 2005):

The SPC forwards the 3/9 ranked proposals, 603C-Full NanTroSEIZE Plate Interface, 595-Full3 Indus Fan and Murray Ridge, and 626-Full2 Pacific Equatorial Age Transect, for the Operations Task Force to consider in developing drilling schedule scenarios for FY2007 and beyond.

Operations Task Force (former OPCOM) to consider for FY2006 and beyond: 477-Full3 Okhotsk/Bering Plio-Pleistocene, 482-Full3 Wilkes Land Margin, 519-Full2 South Pacific Sea Level, 545-Full3 Juan de Fuca Flank Hydrogeology, 553-Full2 Cascadia Margin Hydrates, 564-Full New Jersey Shallow Shelf, 589-Full3 Gulf of Mexico Overpressures, 600-Full Canterbury Basin, 603A-Full2 NanTroSEIZE Phase 1, 603B-Full2 NanTroSEIZE Phase 2, and 621-Full Monterey Bay Observatory.

## Discussion

O.Eldholm requested that the three European IMI governors receive ESSAC minutes and other relevant documents. J.Kenter said that ESSAC have no objections, and that the minutes are open and posted on the ECORD website.

The participants discussed possible improvements of the proposal reviewing system. The SPC panel is concerned with the number of proposals in the pool. The pool is too small and it takes too long to go through the system. To forward to OpCom any proposal that is in the SPC? J.Kenter pointed out that there is an idea of how large the pool should be, there is a feeling that Opcom

prefers having a larger pool than the SPC. In contrast to the situation with JR, with respect to MSPs, there should be more proposals in the pool than now. D.Falvey remarked that not all proposals should be or could be fast tracked.

What is needed to be discussed also is how (if) we can combine bottom-up and top-down approaches. ECORD Council reacted to this problem by being proactive by creating workshop series Magellan. This will create more proposals, but does not decide the problem if the proposals are not ranked highly. At least Europe should take lead in microbiology. Another question, Sumatra, what is happening and what can be done.

ACTION all Council members – send to ESSAC ideas and position papers concerning the functionality and efficiency of the current structure of IODP to be discussed at IODP Management Forum Retreat in Rome 24-26 May 2005. (Deadline for position papers 2 May)

#### **ECORD Council Recommendation:**

ECORD Council recommend that ESSAC organize a workshop on geo hazards as soon as possible.

## **14. EC reporting procedures (M.Weydert)**

The legal framework for the EC contract is the EC Treaty. In the Framework programme there are certain rules which are translated into the contract. Financial regulations also exist.

The contract for an ERA-NET

- is a contractual link of all participants with the Commission
- defines the following points
  - scope of the ERA-NET
  - consortium
  - beginning and end of project and of contract
  - work to be executed
  - financial rules, EU contribution and payments
  - reporting
  - IPR

The contract is composed of:

- The core-contract: Standard text completed with project data (+ special clauses)
- Annex I: The “Description of Work”
- Annex II: General conditions (standard text)
- Annex IV : Form A (accession to the contract)
- Annex V : Form B ( accession of new legal entities to the contract)
- Annex VI : Form C (financial statement per activity\*)

\*to be filled periodically by each contractor

Consortium agreement – takes some time to create and signed, but there are models available, and it is advisable to have it signed as soon as a project started.

#### **Reports, deliverables and questionnaires**

Deliverables

- Deliverables are concrete output and evidence of the work
- good deliverables are hence “finished” products (e.g. a common call or a common programme, not just a workshop report)

- milestones are key points in the process (e.g. workshop to define a joint call, publication of a joint call)
- their timing can coincide with that of a deliverable
- there can be more milestones than deliverables
- Dates

Should be something to be handed over. If they are on paper, they should be sent to the Commission by registered mail.

Mind the cover page for deliverables, otherwise they may be lost.

### **Questionnaires**

Two sets of questionnaires have to be filled on line when available.

### **Reporting**

In ERA-NETs the following reports are required\*:

- Short (2-3 pages) interim progress reports every 6 months
- Reports on distribution of Community contribution (with periodic reports)
- Month 18: "review" of the description of work
- Months 18, 36 and end: progress report and financial report
- Months 18 and end: audit certificates
- end: publishable final report, dissemination report, gender action plan, various financial reports

\* some other reports can be added (e.g. on ethics)

### **Audit certificates**

Audit certificates are needed to assure that the accounting is properly set in each organisation.

### **Subcontracting**

Subcontracting should not be employed for core tasks – not for management. It has a repercussion on overheads, but small subcontracts can be done.

**Interim reports** are to be submitted by e-mail. **Periodic** reports by registered mail plus a copy by e-mail.

**Management report** is a financial report

Payment must be justified and accompanied by text explanation. Justification of major cost items and resources is needed. Major cost items are normally travel and personnel. Impact of major deviations from budgeted finances and personnel should be indicated.

Annex II and financial guidelines can be downloaded from <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm>

### **Discussion**

What does the Commission want to achieve with all these reports?

S.Dürr on behalf of other participants asked M.Weydert to convey to the EC a message to decrease bureaucracy.

## **15. ERAnet activities**

Report from the Zürich meeting was distributed among the participants. SWOT analysis and interim 6-month management reports can be sent to non-ECORD-net partners on request.

### **Tahiti outreach**

D.Evans briefed the participants on the Tahiti outreach activities, apologising for Andy Kingdon who was not able to attend the meeting.

- Brochures for Tahiti being printed in English in time for EGU



- Translations into German, French and Japanese are in hand
- Discussions in hand regarding filming with French and German organisations
- A number of local event will be organised on the island
- There will be no Tahiti press conference or launch at EGU
- Uncertainties over timing make this inadvisable
- Andy Kingdon and Albert Gerdes will nevertheless have discussions with journalists
- Town meeting
- Possible Paris venue in due course
- There is no 'Tahiti press release'
- Draft will be circulated in advance of release
- ESSAC, ESO, EMA, National Press Officers
- Please provided name of press officer to AK if you want to be advised in advance of press releases (only NI have done; not UK,F, D) Co-chiefs will be involved.

## **16. AOB**

Next Council meeting to be organised jointly with ESSAC. Venue: Edinburgh, UK. Dates: 12-14 October or 24-25 November.

Meeting closed with thanks for the hosts in VR.