

**11th ECORD COUNCIL MEETING
DEN HAGUE, NETHERLANDS**

7-8 June 2007

Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)
Laan van Nieuw Oost-Indië 300
2593 CE Den Haag

MINUTES

PARTICIPANTS

COUNTRY

Austria Reinhard Belocky, member
Denmark Ulla Høeberg Hansen, member
Finland Eija Kanto, member
Finland Sammuli Hemming, alternate
France Bruno Goffé, member, vice chair
Germany Stefan Winkler, alternate, acting vice-chair
Iceland Hans Kristján Gudmundsson, member
Italy Nigel Wardell, alternate
Netherlands Raymond M.L. Schorno, member, chair
Norway Are Carlson, member
Portugal Fernando Barriga, member
Spain Severino Falcon Morales, alternate
Sweden Dan Holtstam, member
Switzerland Marcel Kullin, member
UK Chris J. Franklin, member, Executive

EMAIL

belocky@fwf.ac.at
uhh@fist.dk
eija.kanto@aka.fi
samuli.hemming@aka.fi
bruno.goffe@ens.fr
stefan.winkler.nees@dfg.de
hans@rannis.is
nwardell@ogs.trieste.it
SCHORNO@NWO.NL
are.carlson@forskningsradet.no
f.barriga@fc.ul.pt
severino.falcon@mec.es
dan.holtstam@vr.se
mkullin@snf.ch
cfr@nerc.ac.uk

OBSERVERS

EMA Catherine Mével, observer
EMA Rosa Bernal-Carrera, observer
ESF Bernard Avril, observer
ICDP Uli Harms, observer
IMI BoG Daniel Prieur, observer
ESO Dan Evans, observer
ESO Carol Cotterill, observer ECORD-net
ESSAC Chris Macleod, observer, ESSAC Chair
NWO Saskia Matheussen, observer, ECORD Net

mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr
rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr
bavril@esf.org
ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de
daniel.prieur@univ-brest.fr
devans@bgs.ac.uk
cjcott@bgs.ac.uk
MacLeod@cardiff.ac.uk
matheussen@NWO.NL

APOLOGIES

members

Belgium Jean-Pierre Henriët member
Canada Kathy Gillis, member
Ireland Koen Verbruggen, member

EC Ivan Conesa Alcolea, observer, ECORD-net
ESSAC Gilbert Camoin observer, ESSAC Incoming Chair
SASEC Gerold Wefer, observer

jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be
gillis@uvic.ca
Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie
Ivan.Conesa-Alcolea@ec.europa.eu
gcamoin@cerege.fr
gwefer@marum.de

Thursday, June 7

Agenda Item 0. Welcome and logistical information

R. Schorno welcomed the participants and thanked C. Mevel for organising the ‘New Members Introductory Meeting’ which was held the night before. He presented the venue, logistics and the major objectives for the meeting: nominations (vice-chair, executive, ESSAC); budget situation; preparation for IODP Council; response to ECORD review report; relations with Aurora Borealis, DSF and ICDP; strategy towards EC funding.

The agenda was approved

Agenda Item 1. Approval of the Brussels meeting minutes

As an English native speaker C. Franklin, suggested minor modifications to the text to improve the grammar and style.

F. Barriga presents his apologies for not attending the meeting in Brussels because he did not receive the information in time.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-1 ECORD Council approves the Brussels minutes with the modifications proposed.

Raymond Schorno moved, Chris Franklin seconded, all in favour

Agenda Item 2 Brussels meeting actions (R. Schorno)

The Brussels meeting actions were reviewed.

- **ACTION EMA:** To organise a meeting with the Lead Agencies in the spring, to discuss the consequences of budget cuts and reduced vessel activities. **DONE, 15 May**
- **ACTION CHAIR:** To send a letter to NSF asking for advice on the attitude of the US who request the use of US vessels operated by a US crew in US national waters; Dan Evans to prepare a template. **DONE, discussion between Jamie Allen (NSF) and ESO are in progress.**
- **ACTION CHAIR:** To write a letter to John Marks (ESF) concerning the organisation of Magellan workshop series, to make sure that ECORD is properly acknowledged in all related documents (announcements, reports...). **DONE**
- **ACTION CHAIR:** - To mandate ESSAC to discuss the recommendations of the ECORD review committee on ESSAC, and respond at the next Council meeting in June. **DONE, on agenda**
- **ACTION CHAIR:** To contact P. Styles (Chair of the ECORD Review Committee) about the evaluation of EMA's performance. **DONE. No substantial additional information was received from P. Styles.**
- **ACTION CHAIR:** To organise a written response to the ECORD review report and attend the ESSAC meeting in Iceland, May 11-12. **DONE, draft for discussion**
- **ACTION EMA:** To approach ICDP to discuss the possibility for the ECORD member countries who are not members of ICDP joining as a single consortium. **DONE, on agenda**

- **ACTION CHAIR:** To organise a meeting with Robert Jan Smits to discuss ERA Net and ERA Net Plus opportunities in FP7. **DONE, on agenda**
- **ACTION EMA:** To distribute the membership list of the EC Programme Committee **DONE**
- **ACTION WP8:** To prepare a written response to the EC green paper. **On agenda**
- **ACTION ESSAC:** To identify contacts in Universities/Institutes in non-ECORD European countries, to offer opportunities to participate in IODP through ECORD. **ESSAC Report.**

Agenda Item 3- New council vice chair to be elected; composition of the executive (R. Schorno)

C. Mevel presented the list of previous ECORD chairs and vice-chairs and the current situation. Bruno Goffé is the incoming chair (Oct 1st), and the next vice chair needs to be elected.

Executive: R. Schorno, B. Goffé, S. Dürr, C. Mevel, C. Franklin and S. Persoglia are the current members. S. Persoglia has been unable to participate in the last three meetings and has asked to step down, therefore his replacement for the executive needs to be elected.

R. Schorno encouraged representatives of the “smaller” countries to take these responsibilities. The decision was deferred to give council members opportunity for further discussion about the nominations.

After the coffee break, the following motions were passed:

ECORD Council motion 07-02-2 ECORD Council elects Severino Falcón Morales as incoming vice-chair to replace Sören Dürr as of 1 October 2007.

Fernando Barriga moved, Marcel Kullin seconded, all in favour

The Council thanked S. Falcón Morales for taking on this responsibility. S. Falcón Morales proposed to host the next council meeting in Madrid. This proposition was accepted. Paris will be the location for the 13th meeting.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-3 ECORD Council elects Ulla Høeberg Hansen as member of the executive to replace Sergio Persoglia as of 1 April 2007.

Bruno Goffé moved, Nigel Wardell seconded, all in favour

The Council thanked U. Høeberg for taking on this responsibility.

Agenda Item 4- SASEC report (G. Wefer)

C. Mevel reported that G. Wefer was unable to attend the council meeting but had sent a power point presentation. The presentation was postponed.

Agenda Item 5- Board of Governors report (D. Prieur)

R. Schorno welcomed D. Prieur as the new ECORD Governor, replacing Dave Falvey who has rotated off. D. Prieur presented himself: he is a microbiologist interested in the deep biosphere. Bremerhaven will be his first meeting as a governor. He presented the agenda for the IODP-MI Board of Governors' Meeting and asked the council for advice.

Discussion

C. Mevel commented that there is not much substance in the agenda, although IODP is going through difficult times as the program is facing funding issues. C. Franklin stated that the main discussion will take place on item XII "Approval of the Annual Program Plan". He considered that this item introduces the discussion about the science in the program. However, R. Schorno stated that the agenda does not include a strategic discussion about the Program Plan for the upcoming years. C. Franklin reminded that although the Lead Agencies have the last decision regarding the Program Plan, ECORD has pushed constantly to be officially consulted. C. Mevel reported that this issue was again discussed at the meeting with the lead agencies last May. As a result, EMA received the draft for the FY08 Program Plan. This document was distributed to the executive. Surprisingly, as Governor, D. Prieur has not received it.

D. Evans reminded that IODP-MI distributes the SOC's but the POC's are controlled by the funding agencies. Consequently the funding agencies have the real power in the definition of the program plan. The BoG has a veto on the program plan. Therefore, it is important that the governors receive it some time in advance. It is also important that more European institutions join IODP-MI. Presently, 12 European institutions out of a total of 32 are members.

Another important issue for the BoG is to discuss the second phase of IODP. SASEC is going to update the science plan, in the light of the present budget situation, which will result in less drilling activities. The BoG may have a say on the science priorities.

For IODP-MI BoG agenda Item XIII: "Discussion of Two IODP-MI Offices", the Council advised D. Prieur to offer Europe as a possible location for the IODP-MI Office. The Council will give full support to locate the MI Office in Europe. Europe is the "middle place" between US and Japan. In addition, it can be stated that ECORD provides most of the SOC's in the programme. Therefore, it would be reasonable to locate the MI Office in Europe.

The Council thanked D. Prieur for attending the meeting

Agenda Item 6- ESO report (D. Evans, see PPT presentation)

New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition

D. Evans gave an update on the implementation of NJSS expedition. He reminded the Council that in January ESO was informed that the chosen platform had been involved in an accident. In early February it became clear that this platform will not be available. However at the same time, DOSECC offered ESO a larger, more expensive platform. At the Exceptional ECORD Council meeting in Brussels, an additional budget of \$750K was approved to cover the additional cost. Since then, discussions have continued with DOSECC, with the aim of finalizing the contract to do the work this year. Prior to the expedition, a geotechnical survey was required to demonstrate suitable ground conditions for contract completion. This survey has been difficult to organize, and more expensive than expected. A vibrocoring and seismic survey was finally contracted to Alpine Ocean Seismic Survey Inc. It started 27th March and was completed 5th May, at a cost of 370 k\$. The report has now been sent to DOSECC; we hope that it will be accepted by the insurers. ESO is now waiting for contract completion. The rig availability has been delayed to the end of June. The plan is to start mid-July, and finish by mid-late October. It is not the best weather window, because of the hurricane season. Bad weather is not a problem for the rig operations. However, the rig has to be re-supplied by boat

every week and bad weather could create down times. ESO carefully considered the weather issues and made the decision to go ahead in this weather window.

The delay will affect the offshore staffing. The staffing will be re-arranged considering people availability for mid-October. ICDP will carry out downhole logging. All planning is continuing. ESO is making every effort to implement the expedition this year

Discussion

R. Schorno asked what the likelihood is to have the expedition this year, taking into account that any further delay will imply an expedition next year.

D. Evans explained that a few days delay could be manageable but beyond one or two weeks, it will be impossible to implement the expedition this year because of the weather. We have already missed the best weather window of May-June-July. Any later than October and you get into the potential hurricane season. In the event of a hurricane, the supply and obviously the work will be affected for a few days. The peak of hurricane season is around September 10.

C. Mevel asked what has been the reaction of the science party to the delay. D. Evans replied that the science party has been extremely patient. The scientists understand that we are making all efforts and that these are issues inherent in organizing a MSP operation. C. MacLeod confirmed that the communication between ESO and the science party has been very good.

R. Schorno asked if the expedition operated in October will be considered in US FY08. D. Evans responded that the expedition is already considered as running across two fiscal years. In particular, the onshore science party will be scheduled in 2008.

Great Barrier Reef

The Great Barrier Reef (GBR) will be the next MSP expedition to be implemented by ESO. On February 15th, a meeting was held with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. ESO has submitted an application to drill on the GBR together with an Environmental Impact Statement. The GBR is provisionally scheduled in the September-November weather window of 2008. It is included in the FY 2008 Program Plan. Although the operations will take place mainly in FY09, ESO needs the money up-front to be able to set up contracts. However, there is still potential for delay: site survey approval, safety approval, contracting and vessel availability, permitting, possible NJ delays in 2007, finance, etc.

Discussion

In the case that NJ cannot be implemented this year, ESO considers it very difficult to have both expeditions next year: overlapping is not possible. The only possibility could be to ensure that NJ is done in May-June-July 08. In that case, GBR could take place in September-November 08.

Future Expeditions

There are presently three highly ranked proposals residing with OTF (March 08):

- New England Hydrogeology: a first meeting was held with the proponents in April. However, the third attempt to get the site survey funded by NSF failed.
- Coral Banks, Gulf of Mexico: is a relatively inexpensive proposal that should be easy to implement.
- Chicxilub: This proposal still has safety issues that will be discussed by EPSP later this month. However, the major problem is the very high cost.

D. Evans presented a table with the approximate costs for the implementation of the three expeditions mentioned above. He also informed that there will be a review of all future expeditions at the next Operations Task Force meeting. In August, SPC will also review all

projects that are waiting to be scheduled and will re-rank them considering not only scientific priorities but also fiscal realities.

Discussion

C. Mevel pointed out that if the figure for Chicxilub is correct, ECORD cannot afford to implement such an expensive expedition. It would mean one MSP expedition only in four years. If it is the case, the proponents should be informed. R. Schorno raised two issues. First, how do we prepare for post IODP after 2013 and, if the programme continues, how will it be run? We should bring this issue to IODP Council. Second, if some MSP expeditions are very expensive, we should look for other funding resources. Otherwise, with only 1PU in POCs, expensive MSP will consume 3 to 5 years of funding. We need to discuss some strategies on how to deal with expensive MSP expeditions.

D. Evans mentioned that ECORD could state at the IODP council that we would like to have a wider range of MSP expedition in terms of costs.

C. Franklin proposed to first ensure the last five years of IODP and to discuss later what will happen after IODP.

ACTION EMA: To include in the agenda for the next Council meeting an item to discuss the perspectives for ocean drilling in Europe after the second phase of IODP.

ACTION EMA: To post all the power point presentations presented at this meeting in the password restricted area of the ECORD website.

Agenda Item 7- ESSAC report (C. MacLeod, see PPT presentation)

C. MacLeod presented the implications on the science activities of the new budget constraints in IODP. ESSAC regrets that information on the new funding situation has not been released officially. ESSAC requests ECORD Council representatives/EMA to urge the Lead Agencies to release important information to the scientific community more quickly and in an open manner in the future.

C. Mevel indicated that ECORD has already raised this issue and made this request at the meeting with the Lead Agencies last May. The lead Agencies have agreed.

Program Member Office meeting

C. MacLeod informed Council that at the last Program Member Office meeting (Osaka, March 07), in order to reduce costs, U.S. and Japan proposed a voluntary reduction of their number of SAS panel representatives from 7 to 5. This proposal will change the quota for voting from 7:7:3(+1):1 (USA:Japan:ECORD:China/Korea) to 5:5:3(+1):1. ECORD did not volunteer to reduce its representation accordingly. The number of representatives reflects the 4 participation units. Moreover, this new representation increases the weight of ECORD. ESSAC asked if the Council endorses this strategy.

R. Schorno asked if this modification involves changes in the Memorandum. C. Mevel explained that because it is a voluntary reduction, it does not require any changing in the Memorandum.

ECORD Council endorsed ESSAC's strategy towards representation in SAS panels.

ESF Magellan Workshops

Three Magellan workshops are scheduled in 2007. The communication with the Magellan steering committee set up by ESF has improved.

Funding for ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops

C. MacLeod raised the issue of ECORD participation at IODP-MI funded workshops. Participation is supported by IODP-MI according to the financial quotas: 7:7:3:1. As a consequence, a number of ECORD scientists interested in participating could not be invited. It was clarified with IODP-MI that additional ECORD scientists could be invited if they could support their travel. The additional budget allocated to ESSAC by the ECORD Council to help ECORD scientists has been very useful. It is essential that ECORD is well represented at these workshops where future strategies are discussed.

SAS panel nominations

Three SAS panel representatives are rotating off. Nominations are based on consultation with national offices which provide names for discussion at ESSAC.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-4 ECORD Council approves ESSAC nominations for replacements on SAS panels:

Scientific Technology Panel, Natalie Vigier (Fr) for Christophe Basile (Fr)

Site Survey Panel, Neil Mitchell (UK) for Roger Searle (UK)

Science Steering & Evaluation Panel, Kai-Uwe Hinrichs (Ger) for Rüdiger Stein (Ger)

Bruno Goffé moved, Stefan Winkler-Nees seconded, all in favour

Science Advisory Structure Executive Committee alternates

C. MacLeod indicated that at 2/3 of SASEC meetings, ECORD was not fully represented. The delegate(s) and formal alternates were unable to attend. The ESSAC office was informed too late to find a suitable replacement and to have the approval of the SASEC chair. ECORD has only two representatives on SASEC. ESSAC proposed to establish a pool of knowledgeable ECORD scientists to draw upon if the formal delegates or their alternates are unable to participate. C. MacLeod made clear that this is an informal arrangement and that no obligation is made to these scientists about future participation in this panel.

C. Mevel expressed her support of the ESSAC proposal. She indicated that she has been involved with the ESSAC office trying to find a last minute ECORD representative to SASEC meetings and that it has proved to be a hard task.

R. Schorno asked if ESSAC representatives would be on the list. It is essential that the scientists representing ECORD have enough background knowledge to participate effectively in the discussions. C. MacLeod indicated that all the scientists in the list except one are or have been ESSAC members in the past. To the question regarding the possibility of having all the current ESSAC members in the list, C. MacLeod responded that it could be difficult to get SASEC approval if the list is too long. In addition, some of the ESSAC representatives are already members of other SAS panels and this excludes them from participating in SASEC meetings.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-5- ECORD Council approves the proposal by ESSAC to establish a pool of knowledgeable ECORD scientists to draw upon if SASEC representatives and their formal alternates are not available to attend SASEC meetings. This pool also includes ESSAC representatives that are not yet members of any other SAS panels. ESSAC will keep ECORD Council informed of changes in the composition of the pool.

Chris Franklin moved, Marcel Kullin seconded, all in favour

Staffing update

C. MacLeod explained the procedure for staffing expeditions and indicated that ESSAC prioritization is based first on scientific expertise, and then according to the financial quota within ECORD, as mandated in the MoU. ESSAC sends a prioritized list of applicants to the

Implementing Organizations (IOs). Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the IOs to finalize the expedition scientific parties based on the scientific expertise required and according to the IODP quota: 8:8:8:1 (US:Japan:ECORD:others). Therefore, to keep the quota within ECORD is a highly complicated process.

It is noted that for NantroSEIZE expedition, 39% of the total applicants came from ECORD, and 42% for the Equatorial Pacific. These numbers demonstrate the enthusiasm of ECORD scientists to participate in the programme.

C. MacLeod pointed out some imbalances in the ratio between number of applicants and financial contribution. Italy has a similar number of applicants to Germany, but its contribution is considerably smaller, therefore the number of berths allocated to Italy is small. This leads to some frustration because many valuable Italian scientists cannot participate. Another imbalance concerns Canada which, even before the staffing for the last two expeditions, has an over quota of 2.1

For Denmark, the funding agency has contributed a fair amount to the programme, but the response from the scientific community has not been strong. It may be that the scientific community in Denmark is not well organized and informed. This stresses the role of ESSAC representatives who need to be effective in advertising the programme in their countries.

C. Mevel indicated that, at the Council's request, she has encouraged Italy to increase substantially its contribution to better reflect the involvement of its scientific community. At this point, she has no response. N. Wardell responded that the situation in Italy is complex. Canada has submitted a proposal to increase its contribution to ~500 k\$, but it is still pending. The total number of ECORD participants from the beginning of IODP is a little less than expected because some expeditions had a reduced science party.

C. Franklin raised a question about reduced science parties. Who has the authority to decide?

C. Mevel indicated that it is the responsibility of the operator, if the scientific activity does not cover all aspects of a regular expedition.

Bering Sea call

The call for applications will be issued shortly. The deadline will be September/October 2007.

Teachers' Workshop

The first ECORD Teachers Workshop was held in Vienna, at the EGU meeting, in association with the GIFT workshop. ESSAC indicated that it was highly successful, with 70 participants from 22 countries. ESSAC request the ECORD Council to keep sponsoring this activity in the future. C. Mével clarified that, after negotiation with the EC, this workshop was funded by ECORD net as a test, but it will not be possible to use this funding scheme another time. She suggests that there might be funding schemes for education at the EC that could be approached. The request for support was delayed to be included in the budget discussion.

Distinguished Lecturer Programme

At this point, ESSAC has received 20 applications, mostly from UK and Canada. More are expected to arrive.

IODP-MI 'DRILLS' Lectures

IODP-MI has also launched a lecture programme, "DRILLS". Three scientists have been selected to tour in the US and Canada, Europe and Asia. The Council considers that this programme duplicates already existing programmes in USA, Japan and ECORD. It could be eliminated in the future to save funds.

ECORD Summer Schools

Two ECORD co-sponsored summer schools will take place this summer:

- Bremen Summer School on Paleoceanography (August 2007)
- Urbino Summer School on Paleoclimatology (July 2007).

Ten scholarships of 1000 Euros have been awarded to students to attend these summer schools. 48 applications were received, unfortunately none from non-ECORD European countries.

A call for summer schools in 2008 was issued by ESSAC this spring. Two applications were received:

(1) Bremen Summer School 2008 “The Deep Subseafloor Biosphere

Budget requested: €7500

(2) Urbino Summer School in Palaeoclimatology 2008

Budget requested: €15,000

ESSAC requested a decision from ECORD Council at this meeting as to what level they are prepared to support summer schools in 2008.

The ECORD council confirmed that the ECORD Scholarship scheme (10 x €1000 awards to outstanding young scientists) will continue.

F. Barriga suggested that the Urbino summer school changes its name to Urbino-IODP summer schools. MacLeod replied that Urbino has already recognised the ECORD funding participation at a prominent level.

C. Mevel asked if ESSAC has explored other sources to fund these schools. Perhaps ESF has developed a scheme to help organise summer schools. C. Macleod stated that it is not an ESSAC responsibility to seek additional funding for these summer schools but of the organisers. B. Avril responded that ESF is developing schemes for highly visible scientific conferences but could develop new schemes for summer schools.

R. Schorno stated that the first question to ask is whether the ECORD Council wants to continue to support summer schools in the mid-long term. C. MacLeod responded that Bremen is proposing to have a recurrent summer school to cover all IODP themes and to use the Bremen core repository as support for teaching. C. Mével stated that it is an interesting idea.

R. Schorno suggested that IODP-MI could be invited to co-sponsor the Urbino School. C. MacLeod responded that there is no project for summer schools at IODP-MI level.

U. Harms stated that ICDP organizes a one week summer school every year that could be coordinated with ECORD. The students need the same type of training for both oceanic and continental drilling.

C. MacLeod indicated that the Bremen school should be the priority, because it covers a new theme of IODP. However, he also stressed that the Urbino summer school is very worthy for students. If the Council does not agree to fund the Urbino summer school, he suggested that at least some ECORD scholarships could be allocated to students wishing to participate.

After discussion, the ECORD council decided to support the two summer schools, at a level of 7500 € each.

ESSAC matters

C. MacLeod recalled that the ESSAC Office will relocate from Cardiff to Aix en Provence as of 1 October 2007. G. Camoin will become ESSAC chair, C. MacLeod will become out-going vice-chair. ESSAC has nominated Rudiger Stein to become the incoming ESSAC vice Chair.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-7- ECORD Council approves ESSAC nomination of Rüdiger Stein as new vice-chair as of 1 October 2007. Council approves the implication that in principle the ESSAC office will move to Bremerhaven as of 1 October 2009.

Raymond Schorno moved, Dan Holtstam seconded, all in favour

On behalf of G. Camoin, C. MacLeod presented a new scheme for ESSAC organisation.

Agenda Item 8- EMA report (C. Mével, see PPT presentation)

FY08 Program plan

C. Mevel informed Council that for the first time the Lead Agencies have sent to EMA the draft of the Program Plan for FY08 before it goes to SASEC and the BoG. It has been distributed to the ECORD Council Executive committee for comments.

The program does not include New Jersey Shallow Shelf offshore component because it is already considered in FY07 PP.

The budget for FY08 has increased considerably compared to previous years because the CHIKYU starts in September 2007. The refitted JOIDES Resolution will start operations in January 2008. The budget covers only 9 months of operations for both vessels. Operating the CHIKYU is significantly more expensive than the JOIDES Resolution.

R. Schorno noted that as a consequence the balance between the Lead Agencies has been broken. C. Mével explained that the Memorandum between Japan and USA specifies that they will participate equally over the whole duration of the programme, SOCs and POCs combined. Because the operation of the Chikyu is very expensive, Japan will contribute mostly in POCs.

It is important to note that the ECORD contribution in SOC's corresponds to 45% of the total. If ECORD cannot provide the SOCs, the whole programme will be affected. C. Franklin asked if the mobilisation costs for New Jersey are considered. C. Mevel reminded the Council that last year at Council request, EMA sent to the Lead Agencies a table with the whole budget for ECORD including mobilisation costs. Until now there has not been any reply. C. Franklin insisted on the importance of solving this issue with the Lead Agencies.

ACTION EMA: To send to the Lead Agencies a statement for ECORD financial contribution to IODP in FY07 (POCs and SOCs).

Management Forum meeting (see appendix1)

The management Forum meeting discussed important issues regarding the future of the programme, in the light of funding problems. Neither the JOIDES Resolution nor the Chikyu will be operated 12 months a year for the IODP. This will definitively impact on the way the programme is run.

ECORD Activities

All the ECORD member countries have signed the Annex H for FY07, but not all have paid. The contract with ESO for FY07 is signed.

EMA (INSU-CNRS) has also signed an MOU with ICDP: this will allow EMA to receive the 500 k€ contribution of ICDP to the New Jersey expedition.

Outreach Activities

ECORD Newsletter #8 was published and distributed last April.

EMA organized the booth at EGU. The ECORD-ICDP joint Town hall meeting was held on April 17th and was very successful.

FY07 Budget (see appendix2)

After the completion of the New Jersey expedition, the remaining ECORD funds will be around 68 000 \$. This shows that the POC budget is insufficient to operate one MSP expedition per year. The situation will be even more difficult in the future, with only one P.U. in POCs (5.6 M\$).

On behalf of G. Camoin, C. Mével presented the budget request to support the ESSAC office in FY08. She reminded the Council that the FY starts on Oct 1st; therefore, the office needs least some funding for the last part of 2007. The budget covers the base budget (scientific coordinator salary, travel and subsistence, and office costs), as well as additional support for scientific activities. The total budget is 186 500 €, of which CNRS will support 37 00 € (postdoc, assistant the ESSAC chair). The remaining base budget is 82 500 €, and the budget request for additional activities is 67 000 €.

After discussion, the council decided to support the base budget, as well as the budget for the 2008 summer schools at a level of 7 500 € each, plus 10 000 € for scholarships. For the remaining items, G. Camoin is invited to present his request at the next council meeting in October.

ECORD Council passed the following motion:

ECORD Council motion 07-02-6- ECORD Council approves the 2008 ESSAC support budget of 82.500 € and an additional budget of 25.000 € for summer school activities. ESSAC is invited to present a detailed budget proposal at the next Council meeting for other support activities in 2008, including an indicative 9.000 € to start a second round of lecturer series.

Stefan Winkler-Nees moved, Reinhard Belocki seconded, all in favour

EMA will transfer a first payment to ESSAC from the remaining ECORD funds.

Budget situation in FY08 and beyond (see appendix2)

C. Mevel presented an update of the budget situation for FY08. The ECORD member countries are expected to raise their contribution by 60%. There are still some uncertainties as some countries have not yet expressed their position. It is important to have a clear view of the situation to inform the Lead Agencies at the IODP Council.

Austria, Ireland, Belgium and Finland have indicated that they will not be able to increase their contribution. France, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, will increase by 60%. Spain has decided to increase more, to reach 762 000 \$ in FY09. In the UK, the increase is secured for FY08, but still pending beyond – an evaluation of the UK participation in IODP is in progress. The other member countries gave an update.

- Denmark will not raise its contribution. A reduction is even considered, because of the small level of participation of Danish scientists. The decision will be made this fall.

- Iceland: Still pending.

- Sweden: Will increase by 60%.

- Portugal: Still pending. It will not be possible to have an answer by the end of June.

- Switzerland: Will increase by 60% for the next 2 years. However, Switzerland insists that the level of contribution should reflect the size and wealth of the country. This applies in particular to Italy.

- Italy: Still pending. The situation is complex because the contribution is paid by several institutions. The decision will be made by the end of June.

- Canada: At the request of the ECORD Council, Canada is trying to increase its contribution to ~500 k\$. A proposal has been submitted to NSERC, and is still pending. The office will move from Victoria to Montreal.

The situation is very encouraging, even if we have not yet reached the 4 P.U. C. Mevel indicated that after the final numbers are known, EMA will revise the financial contribution's table in the MoU for the second phase of IODP. She also indicated that amendment to the MoU may be needed.

S. Falcón Morales indicated that in order to legally commit to the new level of contribution; Spain needs to sign an addendum to the MoU.

C. Franklin volunteered to check the MoU and see whether an amendment signed by all parties is required.

ACTION EMA: To update the Annex H of the ECORD MoU for the second phase of IODP and circulate it to the ECORD Council members and to the ESSAC Chair (to revise the quota).

For the second phase of IODP, ECORD has agreed to contribute 3 P.U. in SOC's and 1 P.U. in POC's. With only 1 P.U. (5.6m\$) in POCs, as signed in the Memorandum with the Lead Agencies, it will be very difficult to operate one MSP per year. Considering the whole financial situation of the programme, it is very unlikely that the Lead Agencies will agree to modify the SOC/POC ratio for the ECORD contribution. As evidenced by the FY07 PP, the programme needs the ECORD SOCs. An ERA net + could help to solve the problem. The additional money would allow allocating more funds to POCs.

Agenda Item 10- Report on the meeting with the Lead Agencies, May 15th and preparation for the IODP Council meeting (June 27-28) (see appendix3)

The meeting was organised at the request of ECORD Council (Brussels, February 27th 2007). Four main issues were discussed: Financial status of the programme, POCs/SOCs ratio for the ECORD contribution, SOC flow in IODP and approval of the Annual Program Plan.

This meeting helped improve the communication between ECORD and the Lead Agencies.

Both the US and the Japanese vessels are facing financial difficulties, and there is not a clear vision of the real ship-time that will be allocated to IODP in the second phase of the programme. In this context, the Lead Agencies are not prepared to modify the POC/SOC ratio because the overall budget heavily relies on the SOCs paid by ECORD. In addition, NSF and MEXT are looking for other funding sources to cover the cost of the ships when they are not used by IODP.

C. Mevel informed ECORD Council that EMA received the FY08 Program Plan from the Lead Agencies the week before the IODP Council. EMA sent it to the Executive for comments. This is a major improvement.

ACTION EMA: To finalize ECORD's response to the Program Plan to be sent to the Lead Agencies.

C. Mevel also attended the "IODP New Membership Forum" held in Washington DC the following day.

This meeting was set up to attract new members. It was attended by representatives of Australia, Chinese Taipei, Israel, New Zealand, Pakistan, Russia, Thailand and Vietnam. They received presentations by all IODP entities (including ECORD/ESO, by C. Mével).

Australia is likely to join IODP next year as a member of the Asian consortium. The other countries represented are all interested; however it is difficult for them to find the money to join. The representative of Israel, Dr. Ahuva Almogi-Labin, was interested in joining ECORD. Israel has a special relationship with the European Commission and it would be

more appropriate to join ECORD than the Asian consortium. However, the financial situation for that type of activity is difficult. She will remain in contact with EMA.

Agenda Item 11- EC Green Paper on Maritime Policy: status of the written response and preparation for the Aberdeen meeting, June 22nd (S. Winkler-Nees, see PPT presentation)

The consultation on the Green paper will be finalised by the end of this month. The ESF Marine Board channels the responses. The Marine Board was also in charge of organizing the Eurocean 2007 meeting in Aberdeen. Stefan Winkler-Nees was involved in the preparation of the meeting and the writing of the draft “Aberdeen declaration” on behalf of ECORD. ESSAC encouraged ECORD scientists to register for the Aberdeen meeting, to show that there is interest from the community. There will be no presentation on ECORD; the topics presented are much broader. However, there is an opportunity to mention ECORD in two of the talks. C. Mével, R. Schorno and S. Winkler-Nees will attend the meeting.

ACTION EMA: To prepare a slide about ECORD for two of the speakers at the Aberdeen Eurocean conference, Ed. Hill and Maurice Héral and request them to include the slide in their presentation.

ACTION S. WINKLER: To finalize the written response to the EC green paper.

Agenda Item 12- ECORD Evaluation: report from the subcommittee
(See appendix 4 – draft response to the ECORD evaluation committee)

R. Schorno presented the draft to the Council for consideration. The Council accepted the general approach of the document and discussed minor modifications. It was decided that a final version would be presented to the Council on Friday morning for approval. The response will be distributed to the members of the review Committee and to all the individuals who have received the evaluation report: key individuals at the EC, IODP, NSF, MEXT, etc...

Agenda Item 13- Aurora Borealis (C. Mével, see appendix 5 - ERICON proposal)

C. Mevel informed Council that the ESF Polar Board has submitted a proposal to the EC, led by Paul Egerton for the preparatory phase of Aurora Borealis. ECORD, through CNRS-INSU, is involved in two work packages.

Agenda Item 14 - Deep sea frontier (C. Mével)
See appendix 6 - DSF proposal

The DSF document is published by the EC, thanks to Alan Edwards. It is out now and will be distributed to Council members. It is a well-written document, and ECORD is properly acknowledged. The document will be distributed at the Aberdeen meeting.

C. Mevel noted that Phil Weaver coordinated the Deep Sea Frontier proposal to the EC for a “coordination action”. However, she was never able to get in contact with him to follow the development of the proposal. The proposal has now been submitted. As it stands, it is not very satisfactory for ECORD. It does not follow the decisions made at the DSF steering committee meeting. ECORD (INSU-CNRS) is not an official partner and is not even mentioned in the

list of relevant EC programmes. However, drilling and IODP are mentioned throughout the document. C. Mevel raised the issue with A. Edwards. He responded that if the proposal is well evaluated, the EC will make sure that drilling and ECORD are properly included during the negotiation phase.

N. Wardell is worried that if we are not present in the first phase (this proposal), we could be left out of the bigger project that could be funded in the future.

U. Harms expressed his surprise to see that that IODP is mentioned so many times but not the European lead agency (ECORD) for drilling.

B. Goffé indicated that for France it is politically important that ECORD is part of the DSF initiative.

C. Franklin reminded Council that the DSF Foresight paper is an initiative of ECORD and that the EC will see us as a part of DSF.

C. Mevel stressed that the most important point is to ensure that ECORD scientists are involved in the workshops organized under the framework of this project, to prepare for the future. F. Barriga mentioned that some aspects of Earth Sciences are underrepresented in P. Weaver's proposal.

C. Mevel proposed asking for a meeting of the DSF steering committee to discuss the future of DSF.

Agenda Item 15- ECORD and ICDP (U. Harms, see PPT presentation)

U. Harms presented the current situation of ICDP. There is an overlap between membership in ECORD and ICDP. Some European countries participate in ICDP but not in ECORD and vice versa. ICDP is interested to discuss schemes allowing ECORD to join as a consortium. However, there is no simple mechanism because of this overlap.

M. Kullin noted that Switzerland is in negotiation to join ICDP and asked if it would be better to stop this negotiation and to join ICDP as a consortium of ECORD.

U. Harms responded that there is not a clear answer at the moment. But it could be easier from a contractual point of view to joint ICDP as single country. He indicated that the financial contributions must be the same in any case, but the voting will be affected.

The Council welcomed the positive stance of ICDP and expressed its willingness to continue the discussions. Council thanked U. Harms for attending the meeting.

Friday, June 8

R. Schorno presented a summary of Thursday's motions.

- Representation of ECORD/ESSAC in the SASEC panel. The Council gave instructions to ESSAC: if ESSAC is approached with a request to reduce the number of ECORD representatives in the SASEC panel, ESSAC should pass on this request to the ECORD Council
- MoU, FY08. Chris Franklin looked into the MoU to check what changes are necessary to adapt the financial table (to account for the new contributions and quota). Only the annex on finances, Annex H, needs to be revised. There is no need to modify the MoU.
- Response to the review report: The finalized text was presented to the Council and the following motion was approved.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-9- ECORD Council accepts the evaluation report presented by the ECORD Review Committee in January 2007. Council approves the amended response prepared by the Response Committee appointed at the ECORD Council meeting #10. The approved response is to be appended to the evaluation report and distributed to the ECORD Council members, to the European Commission and to the ECORD Review Committee members.

Raymond Schorno moved, Are Carlson seconded, all in favour

ACTION EMA: To distribute the Council response to the ECORD review report to all Council members, the European Commission and the members of the Review Committee.

Agenda Item 16- FP7 status

C. Mevel presented the apologies of A. Edwards for not attending the meeting. She conveyed his message and recommendations. To obtain an ERA net+ ECORD needs political support at the national level. The work programme is elaborated by the Programme Committee. It is essential that the national representatives at the Programme Committee request an ERA net+ for ECORD in 2008. The final meeting to elaborate the work programme for 2008 is scheduled at the end of June. Therefore, action is required as soon as possible. The council members need to make it clear to their representatives that ECORD is already pooling funds (presently 14M\$, and more that 20M\$ in 2008).

There is a risk that ECORD loses momentum if we do not get an ERA-net+.

A. Edwards also advised contact with other units of the Environment Directorate at the EC, in particular, Elisabeth Lipiatou, in charge of the Climate Unit.

ACTION COUNCIL MEMBERS: To contact their Program Committee Members to lobby for an ECORD Net+.

ACTION S. WINKLER: To contact Elisabeth Lipiatou to organise a meeting to present ECORD.

Agenda Item 17- Report on meetings with EC key individuals (C. Franklin, S. Winkler-Nees, see ppt presentation)

1. Meeting with Hervé Péro and Gerburg Larsen (Chris Franklin and Stefan Winkler-Nees). The feeling is that the discussion was mostly driven by the Aurora Borealis. The EC wants to support a visible piece of equipment; it is more difficult to sell the MSP concept. Overall, the meeting can be considered as a success: ECORD visibility improved and Gerburg Larsen was very interested

2. Meeting with Eluned Morgan (MEP from Wales, contact established via Chris McLeod). The meeting was held at ESF, with C. Mével, S. Winkler-Nees, Chris Franklin (via video link), P. Egerton, and B. Avril. She was very interested by the science developed by IODP. After the meeting, she sent J. Potocnik a letter in support of an ERA net+ for ECORD. Council thanks ESF for organizing the meeting in Strasbourg.

ACTION EMA: To send Eluned Morgan the DVD compiled by Henk Brinkhuis which won an award in The Netherlands.

3. Meeting between Angelika Niebler (MEP from Germany) and Prof. Kleiner, head of DFG, will take place on 16 June 2007. Stefan will give feedback to Council.

Agenda Item 18- Discussion on a possible ERA net + proposal

C. Franklin recommended that we tell the EC that we need support not to lose momentum. C. Mével pointed out that we need a careful definition of our “Common Pot”, since we are a particular case. The common pot is the money we pool to pay our contribution to IODP. This allows ESSAC to issue a call for participation in IODP expeditions. An ERA-net+ should lead towards a common pot. The participation in IODP expeditions presently follows the “juste retour” scheme because the quota apply. However, other ESSAC programmes have no “juste retour”: Distinguished Lecturer Series, summer schools, scholarships, Magellan workshop series...). We need to convince the commission that if we have an ERA net+, we will apply the common pot scheme to the expedition applicants. Moreover, with additional money, we can involve all European countries. We also need to consider the status of Canada with respect to the EC.

Agenda Item 19- AOB

- SASEC

The power point presentation on SASEC sent by Gerold Wefer was presented to the council (see PPT).

- Relations between ECORD and the ESF Marine Board

S. Winkler presented S. Dürr apologies for not attending the meeting. He thanked the Council for accepting him as a vice chair alternate.

Stefan raised the possibility of ECORD becoming a member or at least an observer of the ESF Marine Board. The Marine Board has a strong lobbying position that could benefit ECORD. The present composition of the Marine Board is biased towards biologists and ocean drilling is poorly represented. Raymond reminded Council that he is the ECORD liaison to the Marine Board. Only institutes/agencies are members. What is important is to have established good contacts through the response to the Green Paper. There is now a good relationship between ECORD and the Marine Board that needs to be maintained.

- Future strategy for ECORD

It has been pointed out by the Review Committee that ECORD needs to have a long term strategy. Chris Franklin suggested taking it one step further to think about post IODP (beyond 2013). Therefore, two issues should be considered: the science in the second phase IODP, and the future of ocean drilling after IODP. C. Mével stressed the need to involve ESSAC in this discussion. Raymond proposed to add 1 to 2 people to the Executive and form a working group. The following motion was passed.

ECORD Council motion 07-02-8- ECORD Council establishes a Vision Group to develop a strategy for the future of ocean drilling in Europe, after the end of IODP.

The vision group consists of the ECORD Executive (R. Schorno, B. Goffé, S. Winkler-Nees, C. Mével, C. Franklin and U. Høeberg), D. Evans and G. Camoin

Stefan Winkler-Nees moved, Ulla Høeberg-Hansen seconded, all in favour

- U. Høeberg-Hansen indicated that the introductory meeting for new ECORD members organized on Wednesday was very useful. She also requested that all the documents relevant to the ECORD council meetings are circulated at least one week before the meeting.

ACTION EMA: To send the documentation for the council meetings at least one week in advance.

- The links between ICDP and ECORD

There is obviously willingness on both sides to develop a better interaction and to find ways to formalize our relationships. We already have common activities: the Town hall meeting at EGU, ICDP will participate financially in the NJ expedition and ICDP will carry out the logging, we share the same database system developed by ICDP. U. Harms will report back to ICDP. There are also discussions ongoing at the IODP level, in particular to develop common evaluation of proposals and share core repositories. An ad hoc implementation group will be formed very soon to make recommendations on the links between ICDP and IODP. U. Harms suggested a request to IODP (S. Humphris, chair of SASEC) that ECORD is represented in this group.

ACTION EMA: To contact Susan Humphris to ensure that there will be one representative of ECORD in the Implementation Group of IODP-ICDP Relations.

- Implementation of future MSP expeditions

Dan Evans raised the question of the implementation of MSP operations in the future. A rough calculation has shown that some MSP operation could be extremely expensive and could require pooling the POC funds over 3-4 years. Dan is concerned because some time ago, SPC passed a consensus stating that the best science should be implemented, even if the consequence is not to have an MSP operation each year. Therefore, ESO might be requested to implement very expensive expeditions. Council reiterated that it is essential to keep the momentum in ESO, and therefore to have an operation at least every second year. Council noted that the JOIDES Resolution and the Chikyu also have funding problems and have to consider fiscal realities. It should be made clear to the programme that ESO will not operate expeditions that require pooling funds over several years, unless other sources of funding can be found.

- Next ECORD Council meeting

S. Falcón offered to host the next meeting in Madrid. The dates of Oct 22-23 were tentatively decided but require confirmation from B. Goffé.

ACTION EMA: To confirm to Council members the dates for the next Council meeting in Madrid.

The meeting was formally closed. C. Franklin thanked R. Schorno and NWO for hosting the meeting. On behalf of the ECORD Council, he also warmly thanked C. MacLeod for his work as the ESSAC Chair.

The council meeting is followed by two presentations by Bernard Avril, ESF (see PPT presentations), and an ECORD net meeting.