

Approved in Paris on 05/06/08

## 12th ECORD COUNCIL MEETING

MADRID, SPAIN

22-23 October 2007

Spanish Secretary of State of Universities and Research

C/Albacete 5, Madrid

## MINUTES

<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>		
<i>COUNTRY</i>		<i>EMAIL</i>
Austria	Reinhard Belocky, member	<a href="mailto:belocky@fwf.ac.at">belocky@fwf.ac.at</a>
Canada	Kathy Gillis, member	<a href="mailto:gillis@uvic.ca">gillis@uvic.ca</a>
Denmark	Ulla Høeberg Hansen, member, Executive	<a href="mailto:uhh@fist.dk">uhh@fist.dk</a>
Finland	Sammuli Hemming, alternate	<a href="mailto:samuli.hemming@aka.fi">samuli.hemming@aka.fi</a>
Germany	Sören Dürr, member	<a href="mailto:soeren.duerr@dfg.de">soeren.duerr@dfg.de</a>
Germany	Stefan Winkler-Nees, alternate	<a href="mailto:stefan.winkler.nees@dfg.de">stefan.winkler.nees@dfg.de</a>
Iceland	Hans Kristján Gudmundsson, member	<a href="mailto:hans@rannis.is">hans@rannis.is</a>
Italy	Nigel Wardell, alternate	<a href="mailto:nwardell@ogs.trieste.it">nwardell@ogs.trieste.it</a>
Ireland	Xavier Monteys, alternate	<a href="mailto:Xavier.Monteys@gsi.ie">Xavier.Monteys@gsi.ie</a>
Netherlands	Raymond M.L. Schorno, member, Vice-Chair	<a href="mailto:schorno@nwo.nl">schorno@nwo.nl</a>
Norway	Are Carlson, member	<a href="mailto:are.carlson@forskningsradet.no">are.carlson@forskningsradet.no</a>
Portugal	Fernando Barriga, member	<a href="mailto:f.barriga@fc.ul.pt">f.barriga@fc.ul.pt</a>
Spain	Severino Falcon Morales, alternate, Vice-Chair	<a href="mailto:severino.falcon@mec.es">severino.falcon@mec.es</a>
Sweden	Dan Holtstam, member	<a href="mailto:D.Evans.holtstam@vr.se">D.Evans.holtstam@vr.se</a>
UK	Chris J. Franklin, member, Executive	<a href="mailto:cfr@nerc.ac.uk">cfr@nerc.ac.uk</a>
<b>OBSERVERS</b>		
EC	Ivan Conesa Alcolea, observer, ECORD-net	<a href="mailto:Ivan.Conesa-Alcolea@ec.europa.eu">Ivan.Conesa-Alcolea@ec.europa.eu</a>
EMA	Catherine Mével, observer	<a href="mailto:Mével@ipgp.jussieu.fr">Mével@ipgp.jussieu.fr</a>
EMA	Rosa Bernal-Carrera, observer	<a href="mailto:rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr">rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr</a>
ESF	Bernard Avril, observer	<a href="mailto:bavril@esf.org">bavril@esf.org</a>
ESO	Dan Evans, observer	<a href="mailto:devans@bgs.ac.uk">devans@bgs.ac.uk</a>
ESO	Carol Cotteril, observer ECORD-net	<a href="mailto:cjcott@bgs.ac.uk">cjcott@bgs.ac.uk</a>
ESSAC	Gilbert Camoin observer, ESSAC Chair	<a href="mailto:gcamoin@cerege.fr">gcamoin@cerege.fr</a>
IMI BoG	O. Eldholm, observer	<a href="mailto:olav.eldholm@geo.uib.no">olav.eldholm@geo.uib.no</a>
NERC	Sasha Leigh, observer ECORD-Net	<a href="mailto:snbl@nerc.ac.uk">snbl@nerc.ac.uk</a>
ESF	Paul Egerton, observer European Polar Consortium	<a href="mailto:pegerton@esf.org">pegerton@esf.org</a>
	Nicole Biebow, observer, European Polar Consortium	<a href="mailto:Nicole.Biebow@awi.de">Nicole.Biebow@awi.de</a>
<b>APOLOGIES</b>		
<i>members</i>		
France	Bruno Goffé, member, Chair	<a href="mailto:bruno.goffe@ens.fr">bruno.goffe@ens.fr</a>
Switzerland	Marcel Kullin, member	<a href="mailto:mkullin@snf.ch">mkullin@snf.ch</a>
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriët member	<a href="mailto:jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be">jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be</a>
SASEC	Gerold Wefer, observer	<a href="mailto:gwefer@marum.de">gwefer@marum.de</a>

The pdf files of all presentations are posted in the restricted area of the ECORD website  
<http://www.ecord.org/about/access.html>

**Monday, October 22**

**Agenda Item 0. Welcome and logistical information**

S. Falcón Morales welcomed the participants and provided logistical information. C. Mével explained that, due to health problems, B. Goffé had to cancel his trip at the last minute. Vice-chair R. Schorno agreed to chair the meeting.

The agenda was approved

**Agenda Item 1. Approval of the Den Haag meeting minutes (R. Schorno)**

The Council approved the minutes with minor modifications.

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-1** ECORD Council approves the Den Haag minutes with textual modifications to be applied for checking the English wording.

Chris Franklin moved, Ulla Høeberg Hansen seconded, all in favour

**Agenda Item 2 Den-Haag meeting actions (R. Schorno)**

- **ACTION EMA:** To include in the agenda for the next Council meeting an item to discuss the perspective for ocean drilling in Europe after the end of the second phase of IODP. ***Done***
- **ACTION EMA:** To post the Power-Point presentations presented at the ECORD council meeting in the password-restricted area of the ECORD website. ***Done***
- **ACTION EMA:** To send to the Lead Agencies a statement for ECORD financial contribution to IODP in FY07 (POCs and SOC's). ***Done***
- **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). ***The Annex H has been updated but there are still uncertainties in some countries.***
- **ACTION EMA:** To finalise ECORD's response to the Program Plan to be sent to the Lead Agencies. ***The response as been sent but no answer has yet been received.***
- **ACTION EMA:** To prepare a slide on 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. ***Done. ECORD was mentioned in both presentations.***
- **ACTION S. WINKLER-NEES:** To finalize the written response to the EC green paper. ***Done. The Council discussed this point the next day.***
- **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. ***Done. No answer from the committee members has been received.***
- **ACTION EMA:** To send to Eluned Morgan the DVD compiled by Henk Brinkhuis which won an award in Netherlands. ***Done.***
- **ACTION EMA:** To contact Susan Humphris to ensure that there will be one representative of ECORD in the Implementation Group of IODP-ICDP Relations. ***Done. However after discussion with S. Humphris and U. Harms it was clear that this group was not the proper forum to discuss ECORD participation.***
- **ACTION S. WINKLER-NEES:** To contact Elisabeth Lipiatou to organise a meeting to present ECORD. ***The efforts to organise this meeting have been unsuccessful. There is not***

*sufficient interest for meeting with ECORD representatives. I. Conesa advised Council to explore other possible contacts at the meeting that will be held in Brussels on October 30. C. Mével and S. Winkler-Nees will participate.*

- **ACTION COUNCIL MEMBERS:** To contact their Program Committee Members to lobby for an ECORD Net+. *Done.*
- **ACTION EMA:** To send documentation for Council meetings at least one week in advance. *Done.*
- **ACTION EMA:** To confirm to Council members the dates for the next Council meeting in Madrid. *Done.*

### **Agenda Item 3- New council Vice-Chair to be elected; composition of the Executive**

C. Mével presented the list of previous ECORD Chairs and Vice-Chairs and the current situation. S. Falcón Morales is the incoming Chair (April 1<sup>st</sup>), and the next Vice-Chair needs to be elected. R. Schorno stated that following the rule of alternance between big and small countries the natural choice should be the UK. Consequently he nominated C. Franklin as incoming Vice-Chair and the following motion was voted:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-2** ECORD Council elects Chris Franklin as incoming Vice-Chair to replace R. Schorno as of April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

R. Schorno moved, S. Winkler-Nees seconded, all in favour except one abstention (C. Franklin)

The Council thanked C. Franklin for taking on this responsibility.

Executive: R. Schorno, B. Goffé, S. Falcón Morales, C. Mével, C. Franklin and U. Høeberg Hansen are the current members. U. Høeberg Hansen will step down for maternity leave as of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008. Her replacement needs to be elected. On April 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 C. Franklin will become Vice-Chair. His replacement in the Executive needs to be elected. Both decisions were deferred until the next day to give council members an opportunity to further discuss the nominations.

The next day, the following motions were passed:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-3** ECORD Council elects Reinhard Belocky as member of the Executive to replace Ulla Høeberg Hansen as of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

R. Schorno moved, U. Høeberg Hansen seconded, all in favour

#### **ECORD Council motion 07-03-4**

ECORD Council elects Sören Dürr as member of the Executive (to replace Chris Franklin) as of 1 April 2008.

R. Schorno moved, C. Franklin seconded, all in favour

The Council thanked U. Høeberg Hansen for serving as a member of the Executive, and R. Belocky and S. Dürr for taking on the responsibility of being member of the Executive.

### **Agenda Item 4 - Board of Governors report (O. Eldholm).**

O. Eldholm presented the structure of IODP Management International and its Board of Governors (BoG). He is one of the three ECORD members of BoG, together with John Ludden (UK) and Daniel Prieur (France) and the only ECORD representative in the Executive Committee of the BoG. The last annual meeting of IODP-MI was held in Bremerhaven on June 27<sup>th</sup> 2007. He summarized the discussions and decisions made at this meeting.

O. Eldholm presented the results of the elections for IODP-MI officers, the Executive Committee and other committee members. The SASEC committee members as well as the new chair for SPC (James Jiro Mori, Kyoto University) were approved. As Chair of the Audit Committee, O. Eldholm was pleased to inform Council that the audits carried out have been excellent.

A new Policy on Conflict of Interests has been approved, the text of this policy can be found in IODP-MI web page. S. Dürr asked for a short overview of this policy. O. Eldholm replied that basically it implies that same persons cannot make decisions at different levels of the organization. S. Dürr indicated that in the past ECORD Council has found it difficult to identify candidates for the BoG who are not involved in other IODP entities. O. Eldholm answered that he understands the point but that at the time of signing as a member of the BoG, the nominate will have to endorse this policy.

O. Eldholm informed Council that the Treasurer's and Investment Committee Report was approved. The membership for institutions which is presently 5000 US\$ per year could be substantially reduced in the future. This reduction could have a positive impact in increasing the number of institutions joining IODP-MI.

O. Eldholm informed Council that unauthorized core sampling occurred in one expedition and that the BoG has taken action to ensure that it will not happen again.

O. Eldholm indicated that the BoG was informed of the funding problem for IODP at this meeting. As a consequence, the approval of the Annual Program Plan (APP) for FY08 was deferred. The APP was approved by email vote. O. Eldholm has voiced ECORD request to be involved in the preparation of the APP. He indicated that the answer was very positive and actions have been taken and that the document was circulated also to ECORD.

The funding problems at IODP initiated the discussion about the closure of one IODP-MI office. This was also one of the recommendations of the Triennium Review Committee. However, O. Eldholm stressed that the focus has been mostly on IODP-MI to save money, although the budget of IODP-MI is very small compared with the Implementing Organizations. He raised the question of whether it is reasonable to scale down the operations of IODP-MI to make negligible savings or would it be wiser to look for other options to reduce the Programme costs. The risk is that the programme could lose its integrated nature.

O. Eldholm presented two important resolutions taken by the IODP-MI BoG:

- to explore the possibility of merging the two IODP-MI offices into one smaller office
- to establish an ad-hoc committee to investigate the potential impact of financial shortfall and to make recommendations on how to achieve IODP longer term goals in the current situation. A preliminary report is expected by February 2008.

Due to the challenging time that IODP is going through, an extraordinary BoG meeting will take place in San Francisco on December 11<sup>th</sup>, and he asked Councils' advice to address the following points:

- Integrated nature of IODP (vs. Lead Agency operation)
- One or two offices
- Minimum budget threshold for IODP-MI to function
- IODP-MI achievements/functions: workshops, SASEC, reorganisation, Management Forum, Mission concept, Third party/industry support, New members, etc...
- Cooperation industry and/or Third parties

O. Eldholm reminded Council that within other activities, IODP-MI has been successful in reorganising SASEC into a long-term planning committee that can look into the goals and major objectives of the Programme and can require corrections on the Program Plan if needed.

O. Eldholm indicated that IODP-MI has been very active in making contacts with industry to help support the Programme. IODP-MI is looking for ways to fill some of the ship drilling time that cannot

be funded through the standard sources. This amounts to approximately five months per year. Manik Talwani has informed that some major oil companies have shown interest in carrying out missions in partnership with IODP in continental margins as well as in the Arctic. These projects could benefit both industry and the scientific community.

O. Eldholm indicated that IODP-MI has been working diligently to ensure new memberships for the Programme. As a consequence, Australia has announced its intention to join the Programme.

### *Discussion*

The Council considered it very important to provide O. Eldholm with some guidance before the next BoG meeting. R. Schorno suggested conducting the discussion after C. Mével's presentation on the SASEC Report and the IODP Council Report. He further suggested that the more pressing subjects be discussed: the integrated nature of the Programme; the appropriateness of conducting workshops while we are doing the same here in Europe; and the possibility of having only one IODP-MI office, and possibly in Europe. O. Eldholm and C. Mével indicated that they have offered to host the office in Europe on several occasions, though the response has not been enthusiastic.

S. Dürr asked if a recommendation from the ECORD Council regarding the budget's reduction of the science operators could be appropriate. O. Eldholm replied that any recommendation from the ECORD council will be presented at the BoG meeting in December. C. Franklin noted that improvements in the efficiency of the Programme should not be limited to means of reducing expenses in order to meet the budget. We should also consider ways to increase the budget. O. Eldholm agreed and informed that IODP-MI is considering new memberships options for industry, for example, to become associate member. R. Schorno indicated that this point should be brought up during the agenda item of the ECORD Vision Group. At this point it was agreed to continue the discussion after the presentation of SASEC and IODP Council reports.

### **Agenda Item 5- SASEC report (C. Mével).**

The presentation is based on Susan Humphris (current chair of SASEC) presentation to IODP council in Bremerhaven last June.

SASEC met in Bremerhaven during the "IODP week" last June. ECORD was represented by Gerold Wefer (member) and Hans Brumsak (alternate for Mike Bickle, selected using the policy approved by the Council). D. Evans and C. Mével attended as observers.

SASEC discussed its scientific evaluation plan. The short-term evaluation is carried out by the Science Planning Committee (SPC) and looks at the science achievements of each expedition. SASEC is responsible for the long-term evaluation. The evaluation of the first phase (2003-2007) will be conducted thematically by a panel chaired by the Vice-President of IODP-MI for Science Planning, Hans Christian Larsen. SASEC decided to start with *Climate*. The panel met in Bremen during the Topical Symposium last summer. The report is not yet available. In the future, the evaluation will consider *Crustal Structure* (2008) and *Sub-sea Biosphere* (2009).

Considering the difficult fiscal situation of the Programme, SASEC decided to develop an "IODP Implementation Plan: 2008-2013" that will provide guiding principles and foci for the remainder of the current program. G. Camoin added that the first draft of this document was circulated and SPC members have submitted amendments via email. The document was included in the Agenda Book for this meeting. C. Mével added that if an interesting proposal outside the scope of the defined foci is received, it will still be considered.

SASEC accepted the recommendations regarding the SAS: the reduction of US and Japanese membership from 7/7 to 5/5; and to reduce EPSP, STP and SSP physical meetings to 1 per year. The reduction in panel membership is voluntary and therefore does not require a change in the Memorandum. This is favourable to ECORD because its proportional participation will increase.

IODP-MI has organized 2 workshops in 2007. For 2008, SASEC recommended to fund one workshop on **High to Ultra-high Resolution Sedimentary Records**, which fits in the science foci proposed.

SASEC together with IODP-MI has set up the IODP Drills programme. It is the equivalent of ECORD Distinguished Lectures Programme. C. Mével noticed that Drills is duplicating efforts with similar programmes at national/consortium level, such as the ECORD Distinguished Lectures Programme. Cutting IODP Drills programme in the next fiscal year would save funds.

Regarding the IODP-ICDP relations, SASEC recommended the formation of an *ad hoc* implementation group of representatives from both programmes, plus curatorial expertise. The group would develop an implementation plan that includes financial implications for common core storage and metadata integrations. ECORD is also interested in developing its relationship with ICDP, though after discussion with Uli Harms, C. Mével informed Council that because of its focused mandate this *ad hoc committee* is not the place to discuss future cooperation between ECORD and ICDP.

SASEC discussed possible partnership with industry, to alleviate some of the financial burden on IODP. SASEC recommended that IODP-MI works with the IOs and the scientific community to develop/facilitate non-IODP work with industry consortia and/or governments. Ideally, it would be beneficial for cores and data to become part of IODP after the appropriate moratorium period.

C. Mével commented there has been some discussion between IODP-MI and the oil industry regarding possible collaboration in the Arctic. C. Mével and D. Evans were contacted by Manik Talwani. He is willing to organize a meeting between ECORD, ESO and several oil companies interested in obtaining general stratigraphic data from the Arctic. The meeting was originally planned for October 2007, but has been delayed. Because it is important to involve scientists in the discussions, D. Evans contacted the lead proponents of the two existing proposals on the Arctic. No response has yet been received. At the ESSAC meeting, C. Mével had the opportunity to talk to Rudiger Stein (one of the two lead proponents). He feels that such collaboration might be beneficial, but is concerned that collaboration with industry in Arctic research may create a negative image for IODP. Nevertheless, he is open to participate in the meeting organized by M. Talwani.

K. Gillis asked if the national funding agencies of all members have endorsed the collaboration with industry. She indicated that in Canada, it was not well received by the reviewers of their proposal. C. Mével answered that it is now widely accepted, in particular by NSF, because they have no alternative. JAMSTEC is not necessarily looking for industry partnership but the Japanese agency is thinking to share vessel time with other governmental agencies or other ministries in Japan. For ECORD, it is Council's decision to collaborate or not with industry.

Referring to Rudiger Stein's concerns, S. Dürr indicated he believes that industry-collaboration offers the possibility to have an influence to do things correctly from the environmental point of view. O. Eldholm concurred and added that at the present time oil industry is also very concerned about environmental issues and that probably the environmental challenge of drilling the Arctic is one the main concerns for industry. C. Mével suggested that this message should be passed along by the funding agencies to the project scientists. She indicated that B. Goffé has also manifested the French interest in collaborating with industry.

R. Schorno asked the audience if there was an agreement among the ECORD Council to be proactive in developing collaboration between industry and the scientific community. D. Evans noticed that there are two issues:

1. industry using IODP platforms independently, and
2. the possibility of real collaborative work.

C. Mével concurred with D. Evans and added that at this stage SASEC is trying to develop joint projects between IODP and industry. D. Evans replied that it might be possible to develop such joint projects, though everything depends on the attitude of those funding the ship.

It was agreed that the minutes should record the discussions carried out on this theme and that the minutes should be given to the European BoG members before its meeting in December.

#### **Agenda Item 6- IODP Council report (C. Mével).**

IODP Council met in Bremerhaven in June 2007. ECORD was represented by R. Schorno, S. Winkler-Nees-Ness, E. Kohler and C. Mével.

##### IODP membership

China remains an associate member at a level of 1M\$ per year. The interim Asian Consortium still has only one member, Korea, at a level of 0.3M\$ per year. Korea is aiming to increase its participation in FY08, but it is still pending. Negotiations are progressing with India and Australia. *Since the council meeting, Australia has announced that they will join the IODP in FY08, at the level of 1/4 membership. Dave Falvey, from the Australian Research Council, will meet with the LAs next December to finalize the Memorandum. It is not clear if Australia will join IODP on his own or as part of the Asian Consortium.*

The status of guest scientist was presented. There will be an increase in the number of berths on the *JOIDES* Resolution and on the *CHIKYU*. This opens the possibility to invite outstanding scientists from non-IODP countries as guest scientists. For example, this status could benefit a Polish Professor who has applied to ESSAC for the Bering Sea Expedition. It could be a way to involve Poland at no cost on ECORD's berths.

##### IODP funding situation

The overall funding situation is difficult not only by NSF funding restrictions but also by the increase in price of all oil related activities.

NSF informed IODP Council of its impossibility of running the *JOIDES* all year round. NSF is considering going off contract part of the year and leasing the vessel to industry or other agencies when it is not operating for IODP. NSF does not own the ship and therefore cannot make any profits. There are still a number of legal issues to solve because the vessel belongs to TRANSOCEAN, a private company, though most of the scientific equipment belongs to NSF.

The situation for JAMSTEC is different. JAMSTEC owns the *CHIKYU* and the budget has not changed, however the operation costs are higher than those envisaged at the beginning of the Programme. Because the *CHIKYU* was financed on tax-payers money, JAMSTEC will contract the *CHIKYU* to other ministries or government agencies in Japan rather than industry.

For Phase II of IODP, it is anticipated that the *JOIDES* will operate for 7-8 months of the year for IODP. The *CHIKYU* will operate for 5 months in riser mode and 2 months in riser-less mode. For both vessels, the agencies have to cover the day rate even when they are not operating. ECORD hopes to implement one *MSP* expedition every two years unless ECORD succeeds in raising additional funds. The remaining time the *JOIDES* and the *CHIKYU* will be used for commercial operations, or for projects for other government agencies. Because there is a trade-off between the number of days and the complexity of the expeditions, any increase in the cost of operations will have an impact in the number of days that the vessel can work for IODP. How the schedule of the expeditions will be impacted by leasing the vessels to industry or other agencies is not yet completely assessed. There is also the risk of discouraging new IODP membership, if it is possible to lease the ship. MEXT also informed IODP Council that the *CHIKYU* has experienced problems with the riser. Three of the tensioners that support the riser system were damaged. The tensioners have been sent to Rotterdam, to the company that build them. The reason for the failure is still unknown. As a consequence drilling in riser mode is delayed until January 2009. This delay is likely due both to technical and financial issues.

The Lead Agencies presented the expenses since the beginning of the programme.

	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Program Plan (a)</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>52.6</b>
<b>Carryforward</b>		<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.9</b>
<b>Cumulative Total (b)</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>110.6</b>	<b>148.3</b>	<b>199.0</b>
<b>LEAD AGENCIES</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>34.9</b>
<b>Cumulative Total</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>114.8</b>	<b>149.7</b>
<b>% Total Program</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>ECORD</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>14.5</b>
<b>Cumulative Total</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>21.8</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>44.1</b>
<b>% Total Program</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>China</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>Cumulative Total</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<b>% Total Program</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Interim Asian Consortium</b>			<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Cumulative Total</b>			<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.</b>
<b>% Total Program</b>			<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>

For ECORD, the figures exclude the mobilization costs.

The table is now inaccurate because for 2007 it includes the expenses planned for New Jersey. C. Mével indicated that she will keep the LAs updated on the expenditures of ESO.

#### IODP FY08 Program Plan

Normally, the Annual Program Plan (APP) is submitted by IODP-MI to the LAs in spring, then approved by SASEC in June and the LAs give their final approval in August. However, this year, there are still many uncertainties, due to the refit of the JOIDES Resolution, and to the implementation of MSP expeditions. The draft Program Plan presented at the IODP Council reached a total of 184 M\$ (POCs+SOCs) and did not meet the budget guidance. The LAs informed that the figures will change. In particular, the Implementing Organisations (IOs) were set up considering 1 year of ship work. Under the new conditions they need to decrease their size.

#### IODP-MI Triennium Review

A review of IODP-MI was conducted last fall at the request of the LAs, by a committee chaired by Mike Coffin. The LAs are impressed by the thorough review. The BoG is in charge of considering and possibly implementing the recommendations. One of its recommendations, as O. Eldholm mentioned, is the merging of the two IODP-MI offices.

ECORD representatives at the IODP Council stressed the importance to keep the community informed of the financial difficulties the programme is facing, and the consequences on the drilling activities. The LAs agreed and said they would come back for a joint action. However to this date nothing happened.

#### *Discussion*

K. Gillis questioned the idea of inviting non-IODP scientists. She said Canada would prefer to give more opportunities to scientists coming from countries that pay their contributions to the Programme. R. Schorno clarified that these berths will not come from ECORD berths. C. Mével explained that the additional berths will be used for different purposes: more technical support, training programmes, additional scientists, etc... N. Wardell noted that there is always a long list of applicants that are not



invited and that they should be in priority if there are extra berths available. S. Dürr said that in order to find the scientific expertise needed in each case, a competition for the additional berths should be opened.

The Council agreed that scientific expertise should prevail over nationality at the moment of adjudicating the extra berths. The next day the following motion was passed:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-5**

ECORD Council agrees that in case additional berths are offered preference should be given to scientific qualification.

R. Schorno moved, C. Franklin seconded, all in favour

S. Dürr insisted on the need for more open communication. C. Mével commented that probably the LAs have difficulties to communicate among themselves. K. Gillis noted that information is coming from JOI but not from the LAs. ECORD Council agreed in the necessity of keeping the scientific community informed and the following action was decided

ACTION EMA: To communicate Council's request to the Lead Agencies for a more open and effective official information on the current situation of the Programme.

**Agenda Item 7- ESSAC report (Gilbert Camoin).**

ESSAC matters

ESSAC Office officially started in Aix en Provence on October 1<sup>st</sup>. The handover from Cardiff was very smooth and efficient. The new staff in the ESSAC Office is composed by: Gilbert Camoin, Chair; Bonnie Wolf-Boenisch, Scientific Coordinator and Mirthysse Joanides, in charge of ESSAC budget. G. Camoin presented the new logo for ESSAC. Many council members expressed their concern about having a new logo for ESSAC. All ECORD entities, EMA, ESO and ESSAC should try to homogenize their logos. ESO and EMA have already a logo based on the ECORD logo. It was recommended to ESSAC to work together in this direction.

G. Camoin reported that at its last meeting in Granada, ESSAC thanked warmly C. MacLeod, J. Pearce, F. Lenci and E. Urquhart for the outstanding work that they have done over the last two years. ESSAC has been re-structured in three subcommittees to increase its efficiency and the involvement of the ESSAC delegates in ESSAC life. The subcommittees meet electronically to prepare the meetings on general issues and to work on specific issues at the Chair's request. Each subcommittee is coordinated by an ESSAC Delegate nominated by the ESSAC Chair. G. Camoin presented the constitution and tasks of ESSAC subcommittees as follows:

*Staffing and Nominations subcommittee*, coordinated by C. MacLeod

*Education and Outreach subcommittee*, coordinated by E. Arnold

*Workshops, Communication and Vision subcommittee*, coordinated by R. Stein

S. Dürr asked how the members of these committees were nominated. G. Camoin replied that people were invited to appoint themselves; however the Chair and the Scientific Coordinator are members of all committees.

Financial situation and consequences for IODP

G. Camoin reported on the Science Planning Committee (SPC) meeting held in Santa Cruz, August 2007. The new fiscal realities will result in only ~7 months of scientific operations per year both on JOIDES Resolution and CHIKYU. In the remaining periods the ships will be used for commercial work. G. Camoin insisted that non-IODP commercial operations will have considerable bearing on scientific programmes in the future mainly in terms of requiring short and long term flexibility and greater speed in IODP expedition scheduling; and in dictating the geographical areas of (scientific) operation of the ships.

SPC approved the concept of ‘Complementary Project Proposals’ (CPP). SPC has designed the evaluation process of a CPP within SAS. If the initial CPP presentation is strong, a single-pass SSEP/SPC review cycle could be sufficient for a SAS judgment of relevance or interest to IODP. At SPC, the CPP review would lead not to inclusion in the regular SPC annual proposal ranking on scientific grounds, but to a separate yes-or-no decision to forward to OTF for potential scheduling. G. Camoin presented the JOIDES Resolution schedule of operations for 2008-2009. He indicated that the delay in the refit of JR has resulted in the removal of the Shatsky Rise Expedition. The first JR expedition has been postponed to May 2008. The first of the Equatorial Pacific Expedition originally scheduled for March-May 09 has been put back to September-November 2008, in place of the Shatsky Rise Expedition. The dates may be adjusted pending final vessel delivery from shipyard.

Expedition		Port (Origin)	Dates <sup>1,2</sup>	Total Days (Port/Sea)	Days at Sea (Transit/Ops)	Co-Chief Scientists	Alliance Contact(s)
Deployment, mobilization, sea trials, transit	N/A	Singapore	1 April - 18 May 08 <sup>1</sup>	47 (15/32)	25/7	N/A	Jack Baldauf
Equatorial Pacific/JdF <sup>3</sup>	317	Honolulu	18 May - 18 July	61 (7/54)	19/35	Mitch Lyle Isabella Raffi	Cédric John
Bering Sea	318	Astoria <sup>4</sup>	18 July - 17 September	61 (3/58)	12/46	Kozo Takahashi Christina Ravelo	Carlos Zarikian
Equatorial Pacific	319	Tomakomai	17 September - 17 November	61 (6/55)	26/29	Heiko Pälike Naokazu Ahagon	Kusali Gamage
Canterbury	321	Tahiti	17 November - 17 January 09	61 (5/56)	11/45	Fulthorpe + ECORD (TBN)?	rg Geldmacher
Wilkes Land <sup>5</sup>	323	Wellington	17 January - 22 March	64 (5/59)	16/43	C. Escutia + ECORD (TBN)?	Adam Klaus
Mariana <sup>6</sup>	TBN	Wellington	22 March - 22 May	61 (5/56)	18/38	TBD	Jay Miller

<sup>1</sup> Dates for expeditions may be adjusted pending final vessel delivery date from shipyard

<sup>2</sup> The start date reflects the initial port call day. The vessel will sail when ready.

<sup>3</sup> The expedition will consist of operations in both the Equatorial Pacific (30 days) and Juan de Fuca (5 days). Following Equatorial Pacific operations, scientists will disembark in San Diego on or about 7 July prior to Juan de Fuca operations.

<sup>4</sup> The port of call is tentative. Note that the port call is split between San Diego (2 days) and Astoria (3 days).

<sup>5</sup> Wilkes Land activities include completion of the Adelie Drift APL.

<sup>6</sup> Although the Mariana expedition is currently shown, the actual implementation of this expedition is awaiting final FY09 budget guidance.

G. Camoin informed Council that scheduling will be based upon “Tier 1” proposals as of 2008. Tier 1 proposals are those proposals that are of highest strategic importance for IODP and should be drilled by 2013. Five or six programmes may be scheduled over 3 years by selecting one tier 1 proposal in each ocean basin. Tier 2 proposals are those of high scientific merit but which may realistically not all get drilled before 2013. Tier 2 proposals will be ranked annually by SPC. The scheduling of tier 2 proposals will depend on several factors such as the budget and the duration of non-IODP work.

In FY08, the Chikyu will operate in riserless mode only. Operations involving the riser are postponed for January 2009 due to the failure of the tensioners. The schedule combines both IODP and non-IODP operations. G. Camoin mentioned that SPC top priorities for FY 10 are in riser mode the expedition: Himalayan climate-tectonic links (prop. #595; Clift et al.), and in riserless mode the CHIKYU expedition: Asian monsoon (prop.#605; Tada et al.).

2007												
US FY07									US FY08			
JP FY H18			JP FY H19									
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
ODS (Oversea's Drilling Shakedown)								Dock		IODP:NanTroSEIZE Stage1 Riserless		

2008												
US FY08									US FY09			
JP FY H19			JP FY H20									
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
IODP Stage1/RL		Dock & Inspection				Non-IODP				IODP:NanTroSEIZE Stage 1 Riserless		

2009												
US FY09									US FY10			
JP FY H20			JP FY H21									
Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
IODP:NanTro Stage2/Riser			Non-IODP			IODP:NanTro Stage2/Riser					IODP R/L ??	

Concerning *MSP* operations, the New Jersey Margin (Exp 313) originally intended for the summer of 2007 has been delayed until FY08. The Great Barrier Reef (Australia; IODP prop. #519) will take place either in FY08 or FY09, depending on the scheduling of the New Jersey Margin operation.

The SPC has not designated any of the 3 *MSP* proposals that are currently in the system as a top priority for FY 10. These include:

- Prop. #548 (Chicxulub impact crater; Morgan et al.).
- Prop. #581 (Gulf of Mexico Coralgall banks; Droxler et al.).
- Prop. #637 (New England hydrogeology; Person et al.).

SPC has decided to revisit the proposals at its next meeting in March 2008.

#### Strategic Scientific Planning. Mission Proposals

G. Camoin reminded Council on the antecedents of the Mission Concept. He informed that three mission proposals were received by IODP-MI for the April 1, 2007 deadline. They each contained conventional constituent drilling proposals bundled together with an umbrella overview. They were reviewed by both the SSEP and an external review panel, and were evaluated by the SPC in Santa Cruz.

G. Camoin summarised the decisions of SPC for each mission proposal as follows:

#### Proposal 713-MP Mission Monsoon :

SPC decided to not designate Proposal 713-MP as a Mission. A detailed planning group (DPG) will be formed to prioritise components of proposal 713-MP.

#### Proposal 719-MP Mission Moho (Ildefonse et al.)

Proposal 719-MP was not designated as a Mission by the SPC. SPC requested that the EDP works with IODP-MI and the IOs to assess the technological needs required to achieve the deep penetrations required for a Mohole.

#### Proposal 720-MP The continental breakup and birth of oceans Mission, (Hopper et al.)

Proposal 720-MP (Birth of oceans) was not designated as a Mission by the SPC.

Given the budget situation, it is unclear whether or not any proposal will ever receive Mission designation in the future.

G. Camoin indicated that there were two requests for "Complex Drilling Proposals" (CDPs). SPC decided to designate Proposal #707-Full2 Sagami Bay Seismic Monitoring (Kobayashi et al.) as a CDP. Proposal 694-Full3 Project IBM - Izu-Bonin-Mariana Arc Evolution (Tatsumi et al.) was not designated as a CDP.

#### Other IODP updates

G. Camoin presented some IODP-MI statistics on proposals. The number of proposals submitted on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2007 has increased notably from the number of proposals received by the October 2006 deadline. G. Camoin emphasized the healthy participation of ECORD which holds 38% of the total active proposals. This is only a few percent under the US (42%) and well above Japan (15%). There are 51 ECORD proposals in total: 10 « Deep Biosphere and subseafloor ocean » (20%), 25 « Environmental change, processes and effects » (49%) and 16 « Solid Earth cycles and geodynamics » (31%). For the last call for submission on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2007, ECORD maintained its presence by submitting 8 proposals.

#### Staffing

G. Camoin presented an update on the staffing of expeditions 314, 315 and 316 (NantroSeiZe).

G. Camoin reported that eight ECORD scientists have been selected for Expedition 317, Equatorial Pacific. Nine ECORD scientists have been selected for Expedition 319, Equatorial Pacific.

For the staffing of the Bearing Sea expedition, G. Camoin informed Council that ESSAC has received 59 applications from twelve ECORD countries and four from non-ECORD countries (including 5 non-eligible applicants and 2 applications for shore-based work). G. Camoin explained the selection process as follows: ESSAC delegates reviewed all applications individually and indicated preference by grouping applicants (0 to 3 stars) based primarily on proposed research, experience and expertise. The ESSAC Nominations and Staffing subcommittee made the final selection. G. Camoin pointed out that the ECORD quota balance was monitored though not rigidly applied. G. Camoin informed Council that at its last meeting, ESSAC decided to forward only the applications with 1 to 3 stars to the IO. The IO should contact ESSAC if their selection deviates significantly from the ESSAC ranking.

The present status of sail applications and quota balance was presented (Table 1). G. Camoin indicated that ESSAC is aware of the need for more active involvement from the scientific community of some ECORD countries in order to encourage applications for IODP expeditions.

The call for the Canterbury Basin Sea Level expedition and Wilkes Land Paleooceanography expedition has been launched, and will appear in EOS between October and November 2007. The ESSAC office is preparing a flyer to be distributed among ECORD entities and within the ECORD scientific community.

#### ESSAC representations in SAS panels

G. Camoin indicated that ESSAC is keen to prepare the rotations of delegates within committees ahead of time as part of the selection process. It was decided in Granada that ESSAC will begin planning SAS panel member rotations two meetings ahead of time.

G. Camoin indicated that at the moment ESSAC had identified:

- 1 rotation at the SPC: R. Pedersen in March 08.
- 3 rotations at the SSEP: J. Backman in Nov 07, and F. Eynaud and J. Konnerup-Madsen in May 08.
- 1 rotation at the EDP: R. Person in June 08.

Sail Applications and Balance at start of Bering Sea staffing process

Member	NEW TOTAL %	OLD TOTAL %	US\$ 2003-06	US\$ 2007	US\$ 2008-13	TOTAL 2003-13 US\$
France	25.2%	23.6%	8 500 000	3 500 000	33 600 000	45 600 000
Germany	25.6%	25.7%	9 250 000	3 500 000	33 600 000	46 350 000
UK	25.2%	23.6%	8 500 000	3 500 000	33 600 000	45 600 000
Sum	75.9%	73.0%	26 250 000	10 500 000	100 800 000	137 550 000
Austria	0.5%	0.6%	200 000	100 000	600 000	900 000
Belgium	0.1%	0.2%	60 000	30 000	180 000	270 000
Canada	1.8%	1.3%	450 000	150 000	2 650 000	3 250 000
Denmark	2.8%	4.2%	1 500 000	500 000	3 000 000	5 000 000
Finland	0.4%	0.6%	199 140	66 380	398 280	663 800
Iceland	0.2%	0.3%	90 000	30 000	288 000	408 000
Ireland	0.6%	0.7%	240 000	120 000	780 000	1 140 000
Italy	1.8%	1.8%	650 000	250 000	2 400 000	3 300 000
The Netherlands	1.6%	1.9%	680 000	210 000	2 016 000	2 906 000
Norway	5.0%	4.7%	1 700 000	700 000	6 600 000	9 000 000
Portugal	0.7%	0.8%	270 000	90 000	864 000	1 224 000
Spain	3.0%	2.4%	850 000	350 000	4 286 000	5 486 000
Sweden	3.0%	5.5%	1 972 500	330 000	3 168 000	5 470 500
Switzerland	2.5%	2.4%	850 000	350 000	3 360 000	4 560 000
Sum	24.1%	27.0%	9 711 640	3 276 380	30 590 280	43 578 300
Total ECORD			35 961 640	13 776 380	131 390 280	181 128 300

Exp 301	Exp 302	Exp 303	Exp 304	Exp 305	Exp 306	Exp 307	Exp 308	Exp 309	Exp 310	Exp 311	Exp 312	Exp 314	Exp 315	Exp 316	Exp 317	Exp 319	Bering	Total berths so far
2	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	1			29
2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	2		4	2	1	2		34
1	2	2	3	1	2	2		2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	6		33
3	6	5	8	6	5	6	5	5	7	5	7	4	8	5	3	8		96
																		0
						1												1
		1							2									3
		1				1												2
												1						1
																		0
																		0
1							1			1					1			4
1							1		1						1			4
1	1			1	1													4
					1													1
					1	1	1					1			1			5
1	2						1							1	1			6
		1		1					1					1		1		5
2	5	3	0	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	1		36
5	11	8	8	8	8	9	8	6	9	7	8	5	9	7	7	9	8	132

Bering Sea applies
4
10
13
27
1
1
6
0
1
0
0
2
3
0
3
8
0
1
26
53

				IF NEW JERSEY INCLUDED (provisional staffing)			
Member	NEW Financial Contribn	NEW Entitle ment	ALLOC (NEW)	Exp 313 NJ	NEW Entitle ment	Berths INCL 313	ALLOC (NEW)
France	25.2%	35.2	-6.2	2	37.5	31	-6.5
Germany	25.6%	35.8	-1.8	2	38.1	36	-2.1
UK	25.2%	35.2	-2.2	2	37.5	35	-2.5
Sum	75.9%	106.3	-10.3	6	113.2	102	-11.2
Austria	0.5%	0.7	-0.7		0.7	0	-0.7
Belgium	0.1%	0.2	0.8		0.2	1	0.8
Canada	1.8%	2.5	0.5	1	2.7	4	1.3
Denmark	2.8%	3.9	-1.9	1	4.1	3	-1.1
Finland	0.4%	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	2	1.5
Iceland	0.2%	0.3	-0.3		0.3	0	-0.3
Ireland	0.6%	0.9	-0.9		0.9	0	-0.9
Italy	1.8%	2.6	1.4		2.7	4	1.3
The Netherlands	1.6%	2.2	1.8		2.4	4	1.6
Norway	5.0%	7.0	-3.0		7.4	4	-3.4
Portugal	0.7%	0.9	0.1		1.0	1	0.0
Spain	3.0%	4.2	0.8		4.5	5	0.5
Sweden	3.0%	4.2	1.8		4.5	6	1.5
Switzerland	2.5%	3.5	1.5		3.8	5	1.2
Sum	24.1%	33.7	2.3	3	35.8	39	3.2
Total ECORD		140	-8.0	9	149		-8.0

Table 1 - Sail Applications and Balance at start of Bearing Sea Expedition staffing process.

### ESSAC Delegates

G. Camoin informed Council on the next rotations of ESSAC Delegates. He reminded Council that the ESSAC Terms of Reference state that the *term-of-office* for ESSAC Delegates and alternates should be reviewed every 3 years. Following the ESSAC #9th meeting, three rotations are expected:

- \* K. Gillis, Canada, to be replaced by M. Riedel
- \* M. Sacchi, Italy, to be replaced by E. Erba
- \* E. Arnold, Sweden, replacement TNA

### Summer Schools

G. Camoin reported on the two ECORD co-sponsored summer schools that took place last summer.

#### *- Urbino Summer School*

Approximately 60 students from around the world attended this summer school, mostly at the graduate student level. The school addressed a wide range of topics with a strong IODP Environmental Change theme. The three-week course combined lectures with practical and informal presentations and fieldwork. About 40 experts (two thirds from ECORD countries) participated in the course.

*The Urbino Summer School was sponsored by: Netherlands Darwin Center for Geobiology, IMAU-Utrecht, Netherlands Research School for Sedimentary Geology (NSG), IMAGES, ECORD, Universities of Urbino and Utrecht and the provinces of Pesaro and Urbino.*

#### *- ECORD Summer School in Paleoceanography*

The summer school took place in Bremen, Germany from August 13-24, 2007. It was organized by G. Wefer & D. Hebbeln. The school combined lectures and exercises on key topics in paleoceanography and featured some important aspects of IODP science:

- The “virtual ship” experience
- The Integrated Ocean Drilling Programme: Facts, Background and Proposals
- Student Day
- IODP-MI Topical Symposium “North Atlantic and Arctic Climate Variability”

The ECORD Summer School in Paleoceanography was sponsored by MARUM, IODP Bremen Core Repository, and GLOMAR – Bremen International Graduate School for Marine Sciences. All at the University of Bremen in Germany.

#### *Summer Schools proposed for 2008*

G. Camoin reminded the Council that two ECORD summer schools will be organized in 2008:

- Bremen Summer School 2008 “The Deep Seafloor Biosphere”.
- Urbino Summer School in Paleoclimatology 2008.

A funding of 7 500€ each has been approved. ESSAC requests an increase in the ECORD Scholarships budget from 10 00€ to 14 000€. This increase will help cover travel expenses for students travelling from Canada. ESSAC Office is preparing the call for applications for scholarships, and should be distributed in December 2007 with deadline on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2008.

With regards to future planning, G. Camoin indicated that a call for Summer Schools applications will be issued with deadline on May 1, 2008. At its spring meeting, ESSAC will discuss at length its strategy for future Summer School activities and make recommendations to the ECORD Council. ESSAC agreed that organisation should commence one year prior to the beginning of the summer school.

### IODP-MI Workshops

Three IODP-MI sponsored workshops were held in 2007. One third of the applications came from ECORD scientists who were selected by the participants as being key attendees at workshops. IODP-MI was able to fund ECORD scientists up to the 7:7:3 quota, on average 6 people for each workshop. The ESSAC Office was given € 5K to help support over-quota scientists and has been working closely with IODP-MI, ESF Magellan and national offices to find funds for remaining scientists. For 2008 only one IODP-MI sponsored workshop is planned: High to ultra high resolution sedimentary records.

### Magellan Workshops

G. Camoin reported that three Magellan Workshops were held in 2007 and that one is planned for 2008. The deadline for the next call is November 15, 2007. The relation with the Steering Committee of the Magellan Workshops has improved. ESF solicited ESSAC input regarding workshop scientific topics and ESSAC propositions have been included in the new ESF call for applicants. The Magellan Steering Committee will meet in Hameln, Germany on February 7-8, 2008.

### EuroFORUM

The next EuroFORUM will take place in Vienna, April 2008 as an Interdivision Session of EGU entitled: "IODP-ICDP EuroFORUM'08: Achievements and perspectives in ocean and continental drilling". Conveners are Gilbert Camoin and Ulrich Harms.

In addition to the main session, more focused sessions could be organized and related to the activities of the EuroFORUM'08 (e.g. « EuroFORUM 2008 - European Collaboration for Implementation of Marine Research on Cores – EuroMARC - »).

### ECORD Distinguished Lectures Programme

G. Camoin reported on the planning schedules for lecturer's tour:

*Dr. Benoît Ildefonse:* U. of Bristol, U. of Liverpool, U. of Durham, Cambridge U. + ongoing discussions regarding lectures in Germany and Czech Republic.

*Dr. Judith McKenzie:* Univ. of Granada, Spain, + ongoing discussions regarding lectures in Croatia, UK, Sweden and France.

*Dr. Paul Wilson:* McGill Univ. and Univ. of Alberta, Canada; Univ. of Geneva, U. of Fribourg and ETH-Zürich in Switzerland + ongoing discussions regarding lectures in Portugal and Finland.

### IODP-MI "DRILLS" Lecturer Programme

G. Camoin noted that the DRILLS Programme has an identical structure to the ECORD version. ESSAC feels that the DRILLS Programme might be not needed, particularly in Europe where it may be redundant with ECORD DLP.

### ESSAC Budget

G. Camoin presented the ESSAC budget request for FY08 (appendix, table 1).

### *Discussion*

S. Dürr expressed his concerns in maintaining two ECORD co-sponsored summer schools running in parallel. R. Schorno pointed out that for FY08, both summer schools were approved at the last ECORD council meeting, as presented by C. MacLeod. K. Gillis noted that the Bremen summer school was planned to cover the three themes of the IODP Initial Science Plan successively. She also indicated that the two summer schools were not redundant but complementary. G. Camoin stated that ESSAC will discuss its long term strategy on summer schools at its next meeting. He suggested a continuation of the discussion at the next council meeting, with more input from ESSAC.

B. Avril suggested that ESF could organize summer schools in partnership with other institutions. Some schemes developed by ESF may be useful for ECORD and ESSAC. He pointed out that conferences on Global Change Systems have been developed in partnership between ESF and VR. R. Belocky replied that the above mentioned conferences have a different format than the summer schools, and consequently this schema developed by ESF could not be used by ESSAC.

At R. Schorno's suggestion, Council agreed to postpone the budget discussion until after the presentation of the ECORD budget and financial situation.

### **Agenda Item 8- ESO report (D. Evans).**

D. Evans informed Council of the sad loss of Tim Brewer, who was the manager of the European Petrophysics Consortium. His sudden death occurred in Barcelona on mid July while attending a conference. Tim Brewer has been succeeded by Dr. Sarah Davies at Leicester University. Dr. Mike Lovell, who is the present Chair of IOPD Science and Technology Panel, will team with Dr. Davies in the first period.

#### FY08 Annual Program Plan

ESO has submitted his Annual Program Plan in May to IODP-MI. It included the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) Expedition on the last quarter of 2008. This proposal was written under the assumption that New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition (NJSS) was completed in 2007. Unfortunately NJSS did not happen and in August 2007, ESO submitted to IODP-MI a revised Program Plan. The last proposal includes NJSS and GBR, if the start of NJSS can be guaranteed for May 2008. In this case, GBR will be implemented in the weather window of September-November 2008. At the moment, the ideal situation of a May start for NJSS is unlikely to happen. However the official position of ESO remains unchanged.

#### New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition

D. Evans provided an update on the current situation of NJSS expedition. He reminded Council that in 2006, DOSSEC was defined as preferred contractor that met the budget allocations. Given the budget restrictions no other platform could be available. In January 2007, ESO was informed that the chosen platform had been involved in an accident. In early February it became clear that this platform would not be available for May. At that 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. After the approval of extra budget, discussions continued with DOSECC, with the aim of leading to contract for 2007. The geotechnical survey was completed and a vibrocore and seismic survey was completed by Alpine Ocean Seismic Survey Inc. By early June, DOSSEC informed ESO that no platform could be available before mid August. At this point, ESO decided to postpone the NJSS Expedition for 2008. If operations begin in August the working period will extend until November. This is well into the bad weather season and involves safety issues and potential supply problems to the platform. Since then, DOSSEC committed to search for alternative platforms for May 2008. The communication with DOSSEC has not been smooth and ESO gave them until the end of September to come up with a feasible plan for 2008. DOSSEC was unable to devise a plan and withdrew from the contract. ESO was then obligated to re-tender and the procedure has started early October with the publication of the call in the Official Journal of European Union. The call will close on November 23.

#### Great Barrier Reef

Following the FY08 Program Plan submitted by ESO to IODP-MI, the GBR Expedition is provisionally scheduled for implementation in the September-November weather window of 2008. D. Evans manifested that if there is any delay, the expedition will have to be postponed one year, because of the weather window. The site survey has been completed but the results are not yet available. The data needs to be approved by the Site Survey Panel. During the preparation phase of the expedition there could be many possible causes for delay: site survey approval, safety approval, contracting and vessel availability, permitting, possible delays in NJSS in 2008. The tender was published in the OJEU and is now closed. One contractor has responded. At this stage, there is no cost involved.

D. Evans informed Council about the permit situation. In February 2007, a successful meeting was held with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). After this meeting, an official application for drilling was submitted. However, on July 10, 2007, ESO received an email from GBRMPA stating they may reject the application on the grounds that the proposed activity is inconsistent with Section 38 of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act. ESO interpreted from this message that GBRMPA may suspect that the drilling data could be used by industry for mineral prospecting or oil exploration. ESO immediately responded to these concerns with a detailed letter as well as a support letter from Keir Becker, Chairman of SPC. In co-ordination with Dave Falvey (Executive Director, Physics, Chemistry & Geoscience at the Australian Research Council) a personal response and 3 excellent letters from senior Australian scientists were sent to the GBRMPA. In the meantime, Australia announced that they will join IODP.



Despite all these activities, GBRMPA notified ESO early this month that the application was refused. ESO will appeal and IODP Australia will be key to overturn this decision. D. Evans stated that the case is politically sensitive.

#### *Discussion*

S. Dürr asked D. Evans for more information concerning the political issue mentioned. D. Evans responded that they are oil companies who are interested in prospecting in the Jason area and that GBRMPA does not want to open the possibility for oil drilling in the park. Additionally, there is a federal election in early December and that environmental protection is a key issue.

F. Barriga asked if the Park Authority considers the drilling operation itself to be too disruptive for the environment. D. Evans responded that he does not believe this to be the case. He insisted that IODP Australia has a good chance in overturning the decision and that ESO will be working closely with them. D. Evans asked Council for advice and invited Council members to comment on the letter of response that he is preparing for the GBRMPA. R. Schorno commented that a rise in sea level and its impacts on the preservation of the Great Barrier Reef, should be critical elements for the Park Authority. G. Camoin pointed out that GBRMPA has authorised the site survey cruise, which included seismic, multibeam and also dredging which is very disruptive to the environment.

#### Future Expeditions

Following the SPC meeting in August, no additional proposals for *MSP* operations have been received by the Operational Task Force (OTF). The three existing proposals will therefore be re-ranked on March 2008.

- New England Hydrogeology: No new developments. The third attempt to get the site survey funded by NSF failed and it is very unlikely that the survey will be funded in the future.
- Coralgal Banks, Gulf of Mexico: This proposal does not arise great enthusiasm in the IODP community, although it is ranked closely to the Chicxulub.
- Chicxulub: This is a very expensive proposal. Proponents have been advised to recheck the total cost of the expedition such that a maximum of 12 000 000 USD is not exceeded, and to re-submit the proposal for re-ranking on March. D. Evans indicated that he does not know how this maximum figure was decided. He said that no other proposals for *MSP* operations will be considered in March.

#### Arctic – Industry & (IODP)

D. Evans confirmed C. Mével's report on the contacts made by M. Talwani regarding a possible meeting with oil industry representatives. The aim will be the constitution of a consortium to run an expedition in the Arctic. The consortium will be outside IODP, but could be an opportunity for IODP scientists to participate and/or to acquire data from the expedition. The meeting was originally planned for October, but has been delayed and there are no new developments.

D. Evans remarked ESO receives funds from ECORD to work within the IODP, though many of the present issues fall outside the IODP. He indicated that ESO is ready to cooperate in the preparation of workshops with industry representatives, and considers these workshops within ESO's broad outreach duties. D. Evans indicated that if the consortium is formed outside IODP, ESO will not be involved.

#### *Discussion*

K. Gillis asked for clarification as to why the head of IODP-MI is approaching industry to do non-IODP projects in a challenging environment. D. Evans responded M. Talwani hopes that this will benefit IODP scientists if they choose to participate. C. Mével added that during the SPC meeting in Santa Cruz, she and D. Evans asked M. Talwani for clarification concerning the relationship with industry in the case of ECORD since we do not own a platform. No clear answer was received, except the benefit for the scientific community. .

#### ESO FINANCES

D. Evans presented the ESO Financial Statement FY07 for SOC's to Council. The ESO expenditure was 1 613 059 USD, which is marginally less than what was predicted at the revised Annual Program Plan presented to IODP-MI on July.

While presenting ESO Financial Statement for POCs, D. Evans, indicated that the total expenditure in POCs was 881,730.23 USD because NJSS Expedition did not take place this year. This amount includes:

- Management and Administration costs
- Preparation for New Jersey
- Travel
- Geotechnical survey (around 30% of total)

Due to BGS holding funds from 2006 (\$6,285,410), no invoice has been issued to CNRS in 2007. D. Evans asked ECORD Council to accept ESO FY2007 accounts.

At R. Schorno's suggestion, ECORD Council postponed the decision until the next day in order to provide council members with sufficient time to study the accounts presented.

#### *FY08 Requirements*

Given the present tender and permit situation for NJSS and GBR, D. Evans indicated that it is very unlikely to run both expeditions next year. For FY 08, ESO requires ECORD Council to set a maximum budget for the New Jersey expedition of 12,000,000 USD. Evidently, ESO will make every effort to keep the total cost under this figure, but this limit allows ESO some flexibility for contracting.

#### *Future Work*

If the GBR Expedition is implemented on late 2009, it will stand on FY09 and FY10. Therefore by the end of FY10, ECORD could have finished both expeditions on-shore and off-shore without taking funds from FY11.

Beyond GBR, targets are uncertain. If Chicxulub is ranked, ECORD Council should consider saving up for three years or more in order to implement one proposal. This perspective contradicts ECORD objectives of having one *MSP* per year, and SASEC hopes for a minimum of one *MSP* every two years. If ECORD could have the support of the European Commission thorough an ERA Net +, the situation could improve greatly.

#### *Discussion*

Considering the presence of observers at the meeting, R. Schorno asked Council members if there are any objections to continuing the discussion on finances in their presence. S. Dürr indicated that similar situations have occurred in the past. Personally, he said, he was not completely comfortable having financial discussions open to observers. However he agreed under condition of confidentiality of the figures being discussed. D. Evans concurred and added that because of tenders, industry should not have access to budget information. ECORD Council agreed to continue the meeting asking observers to respect the confidentiality of the discussions carried out.

In order to provide Council members a sufficient amount of time to revise and understand the financial statements before approval, R. Schorno indicated that all financial related information should be given in advance and be included in the agenda book for the meeting.

R. Schorno further stated that Council should not only organise its savings for *MSP* operations, but should also follow ESSAC's support requirements for its activities. He said that even though these are smaller expenditures, they are important for the future coordination of European activities. He suggested continuing with the EMA presentation in order to have a global vision of the budget requirements from ESO, ESSAC and EMA.

#### **Agenda Item 9- EMA report (C. Mével).**

##### IODP level

C. Mével presented the new schedule for operations on FY08 and early FY09. The modified schedule includes a three months reduction in drilling operations for *SODV* due to delays in the refitting of the vessel. JAMSTEC had informed that the *CHIKYU* experienced problems with the riser system and

will not be able to work in riser-mode in 2008. EMA was given the opportunity to comment on the FY08 APP in May, before the IODP council meeting. A new version was submitted in August 2007, with reduced ship time. In response to reduced ship time, CDEX has cut the POCs and USIO the SOC's (see appendix, table 2). EMA has officially asked the Lead Agencies the reason for this major difference. No answer has yet been received.

FY 08 is a transition year with only four months of operation time for the *SODV* and five months of operation time for the *CHIKYU* in riserless-mode. For *MSPs* the situation is still uncertain. Consequently, EMA has sent a letter to the LAs in September requesting modification of the SOC/POC ratio for ECORD. A reduction of two million USD in the ECORD's SOC's contribution to the Programme would be in accordance with the overall reduction in drilling time. No answer had yet been received, although the LAs held a meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup>.

There is an agreement that the US and Japan IOs should cut their costs in light of the present financial situation, and that IODP-MI remains too expensive. The LAs, however, seem to protect their operators. The LAs also want to reconsider the structure of the Science Advisory Structure (SAS) as well as their operating costs. Although the SAS is not funded through commingled funds, their support comes from the same funding sources.

- CEDEX: JAMSTEC organized an inauguration ceremony for the start for the start of the first IODP expedition, NANTROSEIZE, in September. C. Mével informed Council that she attended the ceremony on behalf of ECORD, but was not given the opportunity to make a presentation.

- USIO: The start date for operations is still undecided. The Singapore shipyard is overbooked and there are delays. Transocean, the owner of the ship, is trying to accelerate the process. Information from Steve Bohlen (USIO) indicates that the delivery of the *JR* is anticipated in "spring to summer" 2008.

#### At the European level

C. Mével reminded Council that the *Deep Sea Frontier Initiative (DSF)*, was launched by the ECORD Council following discussion with the EC. The initiative resulted in a call for a 'coordination action' in FP7. The proposal was coordinated by Phil Weaver (NOC) and was submitted to the EC on May 2007. Unfortunately the proposal was not funded.

C. Mével indicated that the FP7 Work Plan for 2009 will soon be finalised. A meeting of all ERA Nets in environment is scheduled for October 30<sup>th</sup>, C. Mével and S. Winkler-Nees will attend.

C. Mével informed Council that A. Edwards has moved to another position at the EC. Pascal Le Grand will take over his tasks at the EC. A. Edwards encouraged keeping alive the DSF initiative although the Commission is not ready to sustain it financially.

C. Mével presented the *Aberdeen Declaration*, which was prepared at the meeting held on June 2007. R. Schorno stated that he has received copies of the declaration, and that these copies will be distributed to the Council.

#### Attracting new members

C. Mével reported that John Ludden had made new contacts in Poland at the Polish Geological Institute in Warszawa. Jerzy Nawrocki, Scientific Director, is willing to submit a proposal to the Polish Ministry. C. Mével had offered her help in preparing the proposal as EMA Director. C. Mével also indicated that two Polish scientists have submitted applications to sail in the Bering Sea expedition. She suggested ESSAC to check with IODP-MI if one of these scientists may receive 'guest scientist' status. ECORD could cover the travel expenses to join the ship.

C. Mével informed Council that a workshop for scientists from non-ECORD European member countries is being organised under the frame of ECORD Net, in cooperation with ESSAC. The workshop will be held in Edinburgh next spring. ESSAC will help to identify scientists/universities to be invited and speakers within the ECORD community.

#### ECORD Information Database

The ECORD Information Database has been launched. It archives and reflects an up-to-date framework of the ECORD participation in IODP. The database is now functional and accessible on the ECORD website ( <http://ecordbase.ecord.org/> ). The ECORD council members have received an Email from Patricia Maruejol with a password-protected access. They are encouraged to consult the database and send comments to Patricia.

#### Outreach

EMA will participate in the booth at AGU (Dec 07) organised by IODP-MI. EMA is organising the booth at EGU in 2008 as well as the ECORD-ICDP joint Town hall meeting. EMA also plans to have a booth at the IGC conference in Oslo next August, and ECORD will be in charge of the manning (because it is in Europe). The Norwegian IODP committee has agreed to help.

ECORD Newsletter #9 was published and distributed early October. The Newsletter #10 will be ready for distribution in April 2008. The call for contributions ends early February.

The ECORD leaflet has been modified with the new addresses of the ESSAC office. C. Mével invited all Council members to direct their request of ECORD materials to Patricia Maruejol.

C. Mével informed Council that two new promotional brochures are in preparation. The first one called “European science programming for ocean research drilling”, is being prepared by NWO in coordination with ESSAC. It aims to advertise the role of ESSAC and the involvement of the ECORD science community in IODP. The second brochure aims to advertise the accomplishments of ECORD during the first phase of IODP. C. Mével indicated that either a professional publisher company or the BGS could be contracted. The brochure will be funded under the ECORD Net project and probably a special authorization from the EC will be required.

#### EMA Budget FY08

C. Mével presented Council the EMA budget requirement for FY08 together with EMA financial statement for FY07 (see appendix, table 3). She indicated that overall EMA has remained within the budget approved for FY07. However, there have been instances where expenses have been distributed differently from what was planned. For instance, in FY07 EMA had not received any funding request for supporting SAS/ECORD meetings (18 000 € originally budgeted), though the completion of the ECORD Information Database required funds (16 240 €) that were not initially planned.

For FY08, EMA requested a similar budget as for FY07. C. Mével reminded Council that around two thirds of EMA budgeted is funded through ECORD Net and the requirement from ECORD commingled funds is 85 000 €. R. Schorno noted that FY08 will be the last year that ECORD Net will fund part of the EMA budget unless an ECORD Net + is funded by EC.

A final statement of the costs of the ECORD evaluation was also presented to the Council (see appendix, table 4). The total cost (travel costs for the committee members, printing) amounts 24 354 €. It was covered from ECORD-Net funds.

#### ECORD Budget FY08 and beyond

C. Mével presented the Budget situation for Phase II of IODP (see appendix, table 5). Some decisions have been made since the last Council meeting in June 2007, but there are still uncertainties. Italy has secured its budget increase at the level 400 000 \$. Iceland remains at the same level of 30 000 \$. There is no new information from Belgium. Kathy Gillis pointed out that Canada paid its contributions in Canadian dollars. The exchange rate has changed and as a consequence, the figure should be

200 000 USD. Denmark will remain in ECORD but the level of contribution will be decided in December. R. Schorno remarked that a proposal to increase the contribution from Netherlands is pending. In Portugal, the situation is also pending. F. Barriga informed that a meeting of IODP-ECORD Portugal and government representatives is being organised for January 2008 in hopes of increasing their contribution.

C. Mével emphasized that the overall situation is quite good. However, even in the optimistic situation, ECORD budget for phase II remains below 22.4 M \$ (4 P.U.). R. Schorno noted the UK has secured its funds until 2013. S. Dürr asked about the commitment of French funds. C. Mével responded that the change in government has affected budget priorities at all levels, but hopefully this will not affect ECORD in FY08.

C. Mével stated she will need to clarify an issue with ESO before presenting the ECORD financial statement. She requested to postpone finalizing the budget discussion until the following morning. R. Schorno suggested that Council finalize the discussion of finances and the approval of ESSAC, EMA and ESO budgets the following day.

R. Schorno suggested S. Winkler-Nees include the Aberdeen report in his presentation the next day. S. Winkler-Nees agreed and invited Council members to check the Aberdeen Declaration, which was available at the table.

The discussion continued on the issues raised during the morning by O. Eldholm's presentation. R. Schorno summarized the points for discussion:

- Direction for the future of ECORD in IODP
- Integration in IODP
- Situation and location of IODP-MI office

C. Mével asked Council for advice with regards to the Lead Agencies. She indicated that the LAs have not been responsive to EMA's requests. C. Franklin suggested asking the LAs about the process they are going through, without putting pressure on them. S. Dürr manifested that ECORD should be informed since it is a contributing member. ECORD is willing and able to take responsibility of the Programme and should be involved in the decision-making processes. C. Franklin agreed and suggested sending the message that ECORD is ready to help but needs to be informed. R. Schorno asked if ECORD should impose a deadline on the LAs for a response. C. Mével reminded that ECORD is also in a difficult situation with *MSP* expeditions. S. Dürr manifested that the financial commitment of ECORD for 2008 is very close to the target and that the problems with the *MSP* operation are technical rather than financial. C. Franklin emphasized the need to help NSF to put pressure on to get more funding in the USA. R. Schorno asked if the European Commission could intervene with the NSF. I. Conesa indicated that there is a cooperation agreement between the EC and the US. ECORD could submit a request to Direction D, which is in charge of international cooperation. S. Dürr reminded Council that NSF has a representative in Paris and suggested inviting the NSF representative to the next Council meeting to be held in Paris. To conclude this part of the discussion, the following action was decided:

**ACTION EMA:** To invite NSF's representative to the next Council meeting (to be held in Paris).

R. Schorno encouraged the participants to continue discussing the issues suggested by O. Eldholm and asked him to prioritize the points to be discussed. O. Eldholm indicated that the most urgent issue relates to the integrated nature of the Programme. He stated that the reduction of the IODP-MI offices could have a negative impact in the integrated nature of IODP and the savings made might not be as significant as required.

R. Schorno indicated that Europe could perhaps take over some of the tasks that IODP-MI will be obligated to drop in light of the present financial situation. For example, ESSAC is already running the ECORD Distinguished Lectures Programme. O. Eldholm indicated that the reduction in the number of

offices is a political decision and that ECORD has no influence in the decision process. He also said that the BoG review committee has already recommended the transfer of education to the individual IODP members and that this recommendation has been approved at all levels. O. Eldholm insisted that IODP-MI guarantees the integrated nature of the Programme and that at this time there are no other models available.

Based on informal conversations, C. Mével has the impression that NSF is pushing for more independence. NSF and MEXT control the POCs, which represent by far most of the costs O. Eldholm replied by questioning if Europe is better served if NSF and MEXT run the Programme entirely or by a stronger integrated activity, which includes European participation. R. Schorno mentioned that ECORD has been actively asking the LAs for more participation in the Programme. As a result ECORD has received the APP earlier this year and was able to have an input in the definition of the Program Plan. Quoting C. Franklin, R. Schorno reminded Council that ECORD's representation in the BoG is the way in which it participates in the governance of the Programme. It is important to maintain IODP-MI strong; otherwise all decisions will be made by the LAs. S. Winkler-Nees proposed to include this point in the discussion of the Vision Group. C. Mével and C. Franklin agreed and insisted in the importance of having the discussion in a wider context.

O. Eldholm called to separate what will happen after 2013 from the immediate decisions that will be taken in December 2007. He reiterated the need of a mandate from ECORD Council to the BoG members for the current Program Plan.

The Council named S. Winkler-Nees, S. Dürr and C. Franklin to prepare a motion to be voted on the next day. Thereafter the following motions were passed the next day:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-6**

ECORD Council strongly favours streamlining the IODP organizational structure but without endangering the integrative nature of the Programme.

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

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-7**

ECORD Council encourages the Lead Agencies to do everything in their power to seek funds to retain IODP activities in a way that there are continuous operations year round. ECORD will do everything it can to assist the Lead Agencies in this endeavour.

C. Franklin moved, A. Carlson seconded, all in favour.

It was agreed that all discussions will be recorded in the minutes and that they should be approved by the end of November. Therefore the ECORD BoG members can make use of them at its next meeting.

**Tuesday October 23**

**Agenda Item 10- ECORD FY08 funding situation and beyond (C. Mével).**

C. Mével explained that there was a misunderstanding between ESO and EMA during the preparation of the financial statement. As a consequence, there is a mistake in one of the tables posted before the meeting. She apologized for the inconvenience.

C. Mével summarised ECORD financial statement between 2004-2007 (see appendix, table 6). ECORD has pooled more than 49 M\$, while 4 P.U. amount to 48 M\$. However, the 49 M\$ include mobilisation costs, and the ESSAC and EMA budget.

Table 8 of the appendix summarizes the situation at the end of FY07. Currently ECORD has a reserve of 8.2 M\$. In FY06, ESO did not spend all the money allocated because the NJ expedition was postponed. In FY07, the expedition was postponed again. As a result in FY07, ESO did not invoice

EMA, and still has a positive balance of 5 403 678 US\$. In addition, EMA also has a positive balance of 2 800 476 US\$. CNRS-INSU has a new financial director who has agreed to invest the funds. The money will be available next April, and will bring in 50 000 US\$.

The FY08 budget will be between 21.4 and 21.8 M\$ (see appendix, table 8). ECORD has agreed to pay 3 PU (Participation Unit) in SOC's to NSF (16.8 M\$). Adding the reserve and the ICDP contribution, the available budget for MSPs is the order of 12.4 (minimum) to 12.9 (maximum) M\$, once the 16.8 M\$ in SOC's and the ESSAC and EMA budgets have been deducted (see appendix, table 9).

For FY08, EMA has requested LAs to reduce ECORD's contribution in SOC's by 2 M\$, but the negotiation is still ongoing.

D. Evans apologised for the error in the financial statement presented earlier to the Council and according with the budget for FY08 he recommended Council to approve ESO budget to the maximum available to give ESO enough flexibility in contracting. He enforced the fact that ESO will make all possible efforts to keep the expending as low as possible and certainly for NJSS under the 12M \$

S. Dürr noticed that the amounts managed by EMA and ESO are big enough to provide enough interests to cover EMA and/or ESSAC budget. The 50 000 US\$ mentioned by C. Mével seemed small for a capital of around 8M US\$. C. Mével clarified that the amount invested is only the 2 M\$ at CNRS-INSU, the rest ~ 5M\$ is with ESO. BGS had indicated they have administrative restrictions to do the same. D. Evans reminded that BGS had invoiced EMA in 2006 considering the immediateness of NJSS. When it became clear that NJSS would not be implemented in 2007, BGS did not invoice EMA for the remaining 2M US\$. S. Dürr recommended that EMA should transfer the funds to BGS as late as possible. C. Mével said that for contracting BGS needs to have the money in the bank. D. Evans clarified that only the contract between EMA and ESO is needed. He indicated that in the future ESO could delay the invoice if needed. R. Schorno asked if BGS could send the money back to CNRS-INSU. C. Mével responded that it is not possible because of contracting clauses.

Regarding the signature of Annex H for FY08, C. Mével indicated that EMA will send the document for signature to all members except Portugal and Denmark which are still pending. F. Barriga asked to send the Annex H for 90 000 US\$. R. Schorno indicated that NWO is considering to increase its contribution to 400 000US\$ and asked EMA to wait until the final amount is decided. C. Mével concluded indicating that EMA will send together with the Annex H, the new table stating contributions by country for the second phase of IODP.

R. Schorno continued the discussion on ESO budget, indicating that from the FY08 budget presented by C. Mével, even in the minimum scenario there is enough money to consent ESO's request for a maximum of 12M US\$ for NJSS Expedition. C. Mével commented that 12 M US\$ seems expensive compared with ACEX, but NJSS is a 3 months expedition. C. Franklin noticed that ESO budget does not include the costs of the onshore science party. They will be included in FY09. R. Schorno noticed that oil prices could continue to grow and consequently ESO budget could change significantly. D. Evans responded that if issues regarding tenders arise he will inform Council rapidly and effectively.

D. Evans clarified that ESO is asking for a maximum of 12 M US\$ for NJSS but is also asking to include in ESO's budget the maximum available. The maximum budget will allow ESO enough flexibility to prepare Great Barrier Reef Expedition. He asserted that BGS will not invoice EMA if not needed. However, BGS needs a contract signed with EMA to proceed with preparations for GBR.

Council agreed to ESO request but insisted that the money should be transferred as late as possible to avoid losing money in interests and in exchange rates.

The following motion was passed:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-8**

ECORD Council approves a maximum budget of 12 000 000 US\$ for the New Jersey Expedition and a total budget for FY08 to the maximum available to allow ESO to prepare the Great Barrier Reef Expedition.

R. Schorno moved, S. Dürr seconded, all in favour except one abstention (C. Franklin)

*To formally approve the BGS accounts (see appendix, table 10), the following motion was approved electronically after the meeting:*

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-11**

ECORD Council approves the BGS FY07 accounts as presented by ESO.

R. Schorno moved, S. Dürr seconded, all in favour except two abstentions (C. Franklin, F. Barriga)

The EMA budget was presented for voting. C. Mével indicated that EMA budget is similar to what was requested in FY07. The global EMA budget is 280 000 € from which EMA is requesting Council 85 000 €. The rest is covered by ECORD Net funds. The following motion was passed:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-9**

ECORD Council approves the FY08 budget of € 280 000 presented by EMA. Of this total budget, € 85 000 will be covered from ECORD commingled funds, the remaining € 195 000 from ECORD-net funds. The EMA budget includes salaries.

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

R. Schorno introduced the discussion of ESSAC budget and G. Camoin asked to leave the room. C. Mével presented and explained ESSAC budget. In relation with the Distinguished Lecturers Programme (DLP), R. Schorno reminded Council it is very likely that some money will be carried over from the budget approved for FY07 because of the late start of the programme. He suggested using the leftover from Cardiff to cover the DLP budget for FY09.

R. Schorno proposed that ESSAC budget for outreach activities could be covered by ECORD Net. C. Mével asked I. Conesa, if promotional material could be covered by ECORD Net. I. Conesa responded that it is possible if they are part of the designated activities of the project. R. Schorno indicated that ESSAC activities were included in the ECORD Net project.

Regarding ESSAC requested budget for scholarships, S. Dürr suggested that a single scholarship cannot exceed 1400 US\$.

C. Mével explained that the overall ESSAC budget for FY08 is less than the FY07 budget approved for the Cardiff Office because salaries are counted differently in France.

The following motion was passed:

**ECORD Council motion 07-03-10**

ECORD Council approves a budget of € 143 500 for 2008 for ESSAC. This budget includes € 14 000 for scholarships for the FY08 Summer Schools. The amount for one scholarship cannot exceed € 1 400. All funds remaining at the University of Cardiff for the FY07 Distinguished Lectures Series will be transferred to Aix en Provence and considered in FY09 ESSAC budget. The € 5 000 requested for outreach and exhibition support are not included and should be covered from ECORD-net funds

R. Schorno moved, N. Wardell seconded, all in favour

S. Dürr indicated that ECORD should be fully accountable for the management of the Programme and asked EMA to explore mechanisms and costs to carry out an audit of ECORD finances.



ACTION EMA: To explore the mechanisms to carry out an audit of ECORD finances and to inform at the next Council meeting.

R. Schorno proposed a change in the agenda and the meeting continued with Aurora Borealis presentation.

**Agenda Item 11- ERICON Project - Aurora Borealis (P. Egerton).**

P. Egerton thanked C. Mével and ECORD's Chair for the invitation to present the ERICON-AB Project. The proposal was submitted within FP7 for the preparatory phase. The proposal was well evaluated and the contract is currently under negotiations with the EC.

P. Egerton indicated that the German Federal Ministry for Science and Education (BMBF) is funding a portion of the preparatory work for AURORA BOREALIS. (Approx: 5 Mill EUR, 2007-09). The funding requested to EC under ERICON-AB proposal is 4.5 M€ (2008-11). The total for management and technical development is 9.5 M€.

The Coordinator/Political Director is Dr. Paul Egerton - European Science Foundation- and the Executive Manager is Dr. Nicole Biebow – Alfred Wegener Institute. 16 Partners (Funding Agencies, Scientific institutes, Companies) of 10 European Nations are participating. Contract signature is estimated for late November 2007 and the start of project for January 2008.

P. Egerton made a detailed presentation on the structure of the ERICON Consortium and on the workpackages included in the project. He indicates that ECORD is directly involved in Workpackage 3: "International Access to the Polar Research Facility" which is coordinated by Russia. Specifically ECORD is directly concerned in Task 3.1.

*Discussion*

P. Egerton clarified that ECORD is represented by CNRS-INSU as EMA is the legal representative of ECORD.

R. Schorno asked when ECORD could use Aurora Borealis as a legal instrument to negotiate with the LAs. P. Egerton responded that ERICON-AB project is the preparatory phase for the Aurora Borealis vessel and it should be considered as a process that will conduct to the construction of the ship. He indicated that Aurora Borealis could be used as an *MSP* for drilling the Arctic regions for some periods every year. P. Egerton concluded that ERICON consortium should be very flexible to incorporate ECORD and IODP in all the phases of the project.

Reviewing the list of participants, R. Schorno noted that Ireland and Iceland are members of ECORD, which are not participating in ERICON-AB. P. Egerton responded that the project is open to include more participants, specifically he indicated that contacts have been made with Iceland (RANNIS).

D. Evans asked who will provide expertise on drilling. P. Egerton responded that they relied in Alfred Wegener Institute to establish the right contacts in the right institutions. D. Evans asked if commercial companies have been contacted. N. Biebow indicated that the technical requirements and designs for drilling are included in the tender process and consequently will be done by a commercial company. R. Schorno suggested putting in place some mechanisms to involve ECORD Scientific Operator in the technical design of the Aurora Borealis. P. Egerton acknowledged the suggestion and indicated that ESSAC and ESO should be included in future scientific and technical meetings.

S. Winkler-Nees asked whether contacts have been established between ERICON and industry. N. Biebow responded that Aurora Borealis is not a riser vessel and consequently cannot be used for oil prospecting however oil industry is interested in the scientific work that will be carried out. Aurora Borealis will be very well suited to survey the ecological conditions of the Arctic and oil companies are interested in this service. She clarified that the consortium is not looking at this stage for companies to share building costs of the ship. If private companies were paying for the ship they would like to share

ship time according with their interest, which could be in contradiction with scientific plans for the vessel. She also indicated that Aurora Borealis is planned to introduce brand new technology, in particular the dynamic positioning in ice covered waters. She indicated that this technological development is of great interest for industry but how to deal with possible technological transfer has not been discussed yet. S. Winkler-Nees observed that if industry is sharing the construction costs of the European vessel they would be interested in using the ship, very likely, during the best weather window.

**Agenda Item 12- FP7 report (Ivan Conesa).**

I. Conesa presented the ERA-NET scheme in FP7. S. Winkler-Nees commented that under FP7 the reinforcement of the ERA-NET scheme implies broadening and deepening the scope of the existing ERA-NETs. Thereafter, he considered important to further develop the ideas within ECORD's Vision and Strategy discussion.

I. Conesa presented the ERA-NET + scheme where member states contribute to a joint trans-national call (67%) and EU contributes funding for research, up to 33% of the joint call. He indicated that ERA-NET+ scheme apply to a single joint call. I. Conesa indicated that ECORD has started a good lobbying with Programme Committee representatives. At the last meeting of the Programme Committee, some countries have already expressed their interest in funding an ERA-NET+ for ECORD. He indicated that not everything is settled but there is a good opportunity for ECORD to be eligible for an ERA NET+. I. Conesa indicated that ERA-NET+ does not fund administration or coordination, the EU funding is specifically aimed at research. S. Winkler-Nees added that under the ERA-NET+ scheme, all the ECORD Net activities could not be funded. Consequently, the national funding agencies will need to take over the management and administration expenses of the project.

I. Conesa explained in detail the functioning, concept, legal basis, objectives and specificities of the ERA-NET+ schema, and suggested ECORD Council members to answer the question if an ERA-NET+ scheme is the most appropriate tool for the development of ECORD. He insisted to mention that ERA-NET+ scheme funds only one call over a maximum of 5 years.

Several Council members reacted at the information presented by I. Conesa. R. Schorno indicated that the call for participating in IODP expeditions should be open to scientists from USA and Japan and not only from Europe. C. Mével noticed that the ERA-NET+ scheme does not seem to apply to the type of activities developed by ECORD. S. Dürr said that ECORD should be creative and probably the call could be made for one project that is already in the system. Regarding R. Schorno remark, I. Conesa responded that participation of scientists from outside the EU should not be a problem, but the call must be done properly.

I. Conesa presented ECORD Council the HORIZONTAL ERA-NET scheme, which should include at least three different thematic areas. He indicated that if a proposal is accepted under the 'horizontal' label both, ERA-NET and ERA-NET+ schema could apply.

S. Winkler-Nees explained that an ERA-NET+ is considered as stepping stone for an Article 169 and in that perspective he suggested ECORD to go for an ERA-NET+ for one year to prepare an Article 169. C. Mével reminded that in the past ECORD had unsuccessfully approached the EC for an Art. 169. The EC considered ECORD too small for an Art. 169, and this led ECORD to launch the Deep Sea Frontier initiative. DSF was listed by the EC in the "second train" of possible Article 169 and was finally discouraged to pursue in the near future. However, Pierre Mathy indicated that the EC could continue to support ECORD, ESO-NET and HERMES with the perspective of an Art.169 within FP8.

P. Egerton indicated that BONUS will be funded under an Article 169 during 2011-2014. In such case, he added, the second train of Art. 169 should consider the frame time 2014-2016.

R. Schorno suggested organising a meeting with P. Mathy in Brussels to discuss ECORD possibilities for an ERA-NET+. ECORD Council requested EMA the following action:

**ACTION EMA:** To officially request a meeting with Pierre Mathy to discuss funding possibilities for ECORD in FP7.

Potential participants for this meeting: S. Dürr, C. Franklin, B. Goffé, S. Winkle, S. Falcón Morales and C. Mével.

R. Schorno thanked I. Conesa for attending the Council meeting and presenting valuable information about FP7.

**Agenda Item 13- DSF Initiative and Strategy for the future of ocean drilling. Report of the “Vision Group” (S. Winkler-Nees).**

S. Winkler-Nees indicated that he had prepared four reports to present at the Council meeting:

1. Future EU Marine Policy (Aberdeen Report)
2. ERA Net plus for ECORD
3. DSF Initiative
4. Visions-Strategies for ECORD

It was agreed that the first two reports have been discussed within previous agenda items. S. Winkler-Nees informed Council that the Blue Book, containing the Aberdeen Declaration, has been published. It describes European Marine and Maritime policy. The document can be downloaded at:

[http://www.ciesm.org/news/policy/Aberdeen\\_Declaration\\_2007.pdf](http://www.ciesm.org/news/policy/Aberdeen_Declaration_2007.pdf)

Council agreed to concentrate on the last two presentations of S. Winkler-Nees.

- DSF Initiative

R. Schorno noticed that one recommendation from Aberdeen is the creation of “Network of Networks”, which is a more holistic approach for coordination. He noticed that ECORD has already made some steps in this direction with the DSF Initiative. C. Mével signalled that at the ECORD Net meeting held in Lisbon, the actual situation of DSF was discussed. She reminded Council that the proposal leaded by P. Weaver was not funded by the EC although it received a fair evaluation. At the same time A. Edwards, in a personal communication to C. Mével, indicated that the EC is encouraging ECORD and the other programmes to maintain the initiative alive. In Lisbon, members of WP8, proposed to call for a meeting of the DSF Steering Committee. S. Winkler-Nees informed that he has started making arrangements for the meeting however to find a suitable date had showed to be difficult. Most important, he said, the aims of the meeting were not clear and invited Council for comments.

For R. Schorno, the question of DSF Initiative being the way for a DSF Art. 169 in 10 years could frame the discussion of the DSF Steering Committee. S. Dürr expressed that the vision for DSF should be scientific and indicated that defining the vision of DSF is the task of its Steering Committee. C. Mével agreed and proposed to organise the meeting of Steering Committee before Christmas. S. Dürr suggested inviting the Steering Committee, to discuss how DSF could continue after the proposal was rejected. For S. Winkler-Nees, ECORD should have an internal strategy for DSF before calling for a meeting of its Steering Committee. He indicated that at some point in the past, ECORD lost the control of this initiative.

C. Franklin stated that there are strands for discussion

- DSF and how do we take this group forward.
- ECORD and how do we go forward after the end of ECORD Net.
- IODP and how do we take it forward after 2013.

From his point of view, ECORD needs to develop these strands, the first two at the European level and the last one at the global level. For DSF, the Roadmap published in January 07 is the starting point for the discussion.

C. Mével insisted on having a meeting of the Steering Committee. She considered important to have a discussion at the management level. She reminded Council that to find ways to continue with DSF was a recommendation from A. Edwards. S. Dürr suggested inviting somebody from the Marine Board. P. Egerton suggested contacting the proponents of Coordination Action on Life in Extreme Environments, funded by the EU Environment Division and offered to send further information to EMA.

ACTION S. WINKLER-NEES: To organize as soon as possible a meeting of the DSF Steering Committee to discuss future actions for DSF. If possible the meeting should take place before Christmas.

#### Report on the Vision Group

S. Winkler-Nees reminded Council that the constitution of the ECORD Vision Group was mandated by ECORD Council during its last meeting in Den Haag. He presented his view about the strategic document that should be the outcome of the vision group. He asked the council for comments.

S. Winkler-Nees indicated that the document should start with an overarching vision statement, and presented two possible options to start the discussion:

1. « *To be the first port of call for seafloor and sub-seafloor research by European scientists* »
2. « *The European science portal / organisation / management / association for seafloor and sub-seafloor research* »

#### *Discussion*

C. Mével asked about the targeted audience for the document. S. Winkler-Nees responded the document should be addressed to funding agencies. R. Schorno agreed and indicated that the document should help Council members to contact national funding agencies. F. Barriga said that it is an obvious relation between seafloor studies and subseafloor studies. To understand the seafloor, we need to get the third dimension. While talking with science managers, he said, it is important to emphasize the high rate of return for marine seafloor and subseafloor research.

C. Franklin reminded Council that the Vision Group was initiated in preparation for the end of IODP and how will ECORD address negotiations with the LAs in the future.

G. Camoin offered the help of the ESSAC subcommittee “Workshops, Communication and Vision”, which has started the discussion of the Initial Science Plan. R. Schorno noticed that ESSAC could help to identify the scientific challenges to be addressed by ECORD.

S. Winkler-Nees mentioned that ECORD Vision Group should develop the European identity that might lead in the long-term to the establishment of ECORD as an organization. R. Schorno noted it could only be feasible if the vision is not restricted to drilling, and in that case, how can ECORD play a major role in DSF. S. Winkler-Nees argued that ECORD Vision Group should focus on drilling, while broadening the vision to other scientific aspects is the duty of DSF. He continued saying that ECORD should concentrate in getting the necessary funds for drilling. S. Dürr manifested that it is a strong disadvantage to focus in drilling, it make the vision too technical and not enough science directed. S. Winkler-Nees argued that in the Aberdeen group, he saw many different marine communities with strong lobbying positions. S. Dürr said ECORD should not focus in specific scientific communities, the expertise needed to answer a scientific question is defined by the question itself.

P. Egerton mentioned that as part of the ERICON-AB project, ECORD will play a major role in defining mechanisms for using the Aurora Borealis. He suggested Council to think in the possibility of taking on the responsibility of managing such European infrastructure.

D. Evans said that evaluating ECORD position within IODP is one of the most important subjects, because under the current organisation the scientific vision and all drilling strategy is decided by IODP. Thereafter thinking beyond 2013, does ECORD want to maintain the situation or does ECORD want to become more independent? He noticed that many of the subjects discussed during the day in terms of ERA-NET+ or Aurora Borealis are very difficult to implement within IODP. R. Schorno argued that the discussion on the vision is set up to provide ECORD the opportunity to influence, from the beginning, the follow-up process of IODP. He manifested the interest of ECORD to become one of the three LAs who will define the future Programme.

S. Dürr indicated that D. Evans statements implied the question of whether ECORD will carry out activities outside IODP or not. C. Franklin proposed to come back to the original question: Do we want to have an *integrated* Programme after IODP?

Council members agreed in the importance of the topics being discussed and in the necessity of pursuing the exchange of views.

At this point, C. Mével proposed Council to present B. Goffé's PPT, which contained ideas about other funding mechanisms for ECORD. Council agreed and C. Mével proceeded. The presentation explained the main objectives, structure and functioning of EUREKA, a pan-European network of market oriented, industrial R&D (<http://www.eureka.be>). EUREKA is funded at the national level. EUROGIA is a cluster of EUREKA, aimed at energy. The technical committee is composed of industry, laboratories and universities representatives. During the period 2004-2006, 32 projects were funded for a total of 83 M€. EUROGIA is ending now, but EUROGIA2 is being organized. Among the topics EUROGIA2 is willing to promote are fossil energies and new energies.

B. Goffé suggests that ECORD Council make contact with EUROGIA2:

- ECORD could become a member of the technical committee of EUROGIA2
- ECORD could promote new targets for R&D in agreement with EUROGIA2 objectives; Arctic exploration and Natural H<sub>2</sub>

This may allow ECORD to find new funding sources from governments by showing our ability to help European industry to provide energy for the future. B. Goffé also suggested inviting Gabriel Marquette, chairman of the Board to the next council meeting.

R. Schorno indicated that relation with industry was one of the topics included in the ECORD Vision Group, and he considered the presentation useful to promote ECORD relationship with industry. C. Franklin cautioned that it is important that research keeps its independence with respect to oil industry. He said that there are different ways to liaise with industry. He reminded that there is already an industry liaison panel in the UK that could be extended to other European countries. S. Winkler-Nees noted that the discussion whether ECORD should be involved with industry was not finalized.

R. Schorno proposed to circulate within Council members the essential questions that came out of the meeting with the solicitation of replying within a deadline. He proposed the following questions:

1. How far do you want to go relating with industry?
2. Do you see a role for ECORD after the IODP Programme?
3. Do you want to have an *integrated* Programme after IODP or rather an European Programme?

D. Evans suggested the Vision Group, to take into account the questions and prepare a more developed draft to be circulated later.

ECORD Council agreed to call for a meeting of the Vision Group as soon as possible to prepare a draft document of ECORD Vision. The document should be circulated within Council members, and discussed at the next Council meeting. The following action was required:

**ACTION S. WINKLER-NEES:** To organize a meeting of ECORD Vision Group to prepare a draft document to be discussed at the next Council Meeting.

**AOB items**

1. R. Schorno solicited Council's advise regarding sponsoring an industry scientist invited to participate in the IODP Program Planning Group. ECORD Council considered that industry scientists should check first with her/his company before applying for ECORD support. It was agreed that only in the case of self-employed people or very small companies, ECORD will directly consider the possibility of sponsoring.

2. Next ECORD Council meeting

As decided in Den Haag the next Council will be held in Paris in the first week of June. The dates will be decided after confirmation from B. Goffé.

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

**The meeting is formally closed. R. Schorno thanked S. Falcón Morales and the Spanish Directorate of International Programmes for hosting the meeting.**