

**13th ECORD COUNCIL MEETING  
PARIS, FRANCE  
5 - 6 June 2008**

CNRS – Campus Gérard Mégie  
3 rue Michel Ange, 75016 Paris

**MINUTES**

<b><i>PARTICIPANTS</i></b>		
<i>COUNTRY</i>		<i>EMAIL</i>
Austria	Reinhard Belocky, member, Executive	belocky@fwf.ac.at
Canada	Anne de Vernal, member	devernal.anne@uqam.ca
Finland	Sanna Carlsson, member	sanna.carlsson@aka.fi
France	Bruno Goffé, vice-chair	bruno.goffe@ens.fr
Germany	Sören Dürr, member, Executive	soeren.duerr@dfg.de
Germany	Stefan Winkler, alternate	stefan.winkler.nees@dfg.de
Iceland	Rikke Pederson, member	rikke@rannis.is
Iceland	Arman Hoskuldsson, alternate	armh@hi.is
Italy	Nigel Wardell, alternate	nwardell@ogs.trieste.it
Ireland	Koen Verbruggen, member	Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie
Netherlands	Raymond M.L. Schorno, member	schorno@nwo.nl
Norway	Are Carlson, member	are.carlson@forskningsradet.no
Portugal	Fernando Barriga, member	f.barriga@fc.ul.pt
Spain	Severino Falcon Morales, Chair	severino.falcon@mec.es
Sweden	Dan Holtstam, member	D.Evans.holtstam@vr.se
Switzerland	Marcel Kullin, member	mkullin@snf.ch
UK	Chris J. Franklin, member, Vice-Chair	cfr@nerc.ac.uk
<b><i>OBSERVERS</i></b>		
EMA	Catherine Mével	Mével@ipgp.jussieu.fr
EMA	Rosa Bernal-Carrera	rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr
ESO	Dan Evans	devans@bgs.ac.uk
ESSAC	Gilbert Camoin	gcamoin@cerege.fr
IMI BoG	O. Eldholm Eldholm	olav.eldholm@geo.uib.no
IMI BoG	D. Prieur	daniel.prieur@univ-brest.fr
IMI BoG	J. Ludden	jludden@bgs.ac.uk
SASEC	Gerold Wefer, observer	gwefer@marum.de
NSF	James Allan	jallan@nsf.gov
MEXT	Toshi Oshima	TOSHIMA@nsf.gov
CDEX/ JAMSTEC	Nobuhisa Eguchi	neguchi@jamstec.go.jp
EUROGIA	Gabriel Marquette	Marquette@paris.sl.slb.com

<b>APOLOGIES</b>		
<b>MEMBERS</b>		
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriet member	jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be
Denmark		
<b>OBSERVERS</b>		
ESF	Bernard Avril	bavril@esf.org
ESF	Paul Egerton, ERICON	pegerton@esf.org
EC	Pierre Mathy	Pierre.Mathy@ec.europa.eu
ICDP	Uli Harms	ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de

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

Thursday, June 5

### Agenda Item 0. Welcome and logistical information

B. Goffé welcomed the participants and provided logistical information. The agenda was approved with minor changes to accommodate the MEXT report on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> June, because Toshi Oshima's flight had been delayed.

### Agenda Item 1. Approval of the Madrid meeting minutes (S. Falcón Morales)

C. Franklin noted two mistakes, the first under agenda item 9 (EMA report) concerning a statement made by himself, and the second under agenda item 10 (ECORD FY08 funding situation and beyond). In, paragraph 7 -5<sup>th</sup> line- should be written "ESO budget does not include the *onshore* science party". With no additional comments, the council approved the minutes by consensus.

#### ECORD Council motion 08-01-1

ECORD Council approves the Madrid minutes with minor modifications.

N. Wardell moved, S. Falcón-Morales seconded, all in favour

### Agenda Item 2 Madrid meeting actions (S. Falcón Morales)

- ACTION EMA: To communicate Council request to the Lead Agencies for more open and effective official information on the current situation of the programme. ***Done. Communication with the LAs has improved.***
- ACTION EMA: To invite NSF's representative to the next Council meeting which will be held in Paris. ***Done. B. Goffé and C. Mevel met NSF representative David DONNER in Paris and a formal contact was established.***
- ACTION EMA: To officially contact Pascal Le Grand requesting a meeting with ECORD representatives. ***Done. On January 2008, ECORD representatives met P. Le Grand and P. Mathy in Brussels.***
- ACTION EMA: To explore the mechanisms to carry out an audit of ECORD finances and to inform the next Council meeting. ***Done. CNRS Financial Office is able to carry out the audit if required by the ECORD Council.***

- ACTION EMA: To officially request a meeting with Pierre Mathy to discuss funding possibilities for ECORD in FP7. *Done.*
- ACTION S. WINKLER: 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. *Done. The meeting of the DSF steering committee took place on January 29<sup>th</sup> 2008 in Berlin..*
- ACTION S. WINKLER: To organize a meeting of ECORD Vision Group to prepare a draft document to be discussed at the next Council Meeting. *Done. The document prepared after the meeting of the Vision Group held in Copenhagen in November 2007 was handed out to the Council members.*

### 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. C. Franklin is the incoming Chair (October 1<sup>st</sup>), and the next Vice-Chair needs to be elected. C. Mevel invited representatives of smaller countries to come forward to follow the rule of alternation. F. Barriga manifested his disposition to serve as ECORD Vice-Chair and the following motion was voted:

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-2** ECORD Council elects Fernando Barriga as incoming Vice-Chair to replace Bruno Goffé as of 1 October 2008.

C. Franklin moved, S. Winkler seconded, all in favour except one abstention (F. Barriga)

The Council thanked F. Barriga for taking on this responsibility.

As of 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008, the Executive will be composed as follows: C. Franklin, F. Barriga, S. Falcón Morales, S. Dürr, R. Belocky and C. Mével.

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

O. Eldholm reported on the BoG meeting held in San Francisco on December 11<sup>th</sup> 2007. Two main resolutions regarding the involvement of IODP-MI's president in the development of an industry link and the restructuring of IODP-MI, were passed (see *Board of Governors report* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>).

O. Eldholm explained that the BoG has not been informed about the implementation of the first resolution. It is known that several steps have been taken to develop a proposal for an Ocean Drilling Consortium that would address research challenges common to the academic community and industry. Moreover, a workshop attended by academic and industry representatives will be held in June 2008 at Rice University in Houston, Texas (<http://www.iodp.org/ODC>). C. Mevel informed that she will attend this workshop.

In relation with the second resolution, O. Eldholm informed that the US members of the BoG Executive committee have presented a proposal for a new structure but at the moment no further information has come forward.

He indicated that, in general, more communication is needed. The next BoG meeting will take place in June in Beijing during the IODP week. C. Mevel indicated that very likely the proposal for a single IODP-MI office in Japan will be put forward at the next meeting. D. Prieur informed that only a draft agenda has been circulated for this meeting and agreed that

there are communication issues. J. Allan indicated that the LAs are putting pressure on IODP-MI to reduce its budget. On behalf of NSF, J. Allan indicated that NSF has no opinion on where the office should be located. He also clarified that the LAs do not attend BoG's meetings and consequently do not receive the agenda. J. Ludden made the point that lack of communication is eroding the system. Evidently communication between the LAs and the BoG needs to be improved. The ECORD Council passed the following consensus:

**ECORD Council Consensus**

ECORD Council and the ECORD BoG members feel that communication between the BoG leadership and IMI/Council members should be improved.

The three ECORD BoG members will convey this consensus to the BoG at the next meeting in Beijing.

O. Eldhom reminded Council that he is rotating off and a new ECORD member should be appointed in the BoG Executive Committee. C. Mevel signalled that the ECORD Council has designated Hans Thierstein as ECORD BoG member to replace O. Eldhom. This will be approved at the next BoG meeting. The decision to appoint a new ECORD member on to the BoG Executive Committee should be taken by the three ECORD BoG members.

**Agenda Item 5- SASEC report (G. Wefer).**

Gerold Wefer reported on the last SASEC meeting held in Santa Cruz, USA, on January 2008 (*see Science Advisory Structure Executive Committee (SASEC) report at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html> and the minutes of the Santa Cruz meeting at <http://www.iodp.org/sasec/>*).

One issue was the continuation of the IODP DRILLS programme. The ECORD council had passed the message that they consider that it overlaps with other programmes such as the ECORD DLP. Nevertheless, SASEC felt important to continue at least for one year. G. Camoin expressed that ESSAC members consider it useful to have lecturers coming from outside Europe.

A crucial issue for SASEC is to prepare the post-2013 drilling programme. A major workshop will be organised in Bremen in September 2009 to discuss the science plan for a future programme. The timing of this workshop was decided to meet the NSF requirement to have a plan by 2010. Between 200 and 300 scientists are expected to participate. G. Wefer stressed the importance of involving a new generation of scientists in the definition of the science plan for post 2013.

G. Wefer explained that SASEC's role in defining the APP for FY09 and beyond has been greatly reduced because under the current financial situation, SASEC does not have a clear insight on the programme costs (POCs and SOC's). SASEC is in a difficult position to approve the annual IODP program plan and budget because the cost implications cannot be assessed. J. Allan commented that Platform Operations Costs (POCs) are the biggest part, while Science Operation Costs (SOC's) amount to less than 20% of each expedition's costs. Regarding possible savings, he clarified that the LAs have not yet been officially presented with a plan to move to one IODP Office. IODP-MI as a corporation should make this decision. O. Eldhom pointed out that the LAs do not seem to agree to have an IODP-MI office in Europe. C. Mevel added that ECORD has offered several times to host an IODP-MI office in Europe, but there was no follow-up. J. Allan replied that this move is an important decision that should be taken in a corporate manner.

C. Franklin was pleased that the science community is getting together to define the post-2013 science plan. He indicated that in the same line of reasoning, an international working group of funding agencies may be needed to prepare for post IODP. J. Allan agreed and indicated that such initiative will be in the best interest of everybody. Both agreed that the meeting in Beijing will be the best opportunity to discuss about post IODP 2013.

G. Wefer called for further discussion among ECORD Council on the collaboration with industry and other outside entities. He reminded Council that M. Talwani has been charged by the BoG to develop mechanisms for cooperation with industry. During the Santa Cruz meeting, M. Talwani presented details on a proposal for an industry sponsored Ocean Drilling Consortium (see <http://www.iodp.org/ODC>). The aim is to use the JOIDES Resolution outside of IODP for industry-academia joint projects and cover the 5 months gap that the USIO is not able to fund. The SASEC community expressed several questions regarding this proposal. Among others: which companies will be offered the opportunity to participate?; access to the data collected and rights to publish results; how new technology will be developed; concerns about confidentiality; etc.

J. Allan confirmed that NSF is not able to fund year-round operations for the JOIDES Resolution and the efforts made by Talwani are welcomed. He also noted that NSF would have to grant permission for the use of U.S. government equipment on the JOIDES Resolution. NSF is currently setting up the legal framework to allow the use of the JOIDES Resolution by a private company.

C. Franklin asked for clarification on the relation between IODP-MI and the Ocean Drilling Consortium. J. Allan replied that it is an informal relationship. The BoG has authorised the use of corporate funds (not IODP commingled funds) to develop this initiative. J. Ludden drew attention to the implication of Talwani's activities in the long term for IODP. C. Mevel indicated that agenda item 14 is entirely dedicated to this topic. The council agreed to further develop this discussion during the afternoon session.

#### **Agenda Item 6- ESO report (D. Evans)**

D. Evans informed the ECORD Council that ESO was unable to reach a contract agreement to carry out the New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition in 2008 (see *ESO report by Dan Evans* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). Only one company responded to the tender. Negotiations were ongoing for several weeks to finalize the contract, aiming at a May start. However on April 11<sup>th</sup>, the company informed ESO that although the platform was available, their staff was committed to other contracts. Immediately, ESO organized a conference call with the company to discuss possible options. Three options were considered:

- option 1 was a September start: it was considered unacceptable because of the weather window.
- option 2, suggested by the company was to hire drillers and aim for a late June start. This proved unfeasible because drillers are in high demand, and the company had to give up on this option.
- option 3, offered by the company, was to sign a contract now for a firm start in 2009 that would guarantee their services and a platform.

The last option was investigated but proved to be unacceptable under European regulations. A new notice in the Official Journal of the European Union was issued. 4 expressions were received and tenders have been issued to three companies. Final tenders will be submitted on 20<sup>th</sup> June.

Addressing the Great Barrier Reef Expedition, Dan Evans reported that a permit was granted at the end of February for 2009. However, drill sites are limited to 25 at 7 locations and the permit ends 1<sup>st</sup> November 2009. The permit is granted under several conditions, however, ESO is confident that they are able to manage them. A notice on the Official Journal of the European Commission has been re-issued, tenders will close on 8<sup>th</sup> August. The sites need to be approved by the SSP and EPSP and by Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. Nominations for co-chiefs closed at the end of April, Jody Webster (Australia) has been appointed and Yusuke Yokoyama (Japan) has been invited. The call for Science Party applications will be issued at the end of June.

C. Franklin asked if the fact that Australia has joined IODP had helped to grant the permit from the GBRMPA. D. Evans indicated that Australian scientists have been very helpful in dealing with the authorities. J. Allan clarified that Australia has not yet joined IODP. He also indicated that negotiations with China and Korea are also ongoing. China has not yet paid and discussions on future participation have slowed down. Korea has not signed for beyond FY09. O. Eldhom pointed out that the IODP week was organized in Beijing to help improve the relations with China. J. Allan replied that China is looking at three options for the future: a) renewing a 1 M USD membership, b) renewing as full member, and, c) starting their own programme. C. Mevel indicated that in the past China has shown interest in the DSF initiative. She stressed the need to broaden the scope of the science plan for post 2013 to include other scientific communities.

#### **Agenda Item 7.1- NSF report and status of the JOIDES Resolution (James Allan)**

James Allan was invited to attend the Council and give an update on the NSF funding and JOIDES Resolution status. He indicated that IODP is facing challenging realities: an enormous rise in platform operational costs and the fact that planned funding increases have not occurred (see *NSF report and status of the JOIDES Resolution by James Allan* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). To ensure the sustainability of the programme, instead of increasing membership costs, the LAs have chosen to reduce platforms operations.

J. Allan expressed the fact that IODP platform operations and integrative activities represent multi-year efforts in planning and execution, with multi-year funding requirements. He reminded that ECORD, Japan and USA have had essentially same rights for science berths during every year of IODP, although ECORD contributes much less to the Programme than the Lead Agencies. J. Allan explained that during ODP, NSF was able to subsidize the programme when necessary. Unfortunately, it is not possible any more, due to the lack of funds. After getting a final FY08 budget, NSF/ODP received a small increase in FY08 as opposed to FY07 (about equivalent to inflation), but overall NSF/ODP funding is down in inflation-adjusted terms by about 20% since ODP (ie, 2001-2002 timeframe). *Note that NSF/ODP remained NSF/ODP even after IODP started.* At the same time, fuel costs have exploded. He indicated that FY08 ECORD contribution, as defined in the Memoranda, is needed to ensure IODP viability and that NSF cannot make up any shortfall in funds. ECORD contribution to IODP is totally directed to fund the integrative activities of IODP (IODP-MI, IO's, Core Repositories) and to fund SOC operations (CDEX, ESO). J. Allan clarified that NSF is supporting JR operational SOC's entirely with U.S. funds, and consequently, ECORD money is not supporting JOIDES Resolution operations. J. Allan informed Council that NSF will provide the JOIDES Resolution to IODP 70% of the time between FY2009 and 2013, more if possible. He indicated that NSF has committed to supporting a 10-year extension of IODP beyond the current phase. J. Allan concluded by saying that ECORD membership is essential to sustain IODP and that increased ECORD leadership in the programme should be consistent with increased ECORD contributions.

J. Allan presented a video showing the substantive progress made to complete the

refurbishment of the JOIDES Resolution. J. Allan informed Council that the JOIDES Resolution's expected delivery from the shipyard is August 2008. The ship is scheduled to start operations for IODP in November 2008. The refit has been delayed because the shipyard is overcommitted, and the JOIDES Resolution is considered as a very small project. However, USIO is looking more confident for a start date for operations in November 2008. The JR will operate eight months for IODP in FY09. Expeditions 317, 318, 320 & 321 are scheduled between November 08 and July 09.

J. Ludden asked how much JR costs per month. J. Allan replied that for FY09 the costs are about 64 M USD.

## **Agenda Item 7.2- CDEX report and status of the CHIKYU (Nobuhisa Eguchi)**

Nobuhisa Eguchi from CDEX presented a brief update on the current status of CHIKYU (see *MEXT report and status of the Chikyuu by Toshi Oshima and Nobu Eguchi* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). After successfully completing expeditions 314, 315 & 316, the vessel went into dock for inspection, repair and maintenance. Some mechanical failures of bevel gears of azimuth thrusters were found and will be fixed. In FY09, the CHIKYU is scheduled for four months of riser operations. The NanTroSEIZE Stage 2 (riser) operation is scheduled for March-June 2009. For the following years, assuming riser drilling is maximised, the CHIKYU could conduct one riser (five months) and one riserless (2 months) expeditions per year. The number of months of operations per year could change depending on the expeditions' costs.

J. Ludden asked for clarification on the technical problems encountered by the CHIKYU. N. Eguchi replied that during (riserless) expeditions 314, 315 and 316 (Nankai zone) some problems associated with strong currents have signalled the challenges in operating riser drilling under such conditions. S. Dürr asked if riser operations will take place in 2009. N. Eguchi confirmed that four months of riser operations are scheduled for FY09. However, if problems arise with the gear change -which is anticipated to be completed by January 2009- the operation schedule could be compromised because the window for drilling is conditioned by fisheries. J. Ludden commented that if ECORD's contribution to IODP is covering mainly SOC's and there have not been any JR operations this year it sounded logical to reduce the contribution. J. Allan responded that if ECORD lowers its contribution, planning for FY09 would be compromised. He reasoned that planning and budgeting should be considered on a multiyear basis. He also indicated that TAMU is undergoing a substantial re-structuring: the leadership and management structure will be changed and significant reduction in staff members is expected. C. Franklin asked about JR's day rate. J. Allan responded that day rate for JR will be around 80 000 USD. This dayrate figure does not include fuel, personnel, or logistical costs. C. Franklin concluded, for the JR, that around 5M USD could solve the shortfall and allow year round operations. He also suggested inviting a representative from the EC to the IODP meeting in Beijing as a way to encourage the EC to support IODP. J. Ludden indicated that the best way to promote the programme in the EC is having more MSP operations. He mentioned that if ECORD paid less for SOC's more money would be available for POC's. J. Allan explained that discussing the structure of the programme is a very important point for post 2013 but for the moment if less money is available for SOC's the whole programme will be affected and its future seriously compromised.

S. Dürr expressed Council's appreciation for all the efforts and involvement that NSF and JAMSTEC are putting into the programme, but he voiced the difficulties encountered by European funding agencies to justify to their national governments an important increase (60%) in contributions when no operations occurred. He stressed that ECORD is not considering reducing its contributions but reconsidering the way that contribution is divided

between SOC's and POC's. At a time when competition for funds is great, ECORD needs to prove that tax-payers money is reasonably spent and that results are important. He concluded that all the money saved in SOC's will go into POC's for MSPs. J. Allan replied that the programme is facing difficulties that could not be envisaged in the beginning. He invited Council to look at the accomplishments of IODP and scientific return on a long-term basis and to not judge the outcomes based on one-year operations. He reiterated that any reduction in the budget for SOC's will imply a reduction in operations for FY09 because even when the ships are not operating there are fixed infrastructure costs that should be covered by the IOs. C. Mevel insisted that the reduction in operations should be reflected in the reduction of costs. J. Allan recalled that TAMU was taking several steps to reduce its fixed costs; several layoffs will take place in the following months. S. Dürr said that it was not intended to completely recalculate ECORD's contribution to IODP but to find a fair threshold that reflects the effective reduction in operations time. J. Allan anticipated that any change in the current memoranda may have serious impacts on the programme. He requested Council not to act in a precipitous manner. C. Mevel asked N. Eguchi if CDEX is effectively planning for FY09 to have 122 day of riser drilling. N. Eguchi responded affirmatively and D. Evans added that the CHIKYU's riser operations were included in FY09 APP submitted recently.

#### **Agenda Item 8- EMA report (C. Mevel)**

C. Mevel informed Council on the ongoing discussions with the Lead Agencies regarding ECORD contributions to IODP (see *ECORD Managing Agency –EMA- report by Catherine Mevel* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). She recalled that after the first announcement on the reduction of ship time operations, EMA negotiated with the LAs a reduction of 1M USD for FY08. EMA signed with NSF the addendum for FY08 for a total of 15.8M USD instead of 16.8M USD. She indicated that the first two invoices for SOC's have been paid to NSF. The third invoice of 4.8M USD is still unpaid. Following the announcement of new reductions, an exchange of letters between the LAs and ECORD has occurred (see Agenda Book, 13<sup>th</sup> ECORD Council, items 6-7). Discussion is ongoing, an agreement needs to be found. For the LAs, she said, SOC's and POC's are independent, however reality indicates they are interconnected. She presented a table indicating the number of operations months per fiscal year vs. the total paid by ECORD to SOC's. J. Allan noted that in 2007, CHIKYU started operating for IODP and its operations are much more expensive than the JR's. The day rate for CHIKYU is around 1M USD.

C. Mevel reminded Council that SASEC is committed to develop a new science plan for post 2013. She presented the questions raised by SASEC's chair M. Kono for input from ECORD. She commented that it was not clear to her if SASEC is also considering the structure of IODP. G. Wefer responded that SASEC is aiming to discuss the science and that the structure should follow the science plan. S. Dürr pointed out that the new science plan should not be focused only on drilling. He suggested that it is important to position drilling in a larger scientific context. It was agreed that the discussion will continue on the second day of the meeting.

C. Mevel updated Council on ECORD Net activities. The project is ending on August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2008, and therefore from September 2008 there will not be EC funds to support the management of ECORD. C. Mevel raised three major problems:

- Two thirds of the budget of EMA office is being covered by EC funds, in the future they should be covered by commingled funds.
- Some member countries relied on ECORD Net funds to support travel costs and in some cases salaries for support. What will happen from now on?
- Databases were developed under ECORD Net. How are they going to be



maintained in the future?

She mentioned that a workshop “Research Opportunities with ECORD – Drilling for the Future” was organised by NERC in Edinburgh (May 28-29, 2008). The aim is to attract new members. A review of the relationships between ECORD and ESF regarding EUROMARC and the Magellan Workshops is also being conducted.

C. Mevel informed that EMA – ESO – ESSAC meetings are being organised on a regular basis to coordinate outreach activities.

Catherine Mevel informed Council about the outreach activities developed by EMA. New releases include Newsletter #10, a new ESSAC brochure. A new image brochure to highlight ECORD achievements is being developed by DFG and funded by ECORD Net. ECORD participated in the IODP booth at AGU Fall meeting 2007 and organised the IODP booth at the EGU meeting in Vienna, last April. Together with IODP-Norway, EMA is organising the IODP booth at the IGC meeting in Oslo next August.

#### **Agenda Item 9- ESSAC report (G. Camoin)**

Gilbert Camoin informed Council that ESSAC is successfully functioning under its new structure (see *ESSAC report by Gilbert Camoin* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). The ESSAC website (<http://www.essac.ecord.org/>), which needed a complete overhaul to keep pace with the development of the programme after five years of existence, is now fully operational. A complete new structure was developed aiming at creating a coherent and consistent website that can be sustained for years to come. The ECORD and ESSAC web pages have been connected to update simultaneously on issues such as ESSAC delegates, workshops or expeditions. A new online procedure for applications is being tested. If deemed appropriate, this process will be implemented in the future enabling applicants to create their own profile and to reuse it for other expedition applications. The involvement of all ESSAC delegates has increased and ESSAC has established a new nomination procedure for all calls. J. Ludden congratulated G. Camoin for the excellent nomination procedure that has been implemented by ESSAC. G. Camoin noted that the new process ensure the participation of all people involved.

Gilbert Camoin reported on the two different alternatives currently being considered to find additional uses for the JR when it is not operating for IODP and would relieve NSF of paying the day rate:

- An industry sponsored ocean drilling programme that would comprise a consortium of industry partners to conduct IODP-like drilling and science in areas of interest to industry and would involve IODP scientists. A major issue is liability. Such a consortium would not be able to start until 2010.
- A Fugro, ODL, USIO partnership in which the ship would be provided to Fugro for more traditional industry work for at least 2 to 3 months/year. Initial discussions with Fugro are encouraging. The downside of this arrangement is that there would be absolutely no involvement of IODP scientists.

SASEC is proposing a third possible mechanism “Hybrid (complementary project) proposals”. It would be a joint academic-industry project that: has substantial sponsorship from industry; has a compelling scientific focus; is intended to be completed on an IODP platform operating under normal IO contracts; is reviewed by the SAS, but in a streamlined way. Such a project should receive a minimum of 70% POC support from industry.

G. Camoin presented the Operations Task Force Schedule Recommendations for FY09: Pacific Equatorial Age Transect I (Proposal 626-Full2)

- Canterbury Basin (Proposal 600-Full)
- Wilkes Land Margin (Proposal 482-Full3)
- Pacific Equatorial Age Transect II (Proposal 626-Full2) plus Juan de Fuca Flank Hydrogeology cementing operation (Proposal 545-Full3)

Recommended expeditions for CHIKYU beginning in December 2008 proceed as follows:

- NanTroSEIZE Input Sites and Riserless Observatories (related to Proposal 603-CDP and component proposals)
- Asian Monsoon (Proposal 605-Full2) (if feasible for implementation).

The recommended expedition for mission-specific platform (MSP) operations in FY2009 is Great Barrier Reef (519-Full2) starting in September 2009 and spanning the FY2009/2010 transition.

G. Camoin summarized that after the proposal ranking done at the last SPC meeting, 13 proposals have been forwarded to OTF for possible scheduling in FY2010, including six ECORD proposals. He indicated that only one MSP proposal has been forwarded to OTF (581-Full2 Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks).

- G. Camoin presented the proposals that SPC has classified as Tier1/Tier 2 proposals (see Draft Minutes *March 3-6 2008, Barcelona, Spain* at <http://www.iodp.org/spc/>). The concept of Tier 1/Tier 2 proposals has been developed to help cope with the logistical constraints that will result from the use of the JR for commercial work, outside of IODP. Tier 1 proposals are considered of higher priority and the JR schedule should be built around them.

### ***Atlantic Ocean Tier 1/Tier 2 designations***

Tier 1 proposals:

(EC) 644-Full2 Mediterranean Outflow  
(DB) 677-Full Mid-Atlantic Ridge Microbiology

Tier 2 proposals:

(SE) 659-Full Newfoundland Rifted Margin  
(SE) 522-Full5 Superfast Spreading Crust

No Tier designation:

(EC) 581-Full2 Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks (MSP)

### ***Pacific Ocean Tier 1/Tier 2 designations***

Tier 1 proposals:

(DB) 601-Full3 Okinawa Trough Deep Biosphere  
(SE) 537B-Full4 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Phase B  
(DB) 545-Full3 Juan de Fuca Flank Hydrogeology  
(SE) 505-Full5 Mariana Convergent Margin

Tier 2 proposals:

(DB) 662-Full3 South Pacific Gyre Microbiology  
(DB) 633-Full2 Costa Rica Mud Mounds

(EC) 686-Full Southern Alaska Margin 1: Climate-Tectonics  
 (SE) 537A-Full5 Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project Phase A  
 (SE) 654-Full2 Shatsky Rise Origin

### ***Indian Ocean Tier 1/Tier 2 designations***

Tier 1 proposals:

(EC) 724-Full Gulf of Aden Faunal Evolution

Tier 2 proposals:

(EC) 549-Full6 Northern Arabian Sea Monsoon

No Tier designation:

(EC) 595-Full3 Indus Fan

G. Camoin informed Council that the report from the Thematic Science Review on “Climate Variability” has been presented at the January 2008 SASEC meeting. A second Thematic Science Review on “Ocean Crust Formation” is ongoing. SPC has recommended SASEC forming a Thematic Review Committee on the Deep Biosphere, and delaying the review of seismogenic zone to wait for more results.

G. Camoin emphasized that overall ECORD maintains a very healthy participation in the programme. 41% of all proponents of the 112 active applications that are currently in the system, come from ECORD, well above USA (34%) and Japan (14%).

### ***Nominations and Staffing***

ESSAC Office has issued three calls for applications concerning: Canterbury Basin Expedition, Wilkes Land Expedition and NanTroSEIZE Expedition. The staffing is completed for Canterbury Basin Expedition. Gilbert Camoin presented the status of sail applications and quota balance. Efforts should be made in some countries to increase the response of the scientific community to the calls.

Regarding nominations on SAS panels, the following motions were approved the second day of the meeting:

#### **ECORD Council motion 08-01-8**

ECORD Council approves ESSAC nominations for replacements on SAS panels.  
 STP: S. Krastel, IFM-Geomar, Kiel, Germany to replace W. Brueckmann immediately.  
 EDP: R. Person, IFREMER, Brest, France will stay for an additional year (until Jul. 09) before being replaced by N. Lanteri, IFREMER-Brest, France.  
 SSEP: H. Brinkhuis, Univ. Utrecht, The Netherlands to replace J. Backmann immediately.  
 S. Berné, Univ. Perpignan, France to replace F. Eynaud after May 08.  
 D. Brunelli, Univ. Modena, Italy to replace J. Konnerup-Madsen after May 08.  
 J. Carlut, ENS, Paris, France to replace B. Menez after the SSEP Nov. 08.  
 SPC: G. Fruh-Green, ETH Zurich, Switzerland to replace R. Pedersen after the March 08.  
 SASEC: N. Arndt, Univ. J. Fourier, Grenoble, France to replace M. Bickle after Jan. 08.

M. Kullin moved, A. de Vernal seconded, all in favour. Absentees: F. Barriga, D. Holtsman, R. Belocky, C. Franklin, B. Goffé.

#### **ECORD Council motion 08-01-9**

ECORD Council endorses the following ESSAC recommendations:

1. For SASEC, Gerold Wefer will stay for an additional year to complete a second term.
2. For EDP panels, the extension of the term of:  
 Roland Person, two meetings (until July 09).  
 John Thorogood, one meeting (until January 10).  
 Maria Ask, one meeting (until July 10).

K. Verbruggen moved, R. Schorno seconded, all in favour. Absentees: F. Barriga, D. Holtsman, R. Belocky, C. Franklin, B. Goffé, S. Dürr.

ECORD Council endorsed ESSAC recommendation to support Urbino and Bremen Summer Schools for 2009. G. Camoin informed Council about the 2008 call for ECORD Scholarships: 44 applications were received from 16 countries, 13 grants were awarded. Regarding the DLP Programme, from September 07 to May 08, the three ECORD lecturers gave talks in 13 ECORD countries and 2 non-ECORD countries. ECORD Council agreed to continue to support these activities in 2009. The following motion was passed the following day.

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-10**

ECORD Council endorses ESSAC recommendation to fund the Urbino and Bremen 2009 Summer Schools at a level of € 12 500 and € 7 500 respectively.

S. Falcón-Morales moved, K. Verbruggen seconded, all in favour. Absentees: F. Barriga, D. Holtsman, R. Belocky, C. Franklin, B. Goffé, S. Dürr.

With the purpose of summarizing and reviewing major scientific achievements in ocean and continental drilling, the 2008 EuroFORUM was held jointly with ICDP at the European Geosciences Union meeting in Vienna last April. This event was highly attended and linked with the IODP-ICDP Townhall meeting. To set-up the basis of an European evaluation of the programme in the forefront of the large IODP conference to be held in Bremen in 2009; ECORD Council endorsed ESSAC recommendation to fund the ECORD Conference 09: 'Future of IODP - The European perspectives'.

ESSAC reported that in 2008, one IODP Workshop and three Magellan Workshops, are organised in Europe.

**Agenda Item 10 – Deep Sea Frontier Initiative Status (S. Winkler-Nees).**

S. Winkler-Nees informed Council that the Steering Committee of DSF met in Berlin on January 28-29, 2008 (see *The Deep Sea Frontier Initiative status - June 2008 by Stefan Winkler-Nees* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>).

S. Winkler-Nees recalled that this meeting was decided on after the proposal lead by P. Weaver submitted to the EC in 2008 was not funded. The meeting was dedicated to discuss the perspectives of the Deep Sea Frontier Initiative and Pascal LeGrand participated as an EC representative. It was agreed to develop a proposal for an umbrella ERANet that will allow the establishment of the structure for the joint initiative. All participants agreed in wording a proposal to be conveyed to the national work program representatives. He emphasized that in the new program there will not be a call for ECORD. C. Mevel recalled that ECORD-Net was established to help set-up the structure of ECORD, from the EC point of view, the ECORD-Net goals have been achieved and now is time for the countries to take over.

J. Ludden suggested exploring the possibility of a one-shot ERA-Net to help pay for one MSP leaded by European scientists. S. Dürr indicated that ECORD Council has discussed that option earlier and has considered it unfeasible under the current eligibility criteria mandated by the EC. The funds should be used in one single call, the money going back to European scientists and not to an international programme.

C. Mevel indicated that there are funding opportunities for scientists within the EC and that

the message should be passed out. J. Ludden said that ECORD scientists could develop a proposal to try to use the existing initiatives. G. Wefer indicated that a proposal covering European waters such as the North Atlantic Ocean could be well-received by the scientific community and the EC. J. Ludden agreed, indicating that studies involving climate change are in great demand now. However, G. Wefer indicated that it is difficult to write a proposal knowing that the drilling will not be implemented within in 5 years or even more. C. Mevel suggested that the funds could be used to hire the JR in the new IODP situation. S. Dürr invited Council to discuss options for effective lobbying at the Program Committee. N. Wardell reminded Council that FP7 funding increases towards the end, and there might be more opportunities. The Council decided to continue the discussion the following day.

S. Winkler-Ness briefly presented the current situation of the post-Aberdeen group. It was agreed that ECORD should continue to participate in the meetings to keep the visibility. C. Mevel indicated that under the French Presidency of the EC, a big event called BIOMARINE will take place in Toulon and Marseille in October 2008. Hopefully it will be the opportunity to promote ocean drilling. She has been invited to participate in an open forum.  
<http://www.biomarine.org/>

### **Agenda Item 11- Ocean Drilling Consortium and relationships with industry (D. Evans)**

D. Evans expressed that JR needs more funding to ensure the IODP program even at its reduced 7-8 months level (see *ESO report –page 14- by Dan Evans at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>*). He indicated that it is essential that the JR is funded for year-round work, otherwise the IODP program will be decreased even further. In this context, he presented three options for collaboration with industry that are being discussed:

1. Ocean Drilling Consortium –ODC-. Initiative led by M. Talwani (*please see related documents in the Agenda Book*).
2. Partnership between USIO, Fugro and ODL.
3. DEEPSTAR testing of dual-gradient mud-testing system

Referring to the ODC initiative, D. Evans mentioned that the project was designed to ensure year-round funding for the JR as a possible alternative to straightforward commercial hiring. The project aims to a programme separate from IODP but complementary and science oriented, providing enhanced research opportunities. This programme concerns only the JR, which is a non-riser vessel with limited attraction for exploration. J. Allan clarified that the ODC initiative is completely out of NSF. D. Evans indicated that at the moment, oil industry interest centres on Arctic, which is generally non suitable for the JR but could be envisaged via other routes.

D. Evans informed Council that he attended the first ODC workshop, held in Houston on 21-22 February. Representatives from Shell, Chevron, Fugro, BP, Statoil and Exxon attended the meeting. Tentative themes of common interest were identified (Continental margins, Stratigraphy and deep-water systems, source rocks) and a timetable for project development was defined.

A second meeting with potential companies was held in Houston in mid-April. D. Evans indicated that neither ESO nor EMA were informed or invited. At this meeting the themes of interest were confirmed and a larger Industry-Academia workshop was decided. It will be held in Houston on 15-17 June. C. Mevel informed that she and Dave Mcinroy will participate as ECORD representatives.

ODC is seeking industry commitment for 4 to 5 months each year from 2010 to 2013. D. Evans indicated that the JR cost per month amounts to 7M USD. From which:

- 3.6M USD shipboard drilling services
- 1.7M USD USIO services
- 1.7M USD science

He questioned if such money can be raised and indicated that ODC would seek proposals from scientist or use submitted IODP proposals with their permission. No nationality restrictions are envisaged.

The establishment of ODC will have several implications for IODP. The logistics would need to be coordinated between the two programs but the administrations should be separate. In the community, ODC could be perceived as a ‘competitor’ for IODP. The fact that IODP-MI has initiated ODC and currently uses IODP web page could be considered as a diversion of IODP-MI management and lead to confusion in the community between the two programs.

C. Franklin invited Council to discuss the impact of ODC on the IODP programme. O. Eldhom recalled that IODP Board of Governors charged IODP-MI to develop the idea of ODC. C. Mevel will participate at the ODC Workshop to be held in Houston and will inform Council about the results of this workshop. She proposed that Council to continue the discussion after the next point of the agenda, which referred to industry collaboration in Europe.

## **Agenda Item 12- The EUROGIA scheme and possible opportunities for ECORD** (Gabriel Marquette)

Gabriel Marquette, who is the President of EUROGIA+ Board, presented EUROGIA+ as an EUREKA initiative for Low Carbon Energy Technologies (see *EUROGIA+ by Gabriel Marquette* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>). EUREKA is a pan-European network of market oriented, industrial R&D (<http://www.eureka.be>). G. Marquette indicated that EUROGIA+ was approved in Ljubljana on June 6<sup>th</sup> 2008 during the EUREKA Ministerial Conference. This new programme addresses most of the energy mix challenges. It aims at promoting and supporting European industry competitiveness in the Oil & Gas engineering, manufacturing, supply and service industry as well as the renewable energies industries. G. Marquette indicated that "EUROGIA+" EUREKA label has been supported by 15 countries: Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Monaco, Poland, Slovenia, Spain and Turkey. This list is not limitative as other EUREKA Member Countries may join later.

In relation with ECORD, G. Marquette clearly expressed EUROGIA+ interest in developing a shared project in the Artic. Regarding Artic marine resources, he presented an overview of possible common objectives for a proposal:

- New resources discovery
- Ultradeep imaging
- Deep and ultradeep drilling
- Adaptation of tools to extreme conditions
- Specific numerical modeling
- Understanding of the Earth system
- Past climate changes records
- Biodiversity in underwater subsurface

G. Marquette indicated that this kind of proposal could be considered under the EUROGIA+’s concept of Master Project, which could involve resources amounting to 20-25 M€ per year for 4-5 years. G. Marquette proposed a discussion about how to build together a proposal that is consistent for the EUROGIA stakeholders. Recalling that the proposals will be peer and internationally evaluated, he informed Council that the first call for Master Projects will be in spring 09.

C. Franklin asked for some clarifications regarding the budget for the projects and the rules for allocation. G. Marquette answered that a Master Project is composed of several projects that are funded independently, the budget of the Master project correspond to the aggregation of the budgets of these projects. Projects should be defined and prepared by consortia, formed

by industry, Universities and Research Laboratories. The project selection will be based on criteria such as the quality of the consortium (at least two countries should be involved), the expected deliverables –particularly the technological innovation, the market perspectives as well as the impact on advanced research in academia and industry.

C. Franklin questioned if funding refers to real money or in kind contribution. G. Marquette indicated that both types are considered. A. de Vernal inquired on the participation of Canada. G. Marquette replied that there are no restrictions for other countries to join the initiative. C. Mevel asked for possible mechanisms to proceed and indicated that a science workshop on the Arctic will take place in Bremerhaven next November. D. Evans added that industry representatives are invited to participate in this workshop. G. Marquette manifested that in order to motivate industry to become involved, a joint workshop could be a good idea. With the purpose of developing the relation with the proponents the following action was decided.

**ACTION EMA:** To establish a link between the EUROGIA group and the ECORD scientists organising the joint ESF-Consortium for Ocean Leadership (IODP USIO) workshop *Arctic Ocean History: From speculation to reality*. This workshop will take place in Bremerhaven on November 3-5, 2008.

J. Allan observed that CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration is one of EUROGIA+'s Master Projects and asked if Shell is part of this initiative. G. Marquette replied that TOTAL is involved and added that storing CO<sub>2</sub> off shore could be investigated by ECORD and could even involve using the JR. C. Mevel noticed that representatives of the UK-IODP industrial liaison panel will attend the workshop in Bremerhaven. K. Verbruggen asked for the funding source for EUROGIA+ projects. G. Marquette answered that political and financial support for this programme comes from Public Authorities in Europe and Industry. Upon positive evaluation from EUROGIA Technical Committee and approval by the EUROGIA Board, projects receive the official EUROGIA label. Public funding will be given to each consortium members at their respective national level, under the rules, quotas and percentage defined nationally for EUREKA collaborative research projects. G. Marquette invited ECORD Council members to visit their web site ([www.eurogia.com](http://www.eurogia.com)).

### **Agenda Item 13- Aurora Borealis and the ERICON project (Catherine Mével)**

Catherine Mevel presented the status for the Aurora Borealis Project (*see European Polar Research Icebreaker Consortium (ERICON) by Paul Egerton and Catherine Mevel at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>*).

The support action ERICON submitted to the EC is funded and ECORD is involved in this project. ERICON will generate the strategic, legal, financial and organisational framework for European Ministries and funding agencies to decide about the construction and running of the first European Research Icebreaker. ECORD is represented in the project by CNRS-INSU. ECORD through EMA has the responsibility for facilitating liaison mechanisms for interaction between IODP management structures and the AURORA BOREALIS-ERICON. ECORD by the way of CNRS-INSU will be funded up to 107 000 € over 4 years. C. Mevel and D. Evans attended the kick-off meeting in Strasbourg in May 2008.

C. Mevel informed Council that the intention is to use AURORA BOREALIS for drilling around three months per year. ERICON is envisaging using the vessel in the frame of the future international drilling programme, through ECORD. In this context, while preparing the post 2013 programme, several questions arise for discussion:

- What could be the role of ECORD in the scientific and operational management of the facility for drilling?
- What would be an acceptable way forward in terms of proposal handling for the drilling component?
- How should we progress in developing a framework MOU for cooperation with the

**ERICON-AB Project and ECORD?**

- What implications does the development of ERICON-AB have in terms of securing POCS and SOCs from European agencies and developing a concept for participation shares for usage of the vessel?

C. Mevel informed Council that a better evaluation of the cost is now available. The construction is estimated at 635 M€ and the running costs at 32 M€ per year. The funding for construction is yet not secured. The EC will contribute not more than 10% of the total costs. BMBF (Germany) and Russia could be the main contributors and they are looking for other partners, in Europe and elsewhere. The aim is to secure funds by 2010 to start tendering.

C. Mevel explained that the current EC project is for developing the consortium model. She suggested that ECORD should follow the ERICON project closely because it fits into the MSP concept but reminded that MSPs are not carried only in ice-covered waters. Consequently ECORD cannot commit all the POCs to the Aurora Borealis-AB. ERICON is investigating other possibilities for funding the ship operations, possibly via an EC infrastructure programme. C. Mevel insisted that if the Aurora Borealis is ready to work post 2013, it should be considered in the discussions with the Lead Agencies.

C. Mevel informed Council that N. Biebow, ERICON Executive Manager, has asked for Council's feedback on ECORD involvement in AB:

- Raise the interest of the national scientific community in the AURORA BOREALIS by providing information about the project
- Provide national contact partners for the development of a scientific program and for collecting technical requirements for deep-sea drilling
- Nominate members of the ERICON Council and the ERICON Scientific Advisory Committee
- Provide names of national representatives for the Berlin Ceremony on the presentation of the new technical design of AURORA BOREALIS (invitations will be sent out soon) - Dec 3
- Enhance the submission of drilling proposals for ice-covered areas to IODP
- Investigate if there is sufficient scientific demand on the national level to participate formally in the project and if so contact the national funding agencies and relevant politicians
- Discuss the possibility of carrying out dedicated AURORA BOREALIS Workshops in their countries (funding will come through the AURORA BOREALIS project)

**Friday June 6**

The second day of the ECORD council meeting was a closed session. However, Toshi Oshima (MEXT) who couldn't arrive the day before, was invited to make his presentation as agenda item 17.

**Agenda Item 14- Preparation for the IODP council (Catherine Mével)**

S. Falcón Morales introduced the discussion stating the importance of this meeting, under a global situation of funding restrictions and ship costs increases.

C. Mevel recalled to Council that at the Executive meeting of the ECORD Council held in Vienna (April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2008), it was decided to request a meeting with the LAs prior to the IODP Council. The meeting is scheduled on June 24<sup>th</sup> during the IODP week in Beijing.

C. Mevel presented the list of topics presented to the LAs for discussion at the meeting in Beijing:

1 – ECORD contribution to IODP.



ECORD has requested a reconsideration of its contribution in SOC's to IODP and to use, if possible, a numerical relation that reflects the real ship activity per year.

2 - IODP structure

3 – The efficiency of SAS

4 - The efficiency of Engineering development panel

5 - Relationships between IODP and the Ocean Drilling Consortium initiative

6 - Aurora Borealis

C. Mevel called for Council attention to the response letter received from the LAs (see Agenda Book for the meeting). The LAs are appealing to ECORD to look at the programme funding as a multiyear budget. C. Mevel asked for input from the Council.

Upholding his position from the day before, S. Dürr indicated that despite the fact he fully understands the position manifested by J. Allan, the LAs shall understand that a compromise needs to be reached. Otherwise the danger is that probably some ECORD partners might back off. For him, the bottom line of negotiation shall imply that in the interest of the whole programme, solutions need to be found together and everyone involved will have to compromise. C. Franklin agreed with the last statement and observed that for him, J. Allan was asking Council to not withhold this year payment but to continue the discussions on following years contributions. S. Dürr replied that it shouldn't be a problem to reach an agreement on those terms. C. Mevel summarized the discussion: ECORD will not withhold any payment this year but considers that there shall be some place for negotiation on next year's contribution.

C. Mevel indicated that NSF is aiming for 8-months of operations per year until the end of the programme. NSF has secured funds for this, however the JR's time devoted to IODP depends on finding the necessary funds for the time that is not financed. The funds could come through the ODC initiative or any commercial work. Japan is officially maintaining that the CHIKYU will run 7-months per year for IODP until the end of the programme but funding is not yet secured. C. Mevel concluded indicating that for both LAs beyond 2009, funds are not clearly secured and neither is the ship time allocated to IODP. R. Schorno proposed establishing a bottom line of time operations per year for ECORD to pay a full contribution to IODP. Because POCs are more expensive, ECORD needs to reduce its SOC's contribution to be able to carry out MSPs. C. Franklin noted that because of the new accounting procedures imposed by the US Congress, NSF has started to pay most of its contribution, operational SOC's and POCs, directly to the Ocean Leadership Consortium. C. Mevel clarified that, even in that situation, IODP-MI is taking the budget decision on how much is allocated for SOC's to the US IO. In any case, it is important is to recognise that SOC's and POCs are not independent. ECORD has no control on the way the POCs are being spent by the LAs. For example, the dayrate for the JR while it is in the shipyard is considered as POCs in the APP for FY2008. C. Franklin observed that at the same time the LAs does not want to consider as POCs the mobilisation costs of MSPs although those are small figures compared with the global cost of the programme. R. Schorno asked if the US IO is making any saving while the JR is not committed to IODP. C. Franklin indicated that the only saving is fuel because the dayrate has to be paid anyway out of the NSF budget. D. Evans added that they are also fixed costs related to the maintenance of the general IODP structure. Some changes in the organization may be necessary in the light of reduced activity within IODP. However, Chris Franklin warned also that an overall discussion of the structure may result in a different programme where each IO manages and administers their ship. In such a case a new memorandum should be written and the conditions for berth exchanging should be negotiated again. He indicated that it is unsure that the advantageous conditions that ECORD benefits now could be

maintained. S. Dürr agreed and added that considering the time left before the end of the programme it doesn't make sense to discuss a new memorandum. He said that ECORD should keep the existing conditions of participation until 2013 but consider some serious changes beyond 2013. B. Goffé indicated that from the European point of view, ECORD's participation in IODP is not only a financial problem but also a problem of visibility and strategy. If NSF and CHIKYU are trying to develop links with industry to help pay for ships operations, ECORD could also use part of its money to develop shared independent MSPs projects with industry, as with EUROGLIA for example. For the negotiations with the LAs, he proposed to keep the current structure and to negotiate the use of part of ECORD's money to carry one or two independent MSPs operations with industry.

With the purpose of given authority to ECORD Representatives to negotiate with the LAs in Beijing, the following motion was passed:

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-3**

ECORD Council mandates the ECORD representatives at IODP Council to negotiate following years and to make payments for FY08 as appropriate.

C. Franklin moved, S. Dürr seconded, all in favour. Absentee: F. Barriga.

C. Mevel informed that D. Falvey, Australian Representative, is asking to meet ECORD representatives before IODP Council. C. Franklin asked if Australia and New Zealand are considering joining ECORD. C. Mevel answered that most likely they are looking for a common position at the IODP Council. C. Franklin insisted that in the case that Australia is asking to join ECORD, the Council representatives should have a position mandated from Council. A tour of the table was requested:

Iceland. R. Peddersen abstained.

Italy. N.Wardell agreed but noted that Australia had probably already evaluated their possibilities at joining IODP through ECORD and their possible advantages or disadvantages in doing so.

Germany. S. Dürr agreed.

Spain. S. Falcón Morales agreed.

France. B. Goffé agreed.

Canada. A. de Vernal agreed.

Switzerland. M. Kullin agreed in principle but indicated that it would depend on the amount of their contribution.

Netherlands. R. Schorno agreed but reminded that IODP has been already negotiating with Australia for several months.

UK. C. Franklin agreed.

Sweden. D. Holtsman agreed, but supported R. Schorno's remark

Ireland. K. Verbruggen agreed and added that if Australia joins ECORD more money will be available.

Norway. A. Carlson agreed.

Finland. S. Carlson abstained.

Austria. R. Belocky agreed.

C. Mevel summarized indicating that ECORD representatives have the mandate to talk to the Australian representatives in the interest of all ECORD Council members.

C. Franklin indicated that the programme could benefit politically if a representative of the European Commission attend the meeting in Beijing. He noticed that following what J. Allan presented the day before around 5.6 M USD is what NSF is looking for to have the JR operating year round for IODP. If a representative of the EC attends the meeting in Beijing, the message could be passed to the EC.

A tour of the table was required asking if ECORD Council considered useful to invite the EC to participate in the next IODP Council.

Germany. S. Dürr agreed but indicated that he was sceptical that it will make any difference.

Iceland. R. Peddersen abstained.

Italy. N. Wardell questioned the point of inviting the EC. He indicated that at the moment the EC has expressed its interest in funding the DSF initiative which involves ECORD but is larger than ocean drilling.

Spain. S. Falcón Morales agreed.

France. B. Goffé agreed.

Canada. A. de Vernal agreed.

Switzerland. M. Kullin agreed.

Netherlands. R. Schorno agreed.

UK. C. Franklin agreed and indicated that the EC contribution could make a big difference for the programme.

Norway. A. Carlson agreed.

Ireland. K. Verbruggen agreed but expressed his concerns that the presence of an EC representative during the negotiations with the LAs could be counterproductive.

Finland. S. Carlson abstained.

Austria. R. Belocky considered it useless to invite the EC to the meeting in Beijing. He indicated that the EC knows the programme and that ECORD have asked for financial support but the EC has not answered positively.

C. Mevel summarized indicating that the Council's majority agreed to invite a representative of the EC to the next IODP Council. The following action was decided:

**ACTION EMA:** To officially request the LAs to invite a high level representative of the European Commission to the next IODP Council meeting which will be held in Beijing.

D. Evans questioned on how 5.6 M USD could ensure the year round operations for the JR. C. Franklin indicated that the sum covers basically fuel costs. NSF is obligated to cover all other expenses anyway because is contractually bound to cover the day-rate of the ship. G. Wefer agreed that apparently the amount needed for year-round operations is really smaller compared with the other costs. He indicated that the day-rate negotiated by NSF is extremely favourable for the programme.

#### **Agenda Item 15- ESO budget and contracting issues (Dan Evans)**

D. Evans presented ESO FY08 Costs (see *ESO budget and contracting issues by Dan Evans* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>).

He indicated that the contracted POCs budget in FY2008 was \$12.297M (including 297 k\$ for international travel). Because the New Jersey expedition was postponed, ESO FY2008 budgets were revised

- Revised POCs (US dollars): \$705 k (\$445.7k + \$259.6k travel) for POCs . EMA has not been invoiced because no money was needed.

- Revised SOC (approved by IODP-MI : \$1,439k (\$1698.6k - \$259.6k travel) – instead of 3,169 k\$.

For FY09, the proposed POCs budget –for NJ and GBR- is 20 442 700 USD. This budget includes ICDP contribution (0.5 M USD) and international travel. ESO has proposed to IODP-MI a SOC budget of 4 913 000 USD (excluding travel). The budget has not yet approved by IODP-MI but cuts could be envisaged. ESO is meeting with IODP-MI officials on 22<sup>nd</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> July.

Regarding contracting issues, D. Evans informed Council that the tendering process for NJ has started. ESO is aiming to sign a contract with a value up to c.\$10.5M. A contract has been signed between CNRS and BGS for FY08, however the money would not be spent or invoiced to CNRS until summer FY09.

D. Evans informed that simultaneously ESO is tendering for GBR. After going through the

OJEU process, final tenders return is expected on August 8<sup>th</sup>. ESO wants to sign a contract to the value of c.\$ 7M for an expedition to begin in September/October 2009 (end FY09 / start FY10). However, ESO does not presently have contracted funds to sign the contract. To ensure good planning, ESO needs to get a contract signed in August/September 2008. Funds to pay for a GBR drilling are not required until FY10, but need to be guaranteed.

D. Evans indicated that ECORD funds for FY09 are insufficient by \$2 426 000 to cover the requirements for both NJ and GBR. Moreover, he indicated that as in previous years, CNRS has not been able to sign a contract until about February/March, when funds from most partners have been collected. To avoid this situation, ESO inquired for a mechanism by which funds, or guarantee of funds, can be brought forward in ECORD to allow early (September 2008) signature of the FY09 GBR drilling contract.

ESO requested:

- ECORD Council approval for a FY09 POCs budget for ESO of \$20 442 700 (including SOC travel, ICDP funds and in hand at BGS).
- That a mechanism be found to allow CNRS and BGS to sign in FY2009 contract in September 2008.

Before proceeding with the discussion, C. Mevel presented the ECORD financial situation.

**Agenda Item 16- ECORD and IODP funding situation - report on the ECORD executive meeting (16/4/08, Vienna) and following actions (Catherine Mevel)**

C. Mevel first presented the main resolutions taken at the Executive meeting held in Vienna (see *ECORD and IODP funding situation - report on the ECORD executive meeting (16/4/08, Vienna) and following actions* at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>).

1. Considering that ships' schedule have been greatly affected: delay of the JR, no riser drilling for CHIKYU in FY09, the Executive decided to send a letter to the LA to request a reconsideration of the FY08 ECORD contribution. EMA should pay the second invoice but withhold the third payment.

EMA has sent the letter and the related matters were discussed earlier in this meeting. See agenda item 14.

2. Facing the fact that no platform was available for New Jersey in FY08, the Executive decided to poll the council to allocate a budget to ESO to work towards a contract as soon as possible with an upper limit of 12 M\$. EMA consulted the Council and all members agreed. Thereafter, ESO started the process of tendering for NJ.

3. The Executive decided to include in the agenda for the next ECORD council meeting:

- ODC and relationships with industry
- EUROGIA
- Aurora Borealis

4. The Executive decided to invite Pierre Mathy (EC) to the next Council meeting. Invitation was sent but no positive answer was received.

C. Mevel presented the funding situation of ECORD between 2004 and 2008 (see Table 1).

C. Mevel informed Council that two of the four Italian funding agencies –CONISMA and OGS- have not yet paid their FY07 contributions. Contacts have been established and the payments are expected soon. For FY08, all MoUs have been signed except for Portugal and Italy. The MoU with Portugal is not yet signed because they were trying to increase its contribution. Hopefully the FY08 MoU with Portugal should be signed soon at the level of \$150 000. Italy was trying to constitute a consortium of the four institutions that are now part of ECORD. The plan has failed for FY08 and at the moment no Italian MoU has been signed.

Hopefully the Italian situation will be sorted out in the near future.

Concerning the ECORD FY08 budget (see Table 2), C. Mevel reminded Council that in FY07 a MoU was signed with ICDP to ensure its contribution of 0.5M USD for NJ. Because the expedition did not take place, the payment was deferred to 2008. Due to the new delay, the payment was deferred again to 2009. The contribution is not secured for 2009 because ICDP approves its budget annually. However, ICDP has reaffirmed its interest in contributing to NJ.

Table 1. ECORD funds between 2004 and 2008.

**Actual payments, to cover the shortfalls during the first phase (FY04-FY07)**

	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	total
Austria		100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	400 000
Belgium		30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	120 000
Canada	150 000	150 000	150 000	150 000	200 000	800 000
Denmark	500 000	500 000	1 000 000	0	200 000	2 200 000
Finland	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	331 900
France	2 000 000	3 000 000	3 500 000	3 500 000	5 600 000	17 600 000
Germany	2 250 000	3 500 000	7 000 000	0	5 600 000	18 350 000
Iceland	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	150 000
Ireland		130 000	130 000	130 000	145 000	535 000
Italy					400 000	400 000
Italy (OGS)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000		300 000
Italy (CNR)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000		300 000
Italy (INGV)		75 000	75 000	75 000		225 000
Italy (Conisma)		25 000	25 000	25 000		75 000
Netherlands	470 000	0	210 000	210 000	400 000	1 290 000
Norway	1 000 000	0	1 400 000	0	1 100 000	3 500 000
Portugal	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	450 000
Spain	150 000	350 000	350 000	350 000	476 000	1 676 000
Sweden*	1 312 500	330 000	330 000	330 000	528 000	2 830 500
Switzerland	150 000	350 000	350 000	350 000	560 000	1 760 000
UK	4 300 000	3 800 000	400 000	3 500 000	5 600 000	17 600 000
	12 618 880	12 676 380	15 386 380	9 086 380	21 125 380	70 893 400

\* In FY04, includes 900 000 in kind (Oden)

Table 2. ECORD FY08 budget in US\$

*As presented at the executive, April 2008*

	income	expenses
<b>FY07 ECORD reserve w/EMA</b>	<b>2 800 476</b>	
<b>ICDP contribution</b>	<b>500 000</b>	
<b>FY08 contributions</b>	<b>21 125 380</b>	
<b>SOCs to NSF</b>		<b>15 502 400</b>
<b>EMA*</b>		<b>127 500</b>
<b>ESSAC**</b>		<b>215 250</b>
<b>ESO contract</b>		<b>6 893 920</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24 425 856</b>	<b>22 736 320</b>
<b>balance</b>	<b>1 689 536</b>	

*Revised, after NJ delay, May 2008*

	income	expenses
<b>FY07 ECORD reserve w/EMA</b>	<b>2 800 476</b>	

\* 85 000 €, exchange rate =1.50

\*\* 143 500 €, exchange rate = 1.50

<b>ICDP contribution*</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>FY08 contributions</b>	<b>21 125 380</b>	
<b>investment***</b>	<b>76 800</b>	
<b>SOCs to NSF** (provisional)</b>		<b>15 502 400</b>
<b>EMA</b>		<b>127 500</b>
<b>ESSAC</b>		<b>215 250</b>
<b>ESO contract*</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24 002 656</b>	<b>15 845 150</b>
<b>balance (provisional)</b>	<b>8 157 506</b>	

\* deferred to FY09

\*\* still under discussion with the Lead Agencies

\*\*\* 2.2 M€ have been invested for the period Sept 07 - April 08 -

They have yield 49 549.95 € = 76 800 US\$ (exchange rate = 1.55)

**Note that in addition, ESO holds a FY07 reserve of 5 403 680 US\$**

C. Mevel informed Council that, due to the delay of MSP operations, CNRS has been able to invest 2.2M €. At the moment they have already yield 49 549.95€, and will yield more.

Referring to the NSF payments for FY08, C. Mevel indicated that following the Council decision, for FY08, EMA will pay the total contribution of \$15 502 400 to NSF. Any possible reduction will be discussed for the following years.

C. Mevel presented the global financial situation of ECORD, see Table 3. She reminded Council that ECORD money is kept in Euros and therefore it is affected by the exchange rate fluctuations between US dollars and Euros. For example, the biggest contributions have been paid when the exchange rate was 1.58 \$ = 1€, and one month later the exchange rate has moved to 1.55 \$ = 1€. S. Dürr indicated that if necessary, DFG could be willing to cover the exchange losses for its contribution.

Table 3. ECORD financial situation at June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

income	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08
ECORD contrib	12 618 880	12 676 380	15 386 380	9 086 380	21 125 380
carry forward		880	-1 151 620	876 596	2 800 476
investment					76 800
<b>total</b>	<b>12 618 880</b>	<b>12 677 260</b>	<b>14 234 760</b>	<b>9 962 976</b>	<b>24 002 656</b>
expenses					
SOCs		6 793 500	6 840 000	6 807 000	15 502 400
ESO contract	12 493 000	5 265 500	6 349 164	0	0
add ESO contract		1 600 000			
EMA* +	125 000	117 000	117 000	115 000	127 500
ESSAC		52 000	52 000	240 500	215 250
<b>total</b>	<b>12 618 000</b>	<b>13 828 000</b>	<b>13 358 164</b>	<b>7 162 500</b>	<b>15 845 150</b>
<b>balance w/EMA</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>-1 151 620</b>	<b>876 596</b>	<b>2 800 476</b>	<b>8 157 506</b>

<b>balance</b>	<b>5 403 680</b>	<b>4 660 380</b>
<b>w/ESO</b>		

To illustrate the evolution of the EMA and ESSAC budgets between 2004 and 2008, C. Mevel presented Table 4. She indicated that ESSAC budget has increased substantially in the last two years, because new activities have been developed (DLP, summer schools, etc). ESSAC budget slightly decreased in the transition from Cardiff to Aix en Provence mainly because

the way salaries are counted in the UK is different than in France.

Table 4. EMA and ESSAC budgets

budgets approved in Euros, converted into US \$ (subject to exchange rate)

	FY04	FY05	F06	FY07	FY08
<i>exchange rate</i>	<i>1,25</i>	<i>1,30</i>	<i>1,30</i>	<i>1,35</i>	<i>1,50</i>
EMA in €	100 000	100 000	90 000	85 000	85 000
in \$	125 000	117 000	117 000	115 000	127 500
ESSAC in €		40 000	40 000	178 147	143 500
in \$		52 000	52 000	240 500	215 250

EMA's budget has remained overall constant. C. Mevel reminded Council that only 1/3 of EMA's budget is funded through commingled funds, the rest has been covered by ECORD Net. This project is ending on August 31<sup>st</sup> and thereafter the whole budget for EMA should be absorbed by the commingled funds.

C. Mevel presented EMA and ESSAC budgets for FY09. See Table 5. The requested budget for EMA is 256 600 €. This budget is smaller than the expected expenditures for FY09 because approximately 50 000 € is expected as a positive balance from FY08.

C. Mevel reminded Council the investment of 2.2M € will yield approximately 100 000 € by the end of the year. She indicated that she is planning to use this money to fund EMA's budget. C. Mevel observed that once all the reports of ECORD Net are accepted by the EC, additional funds for EMA will come but she anticipated that likely these funds will be available for FY10.

Table 5. FY09 EMA Budget

EMA Budget in Euros	FY08 budget	FY08 expenses provisional	FY09 budget
Salaries			
compensation for the director	50 000	10 272	46 000
scientific coordinator (80%)	45 000	43 275	44 000
Assistant project manager	40 000	37 588	43 200
secretary (50%)		10 509	1 400
Total	135 000	101 644	134 600
Travel	50 000	45 000	50 000
Meetings	3 000	6 400	5 000
Consumables	5 000	1 500	2 000
Database	10 000	7 000	
Other costs (publications, booths..)	20 000	13 000	15 000
Support for SAS/ECORD meetings	12 000	7 500	10 000
Total	235 000	182 044	216 600
overheads 20%	45 000	45 000	40 000
TOTAL	280 000	227 044	256 600

\* 85 000 € from ECORD commingled fund, the rest is covered by ECORDnet

ECORD-Net ends 31/8/2008

in FY08, EMA will have a positive balance of 52 956 € (still provisional)

Total EMA FY09 budget in €	256 600
FY08 balance (provisional)	52 956
request from ECORD commingled funds in €	203 644
request from commingled funds in US \$ (exchange rate = 1.55)	315 648

C. Mevel presented the budget requested by ESSAC for FY09, see Table 6. G. Camoin indicated that there is an overall increase of 9 000 € for FY09 in relation with FY08. ESSAC is requesting an increase of 3K € for science coordinator's salary; 5K € for summer schools and 1K € for summer schools students.

Table 6. ESSAC requested budget for FY09.

### ESSAC REQUESTED BUDGET FOR FY09

September 30 th, 2008- October 1st, 2009

REQUESTED BUDGET FY 09	Budget FY 09	Budget FY 08	Evolution 08-09	Budget FY 07	Evolution 07-09
<b>Salaries</b>					
Science coordinator's salary (12 months)	48 000,00 €	45 000,00 €	(+ 5000)		
<b>Travel and subsistence costs</b>					
Science Coordinator	5 000,00 €	5 000,00 €	(=)		
Chair	11 000,00 €	11 000,00 €	(=)		
<b>Office costs</b>					
General office costs	13 500,00 €	13 500,00 €	(=)		
<b>Meetings</b>					
ESSAC October meeting <b>1</b>	1 500,00 €	1 500,00 €	(=)		
ESSAC May meeting <b>1</b>	1 500,00 €	1 500,00 €	(=)		
Travel support for speakers invited at ESSAC meetings <b>2</b>	4 000,00 €	4 000,00 €	(=)		
<b>Additional Council activities</b>					
Support for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme	18 000,00 €	18 000,00 €	(=)		
Workshop scientist support <b>3</b>	5 000,00 €	5 000,00 €	(=)		
Summer Schools support	20 000,00 €	15 000,00 €	(+ 5000)		
Summer school students	15 000,00 €	14 000,00 €	(+ 1000)		
Conference 09 travel support <b>4</b>	10 000,00 €	10 000,00 €	(=)		
<b>ECORD CONTRIBUTION</b>	<b>152 500,00 €</b>	<b>143 500,00 €</b>	<b>(+ 9000)</b>	<b>178 147,00 €</b>	<b>(-25647)</b>

**1 Support for ESSAC meetings**

**2 Expedition reports, proposal presentations, workshop reports etc.**

**3 Support for 'over-quota' participation of ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops**

**4 Travel support for keynote and invited speakers at the 09 ECORD Conference**

meeting for execution in FY10.

G. Wefer asked if ESSAC has explored the possibility of funding students to participate in the big IODP meeting planned in Bremenhaven. C. Mevel observed that funds for students could also come through the Magellan programme.

C. Mevel presented ECORD Funding for FY08 and beyond, see table 7. She indicated that there are still some uncertainties. Belgium has secured funds until FY08, a proposal has been submitted for the following years. A. de Vernal clarified that Canadian contributions for FY08 to FY10 will be 300 000 USD per year. For the last three years of the programme, Canada



will submit a new proposal to government.

C. Mevel indicated that for most of the countries contributions are approved year to year. Consequently, ECORD's overall funding situation is not secured. For FY09, C. Mevel observed that for FY09 a total funding of around 21.5 M USD is expected.

**Table 7. ECORD Funding for FY08 and beyond**

<b>ECORD contributions</b>	<b>FY08 US \$</b>	<b>FY09 US \$</b>	<b>FY10 US \$</b>	<b>FY11 US \$</b>	<b>FY12 US \$</b>	<b>FY13 US \$</b>	<b>total</b>
<b>Austria</b>	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	600 000
<b>Belgium</b>	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	180 000
<b>Canada</b>	200 000	350 000	350 000	500 000	500 000	500 000	2 400 000
<b>Denmark</b>	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	1 200 000
<b>Finland</b>	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	398 280
<b>France</b>	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	33 600 000
<b>Germany</b>	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	33 600 000
<b>Iceland</b>	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	180 000
<b>Ireland</b>	145 000	145 000	145 000	145 000	145 000	145 000	870 000
<b>Italy</b>	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	2 400 000
<b>Netherlands</b>	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	2 400 000
<b>Norway</b>	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	6 600 000
<b>Portugal</b>	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	540 000
<b>Spain</b>	476 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	4 286 000
<b>Sweden</b>	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	3 168 000
<b>Switzerland</b>	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	3 360 000
<b>UK</b>	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	33 600 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 125 380</b>	<b>21 561 380</b>	<b>21 561 380</b>	<b>21 711 380</b>	<b>21 711 380</b>	<b>21 711 380</b>	<b>129 382 280</b>

in red, still pending

S. Dürr informed Council that German contribution for FY09 is not completely secured and that the worst scenario will imply that their contribution will decrease to 3.6 M USD. He indicated that a final decision shall be known by the end of October. B. Goffé indicated that French contribution for FY09 is not secured either because it is reconsidered every year. C. Franklin manifested that UK has secured its contribution for FY09.

C. Mevel presented the ESO budget requested for FY09, see Table8. C. Mevel summarized that considering ESO's balance from FY08, ESO is requesting from EMA a total budget of 15'288.820 USD. C. Mevel pointed out that considering incomes and expenses for FY09, there is a shortfall of 2.5M USD assuming all MoUs and signed and invoices are paid. The situation could worsen if Germany decreases its contribution.

C. Franklin indicated that to cover the shortfall of 2.5M USD, UK could bring forward funds from FY10. This will provide ESO the guarantee needed to sign the contract for GBR

**Table 8. ESO POC request, to implement New Jersey and Great Barrier Reef**

see ESO costs FY08 and FY09

			Expected ECORD budget	
Estimate of the cost	US \$	19 949 200	ECORD contributions	FY09 US \$
FY07 reserve with ESO	5 403 680		Austria	100 000
FY08 POCs	-445 700		Belgium	30 000
FY08 international travels	-297 600		Canada	350 000
balance, end of FY08	4 660 380	-4 660 380	Denmark	200 000
			Finland	66 380
ESO request for FY09		15 288 820	France	5 600 000
			Germany	5 600 000
			Iceland	30 000
			Ireland	145 000
			Italy	400 000
			Netherlands	400 000
			Norway	1 100 000
			Portugal	90 000
			Spain	762 000
			Sweden	528 000
			Switzerland	560 000
			UK	5 600 000
			<b>Total</b>	<b>21 561 380</b>
ECORD FY09 budget in US\$				
	income	expenses		
FY08 ECORD reserve w/EMA	8 157 506			
FY09 contributions	21 561 380			
ICDP for NJ*	500 000			
SOCs to NSF		16 800 000		
EMA (provisional)**		315 650		
ESSAC (provisional)***		236 375		
ESO contract		15 288 820		
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 218 886</b>	<b>32 640 845</b>		
<b>balance</b>	<b>-2 421 959</b>			

\* pending

\*\* 252 000 € = 313 720 US\$, exchange rate 1.55

\*\*\* 152 500 € = 236 375 US\$, exchange rate = 1.55

**Note that 5.2 M € have been invested**

C. Mevel suggested that EMA, ESSAC and ESO budgets be approved and that the mechanisms to guarantee the funds be discussed later. The following motions were passed:

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-3**

ECORD Council approves the FY09 budget of € 256 600 presented by EMA. The EMA budget includes salaries.

C. Franklin moved, K. Verbruggen seconded, all in favour except one abstention (B. Goffé). Absentee: F. Barriga.

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-4**

ECORD Council approves the FY09 budget of € 152 500 presented by ESSAC. This budget includes: € 20 000 for Summer Schools support; € 15 000 for scholarships for the FY09 Summer Schools; € 18 000 to support the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme; € 5 000 to support 'over-quota' participation of ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops; € 10 000 for travel support for keynote and invited speakers at the 09 ECORD Conference.

S. Falcón-Morales moved, M. Kullin seconded, all in favour except one abstention (B. Goffé). Absentee: F. Barriga.

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-5**

ECORD Council approves a maximum POC budget of 19 949 200 US\$ to allow ESO to implement the New Jersey Expedition and the Great Barrier Reef Expedition in 2009 calendar year. This budget is subject to securing a mechanism for covering the costs from future years.

K. Verbruggen moved, R. Schorno seconded, all in favour except one abstention (C. Franklin). Absentee: F. Barriga.

On behalf of EMA, ESO and ESSAC, C. Mevel thanked the Council for their trust.

C. Mevel manifested that as soon as Germany comes to a decision, if needed, a discussion among the Executive would be organised.

Answering the question of whether motion 08-01-5 guarantees ESO contract for GBR, D. Evans answered no. He indicated that if CNRS pays first FY09 ECORD's contribution to NSF there will not be enough funds left to sign a contract with BGS for GBR. He clarified that funds will not be realised until FY10 but to proceed with the contracting of the platform under the EU laws the funds for the contract should be guaranteed in FY09. The way to guarantee the funds is to have a contract signed in FY09 between CNRS and BGS. Due to contract procedures CNRS requires at least to have the MoUs signed to back up the upcoming funds. However, under the current conditions as there is a shortfall for FY09 CNRS will not be able to sign a contract with NSF -SOCs to IODP- and a contract with BGS –POCs for BGR.

To avoid the situation presented by D. Evans and to facilitate the process of signing the contract for GBR in FY09, ECORD Council approved the following motion:

**ECORD Council motion 08-01-6**

For FY09 ECORD Council decides to guarantee the POCs for ESO as a priority from the ECORD commingled funds, for the specific purpose of enabling the signing of ESO contract at the earliest stage.

N. Wardell moved, K. Verbruggen seconded, all in favour except one abstention (S. Falcón-Morales). Absentee: F. Barriga.

**Agenda Item 17- MEXT report and status of the Chikyu (Toshi Oshima)**

Toshi Oshima coincided with James Allan to inform Council that MEXT and NSF have committed to support a 10 year extension of IODP beyond the current phase. T. Oshima informed Council that MEXT is engaged to prepare the post-IODP programme and invited Council to join the discussions that in this regard will take place at the next IODP Council meeting.

T. Oshima confirmed that in FY09, CHIKYU will conduct seven months of operations for IODP. Two NanTroSEIZE expeditions are planned. Five months (March – July) of riser drilling and two months (August-September) of riser-less operations.

C. Mevel asked if changes in the structure of the programme for post-2013 are going to be discussed. T. Oshima replied that Japan is ready to discuss all topics based on the achievements of the current programme. C. Mevel inquired about MEXT's view of the IODP structure. He responded that they consider the structure is complicated not only regarding the procedures but also the money flow.

R. Schorno inquired about CHIKYU's availability for industry. T. Oshima responded that due to financial shortfalls MEXT expects to carry out, per year, 70% of operations for IODP and 30% for non-IODP, which means that possible operations with industry could occur. However, he clarified that CHIKYU was built using tax payers money and thereafter MEXT will prioritize Japanese Agencies and Japanese industrial cooperation. CHIKYU will also prioritize working in Japanese waters.

C. Mevel asked if MEXT will be able to fund 5 months of riser and 2 months of riserless drilling until the end of the programme. T. Oshima responded positively but mentioned that if operations costs will continue to rise, MEXT will be obligated to revise the yearly time of operations for IODP.

D. Evans asked about MEXT's view on the reduction to a single IODP-MI office. T. Oshima responded that MEXT does not have any opinion on one or two offices but indicated that they will have to keep one office in Japan.

S. Falcón-Morales thanked T. Oshima for coming and participating on the meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 18 - Deep Sea Frontier Initiative, Post Aberdeen Group, and perspectives in FP7 (Stefan Winkler-Nees)**

S. Winkler briefly presented the draft of the ECORD Vision and Strategy Document ECORD Council decided to continue to develop the strategy for ocean drilling and its involvement in the **Deep Sea Frontier Initiative**, as well as for the relationships with industry in Europe during the last phase of IODP and beyond. At C. Franklin's suggestion, the Executive is tasked to finalise the document initiated by the Vision Group. Final discussion of this document will take place at the next Council meeting. The following motion was passed:

##### **ECORD Council motion 08-01-7**

ECORD Council tasks ECORD Executive to further develop the draft of ECORD Vision document. Final discussion of this document will take place at the next ECORD Council meeting.

R. Schorno moved, S. Falcón-Morales seconded, all in favour. Absentees: F. Barriga, D. Holtsman, R. Belocky, C. Franklin.

The Council heartily thanked Stefan Winkler-Ness who has invested himself in promoting and developing the ECORD Vision and the Deep Sea Frontier Initiative, and is now moving to new responsibilities.

C. Mevel inquired for Council's input to answer the questionnaire send by SASEC's Chair Masahuro Kono. The reply is expected for June 12<sup>th</sup>. The following action was decided:

**ACTION EMA:** To prepare a draft letter in response to Masaru Kono, SASEC's chair, regarding his request for comments on renewal process. The draft letter will be circulated among the members of ECORD Council prior to be sent to M. Kono.

#### **Agenda item 19 - AOB**

S. Falcón-Morales inquired about mechanisms to fund 3D site surveys for European led proposals. C. Mevel clarified that 3D site surveys are required to locate sites for riser drilling and indicated that they are very costly. G. Camoin coincided with C. Mevel and added that the programme should consider pre-cruise science in the future. The following actions were passed:

**ACTION ESSAC:** To prepare the discussion on how to support 3D-site surveys for European-led proposals for the next ECORD Council meeting.

**ACTION EMA:** To include in the agenda for the next ECORD Council an item on funding for 3D-site surveys for European-led proposals.

S. Falcón-Morales thanked the French partners for hosting the meeting and reminded that the next meeting will take place in London in November. EMA was tasked to consult Council members to fix the dates.

**ACTION EMA:** To poll the members of ECORD Council to fix the dates for the next ECORD Council to be held in London.

End of the meeting.