

ECORD Council Meeting #17

Berlin, 2-3 June 2010
European Commission office in Deutschland
Unter den Linden 78, 10117, Deutschland

MINUTES

Approved at the ECORD Council Meeting # 18 held in Paris on 17/11/10.

MEMBERS	NAME	EMAIL
Austria	Reinhard Belocky	belocky@fwf.ac.at
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriet	jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be
Canada	Anne de Vernal	devernal.anne@uqam.ca
Denmark	Marit-Solveig Seidenkrantz	mss@geo.au.dk
Finland	Jenni Virtanen	jenni.virtanen@aka.fi
France	Mireille Perrin	mireille.perrin@cnrs-dir.fr
Germany	Guido Lüniger	guido.lueniger@dfg.de
Ireland	Koen Verbruggen	Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie
Netherlands	Josef Stuefer	j.stuefer@nwo.nl
Portugal	Fernando Barriga	f.barriga@fc.ul.pt
Spain*	José Ramón Sánchez Quintana	jose.sanchezq@micinn.es
Sweden	Dan Holtstam	dan.holtstam@vr.se
UK	Michael Webb	mweb@nerc.ac.uk
OBSERVERS		
IODP-MI	Kiyoshi Suyehiro	ksuyehiro@iodp.org
NSF	Ian Ridley	wridley@nsf.gov
ERICON-AB	Bonnie Wolff-Boenisch	Bonnie.Wolff-Boenisch@awi.de
IMI BoG	Gerold Wefer	gwefer@marum.de
IMI BoG	John Ludden	jludden@bgs.ac.uk
SASEC	Jan de Leeuw	Jan.de.Leeuw@nioz.nl
SASEC	Damon Teagle	Damon.Teagle@soton.ac.uk
ESO	Robert Gatliff	rwga@bgs.ac.uk
ESSAC	Rüdiger Stein	Ruediger.Stein@awi.de
EMA	Catherine Mevel	mevel@ipgp.fr
EMA	Mohamed Amine Benchikh	benchikh@ipgp.fr
EMA	Patricia Maruéjol	maruejol@crpg.cnrs-nancy.fr
ICDP	Uli Harms	ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de
EC	Annika Thies	Annika.Thies@ec.europa.eu

* J.R. Sánchez Quintana cannot attend the closed session because of a meeting at the Spanish funding agency.

APOLOGIES		
MEMBERS	NAME	EMAIL
Iceland	Jonasson Hallgrímur	hallgrimur@rannis.is
Italy	Nigel Wardell	nwardell@ogs.trieste.it
Norway	Øyvind Pettersen	op@rcn.no
Switzerland	Martina Kern-Lütschg	mkern@snf.ch
OBSERVERS		
Sweden	Magnus Friberg	magnus.friberg@vr.se
Russia	Alexander Matul	amatul@ocean.ru
MEXT	Shingo Shibata	shibata@mext.go.jp
ESF	Paul Egerton	pegerton@esf.org
Marine Board	Niall McDonough	NMcDonough@esf.org

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACEX	Arctic Coring Expedition, Expedition 302
AERES	Agence d'Evaluation de la Recherche et de l'Enseignement Supérieur
AGU	American Geophysical Union
BGS	British Geological Survey
BoG	IODP-MI Board of Governors
CMO	Central Management Office
CoNISMA	Consorzio Nazionale Interuniversitario per le Scienze del Mare, Italy
CRISP A	Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project
DCO	Deep Carbon Observatory
DLP	Distinguished Lecturer Program
DS ³ F	Deep-Sea and Sub-Seafloor Frontiers project
EB	Executive Board
EC	European Commission
ECORD	European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling
EDP	Engineering Development Panel
EGU	European Geosciences Union
EMA	ECORD Managing Agency
EMAR2ES project	European MARine MARitime REsearch and Science project
EOR	Expedition Objective Research
ERIC	European Research Infrastructure Consortium
ERICON Aurora Borealis	European Polar Research Icebreaker Consortium - Aurora Borealis
ESF	European Science Foundation
ESFRI	European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures
ESO	ECORD Science Operator
ESSAC	ECORD Science Support and Advisory Committee
EUROCORES	European Collaborative Research
EuroMARC	EUROCORES programme Challenges of Marine Coring Research
FP8	Eighth framework programme
FY	Fiscal Year
GBREC	Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes
ICDP	International Continental Scientific Drilling Program
ILP	ECORD Industry Liaison Panel
INSU-CNRS	Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers, France
INVEST	IODP New Ventures in Exploring Scientific Targets
IODP	Integrated Ocean Drilling Program
IODP-MI	IODP Management International, Inc.
IOs	Implementing Organizations
ISP	Initial Science Plan for the IODP
IWG+	International Working Group +
JAMSTEC	Japan Marine Science & TEchnology Center
JR	Joides Resolution
KIGAM	Korea Institute of Geosciences and Mineral Resources
K-IODP	Korea Integrated Ocean Drilling Program)
LAs	Lead Agencies
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
MARCOM project	Towards an Integrated Marine and Maritime Science Community project
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology
MISTRALS	Mediterranean Integrated Studies at Regional And Local Scales
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSPs	Mission-specific platform

NanTroSEIZE	Nankai Trough SEIsmogenic Zone Experiment
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council, UK
NIOZ	Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research
NJSS	New Jersey Shallow Shelf
NSF	National Science Foundation, USA
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
ODP	Ocean Drilling Program
OGS	Istituto Nazionale di Oceanografia e di Geofisica Sperimentale (Italy)
OSP	Onshore Science Party
OTF	Operation Task Force
POC	Platform Operation Costs
SAS	Science Advisory Structure
SASEC	Science Advisory Structure Executive Committee
SOC	Science Operation Costs
SPC	Science Planning Committee
SPWC	Science Plan Writing Committee
SSEP	Science Steering & Evaluation Panel
SSP	Site Survey Panel
TerMEEx	Terra-Mediterranean Earth Science Experiment
TUMST	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology
USAC	U.S. Science Advisory Committee
USIO	U.S. Implementing Organization
USSP	U.S. Science Support Program
WP	Work Package

Wednesday, June 2nd
OPEN SESSION

Agenda Item 1 - Welcome and logistical information (Guido Lüniger)

The meeting was hosted at the European Commission office in Berlin by the ECORD Council Chair, Guido Lüniger.

C. Mével, EMA Director presented apologies from Martina Kern-Lütschg (Switzerland), Øyvind Pettersen (Norway), Nigel Wardell (Italy), Magnus Friberg (Swedish Research Council), Shingo Shibata (MEXT), Niall McDonough (Marine Board), Paul Egerton (ESF) and Sasha Matul (Russia).

Guido Lüniger asked if there are modifications to be added to the agenda. With no modification the agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 2 - Approval of the Rome meeting minutes (Guido Lüniger)

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-1

ECORD Council approves the minutes of its Rome meeting without modifications (ECORD Council meeting#16).

ACTION EMA: to include a list of acronyms in the agenda book for future ECORD Council meetings.

Agenda Item 3 - Rome meeting actions (Guido Lüniger)

G. Lüniger reviewed the actions passed by the Council at the last meeting in Rome.

ACTION EMA and Executive: To look at the list of current ECORD IODP-MI members and make a suggestion for the replacement of J. Ludden as ECORD Governor in 2010. The name of the new ECORD Governor should be submitted by email to the Council for approval. *Done – see agenda item 6.*

ACTION EMA + ECORD Executive: To investigate with ESF how the Magellan Workshop Series could be extended to facilitate the development of new proposals for the next phase of ocean drilling. *Done – see agenda item 14.*

ACTION EMA: To continue the dialogue with the Marine Board and investigate how ocean drilling/DS3F concept could be incorporated in the planned “Navigating the Future” position paper. *Done – see agenda item 13.*

ACTION S. Leigh + M. Friberg + EMA: To draft a statement on the position of the ECORD Council regarding the *Aurora Borealis* vessel. The draft should be submitted to the Council by email for its approval. *Done – included in the minutes of ECORD Council meeting #16.*

ACTION EMA: To inform the Lead Agencies (LAs) and IODP-MI of a possible shortfall in the 3 P.U. in SOC in FY11. *Done.*

ACTION EMA: To inform the USIO of the Council’s support to nominate Paola Vannucchi as co-chief scientist for CRISP-A expedition. *Done – Paola has been invited as a co-chief.*

ACTION ECORD Executive: To define the terms of reference and timeline for an independent evaluation of the ECORD scientific achievements using ocean drilling and of future prospects in a new programme of sub seafloor exploration. *In progress – see agenda item 23*

ACTION EMA: To ask NWO if they are willing to conduct the evaluation of ECORD scientific achievements using ocean drilling. In case of a negative answer, EMA should return to the Council by email for further guidance. *Done. NWO declined – see agenda item 23.*

ACTION EMA and Executive: To prepare a text for the “Expression of Interest” to be signed by the ECORD member countries willing to continue participate in ocean drilling activities within the new programme. *Not yet done. The expression of interest has to be signed in the second half of 2011. This will be discussed at the next Council meeting.*

ACTION ECORD Chair: To ask BGS and INSU-CNRS if they are willing to continue managing ESO and EMA respectively within the new phase of the drilling programme. *In progress.*

ACTION EMA: To find clarification on the process for filling these positions. *Done - See agenda item 22.*

ACTION M. Friberg: To prepare a presentation of the ERIC scheme and the potential benefits for ECORD at the next ECORD Council meeting. *Done – see agenda item 18.*

ACTION M. Friberg + EMA + ESO: To investigate the possibility of including ECORD in the ESFRI list for FP8. *Don – see agenda item 18.*

ACTION EMA: To poll the ECORD Council members to fix the dates during the week of May 31 to June 4, 2010, for the next ECORD Council meeting. To check with the incoming Chair, Guido Lüniger, if it is possible to held the meeting in Bonn. *Done.*

Agenda Item 4 - New Council Vice-Chair to be elected; composition of the Executive (C. Mével)

Anne de Vernal was elected incoming Vice-Chair as of October 1, 2010 to become the Chair as of April 1, 2011.

ECORD Council motion 10-01-1

ECORD Council elects Anne de Vernal as incoming Vice-Chair from Oct 1, 2010, to become the Chair as of April 1, 2011.

The Executive will be composed of Mireille Perrin (Chair), Anne de Vernal and Guido Lüniger (Vice-Chairs), Michael Webb and José Ramón Sánchez Quintana.

Verbruggen moved, Perrin seconded, 12 of 13 in favour, 1 abstained (Anne de Vernal)

Agenda Item 5 – IODP-MI report (K. Suyehiro)

Dr. K. Suyehiro, president of IODP-MI reported on IODP-MI activities. He presented the planned and potential expeditions for the three platforms in FY10-FY11. He informed that technological development associated with the riser system of the Chikyu is in progress and will allow to drill at NanTroSEIZE next year even in strong Kuroshio current.

The new IODP-MI office opened on January 2010. It is located at the Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology (TUMST) in central Tokyo. A multi-year contract with TUMST will allow IODP-MI to maintain offices at the campus until the end of FY2013. The non-profit Japanese Corporate status of IODP-MI was established on November 11, 2009. The Sapporo Office members joined the Tokyo office on March 1, 2010 and the new Washington, D.C. office maintains only contracting and finance functions.

The Second Triennium Review of IODP- MI (FY07-09) is expected for mid June 2010. It will focus on the SAS structure and make recommendations for the new phase. The Science Plan Writing Committee has been appointed and the first draft is expected for mi-June as well. K. Suyehiro outlined the challenges that the CMO is facing: the delivery of IODP science, serving the IODP Members, bridging to the next program. He insisted on the IODP-MI Values: Open, Ocean, Uniting, Inspiring, and International.

He reminded the role of SOC's and commingled fund and how any cut will directly affect the program objectives. C. Mével insisted that it is important to understand since ECORD has to make a decision on its level of contribution over the next 3 years (FY11-13). The incomes consist in the contributions from IODP members, ~US\$ 23M per year from which ~US\$16.8M is provided by ECORD. From this amount, a substantial part goes to the platform operators to support science activities during expeditions. The remaining money (~ US\$ 6 M) supports integrative activities such core repositories, overall management and administration, outreach and engineering development.

Agenda Item 6 - Board of Governors report (J. Ludden)

John Ludden reported on the activities of the IODP-MI Board of Governors (BoG). He emphasised that the most important work accomplished this year was the appointment of Suyehiro as Director of IODP-MI and the creation of the IODP-MI office in Tokyo with all the cooperation and effort this has requested.

He reminded that the role of BoG that is to provide guidance to the program and to be the potential voice of the community through the various oceanography institutions and universities represented. The membership fee is currently \$5.000 and 12 European institutions are members.

ECORD is entitled three seats on the BoG. Hans Thierstein (Switzerland) resigned this spring and will be replaced by Mathilde Cannat (IPGP, France). J. Ludden will stay one more year. Therefore, as of June 2010, the ECORD Governors are G. Wefer, J. Ludden and M. Cannat.

At its last BoG meeting (AGU, San Francisco, December, 2009) the BoG discussed the following points: 2010 Program Plan, consolidation of the Tokyo office and the employee, Triennium Review, INVEST report, IWG+ status. The next meeting (Kyoto, June 16, 2010) is associated with the IODP-MI Day (June 15) to which all IODP-MI members who have paid their membership fee are invited.

J. Ludden explained that IODP-MI Inc has its own budget (the corporate funds) coming from membership fees plus additional allocations NSF and MEXT. The current balance is \$800.000 with the aim to reach \$1M. The membership fee will decrease once US\$ 1M is reached. M. Webb asked about the type of activities funded by the corporate budget. J. Ludden and K. Suyehiro responded that it concerns all activities outside the NSF contract, for instance the initiative led by M. Talwani to build a project with industry (Ocean Drilling Consortium)

Agenda Item 7 – SASEC report (J. de Leeuw)

J. de Leeuw reported on the last SASEC meeting (January 18-19, 2010, Seoul).

SASEC recommended the Science Plan Writing Committee (SPWC) candidates subsequently approved by IWG+.

The IODP-MI Board of Governors tasked SASEC to develop a plan for the remaining 3 years of the program. SPC/OTF will present a small number of alternative drilling schedules through 2013 at the June meeting. This 3-year plan will be driven by some guiding principles such as a major scientific impact in an ISP theme or initiative

SASEC accepted the report of the Subcommittee Assessing Models for post-2013 Proposal Evaluation Process and forwarded it to IWG+. It includes the following recommendations: separate planning pathway for riser as well as complicated, multi-expedition non-riser projects, simplification of the panel structure through reduction of SSEP/SPC/SASEC to 2 panels.

He alleged IODP should “open up” in order to better collaborate with ICDP and other programmes such as the Deep Carbon Observatory (DCO) to operate more efficiently and save costs. A meeting between IODP, ICDP, DCO and others is planned to develop strategies for creating linkages.

Criticisms were expressed concerning the IODP web site. It needs to be more attractive (especially about the way IODP is presented), to be simplified and regularly updated.

Agenda Item 8 - NSF report (I. Ridley)

Ian Ridley explained the structure of the Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) within the Marine Geosciences Section at NSF. All activities run by Ocean Drilling were detailed.

He presented JR program plan for FY09-11.

He presented the U.S. Science Support Program (USSP), managed by the Consortium for Ocean Leadership for the NSF under a Cooperative Agreement. Its aim is to support involvement of the U.S. scientific community in IODP. The budget is \$7M per year including expedition participant costs, SAS participation, workshops, small grants, education and outreach, U.S. Science Advisory Committee (USAC), etc. He detailed the 2009-2010 in terms of workshops, Distinguished Lecturer Series, Schlanger Fellowships (merit-based awards for outstanding graduate students to conduct research related to the drilling program).

He presented NSF financial situation over the next fiscal years. A budget increase was initially expected in FY10, but could be frozen until FY11 after the midterm elections in November. The new head of marine Division, David Conner, has been appointed and will start next July. NSF is still aiming at operating the

JR 12 months per year but it may not be possible. If the JR is operating only 8 months, an industrial partnership will be sought to fund the remaining 4 months. He added that it will be difficult to get external contract with industry and he added that the SAS is considered as a barrier from the Industry point of view.

Agenda Item 9 - EMA report (C. Mével/P. Maruéjol)

C. Mével described the **changes that occurred at the ECORD Managing Agency**.

Rosa Bernal-Carrera moved to another position within the IPGP. Catherine thanked Rosa for her dedication, efficiency and permanent good temper. She introduced Amine Mohamed BENCHIKH who took over the position on March 1.

The EMA office is moving mid July to the new IPGP building close by. The new EMA address is:

IPGP, Bureau 362, 1 rue Jussieu, 75238 Paris CEDEX 05. Tel: +33 1 83 95 76 57, ema@ipgp.fr

C. Mével listed all meetings EMA participated in. Further details related to IWG+, DS3F and ERICON will be provided under agenda items 16, 13 and 15 respectively.

ECORD funding situation: In FY09, ECORD paid 16.8 \$M (3 P.U.) in SOC's to IODP (NSF). Following ECORD Council's recommendation, EMA negotiated with the LAs and IODP-MI a modification in the money flow. The new scheme is included in the FY10 Addendum to the Memorandum signed with the LAs. The SOC's to ESO are still negotiated with IODP-MI as part of the Annual Program Plan (APP). But they are now directly paid by EMA to ESO and deducted for the ECORD SOC contribution to the commingled funds. The FY10 Budget should be balanced. However, because the ECORD account is in Euros, the recent collapse of the Euro with respect to the US\$ will likely result in significant loss, but it is too early to be estimated. To be able to implement two MSP expeditions before the end of the programme, ECORD will need more POC's. Therefore ECORD requested the LAs to modify the POC/SOC ratio of its contribution to the programme and keep an additional US\$ 3.5 M in POC's in FY11, and a total of ~US\$ 10.5 M over the three last years. The LAs responded that they are concerned that this shortfall will threaten the integrative activities. The budget was further discussed under Agenda item 22.

The second Triennium review of IODP will focus on the effectiveness of the IODP science planning process, SAS performance, and relationships between the SAS, IODP-MI and the Implementing Organizations. The review committee is chaired by Ian McGregor and has requested input from the community (written statements) to help shaping the SAS structure for the new programme. The first draft of the report will be presented at the SASEC/IWG+ meetings in June 2010.

C. Mével introduced the TerMEx initiative and Mistrals programme. The kick-off meeting of the Terra-Mediterranean Earth Science Experiment (TerMEx) French initiative will be on 7-9 June, 2010 in Paris. TerMEx aims to consolidate existing collaborations, promote and develop new projects involving scientists from the Mediterranean countries and other European countries. This initiative is part of the programme cluster MISTRALS (Mediterranean Integrated Studies at Regional And Local Scales) and INSU-CNRS is one of the sponsors. Discussions will include possible drilling projects in the Mediterranean. CDEX is sending two representatives to present the Chikyu and C. Mével will present the opportunities offered by IODP.

Patricia Maruéjol presented the ECORD Outreach activities. The ECORD Outreach Team is composed of ESO and EMA outreach specialists (A. Stevenson, A. Gerdes, and P. Maruéjol) and the ESSAC science coordinator (J. Lezius).

Since October 2009, EMA has provided support to several national initiatives and international conferences (e.g. Arctic Climate-COP15 Copenhagen, AGU 2009,). At EGU 2010, IODP and ICDP jointly organized a large booth, coordinated by ECORD and funded by IODP-MI. It included demonstration of the CoreWall software by ICDP, exhibition of a model of the *L/B Kayd*, presentation of IODP videos. The joint IODP-ICDP Townhall Meeting attracted nearly 200 attendees. Several media conferences were organized and are webcasted at <http://www.egu-media.net/>.

EMA released the Newsletter #14 distributed at the EGU 2010. The Newsletter #15 will be released in November 2010. EMA developed new ECORD folder carrying sheets summarizing the MSP expeditions conducted so far as well as IODP/ECORD structures. The ECORD flyer will be updated this fall.

Agenda Item 10 - ESO report (R. Gatliff)

Robert Gatliff reported on the MSP expeditions in FY09-10 and the plan for FY11-13.

The offshore operations of the **New Jersey Shallow Shelf (NJSS) expeditions** were conducted from April 30 - July 17, 2009 and the onshore science party ran successfully in Bremen from Nov 4 to Dec 6. 3 holes were drilled and recovered 1311m of core with 80% recovery although the lithified sands were a drilling and coring challenge. The core quality is very good to excellent. The Preliminary Report, published in January 2010, is available at:

http://publications.iodp.org/preliminary_report/313/.

The Operation Review Committee will meet on July 21-22, in Edinburgh.

The Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes (GBREC) expedition was conducted from February 11 until April 6, 2010. The 55 days duration was longer than the 45 days planned due to downtime. However, this did not impact the budget since ESO negotiated with the vessel's contractor a deal allowing extension of the campaign at no cost. The core recovery is on average 30%, which is much less than Tahiti but better than average coral drilling. The Onshore Science Party will begin on July 2 for two weeks long.

Gatliff detailed the many problems encountered during the mobilization and operation phases, delaying the expedition and lowering the core quality:

- A change in the vessel initially contracted was necessary due to an engine failure. The contracted company committed a brand new vessel the "*Greatship Maya*". The completion of the vessel was unfortunately delayed, resulting in successive delays of the sea trials, the mobilization and the start of the expedition
- Technical difficulties resulting in breakdowns occurred during the drilling operations. In particular, dynamic positioning system failed. The strong current also affected the drilling techniques used.
- The weather conditions also affected the drilling operations. The initial plan was to conduct the operations before the start of the hurricane season. When the operations were delayed, the Park Authorities claimed that the hurricane season should not be a problem because the weather is actually better between the hurricanes. In reality, the area experienced the worse weather in a hundred years.
- Health and safety problems were experienced, due to the attitude of both the ship crew and the scientists.

Future plan for MSPs

Three MSP proposals are currently residing at OTF and ESO has started scoping them.

- **Hawaiian Drowned Reefs:** ESO visited Hawaiian authorities on March 3rd-4th, 2010 and the first indications on the permit are positive. Contracting a vessel will be expensive because of the long transit to Hawaii. Similar drilling techniques as for Tahiti could be used. A cheaper option would be to use a seabed rock drill but the feasibility needs to be better investigated.
- **Chicxulub K-T Impact Crater:** It is an ambitious project, addressing a new type of science, and that could raise public interest. As the plan is to use a jack-up rig, a hazard site survey is needed. The same platform as for New Jersey could be used. Permitting in Mexican water is clearly an issue.
- **Coralgal Banks** appears as a good option for 2013 if funds are limited as the expedition is relatively inexpensive. However, it is a less ambitious project and has been ranked lower. The use of the seabed rock drill is an option.

On the basis of these 3 MSP projects, ESO has submitted to OTF a 3-option scenario for the MSP programme FY11-13. The preferred plan for OTF includes a hazard site survey for Chicxulub in FY11, Chicxulub Impact crater drilling in FY12 and Hawaii, Baltic or another in 2013. A total of 15 MSP proposals are residing at SSEP. This is encouraging for the future and this shows the success of the MSP concept.

Jan de Leeuw asked whether the GBREC expedition should have been delayed to avoid using an insufficiently tested ship and drilling during an unfavorable weather window. B. Gatliff responded that this would have resulted in a new bidding process, with no guarantee to keep the same price. Moreover the delays accumulated progressively. The contract negotiated allowed for downtime. Mike Webb wondered whether the council is asking ESO an impossible task given the budget constraints. A review of the operations is clearly needed and will be conducted by IODP-MI.

J.P. Henriot asked if the seabed drill option was considered given such shallow waters. R. Gatliff stated it was considered but at this time ESO did not think this system was appropriate.

Agenda Item 11 – ESSAC report (R. Stein)

The last ESSAC meeting was held in Tromsø (Norway), May 26-27. All ECORD member countries were represented, except for Iceland.

Election of the ESSAC Vice-Chair: ESSAC nominated Carlota Escutia Dotti (Spain) as the new ESSAC vice chair, to become the chair on Oct 1st, 2011.

ECORD Council approved the ESSAC Motion 1005-01 and the following motion was passed.

ECORD Council motion 10-01-2

ECORD Council approves the nomination of Carlota Escutia as the new ESSAC vice chair.

Barriga moved, Verbruggen seconded, 12 of 13 in favour, 1 abstained (Sanchez-Quintana)

R. Stein informed that ECORD is leading 53% of the total proposals submitted last fall and 38% of current active proposals in the system (40 out of 105). He pointed out the large number of proposals scoping the Arctic. The residence time for proposals remains a concern. The new programme should start on a healthy basis. Therefore, ESSAC suggested that the proponents of proposals currently in the system should be requested to resubmit their proposal to the new phase, and emphasize their relevance to the new science plan.

R. Stein presented the ship **schedule for FY11-13** as discussed at SPC and OTF meetings. Scheduling options for FY11-13 for each platform were discussed but not finalized yet. The Baltic sea proposal has not yet been forwarded to OTF, but it will likely be at the next ranking meeting.

By June 2010 the **Science Plan Writing Committee** will deliver a first draft of the new science plan. This draft will be available on-line during 6 weeks for comments from the scientific community. Four major scientific themes called “frontiers” makes up the new science plan: (1) Climate and Ocean Changes: Reading the past, Informing the Future, (2) Deep Life, (3) Renewing the Lithosphere: consequences for our planet, (4) Earth in Motion: Crustal Dynamics, Fluid Flow and Active Experimentation. In addition, the science plan will address: (1) Education and Public Awareness, Capacity building, (2) Links and Partnerships, (3) Implementation and Program Management.

R. Stein also presented a new research initiative for implementing an **International Scientific Program for Climate and Human Evolution Research**, based on the report “*Understanding Climate's Influence on Human Evolution*” (March 2010), commissioned by the NSF.

Staffing and quotas issues. ESSAC Office issued calls for applications for 7 expeditions. Nominations are completed for Juan de Fuca Hydrogeology II, South Pacific Gyre Microbiology, and the Louisville Seamount Chain Expeditions. ESSAC is currently reviewing applications to CRISP-A, Superfast Spreading, and Mid-Atlantic Microbiology. Three calls are still opened for *Chikyu* operations.

R. Stein presented the quota situation for ECORD member countries. Some countries are still underquota while others are overquota. ESSAC is working to improve the quota situation, however it is likely that at the end of the programme there will still be some discrepancy.

GBR	NanTr	JdF	CasCo	SPG	Louis					
Exp 325	Exp 326	Exp 327	Exp 328	Exp 329	Exp 330	Total berths so far	Member	NEW Financial Contribn	NEW Entitlement	ALLOC
3		3		1	2	50	France	25,4%	58,2	-8,2
2		0		3	2	61	Germany	26,1%	59,7	1,3
2		2		1	3	54	UK	25,4%	58,2	-4,2
7	0	5	0	5	7	165	Sum	76,9%	176,2	-11,2
						0	Austria	0,5%	1,2	-1,2
						1	Belgium	0,2%	0,4	0,6
					1	7	Canada	1,3%	3,0	4,0
		1		1		6	Denmark	2,3%	5,3	0,7
						2	Finland	0,4%	0,9	1,1
						0	Iceland	0,1%	0,3	-0,3
				1		1	Ireland	0,7%	1,6	-0,6
						8	Italy	1,3%	2,9	5,1
						6	The Netherlands	1,8%	4,2	1,8
				1		7	Norway	5,0%	11,5	-4,5
						2	Portugal	0,6%	1,3	0,7
1						9	Spain	2,8%	6,5	2,5
						7	Sweden	3,4%	7,9	-0,9
						8	Switzerland	2,5%	5,8	2,2
1	0	1	0	3	1	64	Sum	23,1%	52,8	11,2
8	0	6	0	8	8	229	Total ECORD		229	0,0

ECORD Council endorsed ESSAC nominations for the following SAS panels: SPC, SSP and EDP. The next day ECORD Council passed the following motions:

ECORD Council motion 10-01-3

ECORD Council approves the nomination of the following new SAS members by ESSAC:

- SPC: Javier Escartin (F), Heiko Pälke (UK)
- SSP: Peter Clift (UK)
- EDP: Neal Watson (UK)

Barriga moved, Verbruggen seconded, all in favour

ECORD Summer Schools and Scholarships: In 2010, three ECORD Summer Schools will be funded and for the first time one will be hosted in Canada. 14 Scholarships among 47 applications were allocated to young scientists including one from Poland.

In 2011, two summer schools will be funded:

- the Bremen Summer School, organized at the Core Repository, will address "Sub seafloor fluid flow and gas hydrates"
- the Urbino Summer School will continue to address "paleoclimates".

For the future, it is envisaged to continue organizing summer schools in Bremen around the Core Repository, to provide opportunity to work on the cores. Scientists from other universities are welcomed to use the facility for a topic of their choice.

The new **ECORD Grants initiative** is a merit-based award for outstanding graduate students to conduct research directed towards the objectives of DSDP/ODP/IODP expeditions. The first call received 8 applications out of which 5 were funded.

The Distinguished Lecturer Program (DLP) FY09-FY10 will be active until June 2010.

For 2011, 3 lecturers have been selected: Dominique Weiss (Canada), Helmut Weissert (Switzerland) and Kai-Uwe Hinrichs (Germany). Statistics about DLP are in preparation.

EUROFORUM and ECORD-ESF workshop: During the EGU2010 in Vienna, ESSAC organized the EuroFORUM 2010, "Achievements and perspectives in scientific ocean and continental drilling".

ESF Magellan has sponsored two workshops in late 2009 and one in 2010 on "Large Igneous Provinces and Mass Extinction" (Vienna). The future of Magellan was further discussed under agenda 15.

J. Ludden alleged that many ECORD scientist sailing are PhDs, which may or may not be a problem. He said in the US there is an encouragement for senior scientists to sail (through an NSF support program) that has no equivalent in Europe. Stein responded that students represent 35%-40% of the staffing. Jean-Pierre Henriot did not consider as a problem because it is important to engage the new generation. C. Mével added that this is not unique to ECORD

Concerning the science plan, J. Ludden noted that words such as “energy”, “new source of energy” are not mentioned enough or missing. This view was shared by council members as well as Ian Ridley who explained that the US Department of Energy is interested in new energy.

Concerns were also expressed about absence of “continental breakup”, topic which could facilitate the link with industry. R. Stein responded that this point was discussed at SPC and ESSAC. There is a clear lack of proposals in this theme that was mentioned several times. C. Mével reminded that a whole science plan was developed between academia and industry under the frame of the Ocean Drilling Consortium (ODC). ODC did not succeed but the material is there.

The first version of the new Science Plan will be soon available on the IODP website for comments from the community.

Agenda Item 12 - ECORD Industry liaison panel (Michael Webb)

Michael Webb presented updates on the ECORD Industry Liaison Panel (ILP) in the place of Sasha Leigh (NERC). The ILP will focus on the Arctic Ocean. Dayton Dove (UK-IODP Science Coordinator) is preparing a brochure with the aim of encouraging industry support for scientific drilling in the Arctic. The plan is to organize a workshop with industry and academia to explore potential avenues for scientific cooperation and funding.

Following the proposal prepared by Sasha Leigh and distributed at the meeting, ECORD Council passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-2

ECORD Council supports the proposal of Sasha Leigh (NERC) to organize a joint industry-academia workshop to discuss potential cooperation in the Arctic.

This workshop will be organised by the ECORD Managing Agency, with the support of Sasha Leigh and UK IODP, and in consultation with the ECORD ILP and ESSAC

In preparation for this workshop, the ECORD Council members will be requested to contribute:

- names/groups to which the Arctic brochure should be sent to,
- names/groups who should be invited to participate in the workshop.

Agenda Item 13- Deep Sea and Sub Seafloor (DS³F) Project and Ostend EuroOCEAN meeting (C. Mével)

The EC funded **DS³F Project, led by Achim Kopf**, started January 1st, 2010. Unfortunately, Pascal le Grand, the initial project contact at the EC, has moved to another position at the and new contact is still pending. C. Mével gave an overview of the Project.

Because it is now an EC funded program, DS³F is already more visible. As a consequence, Achim Kopf has been appointed as a member of the MARCOM Expert Group on Science Policy Interfacing.

The Marine Board has been invited by the Belgian EU Presidency Organizers and the Local EuroOCEAN 2010 Organizing Committee, to actively participate in the preparation of the EUROCEAN 2010 conference, scheduled Oct 12-13 in Oostende by contributing to:

- develop and finalize the EUROCEAN 2010 Conference Programme;
- develop and finalize the Oostende Declaration - key output of the EuroOCEAN 2010 Conference

ECORD has been consulted for the drafting of the Oostende declaration to be signed at the meeting.

Achim Kopf has been invited to give a presentation of DS³F at the session “*Marine Sciences 2020: Grand Challenges and Opportunities for the next decade*”. This will provide a very good political exposure. Because ECORD is not supported by an EC-funded project, it is only visible to the Commission through DS³F.

The **EMAR²ES project** has contacted ECORD to fill questionnaire “*Stakeholder identification*”. EMAR²ES is an EU-FP7 Support Action to initiate cooperation between the communities of European MARine MARitime REsearch and Science.

Agenda Item 14 – Relations with ESF. Future of Magellan (C. Mével)

C. Mével presented the excuses from P. Egerton who sent her a presentation for the council.

The Magellan programme, with 5 years duration (Feb.2006 – Feb. 2011), aims at stimulating and nurturing development of new and innovative science proposals to support European leadership in the planning of marine drilling expeditions. The programme is run by ESF but funded by national funding agencies. The budget is 93.5 K€ per year. The steering committee is populated by members of the drilling community, and most of them are current ESSAC members.

The programme has already funded 16 workshops and one is scheduled for this fall. It also supports grant for short-term visits. A mid-term report of Magellan activities was submitted and approved by LESC and a final report is expected in spring or autumn 2011. Programme extension is requested till August 2011.

A Magellan Steering Committee Meeting is planned on August, 19-20, 2010 in Germany, to discuss the future of Magellan. ECORD will be represented by C. Mével (EMA) and R. Stein (ESSAC).

ECORD Council considers the Magellan programme very successful (consensus 09-02-1, ECORD Council meeting15). There is still the issue of the visibility of ECORD which has not really been solved with ESF. Magellan workshops reports do not acknowledge ECORD but only ESF, although the programme was launched at the initiative of ECORD and is funded by ECORD funding agencies. J.P. Henriet advocated that ECORD Council should not blame ESF but rather the Magellan structure that has total freedom. R. Belocky informed the council that ESF is under discussion and may undergo major organizational changes in the near future.

EUROMARC (2007-2010) was a EUROCORE program designed to help support site surveys and post cruise science for marine coring projects including IODP. EUROMARC issued only one call from which 7 research projects were funded

In ESSAC's opinion, EUROMARC is important for getting funding for site surveys and post-cruise science. However, the Council questioned whether a EUROCORE is the right instrument. M. Webb highlighted that for NERC, EUROMARC is not considered as the right instrument and called for the establishment of a joint program directly run by the funding agencies involved and not by ESF. Part of the IODP subscriptions could be run to start this new joint program. J.P. Henriet disagreed. He stated that EUROMARC as well as other EUROCORE programs have really helped scientists from the smaller countries.

Agenda Item 15 – Progress of the Aurora Borealis Project (B. Wolff-Boenisch)

Dr. Bonnie Wolff-Boenisch, ERICON Aurora Borealis Executive Manager, reported on the status of the ERICON Project, particularly on the science plan, estimated operation costs, and liaisons with industry.

The process of drafting the **Long-Term Science Plan 2015-2030** outline, integrating the old science plan 2006-2016, has been initiated. The plan will emphasize international scientific priorities through 5 major topics: (1) Large-scale processes and sea-ice-atmosphere interactions; (2) The polar biosphere; (3) Paleoclimate and Paleoenvironment; (4) Geology of the polar oceans; (5) Arctic and Antarctic sea-floor processes and natural hazards.

Evaluating Operation costs is addressed in the Work Package 4 « *Financial Frameworks, Commitment to Construction and Operation* ». The first deliverable "Verified estimated on future running cost escalation, crewing and support of the vessel» (D.4.1) is almost completed to be delivered on June 2010. The average yearly running cost is estimated between 34-45M€. She explained the methodology used to arrive to this figure.

The vessel raises interest from **industry** across many sectors: maritime technology, shipbuilding, offshore service suppliers, hydrocarbon industry... Contacts with various companies have been initiated.

She also emphasized the successful meeting hosted in Italy by the Italian Foreign Ministry in April 2010 which gathered more than 35 participants from politics and funding organizations, industry, science representatives....

J.P. Henriet requested information about the duration of vessel operations. B. Wolff-Boenisch responded that the cost of US\$35-45M was calculated for twelve months of operations including three months of drilling. C. Mével reminded that the figure only covers the ship cost but not the associated scientific costs such as core curation, laboratories, logging, etc.

G. Wefer asked whether the Liquefied Natural Gas based technology (LNG) has been considered. She replied that it is a new incoming technique. There is a high pressure from industry deeply interested by this

technology because as of 2014, ships will have to comply with emission pollution rules. The world leader in this technology (MAN-Sulzer Engines and Propulsion) has already been approached.

G. Lüniger asked if some countries have already expressed interest in building the vessel. She reported that in Germany there was an official state recommendation that Germany would put at least the third of the budget. But until a business plan detailing the cost is available, any real commitment appears unlikely.

J.P. Henriet raised the issue of the nationality of the vessel that may impact the permitting. She recognized that permitting will be an issue. She reminded that Russia is a project partner and is involved in the discussions. As circum-Arctic countries, Canada and USA will also be approached

Agenda Item 16 – Report on International Working Group + activities (C. Mével)

C. Mével reported on the IWG+ and Lead Agencies meeting. She listed the points already agreed in the Position Papers and those still to be discussed at the next IWG+ meeting (Kyoto, June).

Position Paper 1 “Multinational Program Architecture and Financial Contribution”. The POC/SOC distinction will be abolished; Platform Providers will cover all costs associated with operating their platforms. Money for integrative activities will go to CMO; Commingled funds will be maintained and will need to pay for integrative activities plus a minimum of US\$10M to secure riser operations of Chikyū. Clarification is still needed for the member categories and the associated rights.

Position Paper 2 “Program Management and Money Flow”. IODP-MI will continue as CMO through the transition to the new program and its performance and effectiveness will be closely monitored. The CMO will continue to conduct the integrative activities.

The new Program will be managed by an Executive Board (EB), as sole Executive Authority and highest ranking entity in the new Management Structure. The exact role and membership of the EB and its relationships with the BoG still need to be clarified

The US (NSF) will continue to be the banker for the commingled funds until 2016.

Position Paper 3 “SAS Structure”. The direction is toward simplification: two committees for proposal evaluation and program plan development where there are now three (SSEP/SPC/SASEC) and a separate pathway for planning for riser projects and long-term multi-expedition non-riser projects. The Implementation Committee would report directly to the EB.

Position Paper 4 “Transition to the New Program”. A plan for the transition has been developed. There is no need for an interim SAS. The new SAS will be set up by the fall of 2011 and the existing SAS will be progressively phased out. The fate of existing proposals still needs to be decided.

Actions for the next IWG+ meeting, scheduled in Kyoto next June. The final decision about the transition phase needs to be made and the scientific community should be informed. The program architecture, money flow and management should be decided by mid-2011, in order to start the discussion for the MoU. The first draft of the science plan will be presented in Kyoto and posted on the IODP website for comments. C. Mével suggested that a common response from ECORD is organized.

Discussions mainly focused on the functions of the Executive Board and its relationships with the SAS. K. Suyehiro informed that the BoG will discuss this point at its upcoming meeting. He expressed concerns about the role of the BoG as stated in the Position Paper. It is not planned that the EB will replace the BoG which is mentioned as a requirement in the IODP-MI's by-laws. But IODP-MI only overlooks the commingled funds.

Ian Ridley informed about an ongoing discussion between MEXT and NSF regarding the membership of the EB. While NSF is in favor of having representatives of the science community, MEXT is opposed to this concept. NSF feels that excluding the scientists would send the community a wrong message that the program is run by the funding agencies and the Science is relegated at lower level. The NSF view is strongly supported by the Council.

C. Mével explained there is no intent for the EB to take over the responsibility for scheduling the ships. This will be the task of the Implementation Committee that will be completely populated by scientists. The EB

will make sure that there is no deviation from the science plan and the budget guidance. M. Webb informed that the LAs may claim to have veto rights, but this is still to be discussed

Agenda Item 17 – Presentation of the ERIC Scheme (Annika Thies)

Annika Thies, lawyer for the European Commission in DG Research (Research Infrastructures unit), presented the ERIC legal framework.

She overviewed the main features of the ERIC regulation: aims, benefits and advantages; as well as the requirements to set up the newly structure: internal structure of an ERIC, application process to the EC.

Amidst points the most addressed was the “effective access” requirement: an ERIC may ensure at least a certain percentage of the facility opened to all the rest of the European community and the Associated Member States. But this does not mean the access has to be for free.

Answering a council question, A. Thies explained that various types of organizations are applying for an ERIC. Many of them come from the ESFRI List. However ERIC is not restricted to ESFRI but the criteria laid out in the European regulation on European infrastructure have to be fulfilled. The definition of “research infrastructure” used in the ERIC regulation is the same as the one used in the FP7 work programme.

J. Ludden asked about the liability issue covered by ERIC scheme. Different liability regimes are available, she responded, such as the limited liability. For instance the obligation of the membership fees payment and the operational risk coverage are secured by the ERIC.

The signature process was explained. At the submission stage, the ERIC proposal is carried by the permanent representative of the country hosting the infrastructure. At this stage of assessment, the EC does not require any signature. Should the proposal be accepted, signatures from each national government are mandatory. However an institution, a research council or others organizations can receive a delegation to sign from its government. C. Mével alleged that the contribution to ECORD is very variable among the members and that signing an ERIC at the government level may prove difficult for smaller countries. Moreover, a long-term commitment might be difficult

C. Mével asked if there is a minimum budget required. . There is not, according to A. Thies, who explained that the main evaluation criteria regard scientific relevance and importance at European level, rather than budgetary limits. A request by Member States to set up an ERIC of high scientific importance for the ERA with an annual operational budget of around 1 Million Euro would, if it complied with the other requirements of the ERIC Regulation, be accepted by the Commission.

Agenda Item 18 – ECORD and ERIC, ECORD and the ESFRI list (D. Holtstam)

On behalf of M. Friberg, D. Holtstam discussed the feasibility for ECORD to be accepted as an ERIC. ECORD is not part of the ESFRI list. In general, ECORD does not really fit because it is rather a research program. However, the cores repositories as well as the databases can be considered as shared infrastructures. Therefore his recommendation was that ECORD applies to the ESFRI roadmap call as soon as possible.

A. Thies clarified these two points: an infrastructure can be an ERIC without being part of the ESFRI list. In addition, further aspects of ECORD may be eligible to the ERIC requirements, not just the repository or the shared data based. She will discuss this latter point with her colleagues.

J.R. Sánchez Quintana informed that Spain has discussed the possibility to sign an ERIC at a governmental level. The fact that the decision process in IODP occurs outside Europe (at the international level) raises a major obstacle for the Spanish signature. For J. Ludden, handling this issue largely depends on the role of ECORD in the next program. If the next program runs as an umbrella to three independent platforms, it will make it easier to convince at a governmental level, even if the infrastructure involves commitment from outside Europe.

B. Wolff-Boenisch asked C. Mével what would be the added value of an ERIC. She replied that it would be the long term commitment of the partners, as well as the visibility.

Agenda Item 19 – ICDP (U. Harms)

U. Harms presented the ICDP 2010 status and explained the overall structure and the decision process. ICDP members are from academies, national funding agencies, a private company (Schlumberger), an international organization (UNESCO). Currently, ICDP has 22 member countries - and is still growing.

The proposal submission path was described showing the specificities of ICDP compared to IODP. The key difference is that ICDP never fully funds a project, but co-funding is the rule. The funding rate is in average 19% of the project total cost. It is the responsibility of the PI to secure the remaining funding. ICDP plays a leverage role. Workshops are the essential part in the proposal submission process.

He presented a map of the ICDP drill sites, emphasizing that they are located around the world. He described the Lake Elgygyt'gyn project as an example. *Suyehiro pointed out that many projects are in the southern hemisphere, as opposed to IODP. U. Harms explained that UNESCO, as a member of ICDP Executive Committee, insists that developing countries play a role, which may explain the interest in the southern hemisphere.*

To implements the projects, ICDP supports **technical development** such as the platform for lake drilling "GLAD800", the CoreWall system for which ICDP has participated in the development. The Operational Support Group brings technical and logistical support.

He insisted that cooperation between ICDP and IODP is highly valuable. Some ICDP panel members are involved in IODP. There are various areas for possible cooperation: joint drilling project (Chicxulub, New Jersey), infrastructure sharing (database management, logging), exchange of expertise between panels, education and outreach (e.g. EGU Townhall meeting). He indicated that some old IODP proposals were submitted to ICDP (e.g. Mjølner).

M. Webb asked about the way ICDP manages the cores (equipment, facilities). U. Harms explained that there's no central core repository for ICDP because of legal issues. Moreover, the core size is very variable and makes the curation more complex. For each project, the Principal Investigator (PI) signs a contract addressing in particular the problem of core curation. ICDP only experienced a very few number of projects in which accessibility to the cores was a problem. Nevertheless ICDP is convinced of the interest of central archiving and has started an initiative in Germany.

M. Perrin requested information on the co-funding process. There are various possibilities. Either the proponent simultaneously approaches ICDP or another funding agency or he approaches them in a specific order. But most proposals are firstly submitted to ICDP. Approval from ICDP helps the P.I. to leverage funding from others agencies. M. Perrin asked whether some projects accepted by ICDP have failed to assemble their total budget. U. Harms replied that PIs have always been able to secure their budget within 4 years. It was emphasized, however, that drilling projects on land are significantly cheaper than at sea.

Ian Ridley inquired about ICDP site survey requirements. U. Harms responded that it is dependant on the project. For lake drilling, a detailed seismic imaging is requested. ICDP has extended the ODP-IODP procedure for safety. For other projects, the PI has to show a seismic or others geophysical image of the target

I. Ridley raised the issue that some proposals are submitted to ICDP whereas they deal with ocean drilling.. C. Mével replied that some proponents try to avoid the very complex path in the IODP SAS. She mentioned a proposal submitted to ICDP while the holes are off-shore in 350m water depth. For projects involving holes both on and offshore, Suyehiro suggested that the highly ranked proposals in ICDP system should be automatically considered highly ranked in IODP and vice versa. C. Mével suggested using joint workshops. U. Harms seconded and advocated that the Magellan workshops scheme should be extended to ICDP.

The benefit of the workshop model was discussed at length. It should help focusing proposals before they are submitted.

J. Ludden wondered about the possible establishment of a structure gathering both ICDP European countries and ECORD. He continued with the concept of a European Scientific Agency dealing with drilling on behalf of ICDP and IODP. C. Mével stressed that the same agencies sitting in ECORD are represented in ICDP. U. Harms recognized that he would have really preferred to see a joint European representation in ICDP that would have made the work easier, but it didn't succeed because of various constraints.

Thursday, June 3rd
CLOSED SESSION

Catherine presented the excuses of José Ramón Sánchez Quintana who had to leave because of a meeting at the Spanish funding agency.

Agenda Item 20- ESO budget (R. Gatliff)

R. Gatliff presented the situation of ESO finances for the current FY10 and estimations for the remaining years of the program (FY11-FY13).

ESO budget FY10

B. Gatliff presented the situation for FY10, for both POCs and SOCs. For the POCs, a significant underspend of ~US\$ 3M is expected after the NJSS and GBREC expeditions. For the SOCs, the estimation is easier to make. The situation will be clearer after the onshore science party is completed, next July.

ESO budget FY11

The FY11 Program Plan was delayed because of successive changes at the OTF level regarding the plan for MSPs, therefore the ESO budget presented is still provisional. Initially, the plan was to implement Hawaii in FY11. However, OTF modified its priorities. The plan is now to conduct a hazard survey for Chicxulub in FY11 for drilling in FY12, and to implement Hawaii or another project in FY13.

The FY11 budget was submitted to IODP-MI who has not yet responded.

ESO COSTS FY 11		
October 10 to September 11		
Assumes hazard site survey for Chicxulub proposal		
	SOCs	POCs
	k\$US	k\$US
Management and administration	866.5	318.3
Technical, engineering and science support	1069.5	1220.6
Engineering development	-	-
Core curation	78.4	-
Data management	398.0	-
Publications	-	-
Education	-	-
Outreach	161.2	-
Currency conversion rates used (11 Feb 10)	Total	2573.6
£1=\$1.59 €1=\$1.39		1538.9
Total POCs & SOCs		\$4,112,500
Note: ESO expects an approximate \$3M POCs carry over from FY10		

The total planned budget amounts ~US\$ 4.1M. It includes

- US\$ **1,538,900 in POCs**, including the cost of the vessel for the site survey. The hazard survey will check the ground to emplace a jack up rig as for the NJSS expedition. ESO is considering signing a single contract with two parts: one for the hazard survey in FY11 and one for the drilling in FY12. But this may not be practical.
- US\$ **2,573,600 in SOCs**. It includes the cost of a new logging instrument that will allow several measurements in a single pass, saving time and money.

R. Gatliff concluded that the savings in FY11 will help run two expeditions in FY12 and FY13.

Approximate and estimated MSP costs 2004-2013

R. Gatliff presented a table summarizing the cost of past MSP expedition and projecting for the last three years of the programme. The future MSP program (FY11-13) would include Chicxulub hazard survey in FY11, Chicxulub expedition in FY12 and Hawaii or another expedition (Baltic Sea) in FY13. He pointed out that Chicxulub and Hawaii are very expensive expeditions, respectively estimated at US\$13,2M and US\$12,1M.

It was reminded that ECORD will have enough funding for this plan only if the POC/SOC ration is modified – letter sent to the LAs on May 13, 2010. The request is to retain US\$ 10.4 M from the SOC's. This amount was calculated based on the ESO cost estimates and is still provisional. It will decrease if the MSP costs are lower than predicted.

R. Gatliff warned the Council that this budget is only based on assumptions, and that uncertainties remain:

- Chicxulub or Hawaii could finally not be planned in favour of the Baltic Sea. For Chicxulub the main barrier would be the Mexican authorities' refusal to grant the permission to drill.
- For Hawaii, ESO will investigate the feasibility of using a seabed rock drill to make the expedition cheaper.

The budget is not finalized even if it has been already submitted to IODP-MI. The main cost for MSPs is the ship cost and is the most difficult to estimate. It is only after the tender process has been completed that real figures are available. MSP expeditions can also be shortened to fit within the budget, as long as the science objectives are not compromised.

Jean-Pierre Henriët asked about the time window for the hazard survey, considering the weather window and the permitting issues. Robert Gatliff replied that ESO has started discussions about permitting and the proponents were positive.

Jean-Pierre Henriët asked if ESO had a back up plan for FY11 if the permit was refused. If Chicxulub is not feasible, the Hawaiian Drowned Reefs would be the alternative option in FY12, so that no expedition would be implemented in FY11 and the POCs would be carried over to FY12. Concerning the Hawaii project, the environmental authorities have been approached on March 3-4, 2010 and the outcomes were very positive.

Josef Stuefer questioned whether ECORD fully realised the impact of the US\$10,5M cut in SOC's contribution. C. Mével, answered that the impact on the commingled funds was understood, but that it was the only way to accommodate the council decision to implement two expeditions before the end. She added that the amount of US\$10.5M should be viewed as the worst scenario and ECORD will try to make its possible decrease this amount.

M. Webb put forward the possibility to use a research vessel from a research organization in Europe to operate a seabed rock drill and make the Hawaii expedition cheaper. ESO responded that the potential savings could reach US\$ 4 M. It is an interesting avenue to pursue providing that the scientific objectives will be achieved

Mike Web asked why the Baltic Sea proposal is the preference, R. Gatliff and C. Mével answered that the scientific interest is strong, but also that it would be interesting politically. The EC is supporting an Article 169, BONUS, in the Baltic Sea region and it would be an opportunity for outreach about ECORD and IODP. R. Stein that added SPC is much interested in the science but did not pass it to OTF to keep the opportunity to improve the proposal.

Agenda Item 21 – ECORD budget: ESSAC and EMA budget (C. Mével)

ESSAC budget FY11

For FY11, ESSAC requests a budget of 156.600€, slightly lower than the FY10 budget of 165.100€. This is due to the predicted positive balance for FY10. Savings have been made on the two following items:

- Travels support for the ECORD conference at the EuroFORUM (EGU 2010)
- Scientist support for Magellan workshops were lower than planned

Addressing the ECORD Grants Program, ESSAC is keen on continuing even if only 8 applications were received. R. Stein added that the program just began. He is convinced that the program will raise more interest within the scientist community in the next few years.

ESSAC REQUESTED BUDGET FOR FY11			
September 30 th, 2010 - October 1st, 2011			
REQUESTED BUDGET FY 10	Budget FY 11	Budget FY 10	Budget FY 09
Salaries			
Science coordinator's salary (12 months)	57.600,00 €	57.600,00 €	48.000,00 €
Travel and subsistence costs			
Science Coordinator	5.000,00 €	5.000,00 €	5.000,00 €
Chair	11.000,00 €	11.000,00 €	11.000,00 €
Office costs			
General office costs	12.000,00 €	13.500,00 €	13.500,00 €
Meetings			
ESSAC October meeting 1	1.500,00 €	1.500,00 €	1.500,00 €
ESSAC May meeting 1	1.500,00 €	1.500,00 €	1.500,00 €
Travel support for speakers invited at ESSAC meetings 2	2.000,00 €	4.000,00 €	4.000,00 €
Additional Council activities			
Support for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme	18.000,00 €	18.000,00 €	18.000,00 €
Workshop scientist support 3	(Money left from FY10)	5.000,00 €	5.000,00 €
Summer Schools support	20.000,00 €	20.000,00 €	20.000,00 €
Summer school students	15.000,00 €	15.000,00 €	15.000,00 €
Conference 10 travel support 4	3.000,00 €	5.000,00 €	10.000,00 €
ECORD Grants	10.000,00 €	10.000,00 €	-----
ECORD CONTRIBUTION	156.600,00 €	167.100,00 €	152.500,00 €
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 and PPG 4 Travel support for keynote and invited speakers at the 10 ECORD Conference (EGU Session Vienna)			

EMA budget for FY11

For FY11, EMA requests a budget of 218.500€. It is calculated on the basis of a total FY11 budget of 236.500€, and the predictable remaining from FY10, around 18.000€. The positive balance is due to a three months vacancy in the post doc position that compensates the salary of the EMA Director. C. Mével added that the presented FY11 budget does not include the cost of the ECORD Independent Evaluation still to be discussed.

EMA Budget in Euros	FY09 expenses	FY10 requested budget	FY10 expenses provisional	FY11 requested budget
salaries				
compensation for the director	41,490	47,000	35,178	47,000
scientific coordinator (80%)	43,751	46,000	45,660	46,000
Assistant projectmanager	44,292	45,000	41,589	42,000
secretary (50%)	1,409			
Total	133,743	138,000	122,427	135,000
Travel	38,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
meetings	2,333	5,000	2,500	5,000
Consumables	4,412	5,000	3,500	5,000
database	1,000	2,000	1,660	1,500
Other costs (publications, booths..)	19,332	15,000	19,000	18,000
Support for SAS/ECORD meetings	9,500	15,000	10,000	12,000
Total	208,320	220,000	199,087	216,500
overheads	20,000	25,000	20,000	20,000
TOTAL	228,320	245,000	219,087	236,500
Approved EMA FY09 budget in €	256,600		245,000	
balance from previous year	52,956		636	
actually paid from ECORD commingled funds	176,000		236656	
Total budget	228,956		237,292	

Total EMA FY11 budget in €	236,500
FY10 balance (provisional)	18,000
Request from ECORD commingled funds	218,500

ECORD Council motion 10-01-4

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 ESO budget at the level of USD 1,538,900

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 ESSAC budget for FY11 at the level of 156,000 €.

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 EMA at the level of 218 500 €. This budget includes salaries.

Lüniger moved, Webb seconded, 11 of 12 in favour, 1 abstained (Seidenkrantz)

ECORD Budget

ECORD budget FY09 (Table 1): At the end of FY09, ECORD budget had a negative balance of the ~US\$2.5M. This deficit is due to two reasons: (1) the implementation of NJSS and GBREC resulted in a anticipated deficit (~US\$2.3M); (2) two Italian institutes have not paid their contribution, CONISMA since FY08 and OGS since 2008. The two others, CNR and INGV, pay regularly.

Table 1: ECORD FY09 budget, US\$

US\$			ECORD contributions		FY09
	income	expenses			
FY08 ECORD reserve	8,230,706		Austria		100,000
FY09 contributions	21,256,380		Belgium		30,000
investment	230,000		Canada		300,000
ICDP for NJ*	500,000		Denmark		200,000
			Finland		66,380
SOCs to NSF		16,800,000	France		5,600,000
EMA **		352,800	Germany		5,600,000
ESSAC***		236,375	Iceland		
ESO POC contract		15,176,535	Ireland		130,000
			Italy		190,000
			Netherlands		400,000
Total	30,217,086	32,565,710	Norway		1,100,000
balance	-2,348,624		Portugal		90,000
Unpaid contributions	-165,000		Spain		762,000
balance, Oct 2009	-2,513,624		Sweden		528,000
* pending			Switzerland		560,000
** 252 000 € = 352 800 US\$, exchange rate 1.40			UK		5,600,000
*** 152 500 € = 236 375 US\$, exchange rate = 1.55			Total		21,256,380

ESO contract in FY09	
POCs*	19,949,200
FY07 reserve at ESO	-5,403,680
FY08 expenditures	631,015
Total	15,176,535
SOC travels	474,000
Total	15,650,535

Unpaid contributions from previous years	
CONISMA FY07	25,000
OGS FY08	100,000
CONISMA FY08	40,000
Total	165,000

The ESO contract is actually US\$ 15 650 535
15,176,535 for POCs
474,000 for SOC travels
As of November 2009, ESO has invoiced US\$ 10,000,000

At the end of FY09, the provisional balance is : **US\$ -2,513,624**

ECORD budget FY10 (table 2)

In FY10 Canada has increased its participation from US\$ 200,000 to US\$500,000. However, as of June 1st, 2010 there is a deficit of US\$1.792.000 due to unpaid contributions from six ECORD countries. Among them, some have not yet signed the Annex H to the MoU. If all the countries pay, a small deficit of ~128 k will remain.

As already indicated, the money flow for ESO SOC has been modified. The ESO SOC are negotiated with IODP-MI and approved with the APP. But they are now paid directly by EMA to ESO and deducted from the SOC contribution to the commingled funds. In FY10, ESO SOC are high because they include the support of two onshore parties (NJSS and GBRC).

Table 2: ECORD FY10 budget, US\$

ECORD FY10 budget, US\$

Note that the money flow has been modified

The SOC's to ESO are deducted from the SOC contribution to the commingled funds and paid directly to ESO

	income	expenses
FY09 balance	-2,513,624	
FY10 contributions	21,456,380	
Investment*	10,000	
SOCs to NSF ⁽¹⁾		11,821,325
ESSAC ⁽²⁾		233,940
EMA ⁽³⁾		303,800
ESO ⁽⁴⁾		6,721,675
TOTAL	18,952,756	19,080,740
FY10 balance	-127,984	

* first term

(1) = 16,800,000 - 4 978 675 (SOCs for ESO)

(2) 167,100 €, exchange rate = 1.40

(3) EMA approved budget = 245 000 €

FY09 balance = 28 000 €

EMA actual budget = 217 000 €, exchange rate = 1,40

(4) = 1,743,000 (POCs) + 4 978 675 (SOCs)

ECORD contributions

	FY10 US \$	
Austria	100,000	OAW 50,000
Belgium	30,000	
Canada	500,000	
Denmark	200,000	
Finland	66,380	
France	5,600,000	
Germany	5,600,000	
Iceland		
Ireland	130,000	
Italy	190,000	INGV CNR
Netherlands	400,000	
Norway	1,100,000	
Portugal	90,000	
Spain	762,000	
Sweden	528,000	
Switzerland	560,000	
UK	5,600,000	
Total	21,456,380	

not signed

not paid

current deficit 1,792,000

ECORD budget summary FY04-FY10 (Table 3 and 4)

C. Mével reminded that these figures are used by ESSAC to calculate the berths quota.

Over the period FY04-FY10 ECORD has not been able to contribute the full 4 participation units (P.U.) to IODP. The contribution amounted US\$113.4M instead of the US\$115.2M specified in the Memorandum with the LAs. The deviation is due to the progressive increase of the P.U. from US\$1.5M in FY03 to US\$5.6M in FY10. Some of the ECORD smaller countries have not been able to cope

C. Mével also insisted that the ECORD budget is not secured: there are still some unpaid contributions. Shifting to a more binding agreement such as an ERIC for the next phase would solve this issue.

She also mentioned that the predicted positive balance of US\$ 3M for ESO at the end of FY10 is not included, since the exact figure is still not known.

Table 3: ECORD budget summary FY04-FY10

ECORD budget summary US\$, 17/5/2010

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

	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	TOTAL	TOTAL
Austria		100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	600,000	600,000
Belgium		30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	180,000	180,000
Canada	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	300,000	500,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Denmark	500,000	500,000	1,000,000	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Finland	66,380	66,380	66,380	66,380	66,380	66,380	66,380	464,660	464,660
France	2,000,000	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	28,800,000	28,800,000
Germany	2,250,000	3,500,000	7,000,000	0	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	29,550,000	29,550,000
Iceland	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000			150,000	150,000
Ireland		130,000	130,000	130,000	145,000	130,000	130,000	795,000	795,000
Italy (OGS)	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000				300,000	
Italy (CNR)	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	600,000	
Italy (INGV)		75,000	75,000	75,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	495,000	
Italy (Conisma)		25,000	25,000					50,000	
total Italy									1,445,000
Netherlands	470,000	0	210,000	210,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	2,090,000	2,090,000
Norway	1,000,000	0	1,400,000	0	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
Portugal	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	630,000	630,000
Spain	150,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	476,000	762,000	762,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Sweden*	1,312,500	330,000	330,000	330,000	528,000	528,000	528,000	3,886,500	3,886,500
Switzerland	150,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	560,000	560,000	560,000	2,880,000	2,880,000
UK	4,300,000	3,800,000	400,000	3,500,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	28,800,000	28,800,000
	12,618,880	12,676,380	15,386,380	9,061,380	21,015,380	21,256,380	21,456,380	113,471,160	113,471,160

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

Memorandum - M\$ US

FY04	6.0
FY05	14.0
FY06	14.0
FY07	14.0
FY08	22.4
FY09	22.4
FY10	22.4
TOTAL	115.2

actual budget 113.4

Deficit -1.8

Table 4: ECORD budget summary FY04-FY10

Table 4

Summary FY04-FY10

income	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
ECORD contrib	12,618,880	12,676,380	15,386,380	9,061,380	21,015,380	21,256,380	21,456,380
carry forward		880	-1,151,620	876,596	2,775,476	8,065,706	-2,513,624
investment					120,000	230,000	10,000
ICDP						500,000	
total	12,618,880	12,677,260	14,234,760	9,937,976	23,910,856	30,052,086	18,952,756
expenses							
SOCs to NSF		6,793,500	6,840,000	6,807,000	15,502,400	16,326,000	11,821,325
ESO contract**	12,493,000	5,265,500	6,349,164	0	0	15,650,535	6,721,675
add ESO contract		1,600,000					
EMA	125,000	117,000	117,000	115,000	127,500	352,800	303,800
ESSAC		52,000		240,500	215,250	236,375	233,940
total	12,618,000	13,828,000	13,358,164	7,162,500	15,845,150	32,565,710	19,080,740
balance w/EMA	880	-1,151,620	876,596	2,775,476	8,065,706	-2,513,624	-127,984
balance w/ESO				5,403,680	4,772,665	4,731,806	?????

Note that for the period FY05 to FY09, 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
From FY10, the SOC's are paid to ESO from the ECORD budget and deducted from the contribution to the commingled funds

ESO International travels	206,500	160,000	193,000	297,600	474,000	
SOCs to ESO						6,721,675

C. Mével raised the case of Iceland. This country has stopped contributing since FY09 as a consequence of the economic crisis. The contact has been lost, although she tried to get information through the ESSAC member. The ECORD budget is not heavily impacted since the contribution was only US\$ 30,000. However, ESSAC has received an application from an Icelandic scientist to sail in a forthcoming expedition. She asked the council for guidance, reminding that Iceland has already contributed US\$150,000 over FY03-FY08 and has not sent any scientist so far. R. Stein reminded that this gives Iceland some rights, even if this committed amount does fully cover the cost of a berth. He also reminded that considering an application has not been only based on the financial contribution aspect but also on the scientific excellence of the applicant.

Council members considering the exceptional situation of this Icelandic application passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-3

Although Iceland has not paid its contribution to ECORD since FY09, ECORD Council encourages ESSAC to consider the application to sail on an IODP expedition submitted by an Icelandic scientist. The decision regarding this application should be made exclusively on scientific merit.

ECORD provisional Budget for FY10-FY13 (Table 5 and 6)

C. Mével informed council that the situation for Italy is not completely sorted out. There was a hope that from FY11, the Ministry would support the Italian contribution that could therefore increase to ~350,000. Unfortunately, this may be delayed. The contribution of US\$ 30,000 for Belgium is secured till will contribute until 2011, but the funding for 2012 and 2013 is uncertain. J.P. Henriet informed that Belgium is keen on renewing its participation. Contributions from others ECORD countries will remain stable.

Catherine Mével reminded the council that all the tables presented so far are given in US dollar. However, the ECORD account at CNRS is in Euros, since as a government agency, CNRS is not allowed to have an account in dollars. Therefore, the amount of money in the bank is subjected to Euro/US dollar exchange rate fluctuations. From the beginning of 2010, the collapse of Euro has resulted in severe loss. Most of the contributions were received at a US dollar/Euro exchange rate of 1.50 but the invoices were paid at ~1.25. Table 6 details how this loss could reach as much as ~1M if the exchange rate remained at 1.25. She informed the council that she is still discussing with CNRS to establish a dollar account, but the result is still unknown. The situation is quite worrying since the fluctuations in the exchange rate are likely to continue and the Euros may continue to drop. Every effort to find a solution will be pursued.

EMA has already informed NSF that given this financial situation, ECORD might not be able pay the full three P.U. There was no particular objection from R. Batiza, since the Memorandum is not binding. However, the positive balance of ESO estimated at ~3M will more than compensate the loss.

M. Webb raised the possibility that NERC would pay directly BGS instead of passing through EMA. C. Mével responded that this option has already been explored by ESO but NERC refused. Another possibility would be that NERC would pay directly its contribution to NSF. It was reminded, however, that NSF highly appreciates dealing with only one entity on behalf of all member countries (EMA/CNRS).

EMA also reminded the exchange of letters regarding the planned modification in the SOC/POC ratio, to allow the implementation of two MSP expeditions before the end of the programme. A letter requesting to keep US\$ 10.4 M as POCs over the three last years of the programme was sent to the LAs on May 13, 2010. The LAs responded that it would affect the commingled fund and have a strong negative impact on integrating activities. They asked for ECORD's comment on which activities should be cut. The Council decided that it is not enough informed on how the money is spent to make specific suggestions. C. Mével also emphasized the risk of affecting the ECORD berth allocation.

With regards to the financial situation, the following consensuses are passed:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-4

ECORD Council acknowledges that there will be a shortfall in its FY10 budget due to the collapse of the Euros with respect to the US Dollar. Given the positive balance of the ESO budget in FY10 as well as the planned reduced ECORD contribution in SOC for FY11 to 13, ECORD Council decides that the full 3 P.U.s should be paid to NSF in FY10 as signed in the Memorandum.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-5

Following the request of the Lead Agencies to provide our opinion as to which integrative activities should be cut; ECORD Council suggests that the following core group of integrative activities is essential to the program: evaluation, core curation, databases and publications.

The ECORD Council needs to be better informed on how the commingled funds are spent to make further recommendations. A discussion with IODP-MI and the Lead Agencies is necessary.

The ECORD Council feels that the request to consider any decrease in participation is too vague to be answered.

Table 6: Exchange rate variation and budget FY10

	INCOME	USD	€	exchange rate
Austria (OAW)		50,000.00		
Austria (FWF)		50,000.00	38,098.00	1.32
Belgium		30,000.00	25,000.00	1.20
Canada		500,000.00		
Denmark		200,000.00		
Finland		66,380.00	48,847.34	1.36
France*		5,600,000.00	3,586,000.00	1.50
Germany		5,600,000.00	3,737,300.48	1.50
Iceland				
Ireland		130,000.00	100,000.00	1.30
Italy-INGV FY10		90,000.00		
Italy-CNR FY10		100,000.00		
Netherlands -NWO		400,000.00	267,648.04	1.49
Norway		1,100,000.00	743,195.32	1.48
Portugal		90,000.00		
Spain		759,585.00		
Sweden (VR)		528,000.00	387,120.25	1.36
Switzerland (SNF)		560,000.00	393,263.57	1.42
UK		5,600,000.00	4,039,651.13	1.39
Total		21,453,965.00	13,366,124.13	
carry over FY09			2,140,040.43	
Investment			8,048.72	
reimburse Pezard			150,000.00	
Total			15,664,213.28	
* € 150,000 still to come				
EXPENSES		USD	€	exchange rate
EMA			176,656.00	
BGS invoice FY09		5,650,535.00	3,955,374.50	1.43
NSF invoice		3,821,325.00	2,674,927.50	1.43
NSF invoice		4,000,000.00	2,962,962.96	1.35
Total		13,471,860.00	9,593,264.96	
Situation, 20/4/2010				
income		€	US \$	exchange rate
expenses		15,664,213.28		
balance		6,070,948.32	7,588,685.40	1.25

Previsions for the remaining of FY10

	expenses	USD	€	exchange rate
NSF		4,000,000.00	3,200,000.00	1.25
BGS FY10		6,721,675.00	5,377,340.00	1.25
Total		10,721,675.00	8,577,340.00	
income		USD	€	exchange rate
situation			6,070,948.32	
still to come		1,792,000.00	1,433,600.00	1.25
France			150,000.00	
Total		1,792,000.00	7,654,548.32	
balance		€	USD	exchange rate
		-922,791.68	-1,153,489.60	1.25

Table 5

ECORD provisional budget FY10-FY13

contributions	FY11	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
Austria	100,000	100,000	100,000	300,000
Belgium	30,000	30,000	30,000	90,000
Canada	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000
Denmark	200,000	200,000	200,000	600,000
Finland	66,380	66,380	66,380	199,140
France	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	16,800,000
Germany	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	16,800,000
Iceland				
Ireland	130,000	130,000	130,000	390,000
Italy	350,000	350,000	350,000	1,050,000
Netherlands	400,000	400,000	400,000	1,200,000
Norway	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	3,300,000
Portugal	90,000	90,000	90,000	270,000
Spain	762,000	762,000	762,000	2,286,000
Sweden	528,000	528,000	528,000	1,584,000
Switzerland	560,000	560,000	560,000	1,680,000
UK	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	16,800,000
Total	21,616,380	21,616,380	21,616,380	64,849,140
expenses	FY11	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
SOCs to NSF	16,800,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	50,400,000
EMA+ESSAC	550,000	550,000	550,000	1,650,000
Total	17,350,000	17,350,000	17,350,000	52,050,000
available for POCs	4,266,380	4,266,380	4,266,380	12,799,140

Deficit = 2.4 M\$

Memorandum FY10-FY13

FY11	22.4
FY12	22.4
FY13	22.4
TOTAL	67.2

Note that over the 10 years, the ECORD budget will have accumulated a shortfall of US\$ ~4.2 M compared to the 4 P.U. mentioned in the Memorandum signed with the Lead Agencies

This figure does not even take into account the EMA+ESSAC budgets and the mobilisation costs for MSPs which are not considered by the Lead Agencies as part of the ECORD contribution

Agenda Item 22 - ECORD in the new phase: actions to be taken? (G. Lüniger/C. Mével)

The selection of EMA and ESO

The current EMA and ESO have been appointed for the duration of the current phase, i.e. till 2013. For the next phase, it is important to decide who will take these roles. At the last council meeting, it was decided that the ECORD chair would send a letter to BGS and CNRS asking whether they were willing to continue as ESO and EMA respectively. The answer would be considered as a piece of information, not a commitment for the future decision. This has not yet been done, but BGS and INSU-CNRS have already indicated that they are willing to continue. C. Mével informed that a formal bidding process is not mandatory to fill these positions because as EMA, CNRS/INSU is linked with the member countries with a MoU which is not a legal commitment. Because of that, EMA is linked with ESO through an agreement on research collaboration that again is not legally binding. However, to ensure openness and clarity, this does not prevent the Council from launching a call, as was done at the start of ECORD. She insisted that the future ESO should be appointed soon since, as an Implementing Organization, it will need to start scoping proposals early 2012 to be ready for the first expedition in FY14.

Some Council members suggested that a bid would be the best way. The ECORD evaluation should provide useful information for the final decision. C. Mével reminded that, as planned, the evaluation will not focus on the structure of ECORD but only on the scientific achievements. The discussion on the evaluation continued under the next agenda item

ERIC Scheme

An ERIC would provide ECORD a legal framework. Some members felt difficult to convince their own ministry to sign an agreement for 5-10 years, adding that the MoU system may be more suitable for ECORD even if it has to be improved. However the Council is keen on investigating the ERIC option, particularly for questionable aspects like: insurance liability (e.g. incident during an expedition) or the governance since the new structure will modify the way ECORD is managed. These aspects are crucial as ECORD will run more MSPs, handle more calls, etc. in the future program. Therefore the Council passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-6

The ECORD Council considers important to investigate all possible options for the governance of ECORD in the new programme, including a MoU or an ERIC. The ECORD Council tasks a subgroup composed of the ECORD Executive augmented by Josef Stuefer to consult all relevant entities, possibly including a lawyer and report at the next meeting.

The business plan

It was stated that a business plan is needed both to estimate the viability of ECORD objectives in the new programme and to facilitate the discussions at the national funding agencies level, with the ministries, with possible industry partners, etc...

The business plan should deal with the exchange rate, indexation, fuel cost, multiple scenarios for running MSP. Its structure would consist in three main parts addressing (1) a science plan summary of 4-5 pages in length, (2) the cost of the science project and (3) a financing plan. After discussion, it was decided that ECORD should build its own business plan and then include it in a plan at the whole programme level.

The Council passed the following motion and action:

ECORD Council Motion 10-01-5

In recognition of a developing international science programme for future ocean drilling:

- ECORD will develop an independent business plan, which involves an enhanced MSP programme and accompanying contributions to international scientific drilling programme.
- ECORD Council asks IWG+ to complement the architecture of the new phase of the programme with a realistic cost estimate and a plausible funding scheme, to support the next programme with a transparent business plan.

Henriet moved, Stuefer seconded, all in favour.

ACTION EMA and ESO: to develop the business plan for ECORD

Agenda Item 23 – ECORD evaluation (G. Lüniger/C. Mével)

At the last ECORD Council meeting, the Council recognised the need for an independent evaluation of the ECORD scientific achievements (Council consensus 09-02-3).

Terms of reference

Item 24 opened with discussing the Terms of Reference of which a first draft was presented to the ECORD Executive at the Roissy meeting. It mentioned that the “ECORD Evaluation Committee” will undertake two tasks:

- To conduct an evaluation of the role of ECORD in the scientific achievements of IODP (2004 - present). This will cover two aspects: the analysis of IODP scientific achievements with a particular emphasis on the role and impact of ECORD scientists (proposal submission, cruise participation, post cruise scientific publications...) and the analysis of the impact of the MSPs on the IODP scientific accomplishments.
- To assess the new science plan (post 2013) and how it fits with ECORD scientific strategies.

Throughout the discussion the nature of the evaluation progressively changed. Initially focusing on scientific achievements, the Council requested a broader evaluation covering also operations and management aspects.

After discussion, it was decided that the evaluation should address not only the science but also the operations. It should build on the ECORD Mid-Term Review, to make sure that the issues raised in the report have been addressed.

The Council members passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-7

At its last meeting in Rome, ECORD Council passed the consensus 09-02-3:

“ECORD Council recognises the need for an independent evaluation of the ECORD scientific achievements using ocean drilling and of future prospects in a new programme of sub-seafloor exploration.”

ECORD Council decides to include not only the evaluation of the scientific accomplishments but also of the MSP operations. Therefore, the new evaluation should be built among other things on the outcomes of the mid-term evaluation review (available at <http://www.ecord.org/enet/ecord-midterm-review.pdf>)

Setting up the evaluation committee

At the last ECORD Council meeting, EMA has been tasked to find an independent European institution that will conduct the evaluation. C. Mével reviewed the results of the investigations reminding that a decision has to be taken before the end of June.

- NWO was asked but declined. J. Stuefer explained that: (1) NWO does not have the manpower; (2) it does not have the mandate to evaluate an international science program; (3) there would be a conflict in interest because NWO is an ECORD member.
- ICDP was asked and agreed to support ECORD to set up the independent review committee but not to run the evaluation. Uli Harms has actually already provided potential names.
- Technopolis, a commercial company expert in science evaluation, has been suggested by R. Belocky at the last ECORD Executive meeting. Technopolis has been contacted by EMA and should send a preliminary quote to C. Mével. Some reluctance to contract a commercial company appeared because it is expensive and could not fit with the type of evaluation ECORD is requesting.
- AERES, the French governmental agency for scientific evaluation, was suggested by Bruno Goffé (INSU-CNRS). AERES is interested, willing to expand its area of activity to international evaluation. It would be at some costs but far less than a commercial company. Further discussions with AERES are planned, C. Mével indicated.

J. Ludden affirmed that using a European agency, which is independent from any national interest will emphasise the relevance of the evaluation and gave the name of ACADEMIA EUROPA.

Council members agreed on the fact that if ACADEMIA declined, the Marine Board would be asked to set up the committee jointly with ECORD and ICDP, and passed the following consensus and action:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-8

To organise an independent evaluation, ECORD Council favours a European organisation over an organisation from an ECORD member country

ACTION EMA: to contact ACADEMIA EUROPEA to investigate if it can organise the evaluation. If not, the help of ICDP, as already supported by the ECORD Council, should be sought.

The independent evaluation committee

C. Mével has received very few nominations (13 names) from 8 ECORD member countries and others nominations (7 names) were proposed by ESO and ICDP. Jan De Leeuw suggested that one or two members of the former ECORD review panel would integrate the new evaluation committee.

Timeline and budget

The timeline is tight; the report needs to be ready by mid-2011 enabling the funding agencies to make their decision in the fall. Considering the budget, 30,000€ were agreed as reasonable with the possibility to go up after consulting the Council. C. Mével reminded that the budget needs to be added to the EMA budget.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-9

ECORD Council allocates the ECORD Managing Agency a budget of 30,000 € for organizing the evaluation. If this budget proves to be insufficient, the EMA should come back to the Council.

Agenda Item 24 – Discussion on IWG+ activities and preparation for the June 2010 IODP Council and IWG+ meetings (C. Mével)

This item opened with the introduction of the ECORD representatives who will attend IODP Council and IWG+ meetings (Kyoto, June 16-17). C. Mével suggested that another meeting would be helpful between the LAs and more ECORD representatives. Addressing the agenda of the IODP Council meeting, the Council raised concerned that it does not include any item on the Annual Program Plan. C. Mével will request further information to IODP-MI.

After having listed the most important points to be discussed at these meetings, C. Mével presented the Points of Agreement (Position Papers) and their related key issues.

Position Paper 1 “Programme architecture and money flow”. It is proposed that the current two LAs would get one third of berths each and the remaining third would be shared among the others members according to their financial commitment. SAS panels and committees would be populated in the same proportion. This situation means the equal right model would be no longer applicable, leading ECORD to lose berths compared to the 8 berths it got in the current program. C. Mével made this change clear by introducing a two-case scenario based on the IODP member’s contributions, except the LAs.

	USD M	%	Nb based on 8 berths	Nb based on 9 berths
ECORD	21.5	82.4	6.6	7.4
China	1	3.8	0.3	0.3
Korea	1	3.8	0.3	0.3
ANZIC	1.6	6.1	0.5	0.6
INDIA	1	3.8	0.3	0.3
	26.1	100.0	8.0	9.0

In each scenario, ECORD would get less than 8 berths. Moreover, if a member country raises its contribution (e.g. China) then the quota of berths allocated to ECORD will be severely affected.

The definition of "Platform Provider" is now acceptable for ECORD as discussed during the open session.

F. Barriga questioned the LA concept. The scientific contribution Europe brings should be further put forward. C. Mével responded that keeping the LA status was decided after the Tokyo meeting when ECORD was not present. Although the decision process is not satisfactory, it will be difficult to argue against the LA concept. M. Webb thought more feasible not to ask for the LA status but to convince the LA to allocate the same number of berths ECORD has now.

J. Stuefer questioned on what happen to the berths when the Japanese cannot use all theirs. C. Mével replied that up to now the berths have been offered to ECORD. However IODP-MI will commit these berths to the ECORD accounting, J.P. Henriët added. R. Stein gave the example of the South Pacific Gyre expedition where ECORD is likely to send two more scientists (10 instead of 8) because there is a lack of expertise in the other countries. He added that such situation could occur more often in the new programme as more MSPs will be implemented.

The role China could play in the new programme was also discussed

The Council is still concerned about the Chikyu scientific achievements. An evaluation would be useful because it has not yet demonstrated its capabilities beyond what can be achieved with the JR (6 km deep hole). It appears that IODP has co-funded the development phase of the Chikyu, although C. Mével reminded that the POCs are funded exclusively by Japan. M. Webb said if the Chikyu does not deliver the technology and prove its capabilities in the next programme, ECORD will preserve the right to cut funding. It was suggested not to raise the issue concerning the Chikyu in the current phase but only for the next phase.

Position Paper 2 “Program architecture and money flow”.

Addressing the core activities of the **CMO**, C. Mével underlined the proposal that “*education and outreach funds will be utilized for capacity building of young researchers on board by subsidizing their participation*”. She assumed that it is to help Japanese send more students/young scientists on board. But this is a minor point.

Concerning the “*Performance and effectiveness of IODP-MI as CMO will be closely monitored during the transition period*”, ECORD agrees but the procedure needs to be clarified.

ECORD Council stated that clarification on the role of the **Executive Board** is required. When will it be set up and who will have the authority to do that? It will be the responsibility of IWG+ to decide.

C. Mével noticed that the role of the BoG and its relationships with the EB are totally missing from the Points of Agreement. J. Ludden informed that discussions are ongoing with the LAs and IODP-MI.

Position Paper 3 “SAS Structure”. The main concerns deals with the presence of the Science Chairs in the EB as expressed in the open session. The Council strongly supports the idea of having the science community represented in the committee.

“Position Paper 4: Transition phase”.

The IOs need to start scoping the projects for the first year. Scoping for riser projects needs to start now, but only early 2012 for the JR and MSPs. MEXT and NSF have already decided that CDEX and USIO will remain the IOs for the *Chikyu* and the *JR* respectively. The ECORD Council needs to decide soon for the ECORD IO.

There will be no interim SAS. The new SAS will be set up as soon as possible (Fall 2011) and the existing panels will be progressively phased out. Should new SAS members for the current structure continue to be appointed? Up to now, no decision has been taken but if the program disappeared in one year, it would be not wise to appoint new members as they would not have time enough to start their action. The new SAS will build the program for the first year (and possibly the second year) from proposals currently at OTF.

The others proposals could be:

- All deactivated and the proponents are encouraged to resubmit in the light of the new science plan. That means no burden for the new programme, which will start from zero. ESSAC favours this option for which it passed a consensus at its last Meeting;
- Filtered by the current SAS before being forwarded to the new SAS;
- All forwarded to the new SAS for evaluation and action

M. Webb suggested using the new community workshops to filter the proposals before submitting to SAS. This process would unblock the system as the proposals dealing with similar scientific interest could be gathered or even merged.

The call for proposals will be interrupted until the new science plan is made public. It is suggested that no call will be sent out in the spring of 2011.

After discussion, and in preparation for the next IWG+ meeting, the Council passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-10

After discussion of the revised points of agreement circulated by the Lead Agencies in preparation for the next IWG+ meeting, the ECORD Council acknowledges the modification in the requirement to become a

Platform Provider. This new requirement allows ECORD to obtain this status. Concerning the other points, the ECORD Council decides

- that the ECORD delegation to IWG+ should keep on supporting the simplified membership scheme as agreed upon at the Tokyo meeting, but remains open to discussion
- that it is essential to include representatives of the science community (the Chairs of the future evaluation and implementation panels) as members of the Executive Board.

ACTION EMA: to inform the LAs on the agreed ECORD position before the IWG+ meeting

Agenda Item 25 - Next ECORD council meeting (C. Mével)

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-101

The next ECORD Council meeting will be organised in France, November 17-18, 2010. It is planned that the meeting will last at least one and a half day. If necessary and depending on the agenda, the meeting will be extended to two full days.

ACTION EMA: To decide with the incoming Chair, Mireille Perrin, the location of the next Council meeting to be held in France.

Agenda Item 26 - AOB (G. Lüniger)

The Council warmly thanked G. Lüniger for organising the meeting.

Next meeting, France November 2010.

ECORD Council Meeting #17
Berlin, 2-3 June 2010
European Commission office in Deutschland
Unter den Linden 78, 10117, Deutschland

CONSENSUS, MOTIONS AND ACTIONS

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-1

ECORD Council approves the minutes of the Rome meeting without modifications (ECORD Council meeting #16).

ACTION EMA: to include a list of acronyms in the agenda book for future ECORD Council meetings.

ECORD Council motion 10-01-1

ECORD Council elects Anne de Vernal as incoming Vice-Chair from Oct 1, 2010, to become the Chair as of April 1, 2011.

The Executive will be composed of Mireille Perrin (Chair), Anne de Vernal and Guido Lüniger (Vice-Chairs), Mike Webb and José Ramón Sánchez Quintana.

Verbruggen moved, Perrin seconded, 12 of 13 in favour, 1 abstained (de Vernal)

ECORD Council motion 10-01-2

ECORD Council approves the nomination by ESSAC of Carlota Escutia as the new ESSAC Vice-Chair

Barriga moved, Verbruggen seconded, 12 of 13 in favour, 1 abstained (Sanchez-Quintana)

ECORD Council motion 10-01-3

ECORD Council approves the nomination of the following new SAS members by ESSAC:

- SPC: Javier Escartin (F), Heiko Pälke (UK)
- SSP: Peter Clift (UK)
- EDP: Neal Watson (UK)

Barriga moved, Verbruggen seconded, all in favour

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-2

ECORD Council supports the proposal of Sasha Leigh (NERC) to organise a joint industry-academia workshop to discuss potential cooperation in the Arctic.

This workshop will be organised by the ECORD Managing Agency, with the support of Sasha Leigh and UK IODP, and in consultation with the ECORD ILP and ESSAC

In preparation for this workshop, the ECORD Council members will be requested to contribute

- names/ groups to which the Arctic brochure should be sent to,
- names/groups who should be invited to participate in the workshop.

ECORD Council motion 10-01-4

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 ESO budget at the level of USD 1,538,900

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 ESSAC budget for FY11 at the level of 156,000 €.

ECORD Council approves the proposed FY11 EMA at the level of 218 500 €. This budget includes salaries.

Lüniger moved, Webb seconded, 11 of 12 in favour, 1 abstained (Seidenkrantz)

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-3

Although Iceland has not paid its contribution to ECORD since FY09, ECORD Council encourages ESSAC to consider the application to sail on an IODP expedition submitted by an Icelandic scientist. The decision regarding this application should be made exclusively on scientific merit.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-4

ECORD Council acknowledges that there will be a shortfall in its FY10 budget due to the collapse of the Euro with respect to the US Dollar. Given the positive balance of the ESO budget in FY10 as well as the planned reduced ECORD contribution in SOC's for FY11 to 13, ECORD Council decides that the full 3 P.U.s should be paid to NSF in FY10 as signed in the Memorandum.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-5

Following the request of the Lead Agencies to provide our opinion as to which integrative activities should be cut, ECORD Council suggests that the following core group of integrative activities is essential to the program: evaluation, core curation, databases and publications.

The ECORD Council needs to be better informed on how the commingled funds are spent to make further recommendations. A discussion with IODP-MI and the Lead Agencies is necessary.

The ECORD Council feels that the request to consider any decrease in participation is too vague to be answered.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-6

The ECORD Council considers important to investigate all possible options for the governance of ECORD in the new programme, including a MoU or an ERIC. The ECORD Council tasks a subgroup composed of the ECORD Executive augmented by Josef Stuefer to consult all relevant entities, possibly including a lawyer and report at the next meeting.

ECORD Council Motion 10-01-5

In recognition of a developing international science programme for future ocean drilling:

- ECORD will develop an independent business plan which involves an enhanced MSP programme and accompanying contributions to international scientific drilling programme.
- ECORD Council asks IWG+ to complement the architecture of the new phase of the programme with a realistic cost estimate and a plausible funding scheme, to support the next programme with a transparent business plan.

Henriet moved, Stuefer seconded, all in favour.

ACTION EMA and ESO: to develop the business plan for ECORD

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-7

At its last meeting in Rome, ECORD Council passed the consensus 09-02-3:

“ECORD Council recognises the need for an independent evaluation of the ECORD scientific achievements using ocean drilling and of future prospects in a new programme of sub-seafloor exploration.”

ECORD Council decides to include not only the evaluation of the scientific accomplishments but also of the MSP operations. Therefore, the new evaluation should be built among other things on the outcomes of the mid-term evaluation review (available at <http://www.ecord.org/enet/ecord-midterm-review.pdf>)

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-8

To organise an independent evaluation, ECORD Council favours a European organisation over an organisation from an ECORD member country

ACTION EMA: to contact ACADEMIA EUROPEA to investigate if it can organise the evaluation. If not, the help of ICDP, as already supported by the ECORD Council, should be sought.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-9

ECORD Council allocates the ECORD Managing Agency a budget of 30,000 € for organising the evaluation. If this budget proves to be insufficient, the EMA should come back to the Council.

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-10

After discussion of the revised points of agreement circulated by the Lead Agencies in preparation for the next IWG+ meeting, the ECORD Council acknowledges the modification in the requirement to become a Platform Provider. This new requirement allows ECORD to obtain this status. Concerning the other points, the ECORD Council decides

- that the ECORD delegation to IWG+ should keep on supporting the simplified membership scheme as agreed upon at the Tokyo meeting, but remains open to discussion
- that it is essential to include representatives of the science community (the Chairs of the future evaluation and implementation panels) as members of the Executive Board.

ACTION EMA: to inform the LAs on the agreed ECORD position before the IWG+ meeting

ECORD Council consensus 10-01-101

The next ECORD Council meeting will be organised in France, November 17-18, 2010. It is planned that the meeting will last at least one and a half day. If necessary and depending on the agenda, the meeting will be extended to two full days.

ACTION EMA: To decide with the incoming Chair, Mireille Perrin, the location of the next Council meeting to be held in France.