

# ECORD Council Meeting #19

May 31st-June 1st, 2011

Salle des boiseries, Judith Jasmin Building  
405 Ste-Catherine East, room J2805,  
Montréal, Canada

## MINUTES

Approved at the ECORD Council Meeting # 20 held in Granada on 2-3 November 2011.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>
Austria	Reinhard Belocky	<a href="mailto:belocky@fwf.ac.at">belocky@fwf.ac.at</a>
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriet	<a href="mailto:jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be">jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be</a>
Canada	Anne de Vernal	<a href="mailto:devernal.anne@uqam.ca">devernal.anne@uqam.ca</a>
Finland	Jenni Virtanen	<a href="mailto:jenni.virtanen@aka.fi">jenni.virtanen@aka.fi</a>
France	Mireille Perrin	<a href="mailto:mireille.perrin@cnrs-dir.fr">mireille.perrin@cnrs-dir.fr</a>
Germany	Guido Lüniger	<a href="mailto:guido.lueniger@dfg.de">guido.lueniger@dfg.de</a>
Ireland <sup>1)</sup>	Koen Verbruggen	<a href="mailto:Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie">Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie</a>
Italy	Marco Sacchi	<a href="mailto:marco.sacchi@iamc.cnr.it">marco.sacchi@iamc.cnr.it</a>
Portugal	Fernando Barriga	<a href="mailto:f.barriga@fc.ul.pt">f.barriga@fc.ul.pt</a>
Spain <sup>2)</sup>	Carlota Escutia Dotti	<a href="mailto:cescutia@ugr.es">cescutia@ugr.es</a>
UK	Michael Webb	<a href="mailto:mweb@nerc.ac.uk">mweb@nerc.ac.uk</a>
<b>OBSERVERS</b>		
IMI BoG*	Mathilde Cannat	<a href="mailto:cannat@ipgp.fr">cannat@ipgp.fr</a>
SASEC	Jan de Leeuw	<a href="mailto:Jan.de.Leeuw@nioz.nl">Jan.de.Leeuw@nioz.nl</a>
ESO	Robert Gatliff	<a href="mailto:rwga@bgs.ac.uk">rwga@bgs.ac.uk</a>
ESSAC	Rüdiger Stein	<a href="mailto:Ruediger.Stein@awi.de">Ruediger.Stein@awi.de</a>
ESSAC	Carlota Escutia Dotti	<a href="mailto:cescutia@ugr.es">cescutia@ugr.es</a>
EMA	Catherine Mevel	<a href="mailto:mevel@ipgp.fr">mevel@ipgp.fr</a>
EMA	Mohamed Amine Benchikh	<a href="mailto:benchikh@ipgp.fr">benchikh@ipgp.fr</a>
EMA	Gilbert Camoin	<a href="mailto:camoin@cerege.fr">camoin@cerege.fr</a>
IODP-MI	Kiyoshi Suyehiro	<a href="mailto:ksuyehiro@iodp.org">ksuyehiro@iodp.org</a>
NSF	Ian Ridley	<a href="mailto:wridley@nsf.gov">wridley@nsf.gov</a>
MEXT	Shingo Shibata	<a href="mailto:shibata@mext.go.jp">shibata@mext.go.jp</a>
MEXT	Shinichi Kuramoto	<a href="mailto:s.kuramoto@jamstec.go.jp">s.kuramoto@jamstec.go.jp</a>
ECORD Evaluation	Arne Björlykke	<a href="mailto:arne.bjorlykke@nhm.uio.no">arne.bjorlykke@nhm.uio.no</a>
CCOD	Dominique Weis	<a href="mailto:dweis@eos.ubc.ca">dweis@eos.ubc.ca</a>
CCOD	Uli Wortmann	<a href="mailto:uli.wortmann@utoronto.ca">uli.wortmann@utoronto.ca</a>

1) K. Verbruggen could not attend the meeting but participated in the closed session via teleconference

2) Alternate of José Ramón Sánchez Quintana

<b>Apologies</b>		
<b>MEMBERS</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>
Denmark	Marit-Solveig Seidenkrantz	<a href="mailto:mss@geo.au.dk">mss@geo.au.dk</a>
Iceland	Jonasson Hallgrímur	<a href="mailto:hallgrimur@rannis.is">hallgrimur@rannis.is</a>
Netherlands	Josef Stuefer	<a href="mailto:j.stuefer@nwo.nl">j.stuefer@nwo.nl</a>
Norway	Øyvind Pettersen	<a href="mailto:op@rcn.no">op@rcn.no</a>
Switzerland	Martina Kern-Lütschg	<a href="mailto:mkern@snf.ch">mkern@snf.ch</a>
Sweden	Dan Holtstam	<a href="mailto:dan.holtstam@vr.se">dan.holtstam@vr.se</a>
<b>OBSERVERS</b>		
SASEC	Damon Teagle	<a href="mailto:Damon.Teagle@soton.ac.uk">Damon.Teagle@soton.ac.uk</a>

ICDP	Uli Harms	<a href="mailto:ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de">ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de</a>
Russia	Alexander Matul	<a href="mailto:amatul@ocean.ru">amatul@ocean.ru</a>
Marine Board	Niall McDonough	<a href="mailto:NMcDonough@esf.org">NMcDonough@esf.org</a>
ERICON-AB	Bonnie Wolff-Boenisch	<a href="mailto:Bonnie.Wolff-Boenisch@awi.de">Bonnie.Wolff-Boenisch@awi.de</a>
ESF	Paul Egerton	<a href="mailto:pegerton@esf.org">pegerton@esf.org</a>
IMI BoG	John Ludden	<a href="mailto:jludden@bgs.ac.uk">jludden@bgs.ac.uk</a>
IMI BoG*	Gerold Wefer	<a href="mailto:gwefer@marum.de">gwefer@marum.de</a>

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

## **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 <sup>3</sup> 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

**Tuesday, May 31<sup>th</sup>**  
**OPEN SESSION**

**Agenda Item 1 - Welcome and logistical information (A. de Vernal/M. Perrin)**

The meeting was hosted by Anne de Vernal at UQAM.

C. Mével, EMA Director presented apologies from several ECORD members:

Oyvind Pettersen (Norway), Dan Holdstam (Sweden), Martina Kern-Lütschg (Switzerland), Josef Stuefer (Netherlands) and Marit Solveig Seidenkrantz (Denmark)

-Jose Ramon Sanchez-Quintana (Spain) was represented by Carlota Escutia-Doti.

-Koen Verbruggen (Ireland) participated in the closed session by visio conference.

In addition the following invited observers were not able to attend: Uli Harms (ICDP), Alexander Matul (Russia), Niall McDonough (Marine Board), Bonnie Wolff Boenisch (ERICON), Paul Egerton (ESF).

ECORD welcomes the new representative for Italy, Marco Sacchi, who attended his first ECORD Council meeting.

The agenda was approved with no modification.

**Agenda Item 2 - Welcome address (Yves Mauffette, Vice President Research, UQAM)**

Yves Mauffette, vice-president of UQAM, welcomed the ECORD council. He presented the scientific activities of UQAM, and insisted on the interest for participating in IODP.

**Agenda Item 3 - Approval of the Paris meeting minutes (Mireille Perrin)**

**ECORD Council motion 11-01-1**

ECORD Council approves the minutes of the Paris meeting without modifications (ECORD Council meeting #18).

Henriet moved, Webb seconded, all in favour (*10 votes: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain, UK*).

**Agenda Item 4 - Review of Paris meeting actions (M. Perrin)**

M. Perrin reviewed the actions from the last meeting in Paris.

ACTION ESSAC: At the next Council meeting, to present a five year average table of the ECORD berths quotas. Done, see item#15

ACTION EMA: Recommend to IODP-MI to investigate the possibility of inviting students when a full science party is not required on an expedition. In progress. Kiyoshi Suyehiro will investigate with the IOs.

ACTION EMA: Approach the 3P ARCTIC conference organisers to investigate how ECORD can participate. Done, see item #14

ACTION EMA: Investigate the possibility of organising the Arctic workshop as a side meeting to the 3P Arctic conference (Halifax, Canada, 30/8-2/9/2011). Done, see item #14

ACTION EMA: Prepare a two page flyer to promote ocean drilling science to be distributed to the European Commission. In progress, see item#13

ACTION Josef Stuefer: Approach the Committee responsible for preparing the Marine Board-ESF Position Paper "Navigating the Future IV" to investigate how the ECORD science goals could be addressed. Done, see item#13

ACTION Koen Verbruggen: Contact Jeffrey O'Sullivan, Irish representative at the ESF-Marine Board with the same goal. Done ?

ACTION Executive: Revise the business plan. Done, see item#21

Action EMA : organize an electronic vote for the two motions. Done, see item #4 and #6

ACTION EMA: Send the ECORD comments to the Lead Agencies before AGU meeting. Done

ACTION EMA: Contact Gerold Wefer to discuss about the role of BoG in the new program. In progress

ECORD Council consensus 10-02-2

The ECORD Managing Agency is requested to hire a French consultancy with an international experience in accounting to advise ECORD on the best option to manage the ECORD funds and avoid the effect of exchange rate fluctuations. Advice on the most suitable legal structure will also be sought  
In progress, see item # 22

#### **Agenda Item 5 - Amendment to the ECORD MoU (C. Mével)**

At the last ECORD Council meeting it was decided to modify the term of the chair. To be effective, this modification requires an amendment to Annex C of the ECORD MoU. Two ECORD Council members (Verbruggen and Webb) proposed an amendment (see annex) that was discussed and approved.

##### **ECORD Council motion 11-01-2**

Following the adoption of motion 10-02-2 to modify the term of the ECORD chair, ECORD Council approves the proposed amendment to the Annex C of the MoU.

*Lüniger moved, Webb seconded, all in favour (10 votes).*

Action EMA: modify the Annex C to the ECORD MoU accordingly and distribute it to all ECORD member countries.

#### **Agenda Item 6 - New Council Chair to be elected; composition of the executive (M. Perrin)**

Mireille Perrin will remain Chair until September 30, 2011 to become the Vice-Chair as of October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 for a six month period. Anne de Vernal has rotated in as Vice-Chair from April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 to become the Chair as of October 1<sup>st</sup> 2011 until September 31<sup>th</sup> 2012.

With Anne de Vernal becoming vice-chair, a new member must be appointed to the Executive. The three major contributors must be all represented, therefore the council appointed Guido Lüniger.

##### **ECORD Council consensus 11-01-1**

ECORD Council appoints Guido Lüniger, former vice- chair, as the third member of the executive.

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

Mével reminded that the last ECORD chair of the current phase will be elected (first as a vice chair) at the next council meeting. She presented a table with the successive chairs showing that the next chair should be from UK.

#### **Agenda Item 7 – IODP- MI report (Kiyoshi Suyehiro)**

(See IODP-MI report by K. Suyehiro at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

K. Suyehiro, President of IODP-MI informed on the **Annual Program Plan FY11**. The version approved on November 2010 had to be revised due to change in the Chikyu schedule. The revised version, dated May 18<sup>th</sup>, is now in the approval process by the LAs. A summary of the budget was provided as well as explanations on the revisions. The Chikyu was damaged by the tsunami generated by the dramatic Tohoku Earthquake. Therefore the expeditions planned for this year had to be postponed. This resulted in a significant decrease in CDEX budget: -US\$56,8M in POCs and -US\$2,9M SOC. The SOC budgets for the USIO and ESO have not changed. Therefore some SOC money is still available at IODP-MI.

**FY11 operation schedules for the 3 platforms** are finalised. No MSP expedition is scheduled, only a site survey to prepare for the Chicxulub expedition is planned for FY12. The two Chikyu expeditions were postponed: Shimokita Coal Bed Biosphere, first “Complimentary Project Proposal” (i.e. project receiving funding from outside IODP) and the Plate Boundary Deep riser expedition. Hopefully Shimokita will be implemented in FY12. Reaching the boundary plate of the Nankai Trough remains the critical goal for the Chikyu.

**Planning scenarios are being developed for FY12.** The preparation of the FY12 Annual Program Plan has started but there are still some issues. Following the Tohoku earthquake, IODP-MI has set up a planning group to discuss the opportunity of a "Rapid Response Drilling" project. A meeting was held in Tokyo mid-May and the report will be presented at the next SASEC meeting (June 14<sup>th</sup> –15<sup>th</sup>). To document the effect of the earthquake, the project must be implemented less than ~a year after the event. But at this stage, there are not enough data to decide where to emplace the hole. Regarding the JR, Suyehiro referred to the letter sent by David Divins, director of IODP at the Consortium for Ocean Leadership, explaining that budget constraints at NSF will result in implementing only three expeditions in FY12. The LAs and IODP-MI are currently discussing the possibility of using the US\$ ~2 M in SOC's not used by the Chikyu to support JR operations. Mével expressed concern that ECORD has not been informed and/or consulted. It will be discussed at the June IODP council meeting, Suyehiro said. For **FY13**, there are still a lot of uncertainties for both the Chikyu and the JR.

He presented the new **Science Advisory Structure (SAS)**. He reminded that IODP-MI is currently implementing IWG+ decisions. The current SAS will phase out in September 2011 and SIPCom and PEP will start working early October 2011.

IODP-MI keeps investigating countries from Asia, South America (in particular Brazil) and Africa as **potential new members** in the next phase of IODP

IODP has a booth at major conferences, AGU, EGU and JpGU and organizes town hall meetings. The **New Science Plan** is nearly ready for printing before being submitted to IWG+ on June 16<sup>th</sup>.

Suyehiro informed about the status of the **Mohole project**. After the two workshops held in 2010, the following step is a scoping study aiming at evaluating the feasibility and cost of the project. The company BLADE Energy Partner was contracted to produce an initial "pre-scoping" study. The preliminary feasibility study has been released on May 27<sup>th</sup>. The main conclusions show that the project is technologically feasible. Initial time estimates require ~500 days of drilling, but 40% of the time is devoted to bit trips. Hopefully the time can be shortened by improving bit life. With this positive assessment, the next step is to set up a "scoping office" for a more detailed study.

*Webb questioned whether a financial study will be conducted for the MOHO project to complete the technical study. Suyehiro responded that it was planned since the beginning that if the technical study was positive, then the next step would be a financial study. He added that discussions with the BoG are on-going on conducting a more detail study including both technical and financial evaluation, and risks assessment. IODP-MI has submitted a proposal to the Sloane Foundation to help set up the scoping office. The result will be known next June.*

*De Leeuw informed about the potential for attracting new members from the Middle-East. He has some contacts there and offered to develop liaising.*

*Referring to the last SASEC meeting (January 2011, Miami), Gatliff asked if IODP-MI has news from Petrobras and from representatives from the Brazil community. Mével replied that she will address this point in her presentation. A meeting is now scheduled in July in Brasilia gathering local representatives and an IODP delegation consisting of NSF, MEXT and herself (EMA).*

*J.P. Henriot asked if the high temperatures likely to be encountered during the Mohole drilling will not preclude downhole measurements because the technology does not yet exist. Suyehiro argued that uncertainties remain regarding the temperatures to reach; the technology needed may not yet be on the market when the project starts. Mével added that during the DS<sup>3</sup>F workshop she organised last February, a representative from Icelandic geothermal industry presented tools capable to resist extreme temperatures (up to 300-400°C). Clearly, interaction with industry will be required to implement the MOHO project.*

#### **Agenda Item 8 – Board of Governors (Cannat)**

See report at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>

M. Cannat, IODP-MI Board of Governors reported on the last BoG meeting held on December 14th, 2010 in San Francisco.

In San Francisco, discussions focused on IODP status, FY11 APP and the new SAS status. Concerning the new SAS, and following ECORD Council consensus 10-02-4 affirming the "need to maintain a standing Engineering Development Panel (EDP), possibly as a subgroup of the planned Technology Panel (TP)", H.

Christian Larsen explained why it was not planned to maintain an “Engineering Development Panel”. After discussions, the BoG recommended to further discuss this issue at the next SASEC and IWG+ meetings.

**The scoping of the Moho** during the remainder program was addressed. Such activity might last 2-3 years and would unveil if the project is doable. The BoG strongly favoured a shorter approach because an answer should be made before the New Science plan is out. Therefore it was proposed to perform a preliminary scoping of 3-6 months- time frame (the outcome was presented by Suyehiro under its agenda). Cannat detailed the “Terms of References” established by the BoG for the scoping.

Discussions also concentrated on the **future program’s proposal evaluation process**. It has been suggested to establish two separate proposal flows: single expedition JR and MSP proposals could be evaluated with a common pathway, whereas planning for riser (Chikyu) and/or long-term, multi-leg expedition non-riser projects need a separate pathway. Some BoG members thought critical, however, to ensure a common evaluation of the science. She added that SIPCom will be the sole structure to supervise the evaluation of whatever proposals.

She concluded with the presentation of the Agenda for the June meeting. One important item will be the election of a renewed BoG structure: Chair, executive committee and committee members. Gerold Wefer has been approached to become the next (and the first from ECORD) chair.

#### **Agenda Item 9 – NSF (Ridley)**

Ian Ridley informed about recent **changes at NSF management staff level**. Subra Suresh was appointed new NSF director; David Conover is the new Ocean Division Director; Tom Janecek has replaced Debbie Smith as ODP Program Director. He emphasized that NSF was delighted with “**New Science Plan**”. It represents a big step forward for a successful future program. He praised the tremendous work accomplished, in particular by the SASEC chair, Maureen Raymo.

Ridley commented the **future of the Ocean-Drilling Program at NSF**. He gave the timetable of the program renewal decision process, which relies on inputs from the several following documents:

- the New Science Plan, to be published in June 2011
  - The review from the National Research Council (NRC), to be delivered on July 2011.
  - The report from a subcommittee of the “Advisory Committee for Geosciences”, to be delivered by late 2011.
- The subcommittee has been set up to provide guidance to NSF on ocean drilling. This committee will look at how ocean drilling fits in the overall science plan of NSF over the next ten years, i.e. how ocean drilling activities stands versus others NSF priorities, such as ocean observatories, astronomy, physics, etc....
- On the basis of all these documents, the National Science Board (NSB) will start to discuss the renewal of the program by May 2012.
  - In August 2012, NSB will publicise its decision. NSB is entitled to give NSF the authorisation to sign the future MoU as well as subsequent contracts, but cannot decide on the budget allocation. The fear to see a cut in the budget will still remain.

He addressed the **reduction of the JR drilling time from 8 to 6 months in FY2012**. He better explained the reasons behind the letter sent out by Ocean Leadership. He explained that OCE division at NSF has 3 main sections. With an overall NSF budget remaining constant (or even decreasing slightly), increasing the budget allocated to the drilling programme would result in decreasing the other sections.

For the next phase of the program, Ridley informed that ODP has to come up to NSF with a **viable long-term business plan** in which industry is involved into JR operations. He realizes that it has been difficult so far to attract industry because the way it works is totally different. Several major companies are interested with the JR but how that could work remains a question mark.

He concluded by expressing his disappointment that the last JR expedition, “superfast crust”, was not a success because it faced technological problems to re-enter the existing hole.

*Mével questioned whether the involvement of industry in the next phase as required by ODP business plan would imply that the JR will no longer operate 12 months a year. Ridley replied that it would have an impact on the availability of the ship. The budget allocated by NSF will not increase, and therefore collaboration with industry is required to compensate the difference. Budget issues in the current phase are largely related to the scheduling of the ship, which involved long transits. With the increasing cost of fuel, this has a strong impact on the budget. The related annual increase is approximately US\$6M, roughly corresponding to the budget of one expedition.*



*He reminded that in DSDP and ODP, a regional panel was in charge to schedule the ship on a regional basis to avoid the long transits. The future program has to go back to a regional approach in the scheduling.*

*Shibata questioned on the US national review process. Ridley told that the original charge of the Committee was to look at the achievements of the Ocean Drilling Program. The review was required by James Collins, Assistant Director for Biological Science. But because of the on-going review conducted by the National Research Council the scope of investigation was refocused. It is now on how the Ocean Drilling Program fits in the NSF long term vision.*

*Perrin wanted to know if early contacts have been initiated with industry. Ridley replied not yet and the risk is to have ODL contracting the JR to industry companies for a longer period of time and at the expense of IODP.*

*Rudy expressed his concern on the cancellation of expeditions in the Indian Ocean during this phase of ocean drilling.*

*De Leeuw advocated to obtain clear figures on the costs of the JR when docked at the harbour (maintenance cost) and when it is at sea (operation cost) to compare both. To him if the difference is not significant then IODP members, including ECORD, could claim additional funds from their national agencies. It would be easier with factual evidences. Ridley replied the difference might be roughly US\$2-3M. Some ECORD members thought the difference is clearly not substantial. Suyehiro said some figures would be presented at the next IODP Council on June.*

#### **Agenda Item 10 - MEXT REPORT**

*See report at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)*

Shingo Shibata first reported on the **damages to the Chikyu following the Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami**. When the tsunami happened, an elementary school class was visiting the vessel. Fortunately, no one was injured. Chikyu was calling at Hachinohe Port, preparing for IODP Exp 337 (Shimokita). The vessel was hit by the tsunami and pushed against the quay. It suffered damages to the hull and one of the thrusters broke away from the ship. The replacement will take almost a year, to be likely completed on early January 2012. The ship is currently docked for repairing. The plan is to use the ship with only five thrusters. Hopefully, it will be possible and the Chikyu will be able to fulfil the planned commercial work in Sri Lanka from early July 2011 to late Jan.2012.

As a consequence, NanTroSEIZE and Shimokita have been postponed beyond January 2012 at the earliest, date of the delivery of the new thruster. CDEX will also be able to conduct the Rapid Response Drilling project if it is scheduled.

He presented updates on **the science and technology policy in Japan**. A Science and Technology Basic Plan is set up every five years and MEXT plays an active role in the preparation. This plan encompasses the Japanese participation in IODP. The implementation of plan covering the period FY2011-FY2015 was postponed following the earthquake.

As part of the **activities to promote IODP**, he explained that MEXT is deeply involved in science support activities. For MOHO a site survey off Mexico will be carried out by the JAMSTEC's research vessel 'Kairei' with the aim to obtain data for a potential site. Initially scheduled on late November 2011, the mission has been postponed.

For the GOLD project a "mini workshop" was held in January 2011 in Tokyo to discuss the proposal. An international workshop is being planned for the summer in Japan. He insisted that MEXT is willing to see the CHIKYU used for the GOLD project in the Mediterranean.

Three core school courses organised by J-DESC were conducted this year 2011 and one is planned. JAMSTEC is planning to open the participation to all scientists from IODP member countries.

At JPGU (Chiba, 22- 27 May 2011), J-DESC organized a Drilling Earth Science session. The IODP-ICDP Town Hall Meeting was arranged and successfully attended.

He informed about the **National Review Process of IODP currently taking place in Japan**. A JAMSTEC committee is discussing Chikyu drilling plans for the next phase and a public outreach strategy for the Mohole Project. As part of this process, a workshop on "Ocean drilling for creating a new paradigm of the life and earth sciences" was organized last March. A MEXT committee will meet after July 2011

He extended condolences to the late Prof. Kensaku Tamaki of Tokyo University who was actively contributing

in IODP.

He also informed that Prof. Hodaka Kawahata has been elected as a chair of the new executive committee of the J-DESC.

*Regarding the GOLD project, J.P. Henriet questioned whether the Chikyu is really needed to drill the sequence above the salt layer. The project could be implemented with a multi-platform approach.*

*Responding to J. de Leeuw, S. Shibata clarified that the GOLD international workshop is the one to be funded by IODP-MI.*

#### **Agenda Item 11 - SASEC (Jan de Leeuw)**

See SASEC report by J. de Leeuw at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>

J. de Leeuw reported on the last SASEC meeting (January 18-19<sup>th</sup>, 2011, Miami, USA).

He gave a progress update on **the New Science Plan**. The final draft was discussed but at this point did not incorporate the Resource and Education/Outreach Chapters. The Final version will be delivered to funding organizations not later than June 2011 and will be presented to press at June meeting in Amsterdam.

He explained the status of the **new SAS**. The structure will be simplified, with two committees (PEP and SIPCom) for proposal evaluation and program development instead of three (SSEP/SPC/SASEC). Three service panels are proposed: Technology Panel (TP), Site Characterization Panel (SCP) and Environmental Protection and Safety Panel (EPSP).

Drafts of Terms of Reference (ToR) for each panel were approved in principle by SASEC and forwarded to IWG+. These Drafts were prepared by a SASEC subcommittee in consultation with IODP-MI.

At the Miami meeting discussions heavily focussed on the role of technology development in the next program and the future of EDP. A subcommittee of SASEC will assess structural models in the post-2013 IODP for advising on a) engineering development and industry-IODP technology transfer and b) on ensuring adequate long term engineering advice to the new SAS. The subcommittee will report at the June 2011 meeting.

He informed that advertisements for the chair positions for PEP and SIPCom have been released. The selections will be made in June. SASEC will be disbanded and the new SAS will become effective starting October 2011.

**Concerning the proposal flow to the new program**, he informed that a SASEC subcommittee (Chair Gabe Pilippelli) was charged to develop simple proposal guidelines, to help the proponents with how the process functions. The role of workshops during the process is particularly put forward. The guidelines are now completed and SASEC will report on it in June.

SASEC requested to be consulted for the development of the new website. Suyehiro informed that the new website will not be for the June meeting.

SASEC recognized the need for IODP **to develop linkages to scientific/national initiatives**, in particular with ICDP and DCO (on-going) but also with PAGES and OOI. He indicated that the Chair of SASEC met with the Scientific Steering committee of PAGES during the INQUA meeting in Bern.

**Ships schedules for JR and Chikyu** for the remainder of the program were discussed and SASEC released a consensus regarding the 2 months reduction of JR operation (from 8 to 6 months) in 2012: "SASEC implores the NSF to reconsider its decision".

*Canat asked for more details on the workshops concept and the new proposals categories and guidelines. De Leeuw replied that the current draft makes no difference in the proposal pathways for evaluation of JR and MSP on one hand, and riser and complicated non-riser proposal on the other hand. Three types of workshops (WS) are considered:*

- unsolicited WS, to help draft a pre-proposal on a specific topic*
- solicited WS: SIPcom or PEP may advise the proponent of a pre proposal to ask funding for holding the WS and develop a full proposal*
- WS to help reach the objectives of the Science Plan. If after some time it becomes obvious that some of the science themes have not been addressed, SIPcom would advise the community to organise a WS on a particular topic.*

## **Agenda Item 12– Report on potential new members for ECORD (C. Mével)**

Catherine Mével reported on liaising with Russia and Brazil.

**With Russia, no real progresses have been made.** The Russian contact is Alexander Matul. He was invited to this meeting but finally could not attend. Matul has clearly informed that he is not in the position of making decisions. He has not yet provided contact names. He requested if it would be possible to sail his PhD student on the South Alaska margin expedition as « as small step toward future ECORD-Russia cooperation ». The ECORD executive was reluctant because it would impact the ECORD berth quota, already under pressure. The participation of a Russian scientist in the ACEX expeditions has not really helped building a strong long-term collaboration with Russia. Mével forwarded the request to IODP-MI, but then the expedition was postponed. Suyehiro reminded that it is possible to invite scientists outside from IODP and it has already been done in the past.

**An IODP campaign towards Brazil is organized next July.** There is a strong interest both from the science community and from Petrobras. An IODP delegation (NSF-MEXT-ECORD) will visit Brasilia on July 14-15 to discuss with Brazilian authorities at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Divisão de Ciência e Tecnologia, Ministério das Relações Exteriores). The purpose is to explain the structure, funding system, science plan and benefits offered by IODP. Subsequently, the delegation will meet the Brazilian scientific community in Rio de Janeiro.

Ridley added that Petrobras is the key to success. In Brazil, large companies like Petrobras give a percentage of their profit to the Ministry for R&D. Barriga indicated that Petrobras can also directly funds scientific project, his University already benefited of such funds in the past.

## **Agenda Item 13 - EMA Report (C. Mével)**

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

Catherine Mével informed the Council on EMA activities (outreach and science support activities, EC-ESF oriented activities).

She listed the meetings attended by EMA, including European funded project meetings i.e. ERICON-AB and DS3F.

She summarized the ECORD **plan for outreach and science support activities**. An EMA-ESO-ESSAC outreach team meeting was held in Paris on February 14-15. The new brochure “*Scientific Drilling in the Arctic Ocean*” was published in Jan. 2011. This brochure was initiated by UK IODP and ECORD ILP with the aim of reaching a large industry audience. The ECORD Newsletter #16 was released on April 2011 to coincide with the EGU meeting where copies were distributed. ECORD flyers on NJSS and GBREC expeditions were updated and included in the ECORD pocket folder. All ECORD publications can be downloaded from the ECORD website: <http://www.ecord.org/pub/publications.html> and printed copies can be asked to the EMA office.

EMA participated in manning the booth at **AGU 2010 in San Francisco (organized by IODP-MI) and organized the booth at EGU 2011 in Vienna (April 2-7)**. Details on EGU were presented. The successful IODP-ICDP Town hall meeting was attended by 200 participants. Two media conferences were organized, one covering the New Science Plan and the other the GBREC expedition (web cast can be watched on web cast at <http://www.egu-media.Net>). The joint organisation between ECORD and ICDP run very successfully. Warm thanks were expressed to R. Belocky for his logistical help. EMA also provided material for other events organized by IODP-MI such as the Ocean Technology Conference 2011.

The **New video on MSPs** with 16mn duration is now released. It was funded by IODP-MI and produced under ESO supervision in particular Alan Stevenson. The video was broadcasted during EGU 2011. It can be downloaded from the ECORD website: [http://www.ecord.org/pi/ECORD\\_video-2011.mp4](http://www.ecord.org/pi/ECORD_video-2011.mp4). A shorter version will soon follow.

EMA provided support to several national activities and meetings intended to introduce ECORD/IODP to the classroom/general public: loan of core replicas to teachers (middle school to university), support to conferences (e.g. public conference in Luxembourg).

**Plan for future outreach activities was described.** For the first time IODP will have a **booth** at the Goldschmidt Conference (August 14-19, Prague) and at the 3P arctic conference (30<sup>th</sup> August-2<sup>nd</sup> September, Halifax). Both booths are funded by IODP-MI and organized by ECORD. The **ECORD brochure specific to the European Commission** is under preparation with a publication date around fall 2011. The general layout was presented: a 6 pages folder consisted of four pages dedicated to each of the four themes of the new science plan, one page describing the platforms and one page explaining the ECORD functioning.

She reported on the **two upcoming JR port calls in Portugal** (or Spain, still under discussion). The USIO and ECORD will jointly co-organize the related outreach. The first port call is planned in the Azores (Punta Delgada, Nov 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011). A local event will be organized by Portugal. The second port call is a larger event and planned either in Lisbon (Portugal) or in Spain, starting on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012. Escutia informed that Spain has offered the USIO to investigate the possibility of having the portcall in Cadiz. Whatever the location, Mével offered to take advantage of this portcall in Europe and arrange visit of the JR for VIPs in Europe. De Leeuw proposed to invite Marine Board representatives who could convey the event to the EC. Ridley underlined that such event always raised enthusiasm. The Council agreed to the proposal and charged EMA to care of the organisation.

ACTION EMA: to organize, in coordination with the local host and the USIO, an outreach event for all ECORD funding agencies at the January 2012 JOIDES Resolution port call. The portcall is planned to be either in Lisbon (Portugal) or Cadiz (Spain).

The next **ECORD Outreach Team meeting** is scheduled during the Goldschmidt Conference in Prague, on August 19th.

Mével informed on the progress of the **ECORD activities linked with the European Commission: DS3F, ESFRI, ESF, Marine Board**.

Presently, **DS3F project** is the only official link between ECORD and the Commission. The project objective is to develop a road map for the next 15 years and better integrate drilling with other initiatives that address deep seafloor processes. The coordinator, Achim Kopf from Marum-Bremen University, is actively involved in IODP. The roadmap should help to lobby the EC in its preparation of the future FP8. Mével leads WP7, responsible for Mission-specific sub seafloor sampling and instrumentation. Under this WP7, she organised a workshop on February 2011 in Grenoble (France) with the aim to produce a strategy document for engineering development in Europe to be incorporated into the 15 years roadmap. The workshop gathered 24 invited participants, both scientists and engineers from academy and industry, across Europe and overseas. A joint session was arranged with the IODP Engineering Development Panel. Although discussion mostly focused on technology, there was a substantial part dedicated to debate on funding strategies and opportunities at national and European levels. Five key areas - Seabed drills, Long piston coring, Pressure sampling, High temperature tools, Borehole monitoring and instrumentation - where Europe can play a leading role were identified. The concept of a network of key actors in sub seafloor instrumentation was approved, in line with the concept of “distributed sub seafloor sampling infrastructure” developed in the ECORD business plan. A final “Big” conference will take place in Barcelona on March 2012 to finalize the roadmap. This event will be highly political.

She informed on the **ESFRI forum on Marine Sciences and Research Infrastructure** that will be held in June 2011 in Brest, France. It will be a highly political meeting, with EC representatives. Mével (EMA), Gatliff (ESO) and Kopf (DS3F) have an invited presentation “Towards a distributed infrastructure for research drilling in Europe”. Mével reminded, however, that Herve Pero, Head of the Scientific Infrastructures at the Commission, announced at the EGU meeting that there will be no opening of the ESFRI list in 2012. Too many “preparatory phase” projects have been funded but very few projects have been consolidated.

The future of **ESF** is still in discussion. Therefore, there is currently no opportunity to apply to ESF for a continuation of the Magellan workshop series that ends next August. According to Belocky the very likelihood in the future is the creation of a new organisation in Brussels, merging ESF and EUROHORCs. ESF in its current format is likely to be shut down next year. Existing commitment will continue until completion. J. de Leeuw clarified that the Marine Board will not be affected by the change because it is totally independent from ESF. The future of the Magellan programme was discussed during the closed session.

The **Marine Board** is currently preparing the Position Paper: “Navigating the Future IV”. It will be a strategic document for the preparation of the FP8 in marine sciences. The Marine Board was approached to include some statements about scientific ocean drilling. Niall McDonough, Executive Scientific Secretary, offered ECORD to provide a 2-3 pages input to the document. These pages were written in consultation between EMA, ESSAC and EESO, and were provided last spring. But since the document will be finalized only in 2012, it is understood by McDonough that some revisions might be necessary.

Mével reported on her participation in the **MISTRALS** meeting held in Malta, April 2011, to promote the GOLD project. The GOLD project is to drill a deep hole through the Messinian salt in the Mediterranean. MISTRALS (Mediterranean Integrated STudies at Regional And Local Scales) aims to promote multidisciplinary research dedicated to the understanding of the Mediterranean basin. However, the meeting

mainly addressed biology, oceanography and humanities, and no industry representative attended. The GOLD PI, Marina Rabineau, is in the process of planning an IODP workshop in October in Tokyo. A revised proposal was submitted to IODP-MI and SASEC decision will be known soon.

She reported on the progress of the **ERICON-AB Project**. ERICON supports the preparatory phase to build the Aurora Borealis icebreaker. Last fall, Germany endorsed the position presented in the Wissenschaftsrat report recommending prioritizing the replacement of the Polar Stern with respect to the construction of the Aurora Borealis. As a consequence, it became clear that the project had to be postponed, because of the lack of formal financial commitment by any of the potential partners.

Given this new situation, the EC organised a hearing in Brussels on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010, chaired by Herve Pero (Head of Unit, Research Infrastructures). Following this meeting, the ESFRI Committee removed the project from the ESFRI list. Mével reminded that ESFRI is fully independent from the Commission and acts as an external advisory body composed of national representatives from the Member States. The EC informed the project coordinator in April 2011 that the project will be funded till the end of the contract, in February 2012. However, some deliverables should be modified in order to be more generic, beyond the Aurora Borealis: science plan for the Arctic, legal structure for shared vessel, etc.... The EC also encouraged the project consortium to investigate the way of organising a « future polar research fleet ».

From an ECORD point of view, the primary implication is the Aurora Borealis is no longer an MSP option for the next phase of ocean drilling. Arctic drilling will have to be implemented using the « ACEX concept » (a drilling vessel surrounded by ice-breaker vessels clearing the way). Stein advocated the use of the seabed rock drill for an Arctic expedition.

Mével reminded the **timeline for the renewal process specific to ECORD**. Expression of interest should be signed by each ECORD countries willing to continue in the program before the end of 2011. To help make their decision on the continuation, all ECORD funding agencies will be provided with 3 keys documents this summer: the New Science Plan, the ECORD evaluation report and the ECORD business plan. In addition some countries are conducting evaluations at the national level. Webb indicated that the UK was very positive. Mével reminded that the ECORD MoU has to be signed before ECORD can join IODP as a single member.

She briefly commented the letter prepared by the ECORD executive in response to the JR funding concern and sent to Rodey Batiza as well as the response from David Conover. Discussions continued during the closed session.

#### **Agenda Item 14 - ECORD Industry Liaison Panel (Catherine Mével)**

(See ECORD ILP report by C. Mével at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Catherine Mével reported on the ECORD Industry Liaison Panel (ILP).

She reminded the membership of the panel, chaired by Richard Hardman, as well as its objectives. The panel is mostly composed of representatives from industry (Total, Shell, Exxon Mobil...) but also academia.

The panel has decided to focus on possible academia-industry cooperation in the Arctic. Mével reiterated her encouragement to the ECORD members to recommend potential names, in particular from industry.

She informed on the ECORD/IODP session organised at the **Polar Petroleum Potential conference (3P ARCTIC)**, in Halifax, Canada, August 30<sup>th</sup> – September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011. An IODP booth will be funded by IODP-MI. The session will have presentations on ACEX, on Arctic proposals submitted to IODP, and by STATOIL and SHELL on their major scientific interests in the Arctic. The “Arctic brochure” will be widely distributed.

An ECORD ILP meeting initially planned in May has been postponed after the Halifax Conference, in the fall, to evaluate the results and discuss future plans. Discussions on the GOLD project will be part of that meeting’s agenda.

The critical lack of Arctic site survey data is a concern shared both by ECORD and ERICON-AB. Both sides agreed to hold a **joint workshop with the purpose to organize the collection of site survey data**:

“Arctic Ocean drilling and the site survey challenge”, November 1-3, 2011 in Copenhagen, co-convened by Naja Mikkelsen, Rüdiger Stein and Bernard Coakley.

It will be the last workshop funded by the ESF Magellan programme.

#### **Agenda Item 15 - ESSAC report (Rüdiger Stein)**

(See ESSAC report by R. Stein at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

After two years in Bremerhaven (Germany), the office will move to the University of Grenada (Spain) on October 1st, 2011. **Carlota Escutia will become the new ESSAC Chair** for a two years term i.e. until the end of the programme (September 30th, 2013).

**R. Stein reported on the last OTF and SPC meetings (March 28-31<sup>st</sup>, 2011).**

Last SPC-OTF-PMO meetings mainly focused on the successive revisions affecting the ships schedules for the remainder of the program (FY11-FY13) and on the transfer of active proposals to the new SAS.

**Platforms schedules for the remainder of the program (FY11-FY13).**

In FY11, the JR will carry out the 3 following expeditions: Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP) A, Superfast Spreading Rate Crust and Mid-Atlantic Ridge Microbiology.

Following the announcement that the NSF budget only allows three expeditions in FY12, the FY12 plan was revised. Currently, Western Mediterranean Outflow and Lesser Antilles are in the schedule. The South Alaska Margin expedition was deferred to FY13. OTF will meet mid-June and propose a revised schedule both for FY12 and FY13. Originally, the JR was likely to transit to the western Pacific and then to the Indian Ocean. But it is now obvious, due to budget constraints that the JR will not end up in the Indian Ocean. SPC expressed its concern that some of the “golden spikes” of the ISP have been poorly addressed so far, in particular monsoons, tectonics and climates as well as continental break up.

Rudy informed that ESSAC sent a letter of concern to Rodey Batiza regarding the funding situation for the JR.

Chikyu’s plans have profoundly changed due to the tsunami damage, as explained by Shibata. All expeditions initially planned in FY11 were cancelled. At this stage, there are too many uncertainties. But the plan is the Shimokita Coal Bed Biosphere proposal as well as the NanTroSEIZE Riser Drilling. Hopefully, the seismogenic zone will be reached at the end of 2013.

No MSP expedition is scheduled in FY11. SPC forwarded the two highest ranked MSPs proposals to OTF: Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment (Proposal 672) and Atlantic Massif Seafloor Processes (Proposal 758).

There are currently six MSPs proposals in OTF: Chicxulub Impact Crater (Proposal 548), Hawaiian Drowned Reefs (Proposal 716), Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks (Proposal 581) and the New England hydrogeology (Proposal 637). The Proposal “Nice Airport Landslide” (Proposal 748) was not forwarded.

The proposal handling during the **transition phase** was addressed at SPC. Following SASEC request, SPC made a recommendation for each of the active proposals whether it should be forwarded to the new programme. Assessment was based on scientific excellence and proposal readiness in the light of the current ISP and the NSP themes. Stein clarified that all proponents will be informed by letter. They will have the opportunity to revise their proposal if it is forwarded. If it is not, proponents will have the opportunity to submit a revised proposal for the Oct 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

SPC approved by consensus the newly elected chairs and vice-chairs in certain SAS panels. At STP: Saneatsu Saito was elected chair and Douglas Schmitt as vice-chair. At SSP: Gilles Lericolais was elected chair and David Mallinson vice-chair. Suyehiro informed on the next SPC meeting that might be in Sendai, Japan (August 22-24, 2011).

**Staffing and quotas issues.** Since the last Council meeting, ESSAC office issued several calls for applications to sail on FY12 expeditions. Stein provided details on staffing selections and nominations. Invitations are now completed for 2 expeditions: Superfast Spreading and Shimokita. Because Shimokita had to be postponed, ESSAC suggested that when the new schedule is known, all ECORD scientists previously selected will be contacted to ask whether they are still available to participate. If not, a new call will be issued.

ESSAC has completed the selection for 3 expeditions: Mid-Atlantic Microbiology, Lesser Antilles and Mediterranean Outflow. For all three, co-chiefs are identified and the staffing is still in process. For Lesser Antilles and Mediterranean Outflow, ECORD might get up to 10 scientists on board.

Stein presented a multi-years average table of the ECORD berths quotas allocation, covering the whole program to date (expeditions from 301 to 341). ESSAC has been attempting to rebalance the distribution with the aim to solve the issue of over quota/under quota. Norway is still severely under quota. France situation will improve after the Lesser Antilles expedition. Italy is far above the quota. He highlighted the nomination of the first Austrian scientists in an IODP expedition (Mediterranean Outflow).

Quota									2. IODP news	3. Nominations and staffing	4. Education and Outreach	5. Workshops	6. Next ESSAC meeting
CRISP Super MAM Shimc MOW LessAl S-Alaska									320-339	310-339	301-339		
Exp 334	Exp 335	Exp 336	Exp 337	Exp 339	Exp 340	Exp 341	Total berths so far	Member	ALLOC	ALLOC	ALLOC	Co-chief	
3	4	3 ?		2			66	France	-2,2	-2,3	-6,4	★	6
2	1	2 ?		1			74	Germany	0,1	-0,5	0,0		5
2	4	1		2			71	UK	2,8	1,7	-1,4		5
7	9	6	0	5			211	Sum	0,8	-1,2	-7,8		
				1			1	Austria	0,3	-0,1	-0,5		
							1	Belgium	-0,2	-0,3	0,6		
							7	Canada	-0,1	1,6	2,4	★	1
		1					7	Denmark	1,4	0,7	1,1		
							2	Finland	-0,5	1,2	0,9		
							0	Iceland	-0,1	-0,2	-0,3		
							1	Ireland	0,1	-0,4	-0,9		
1							9	Italy	0,6	2,6	5,6	★	1
				1			7	The Netherlands	-0,3	1,1	1,8	★	1
		1					9	Norway	-2,4	-5,5	-5,3	★	
				1			3	Portugal	2,3	1,9	1,5		
				2			11	Spain	1,3	0,9	2,7	★	2
							7	Sweden	-3,1	-3,6	-2,3	★	1
							8	Switzerland	-0,2	1,7	0,8		
1	0	2	0	5			73	Sum	-0,8	1,2	7,8		
8	9	8	0	10			284	Total ECORD	0,0	0,0	0,0		

The future Science advisory structure (SAS) was also discussed by ESSAC. Some issues were raised dealing with the election and composition of panels and committee members, rules of conflict of interest, the need of a Site survey Panel. For all these points, SPC will convey an official request to IWG+ for clarifications.

ESSAC passed a consensus on continuing with the present panel members and replacing them with new members as their mandate expires. That rotation scheme would ensure memory. US and Japan are likely to agree with the proposed scheme. He presented a table showing the ECORD membership in the new SAS structure. Mével added that she has requested IWG+ to increase the number of ECORD seats on SIPCom from 3 to 4.

Stein detailed the various ESSAC science support activities in Education, outreach, research grants and workshops.

#### ECORD summer Schools and Scholarships.

In 2011, there will be two summer schools, one in Bremen and one in Urbino.

14 scholarships have been awarded, including one to a Brazilian PhD student, as part of the effort to attract Brazil.

In 2012, three summer schools are planned: in Urbino on "Palaeoclimatology", in Bremen on "Submarine Landslides, Earthquakes and Tsunamis", in Montreal on "Impacts of the cryosphere dynamics from land to ocean".

5 ECORD grants were allocated to young scientists to conduct research towards the objectives of past and upcoming DSDP/ODP/IODP expeditions.

**Distinguished Lecturer Programme (DLP).** The 2010/2012 series of the ECORD DLP has started. The 3 lecturers are: Dominique Weiss (Canada), Helmut Weissert (Switzerland) and Kai-Uwe Hinrichs (Germany). Over the period 2006-2010, more than 55 lectures took place in various countries, including a few outside of ECORD (Poland, Croatia, USA, Australia).

#### Updates on the Magellan workshops and on the future of the program.

Two workshops were recently held:

- Real time Amphibic Monitoring & Borehole Observatories, Germany, October 2010
- Geological carbon capture and storage in mafic and ultramafic rocks. Mascate, Oman. January 2011

The "Arctic Ocean drilling and the site survey challenge", organized in Copenhagen in November 2011, will be the last funded by Magellan.

To insure the continuation of the very successful Magellan program, a proposal by J. Erbacher, current Chair of the Magellan Steering Committee was presented. The aim is to ensure support to workshops during the transition phase, while the future of ESF/EUROHORCS is not settled. It requests both ECORD and ICDP to consider

directly funding a programme supporting oceanic and continental drilling workshops. The programme would be managed from the IODP Germany office. The budget request is ~50 k€ from ECORD and ~10 k€ from ICDP. This request, in particular the financial aspect, was further discussed during the closed session

Next ESSAC meeting (16th) will be hosted in Dublin, Ireland, October 71-28, 2011

*Camoin asked what will be the policy for workshop under the new SAS organisation. Referring to his morning presentation, de Leeuw replied they would play a more important role in the next phase. Perrin wondered whether 3 Magellan WS per year were not too much. Stein replied that the figure of 3 is indicative and will depend on the number of applications received. Stein informed that ICDP has already agreed to participate.*

#### **Agenda Item 16 – Report on International Working Group + activities (Catherine Mével)**

*(See IWG+ and activities report by C. Mével at <http://www.ecord.org/Council/IWG-report.pdf>)*

C. Mével reported on the status of discussions for the future of scientific ocean drilling post 2013 at the international level. At the last IWG+ meeting (Miami, January 2011) most decisions on the Point of Agreements (PoAs) have been made, although there are still a few issues. It is essential to finalise them at the next IWG+ meeting (June), in order for ECORD to start negotiations on the MoUs with the national funding agencies.

Regarding the “**Multinational Program Architecture and Financial Contribution**” (position paper 1), she explained that there is one remaining important issue. It concerns the systematic allocation of US\$ 10M from commingled fund to Chikyu operations. *Shibata reminded that a common position had been already reached between the members and therefore he did not understand why this point was raised again. Ridley confirmed that, for NSF, it is an issue but requested to skip this sensitive topic, what was done.*

The berth allocation model was agreed: 1/3 for the each of the two LAs, the remaining 1/3 will go to others members, distributed upon their total contribution. ECORD as a platform provider is guaranteed a minimum of 8 berths. This is made possible with the increase of Chikyu and JR berths capacity.

She presented a table showing a proposed **distribution of the number of representatives into each SAS panels** broken down by contributors. The proposal shows that ECORD will receive a total of 24 seats. It has also been agreed that the first chair of SIPCOM should be from ECORD. Regarding SIPCOM, the initial ECORD representation was only 3, but she was able to negotiate with the LAs and obtain 4 (including the chair).

**Program Management and Money Flow (position paper 2).** There are no longer pending issues. NSF and IODP-MI informed that the “Cooperative Agreement” between NSF and IODP-MI has not been signed yet. *Suyehiro informed that the contract proposal will be submitted next year to be signed in 2012 and come in force in 2014 until 2018. Mével pointed out that the initial plan was to sign a contract now in order to cover the transition phase i.e. 2012-2016. Ridley explained that NSF is bound by the current contract expiring late 2013. Mével noted that consequence is that the CMO will be open for competition when half of the program will have passed. Suyehiro explained that NSF and IODP-MI are in the process of preparing the reviewing of the NSF business system. Recommendations will be out probably late June 2011. Mével expressed the concern on not having been informed.*

**Position Paper 3 “SAS Structure”.** The new SAS structure and ToR were approved by SASEC in January but still need some fine-tuning. The final version will be presented at the June meeting. Mével noted that how the new program can deal with engineering development is not yet entirely decided. That will be discussed at the next SASEC meeting.

**Position Paper 4 “Transition to the New Program”.** A plan for the transition has been developed. The new SAS will be set up this fall of 2011 and the existing SAS will be phased out.

Call for applications for the PEP and SIPCOM chairs are now closed. 6 applications for SIPCOM (3 ECORD) and 7 applications for PEP chair (2 ECORD) were received. A committee appointed by IODP-MI and chaired by Ian McGregor (chair of the triennium review committee) will review applications and make recommendations. Next call for proposals is planned this spring with an October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 deadline.

**The new Science plan is now out.** ECORD will receive soon printed copies of the NSP to be redistributed to funding agencies, and IODP national offices. A press conference is being organised by IODP-MI at the next IWG+ meeting. A shorter version will be available soon.



### Agenda Item 17 evaluation report

(See report at [http://www.ecord.org/Council/Evaluation\\_report.pdf](http://www.ecord.org/Council/Evaluation_report.pdf))

Arne Bjorlykke, Chair of the Evaluation Committee, first introduced the committee members. The report is almost completed and should be published for next August. Initially planned for June, the completion of report was delayed due to the late publication of the new science plan (mid May). Therefore, Bjorlykke could only present conclusions related to task 1.

He presented the timeline

-September 2010: ECORD Evaluation Committee appointed (7 members).

-November 2010: Meeting between EMA and the Committee Chair, to prepare the first Committee meeting

-February, 1st-3rd, 2011: 1<sup>st</sup> ECORD Evaluation Committee meeting with ECORD scientists and heads of the ECORD bodies (EMA, ESO, ESSAC).

-March 4th, 2011: Visit of a sub group to the core repository at MARUM, Bremen; focus on MSP operations

-June 1st, 2011: Presentation by the Chair of the 1st draft report at the ECORD Council meeting.

-June 15th, 2011: EMA collects comments from ECORD members on the 1<sup>st</sup> draft report

-July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2011: Final Evaluation committee meeting: 1) to finalize the first part of the report in the lights of inputs from the ECORD members comments 2) to discuss the New Science Plan and prepare for the writing of the second part of the report.

-August 2011: completion of the report

To facilitate the work of the committee, Stein and Mével identified 7 scientific topics that cover most of the IODP expeditions. Each of them was allocated an ECORD scientist responsible for providing information, as well as a committee member in charge of leading the evaluation.

Science topic	Scientist	Committee member
Ocean lithosphere	D. Teagle	J. Cann
Fluid flow	M. Riedel	M. Canals
Deep biosphere	K.-U. Hinrichs	K. Richardson
Seismogenic zone	A. Kopf	I. Kukkonen
Climate variability	C. Escutia	H. Oberhänsli
ACEX	J. Backman	A. Bjorlykke
Sea-level	G. Camoin	R. Eschard

Bjorlykke presented a first draft of the findings. General conclusions were very positive.

ACTION EMA: To collect comments from the ECORD Council members regarding the first draft of the ECORD evaluation report. Responses will be conveyed to the ECORD Evaluation Committee. The deadline for responses is June 15th, 2011.

*Henriet noted that it would have been valuable to organize a customer satisfaction survey to evaluate how the community perceives ECORD. To address the efficiency of MSP operations, de Leeuw asked if the committee has access to the PI reports. Mével explained that the committee relied on the "Operation Review" reports, prepared by a committee of experts appointed by IODP MI for each of the MSP expeditions. Bjorlykke added that the committee did not have the expertise to go into the technical details of operations. Stein raised the point that the ECORD structure is far simpler than the IODP structure. Bjorlykke responded that the distributed nature of ESO is difficult to understand. Mével responded that it can also be seen as strength. Gatliff reminded the concept of distributed that is being considered for the next phase*

**Wednesday, June 1<sup>st</sup>**  
**CLOSED SESSION**

**Agenda Item 18 – ESO budget (Robert Gatliff)**

(See ESO budget report by R. Gatliff at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

**ESO budget FY10.** Final statement for FY10 indicates smaller expenditures than originally budgeted resulting in a significant underspent by US\$307K in SOC's and US\$3,1M in POC's. ESO has not yet invoiced EMA by approximately US\$2,4M because it was not needed. Money was saved because the GBRF expedition cost less as ESO negotiated downtime due to bad weather at no cost.

**The FY11 budget** is nearly US\$4M. No drilling expedition will take place this year. Costs cover the preparation of the future mission, fixed costs for ESO, and the site survey necessary for Chicxulub expedition. The site survey will likely be implemented in FY12; however ESO needs to receive funds in advance to go for tender in FY11. Gatliff added that the current level of spending is relatively low because Leicester and Bremen have not invoiced BGS yet. Nevertheless, for FY11 ESO predicts a small underspent.

**For FY12, the total budget** amounts US\$13M, to prepare for the last expedition in FY13. ESO has already submitted a budget to IODP-MI. SOC's are higher than usual because they include the purchase of C-T scanner at a level of \$500k-\$700k. He reminded that purchase of equipment is traditionally supported by POC's and not SOC's. Therefore, IODP-MI may refuse to pay. If so, ESO will come back to the Council for advise on whether it can afford the scanner or not.

POC's amount to US\$10.1M. This budget secured in NERC's books will enable ESO to go for tender in FY2012 in order to operate a mission in FY2013. However, Mével explained that the ECORD budget in FY12 will not allow reaching that level. Only US\$ ~9.2M will be available. Gatliff explained that NERC would allow ESO to go for tender and to sign the contract only if the money is available. Mével reminded that a similar situation happened in the past and an arrangement with NERC was found.

Finally it was decided to allocate an ESO budget of US\$ 9.2M and if a problem arises with the tender, ECORD will approach NERC for commitment over FY13 budget. The allocation was later revisited to take into account the 50 k€ allocated to the new Magellan program (see infra).

**ESO budget FY11**

**2 Budget Summary Table**

Description	SOC	POC	Total
Management and Administration	\$ 839,071	\$ 286,593	\$ 1,125,664
Technical, Engineering and Science Support	\$ 1,562,556	\$ 9,857,625	\$ 11,420,181
Engineering Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Core Curation			
Subtotal Core Curation	\$ 83,429	\$ -	\$ 83,429
Subtotal DSDP/ODP Core Redistribution	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Data Management	\$ 336,884	\$ -	\$ 336,884
Publications	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Education	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outreach	\$ 140,700	\$ -	\$ 140,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,962,639</b>	<b>\$ 10,144,218</b>	<b>\$ 13,106,858</b>
Notes & currency conversions: 28 April 2011			
£1= \$1.65			
€1= \$1.47			

## ESO budget FY11-13

FY2011	Budget	Expenditure	Variance	Comments
SOCs	2524000			POCs include Chicxulub hazard survey costs. FY11 expenditure on track.
POCs	1538900			
<b>FY2012</b>				
SOCs	2962600			POCs include platform costs for FY2013 Expedition.
POCs	10144200			
<b>FY2013</b>				
SOCs	4285200			Expedition year.
POCs	4360000			

Multiple year comparison of ESO costs.

**Scenarios for the future MSPs Program Plan** are built upon the 6 MSP proposals residing at OTF. Gatliff briefly reviewed their status.

**Chicxulub:** ESO is challenging several issues dealing mostly with permitting but progress has been made. A meeting was held between Mexican proponents and the local authorities in Mexico and the overall response looks positive from the authorities. A next meeting with ESO is being arranged. Local authorities have expressed several requests among others- to establish a MoU between ECORD and Mexico, to develop a more detailed agreement setting the liabilities of each party - to invite Mexican scientists to contribute to the project. In parallel, proponents have submitted a proposal to ICDP. It would be a new opportunity for ECORD to collaborate with ICDP

**Hawaii:** Proponents plan to drill down to 100m. Therefore ESO is considering several operation scenarii among them a two-phase drilling implementation: firstly, the use of a seabed rock drill on a local ship with the hope that all science objectives can be fulfilled; if they are not, to drill the deeper holes with the JR at a later date.

**Coralgal Banks:** As recommended by SPC, ESO has not been scoping this proposal. But the proponents are investigating whether they can obtain additional funding from industry and stand very close to an agreement with FUGRO for a test hole. This agreement would lead to drill a hole at no cost for ESO. The proponents are also investigating the possibility to get funding from oil industry. If they are successful, this project would be the first MSP expedition supported by external funds under the CPP (Complementary Project Proposal) frame of IODP.

**Atlantic Massif** requests a seabed rock drill. It is envisaged to use both the MEBO and the BGS rock drill on the vessel James Cook (to be confirmed). BGS and MARUM staffs have met and discussions are well on-going. A PMT meeting is arranged with proponents in June to discuss technology issues, in particular associated with microbiology sampling.

**Baltic Sea:** The major concern is the variable water depth. Drilling holes in shallow waters could be done with a jack up rig but those in deeper waters would require a drill ship. However, it seems that FUGRO has a ship, currently drilling offshore Denmark that could be used to drill all holes.

**New England** remains in the "Holding Bin" because of technology issues related to water sampling.

**ESO has been asked by SPC to scope four proposals.** Project Management Team meetings already took place for Chicxulub and Hawaii. For Atlantic massif, the meeting is arranged for June 2011 and for Baltic Sea, the meeting will follow.

ESO will present its plans, with all the pros and cons for all 4 proposals, at the next OTF meeting (June 10-11, 2011 at BGS Edinburgh) and is hoping for a clear statement on MSP prioritization for the remainder of the program. Stein explained that prioritization could not be made at the last SPC meeting (March 2011) because only Baltic Sea and Atlantis massif were discussed and the panel was not enough informed about Chicxulub and Hawaii.

Gatliff reminded that the MSP proposals that will not be drilled in the current program have good chance to be drilled in the early phase of the new one.

Webb suggested holding back money from the current program around 3-4M\$ to begin planning the first two years of the new program as envisioned in the ECORD business plan. Webb underlined the absence of Arctic proposals in the system while the role of ECORD in the future is strongly built upon the scientific issues locked in the Arctic. The reason is the insufficient site survey data.

Verbruggen questioned on the cost for each proposal. The real cost will depend on the result of tendering, but Gatliff presented rough estimates:

- Chicxulub: ~US\$10 M, similar to the New Jersey expedition
- Hawaii: too difficult to predict as several scenarii are being studied,
- Atlantic Massif: ~US\$2M if a vessel is provided in kind. The US\$2M represents the cost of using the MEBO plus the Onshore Science Party.
- Baltic Sea: likely a little cheaper than Chicxulub.

If Chicxulub proved to be unfeasible, and if the tender for the Baltic sea proved to be cheaper, ESO would consider implementing a second, cheap, expedition.

#### Agenda Item 19 - ESSAC budget (Carlota Escutia)

Escutia put forward that the office relocation will not generate additional costs. For FY12, the request amounts to 158,000€, therefore at a level similar to previous ESSAC budgets. The salary level is regulated by the Spanish law. The office cost has slightly increased mostly because of the setting up of the new office (e.g. new computer) so it is specific to this first year. The University hosts the office for free, she added. For the others cost items there are no major deviations compared to past years.

#### ESSAC REQUESTED BUDGET FOR FY12

September 30 th, 2011 - October 1st, 2012

REQUESTED BUDGET FY 12	Budget FY12	Budget FY 11	Budget FY 10	Budget FY 09
<b>Salaries</b>				
Science coordinator's salary (12 months)	48,000.00 €	57,600.00 €	57,600.00 €	48,000.00 €
<b>Travel and subsistence costs</b>				
Science Coordinator	5,000.00 €	5,000.00 €	5,000.00 €	5,000.00 €
Chair	11,000.00 €	11,000.00 €	11,000.00 €	11,000.00 €
<b>Office costs</b>				
General office costs <sup>1</sup>	14,000.00 €	12,000.00 €	13,500.00 €	13,500.00 €
<b>Meetings</b>				
ESSAC October meeting <sup>2</sup>	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €
ESSAC May meeting <sup>2</sup>	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €	1,500.00 €
Travel support for speakers invited at ESSAC meetings <sup>3</sup>	4,000.00 €	2,000.00 €	4,000.00 €	4,000.00 €
<b>Additional Council activities</b>				
Support for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme	18,000.00 €	18,000.00 €	18,000.00 €	18,000.00 €
Workshop scientist support <sup>4</sup>	5,000.00 €	(Money left from FY10)	5,000.00 €	5,000.00 €
Summer Schools support	20,000.00 €	20,000.00 €	20,000.00 €	20,000.00 €
Summer school students	15,000.00 €	15,000.00 €	15,000.00 €	15,000.00 €
Conference 10 travel support <sup>5</sup>	5,000.00 €	3,000.00 €	5,000.00 €	10,000.00 €
ECORD Grants	10,000.00 €	10,000.00 €	10,000.00 €	-----
<b>ECORD CONTRIBUTION</b>	<b>158,000.00 €</b>	<b>156,600.00 €</b>	<b>167,100.00 €</b>	<b>152,500.00 €</b>

<sup>1</sup> Set up needs of ESSAC Office in Spain

<sup>2</sup> Support for ESSAC meetings

<sup>3</sup> Expedition reports, proposal presentations, workshop reports etc.

<sup>4</sup> Support for 'over-quota' participation of ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops and PPG - Student support for Arctic Workshop

<sup>5</sup> Travel support for keynote and invited speakers at the 10 ECORD Conference (EGU Session Vienna-EUROFORUM)

## Agenda Item 22 - ECORD budget (Catherine Mével)

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

EMA Budget in Euros	FY10 requested budget	FY10 expenses	FY11 requested budget	FY11 expenses provisional	FY12 IPGP Oct-Dec	FY12 CEREGE Jan-Sept	FY12 TOTAL
<b>salaries</b>							
compensation for the director	47,000	35,178	47,000		11,750	23,500	35,250
scientific coordinator (80%)	46,000	45,660	46,000		11,500	34 500	46 000
Assistant project manager	45,000	41,589	42,000		17,050	41 500	58,550
<b>Total</b>	<b>138,000</b>	<b>122,427</b>	<b>135,000</b>	<b>134,000</b>	<b>40,300</b>	<b>99,500</b>	<b>139,800</b>
<b>Travel</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>39,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>30 000</b>	<b>50 000</b>
<b>meetings</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>750</b>		<b>2 500</b>	<b>2 500</b>
<b>Consumables</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>4 000</b>	<b>5,000</b>
database	2,000	1,660	1,500	1,600		1,500	1,500
Other costs (publications, booths..)	15,000	19,000	18,000	27,130	3,000	16 000	19 000
<b>Support for SAS/ECORD meetings</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>7,000</b>		<b>7 500</b>	<b>7 500</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>199,087</b>	<b>216,500</b>	<b>214,480</b>	<b>64,300</b>	<b>161,000</b>	<b>225,300</b>
<b>overheads</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15 000</b>	<b>20 000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>245,000</b>	<b>219,087</b>	<b>236,500</b>	<b>234,480</b>	<b>69,300</b>	<b>176,000</b>	<b>245,300</b>

For FY12, EMA requests a budget of 245,300€. The FY11 balance is expected to be ~zero. FY12 budget is broken into two distinctive but complementary periods. From Oct. to Dec. 2011, the EMA office will be hosted at IPGP (Paris). As of 1<sup>st</sup> January 2012, Mével will retire and Camoin will take over the position of Director of EMA. The office will move to CEREGE, Aix en Provence.

Camoin explained that the cost of the assistant project manager is higher because the job description will be different. Otherwise, the costs are very similar to previous years.

**New dollars account and balance transfer.** The new account in dollars is now effective since early January 2011. Mével firstly underlined how difficult was the track to get the permission to open such account in a foreign currency. The procedure even required the approval of the France Ministry of Budget. Such authorization has never been granted before to any CNRS unit. The amount transfer from the euros account to the dollar account corresponds to the FY10 balance: € 2 867 818,76 exchanged into US\$ 3 963 804. Explanations were given on the calculation of that balance. **Incomes** amount to a total of 16 766 776,67 € including the FY09 carry over (1 879 926,64€) plus the FY10 contributions, except from Iceland, (14,7M€) plus a reimbursement from P. Pezard (150K€) for an advance made by EMA. She also commented the dramatic volatility of the exchange rate (€/€ from 1,20 to 1,50). **Expenses** amount to 13 898 958,00 € and encompassed invoices from BGS and NSF plus budget allocation to EMA (including a small advance for FY11), ESSAC (Advance for FY11) and the Evaluation Committee. She noticed that the **banking investment yields** (319 181,56) were not part of the balance calculation and so have not been transferred yet to the new account. From now on, all contributions will arrive on the dollar account.

**The balance was transferred to the Euro account in February: US\$ 3 963 804**

EXPENSES	USD	€	exchange rate
EMA		176 656,00	0,00
facture BGS	5 650 535,00	3 955 374,50	1,43
facture BGS	788 760,00	623 120,40	1,27
facture NSF	3 821 325,00	2 674 927,50	1,43
facture NSF	4 000 000,00	2 960 000,00	1,35
facture NSF	4 000 000,00	3 240 000,00	1,23
<b>Total</b>	<b>18 260 620,00</b>	<b>13 630 078,40</b>	

ADVANCE FY2011	USD	€	exchange rate
ESSAC		156 000,00	
EMA (1/3)		82 879,60	
Evaluation committee		30 000,00	
<b>Total</b>		<b>268 879,60</b>	

**Situation, December 2010**

	income	expenses	
carry over from FY09	1 879 926,64		
FY10	14 886 850,03		
FY10		13 898 958,00	
<b>balance</b>	<b>16 766 776,67</b>	<b>13 898 958,00</b>	<b>2 867 818,67</b>
<b>investment</b>			<b>319 181,56</b>

**Updates on the FY11 budget.** Mével shared concerns that some countries have not paid yet or have reduced their contribution.

- **Iceland** stopped paying after FY08, due to the financial crisis in the country. However, the good news is that Mével has been able to resume contact with the head of Rannis, Hallgrímur Jónasson. He is very positive. She noted that the contribution is only US\$ 30,000.

- **Denmark** has reduced its contribution from US\$ 200 000 to 170 000 because of a decrease in the budget at the Research council level.

- In **Italy**, only CNR will pay in FY11. OGS, CONISMA stopped paying last year and INGV this year. Consequently, the total contribution of Italy has decreased to US\$ 100 000. Mével emphasized that it will make the quota situation worse. Sacchi informed that CNR might increase its contribution up to US\$250-300K starting from FY2012 with the support of the Ministry.

- **Spain** and **Portugal** has not signed the FY11 Annex H. According to their representatives, the process is in progress and no cuts are foreseen. About Spain, Escutia explained that bureaucracy and regular procedure of negotiations occurring every year always slow down the Annex H signature. To skip that “stopper issue” in the next program, she suggested on behalf of Jose Ramon, to establish an MoU covering the whole program duration so that such document will be signed only once. Mével responded that it would be difficult for most countries, but there are other possibilities. For instance, for Finland, the Annex H is signed for several years. Escutia informed that Spain would continue to contribute at the same level.

**FY11 budget:**

	income	expenses
<b>FY10 balance</b>	<b>3,963,804</b>	
<b>FY11 contributions</b>	<b>21,816,654</b>	
ESO unpaid invoices FY10		2,446,653
SOCs to NSF <sup>(1)</sup>		14,275,959
ESSAC <sup>(2)</sup>		0
EMA <sup>(3)</sup>		196,834
ESO <sup>(4)</sup>		4,062,939
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25,780,458</b>	<b>20,982,385</b>
<b>FY11 balance</b>	<b>4,798,073</b>	

(1) = 16,800,000 - 2,524,041 (SOCs for ESO)

(2) = 156,000 €, advanced in 2010

(3) = 2/3, 1/3 was advanced in 2010

(4) = 1,538,898 (POCs) + 2,524,041 (SOCs)

	FY11 US \$
Austria	100,000
Belgium	30,000
Canada	500,000
Denmark	170,000
Finland	66,380
France*	6,070,274
Germany	5,600,000
Iceland	
Ireland	140,000
Italy	100,000
Netherlands	400,000
Norway	1,100,000
Portugal	90,000
Spain	762,000
Sweden	528,000
Switzerland	560,000
UK	5,600,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,816,654</b>

not signed	not paid
------------	----------

\*including compensation for FY10 deficit

Belgium, Canada and Denmark have now paid

**The FY12-FY13 budget** shows the potential POCs amount available in FY2013 to implement the last MSP of the programme, provided that every member pays its contribution. The amount is US\$13,2M.



contributions	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
Austria	100,000	100,000	200,000
Belgium	30,000	30,000	60,000
Canada	500,000	500,000	1,000,000
Denmark	170,000	170,000	340,000
Finland	66,380	66,380	132,760
France	5,600,000	5,600,000	11,200,000
Germany	5,600,000	5,600,000	11,200,000
Iceland			
Ireland	130,000	130,000	260,000
Italy	100,000	100,000	200,000
Netherlands	400,000	400,000	800,000
Norway	1,100,000	1,100,000	2,200,000
Portugal	90,000	90,000	180,000
Spain	762,000	762,000	1,524,000
Sweden	528,000	528,000	1,056,000
Switzerland	560,000	560,000	1,120,000
UK	5,600,000	5,600,000	11,200,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,336,380</b>	<b>21,336,380</b>	<b>42,672,760</b>

  

expenses	FY12	FY13	TOTAL
SOCs to NSF	16,800,000	16,800,000	33,600,000
EMA+ESSAC*	550,000	550,000	1,100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,350,000</b>	<b>17,350,000</b>	<b>34,700,000</b>

\* calculated at an exchange rate of 1.38

<b>available for POCs</b>	<b>3,986,380</b>	<b>3,986,380</b>	<b>7,972,760</b>
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

Total available for POCs	
<b>FY11 balance</b>	<b>4,797,852</b>
<b>investments*</b>	<b>446,854</b>
<b>FY12 - FY13</b>	<b>7,972,760</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,217,466</b>

### Magellan program

Mével reminded the proposal to support the continuation of the Magellan workshop series.

- A small committee chaired by Jochen Erbacher (current chair of the Magellan Steering committee) will be in charge of the evaluation of the proposals. The committee will consist of 5 members of which 4 from ECORD and 1 from ICDP.
- The German IODP office offers to manage the programme at no cost.
- The total budget requested is 60 000 €: 50,000 € from ECORD and 10,000 € from ICDP. Mével added that ICDP is very keen to participate.
- The management of the funds may either remains at EMA or be transferred to the German IODP office (to be decided).
- Regulations on the use of the funds will be set up by the ECORD executive in consultation with Uli Harms (ICDP) and Jochen Erbacher.

She specified that the budget of the ESF Magellan program was 90.000€ per year, but part of it was used to support ESF overheads.

After discussion, the council endorsed the proposal, with the understanding that 50 k€ will be a maximum.

The Council passed the following motion to approve the proposed budgets.

#### ECORD Council motion 11-01-3

ECORD council approves the principle to support the Magellan Plus programme. This programme will be co-funded by ECORD and ICDP and will support workshops to develop proposals for oceanic and continental drilling. A small committee chaired by Jochen Erbacher (IODP Germany) and composed of 4 ECORD and 1 ICDP representatives will be in charge of the evaluation of the proposals.

For FY12, ECORD Council allocates a maximum budget of 50 000 €. In addition, it is expected that ICDP will contribute 10 000 €. Regulations for the use of the funds will be set up by the ECORD executive in consultation with Uli Harms (ICDP) and Jochen Erbacher.

Jocher Erbacher will submit an annual activity report to the ECORD council.

*Webb moved, Escutia seconded, all in favour (11 votes: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and UK)*

ACTION EMA: contact Jochen Erbacher and Uli Harms to set up the committee

#### ECORD Council motion 11-01-4

ECORD Council approves the FY12 ESSAC budget at a level of Euros 158 000.

*Webb moved, Lüniger seconded, all in favor except one abstention (Escutia-Doti) (11 votes)*

**ECORD Council motion 11-01-5**

ECORD Council approves the FY12 EMA budget at a level of Euros 245 300. This budget includes salaries.

Webb moved, Lüniger seconded, all in favor (11votes)

**ECORD Council motion 11-01-6**

ECORD council approves the FY12 ESO budget at a level of US\$ 9 200 000. If a problem arises with the tender for the drilling platform to be used for the final MSP expedition, ECORD will approach NERC for commitment over FY13 budget.

Webb moved, Lüniger seconded, all in favor (11votes)

**Agenda Item 21 - ECORD business plan (Robert Gatliff / Mireille Perrin/ Catherine Mével)**

(See ECORD business plan report by R. Gatliff and M. Perrin at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

The Council discussed the revised version of the business plan.

Mével stressed two main aspects: i) ECORD aims at being a platform provider and as a result should provide at least US\$20M including at least US\$6M to the commingled funds; ii) they are no more SOC's and POC's as the general principle now is each platform provider has to cover the costs of its own platform.

She also stressed that negotiations have guaranteed ECORD, as a platform provider, 8 berths per cruise.

The financial model in the next phase is very different and allows ECORD to secure each year US\$14M for operating an MSP as opposed to the current US\$7M budget (POC's and SOC's). Therefore, the budget available should allow one expedition per year. The average cost of an expedition has been estimated over a 10 years period taking into account several variables. In particular, the type of expedition -Arctic, standard, seabed drill- strongly influences the cost. Prediction for the cost of an Arctic MSP (US\$ ~19 M) are based on the cost of ACES plus inflation. In conclusion, if the same level of contribution is maintained (\$21.5M), ECORD will be in a better shape to implement MSP expeditions. Gatliff added that considering these figures ECORD may also envision to allocate a small budget and conduct its own technological development program.

*De Leeuw asked on what precisely the activities funded under the commingled-funds are and whether the support for the Chikyu was no longer included. Mével replied that support to the Chikyu is not included.*

*Gatliff added it is more cost effective to implement an MSP every year because every year there is the same level of fixed costs either an expedition is in progress or not.*

*Webb commented the proposal to increase the 6M\$ contribution, where possible, to support the Japanese or US platform for projects of strategic importance to ECORD. This is in line with the concept of "opportunity fund" to be discussed at the next IWG+ meeting.*

Mével introduced the strategy to raise potential additional funds or in-kind contribution both directly (attracting new members, EC, national additional opportunity) or indirectly by encouraging the proponent to seek for others sources similarly to what it is done in ICDP. In that case, the distribution of berths and the conditions for the data access may have to be negotiated, however she stressed that an open data policy should remain the general principle.

Mével explained the concept of "Distributed European Infrastructure for Seafloor Sampling". The objective is to be more visible at the EU scale and not be confined to remain just a member of an international program. The aim is to build a network including the ESO partners as well as European research groups working on sub seafloor sampling and observatory technologies with the intent to establish a new centre of excellence for sub seafloor technologies. This fits with the outcome of the DS3F WP7 workshop. This network should seek to be recognized as an ESFRI's infrastructure.

The infrastructure envisaged would be able to implement drilling expeditions completely outside of IODP, to address topics of European priorities (example: Geohazards in the Mediterranean). For instance, if a group of scientist get an EC contract for research about the Nice landslide airport, they could ask for ESO to manage the operation.

The concept of MSP's will be enlarged to include seabed drills and long piston coring. Mével informed that this is already endorsed by the LAs but it has to be explained to the science community. This new "distributed infrastructure" is designed for an integrated approach covering drilling operations, data and cores management and access, sites survey, technology developments and transfers to industry, training and communications.



*Gatliff added that ESO has some containers of scientific equipment currently used for IODP expeditions and that could be made, in the next phase, at the disposal of research project funded by ECORD members, where not used under an IODP proposal. Equipment could be used on a national research vessel. Verbruggen added that was an excellent idea also because it will increase the visibility of ECORD-IODP in some countries who do not have a lot of berths. According to Gatliff it is also important for an EC infrastructure to provide such equipment with a necessary flexibility.*

*De Leeuw suggested that the executive summary of the business should better reflect the ECORD independency with respect to the IODP structure.*

*Barriga felt that the term "Subsurface" might be misleading for the community and preferred, instead, "sub seafloor". Mével replied that was envisaged originally but because the aim is to attract ICDP, the term subseafloor cannot suit. The name will be revised she concluded.*

*Henriet thought that the site survey activity should be presented with more caution because ECORD will not fund this activity. Mével added that ECORD aims at a better coordination of the research vessels for collecting site survey data.*

She then addressed the ECORD structure. The current structure should be maintained, although the recommendation of the ECORD evaluation Committee to assess it again should be addressed.

*Mével questioned Stein and Escutia how they feel about ESSAC playing a more pro-active role in participating in EU and national initiatives to take advantage of funding opportunities. They replied that it has to be made through specific steps and needs more discussion within the committee Camoin reminded that in the past an ESSAC sub-committee, called "strategies and vision", was tasked to address this matter. Webb added that the current FP7 has not been supporting drilling activities; therefore having ESSAC being more proactive would be extremely valuable.*

The last section deals with outreach and communication activity. It is planned to produce an annual report on the European contribution to the scientific achievements in IODP. A task force to seek co-funding opportunities from national and European funding agencies will be also established.

*To Henriet, ECORD needs to move toward the ESFRI list as fast as possible because since the Aurora Borealis was removed, others competing projects will try to fill the available space. Mével agreed and reminded that the concept of distributed infrastructure will be presented at the ESFRI symposium in June 2011. Henriet proposed to forward a 3 pages document on the infrastructure project very soon to the ESFRI committee.*

*De Leeuw suggested contacting the Marine Board either through J. Stuefer or directly N. McDonough. Henriet added that in the JPI "Oceans", one sub theme deals with seafloor mapping. It would be good to include the subseafloor.*

#### **ECORD Council consensus 11-01-2**

ECORD council approves the general content of the business plan. After editing, the final version will be distributed to the ECORD council members during the summer.

ACTION EMA: To finalize the business plan and to circulate it among the funding agencies.

ACTION EMA: to contact relevant groups in Europe (MARUM, ICDP, etc...) and initiate discussions regarding the "Distributed Infrastructure" project

Action EMA: To prepare a 3 page summary explaining the proposed "Distributed Infrastructure" project to be circulated towards the EC and the Marine Board.

#### **Agenda Item 22 – ECORD legal structure (Catherine Mével)**

(See ECORD status report by C. Mével at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Following the ECORD Council consensus 10-02-2, Mével informed on her meeting with the CNRS legal office about the legal structure issue. According to the legal office, the option of hiring a consultant is premature. The recommendation was that ECORD should first define the needs in term of management. This will be done once the business plan is finalized. The legal office also acknowledged the MoU as the cheapest structure. Any legal recognition of ECORD would bring additional costs. Mével suggested to the Council to assemble an ECORD sub committee responsible for listing the key issues and then Mével will come back to CNRS for legal advices and possibly to a consultant if necessary.

### **Agenda Item 23 - Situation in every ECORD member country.**

A round table allowed hearing the status of the renewal at the national level for each of the ECORD member country.

- Austria has not started discussions and will rely on the outcomes of the evaluation report.
- Spain is interested in renewing at the same financial level subject to the evaluation report. A multi-year MoU would facilitate internal administrative procedure.
- Portugal has reviewed its participation in ECORD. Several others scientific disciplines were asked to carry out a similar evaluation. Many programs had their budgets cut either completely or partially, but the budget for ECORD/IODP was maintained. He informed that the Portuguese government will change early June but normally the contribution is safe.
- In the UK, the participation in IODP was also reviewed. Despite the fact that the report strongly put forward the successful involvement in the program, it is very likely that the contribution will be cut because of the overall reduction in budgets. It is still unclear to what extent.
- Italy is keen on continuing in the next phase. Negotiations are on-going to increase the contribution in the future and at this point it looks promising. However, the Italian research system is being restructured and keys persons will rotate off in the next months.
- In Canada, an application will be submitted for participating in the next phase. 3 drivers will help towards a positive decision: 1) to be more involved in the current program, 2) to emphasize the Arctic based science in the next program, 3) to further develop industry partnership.
- Finland is very much in favour to continue. The Academy of Finland is even considering the option to double its contribution.
- Future of Belgium participation is still uncertain. Currently, the Belgium contribution comes from a scientific project – COCARDE – that will end late 2011. For beyond 2012, a new application needs to be submitted. Henriët reminded that he will retire late 2011 and will be no longer involved.
- In Germany, an assessment report and an application for participating over the next 5 years are under preparation. A response will come out by December 2011. Lüniger is confident that the same level of contribution will be approved.
- In France, the program is seen as a success and the decision will be taken next year. Given the overall budget situation at CNRS, it may be difficult, however, to remain at the same level.
- In Ireland, the overall budget situation is difficult and may affect any scientific program. Nevertheless Verbruggen is confident that the business plan and the evaluation report will positively impact on the negotiation. He also indicated that a multiyear MoU would help in securing the budget.

Mével reported for the countries not represented at the meeting but she was in communication with.

- In Sweden, discussions have not begun yet. According to Holtstam, the program is seen of great interest but the national effort to attract young researcher has not been very successful and that is seen as a concern. Therefore it might be difficult to remain at the same level.
  - In Norway O. Petersen reported that it will be difficult to remain at the same level, given the relatively low level of involvement of the science community
  - For the Netherlands, de Leeuw informed that results are very positive and the same level would be likely kept.
- Denmark, Iceland and Switzerland have not responded yet.

### **Agenda Item 24 - Discussion on IWG+ activities and preparation for the June 2011 meeting (C. Mével)**

After discussion, the ECORD passed the following consensus.

#### **ECORD Council consensus 11-01-3**

ECORD Council is in favor of allocating the \$ ~2M savings from the commingled funds budget FY11 to support JR operations in FY12. However the Council tasks the ECORD representatives at the IODP council to request more transparency in the IODP commingled funds budget.

#### **ECORD Council consensus 11-01-4**

In preparation for the IWG+ meeting, the following statements will be sent to NSF and MEXT:

- As a consortium, ECORD needs to consider the concerns of its member countries. If one country fails to fund the next phase, there is a risk of domino effect
- ECORD considers that it will be a major challenge in the current economic climate to meet the \$20m pa target but ECORD is committed to try (via direct funding and leverage of additional funds) and seek for the status of platform provider. However ECORD does not anticipate at this time being able to contribute more than \$6m pa

to commingled funds.

- MSPs are essential to all ECORD member countries.
- To address a wide range of the science goals listed in the New Science Plan, the JOIDES Resolution regularly operating in all oceans is essential to all ECORD member countries
- ECORD welcomes the unique contribution to deep scientific drilling that is offered by the Chikyu
- ECORD supports the general principle that each platform provider covers the costs of its own platform and cannot commit to fund other platforms on a regular basis
- The commingled funds must be used in priority to support core integrative activities. A high level of transparency in the accounting of commingled funds will be essential.
- If there is a surplus of commingled funds, ECORD supports the concept of « opportunity funds ». These may be used to support a platform for a specific expedition, specific instrumentation (for example CORKs), engineering development, etc... A clear definition of "opportunity funds" and of the decision making process for their utilisation is required.

Action EMA: To send the statements to NSF and MEXT before the IWG+ meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 25 - Next ECORD council meeting (Mireille Perrin)**

##### **ECORD Council consensus 10-01-5**

The next ECORD Council meeting will be organised in Granada, Spain, November 2-3, 2011. The local host will be Carlota Escutia-Doti. The meeting is planned for one and a half day.