

ECORD Council Meeting #15  
Lisbon, 8-10 June 2009.  
HOTEL ALTIS  
Rua Castilho, 11, Lisbon, Portugal

MINUTES APPROVED IN ROME (25 November 2009)

<b><i>PARTICIPANTS</i></b>		
<b><i>MEMBERS</i></b>	<b><i>NAME</i></b>	<b><i>EMAIL</i></b>
Austria	Reinhard Belocky	belocky@fwf.ac.at
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriët	<a href="mailto:jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be">jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be</a>
Canada	Anne de Vernal	<a href="mailto:devernal.anne@uqam.ca">devernal.anne@uqam.ca</a>
Denmark	Marit-Solveig Seidenkrantz	<a href="mailto:mss@geo.au.dk">mss@geo.au.dk</a>
Finland	Kati Lũthje	<a href="mailto:kati.luthje@aka.fi">kati.luthje@aka.fi</a>
France	Mireille Perrin	<a href="mailto:mireille.perrin@cnsr-dir.fr">mireille.perrin@cnsr-dir.fr</a>
Germany	Guido Lũniger	<a href="mailto:guido.lueniger@dfg.de">guido.lueniger@dfg.de</a>
Italy	Nigel Wardell	<a href="mailto:nwardell@ogs.trieste.it">nwardell@ogs.trieste.it</a>
Ireland	Koen Verbruggen	<a href="mailto:Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie">Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie</a>
Portugal	Fernando Barriga	<a href="mailto:f.barriga@fc.ul.pt">f.barriga@fc.ul.pt</a>
Spain	José Ramón Sánchez Quintana	<a href="mailto:jose.sanchezq@micinn.es">jose.sanchezq@micinn.es</a>
Sweden	Dan Holtstam	<a href="mailto:dan.holtstam@vr.se">dan.holtstam@vr.se</a>
Switzerland	Martina Kern-Lũtschg	<a href="mailto:mkern@snf.ch">mkern@snf.ch</a>
UK	Chris J. Franklin	<a href="mailto:cfr@nerc.ac.uk">cfr@nerc.ac.uk</a>
<b><i>OBSERVERS</i></b>		
ESF	Marc Heppener	<a href="mailto:MHeppener@esf.org">MHeppener@esf.org</a>
ERICON-AB	Lester Lembke-Jene	<a href="mailto:Lester.Lembke-Jene@awi.de">Lester.Lembke-Jene@awi.de</a>
ICDP	Uli Harms	<a href="mailto:ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de">ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de</a>
IMI BoG	Daniel Prieur	<a href="mailto:daniel.prieur@univ-brest.fr">daniel.prieur@univ-brest.fr</a>
SASEC	Nicholas Arndt	<a href="mailto:nicholas.arndt@ujf-grenoble.fr">nicholas.arndt@ujf-grenoble.fr</a>
ESO	Dan Evans	<a href="mailto:devans@bgs.ac.uk">devans@bgs.ac.uk</a>
ESSAC	Gilbert Camoin	<a href="mailto:camoin@cerege.fr">camoin@cerege.fr</a>
ESSAC	Rudiger Stein	<a href="mailto:Ruediger.Stein@awi.de">Ruediger.Stein@awi.de</a>
EMA	Catherine Mevel	<a href="mailto:mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr">mevel@ipgp.jussieu.fr</a>
EMA	Rosa Bernal-Carrera	<a href="mailto:rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr">rbernal@ipgp.jussieu.fr</a>
IODP-MI	Kiyoshi Suyehiro	<a href="mailto:ksuye@attglobal.net">ksuye@attglobal.net</a>
Germany	Sören Dũrr	<a href="mailto:soeren.duerr@dfg.de">soeren.duerr@dfg.de</a>
Sweden	Magnus Friberg	<a href="mailto:magnus.friberg@vr.se">magnus.friberg@vr.se</a>
UK	Sasha Leigh	<a href="mailto:snbl@nerc.ac.uk">snbl@nerc.ac.uk</a>

<b><i>APOLOGIES</i></b>
-------------------------

<b>MEMBERS</b>		
<i>Iceland</i>		
<i>Netherlands</i>	<i>Josef Stuefer</i>	<i>j.stuefer@nwo.nl</i>
<i>Norway</i>	<i>Are Carlson</i>	<i>are.carlson@forskningsradet.no</i>

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

**Tuesday, June 09<sup>th</sup>**

### *Open Session*

#### **Agenda Item 1. Welcome and logistical information**

ECORD Council chair Fernando Barriga welcomed the meeting participants to Lisbon. C. Mevel informed Council that its membership has changed significantly over the last six months. She informed Council that the new representative from The Netherlands, Dr. Josef Stuefer, had apologised for not participating at this meeting. F. Barriga welcomed the new members. ECORD Council expressed heartfelt thanks to its members who have rotated off.

#### **ECORD Council consensus 09-01-1**

ECORD Council thanks its members who have rotated off. Raymond Schorno, Are Carlson and Sören Dürr have actively participated in the setting up of ECORD and the negotiations with the Lead Agencies to join IODP.

Their knowledge and enthusiasm as ECORD Council members will be missed.

The Council send its best wishes to Raymond and Sören in their new responsibilities and is sure that Are will enjoy his retirement.

F. Barriga asked if there were any modifications suggested to the agenda. With no modifications suggested the agenda was approved.

#### **Agenda Item 2. Approval of the London meeting minutes (F. Barriga)**

#### **ECORD Council consensus 09-01-2**

ECORD Council approves without modifications the minutes of the London meeting (ECORD Council meeting #14)

#### **Agenda Item 3. London meeting actions (Fernando Barriga)**

F. Barriga reviewed the actions passed by the Council at its last meeting in London.

- **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.” Done*

- ACTION EMA: To investigate with the LAs different ways to simplify the flow of money within IODP. *Done.*  
*In principle NSF does not oppose to the fact that EMA pays SOC's directly to ESO. However, EMA receives contributions from member countries well into the fiscal year and is not able to pay ESO on October 1<sup>st</sup>. ESO indicated that late SOC's payments may generate cash flow problems. More thoughts are required on this issue before moving further.*
- ACTION CHAIR: To send a letter to the Italian partners of ECORD asking for unpaid contributions. *Done. The Italian funding situation was discussed in agenda item 18.*
- ACTION EMA: To send a letter thanking ICDP for its contribution. *Done.*
- ACTION ESO: To prepare, for the next Council meeting, a better estimation of costs for MSPs for the last three years of IODP. *Done. The estimation was discussed in agenda item 18.*
- ACTION EMA: To ask NSF for clarification on what they mean when they state that they consider ECORD as a Lead Agency. *Done. Catherine Mével discussed with Rodey Batiza. NSF is willing to involve ECORD into LAs discussions. However, the definition of a LA implies to equally share the cost of the programme. ECORD is not in the position of fulfilling this requirement.*
- ACTION S. Dürr: To prepare for the next Council meeting, a proposal on the creation of an Earth Science Board at ESF. *This action is beyond the scope of the ECORD Council.*
- ACTION ESSAC: To include Council views on structure into the EGU Workshop 2009 - Beyond 2013: The future of European Ocean Research Drilling. *Done.*
- ACTION EMA: To send motion 08-02-6 to the BoG chair and the SASEC chair. *Done.*
- ACTION EMA: To use funds from its budget to further relations with existing initiatives to promote marine and maritime sciences at the European level. *Done.*
- ACTION EMA: To inform the European Commission of ECORD's involvement in responding to the 2009 call. *Done. Two letters were addressed to Pierre Mathy with cc to Pascal Le Grand (letters provided with the meeting material). The first one concerned the INVEST meeting and the future of ocean drilling, the second one concerned our activities regarding the Deep Sea Frontier initiative.*

- 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. *Done. Catherine Mevel has prepared and distributed this document for discussion.*
- ACTION Council members: To nominate potential participants to the working group. *Some countries have sent nominations.*
- 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. *Done. Agreement has been reached.*
- ACTION CHAIR: If agreement is reached in the previous action, to request nominations for panel membership. *Done. Further discussion took place under agenda item 22.*
- ACTION S. Dürr: To include the Aurora Borealis vessel and the possibility of Arctic Drilling in the ECORD Vision document. *Done.*
- 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. *Done. Marc Heppener was invited to the meeting (see agenda item 24)*
- 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. *Done.*
- **Actions from the ECORD council meeting held in Paris on June 5-6, 2008.**
- ACTION ESSAC: To prepare the discussion on how to support 3D-site surveys for European-led proposals for the next ECORD Council meeting. *Done.*
- ACTION EMA: To include in the agenda for the next ECORD Council an item on funding for 3D-site surveys for European-led proposals. *Done. Discussion took place under agenda item 21.*

#### **Agenda Item 4. New Council vice chair to be elected, composition of the executive (C. Mevel)**

Sören Dürr (Germany) is rotating off. He was the vice-chair of the council, and supposed to become the chair as of Oct1st. Guido Lüniger, the new German representative in the Council, is too new to the system to become the chair next October. As a consequence, Nigel Wardell (Italy) was elected to replace S. Dürr as the incoming vice chair and will become Council Chair from 1 October 2009. Guido Lüniger was elected member of the Executive to replace Nigel Wardell. The current Executive consists of F. Barriga (chair), C. Franklin (outgoing vice chair), N.

Wardell (incoming vice chair), C. Mével (EMA), Reinhard Belocky (Austria), and G. Lüniger (Germany).

**ECORD Council motion 09-01-1**

ECORD Council elects Nigel Wardell to replace Sören Dûrr as the incoming Vice-Chair.

ECORD Council elects Guido Lüniger as member of the Executive to replace Nigel Wardell.

C. Franklin moved, D. Holtsman seconded, all in favour with two abstentions (G. Lüniger, N. Wardell).

G. Lüniger was elected incoming vice chair from 1 October 2009 and will become the Chair as of 1 April 2010. Chris Franklin will replace Guido Lüniger as a member of the Executive.

**ECORD Council motion 09-01-2**

ECORD Council elects G. Lüniger as incoming Vice-Chair from 01 October 2009 to replace Nigel Wardell as of 01 April 2010. ECORD Council elects Chris Franklis as member of the Executive to replace G. Lüniger as of 01 October 2009.

J.P. Henriët moved, A. de Vernal seconded, all in favour with three abstentions (G. Lüniger, N. Wardell, C. Franklin).

The ECORD Executive as of 1 October 2009 will consist of N. Wardell (chair), F. Barriga (outgoing vice chair), G. Lüniger (incoming vice chair), C. Mével (EMA), Reinhard Belocky (Austria), and C. Franklin (United Kingdom).

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

Daniel Prieur reported on the activities of the Board of Governors (BoG). The BoG appointed Dr. Kiyoshi Suyehiro as the new President of IODP-MI, Inc. Dr. Suyehiro took office on May 16, 2009 to replace Dr. Manik Talwani who completed his 5 years of service on May 15 2009 as the inaugural president of IODP-MI.

To facilitate the functioning of IODP-MI, the Board has started discussing various changes to the IODP-MI By-laws, in particular to allow for the consolidation of the two IODP-MI offices into a single one located in Tokyo. The BoG has requested the new President to implement this decision.

D. Prieur informed that another change to be discussed at the next BoG meeting concerns the minimum amount for grants and proposals requiring Board approval. The suggested change is to increase this amount to \$10M. This change was sent for further consultations with the lawyers. The aim is simplification in the management of the program.

Next BoG meeting is scheduled in Washington DC, during IODP week.

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

*see powerpoint presentation*

N. Arndt reported on the last SASEC meeting held in Lisbon in January 2009. SASEC has committed to provide IODP funding agencies brief summaries suitable for non-specialists of scientific objectives, expected results, and societal relevance of high priority riser and MSP proposals and Tier 1 *JOIDES Resolution (JR)* proposals that currently reside with the Operations Task Force (OTF). This information will help funding agencies to reach top level individuals that make budgetary decisions. For the post-renewal phase of IODP, SASEC encourages IODP agencies to consider funding schemes that allow more flexibility in platform use to maximize the scientific return of the program.

Referring to science themes before renewal and the concern expressed by ECORD Council at its meeting in June 2008 (ECORD Council Motion 08-02-06), about “progress in the biosphere initiative”. SASEC indicated that the slow refit of the *JR* limited the implementation of biosphere-related proposals. However, there is currently a number of proposals awaiting scheduling by OTF and SPC has accepted the recommendations of the Scientific Technology Panel (STP) calling for substantial enhancement of sampling procedures related to microbiology. SASEC is confident that the deep biosphere will be addressed on the near future and will share equal priority with other objectives of the Initial Science Plan (ISP).

SASEC coincided with the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee to revolutionize the proposal handling system for the next phase of scientific ocean drilling and appointed a subcommittee to assess models for the proposal evaluation process for the post-renewal phase of IODP. ECORD Council recommended that the mission concept should be incorporated in the new scheme. N. Arndt indicated that the SAS in general considers missions as top-down proposals. SASEC has decided that it would not be productive to proceed with that concept in the current phase of the program, but it should be considered for the next phase. D. Evan emphasized that it is a misunderstanding of the mission concept because the science is still driven by the community through workshops. A major issue for the transition phase is to deal with the proposals currently in the system. ECORD Council recommended deactivating proposals that are lowly ranked and realistically will not be drilled in the current phase. Combining several projects into a single expedition is being considered to implement more proposals before the end of the program.

SASEC is overlooking the organization of the INVEST conference which will be a major step towards establishing the science plan for the new programme.

#### **Agenda Item 7. IODP-MI report (K. Suyehiro, new IODP-MI President)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Dr. Kiyoshi Suyehiro, President of IODP-MI, presented his views on IODP central management and the challenges and opportunities that lay ahead. He confirmed his plan to consolidate the two IODP-MI offices into a single one located in Tokyo to increase efficiency and reduce costs. The Council understands the rationale for this decision but hopes that the closing of the Washington DC office will not disturb the activities of IODP-MI. ECORD Council thanked Dr. Suyehiro for his visit and wished him success in his new appointment.

**ECORD Council consensus 09-01-3**

ECORD Council thanked Dr. Kyoshi Suyehiro for attending the meeting and wished him success in his new appointment

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

*see powerpoint presentation*

C. Mevel informed Council that for the first time the three platforms are working simultaneously for the programme. India and ANZIC (Australia and New Zealand IODP consortium) have signed their MoUs with the Lead Agencies, at a level of \$ 1.4 and 1 M respectively. She informed on the changes occurring at the management level of IODP-MI and BoG. Kyoshi Suyehiro is the new President of IODP-MI. Bryan Taylor is the new Chair of the BoG. Gerold Wefer has been nominated by ECORD as the new ECORD Governor to replace Olaf Eldholm who is rotating off this June. C. Mevel presented the schedule for FY09 and FY10 for the three platforms. *JR* is funded to operate 9 months for IODP in FY09 and eight months in FY10, provided that some non-IODP work is secured. There is a plan to drill gas hydrate for the Korean Government but it is not yet firm. The Ocean Drilling Consortium proposal to build a consortium of oil companies and use the *JR* outside of IODP is still pending. The deadline is mid-June. *CHIKYU* will drill for 5 months (including 2 months of riser drilling) in FY09. This will be the first time the *CHIKYU* operates in riser mode within IODP. In FY10, only one month of operation is currently planned, and 6 months of operation are being planned in FY11. C. Mevel presented Council the recommendations of the Ad-hoc committee set up by IODP-MI to address the financial crisis. Most ideas (such as increase NSF budget or seek for external sources like private foundations...) concern only the *JR* and do not seem very realistic.

EMA informed Council on the outreach activities developed by EMA. Coordination meetings between EMA – ESO – ESSAC are being organised on a regular basis. EMA released Newsletter #12 distributed at the EGU 2009 meeting. New brochures explaining the functioning of ECORD, ESSAC and ESO are being prepared for next fall. EMA organised the IODP booth at the EGU annual meeting in Vienna last April. The joint IODP-ICDP Town hall meeting held on April 23<sup>rd</sup> gathered the ocean and continental drilling communities.

C. Mevel reminded Council that ECORD is a partner of the ERICON-Aurora Borealis project financed by the EC to generate the strategic, legal, financial and organisational frameworks for the construction and running of the Aurora Borealis vessel. ESO is member of the ERICON technical steering committee and EMA is working towards the establishment of liaison mechanisms between ECORD-IODP and ERICON-AB. *See agenda item 10.*

**Agenda Item 9. ESO report (D. Evans)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Dan Evans informed Council on ESO activities concerning mission-specific platform expeditions. The New Jersey Shallow Shelf Expedition successfully started on 30 April 2009 from Atlantic City and is planned to end on July 19<sup>th</sup>. The onshore science party will meet at the Bremen Core Repository, starting on November 6<sup>th</sup>. The NJSS expedition has been widely publicized in the United States. ESO indicated that coring and logging has, as expected, proved to be very challenging, however the coring recovery is very encouraging.

ESO will conduct Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes Expedition (GBREC) this fall. The platform provider is Bluestone, a company located in Singapore. The contract was signed on April 11<sup>th</sup>. The vessel is the *Bluestone Topaz*. The science party is now completed. The expedition is expected to start at the end of October from Townsville, Australia. The onshore science party is scheduled to start April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at the Bremen Core Repository. D. Evans informed that APL#728 to the GBREC has been withdrawn.

**Agenda Item 10. Status of the Aurora Borealis project and relationships with ECORD** (*Lester Lembke-Jene*). *See powerpoint presentation*

Dr. Lester Lembke-Jene, ERICON Aurora Borealis Science and Technical Implementation Manager, gave a report on the status of the ERICON Project. Decision to build the ship is not yet made. The Arctic will certainly be an important topic of the new science plan and the Aurora Borealis could be used as an MSP to drill in the ice covered areas. Several Council members manifested the strong interest of the scientific community for drilling in the Arctic. After the workshop “The Arctic Ocean History: From Speculation to Reality”, held in Bremerhaven in November 2009, 10 proposals for drilling have been submitted to IODP and many more are coming. ECORD Council relayed to ERICON several questions regarding technical feasibility, national financial commitments, operational costs, etc. ECORD Council expects that these and other questions (proposal handling, science planning, funding of operations, etc) will be addressed by the EC funded ERICON project.

**Agenda Item 11. ECORD and the European Commission** (C. Mevel)  
*see powerpoint presentation*

C. Mevel informed Council that the final report of ECORD Net project has been submitted to the EC. A summary report as well as all deliverables are available on-line at <http://www.ecord.org/enet/ecord-net.html>. The final financial report is not yet approved, one participant has failed to submit the documents required by the EC. Since the end of ECORD Net, August 31<sup>st</sup> 2008, ECORD is only supported from the national contribution of the member countries and does not receive funding from the European Commission.

The project “The Deep Sea & Sub-Seafloor Frontier” (DS3F) coordinated by Achim Kopf (University of Bremen), has been approved by the European Commission. This coordination action will be funded at a level of ~1 M € to organise workshops and produce a road map for the future. Catherine Mevel is a partner and is leading a WP on MSP drilling.



C. Mevel informed Council on the closed workshop organised by Pascal Le Grand (DG XII) to discuss possible themes for an EC call on the “Deep Sea Frontier” initiative (DSF). He explained that realistically, for ECORD or DSF, there is no opportunity for an Article 169 before the end of FP7, and it will be difficult in FP8. Two new funding instruments being developed at the EC level were presented: Joint Programming and ERIC. S. Dürr signalled that the real functioning of both instruments is not yet totally defined and that it is worth for ECORD to closely follow their development. ECORD Council agreed and asked EMA to maintain the liaisons established with the EC. The aim of the workshop was to identify a theme on which the three pillars of the DSF could cooperate and that could be the subject of a future EC call. ECORD promoted two themes: Geohazards ; Fluid flow and deep sea ecosystems. Unfortunately, it was finally decided to promote a very open call following the joint marine and maritime call scheme put forward by the Marine and Maritime Research Strategy adopted by the Commission in 2008. The advantage is that these calls may involve the pooling of financial resources from several themes of the Framework Program. But an open call does not encourage integration among the various components of the DSF. As planned, the call will list a series of topics related to the deep sea and the water column.

C. Mevel reminded Council that to increase opportunities within the EC, ECORD and/or DSF require the support at the national level in the programme committee in environment. Several Council members indicated that national programme committee members were approached last year with the requirement of an ERA-Net for DSF. Unfortunately this initiative did not receive the support of enough member countries.

ECORD Council is keen to improve collaboration and exchange with the Marine Board. During the meeting, S. Dürr contacted the new Executive Secretary of the Marine Board-ESF, Dr. Niall McDonough, and he kindly agreed to attend Council meetings to facilitate the flow of information.

Action EMA: To invite Dr. Niall McDonough, Executive Secretary of the Marine Board, to the next ECORD Council meeting and to include an agenda item for his report.

**Agenda Item 12. Report on IODP Council and the International Working Group+ (C. Mevel)**  
*see powerpoint presentation*

C. Mevel reported on the IODP Council held in Lisbon in January 2009. Most of the discussions focussed on post 2013. An International Working Group+ (IWG+) to overlook and prepare the transition was set-up. IODP Council indicated that *societal relevance of the science plan* and *new funding sources* should be major subjects to be addressed. After the meeting, the Lead Agencies (LAs) distributed the Terms of Reference (ToR) for IWG+ for discussion. The ECORD Executive sent several comments to the LAs. All suggestions were accepted, in particular the principle that IWG+ should have an ECORD Co-chair.

C. Mevel informed Council that ECORD has been asked by the LAs to provide input on IODP principles and what should be kept in a new programme. A small committee - G. Lüniger, F. Barriga, C. Franklin, D. Evans and C. Mevel - was set up to prepare a draft to send to the LAs.

### **Agenda Item 13. ICDP Model (U. Harms)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Dr. Ulrich Harms, Executive Secretary of the International Continental Scientific Drilling Program (ICDP), presented Council the Structure and Functions of its organisation. ECORD Council considered ICDP as a valuable example of a successful scientific program that could bring new ideas into the post-IODP program.

### ***Closed Session***

### **Agenda Item 14. ECORD “Vision” –report on the ECORD Executive meeting - IWG+ (C. Mevel + C. Franklin)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

The ECORD executive met in Roissy Charles de Gaulle Airport, May 14th to progress with the vision document and prepare the discussion at the ECORD council level. Following this meeting, a first draft was distributed to the ECORD Council for discussion.

### **Agenda Item 15. Discussion on ECORD “Vision” (F. Barriga)**

Discussion started and continued the next day (*see Agenda Item 19*).

### **Agenda Item 16. ESO Budget (D. Evans)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

*Annex 1 contains ESO Budget tables.*

D. Evans presented Council the current ESO budget situation and the FY10 proposed budget. He indicated that due to carry over FY10 and FY09 are interlinked. The budget requested for FY10 is only 1 743 000 \$ because the operations for both New Jersey Shallow Shelf (NJSS) and Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes (GBREC) expeditions are already covered in the FY09 budget. NJSS Expedition is currently on going thereafter the ESO expenditures for FY09 are not yet confirmed. He has been informed by EMA that there might be a shortfall in the FY09 budget. He insisted that any shortfall in the POCs (Platform Operation Costs) funding for FY09 would impact the number of drilling days for NJSS or/and GBREC. He suggested that to keep the integrity of the GBREC project, only the NJSS project should be cut if necessary.

After discussing the scientific impact of cutting short NJSS and different funding alternatives, it was decided that any shortfall in the ECORD budget should not impact the platform operations and should be supported by the FY10 SOC (Science Operation Costs) contribution to IODP. K. Verbruggen was tasked to prepare a draft motion for the next day.

D. Evans presented Council the estimated MSP costs for 2011-2013. He manifested that present POC funding forecasts will probably not allow for more than one expedition during the next three years of IODP. Several Council members stated that if the SOC/POC ratio is modified, ECORD could afford at least one more expedition in the near future. Although the POC/SOC ratio is specified in the Memorandum with the LAs, ECORD should try to renegotiate this ratio. It was mentioned that national renewal process for post-2013 relies heavily on the number of successful MSP expedition accomplished by ECORD. D. Evans mentioned that only two MSP proposals currently sit at OTF and are almost ready for implementation: Hawaiian Drowned Reefs and New England Shelf Hydrogeology. G. Camoin mentioned that the Baltic Sea proposal (and possibly others) is making its way through the system and should be ready for ranking next March.

Action EMA: start negotiating with the Lead Agencies to modify the POC/SOC ratio in the ECORD contribution to IODP.

#### **Agenda Item 17. ESSAC Budget (G. Camoin/ R. Stein)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

*Annex 2 contains ESSAC budget.*

R. Stein, as the incoming ESSAC Chair, presented the FY10 ESSAC Budget. The budget request amounts to 167 100 €. He indicated that the ESSAC budget has slightly increased compared with FY09 because:

- salary conditions are different in Germany from France ( $\Delta=9\,400\text{ €}$ ), and
- the new ECORD Grants scheme will start in FY10 (10 000€) (*see agenda item 21*)

#### **Agenda Item 18. ECORD and IODP funding situation (Catherine Mevel)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

*Annex 3 contains EMA budget, Annex 4 contains ECORD budget tables.*

C. Mével presented the EMA budget situation for FY09 and the proposed budget for 2010. It is expected that not all the approved budget for FY09 will be spent and the remaining money (~25 k€) will be carried over to FY10. For FY10 the proposed budget requested from ECORD commingled funds amounts 245 000 €. However, EMA is expecting to receive money from the EC when the ECORD-Net final report is accepted (hopefully before the end of the year). Therefore the impact on the ECORD commingled funds should be less.

C. Mevel presented the FY08, FY09 and FY10 ECORD Budget. The funding is secured for the implementation of NJSS and GBREC expeditions in FY09 and FY10 respectively as long as all the member country pay their contribution. Most ECORD member countries have paid their contributions for FY08 and FY09. However problem remains in particular with some Italian institutions that have failed to pay their contributions to the programme for up to three consecutive years. C. Mevel also indicated that at the beginning of the year fluctuation of the exchange rate had a negative impact in the ECORD budget. She insisted that the FY09 budget is balanced provided that all the remaining contributions are paid and that the exchange rate remains relatively stable around at least  $1\text{€} = 1,33\text{\$}$ .

The situation of Italy was discussed. Some of the 4 participating institutions (CONISMA, OGS, INGV and CNRS) are late in their payments. As of today, Italy has paid 415 k\$ instead of 750 k\$ over FY07, FY08 and FY09. As the Italian representative, Nigel Wardell explained that the funding situation in Italy is very difficult. The 4 institutions have created a consortium to participate in ECORD as a single partner as well as to talk to the Ministry with a single voice and hopefully increase the Italian contribution. However it is unlikely that this consortium will be able to pay the FY09 contribution. He is hoping that the institutions that have signed their Annex H will pay, but he is dubious that CONISMA and OGS will pay FY08 and FY09. Italy is already over quota in terms of cruise participants. It was decided that ESSAC should defer nominating Italian scientists for IODP expedition until the financial situation is solved.

The situation for Iceland is also concerning. The ECORD Council member has moved to another position and has not yet been replaced. The contact has been lost, probably due to the crisis in Iceland. The new RANNIS Director never answered Emails from EMA. Catherine Mevel is trying to obtain some information from the ESSAC delegate.

Belgium, Spain and Portugal have not yet signed their MoU for FY09. J.P. Henriët indicated that for Belgium a new proposal has been submitted and he is waiting for the answer. He is quite optimistic. For Spain, J.R. Sanchez-Quintana indicated that due to changes at the Ministry he had to brief new personal about ECORD. The situation should be solved in the near future and he expects the MoU to be signed before summer. In Portugal, F. Barriga is still hoping to increase the contribution. He is expecting an answer from the Ministry before the MoU can be signed.

EMA explained that if the situation of Belgium, Spain and Portugal is solved but Italy and Iceland fail to pay their full contribution there will be a shortfall in the FY09 budget of ~650 k\$. Therefore EMA should inform the LAs that ECORD may not be able to pay its full SOC contribution in FY10.

The following motion was approved the next day:

**ECORD Council motion 09-01-3**

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY10 ESO (1 743 000 \$), EMA (245 000 €) and ESSAC (167 100 €) budgets with the understanding that this could lead to a shortfall in SOC's contribution in FY10. These budgets include salaries. The current estimate is c.€650k, however the final figure is dependent on

- 1) Euro/Dollar Exchange Rate
- 2) Level of expenditure of the contingency amounts for NJ and GBR.
- 3) Level of possible default of funds from some ECORD members

ECORD Council feels that operation and completion of the MSPs as planned is an imperative and as a result will inform the Lead Agencies right away that this shortfall might occur, resulting in a possible underpayment of agreed SOC's contributions in FY10.

K. Verbruggen moved, F. Barriga seconded, all in favour with three abstentions (C. Franklin, G. Luüniger, M. Perrin)

Action EMA: To inform the Lead Agencies that there might be a shortfall in the ECORD SOC contribution in FY10.

The long term ECORD budget was also presented to discuss the possibility of implementing MSP expeditions. C. Mevel reminded that ECORD is not pooling 4 P.U. (22.4 M\$) per year but only ~21.5 M\$ because some of the smaller countries have not increased their contribution in FY08 when the cost of the P.U. increased from 3.5 to 5.6 M\$. As a consequence, the total POC budget available during the three last years of the programme will be less 12 M\$ when the EMA and ESSAC budgets are deducted. This is obviously not enough to support 1 operation per year as planned. See discussion in agenda item 16.

**Wednesday, June 10<sup>th</sup>**

*Closed Session*

**Agenda Item 19. Discussion on ECORD “Vision” (F. Barriga)**

ECORD Council discussed the Vision of a European scientific programme for post 2013. There is a consensus among ECORD member countries to continue participation in a new drilling programme as a consortium. However, it was clearly stated that approval at national level is required for commitment to a new programme. ECORD is willing to continue providing access to Mission Specific Platforms. In the new programme ECORD will aim to at least one MSP expedition per year. In addition to the member country participation, ECORD is willing to seek funds from other sources (from industry, the EC, etc...). The ICDP project approach for funding was mentioned. The Council considers that the definition of MSPs should be expanded to include tools and techniques allowing recovery of cores in the most efficient way.

ECORD Council strongly feels that a new drilling programme should continue to be science driven. ECORD Council stated the need for emphasis on questions of societal relevance without relinquishing the research in basic science. Although a key tool in addressing scientific problems regarding the Earth system, in many cases drilling needs to be integrated with other approaches. This is particularly crucial for onshore-offshore transects, integration of observation and modelling, and long term monitoring to address active process. ECORD Council considers that cooperating with other programmes that investigate the deep sea floor will be a goal for the future. For the moment, ECORD Council relinquished leading the creation of a European Sea Floor Agency, although it may remain a long-term objective. ECORD will continue to actively pursue the development of the Deep Sea Floor Initiative through its support and to the “Deep Sea and Subseafloor Frontier – DS3F” project and through discussions with the EC.

The following motion was passed the next day:

**ECORD Council motion 09-01-4**

ECORD Council relinquish leading the creation on a European Sea Floor Agency. ECORD Council will pursue its aim of integrating the European deep-sea research through the Deep Sea Frontier Initiative.

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

All participants agreed that in a new drilling programme the concepts of Lead Agencies, SOC's and POC's should be revisited. The concept of "*Major contributor*" for a platform provider could better reflect the reality. In the current structure, SOC's and POC's are not independent and each IO/funding agency has its national constraints on the way of managing expeditions. For the new programme, ECORD considers that each platform provider should support the full cost of operations. If the Aurora Borealis vessel is built, ECORD Council considers that it could be potentially contracted as an MSP for drilling in ice covered areas.

ACTION EMA: To include in the agenda for the next ECORD Council an item on the Aurora Borealis vessel and the possibility of using it as an MSP in the new drilling programme after 2013.

**Agenda Item 20. Preparation for the IODP Council and IWG+ (C. Mevel) 30'**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Referring to the future of ECORD, several Council members coincided to indicate that current economic situation does not help to get expression of interests or commitments for post 2013. An evaluation of the current programme will be required.

IWG+ (International Working group +) will play a major role in defining the structure of the new programme. Representatives from all funding agencies currently participating in IODP are invited as members. The work of IWG+ is anticipated to last at least for two years. It is important that the same individuals follow the whole process for continuity. ECORD Council appointed a delegation to represent ECORD interests at the IWG+ meetings. Designated members are: Anne de Vernal (Canada), Mireille Perrin (France), Guido Lüniger (Germany), F. Barriga (Portugal), José Ramón Sanchez (Spain), Chris Franklin (United Kingdom) and Catherine Mével (EMA). Chris Franklin will chair the delegation and is nominated as the ECORD co-chair. Anne de Vernal will not be able to attend the first meeting.

**ECORD Council consensus 09-01-4**

ECORD Council appoints a delegation to represent ECORD interests at the IWG+ (International Working Group Plus ) meetings. Members: Anne de Vernal (Canada), Mireille Perrin (France), Guido Lüniger (Germany), F. Barriga (Portugal), José Ramón Sanchez (Spain), Chris Franklin (United Kingdom) and Catherine Mével (EMA). Chris Franklin will chair the delegation and act as Co-chair at the IWG+ meetings on behalf of ECORD.

## **Agenda Item 21. ESSAC Report (G. Camoin) 60'**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Gilbert Camoin reported on ESSAC activities. He reminded Council that he is rotating off. As of October 1<sup>st</sup> 2009 Rudiger Stein will be the new ESSAC Chair and the office will move to Germany. The new office will be hosted by AWI in Bremerhaven and a new science coordinator will be appointed.

ESSAC informed Council on IODP operations for FY09, FY10 and beyond. For the *CHIKYU*, no drilling for IODP is planned in FY10, and the drilling will start again in FY11. Drilling the NantroSeize project is dependant on the Kuroshio current. In the event that the Kuroshio Current is too strong to drill, a contingency plan for riser drilling needs to be developed. SPC asked IODP-MI to begin scoping of Proposal 618-Full3 (East Asia Margin) as a contingency for NanTroSEIZE. ESSAC informed Council that at the last SPC meeting held in March 2009, 28 proposals were ranked. The top ten were forwarded to the OTF for potential future scheduling, with necessary consideration of site survey data. MSP Proposal 637-Full2 New England Shelf Hydrogeology was forwarded to OTF but is still waiting for the site survey data approval. SPC deactivated three proposals that had little chance of being implemented within the current phase of the IODP. SPC adopted by consensus the principle that time be allocated in each IODP platform schedule to accommodate ancillary project letters (APLs) and engineering testing.

ESSAC presented Council several statistics regarding active proposals. ECORD, with 36% of 113 active proposals maintains a healthy presence. A large majority of proposals (78) corresponds to non-riser platforms, only 4 for riser, 13 for MSPs and 15 for multiple platforms.

ESSAC gave an update on the staffing of IODP expeditions by ECORD scientists. Some countries are over quota. On the long term, it is important that the balance among ECORD participating scientists of the ECORD member countries fits with the quota.

Gilbert Camoin presented the status of program renewal activities and related timelines. ESSAC organised an EGU session followed by a workshop "Beyond 2013: The Future of European Scientific Drilling" at the last EGU meeting in Vienna. The report of the workshop is being finalised and will be released before the INVEST Conference scheduled in Bremen-Germany on 23-25 September 2009.

The ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Program is very successful. The three appointed lecturers for 2008-2009 are Achim Kopf, Peter Clift and John Parkes.

ESSAC presented its plans for ECORD summer schools. Two ECORD supported summer schools will take place this summer:

- 2009 Urbino Summer School in Paleoclimatology (USSP)
- ECORD Summer School 2009 in Bremen on "Geodynamics of Mid-Ocean Ridges"

Fifteen scholarships have been allocated to help young scientists participate. In 2010, ESSAC decided to sponsor three summer schools:

- Summer School on Dynamics of Past Climate Changes. Bremen - Germany.
- Urbino Summer School in Paleoclimatology. Urbino – Italy.
- Summer School Ocean and climate changes in polar and subpolar environments. Québec – Canada.

In 2010, ESSAC will launch the “ECORD Grants” to support outstanding graduate students to conduct research related to samples/data collected by DSDP/ODP/IODP.

Since the last meeting, two new workshops have been sponsored by the ESF-run Magellan Workshop Series as well as the workshop “beyond 2013”.

The issue of 3D seismic survey required for riser drilling was discussed. ESSAC stated that funding is needed from outside IODP and recommended the issue to be discussed by the new ECORD Industry Liaison Panel. Clarification is required from CEDEX whether all riser drilling needs 3D site Survey.

ECORD Council thanked Gilbert Camoin for his report and passed the following consensus:

**ECORD Council consensus 09-01-5**

The ECORD Council expresses its thanks to the CEREGE ESSAC Office.

The chair, Gilbert Camoin, and the scientific coordinator, Bonnie Wolff-Boenisch, formed a dedicated team that made the office function extremely efficiently for the benefit of the ECORD scientific community in Europe. The ECORD Council wishes them well in their new endeavours.

**Agenda Item 22. Status of the ECORD Industry liaison panel – possible relationships with EUROGIA (C. Franklin/S. Leigh) 30’**

*see powerpoint presentation*

S. Leigh informed Council on the functioning of the UK-Industry liaison panel, its membership and its achievements. She reminded the audience that after the Council meeting held in London, the Terms of Reference were circulated among Council members. All country members expressed its agreement to expand the UK- Industry liaison panel to an ECORD- Industry liaison panel (EILP). Some countries have sent recommendations for nominations but more names are always welcomed.

C. Franklin presented Council the call launched by EUROGIA+ on Artic Marine Resources. He reminded Council that EUROGIA+ was presented to Council on June 2008. To answer the call a project reuniting the scientific community and the industry should be prepared. The following consensus was passed:

**ECORD Council consensus 09-01-6**



ECORD Council requests the ECORD Industrial Liaison Panel to consider answering the call issued by Eurogia+ for the Artic.

**Agenda Item 23. Summary of challenges for the future of ECORD and ocean drilling (F. Barriga)**

F. Barriga presented a summary of the discussions held during the meeting and welcomed Dr. Mark Heppener.

**Agenda Item 24. ESF (M. Heppener)**

*see powerpoint presentation*

Dr. Marc Heppener introduce himself as the new Director of Science and Strategy development at ESF. He reminded that a Memorandum has been signed between ESF and ECORD in support of the two ESF-run programmes related to ocean drilling: Magellan and EUROMARC. He indicated that ESF is willing to increase collaboration with ECORD. He explored different avenues of collaboration with ECORD. One possibility would be to develop a “Forward Look” on the future of ocean drilling in Europe. ECORD Council welcomed this offer and tasked the Executive to maintain and deepen the discussion with ESF. ECORD Council also encouraged ESF to participate in the INVEST conference.

ACTION EMA and Executive: To prepare a proposal on a collaboration scheme with ESF after 2013. The proposal should be presented at the next ECORD Council meeting.

**Agenda Item 25. Next ECORD Council meeting (F. Barriga)**

Next Council meeting will be held in Rome (Italy) during the third week of November 2009. Nigel Wardell will arrange a meeting between ECORD council and members of the Ministry to promote ocean drilling in Italy.

ACTION EMA: To poll the members of ECORD Council to fix the dates during the third week of November 2009 for the next ECORD Council to be held in Rome.

**Agenda Item 26. AOB (F. Barriga)**

J.P. Henriët indicated that the 2010 EurOcean conference will be held in Belgium. There is an opportunity to promote Educational activities.

ACTION ESSAC Chair and Jean Pierre Henriët: To organise the participation of ECORD at the special session in Education and Marine Science at the EurOcean Conference 2010.

*End of the meeting.*

ANNEX 1 – ESO COSTS FY10

ESO COSTS FY 10  
October 09 to September 10

GBR offshore (less FY09 carry over), NJ OSP and GBR OSP			
	SOCs k\$US	POCs k\$US	Other k\$US*
Management and administration	732,1	269,0	-
Technical, engineering and science support	1601,7	1474,0	-
Engineering development	-	-	-
Core curation	60,9	-	-
Data management	442,9	-	-
Publications	-	-	-
Education	-	-	-
Outreach	146,6	-	-
<hr/>			
	Total	2984,2	1743,0 -
	Total POCs and SOC	4727,2	
	GRAND TOTAL	4727,2	
Currency conversion rates used (12 May 09)			
	£1=\$1,53		
	€1=\$1,37		
Platform cost and contingency			
	GBR	652,0	
	SOCs travel	445,2	

## Approximate and estimated MSP costs 2004-2013 (k\$US)

29th May 2009

Expedition	Year	Total SOC	Total POC	Income	Balance
				from	POCs
				ECORD	
ACEX	2004/5	1325	11430	12755	0
Tahiti	2005	818	6006		
	2006	2180	662		
		2998	6668	6668	0
	2007	1613	880	9500	5403
	2008	1379	630	0	At BGS 4773
New Jersey	2009	Agreed max 4944	At EMA 11600	8730 6920	Incl ICDP 8823
GBR	2009-10		8823 20423		0
GBR Offshore NJ Onshore GBR Onshore	2010			1772	
		2750	1743		29
??	2011			4360	4389
??	2012			4360	8749
??	2013			4360	13109
Expeditions currently at OTF None	? Hawaiian reefs ? New England Hydrogeology				

	8730	At EMA
plus	6920	New funds
	15650	ESO contract 09
plus	4773	At BGS
	20423	Total ESO budget 09
less	11600	NJ budget
	8823	GBR budget in 09
plus	1743	GBR costs 10
plus	445	SOC travel 10
	11011	Total GBR costs 10

To equate with EMA,  
SOC travel NOT deducted/added for FY10

Includes vessel contingency of \$652k

ANNEX 2 –

**ESSAC REQUESTED BUDGET FOR FY10**

September 30 th, 2009- October 1st, 2010		
<b>REQUESTED BUDGET FY 10</b>	<b>Budget FY 10</b>	<b>Budget FY 09</b>
<b>Salaries</b>		
Science coordinator's salary (12 months)	57,600.00 €	48,000.00 €
<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 €	20,000.00 €
Summer school students	15,000.00 €	15,000.00 €
Conference 10 travel support <b>4</b>	5,000.00 €	10,000.00 €
ECORD Grants	10,000.00 €	-----
<b>ECORD CONTRIBUTION</b>	<b>167,100.00 €</b>	<b>152,500.00 €</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 10 ECORD Conference (EGU Session Vienna)

ANNEX 3 – EMA BUDGET FY10

EMA Budget in Euros	FY09 approved budget	FY09 expenses provisional	FY10 requested budget
Salaries			
<i>compensation for the director</i>	46 000	46 000	47 000
<i>scientific coordinator (80%)</i>	44 000	45 000	46 000
<i>Assistant project manager</i>	43 200	44 292	45 000
<i>secretary (50%)</i>	1 400	1 409	
Total	134 600	136 701	138 000
Travel	50 000	35 000	40 000
Meetings	5 000	3 800	5 000
Consumables	2 000	4 400	5 000
Database		1 000	2 000
Other costs (publications, booths..)	15 000	13 000	15 000
Support for SAS/ECORD meetings	10 000	11 000	15 000
Total	216 600	204 901	220 000
Overheads	40 000	24 000	25 000
TOTAL	256 600	228 901	245 000
Approved EMA FY09 budget in €		256 600	
FY08 balance		52 956	
<i>request from ECORD co-mingled funds</i>		203 644	
actually paid		176 000	
Total FY09 budget		228 956	

Total EMA FY10 budget in €	245 000
requested from ECORD co-mingled funds*	

\* Note that this amount will decrease when we receive the last ECORD-Net payment from the European Commission

ANNEX 4 – ECORD BUDGET FY10

**ECORD budget summary US\$,  
22/5/2009**

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

	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	TOTAL
Austria		100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	<b>500 000</b>
Belgium		30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	<b>150 000</b>
Canada	150 000	150 000	150 000	150 000	300 000	300 000	<b>1 200 000</b>
Denmark	500 000	500 000	1 000 000	0	200 000	200 000	<b>2 400 000</b>
Finland	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	<b>398 280</b>
France	2 000 000	3 000 000	3 500 000	3 500 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	<b>23 200 000</b>
Germany	2 250 000	3 500 000	7 000 000	0	5 600 000	5 600 000	<b>23 950 000</b>
Iceland	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	<b>180 000</b>
Ireland		130 000	130 000	130 000	145 000	130 000	<b>665 000</b>
Italy (OGS)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000	100 000		<b>400 000</b>
Italy (CNR)	75 000	75 000	75 000	75 000	100 000		<b>400 000</b>
Italy (INGV)		75 000	75 000	75 000	90 000		<b>315 000</b>
Italy (Conisma)		25 000	25 000	25 000	30 000		<b>105 000</b>
Italy (consortium)						350 000	<b>350 000</b>
Netherlands	470 000	0	210 000	210 000	400 000	400 000	<b>1 690 000</b>
Norway	1 000 000	0	1 400 000	0	1 100 000	1 100 000	<b>4 600 000</b>
Portugal	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	<b>540 000</b>
Spain	150 000	350 000	350 000	350 000	476 000	762 000	<b>2 438 000</b>
Sweden*	1 312 500	330 000	330 000	330 000	528 000	528 000	<b>3 358 500</b>
Switzerland	150 000	350 000	350 000	350 000	560 000	560 000	<b>2 320 000</b>
UK	4 300 000	3 800 000	400 000	3 500 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	<b>23 200 000</b>
	<b>12 618 880</b>	<b>12 676 380</b>	<b>15 386 380</b>	<b>9 086 380</b>	<b>21 145 380</b>	<b>21 446 380</b>	<b>92 359 780</b>

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

**Contributions still not paid**

Conisma FY07	<b>25 000</b>
Conisma FY08	<b>30 000</b>
OGS FY08	<b>100 000</b>
Italy FY09	<b>350 000</b>
Austria FY09	<b>100 000</b>
Iceland FY09	<b>30 000</b>
Belgium FY09	<b>30 000</b>
Spain FY09	<b>762 000</b>
Portugal FY09	<b>90 000</b>
Canada FY09	<b>300 000</b>
total	<b>1 817 000</b>

**Memorandum - M\$ US**

FY04	6,0
FY05	14,0
FY06	14,0
FY07	14,0
FY08	22,4
FY09	22,4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>93</b>

## FY10-FY13

<b>contributions</b>	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
Austria	100 000	100 000	100 000	100 000	400 000
Belgium	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	120 000
Canada	300 000	500 000	500 000	500 000	1 800 000
Denmark	200 000	200 000	200 000	200 000	800 000
Finland	66 380	66 380	66 380	66 380	265 520
France	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	22 400 000
Germany	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	22 400 000
Iceland	30 000	30 000	30 000	30 000	120 000
Ireland	130 000	130 000	130 000	130 000	520 000
Italy	350 000	350 000	350 000	350 000	1 400 000
Netherlands	400 000	400 000	400 000	400 000	1 600 000
Norway	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	1 100 000	4 400 000
Portugal	90 000	90 000	90 000	90 000	360 000
Spain	762 000	762 000	762 000	762 000	3 048 000
Sweden	528 000	528 000	528 000	528 000	2 112 000
Switzerland	560 000	560 000	560 000	560 000	2 240 000
UK	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	5 600 000	22 400 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>21 446 380</b>	<b>21 646 380</b>	<b>21 646 380</b>	<b>21 646 380</b>	<b>86 385 520</b>

still pending

<b>expenses</b>					
SOCs to NSF	16 800 000	16 800 000	16 800 000	16 800 000	67 200 000
EMA+ESSAC	556 335	600 000	600 000	600 000	2 356 335
<b>FY09 deficit</b>	<b>2 338 624</b>				

<b>available for POCs</b>	<b>1 751 421</b>	<b>4 246 380</b>	<b>4 246 380</b>	<b>4 246 380</b>	<b>16 829 185</b>
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------

## Summary FY03-FY10

income	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
ECORD contrib	12 618 880	12 676 380	15 386 380	9 086 380	21 155 380	21 496 380	21 446 380
carry forward		880	-1 151 620	876 596	2 800 476	8 230 706	-2 338 624
investment					120 000	?	
ICDP						500 000	
<b>total</b>	<b>12 618 880</b>	<b>12 677 260</b>	<b>14 234 760</b>	<b>9 962 976</b>	<b>24 075 856</b>	<b>30 227 086</b>	<b>19 107 756</b>

expenses							
SOCs*		6 793 500	6 840 000	6 807 000	15 502 400	16 326 000	16 800 000
ESO contract**	12 493 000	5 265 500	6 349 164	0	0	15 650 535	1 721 900
add ESO contract		1 600 000					
EMA	125 000	117 000	117 000	115 000	127 500	352 800	330 750
ESSAC		52 000	52 000	240 500	215 250	236 375	225 585
<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>32 565 710</b>	<b>19 078 235</b>

<b>balance w/EMA</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>-1 151 620</b>	<b>876 596</b>	<b>2 800 476</b>	<b>8 230 706</b>	<b>-2 338 624</b>	<b>29 521</b>
----------------------	------------	-------------------	----------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------	---------------

balance w/ESO	5 403 680	4 772 665	0	0
------------------	-----------	-----------	---	---

\* ESO SOC international travels deducted (except for FY10)

\*\* ESO SOC international travels added (except for FY10)

**Note that it has been agreed with NSF that ESO international travels covered by SOC's 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	?
---------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---



**ECORD FY09 budget in US\$**  
**october 2008**

	income	expenses
FY08 ECORD reserve	8 230 706	
FY09 contributions	21 496 380	
ICDP for NJ*	500 000	
SOCs to NSF		16 800 000
EMA **		352 800
ESSAC***		236 375
ESO contract		15 176 535
<b>Total</b>	<b>30 227 086</b>	<b>32 565 710</b>
<b>balance</b>	<b>-2 338 624</b>	
unpaid contributions	-330 000	
<b>balance, Oct 2008</b>	<b>-2 668 624</b>	

\* pending

\*\* 252 000 € = 352 800 US\$, exchange rate 1.40

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

*Note that 5.2 M € have been invested*

ECORD	FY09		(1)	(2)
contributions	US \$	Conisma FY07	25 000	25 000
		Conisma FY08	30 000	30 000
Austria	100 000	OGS FY08	100 000	100 000
Belgium	30 000	Italy FY09	350 000	350 000
Canada	300 000	Austria FY09	100 000	
Denmark	200 000	Iceland FY09	30 000	30 000
Finland	66 380	Belgium FY09	30 000	
France	5 600 000	Spain FY09	762 000	
Germany	5 600 000	Portugal FY09	90 000	
Iceland	30 000	Canada FY09	300 000	
Ireland	130 000	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 817 000</b>	<b>535 000</b>
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>21 496 380</b>			

(1) : unpaid, 22/5/2009

(2) : likely to remain unpaid

Annex H not yet sent

**ESO contract in FY09**

<b>POCs*</b>	<b>19 949 200</b>
<b>FY07 reserve at ESO</b>	<b>-5 403 680</b>
<b>FY08 expenditures</b>	<b>631 015</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15 176 535</b>
<b>SOC travels</b>	<b>474 000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15 650 535</b>

**Unpaid contributions**

<b>OGS FY07</b>	<b>75 000</b>
<b>CONISMA FY07</b>	<b>25 000</b>
<b>OGS FY08</b>	<b>100 000</b>
<b>CONISMA FY08</b>	<b>40 000</b>
<b>Portugal FY08</b>	<b>90 000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>330 000</b>

Note: the ECORD account at CNRS-INSU is in Euros and therefore subject to fluctuations of the US dollar/Euro exchange rate

## ECORD funding situation, 13 May 2009

*The account at INSU-CNRS is in Euros*

*The exchange rate has been favorable in previous years, but we lost in FY09*

### income, calendar year 2009 (from 1/1/2009)

	US \$	Euros	exchange rate
reserve 2008		6 159 734	1,36
investements 08		89 111	
paid contributions 2009 (including ICDP)	22 086 380	15 055 213	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21 304 058</b>	

### expenses

BGS	7 000 000	5 250 000	1.33
NSF	5 000 000	3 850 000	1.30
	5 702 400	4 276 800	1.33
EMA		130 000	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13 506 800</b>	

<b>Balance</b>	<b>7 797 258</b>
----------------	------------------

### still to pay

	US \$	Euros	
NSF - June 09	5 800 000	4 360 902	1.33
BGS - Oct 09	5 000 000	3 759 398	1.33
BGS - Dec 09	3 650 535	2 744 763	1.33
Total	14 450 535	10 865 064	1.33

deficit*	-2 338 624
----------	------------

to pay in 2009	12 111 911	<b>9 106 700</b>	1.33
----------------	------------	------------------	------

	US \$	Euros	
<b>balance</b>		<b>7 797 258</b>	
<b>unpaid contributions</b>	<b>1 817 000</b>	<b>1 366 165</b>	1.33
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9 163 423</b>	

\* built in deficit (see FY09 budget)

still some investment money to come

*The last invoices to pay are calculated at an exchange rate of 1.33 May change!*

The FY09 budget is balanced, provided that all the remaining contributions are paid (US\$ 1,817,000)

## ECORD Provisional budget, FY10

	income	expenses
FY09 deficit	-2 338 624	
FY10 contributions	21 446 380	
SOCs ro NSF		16 800 000
ESSAC*		225 585
EMA**		330 750
ESO contract***		1 721 900
	19 107 756	19 078 235
<b>balance</b>	<b>29 521</b>	

unpaid contribution	1 817 000
---------------------	-----------

Total	-1 787 479
-------	------------

\* € 167,100, exchange rate = 1.35

\*\* € 245,000, exchange rate = 1.35

\*\*\*provisional

**THE BUDGET IS BALANCED PROVIDED  
THAT ALL CONTRIBUTIONS (FY07, FY08, FY09  
AND FY10) ARE EFFECTIVELY PAID**