

**10th ECORD Council Meeting
Extraordinary meeting
Brussels, 27 February 2007**

Participants

Council members/alternates:

Belgium	Jean Pierre Henriët (member)	jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be
Denmark	Ulla Hansen (member)	uhh@fist.dk
Finland	Eija Kanto (member)	eija.kanto@aka.fi
France	Elizabeth Kohler (alternate)	Elizabeth.Kohler@cnrs-dir.fr
Germany	Sören B. Dürr (Chair)	soeren.duerr@dfg.de
Ireland	Xavier Monteys (alternate)	Xavier.Monteys@gsi.ie
Italy	Nigel Wardell	nwardell@ogs.trieste.it
Netherlands	Raymond M.L. Schorno (vice-Chair)	Schorno@nwo.nl
Norway	Annile M. Myhre (alternate)	annile.myhre@geo.uio.no
Spain	Severino Falcon Morales (alternate)	severino.falcon@mec.es
Sweden	Jonas Björck (alternate)	jonas.bjorck@vr.se
Switzerland	Marcel Kullin (member)	mkullin@snf.ch
UK	Chris J. Franklin (vice-chair)	cfr@nerc.ac.uk

Observers:

EMA	Catherine Mével	mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr
	Patricia Maruéjol	maruejol@crpg.cnrs-nancy.fr
ESO	Dan Evans	devans@bgs.ac.uk
ECORD net	Amelie Winkler	amelie.winkler@dfg.de
	Stefan Winkler-Nees	stefan.winkler.nees@dfg.de
EC	Alan Edwards	Alan.Edwards@cec.eu.int
BGS	John Ludden	jludden@bgs.ac.uk
NWO	Saskia Matheussen	matheussen@nwo.nl
ESF	Bernard Avril	bavril@esf.org

Excused: Kathy Gillis (Canada delegate), Chris McLeod (ESSAC-chair), and Rosa Bernal-Carrera (EMA).

**10th ECORD Council Meeting
Extraordinary meeting
Brussels, 27 February 2007**

Agenda Item 0. Welcome and logistical information

S. Dürr opened the meeting and reminded participants of the major reasons for this extraordinary meeting (financial situation, ECORD evaluation report, strategy for obtaining funding and a response to the Marine green paper).

The Agenda was adopted with minor modifications in the order of the items.

Agenda Item 1. Approval of the Bonn meeting minutes

S. Dürr, who did not attend the second day of the Bonn meeting, questioned the phrasing of motion 06-02-6, which to him did not correctly reflect the discussions of the first day. It was too late to change the text, which had been approved. However, the correct sense of the discussion will be communicated to the summer school organizers, namely that they need to amalgamate the science programs, not the schools. Minor corrections of grammar were added to the text. Minutes need to be reviewed by a native English speaker before approval.

ECORD Council motion 07-01-01. ECORD Council approves the Bonn minutes with modifications proposed.

Chris Franklin moved, Sören Dürr seconded, All in favour

The council reviewed the list of Actions from the 9th ECORD Council meeting:

- Actions ESSAC

The ECORD summer school and Distinguished Lecture series are being organized. ESSAC still has to issue a call for the 2008 summer school.

- Actions EMA

All the EMA actions had been completed.

A draft E&O policy was prepared by the Lead Agencies. It was circulated by EMA to council members. It states that education should be funded at the national level while outreach activities need to be integrated and funded at the IODP-MI level. This draft was approved by the council.

EMA contacted Italy and Canada, as required by the council, to encourage them to increase their contribution to truly reflect the level of participation of their scientific community. Italy held a meeting in December, but had not yet responded. The situation is complex in Italy because four institutions are members of ECORD individually. There is a project to form a consortium and ask the Ministry to contribute additional money. But at this point, it is not yet settled. EMA attended a Workshop in Montreal organized by the Canadian Consortium for Ocean Drilling to mobilize their science community.

EMA contacted the Marine Board to be involved in the consultation process for the EC Green Paper on Marine Policy. The Marine Board has already prepared a document, but it is not yet available for dissemination. A shorter text is being prepared.

- Actions Chair

Obtaining appointments with key individuals at the EC has proved difficult.

S. Dürr tried to obtain an appointment with Robert-Jan Smits at the EC to discuss ERA net + opportunities, but was not successful. S. Dürr and C. Mével met with P. Mathy and A. Edwards at the EC. As a consequence of this meeting, S. Dürr tried to obtain an appointment with Herve Pero to discuss opportunities in the Infrastructure programme, with no success. It was not possible either to obtain an appointment with the MEP indicated by C. MacLeod.

He also sought help from F. Barriga to arrange a meeting with Manuela Soares, the new Director of Environment, but got no response.

Agenda Item 2. ECORD Science Operator report

D. Evans presented the new ESO logo, which is more consistent with the ECORD logo.



- Great Barrier Reef expedition:

The Great Barrier Reef is the next MSP expedition likely to be implemented by ESO. ESO organized a visit to Australia to meet with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park authorities as a first step. D. Evans, A. Skinner, together with J. Foster (JCU) and D. Falvey (ARC) were involved. The meeting went well, and ESO was encouraged to submit an application to drill. It will be important, however, to develop an outreach strategy towards the fishermen and the N Queensland conservation areas. The fact that the Chikyu is presently drilling for industry may lead to inaccurate perception of IODP.

The provisional schedule for the GBR expedition is the September-November weather window of 2008. However, there are potentials for possible delays: site survey approval, safety approval, finance, contracting and vessel availability, permitting and possible delays to the planned ESO work off New Jersey. If it is delayed, it will be for 1 year, because of the restricted weather window.

- New Jersey Shallow Shelf expedition:

In January, ESO was informed that the chosen platform had been involved in an accident. By early February, the platform was still at the seabed and it became obvious that it will not be available this summer. However, in early February, a larger platform was offered to ESO. It would be available mid-May; however it would be more expensive. ESO asked for advice and the response from the ECORD chair and EMA was to go ahead and start negotiations, since the required additional budget (+ 750KUSD) is available (assuming ICDP provide 500K USD). Discussions continue with DOSECC with the aim of finalizing the contract. (A. Skinner and D. Nilsson will meet in Iceland on 6-9 March). However, ESO encountered some difficulties in trying to arrange the required geotechnical survey. Because the sites are in US water, ESO is required to use a US vessel with a US crew. Plans are now in hand with an US company, but are still subject to contract.

To be able to finalize the contract for the platform, Dan Evans requested the council to approve an additional contingency budget of 750 KUSD.

ACTION CHAIR : To send a letter to NSF complaining about the US policy of requiring a US vessels operated by a US crew in US national waters. Dan Evans agreed to prepare a template for this letter.

- Operations Task Force meeting attended by A. Skinner, Washington DC, February: 22nd. At this meeting it was stated that both the US and Japan have funding problems, which will likely impact on the amount of drilling that the SODV and the Chikyu will be able to achieve in the coming years. The SODV will start operating on January 1st, 2007 and may not be able to drill all year round. Chikyu will operate for IODP only 6 months per year.

- FY08 budget

Due to funding problems, ESO has been requested by IODP-MI to cut its SOC's budget for

To overcome this budget problem, the Lead Agencies have asked ESO to postpone the GBR expedition to FY09. C. Mével informed Council that she had been contacted by the new IODP Director at NSF, Rodey Batiza. He indicated that NSF funding for FY08 is lower than expected. As a consequence, he requested ECORD to consider delaying the GBR expedition to FY09.

The news that the SODV may not be able to operate 12 months a year due to funding problems is really concerning. It comes at a very bad time, when ECORD member countries are trying to increase their financial contribution. If the overall budget is cut, it is important to look not only at operations, but also at management costs. The budgets of TAMU and IODP-MI are very high. However, even if their budgets are available in the IODP Program Plan, they are difficult to assess.

The Program will not be able to provide what was initially planned, two ships operating full time. Therefore, it is important to reconsider the financial participation of ECORD, in particular the POC/SOC ratio. However, ECORD is not yet in a strong position, since the increase in funding is not yet secured. However, the council felt it important to meet with the Lead Agencies to discuss this issue as soon as possible, and before the IODP council meeting in June.

C. Mével presented the ECORD budget situation, as approved at the last council meeting.

EMA has finalized an MOU with ICDP. It states that ICDP will participate to the NJ shallow

shelf expedition at a level of 500 k\$. However, all payments by ICDP to projects are dependent on the timely membership contributions of ICDP member countries. Therefore, all funding obligations made by ICDP are subject to availability of funds.

Presently, the ECORD budget has a positive balance of 834 376 \$, which allows funding of the increase of 750 000 \$ requested by ESO. The council considered it important to implement NJ in FY07. Therefore, the following motion was passed:

ECORD Council motion 07-01-2 ECORD council approves the request from ESO for a contingency budget of 750KUSD for FY07 to cover potential additional costs for the New Jersey Shallow Shelf expedition.

Jonas Bjorck moved, Marcel Kullin seconded, one abstention (C. Franklin). All in favour.

C. Mével report on the Canada IODP workshop 23-24/2

This workshop aimed at mobilizing the Canadian scientific community to continue participating in ECORD, and to increase its level of contribution. 50 participants attended. There is a strong and active community, particularly in gas hydrates and paleoclimatology. There is also a potential to link IODP with the Neptune program which is a high priority in Canada. The only possibility for funding is to submit a proposal to NSERC. The aim is to request 500 k\$ per year. The proposal will be led by Anne de Vernal, from UQAM. The IODP Canada office will move to Montreal, with A. de Vernal (UQAM) and M. Riedel (McGill).

C. Mével also met with a NSERC representative, Norman Marcotte. He was quite positive but also indicated that the program is very competitive. Only 1/3 of the proposals are funded.

The council recommended inviting a representative from NSERC to the next meeting.

C. Mével reported on a phone call she had with R. Batiza, the new IODP Director (replacing B. Malfait) at NSF. He stated that the NSF budget cuts affect IODP. As a consequence, the SODV will not start before January 08, and will likely not be able to operate 12 months a year. The NSF attitude is to make every effort to cut administrative costs, to favour drilling operations. Because of budget reduction, R. Batiza officially requested ECORD to consider delaying the GBR expedition to FY09.

The council considered that all efforts should be made to implement the GBR expedition at the end of 2008, as planned.

Therefore, the Council recommended that ESO submit a budget to IODP-MI requesting the level of funding in SOC's necessary to implement the GBR in September-November 2008, and not apply a 30% budget cut.

If funding issues arise, discussions should involve not only ESO and IODP-MI, but also EMA and the Lead Agencies. However, C. Mével reminded the council that the POCs are not secured either.

As stated in agenda item 2, C. Mével will request a meeting with the Lead Agencies to discuss funding issues.

ACTION EMA: To organize a meeting with the Lead Agencies in the Spring, to discuss the consequences of budget cuts and reduced vessel activities in Japan and in the US. The ECORD delegation will consist of C. Mével (EMA), R. Schorno and S. Dürr (Council chairs) and O. Eldholm (ECORD Governor)

The ECORD review report is now printed. Copies are being sent to ECORD Council members. It will also be distributed to NSF and MEXT, to IODP MI (M. Talwani, T. Janacek and HC. Larsen) and to the Review panel members.

The council recommended sending 5 copies to each EC contact (with a cover letter), to Bremen, EPC, and to each of the ECORD governors.

Outreach activities

The IODP booth at EGU 2007 (16-20 April) is being organized by ECORD.

A joint ICDP-IODP Townhall meeting will be held on Tuesday April 17, 19-20:00, Room 13 (F1). A flyer is in preparation.

Agenda Item 4. Update on the ECORD Summer schools and ECORD Distinguished Lecture Series

The two 2007 summer schools are advertised on-line but EMA has no feedback on the applications. They are:

Past Global Change Reconstruction and Modelling Techniques
Urbino Summer School in Paleoclimatology
July 18-August 3, Urbino, Italy

ECORD Summer School on Paleoceanography
August 13-24, 2007, Bremen, Germany

Three lecturers have been selected for the distinguished lecture series:

Benoît Ildefonse (CNRS Montpellier, France)

Paul Wilson (NOC, UK)

Judy McKenzie (ETH, Switzerland)

Universities/institutes have now to apply. However, the call is not yet advertised on the ESSAC website. Council recommended encouraging non-ECORD European countries to apply.

J.Ludden raised a question regarding the Magellan workshop series. There is an advert in EOS concerning a future workshop, funded through the Magellan scheme. There is no mention of ECORD in the advert, although the Magellan programme was initiated by the ECORD Council to facilitate the development of IODP proposals. Bernard Avril explained that ESF was not responsible for the advert. It was the initiative of the organizers. The council considers it important that the organizers of Magellan funded workshops receive instructions from ESF.

ACTION CHAIR: To write a letter to John Marks (ESF) concerning the organization of Magellan workshops. The Magellan steering committee should be instructed by ESF to make recommendations to the workshop organizers, to make sure that ECORD is properly acknowledged in all related documents (announcements, reports...)

Agenda Item 5. ECORD Evaluation report: Implementation of the recommendations

General discussion of the report noted that there was no evaluation of EMA. It would be useful to have the Committee's opinion on this matter.

ACTION CHAIR: To contact P. Styles (Chair of the ECORD Review Committee) about the evaluation of EMA's performance.

A major recommendation concerned the ESSAC office. The recommendation is not to move the ESSAC office every two years, to avoid associated down-time, loss of corporate memory and disruption to participants. Some council members suggest that a possible intermediate solution would be for ESSAC to work more with EMA, thereby maintaining the memory of the program.

The report also suggested an absence of links between ESSAC and ESO.

The council considered it important to have ESSAC's opinion on the report recommendations. C. Franklin noted that any major change in the ESSAC functioning would require a change in the ECORD MOU.

ACTION CHAIR: To mandate ESSAC to discuss the recommendations of the ECORD review committee concerning ESSAC, and respond at the next Council meeting in June.

The functioning of EPC was also questioned: it is located at three different sites, which have specialized expertise. This may generate administrative problems and repetition of effort.

ACTION CHAIR: To request a response from EPC on the report

The council decided to review the conclusions of the report (p.38).

I – Council concluded that closer co-operation was already being sought with the EC

II and III – these conclusions were welcomed by the council

IV – ECORD is already engaged with ICDP. ESO uses the ICDP database. ECORD organizes joint townhall meetings with ICDP at EGU. Moreover, there are formal links between IODP and ICDP, though the Scientific Drilling magazine and joint workshops. There is also a move to share core repositories and to set up a joint evaluation system for IODP and ICDP proposals.

A way to be more proactive in improving relationships with ICDP could be for all ECORD member countries which are not yet members of ICDP to join collectively.

ACTION EMA: To approach ICDP to discuss the possibility for the ECORD member countries who are not members of ICDP to join as a single consortium.

V - Council regarded this as a fair statement that can be interpreted both ways: ECORD feels an obligation to continue supporting IODP.

VI - Council felt that this statement was not really justified in the report, in particular in the absence of an evaluation of EMA. It was not stated whether some tasks undertaken by ECORD are not needed. There might also be some confusion between the ECORD structure and the IODP structure. However, the report reflects the perception of the panel and this recommendation has to be considered seriously because it has the potential to present ECORD as bureaucratic. When ECORD was formed, it was considered important to distribute responsibilities among the ECORD members as much as possible. It was a political decision. The question is how much money and time do we lose by distributing ECORD facilities among Europe, and is it worth it? The Council may consider requesting an outside consultant for advice. It is also important to ask Peter Styles for more details about this statement.

VII - Presently, although the ECORD funds are pooled, there is perceived to be no common pot and ESSAC functions with the “juste retour” principle. Moreover, post cruise studies are mostly supported at the national level, although the EUROMARC programme is a step towards better coordination. However, not all the ECORD members are involved in EUROMARC. In some ECORD member countries, finding support for post cruise science is extremely difficult. Sending an ECORD scientist to sail if he/she has not enough support for post cruise science potentially limits the scientific return. Financial support from the EC would definitively help towards a common pot. The council and ESSAC need to work together to prepare a response.

VIII - Council concluded that this recommendation should be discussed by ESSAC.

IX - This remark was well taken. The ECORD MOU does not include a strategy/policy statement. At this stage, there is no “European strategy” as such. It is one aim of the Deep

Sea Frontier initiative. ECORD needs to have a long term policy to appear more ambitious and seek for EC funding, like the European Space Agency.

Bernard Avril pointed out that the report mentions ESSAC-ESF relationships. An ECORD-ESF MOU has been signed, and it should be mentioned.

Council felt that it was important to prepare a written response to the report.

ACTION CHAIR: To organize a written response to the ECORD review report. The response committee will consist of S. Dürr, R. Schorno, C. Franklin, C. Mével, D. Evans, and C. MacLeod. The response committee will attend the ESSAC meeting in Iceland, May 11-12.

Agenda Item 6. Report on the Deep Sea Frontier meeting, 26/1/2007, Brussels

S. Dürr reported that the Deep Sea Frontier foresight paper is being finalised and will be published by the European Commission. This report will be an ECORDnet deliverable. R. Schorno suggested circulating a final draft to Council before publication. As a result of the lobbying, this theme is included in the FP7 first call. The call is for a coordination action, with a maximum level of funding of 1.2 M€ over three years. The DSF steering committee endorsed Phil Weaver's (NOC) offer to lead the proposal. C. Mével will be representing ECORD in the proposal.

Agenda Item 5. Strategies for funding within FP7

S. Dürr and C. Mével met with P. Mathy and A. Edwards at the EC, Feb 9th, to discuss funding strategies for ECORD.

The DSF initiative will have the opportunity for significant funding only in the second half of FP7. Meanwhile, it is important that the three pillars that compose it, HERMES, ocean floor observatories, and ECORD, remain active.

Funding possibilities were discussed to support ECORD during this first period. It is possible to resubmit an ERAnet proposal, or to ask for an ERAnet + to support ECORD. The ERAnet + scheme requires the generation of a common call, to which the commission adds up to 30%. Then, during the second phase, a larger ERAnet + proposal could be submitted to support the Deep Sea Frontier, with the view that an ERAnet + would open the way to an Article 169 in FP8. In the view of the commission, the ERAnet + is the stepping stone towards an Article 169.

If we want to submit an ERAnet + proposal for ECORD, we need to demonstrate that we will be able to generate a common call. Ideally, the call should be based on a common pot, but the Commission has realized that generating a common pot raises legal issues, and therefore it is not a requirement, but should be an aim. S. Dürr suggested that the ECORD member countries pool some money together to support post cruise science. There is already a small common pot to support the summer schools. J. Ludden insisted that we are already issuing a common call: ECORD pools funds to participate in IODP, and tasks ESSAC to select ECORD scientists to sail through a call for applications and review of the applications. C. Mével supported this idea, and suggested that she answer an EC questionnaire about ERAnets by presenting this mechanism. A discussion with the EC is necessary to make sure that this scheme is accepted as a common call. C. Mével also explained that another possibility would be to offer opportunities to all European scientists to be involved in ECORD/IODP if the EC contributed to the ECORD budget. This argument was well received by P. Mathy and A. Edwards.

Council asked how much money the EC is likely to contribute. According to A. Edwards, the budget for BONUS will be in the order of 10 M\$ total, and for Metrology even higher. It is important that ECORD follows what happens with these two ERAnet +.

Another possibility is to apply to the I3 program (Integrated Infrastructure Initiative). There will be a call in 2008.

It is necessary to move fast: the work program for 2008 will be issued in October 2007 and therefore will be finalized before the summer. To support an ERAnet +, there is a need for political support. It is essential that ECORD member countries seek support from their representatives at the Programme Committee. ECORD should also meet with Robert-Jan Smits, responsible for the ERAnet scheme.

ACTION CHAIR: To organize a meeting with Robert-Jan Smits to discuss ERAnet and ERAnet Plus opportunities in FP7. Alan Edwards will help obtain the appointment. The delegation will consist of S. Dürr/R. Schorno, J. Ludden, C. Franklin and B. Goffé.

ACTION EMA: To distribute the membership list of the EC Programme Committee - provided by Pierre Mathy.

Agenda Item 6. ECORD response to the Green paper published by the EC "Towards a future maritime policy for the Union: a European vision for the oceans and seas"

The Marine Board has initiated a process to coordinate a response to the Green Paper. ECORD has been invited to be involved. A long document has already been prepared by the Marine Board, but is not yet ready for circulation. A short version will be circulated for comments.

Council felt it important to use this opportunity. However, the response should come through the DSF initiative. The major areas that concern ECORD in the document are the scientific objectives and the data networks.

ACTION WP8: To prepare a written response to the EC green paper as soon as possible. The response committee will consist of S. Winkler, S. Dürr, C. Franklin, U. Hoeberg-Hansen and R. Schorno. .

A. Edwards informed the council that there will be two public events for the consultation process:

- A main consultation event in Bremen, May 1-2-3. It will be a high profile event, with invited talks, and no real opportunity for interaction.
- Eurocean 2007, June 22nd, scheduled in association with the 18-21 June Oceans 2007 conference in Aberdeen.

A. Edwards insisted that it is important for ECORD to be present at the Aberdeen meeting.

Agenda Item 7. AOB

- *The next ECORD Council meeting* is scheduled 7-8 June in Den Haag, hosted by the ECORD Chair, R. Schorno

- *The IODP council meeting* will be held in Bremerhaven, June 26-27. ECORD will be officially represented by the chair (R. Schorno), the two vice chairs (S. Dürr and B. Goffé) and the EMA Director. But all the ECORD council members may attend. The invitation will be sent out soon by IODP-MI.

- *IODP-MI initiative to attract new members to IODP*

C. Mével reported that she was contacted by M. Talwani. He wanted to organize a meeting in Washington DC (tentative date: May 16) and invite potential new members, including representatives from European countries. The aim is not only to encourage them to join IODP, but also to offer prominent scientists from these countries opportunities to participate in some IODP expeditions. However, the format of this meeting is not yet settled, and there is

no budget to invite the participants. Moreover, he has no specific contacts in European countries and wants to go through the embassies to identify the persons to invite.

She will stay in contact with Manik and make sure that ECORD is well represented at this meeting if it happens.

At the European level, efforts to encourage countries to join under WP2 have not been successful because these countries do not have money to pay a contribution. However, they have good scientists. It may be necessary to change the message that ECORD conveys. We want to offer opportunities to these scientists, even if their country is not able to join ECORD.

Jonas Björck indicated that the Baltic Sea IODP proposal, which includes scientists from the Baltic countries, has been resubmitted and is being evaluated. There will be a small workshop associated with the Baltic symposium scheduled March 19-23. It might be a good opportunity to pass this message to the participants.

We should also try to organize a workshop for the countries of Eastern Europe, but we need to identify contacts. This can be done through ESSAC. Dan Evans suggested asking Alan Stevenson (ESO) for advice.

ACTION ESSAC: To identify contacts in Universities/Institutes in non-ECORD European countries, to offer opportunities for participation in IODP through ECORD.

- Ownership of IODP cores

The cores from the Tahiti sea level expedition will move to the Gulf Coast core repository soon, to follow the geographical core distribution policy. This had led Ursula Rohl to raise the question of the ownership of cores. All ODP cores belong to NSF. However, there is no IODP policy regarding the ownership of cores. At this stage, and until the end of the programme, there is no real issue: the cores are stored in IODP core repositories, supported by IODP commingled funds. However, it is not clear what will happen when the program ends and there is no money to support the repositories. The same problem applies to the data, although they can be easily duplicated, therefore it is less crucial.

It is premature to raise the question at IODP council, especially if we have no solution to offer. However, it will be necessary to solve the question before the end of the programme.

- BoG new member

J. Thiede will rotate off as an ECORD governor next June; C. Franklin proposed that J. Ludden is nominated by the council to replace him.

S. Dürr suggested that this discussion was deferred to the next Council meeting.

Note: replacement turned out to be of more urgency and nomination of J. Ludden was therefore approved by email consultation.

End of the meeting