

**ECORD Council Meeting #14
London, 11-12 November 2008
Central Hall Westminster, Storey's Gate
Westminster, London, SW1H9NH**

MINUTES

Approved at the ECORD Council Meeting # 15 held in Lisbon on 09/06/09.

<i>PARTICIPANTS</i>		
<i>MEMBERS</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>EMAIL</i>
Canada	Anne de Vernal	devernal.anne@uqam.ca
Denmark	Heidi Elberling	heel@fi.dk
France	Bruno Goffé	bruno.goffe@cnsr-dir.fr
Germany	Sören Dürr	soeren.duerr@dfg.de
Italy	Nigel Wardell	nwardell@ogs.trieste.it
Ireland	Koen Verbruggen	Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie
Norway	Are Carlson	are.carlson@forskningsradet.no
Spain	Severino Falcon Morales	severino.falcon@mec.es
Sweden	Dan Holtstam	dan.holtstam@vr.se
UK	Chris J. Franklin	cfr@nerc.ac.uk
<i>OBSERVERS</i>		
IMI BoG	John Ludden	jludden@exchange.keyworth.bgs.ac.uk
SASEC	Nicholas Arndt	nicholas.arndt@ujf-grenoble.fr
ESO	Dan Evans	devans@bgs.ac.uk
ESSAC	Gilbert Camoin	camoin@cerege.fr
EMA	Catherine Mevel	mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr
EMA	Rosa Bernal-Carrera	rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr
NERC	Sasha Leigh	snbl@nerc.ac.uk
NSF	Deborah Smith	dksmith@nsf.gov

<i>APOLOGIES</i>		
<i>MEMBERS</i>		
<i>Austria</i>	<i>Reinhard Belocky</i>	<i>belocky@fwf.ac.at</i>
<i>Belgium</i>	<i>Jean-Pierre Henriët</i>	<i>jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be</i>
<i>Finland</i>	<i>Sanna Carlsson</i>	<i>sanna.carlsson@aka.fi</i>
<i>Iceland</i>	<i>Rikke Pedersen</i>	<i>rikke@hi.is</i>
<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>Raymond M.L. Schorno</i>	<i>SCHORNO@NWO.NL</i>
<i>Portugal</i>	<i>Fernando Barriga</i>	<i>f.barriga@fc.ul.pt</i>
<i>Switzerland</i>	<i>Marcel Kullin</i>	<i>mkullin@snf.ch</i>
<i>MEXT</i>	<i>Masahiko Hori</i>	<i>masahori@nsf.org</i>
<i>OBSERVERS</i>		
<i>ESF</i>	<i>Bernard Avril</i>	<i>bavril@esf.org</i>

ICDP	Uli Harms	ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de
IMI BoG	Hans Thierstein	thierstein@erdw.ethz.ch
IMI BoG	Daniel Prieur	daniel.prieur@univ-brest.fr
SASEC	Gerold Wefer	gwefer@marum.de
ERICON	Paul Egerton	pegerton@esf.org
EC	Pierre Mathy	Pierre.Mathy@ec.europa.eu

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

Tuesday, November 11th

Open Session

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and logistical information

The meeting was hosted by Chris Franklin at Central Hall Westminster in London.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the Paris meeting minutes (C. Franklin)

The agenda was approved with no modifications.

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-1

ECORD Council approves the Paris minutes without modifications.

ECORD Council thanked Marcel Kullin and Rikke Pedersen who have served on the Council and have now moved to new responsibilities. The following motion was passed:

ECORD Council motion 08-02-1

ECORD Council thanks Marcel Kullin and Rikke Pederson who have served on the Council and have now moved to new responsibilities. In particular, Marcel was involved from the start of ECORD, has served as the ECORD chair from April to September 2006, and has worked tirelessly to build the programme. The Council wish them well in their new activities.

C. Franklin moved, N. Wardell seconded, all in favour

Agenda Item 3 Paris meeting actions (C. Franklin)

- *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 Artic Ocean History: From speculation to reality. This workshop will take place in Bremerhaven on November 3-5, 2008. C. Mevel informed that G. Marquette was contacted and registered to participate in the workshop, but unfortunately he did not attend.*
- *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. C. Mevel noted that representatives from EC were invited but did not attend.*

- *ACTION EMA: To prepare a draft letter in response to Masaru Kono, SASEC's chair, regarding his request for comments on the renewal process. The draft letter will be circulated among the members of ECORD Council prior to being sent to M. Kono. The letter was sent to M. Kono.*
- *ACTION ESSAC: To prepare the discussion on how to support 3D-site surveys for European-led proposals for the next ECORD Council meeting. This action was not completed, ESSAC will prepare the discussion for the next 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. Action to be completed at the next Council meeting.*
- *ACTION EMA: To poll the members of ECORD Council to fix the dates for the next ECORD Council to be held in London. Done.*

Agenda Item 4- New council Vice-Chair to be elected; composition of the executive

Reminding the rule of alternation, C. Franklin indicated that the next incoming chair should be the German representative. An offer by S Durr for other countries to volunteer was not taken up. The following motion was passed:

ECORD Council motion 08-02-2

ECORD Council elects Sören Dürr as incoming Vice-Chair to replace Severino Falcón Morales as of 1 April 2009. ECORD Council elects Nigel Wardell as member of the Executive to replace Sören Dürr as of 1 April 2009.

C. Franklin moved, D. Holtzman seconded, (all in favour) S Durr, N Wardell abstained.

The ECORD Executive as of 1 April 2009 will consist of F. Barriga (chair), C. Franklin (vice chair), S. Dürr (vice chair), C. Mével (EMA), Reinhard Belocky (Austria), and N. Wardell (Italy).

Agenda Item 5 - Board of Governors report (J. Ludden).

(see BoG report by J. Ludden at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

John Ludden reported on the activities of the BoG. A Search Committee has been established to find the successor of the current IODP-MI President, the position has been advertised. The first interviews will take place mid-December 2008 during the AGU Fall meeting. M. Talwani's contract ends June 2009.

At the request of the BoG, an Ad-Hoc Committee has been set up by IODP-MI. It is tackling two main questions: 1) How scientific ocean drilling can be most efficiently organized and operated given anticipated levels of funding and available infrastructure with emphasis on the period post 2013, 2) What are the options for developing additional funding for ocean drilling from other government agencies, industry and private sources. This committee met at the end of October and a report should be available soon.

J. Ludden indicated that optimal funding for operations should allow 12 months for JR, 6 months for CHIKYU and one MSP per year. In relation to the initiative of an industry sponsored consortium (Ocean Drilling Consortium – ODC) developed by M. Talwani and aimed to fund 4-months operations per year for the JR, C. Mevel informed Council that after the ODC workshop held in June 2008 a proposal was produced. It has been submitted to several companies but answers are not expected before mid 2009, for a start in 2010. D. Smith clarified that NSF does not have any input on the ODC proposal from M. Talwani. C. Mevel indicated that in addition to the ODC concept, TAMU was discussing with Ocean Drilling Limited (ODL) and Transocean an arrangement to provide the ship to Fugro. Apparently Fugro, ODL and Transocean are eager to move forward, but a model needs to be in place for this type of activity. This option could be implemented quickly with NSF approval. Several Council members expressed their concerns that under this kind of arrangement IODP drilling would have to be scheduled around non-IODP work.

Agenda Item 6- SASEC report (N. Arndt).

(see SASEC report by N. Arndt at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

N. Arndt reported on the last SASEC meeting held in Beijing in June 2008.

There is a concern regarding riser drilling at NantroSEIZE because of the Kuroshio current. It is therefore important to have alternate proposals ready in the event that the current is too strong to allow riser drilling. SASEC encourages acquisition of 3-D site survey data for well ranked projects. However, the acquisition of 3D seismic surveys is extremely expensive. ECORD Council will consider this item at its next meeting and asked ESSAC to prepare a discussion from the European perspective. ESSAC and EMA were tasked with the following actions:

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.

Focusing on program renewal, SASEC is actively involved preparing the INVEST (IODP New Ventures in Exploring Scientific Targets) Conference which is an international scientific meeting being organised in Bremen in September 2009. INVEST will focus on defining the scientific research goals for the second phase of IODP. SASEC also discussed the importance of thematic balance within IODP. ECORD Council expressed concern that IODP has not yet made significant progress in the biosphere initiative, which was one of the underpinning drivers of IODP. The ECORD Council also emphasized the importance of keeping the system open for young scientists and new good proposals. The next day the following motion and action were decided:

ECORD Council motion 08-02-6

ECORD Council is concerned that IODP will not make significant progress in the biosphere initiative, which was one of the underpinning drivers of IODP. Therefore ECORD Council

strongly encourages IODP to make a sustained approach to the study of the deep biosphere during the remainder of the current programme. We encourage IODP to link existing, highly-ranked proposals in dedicated biosphere observatory installation with a coupled programme of 4-6 months additional drilling that would be the subject of a specific call for proposals and creation of a 'biosphere mission group', if appropriate working in a regional context.

S. Dürr moved, K. Verbruggen seconded, all in favour. Absentee B. Goffé

ACTION EMA: To send this motion to the BoG chair and the SASEC chair

Agenda Item 7- ESO report (D. Evans)

(see ESO report by D. Evans at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

ESO informed Council that following postponement of the New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition last April, the expedition is now planned to start in May 2009. A new 'fast-tracked' OJEU notice was issued and, as a result a preferred bidder has been chosen and contractual discussions are ongoing.

To ensure contract completion for New Jersey, ECORD Council gave approval to ESO to include in the contract the possibility of making an early stage payment when the platform leaves the Gulf port. Dan Evans raised the problem of LDW (Logging While Drilling) which cannot be operated from the rig currently under negotiation with the contractor. The Council authorized Dan Evans to continue contract discussions to secure the platform for the New Jersey Expedition. The contract could be modified later to include LWD if required. The next day, the following motions regarding NJSS Expedition were decided:

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-3

With the purpose to ensure contract completion for New Jersey, ECORD Council gives approval to ESO to include in the contract the possibility of making an early stage payment of about 750 000 USD when the platform leaves the Gulf port.

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-4

ECORD Council gives authority to Dan Evans to continue contract discussions to ensure the platform for the New Jersey Expedition. The contract could be modified later to include LWD if required for the expedition.

Addressing the Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes Expedition (GBREC), Dan Evans reported that last September, ESO held a very positive meeting with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). Jody Webster (Australia) as co-chief of this expedition participated in the meeting. The GBRMPA requested that the benefits of the expedition be highlighted to the reef management. As a result, the name of the expedition was changed and ESO has submitted a new permit application for 45 holes at 5 locations and to extend the permit to the end of December 2010. The OJEU notice for this contract was issued and tenders receipt closed August 8th. ESO is in contract discussions with one potential contractor, who is proving to be very responsive.

D. Evans informed Council that on their way back from Australia to UK, ESO staff had the opportunity to visit the JR in Singapore (24th September). D. Evans indicated that although a lot has already been accomplished, much work remained to be done, especially electrics. He was keen to signal the hard work of the US team to get the job completed under difficult circumstances.

Agenda Item 8- EMA report (C. Mevel)

(see EMA report by C. Mevel at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

IODP Council

An extraordinary meeting of the IODP Council will be held in January 2009 in Lisbon, mainly to discuss the renewal of the programme. All ECORD Council members are invited to attend. At this stage, C. Franklin, S. Falcón Morales, S. Dürr and C. Mevel have indicated that they will attend the meeting.

IODP-MI

Contract for the Sapporo office of IODP-MI has been extended to March 2010. IODP-MI's President term will end June 2009. A search committee to find his successor has been established. The review committee for the first three CHIKYU expeditions will meet on January 2009, C. Mevel and D. Evans will attend.

Due to changes in the ships schedule, the final Program Plan for 2009 is not yet available. The JR will start operating for IODP in March 2009, and the CHIKYU in May 2009.

ECORD Net

C. Mevel informed Council that the ECORD Net project came to end on August 31st. EMA is preparing all the final reports; all deliverables will be available to the public by request to EMA.

Outreach

EMA – ESO – ESSAC Outreach meetings are being organised on a regular basis to coordinate activities. Several outreach activities have been developed by EMA. New releases include Newsletter #11 and a new image brochure to highlight ECORD achievements produced by DFG through ECORD Net. A new brochure on MSPs is being prepared. EMA organised together with IODP-Norway and IODP-MI the IODP booth at the IGC meeting in Oslo last August. EMA received from IODP-MI, as permanent loan, five core replicas (K/T boundary, PETM, ACEX, Tahiti, Hole 1256 – transition basalts/gabbros in the ocean crust) for outreach activities. They are available upon request to EMA. EMA is presenting ECORD at a major public scientific event in Paris on November 14-16th under the French EU presidency.

Relation with other European Programmes

EMA presented the EC calls for 2009 under FP7. ECORD Council was keen to keep relations with existing initiatives to promote marine and maritime sciences at the European level. ECORD is actively involved in responding to the 2009 call for a coordination action to support the Deep Sea Frontier initiative. ECORD Council is committed to maintaining its relationships with the Aurora Borealis Project. (see agenda item 15)

Agenda Item 9- NSF report and status of the JOIDES Resolution (D. Smith)

(see NSF report by D. Smith at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Deborah Smith from NSF participated in the open session of the Council. She presented the structure and functioning of the Ocean Division within the Geosciences Directorate at NSF.

D. Smith updated Council on the current situation of the JOIDES Resolution (JR). After a new delay the expected delivery from the shipyard is November 2008 and JR will start operations at the end of January 2009, with a test cruise. Scientific expeditions will start in March 2009. The JR will operate twelve consecutive calendar months for IODP in FY09 – FY10. D. Smith reaffirmed NSF commitment to reduce operational and management costs for IODP.

Several Council members asked for an update on new memberships for IODP. D. Smith replied that the Memorandum between the Australia/New Zealand IODP Consortium (ANZIC) and the Lead agencies is being completed. ANZIC will have the status of Associate Member. The Memorandum with India is also being finalized for an associate membership. Contacts have been made with Russia. The question of the number of berths allocated to associate members was discussed. Council members expressed their concern that it might be more beneficial in terms of berths on an expedition to join IODP as an associate member rather than as a member of ECORD. S. Dürr asked NSF for more information on the way the ECORD contribution to IODP is spent. He indicated that funding agencies are requesting this information, in particular for renewal. D. Smith agreed to provide the information as well as the IODP budget for FY09.

Agenda Item 10 - MEXT report and status of the Chikyu (Masahiko Hori)

C. Mevel informed Council that due to last minute priorities M. Hori could not participate in the meeting.

Agenda Item 11- ESSAC report (G. Camoin)

(see ESSAC report by G. Camoin at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Gilbert Camoin informed Council of the platform schedules for FY09 and FY10, as discussed at the 12th SPC meeting. In FY10, only one MSP expedition (Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes) will take place. Scheduling CHIKYU riser drilling beyond FY09 is problematic. For riser drilling, the CHIKYU is presently constrained to only one operational area with 3-D seismic coverage (NanTroSEIZE). That area has logistical limitations because of the Kuroshio Current. One option is to consider commitment to another riser project such as the Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP) but it has site survey issues. SASEC encourages acquisition of 3-D site survey data for other potential, highly-ranked projects in order to provide other opportunities to utilize riser drilling. The JR schedule for FY10 is uncertain and will depend on funding and the location of non-IODP work.

SPC is considering developing “expedition flexibility” for the remaining duration of the programme, to accommodate more projects. In the current mode, most expeditions are scheduled for 2 months on the JOIDES Resolution. It appears that it would be possible to “de-scope” some proposals, streamline them, maintain the high priority science objectives, and implement them via hybrid legs with flexible expedition length. SPC has requested the IOs, the funding agencies, PMOs and SSEP to evaluate the impacts of this scheme at all levels.

SASEC is organising a major scientific meeting for all scientists interested in the renewal of IODP. The “New Ventures in Exploring Scientific Targets (INVEST)” conference will take place on 23-25 September 2009 in Bremen, Germany. In preparation for this meeting, ESSAC is organizing a workshop/conference (“Beyond 2013 - The Future of European Ocean Drilling Research”) at the European Geophysical Union (EGU) meeting in April 2009. This meeting will address several issues, including: (1) the future of ECORD; (2) new scientific objectives in scientific drilling; (3) relationships between the IODP and other programs; (4) collaboration between academia and industry; and (5) new technologies. At the Japanese level, J-DESC is hosting a big domestic meeting in October-November 2008, the focus will be on renewal of IODP beyond 2013, and the future of ocean drilling.

With respect to the European workshop, ECORD Council recommended inviting people from outside IODP and young scientists to the discussions. Several Council members insisted on the need for injecting “new blood” into the system. It is important to enlarge discussions beyond ocean drilling. Council insisted on the importance of a convincing science plan that shows societal relevance, and of an external evaluation of the scientific achievements. On the second day of the meeting, ECORD Council tasked ESSAC with the following action:

ACTION ESSAC: To include Council views on structure into the EGU Workshop 2009 - Beyond 2013: The future of European Ocean Research Drilling.

ESSAC informed Council that ECORD, with 63% of proposals is leading the submissions as of October 1st 2008. Counting all active proposals, ECORD maintains a healthy presence with 38%. A wide variety of statistics informing on the scientific presence of ECORD in IODP are available upon request at the ESSAC Office.

ESSAC Office has issued two calls for applications concerning: Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes Expedition and NanTroSEIZE 1B Expedition. The staffing is complete for the GBREC Expedition. Gilbert Camoin presented the status of sailing applications and the quota balance.

Member	Financial contribution %	Entitlement	Berths	Balance
France	24.8%	36.5	31	(-) 5.5
Germany	25.9%	38.0	38	0,0
UK	24.8%	36.5	35	(-) 1.5
Sum	75.5%	111,0	104	(-) 7.0
Austria	0.6%	0.8	0	(-) 0.8
Belgium	0.2%	0.2	1	(+) 0.8
Canada	1.1%	1.7	5	(+) 3.3
Denmark	3.1%	4.6	3	(-) 1.6
Finland	0.5%	0.7	2	(+) 1.3
Iceland	0.2%	0.3	0	(-) 0.3

Ireland	0.8%	1.1	0	(-) 1.1
Italy	1.8%	2.7	6	(+) 3.3
The Netherlands	1.8%	2.7	4	(+) 1.3
Norway	4.9%	7.3	4	(-) 3.3
Portugal	0.6%	0.9	1	(+) 0.1
Spain	2.4%	3.5	6	(+) 2.5
Sweden	4.0%	5.9	6	(+) 0.1
Switzerland	2.5%	3.6	5	(+) 1.4
Sum	24.5%	36.0	43	(+) 7.0
Total ECORD		147	147	0,0

ECORD Council endorsed ESSAC recommendations for replacements in several SAS panels. The following motions were passed during the second day of the meeting.

ECORD Council motion 08-02-3

ECORD Council approves ESSAC nominations for replacements on SAS panels.

SPC: R. Stein, Germany, to replace J. Behrmann after the August 09 SPC meeting.

STP: Marc K. Reishow, Leicester, U.K. to replace M. Lowell, who has rotated off, subject to checking that there is no conflict of interest.

ECORD council approves the extension of Gilbert Camoin's mandate at SPC for one more meeting.

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

Concerning outreach activities, ESSAC informed Council that the 2008 summer schools were very successful. Two new summer schools are scheduled in 2009:

- Urbino Summer School in Paleoclimatology (USSP)
- Geodynamics of Mid-Ocean Ridges, in Bremen

The call for scholarships will be launched early next year. A call for the 2010 round of ECORD Summer Schools was issued in October 2008 with a deadline of April 4th, 2009. The call for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme FY09-10 closed on September 30th 2008. The three selected lecturers are Peter Clift (UK), Achim Kopf (Germany) and John Parkes (UK). 34 applications to host a lecture have already been received from 14 countries. ESSAC is preparing a new edition of the ECORD Teachers Workshop. The plan is to hold the event during the EGU meeting in 2010. ESSAC presented a project to establish ECORD Grants from 2010. This programme would consist of allocating awards to outstanding graduate students to conduct research related to the Integrated Ocean Drilling Programme. On the second day of the meeting the following motion was passed:

ECORD Council motion 08-02-7

ECORD Council supports in principle the ESSAC proposal for the establishment of ECORD Grants. The Council will review the budget allocation for these grants at the appropriate time.

S. Dürr moved, N. Wardell seconded, all in favour. Absentee B. Goffé

Friday, November 12th
Closed Session

Agenda Item 12- ESO budget (D. Evans)

(see ESO Report – Closed Session by D. Evans at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Contracts

D. Evans informed Council that BGS was ready to sign the SOC's contract with IODP-MI for FY09 considering the exchange rate of April 1st as has been the practice in previous years. However, ESO had just received a request for adjustment of the currency rate. ESO considers this requirement unacceptable because in the past BGS has dealt with similar problems without requesting any adjustment. The following consensus was reached:

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-2

ECORD Council supports ESO's position to maintain the exchange rate of April 01, 2008 to calculate the SOCs to IODP-MI as has been the practice in previous years. In the past ESO has lost with the fluctuations in the exchange rate and has covered the losses.

As soon as the issue of the exchange rate is settled, BGS will proceed to sign contracts with CNRS, Leicester and Bremen.

FY08 Financial Report

ESO's financial statement for FY08 was approved by ECORD Council.

ECORD Council motion 08-02-4

ECORD Council approves the FY08 annual financial statement as presented by ESO.

K. Verbruggen moved, N. Wardell seconded, all in favour with three abstentions (C. Franklin, S. Dürr, B. Goffé). Absentee S. Falcón Morales

New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition

A new call for tenders resulted in four tenders received. Final tenders were returned on 20th June and were assessed. DOSSEC has been selected as the potential contractor, using the liftboat Kayd owned by Montco. Discussions are being held but progress is slow. ESO is aiming for an early May start, but there are some financial issues to be solved before a contract is signed. The most important refers to the fact that NERC does not pay in advance for contracts. During normal times, contractors get around this by having a bank guarantee loan or an ESCROW that covers their commitment until the first payment when project starts (i.e. leaves New York in the case of NJ). It seems that DOSSEC is having difficulties in organising this because of the global financial situation. D. Evans asked if making an early stage payment to overcome the issue will be acceptable to ECORD Council. K. Verbruggen asked about the risks involved. C. Franklin answered that the legal department of NERC considers that the risk is quite low. The following consensus was reached:

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-3

With the purpose to ensure contract completion for New Jersey, ECORD Council gives

approval to ESO to include in the contract the possibility of making an early stage payment of about 750 000 USD when the platform leaves the Gulf port.

New Jersey – Logging While Drilling issue

D. Evans informed Council that currently LWD will not be possible due to technical incompatibility with the drilling rig and drill string offered by DOSEC. The Co-Chief has indicated that no LWD would severely impact the science of the expedition. The problem is being reviewed by IODP-MI. There is a possibility of using a different drill string and another drilling rig, but this may increase the costs of the operation significantly. The most urgent issue at this stage is to sign the contract. D. Evans clarified that as the POCs budget is fixed, any cost increase means an equivalent decrease in coring time. The following statement was accepted by consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 08-02-4

ECORD Council gives authority to Dan Evans to continue contract discussions to ensure the platform for the New Jersey Expedition. The contract could be modified later to include LWD if required for the expedition.

Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes

D. Evans informed Council that after the OJEU notice was issued and platform tenders were assessed, ESO is in contract discussions with one potential contractor. The process has been very positive. ESO visited the contractor in Singapore and have agreed on the coring methodology. The vessel is being refitted and will be ready in January.

D. Evans informed Council that ESO was requested by the Operations Task Force (OTF) to consider including APL#728 « Latest Pleistocene Early Deglacial Drowned Coralgall Barrier Reef Along the Gulf of Papua » in the GBREC expedition. G. Camoin indicated that SPC encouraged the implementation of 728-APL2, as a piggyback to the Great Barrier Reef drilling. D. Evans clarified that the APL aims to drill a single hole and was based on the likelihood that the drilling platform will transit through the site. However no site survey data have been produced and the site is not yet approved by EPSP. Moreover, implementation of this APL will come at the expenses of three days drilling of the Great Barrier Reef. Several Council members noted that APLs (Ancillary Project Letters) are an important part of the IODP proposal process because they allow flexibility. The APLs are designed for projects requiring a maximum of three days. However, the Council was concerned that adding this project, in different national waters, may jeopardize the negotiations with the contractor. Therefore, Council recommended that to ensure the implementation of the GBR, ESO should if necessary not include the APL in the overall project. The next day the following action was decided:

ACTION EMA: To pass the following message to the SPC chair and the VP Operations regarding the implementation of the APL#728:

The ECORD council recognizes the benefit of the APL system that allows the implementation of exciting science at short notice. However, considering the logistical complexity introduced by the APL in the case of an MSP, in different national waters, the ECORD council is concerned that adding the APL#728 to the Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes project may jeopardize the negotiations with the contractor. Therefore, Council recommends that to ensure the implementation of the GBR, ESO should, at their discretion, not include the APL in the overall project.

Future Expeditions

ECORD Council discussed the perspective of new MSP expeditions. Three MSP proposals were ranked by SPC at their meeting in March 2008:

637 - New England Hydrogeology

548 - Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater

581 - Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks

Among these three, only proposal 581 has been forwarded to Operation Task Force for implementation and none will become available in March 2009 after SPC ranking meeting.

G. Camoin informed Council that ESSAC discussed the revision of the proposal for drilling in the Baltic Sea, currently in the system at the SSEP level. A Magellan workshop is funded for March 2009 to complete the revision, for an April 1st submission. The goal is to have the proposal ready for drilling in 2010. Council discussed the possibility of a fast track procedure for this proposal. The current IODP system does not allow that. ECORD Council reaffirmed its commitment to have one MSP per year until the end of the second phase of IODP.

Finances

ESO suggested that in the likelihood that the platform will stay in the NJ area, a rebate on the demobilisation costs could be arranged with the contractor. For a better balance between the expeditions, D. Evans requested Council to consider reducing NJ maximum budget to \$11.6 M while maintaining the total POC budget at the same level of \$19.95 M. The Council was concerned that reducing the costs implies reducing drilling time. C. Mevel added that proponents have been told that there will be 90 days of drilling. D. Evans answered that proponents are aware that it is subject to funds. ECORD Council passed the following motion:

ECORD Council motion 08-02-5

ECORD Council gives authority to the Executive to make decisions on the global duration of the New Jersey Expedition and flexibility to manage any demobilisation refund.

C. Franklin moved, K. Verbruggen seconded, all in favour

Agenda Item 13- ECORD-IODP budget (C. Mevel)

(see ECORD budget by C. Mevel at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Contracts

The FY08 contribution to NSF (\$15.8M) has been paid. The FY09 addendum to Memorandum with the LAs will be signed soon, at the level of \$16.8 M.

The MoUs for FY09 have been sent to all partners except to those who are not yet sure of their level of contribution.

C. Mevel indicated that the contract with ESO is ready but CNRS needs the commitment of the countries to give the green light.

J. Ludden indicated in the current financial turmoil it is important to minimize the transfer of money to avoid the fluctuations of exchange rate. C. Mevel agreed and added that paying SOCs directly to ESO could be investigated.

ACTION EMA: To investigate with the LAs different ways to simplify the flow of money within IODP.

EMA informed Council that, despite the delay in the New Jersey Shallow Shelf expedition to FY09, ICDP has agreed to maintain its financial participation. The ECORD Council is grateful to ICDP for its renewed commitment.

ACTION EMA: To send a letter thanking ICDP for its contribution.

ECORD Budget FY04 –FY09

EMA presented the ECORD budget situation for FY04 to FY08. Most ECORD member countries have paid their contributions for FY08. However, two Italian institutions have not paid FY07 and not signed Annex H for FY08.

ACTION CHAIR: To send a letter to the Italian partners of ECORD asking for unpaid contributions

ECORD budget during the first phase of IODP (FY04-FY08) actual payments, to cover the shortfalls of ACEX and Tahiti

	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	300 000	900 000
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 (OGS)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000	100 000	400 000
Italy (CNR)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000	100 000	400 000
Italy (INGV)		75 000	75 000	75 000	90 000	315 000
Italy (Conisma)		25 000	25 000	25 000	40 000	115 000
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	21 155 380	70 923 400

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

Not yet paid Annex H not signed

Contributions still not paid

OGS FY07	75 000
CONISMA FY07	25 000
OGS FY08	100 000
CONISMA FY08	40 000

Memorandum - M\$ US

FY04	6,0
FY05	14,0
FY06	14,0
FY07	14,0

Portugal FY08	90 000
total	330 000

FY08	22,4
	70,4

ECORD Budget for FY09 and beyond

For some countries the amount of contribution for FY09 remains uncertain. H. Eberling indicated that Denmark will decide in February 2009. N. Wardell commented that the four Italian institutions that contribute to ECORD are meeting in December 2008 to decide the constitution of an Italian consortium to participate in ECORD. They hope that the contribution will increase.

FY09-FY13

	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	total
Austria	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	500 000
Belgium	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	150 000
Canada	300 000	300 000	500 000	500 000	500 000	2 100 000
Denmark	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	1 000 000
Finland	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	331 900
France	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	28 000 000
Germany	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	28 000 000
Iceland	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	150 000
Ireland	130 000	130 000	130 000	130 000	130 000	650 000
Italy	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	2 000 000
Netherlands	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	2 000 000
Norway	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	5 500 000
Portugal	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	450 000
Spain	762 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	3 810 000
Sweden	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	2 640 000
Switzerland	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	2 800 000
UK	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	28 000 000
Total	21 496 380	21 496 380	21 696 380	21 696 380	21 696 380	108 081 900

still pending

SOCs to NSF	16 800 000	16 800 000	16 800 000	16 800 000	16 800 000
EMA+ESSAC	550 000	500 000	500 000	500 000	500 000
available for POCs	4 146 380	4 196 380	4 396 380	4 396 380	4 396 380

Summary FY03-FY09

income	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09
ECORD contrib	12 618 880	12 676 380	15 386 380	9 086 380	21 155 380	21 496 380
carry forward		880	-1 151 620	876 596	2 800 476	8 230 706
investment					120 000	?
ICDP						500 000
total	12 618 880	12 677 260	14 234 760	9 962 976	24 075 856	30 227 086
expenses						
SOCs*		6 793 500	6 840 000	6 807 000	15 502 400	16 326 000
ESO contract**	12 493 000	5 265 500	6 349 164	0	0	15 650 535
add ESO contract		1 600 000				
EMA	125 000	117 000	117 000	115 000	127 500	352 800
ESSAC		52 000	52 000	240 500	215 250	236 375
total	12 618 000	13 828 000	13 358 164	7 162 500	15 845 150	32 565 710

balance w/EMA	880	-1 151 620	876 596	2 800 476	8 230 706	-2 338 624
			balance w/ESO	5 403 680	4 772 665	

* ESO SOC international travels deducted

** ESO SOC international travels added

Note that it has been agreed with NSF that ESO international travels covered by SOCs are deducted from the ECORD SOC contribution to IODP and added to the ESO contract

ESO International travels	206 500	160 000	193 000	297 600	474 000
---------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

C. Mevel reminded Council that in FY08, because of the delay of the JOIDES Resolution, ECORD negotiated a rebate in the SOC contribution of 1 M\$ (15.8 instead of 16.8 M\$). At the Council meeting of June 2008, the LAs requested Council to consider the ECORD contribution on a long-term basis. At the meeting between the LAs and the ECORD Executive (Beijing, June 2008) an agreement was reached. ECORD will pay its full SOC contribution (3 P.U.) until 2010, and in the light of what has been accomplished by the programme in FY09 and FY10, ECORD will reconsider its position for FY11 and beyond.

At the moment the ECORD budget is secured till 2010, funds to implement NJ and GBR are secured. However, Catherine Mevel reminded the council that the ECORD account at CNRS is in Euros. Up to now, the exchange rate between Euro and US Dollar has been very favourable. However, it may change in the future.

ECORD is aiming to implement one MSP expedition per year during the last three years of IODP (FY11-FY12-FY13). D. Evans indicated the POCs available (~4.2 M\$) will not be sufficient to run one MSP expedition per year. Clearly, if ECORD continues paying 3 P.U. to IODP, there is not enough money for running three more MSPs. Council envisaged the possibility of modifying the ratio SOC/POC paid to IODP for FY11 and beyond. The following action was decided:

ACTION ESO: To prepare, for the next Council meeting, a better estimation of costs for MSPs for the last three years of IODP.

C. Mevel signaled that NSF is now paying all “operational SOCs” (all SOCs associated with the JR operations) directly to the USIO and not through IODP-MI. D. Evans added that this practice has change the definition of SOCs and thereafter the MoU. Other Council members signalled that NSF has indicated that ECORD is consider as a Lead Agency, however we are not being included in the decision making process.

ACTION EMA: To ask NSF for clarification on what they mean when they state that they consider ECORD as a Lead Agency.

Agenda Item 14- ECORD Vision (C. Mevel)

(see ECORD Vision by C. Mevel at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

C. Mevel introduced the discussion by presenting the challenges ECORD and IODP are facing in the medium and long terms. She indicated that in the medium term the funding situation of the programme is very serious at all levels, at the point that its viability could be compromised. Moreover, besides the financial problems the two main platforms have experienced major difficulties. The refit of the JR has been delayed several times. At the moment, it is scheduled to start in March 2009. It is essential that it happens, for IODP's credibility within NSF and internationally. The CHIKYU has not yet drilled in riser mode for IODP. The programme was sold on this new tool and now it is crucial that CHIKYU start conducting riser expeditions. The Chikyuu also needs to find commercial work. It should not be a problem, oil industry is very interested in its capabilities and also other Japanese institutions could potentially use the ship. However, these activities could result in difficulties when organising the ship schedule. JAMSTEC has expressed its intention to fund 6-months operations for IODP. However, it should be pointed out that if all goes well, 2009 is a really exciting year for IODP. For the first year, the three platforms will be operating simultaneously, and the Chikyuu will drill in riser mode.

C. Franklin referred to the transition between ODP to IODP. He indicated that ODP, as IODP now, experienced problems and was able to sort them out by itself. He emphasized that the big challenge was the transition, to ensure the continuity of the programme. In this sense, he asked if Council should put its main efforts into the current situation or into looking at what will happen beyond 2013. Several Council members coincided to mention that there is little to do in relation to the current programme, although they all agreed that what happens during the current phase will have a strong impact in the renewal process. J. Ludden insisted on the need to support the current programme, from his point of view the only thing ECORD can do is to back the industry sponsored initiative ODC (Ocean Drilling Consortium) to make sure the JR operates 12 months a year.

Different options to support ODC were mentioned: participation of European Scientists; involvement of European industry and even the possibility of hiring the JR to carry European funded projects.

At the European level, funding is not secured either. Although, the contribution has increased to \$ 21.5M, the full contribution (\$22.4M=4 P.U.) has not yet been reached. If keeping the ratio SOC/POC agreed in the MoU with the LAs, there is not enough money to run one MSP per year for the last three years of the programme. ECORD has not been successful in approaching the European Commission for financial support.

Referring to the post 2013, C. Mevel proposed several points for debate:

- New, innovative science plan
- What structure is the best adapted to fit the science plan?
- Relationships with other programmes? DSF concept
- Should we seek for partnership with industry? In what form?
- What should be our organization at the ECORD level?
- Relationship with the European Commission?

S. Dürr summarized that the two main questions are :

1. Do we want a post-2013 programme that mainly continues with ocean drilling, or a programme that defines scientific questions first and then defines necessary infrastructure and methodologies including, but also beyond drilling?
2. Do we want a management and finance structure that continues along the existing IODP lines, or shall we create a European entity that is able to exist on its own and cooperates internationally (US, Japan) on a case by case basis?

C. Mevel presented the tentative schedule for renewal set up by SASEC. The process has started with the preparation of the INVEST conference being organised in Bremen in September 2009. It is expected to be completed in 2012.

Looking into the future, two main issues should be addressed: the new science plan and the structure of the new programme. C. Mevel reminded Council that the idea of creating an Agency at the European level has been mentioned previously. C. Mevel added few comments to her presentation that is posted at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>.

Referring to the new science plan, J. Ludden suggested that from the European point of view ECORD needs to develop a science plan that addresses European science questions and related problems such as European laboratories, etc. A European science plan for IODP cannot be developed without taking into account other European programmes such as ICDP, Aurora Borealis, etc. ECORD should try to integrate ECORD/IODP with the major infrastructures listed in ESFRI. N. Wardell agreed and added that the science plan will be developed at IODP level through INVEST but Europe should actively develop its own science agenda. J. Ludden indicated that several initiatives currently being developed in Europe come together under the Deep Sea Floor initiative.

S. Dürr clarified that the main difference between ECORD and the infrastructures included in the ESFRI list, is that ECORD is not looking to build a new infrastructure but to have access to an existing one. This is why we were never able to gain support from the Infrastructure programme at the European Commission. On the other hand, he signalled that the EC is only funding 10% of basic science in Europe.

Concerning the renewal S. Dürr proposed a two-step process. The first step is to freely define the scientific questions; the second step will be to group the questions, possibly around the infrastructure they require, in order to develop subprogrammes. One of them could be IODP with a mission oriented approach, interacting with US and Japan in a case by case scenario. J. Ludden insisted that in this scenario ECORD would have more control of its own destiny and that the mission approach is essential to support such a structure.

N. Wardell insisted that Europe should develop its own science plan. He pointed out that in any scenario Japan will continue with CHIKYU to tackle the scientific questions related to Solid Earth Cycles and Geodynamics, and that the US will continue with the JR addressing the climate question. He agreed with previous comments that Europe should focus on a mission type approach of the scientific problems. A. Carlson and A. de Vernal coincided in the mission approach. The question of the management of this type of structure was raised. C. Mevel asked if DSF could be consider as the successor of ECORD.

S. Falcon Morales insisted on the importance of the societal relevance of the scientific plan. He mentioned that the Spanish scientific community is meeting next December and will discuss the issue of renewal.

K. Verbruggen indicated that ECORD is perceived as too focussed on geology and drilling. He suggested that the efforts of European collaboration in ECORD are not being recognised at the right level. For him ECORD could be in a better position to negotiate funds if the science scope is widened and if ECORD becomes an Agency.

H. Eberling indicated that scientific questions should inform the decisions on the structure. From the European perspective is important to see things happening in Europe, in particular in the Arctic, etc, and to have new results in the coming years. Otherwise, it will be difficult to justify the renewal.

N. Arndt agreed with K. Verbruggen that ECORD is perceived as too geological. It is important to expand the Deep Biosphere theme.

D. Evans was concerned that in the Agency approach, drilling can be diluted and lost. He stressed the power of identifying drilling – and drilling associated work - as a method to get information that indirect methods do not provide. ECORD should keep its focus on drilling.

C. Mevel feels that in IODP big changes are needed not only in the scientific goals but also in the way things are run. IODP needs to better integrate drilling with other activities. If an Agency is created at the European level, it will be important to address how it interacts with international partners such as Japan and USA. She agrees that the mission approach is the way to go. It could also facilitate relations with industry with an “à la carte” approach on specific projects.

J. Ludden proposed a European Scientific Drilling Agency focused on drilling problems, which provides services to other agencies and is in contact with international partners. Following S. Dürr’s comment, he proposed to create an Earth Science Board at ESF level that better represents the needs of the Earth Science community. The scope of this Board would be much wider but would include scientific drilling.

G. Camoin indicated that the discussion on the structure of the programme is not being planned during the INVEST conference, the debates will focus on science. However, at the European level, the consultation process has started through the ESSAC website (please see <http://www.essac.ecord.org/documents/Questionnaire.pdf>) and will continue during the Workshop at the EGU2009.

S. Dürr agreed with G. Camoin on the importance of listening to the scientists on their requirements for the structure they need to accomplish their scientific goals. He also indicated that if the new science plan focuses on the same science topics, it will be very difficult to get support in Europe. He is convinced that the EC will never provide substantial support to ocean drilling. The policy is to provide seed money to help funding agencies get organized. And it is already the case for ocean drilling.

There was a general agreement that the “mission concept”, as defined within IODP, should be considered for the next phase.

The Council discussed the idea of constituting an Earth Science Board at ESF, similar to the Marine Board and the Polar Board. It should be composed of representatives from funding agencies and major institutes in Europe. To work towards this idea, the following action was passed:

ACTION S. Dürr: To prepare for the next Council meeting, a proposal on the creation of an Earth Science Board at ESF.

Agenda Item 15- Status of the responses to the EC call for 2009 (Catherine Mével) (*see EMA Report by C. Mevel at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>*)

C. Mevel presented the calls launched by the European Commission under the FP7 schema that have some relevance to ECORD. The last two have been communicated to EMA by Raymond Schorno.

- *ENV.2009.2.2.1.6 Contribution of seafloor sampling programs to European deep-sea research.*

This call is the response of the EC to ECORD efforts to get the DSF initiative funded. EMA organized a meeting of the steering committee (Barcelona, October 6th, 2008) hosted by Miquel Canals. Scientists are getting organised to answer the call and Achim Kopf (Bremen) will lead the proposal. ECORD will be represented by C. Mevel, and number of ECORD scientists will be involved for their expertise.

- *ENV.2009.2.2.1.2 Towards integrated European marine research strategy and programmes*

This call is to support a single ERA-Net in marine sciences. Council considered that ECORD does not fit directly in the call but that contacts should be maintained.

- *ENV.2009.2.2.1.3 Support to “Maritime Partnership”*

This call is a follow up of the Aberdeen declaration. There have been several meetings of the post Aberdeen Task Force to prepare a proposal. The Marine Board has offered to lead it. Council considered it to be important that ECORD is visible in this proposal.

- *SST 2008 6.6 Integration of Marine and Maritime Sciences in Waterborne Transport in support to the European Research Area.*

This call will be answered by EMAR2RES proposal coordinated by the Community of European Shipyard Association. ECORD Council considered that it is far away from ECORD priorities.

- *FP7 ENV-2009.1.1.6.3 : Climate change impacts on the marine environment : research results and public perception.*

This call is related to present day climate change and its social impact. It is outside of ECORD’s scope.

ECORD Council considers it important that EMA maintains contacts with other European initiatives related to marine and maritime sciences as well as with the European Commission. Catherine Mével explained that keeping contact with Brussels and with all these initiatives is quite a big task. Up to now, it has been covered by Stefan Winkler-Nees, from DFG. Unfortunately, Stefan was paid by ECORD-Net and had to move to another job when the contract ended. The Council encourages EMA to make sure that ECORD is represented in key meetings. ACTION EMA: To use funds from its budget to further relations with existing initiatives to promote marine and maritime sciences at the European level.

The Council also feels it important to keep the EC informed of ECORD activities.

ACTION EMA: To inform the European Commission of ECORD's involvement in responding to the 2009 call.

To further develop the discussion on the ECORD Vision document, Council decided the following actions:

ACTION Executive + S. Dürr: To establish a working group including members outside of the Council to finalize the ECORD Vision document for discussion at the next Council meeting.

ACTION Council members: To nominate potential participants to the working group.

Agenda Item 16- UK-IODP industrial liaison panel: should we expand it to all ECORD member countries? (Chris Franklin)

C. Franklin reminded Council that the UK-IODP programme has its own industry liaison panel with most of the major oil companies represented. The panel has been working on topical areas that can be of mutual interest. At this time the panel has been the contact point between industry and academics. The UK committee is offering to ECORD Council to expand this panel into a European group. The Council will nominate national representatives and the UK is offering to keep the panel running administratively for the first year in particular. If the panel will be extended it will report to the ECORD Council instead of the UK-IODP office.

C. Franklin clarified that this panel is basically looking for science areas to address and stimulating proposals to go into the IODP system. Some Council members proposed to consider this panel as an avenue to get industry financially involved in IODP

ECORD Council was positive in principle to extending the UK-IODP liaison panel but requested further information.

ACTION CHAIR: To circulate among Council members, the Terms of Reference and Membership of the UK-IODP Industry panel liaison, asking for agreement to expand the UK - IODP Industry panel liaison to all ECORD countries.

ACTION CHAIR: If agreement is reached in the previous action, to request nominations for panel membership.

Agenda Item 17- Funding 3D seismic surveys for CHIKYU proposals (Gilbert Camoin/Chris Franklin)

This item will be discussed during the next Council meeting.

Agenda Item 18- ECORD and the Aurora Borealis project (Catherine Mevel)

The ERICON project, led by the ESF Polar Board, is in the final stage of negotiation with the European Commission. It will support the preparation phase of the Aurora Borealis vessel. EMA through INSU-CNRS is a partner in this proposal. In the ERICON project, ECORD is sharing its experience in Arctic drilling as well as in science management and relations with IODP. The total budget for the ERICON project is 4.5M € over four years, EMA will get 107 000€.

C. Mevel indicated that ERICON managers expect that IODP-ECORD will hire the vessel as an MSP for three to four months per year. D. Evans added that if ECORD will contract the AB in a commercial or semi-commercial basis it could be very expensive. The AB is bigger than the CHIKYU. J. Ludden indicated that in Europe the AB is gaining momentum and it is very likely that it will be funded.

C. Mevel informed Council that at the successful workshop “Arctic Ocean History, From Speculation to Reality” (Bremerhaven, 3-5 November 2008) exciting scientific projects for the next 10 to 20 years have been discussed. C. Mevel pointed out that this type of approach suits perfectly the mission concept that Council discussed earlier. The convener of this workshop, Rüdiger Stein, has informed EMA that as a result of the workshop, 10 to 20 proposals will be submitted to IODP at the April 1st deadline.

C. Mevel indicated that now when the scientific community is getting organised and is developing a science plan around the Arctic, the AB might be the tool. J. Ludden indicated that if AB will be constructed by 2013, ECORD should embrace this option for the post IODP programme. The successor of ESO could run two MSPs per year one drilling in the Arctic with the AB and another in other parts of the world.

B. Goffé indicated that earlier in the week he attended a meeting in Monaco organised at very high political level to discuss research in the Arctic. At this meeting AB was presented as a platform for observation and it gathered a lot of attention from attendants. His perception was that the AB might be funded because there is strong political interest in the Arctic.

N. Wardell indicated that Council must follow closely further developments in the AB. He is concerned that in the future AB and ECORD could become competitors for funding. S. Falcon Morales indicated that Council cannot decide to fund the building of the AB. C. Mevel clarified that these type of decisions can only be taken at national level. C. Franklin added that in the past Council had made clear that at the end only individual funding agencies can make the decision for participating or not in the AB project.

ACTION S. Dürr: To include the Aurora Borealis vessel and the possibility of Arctic Drilling in the ECORD Vision document.

Agenda Item 19- ESF Report

C. Mevel informed Council that B. Avril was invited to participate in the open session of the Council meeting and he has apologised.

The Council is keen to maintain good relationships with ESF and to engage ESF in the council discussions about the future.

ACTION S. Dürr: To contact the successor of John Marks as the ESF chair to maintain good relationships with ESF and encourage ESF to actively participate in the council discussions about the future.

Agenda Item 20- Next ECORD Council meeting

In the absence of F. Barriga (next Council chair), Council tasked EMA to fix the dates for the following meeting.

ACTION EMA: To poll the members of ECORD Council to fix the dates on the third week of June 2008 for the next ECORD Council to be held in Lisbon.

Agenda Item 21- AOB (Chris Franklin)

S. Dürr thanked warmly C. Franklin, S. Leigh and B. Bradbury for organising the meeting.

The meeting was closed.

Next meeting: Lisbon, Portugal, 9-10th June 2009.