

ECORD Council Meeting #20
November 2-3, 2011
Parque de las Ciencias (Science Museum)
Granada, Spain

MINUTES

Approved at the ECORD Council Meeting # 21 held in Helsinki on 5-6 June 2012.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<i>MEMBERS</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>EMAIL</i>
Belgium	Jean-Pierre Henriet	jeanpierre.henriet@ugent.be
Canada	Anne de Vernal	devernal.anne@uqam.ca
Denmark	Marit-Solveig Seidenkrantz	mss@geo.au.dk
Finland	Jenni Virtanen	jenni.virtanen@aka.fi
France	Mireille Perrin	mireille.perrin@cnrs-dir.fr
Germany	Guido Lüniger	guido.lueniger@dfg.de
Iceland	Eiríkur Stephensen	eirikur.st@rannis.is
Ireland	Koen Verbruggen	Koen.Verbruggen@gsi.ie
Italy	Marco Sacchi	marco.sacchi@iamc.cnr.it
Netherlands	Josef Stuefer	j.stuefer@nwo.nl
Norway	Øyvind Pettersen	op@rcn.no
Portugal	Fernando Barriga	f.barriga@fc.ul.pt
Spain	José Ramon Sanchez-Quintana	jose.sanchezq@micinn.es
Switzerland	Martina Kern-Lütschg	mkern@snf.ch
UK	Michael Webb	mweb@nerc.ac.uk
<i>OBSERVERS</i>		
IMI BoG*	Gerold Wefer	gwefer@marum.de
SIPCOM	Jan de Leeuw	Jan.de.Leeuw@nioz.nl
ESO	Robert Gatliff	rwga@bgs.ac.uk
ESSAC	Carlota Escutia Dotti	cescutia@ugr.es
ESSAC	Julia Gutierrez Pastor	iact_essac.office@iact.ugr-csic.es
EMA	Catherine Mevel	mevel@ipgp.fr
EMA	Mohamed Amine Benchikh	benchikh@ipgp.fr
EMA	Gilbert Camoin	camoin@cerege.fr
IODP-MI	Kiyoshi Suyehiro	ksuyehiro@iodp.org
NSF	Rodey Batiza	rbatiza@nsf.gov
MEXT	Shingo Shibata	shibata@mext.go.jp

MEXT	Shin Ichi Kuramoto	s.kuramoto@jamstec.go.jp
JAMSTEC	Wataru Azuma	azumaw@jamstec.go.jp
Marine Board	Niall McDonough	NMcDonough@esf.org
Israel	Nicolas Waldmann	nwaldmann@univ.haifa.ac.il

<i>Apologies</i>		
<i>MEMBERS</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>EMAIL</i>
Austria	Reinhard Belocky	belocky@fwf.ac.at
Sweden	Dan Holtstam	dan.holtstam@vr.se
<i>OBSERVERS</i>		
IMI BoG	Mathilde Cannat	cannat@ipgp.fr
IMI BoG	John Ludden	jludden@bgs.ac.uk
ICDP	Uli Harms	ulrich@gfz-potsdam.de
Russia	Alexander Matul	amatul@ocean.ru
Brazil	Cristiano Chiessi	chiessi@usp.br

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 ³ F	Deep-Sea and Sub-Seafloor Frontiers project
EB	Executive Board
EC	European Commission
ECORD	European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling
EDP	Engineering Development Panel
EGU	European Geosciences Union
EMA	ECORD Managing Agency
EMAR2ES project	European MARine MARitime REsearch and Science project
EOR	Expedition Objective Research
ERIC	European Research Infrastructure Consortium
ERICON Aurora Borealis	European Polar Research Icebreaker Consortium - Aurora Borealis
ESF	European Science Foundation
ESFRI	European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures
ESO	ECORD Science Operator
ESSAC	ECORD Science Support and Advisory Committee
EUROCORES	European Collaborative Research
EuroMARC	EUROCORES programme Challenges of Marine Coring Research
FP8	Eighth framework programme
FY	Fiscal Year
GBREC	Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes
ICDP	International Continental Scientific Drilling Program
ILP	ECORD Industry Liaison Panel

INSU-CNRS	Institut National des Sciences de l'Univers, France
INVEST	IODP New Ventures in Exploring Scientific Targets
IODP	Integrated Ocean Drilling Program
IODP-MI	IODP Management International, Inc.
IOs	Implementing Organizations
ISP	Initial Science Plan for the IODP
IWG+	International Working Group +
JAMSTEC	Japan Marine Science & TEchnology Center
JR	Joides Resolution
KIGAM	Korea Institute of Geosciences and Mineral Resources
K-IODP	Korea Integrated Ocean Drilling Program)
LAs	Lead Agencies
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
MARCOM project	Towards an Integrated Marine and Maritime Science Community project
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology
MISTRALS	Mediterranean Integrated Studies at Regional And Local Scales
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSPs	Mission-specific platform
NanTroSEIZE	Nankai Trough SEIsmogenic Zone Experiment
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council, UK
NIOZ	Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research
NJSS	New Jersey Shallow Shelf
NSF	National Science Foundation, USA
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
ODP	Ocean Drilling Program
OGS	Istituto Nazionale di Oceanograpfia 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
TerMEx	Terra-Mediterranean Earth Science Experiment
TUMST	Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology
USAC	U.S. Science Advisory Committee
USIO	U.S. Implementing Organization
USSP	U.S. Science Support Program
WP	Work Package

Wednesday, November 2

OPEN SESSION

Agenda Item 1. Welcome and logistical information (C. Escutia-Dotti/A. de Vernal)

The meeting was hosted by Carlota Escutia at Parque de las Ciencias (Science Museum) in Granada.

Mével presented apologies from Dan Holtstam (Sweden), Reinhard Belocky (Austria), Uli Harms (ICDP), Alexander Matul (Russia) and Cristiano Chiessi (Brazil).

Anne de Vernal asked if there was any modification for the agenda. With no modification, the agenda was approved.

Agenda Item 2. Welcome address (Menchu Comas)

On behalf of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science, Menchu Comas welcomed the participants to Granada. She expressed her pleasure to open this meeting and reminded how much she has enjoyed being involved in ocean drilling in the past.

She reminded about the constant involvement of Spain in IODP. She informed that both the ESSAC and the IODP Spain offices are hosted in the University of Granada while the management structure is in Madrid at the Ministry.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Montreal meeting minutes (A. de Vernal)

ECORD Council motion 11-02-1

ECORD Council approves the minutes of the Montreal meeting (ECORD Council meeting #19) with minor modifications.

Perrin moved, Henriët seconded, all in favour (*15 votes: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, UK*).

Agenda Item 4. Review of Montreal meeting actions (A. de Vernal)

A. de Vernal reviewed the actions passed by the Council at its last meeting in Montreal.

- ACTION EMA: modify the Annex C to the ECORD MoU accordingly and

- distribute it to all ECORD member countries. *Done*
- 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). *Done (agenda item #10)*
 - 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. *Done*
 - ACTION EMA: contact Jochen Erbacher and Uli Harms to set up the committee
Done (agenda item #10 and 12)
 - ACTION EMA: To finalize the business plan and to circulate it among the funding agencies. *On hold – needs to be revised when the new framework is decided*
 - ACTION EMA: to contact relevant groups in Europe (MARUM, ICDP, etc..) and initiate discussions regarding the “Distributed Infrastructure” project. *Done (agenda item#10)*
 - Action EMA: To prepare a 3 page summary explaining the proposed “Distributed Infrastructure” project to be circulated towards the EC and the Marine Board. *In progress*
 - Action EMA: To send the statements to NSF and MEXT before the IWG+ meeting. *Done.*

Agenda Item 5 . NSF report (R. Batiza)

Rodey Batiza, Program Director of Division of Ocean Sciences, reported on the situation at NSF towards the future of the US in IODP.

He firstly informed on an NSF/GEO meeting held in October with Tim Killeen, Assistant Director for GEO and David Connover, Division Director for Ocean Sciences (GEO/OCE). Batiza explained that IODP is competing with others excellent US science programs in a tight budget situation for research. Three budget scenarii are being considered: the best one is to maintain the current level and the worse is a 10% cut. It is obvious that any drop will affect NSF, and as a consequence GEO programs including IODP. Batiza added that Subra Suresh, NSF Director, is well informed about scientific ocean drilling and this could play in favour of IODP in case of budget pressure. A meeting is planned between GEO staff and Suresh in January 2012 to brief him on the report issued by the Advisory Committee for geosciences (AC-GEO).

To commit to the next phase, NSF needs a long-term viable business model for the JOIDES Resolution. Batiza stressed that 12 months of JR operation remain the top priority. He presented a budget table of JR funding showing a total operation costs ranging from USD 65M for 8 months of operations per year to USD 71M for 12 months. NSF expects to receive support from international partners from USD 19.5M to USD 21.5M of which USD 9M from ECORD. If there is less money available, the number of expeditions will be decreased. In addition to the funding of the JR operations, NSF will fund the science support at the national level (USD 13-17M).

He presented a detailed timeline showing all steps leading to the renewal post 2013-IODP. The timeline is very tight.

A workshop is planned in early 2012 in Denver to discuss the prioritization of the New Science Plan within the US community, as recommended by the National Research Council (NRC) review. NRC reviewed the achievements of the past 40 years of scientific drilling and assessed the New Science Plan. The review, now released, is very positive. However, it recommends prioritizing the NSP in the light of the funding situation. The critical step is the meeting of the National Science Board (NSB), which will deliver the final decision on the renewal. The meeting is planned mid 2012. NSB asked NSF to provide a complete package of information before April 2012.

He concluded with adding that NSF wants to be 100% transparent in budget considerations with its IODP partners.

Mével expressed her concern to see NSF anticipating an ECORD contribution of USD 9M while Batiza was informed that ECORD could not go over USD 6M. Batiza confirmed that 6M are OK, and will allocate 8 berths on every expedition. Gatliff asked when NSF would make its final decision on the renewal of the US in the program with decided budget level. The milestone is the NSB meeting replied Batiza, therefore June 2012. Henriët asked whether NSF investigated other US institutions as potential financiers, referring in particular to foundations that are quite numerous in the US. Batiza replied that several actions are carried out both by NSF and the Consortium for Ocean Leadership (CoL). He stressed that CoL does lobbying activities to the Congress to influence ocean policy including scientific ocean drilling, investigates potential new members in the US, performs investigations on commercial work for the JR. He added that NSF looks towards Foundations and gave the example of the ongoing JR expedition "Mid-Atlantic Microbiology" where the deployment of CORKS observatories was paid by a foundation and represents nearly US\$6M, therefore a significant amount of money.

Agenda Item 6. MEXT report (S. Shibata / Shin Ichi Kuramoto)

(See MEXT report by S. Shibata and Shin Ichi Kuramoto at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Shingo Shibata and Shin Ichi Kuramoto reported on MEXT status.

MEXT greatly welcomed the ECORD letter expressing the ECORD strong will to collaborate with Japan to conduct Chikyu projects.

MEXT considers the new architecture acceptable, with an overarching umbrella to maintain the program unity and a streamlined international SAS. An international framework is essential for a long term vision, especially for Chikyu projects. The new platform independence led MEXT to set up a new business model for Chikyu, still under development.

They introduced the plans for the Chikyu, from the end of the current phase to the early phase of the new one. The completion of the NanTroSEIZE project is likely to go beyond 2013. After that, MEXT is investigating future potential target areas and is interested in conducting drilling operations in North Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea. The Mantle project is the other main objective for the next Chikyu program, but it is not ready to go. Costs were estimated for 3 scenarios but there are still uncertainties (depending in particular on the selected site, off Mexico or Hawaii). The lowest cost would amount USD 500M without engineering development. It is clearly a very costly project but if successful it will be a major milestone. For the future, MEXT is planning to combine long complex riser projects with smaller non-riser projects in the same area. This would make mob/demobilisation more cost-effective. MEXT would like to encourage the ECORD community to submit proposals and offers to be present at the EGU booth to explain the technological capacities of the Chikyu.

MEXT developed a new Chikyu policy, more flexible and financially viable. The policy is based on an independent and project-based approach. The membership policy is characterized by three partnerships categories with associated rights and benefits (including offshore and onshore). Partners will be sought among IODP partners, private companies, academia, and countries.

In the difficult economic situation, MEXT is facing a budget cut (of ~10%). The budget allocated to Chikyu will only allow three months of drilling per year. Commercial contracts as well as contributions from international partners will allow increase the drilling time.

The current Chikyu status was presented. The vessel hull was repaired in June 2011. Chikyu is presently performing a commercial contract off Sri Lanka with one thruster less. The project is likely to be delivered in time to make the vessel available for IODP work from April 2012. The new thruster will be installed in May 2012. IODP work will consist of the Rapid Response Drilling (following the Tohoku earthquake), Shimokita coal bed and NanTroSEIZE riser drilling project.

Mével expressed concerns that MEXT model is still under development and therefore there is a risk of delaying the finalisation of the international framework. She also insisted on the need to encourage the community to submit proposals at the earliest (especially for Chikyu long-term project). Shibata replied that MEXT agreed on the international framework and regarding the Chikyu business model there are only few minor details to finalize. De Leeuw questioned on the Chikyu transit time especially on how MEXT would combine IODP work - for instance a 2 years project in the Mediterranean Sea -, with potential commercial contracts elsewhere. MEXT replied that they would draw up the ship schedule accordingly and reassure that it would not be done at the expense of the program

De Leeuw recommended to advertise very early the coming of the Chikyu in a particular region in order to trigger the interest of the scientific community even at a local scale so that they could start writing proposals. Azuma agreed and specified that it is the aim of his coming at the ECORD booth during EGU 2012. Azuma insisted that European scientists should have a clear understanding of the riser capability if IODP wants to see good proposals. He added that riser drilling down to 2-3km takes only 3 months in average and therefore over 10 months period there is time for other projects. Batiza explained that the intention of USIO is to announce 3-4 years in advance the ship track of the JR. The aim is to generate good proposals, provide time for site surveys and minimize transit costs. Wefer acknowledged that the community is not fully aware of what the Chikyu is able to perform not only with riser and put forward the Rapid Response Drilling project as an example of non-riser project. The concept of Chikyu dedicated workshops supported by ECORD is an excellent idea. Henriet questioned on the contract between NSF and the company that owns the JR. Batiza reminded that the JR was owned by ODL, a joint venture between TransOcean and the Norwegian company SIEM. Recently TransOcean sold its shares to SIEM that fully owns the vessel now. NSF contract was transferred to SIEM with the present day rate that is running until 2013, with the option to continue after that. From 2013 to 2023 the day rate will decrease because the loan for the JR refit that is currently charging the day rate will be entirely paid off. He concluded by saying it is an excellent contract.

ACTION EMA: to provide CDEX the opportunity to advertise Chikyu technological relevance to the ECORD scientific community at the EGU 2012 booth/ townhall meeting.

Agenda Item 7. Board of Governors report (G. Wefer)

(See BoG report by G. Wefer at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Gerold Wefer, Chair of the IODP-MI Board of Governors (BoG), reported on the activities of the BoG. The last BoG meeting was held in Amsterdam on June 16th, 2011. One important item was the election of a renewed BoG structure: Chair, executive committee and committee members. For the first time the BoG is chaired by an ECORD member (Gerold Wefer). Among main activities, BoG disbanded SASEC, gave its position on SIPCom's ToR, approved the annual plan and the membership of the selection committee for SIPCOM and PEP chairs. Next meeting is scheduled during the AGU 2011 in San Francisco and will include a special session between the national funding agencies of the IOs and the BoG members.

Agenda Item 8. IODP-MI report (K. Suyehiro)

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

Dr. Kiyoshi Suyehiro, President of IODP-MI, opened his presentation with the SAS status. New SAS has started operating since 1st October 2011. SIPCom and PEP were provided with the approved ToRs. The chairs and members have been appointed. Their first meetings are now scheduled. ToRs are downloadable at the IODP website. ECORD has 24 representatives seating in the SAS committees and panels. He stressed that the big difference from IODP-MI prospective is that now SAS is external to IODP-MI.

Ships schedules were introduced for the remainder of IODP. For FY12, JR has 4 expeditions planned with periods of ship maintenance. Chikyu's plan is three expeditions including NanTroSEIZE starting in late FY12-early FY13. No MSP expedition is planned in FY12 except for the Chicxulub hazard site survey. FY13 planning is still provisional. JR is expected to move towards the Indian Ocean. A workshop on drilling in the Indian Ocean was held in Goa, on 17-18 October 2011 and Suyehiro underlined how scientists were excited to see the JR coming over there. Chikyu will continue implementing NanTroSEIZE and even though it is unlikely to reach the plate boundary during this phase, it remains an objective for the next

program. The last MSP expedition will be the Baltic Sea, with Chicxulub as a potential alternate.

A brief overview of IODP-MI staffs working in Washington and Tokyo was presented.

IODP-MI keeps working to attract new partners. IODP-MI met contacts in Brazil and Taiwan this year and both countries still look very keen on joining the program. Indonesia representatives were met in Tokyo and during the workshop in Goa. There is no real progress with Russia. South Africa was approached.

IODP-MI was awarded USD 500k from the Sloan Foundation to help set up a “scoping office” to conduct scoping activity for scientific crust/mantle drilling (BEAM project). For this purpose, IODP-MI hired the consultant Holly Given. The first Scoping Group meeting is planned during AGU on December 7th, 2011. The plan is to produce several studies (SWOT analysis scheduled early 2012, implementation plan, science plan...) with the aim to gain support from the public, science community and funding agencies to stand up with this Moho challenge. He also informed that the proponents of the current Moho proposal would be asked to update their proposal.

Mével encouraged ECORD members to provide name of senior scientists to be involved in the SWOT analysis – as requested by Suyehiro. Henriët questioned whether IODP-MI is seeking external funding for specific projects at the regional level. Suyehiro replied that IODP-MI is trying to investigate such collaboration and he mentioned the Shimokita project as a successful example of CPP (complementary project proposal, co-funded from outside sources at a level of 70%). Suyehiro added that China is preparing a CPP in South China Sea. Suyehiro also stressed that if IODP-MI won the call for hosting the planning office in the new phase, only one office would be maintained. According to him, a certain level of integrated activities should be maintained in the next phase.

Agenda Item 9. SASEC report (J. De Leeuw, chair of SIPCOM)

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

Jan de Leeuw, Chair of SIPCOM, reported on the last SASEC meeting held in Amsterdam, in June and subsequent discussions before disbandment.

During the SASEC meeting, the New Science plan was publicized at an international press conference.

Regarding the new proposal submission process, the guidelines have been drafted and the role and place of workshop concept inserted into. The document was approved and is now available on the IODP website. SASEC received two workshops proposals. One of them was for the GOLD project. This proposal was not funded because, although the science is promising, the technical aspect was only partially addressed. But he reminded that SASEC acknowledges the obvious interest to drill in the Mediterranean Sea. The new SAS structure was discussed with the approval of the ToRs as well as the place of engineering development. It was decided not to appoint a specific permanent panel. Engineering development will be addressed at the IO level. However this can be subject to modification in the future.

SASEC discussions also focused on which MSP will be the last one of the program. It was decided to wait for SPC decision. SPC later reached the consensus on drilling the Baltic Sea in 2013 and Chicxulub in 2014. SPC also recommended developing collaboration with ICDP around Chicxulub in order “to maximize the impact of this effort”, and to operate Atlantis Massif proposal as a second MSP for FY13 if enough funds are available. De Leeuw informed on the Rapid Response Drilling project that was strongly supported by SASEC at its June meeting as well as by SPC, which, decided in August to forward the JFAST proposal to OTF.

SASEC is willing to develop collaborations and linkages to other scientific and international initiatives, not only with ICDP and DCO (ongoing) but also with organizations such as PAGES and OOI. De Leeuw attended the Science Steering Committee of PAGES where he represented IODP in July 2011. A next meeting between ICDP-IODP-PAGES is planned on December 2011.

The budget for the Annual Program Plan FY12 was approved by SASEC. However concerns were expressed on how the budget is laid out. According to SASEC, what is missing in the budget is the information about incomes flows, i.e. how much each contributor provides and how the money is channelled to IODP-MI, platform operators...SASEC recommends that in the future SIPCOM has a wider overlook on finance flows.

Wefer specified that the POC/SOC system is by nature complex to monitor and recognized that a unique office in Washington would considerably help to simplify the money flow follow-up. Suyehiro stressed that IODP-MI only handles SOC's and that how the SOC's are spent is explained in the APP. He added that the spirit of commingled-fund is to have a common pot fed by different contributors. Mével recognized that the APP is very detailed and all the information regarding expenses is there. What is unclear is the information regarding the income flow, and

the problem comes from the LAs and not IODP-MI. She insisted that SOC flow transparency is crucial for ECORD as it is the main SOC contributor. Suyehiro explained that IODP-MI budget was US\$5-6 M of which half is personal costs.

Agenda Item 10. EMA report (C. Mével)

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

Catherine Mével informed Council on EMA activities.

She briefly revised all meetings she attended including EC meetings (EC projects, ESFRI, Marine Board).

She summarized ECORD outreach activities as well as past and future ECORD participation at international events with a booth: Goldschmidt conference, Halifax Arctic conference, AGU, EGU.

The ECORD Newsletter #17 is now posted on the ECORD website and will be distributed at the AGU Fall meeting in San Francisco. EMA will soon release the 2012 ECORD calendar. Several promotion materials will be updated with the new EMA and ESSAC office information. Preparation for the ECORD VIP event at the JR Lisbon portcall (January 18th, 2012) is well ongoing and a first draft agenda was presented. To date, she has very little return and reminded the Council to provide her more names of persons to invite. Other activities will include a press conference as well as tours of the ship for the general public/students.

The MSP video, short and long version, is now available on ECORD website.

C. Mével reported on the DS3F project. She will attend an “overarching workshop” of the 9 work packages planned on November in Brussels. The big final conference is planned next March in Sitjes (Spain) with the aim to finalize and advertise the DS3F roadmap. ECORD community as well as high representatives from the funding agencies are encouraged to attend.

Mével was invited to give a presentation at the ESFRI symposium (Brest, June 2011) on the European Scientific Drilling Infrastructure concept and its benefits at the EU level.

She was also invited to present ECORD at the open session of the Marine Board in Madrid in October. She mentioned that the Baltic Sea proposal raised strong interest among the representatives of the BONUS program. More information will be provided to BONUS representatives with the aim of publicizing the expedition.

In parallel ECORD is preparing a short document explaining the concept of distributed Infrastructure to the EC and liaising activities with potentials

partners has started. On October 2011 Mével and Kopf met H. Péro, Head of Research Infrastructures at the EC. He informed them that there will be no opening of the ESFRI roadmap next year. The EC wants to see the existing projects consolidated before adding new ones. The ESFRI committee is being reshaped and is looking for experts. There is an opportunity for ECORD member countries to propose experts that understand our science and council members are recommended to work on that at the national level. Carlos Martinez, from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, has been appointed as the chair of the working group on Environment. *Verbruggen suggested circulating as soon as possible the draft of the distributed infrastructure among ECORD members in order to convince at the national level people interested in joining the new ESFRI committee. Sanchez-Quintana intends to meet with Carlos Martinez and will report to Mével on the outcome.*

Péro also recommended ECORD to play the international card. A meeting of the GSO (Group of Senior Officials) is scheduled Nov 9-10th, in Cape Town, to discuss coordination of Research Infrastructures at the international level, under the frame of G8+5. At this meeting, the plan is to define a few pilot projects to develop international collaboration. IODP could be promoted as a test case. Mével reminded that this needs to be done at the national level, however, it has proven difficult to find the right contacts.

Mével reported on new developments regarding possible co-funded MSP projects

A group of scientists (led by Edimburgh University Heriot Watt University and BGS) willing to respond to an EC call for 'Sizable pilot tests for CO2 geological storage' has contacted ESO. The plan is to drill a hole off shore for monitoring and experimentation. This project could be implemented by ESO and could be the first example of a co-funded MSP project (ECORD+EC funds). With the agreement of the ECORD executive, EMA wrote a letter of support for the pre-proposal submitted by the group. In parallel, the group will prepare an IODP proposal.

The MSP proposal to drill and monitor the Nice landslide, submitted to IODP, was not ranked highly enough to be forwarded to OTF. The proponents are now seeking for funding from French regional authority. If they are successful, the project could be implemented by ESO as co-funded MSP project.

Henriet was concerned that ECORD should not help a particular team at the expense of other potential proponents because it gives them a competitive advantage. It was concluded that the whole European community should be made aware of the possibility to develop joint projects with ECORD.

The ECORD Evaluation Report is now finalized and under printing. Copies will be distributed widely to ECORD members. She presented the main conclusions from the Committee that are in general very positive.

ACTION EMA: to distribute copies of the ECORD Evaluation report among ECORD members

ACTION EMA: To prepare a 4 pages summary of the ECORD Evaluation report

The establishment of the Magellan+ program has made significant progress: ECORD and ICDP have agreed on the ToRs, the structure of the committee and the money flow. More was discussed under ESSAC presentation.

Mével informed the committee that she will retire in 2012. Gilbert Camoin will take over the ECORD managing Agency and the office will move to CEREGE, Aix en Provence on January 1st 2011. Gilbert Camoin has appointed Milena Borrissova as the assistant director. Camoin stressed that CEREGE will provide two administrative persons to support him and for free to the program.

Henriet gave information on a future JPI OCEANS. The JPI is still under preparation. He suggested ECORD to contact the Marine Board and promote the insertion of sub-seafloor as a topic. As a member of the Marine Board, Stuefer said he will strive to include sub-seafloor topic in the JPI' strategic research agenda currently in preparation. McDonough reminded that the next framework program will be finalized soon and contacts should be developed as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 11. ECORD Industry liaison panel: Halifax conference (C. Mével/R. Gatliff)

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

ECORD ILP activity was concentrated on participating in the 3PArctic Conference in Halifax (30 August- 2 September 2011) to develop contacts with industry. An IODP session and a booth were organized. The Arctic brochure was widely distributed. The feedback was very positive. The next step is to offer collaboration on existing IODP proposals in areas of interest to industry. It was clear at the meeting that there are overlaps both geographically and scientifically between Industry and ECORD interests. Gatliff added that one remaining issue is the lack of site survey data. The outcome of the workshop currently being held in Copenhagen will be crucial. Another critical issue concerns the perception of ECORD being

linked with industry for Arctic exploration. This question has to be considered seriously.

Henriet questioned whether the JOIDES Resolution is able to go to the Arctic. Batiza replied the vessel is a class A and therefore it cannot go into ice infested areas. Escutia added that JR needs better instrumentation to monitor ice distribution. With such improvements, the vessel could go into some areas if accompanied with an icebreaker.

Agenda Item 12. ESSAC report (C. Escutia-Dotti)

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

Carlota Escutia reported on ESSAC activities.

ESSAC Office moved to Granada as of 1st October 2011. The new ESSAC Chair, Carlota Escutia introduced Julia Gutierrez Pastor as the new Scientific Coordinator.

Escutia informed Council on the platform schedules for FY12, as discussed at SPC meeting in Sendai (22-24 August 2011). JR has 4 expeditions planned of which the Mediterranean Outflow that has two ECORD co-chiefs. Chikyu will implement 3 expeditions including the “Japan Trench Fast Drilling Project », rapid response to the Tohoku earthquake, as well as the continuation of NanTroSEIZE that will be mostly implemented over FY13. So far NanTroSEIZE has achieved 8 expeditions but very deep riser drilling is still to perform, down to 7km below the sea floor.

In FY12, no MSP expedition is planned to implement one or two expeditions in FY13 (Baltic Sea and possibly Atlantis Massif if there is money available).

ESSAC has issued several Calls for applications to sail: FY12 expeditions calls are now closed and ESSAC has completed the selection of ECORD scientists for expeditions 339, 340 and 341, and the staffing is still in progress. Regarding FY13, three calls are still open until late December. The Rapid Response Drilling (JFAST) project has a very short call duration because it was scheduled very recently.

Statistics on the proposals in the system show a good ECORD participation to the program: 27 out of 81 active proposals are ECORD led and involve 325 ECORD proponents. A few proposals (3) require the combination of MSP and non-riser drilling.

She introduced the ESSAC consensus stating that the Committee is fully supporting the ECORD Council efforts to establish the future program with

both an international unity and independent platforms operators.

After having presented the status of staffing, she put forward the quota balance issues. Two countries remain of concern because of under quota: France and Norway. For France the situation is getting better. Regarding Norway, she worried that the ESSAC delegate is regularly missing the meetings and cannot help improve the situation. Escutia also urged Iceland to send a delegate at the ESSAC meetings. She reminded that the co-chiefs are counted in the quota calculation. She also reminded that several charts and statistics are available and can be sent to ECORD Council members if needed.

She presented the ECORD membership in the new SAS. ECORD has a total of 24 representatives. Moreover, SIPCom and PEP are chaired by ECORD scientists (Jan de Leeuw and Dirk Kroon respectively). Calls for applications will be issued soon to replace several SAS members who have to rotate by 2012.

The 2011 summer schools held in Bremen and Urbino were very successful and welcomed students from non-ECORD countries. For 2012, a third summer school is scheduled in Canada and the Bremen school will deal with earthquakes and tsunamis. ESSAC will issue soon the call for hosting the 2013 summer schools session with a deadline for April 2012. 14 out of 50 scholarship applications were granted (including one in Brazil and one in Russia) to help participate in the summer schools. The call for 2012 will be sent out by late 2011. She reminded that the budget for summer schools 2012 is € 20K and € 15K for scholarships. ECORD Research Grants 2011 show good results in awarding outstanding graduate students to conduct research related to the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program. Call for 2012 will be issued early 2012. The second phase of the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme is running very successfully (active until June 2012) with 3 lecturers: Kai-Uwe Hinrichs (MARUM, University of Bremen, Germany, Dominique Weis (PCIGR, University of British Columbia, Canada,) and Helmut Weissert (ETH Zurich, Switzerland). Applications to host a lecture from non-traditional IODP and ECORD audiences within the European Community are especially welcome.

Escutia briefly gave updates on workshops. The last ESF-funded Magellan Workshop is currently taking place (November 1-3) in Copenhagen to discuss the site survey issues related to Arctic drilling. An IODP-MI funded workshop on drilling in the Indian Ocean was held in October 2011 in Goa. The EC funded project DS3F will organize a big final conference on March 2012 where ECORD community is particularly encouraged to attend and

the registration is already open. ESSAC organizes the EUROFORUM 2012 at the next EGU conference in Vienna.

At the last ECORD council meeting, it was decided to fund the continuation of the Magellan workshop series directly from the ECORD budget, since there is no more opportunity at ESF. Escutia reported on the progress made since. The Magellan+ scheme is now established and the first call for proposal will be sent out soon. The ToR was finalized between ECORD and ICDP, with proposal evaluation procedure, committee structure and members. ICDP will start with providing 5K€ but it is a starting point and the contribution may rise later. The proposed Steering Committee has 5 members designated by ESSAC and 1 by ICDP. J. Erbacher, former chair of Magellan, is proposed as the chair.

ECORD Council passed the following consensus:

ECORD Council Consensus 11-02-1

ECORD Council endorses the appointment of J. Erbacher as the Chair of the Magellan + Steering Committee. The Vice-chair and the committee Members will be approved later.

The next ESSAC meeting (#19) is planned May 30th - June 1st 2012, in Aarhus, Denmark.

Agenda Item 13. ESO report (R. Gatliff)

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

Gatliff reported on ESO activities.

He overviewed ESO attendance at IODP panels and meetings.

He presented the outcomes of the GBREC operations review. The report is available on IODP website. It is generally very positive. One major recommendation is to systematically conduct tests of the vessel before sailing. Gatliff reminded that this is normal ESO practice. Unfortunately, in this case, it was not possible because of the tight time window. Another lesson learnt is to never use a brand new ship again. The New Jersey 2nd post expedition meeting took place last August. A series of publications are expected in FY12.

Concerning MSP plans until 2013, there will be no expedition in FY12. In FY13, one or potentially two expeditions will be implemented: one expensive project requiring a drilling platform, and possibly a cheaper one using a seabed drill. Six MSPs proposals are currently residing at the Operations Task Force (OTF). SPC recommended to start scoping four of the OTF

proposals in order to fairly prioritize MSPs. “Project Management Team” for Chicxulub and Hawaii have already taken place and a report was given at the last Council meeting. ESO convened PMT meetings for Baltic Sea and Atlantis Massif. Several issues were sorted out in particular dealing with microbiology sampling. At its last meeting, SPC prioritized Baltic Sea as the last MSP of the program and possibly Atlantis Massif (subject to fund availability). Chicxulub was assigned to be the first MSP in the new program. Over the next few months ESO will go for tender for the vessel to implement the Baltic Sea in FY13. Gatliff reminded that all MSP proposals were excellent and those that will not be drilled in the current phase have good chance to be drilled in the early phase of the new program.

Gatliff detailed each MSP proposal status:

Baltic Sea: The proposal is challenging because of the wide range of water depths. SPC recommended keeping all the holes to meet the science objectives. The implication is that only a drilling vessel (and not a jack up rig which is limited to shallow waters) can be used. There are also some issues related to the microbiology component.

Chicxulub: Permitting has made significant progress: ESO sent a letter to public authorities at ministry and national council levels (SEMARNAT and CONACYT). ESO is formally collaborating with the local university UNAM (the National Autonomous University of Mexico) and was asked to submit soon a permit application for both hazard survey and drilling operation. Hazard survey could be done by late 2012/early 2013 but potential contractors’ quotes need to be examined. ESO invited two Mexican scientists as members of the Science Party. In parallel, the project proponents are submitting a proposal to ICDP to seek for co-funding. If successful, it would represent the second ECORD-ICDP drilling collaboration.

Atlantic Massif : SPC favoured Atlantics Massif over Hawaii as the first seabed drill mission. There are still some technological issues in particular associated with microbiology and fluid sampling. ESO is hoping to operate a seabed drill from a European research vessel. The project could be implemented in FY13 as an additional MSP budget permitting.

Hawaii: Holes are too deep for seabed drill operations given the existing technology. But ESO is keeping an eye on the new MeBo currently in development that will be capable to drill down to 200m. With the new MeBo, ESO is confident that all sciences objectives can be fulfilled.

Coralgal Banks: Proponents are very active in getting co-funding from industry. They have reached an agreement with Fugro for a one day mission to drill a test hole at the cost of USD 75k. In September, ECORD executive discussed this offer and approved to allocate the funding from the ECORD budget. It is a very good deal. The operation will be done as a test, outside of IODP and therefore there will be no IODP science party. It will be a good opportunity to evaluate Fugro technological efficiency in this particular environment. In December, ESO will meet with the proponent to discuss the conditions, in particular the conservation of the cores (expected to be stored in one of the IODP repositories). The proponent keeps seeking for support from oil companies. If successful, he will turn his proposal into a Complementary Project Proposal for MSP. This approach is fully in line with the objective set in the ECORD business plan for the future program.

New England hydrogeology still has some major technological issues, in particular the requirement to sample large volumes of fluids. **Nice Airport Landslide** was not forwarded by SPC.

IODP-MI started working with platforms operators to make all expeditions data up to standards QA/QC.

He informed on the retirement of C. Graham, ECORD data manager at BGS who was replaced by Hans-Joachim Wallrabe-Adams from MARUM.

The GBREC cores are now at Kochi repository. The Bremen summer school in September included the “virtual ship experience” as well as a session on IODP proposal writing.

Gatliff overviewed ESO involvement in outreach activities, in particular the making of the MSP video and the arrangement of media interviews.

He reported on the participation at the 3P Arctic conference in Halifax where ESO gave presentations. He emphasised that there are clear opportunities for co-funding with industry.

In the frame of the DS3F project, Gatliff and Kopf met European MPs in Strasbourg on late October. Feedbacks were positive.

ESO is renewing several old containers by cheap second-hand containers. He also informed that six equipped ESO containers will be made available to ECORD scientists under some conditions. The idea is to make a better use of these equipments when there are no MSP expeditions. This can be seen as the spirit of the concept of distributed infrastructure.

ACTION ESO: To advertise the availability of equipped containers to the ECORD community.

Agenda Item 14. Structure of the new program – where do we stand now? (C. Mével)

(See Structure of the new program report by C. Mével at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Mével reported on the status of the new program architecture. She explained that the ECORD Executive has been working with NSF and MEXT to develop a new framework. The outcome of these discussions still requires endorsement by the Council (closed session).

She reviewed the successive events since the last IWG+ meeting in Amsterdam. In Amsterdam, an agreement was almost reached. However, in August, NSF sent a letter to the community explaining their new position. Essentially, NSF will seek for international partner contributions to fund the JOIDES Resolution operations. This new position made all the previous work of IWG+ obsolete. Although she understands the necessity for NSF to have a viable business model for the JR, Mével conveyed her concern about the way this announcement was done unilaterally, with no previous consultation with ECORD. The announcement resulted in articles in Science and other journals that may have a negative impact on the renewal process in all IODP member countries.

To three co-chairs of IWG+ worked together to reassure the community. A number of letters were sent out by various IODP entities (including ECORD) and are posted on the IODP website. At the ECORD level, the ECORD executive was strongly involved. It was reiterated to NSF and MEXT that any option that would involve the risk of destabilizing ECORD and MSPs cannot be envisioned.

An executive meeting was held in Paris, Sept 22-24, and one session with MEXT representatives and one with NSF representatives were also organized. A new framework was set up to incorporate the new model for the JOIDES Resolution funding. Essentially, the aim is to maintain an international umbrella and proposal evaluation system, but to give more independence to the platform providers (see the details in the agenda book for the meeting).

In summary, the following points have been approved

- International umbrella : IODP forum
- Common SAS for all platforms, simplified
- The central management office becomes the “planning (or support) office”

with reduced responsibilities, and a budget of USD ~2M. Some of the current responsibilities of IODP-MI will be transferred to the IOs

- Independent “Facility Governing Boards” for all platform providers

- Access to platforms :

JR : MoU/exchange berth mechanism with the Chikyu

MSP: MoU with platform providers / exchange mechanism for JR members

Chikyu: still to be defined

The remaining issues are the following

- Precise function of the IODP Forum

- How is the planning office funded? Can IODP-MI do it? Who will be the face of the programme (*to attract new members, raise additional funding....*) ?

- SAS : one or two evaluation layers? Membership?

- Funding of the core repositories

- Funding of the Chikyu: long, expensive projects

- Should IWG+ be disbanded and replaced with the IODP Forum now?

Batiza expressed several comments. He agreed on not counting the co-chief in the country quota. He also agreed on the setting up of a bartering system between countries signing the NSF's MoU to exchange berths on the JR for berths on MSP. That system simplifies the contractual relationship and money flow. According to him the money for the support office is to be subtracted from the total contribution for the JR so that ECORD has not to separately fund the support office and JR operations. A new call for competition for the support office is to be sent out and IODP-MI can apply. He also agreed on the reciprocity mechanism of core repository cost support: USIO supports MSP cores at the Golf Core repository and ECORD does the same with JR cores kept at the BCR

Shibata agreed on using the name of Support Office. He is concerned about the money flow model that requires partners to contribute separately to JR and Chikyu. He would have preferred to see NSF continue acting as a banker. Batiza said that this is not an option.

Kroon expressed concern that disbanding SIPcom would overburden PEP with work at the expense of the quality of the scientific evaluation. PEP should be spared of political/strategic considerations and look exclusively at the science. The need for two layers was also stressed by De Leeuw and Wefer. It was clarified that the idea is not to merge SIPCOM and PEP, but to move the current functionalities of SIPCOM towards IODP Forum, the Support Office or the IOs. Batiza suggested to list all SIPCOM's activities/functions and then to think how they can be allocated between the other bodies. De Leeuw volunteered to prepare this list and circulate it. Mével raised the issue of the membership for the MSP Facility Governing Board. The ECORD Council does not have the right expertise to

deal with project planning. Clearly, it needs to include representatives from the science community.

Mével questioned Batiza whether NSF will get enough support to run the JR 12 months per year. She pointed out that ECORD cannot contribute more than US\$6M, as stated last September in Paris. Batiza responded that it is the aim, but reminded that the partner contributions indicated in his table are provisional. The cost figures for JR are reliable but are based on average expeditions and do not include very expensive tools such as multi-corks.

Addressing the transition period, Mével was concerned about disbanding IWG+ right away. The community is now familiar with this committee as the place where the funding agencies discuss about the future phase. If NSF wants to disband it, explanations on why it is done will be required.

Mével concluded with stressing the very tight timeline. It is absolutely imperative that the new framework is approved at the next IWG+ meeting in January. Moreover, the ECORD business plan cannot be finalized without an international agreement on the new framework. It is essential for ECORD funding agencies to receive both the ECORD business plan and the new framework at the earliest in order to make a decision on the renewal. If the section on the CHIKYU is not completely finalized in January, it is agreed that ECORD and NSF should move forward anyway. Agreement with MEXT can be finalized later, whenever Japan is ready.

Wefer suggested sending a letter to the community to explain the current status of the discussions. This letter should be signed by the three IWG+ co-chairs. Henriet fully approved and added that the programme is facing a shockwave. Therefore, it is crucial to stay united and keep confidence.

Discussions continued during the closed session.

Agenda item 15. Aurora Borealis status and ICDP report (C. Mével)
(See *Aurora Borealis and ICDP report by C. Mével at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>*)

The Aurora Borealis project has been removed from the ESFRI list due to the lack of financial commitment from any potential partner. Nevertheless, the EC continues funding the project till the end (February 2012), but has requested to modify some of the deliverables to make them more generic and not oriented towards a specific vessel. One initiative has been to reconsider the design of the ship, given the recent

technological developments in the ship building industry. AKER Arctic has started designing a “slim version”. A main difference would be a portable drill rig instead of a permanent one. The “AURORA BOREALIS SLIM” would have only one moon pool instead of two and therefore the size of the ship would be reduced. The consequence is a drop by a third of the initial estimated construction cost. Mével informed that she passed the first draft of the slim version to ESO for comments.

Mével informed that the Commission issued a call (INFRA-2012) on improving access to all oceans including Arctic, building on the existing EUROLLEET scheme. By this call the EC recognized the need for the access to the Arctic ocean. Some countries are now engaging considerable effort to building up a renewed icebreaker fleet (Canada, Germany, Norway and foremost Russia). Escutia informed that she has been approached by Korea that has recently built an icebreaker and is willing to develop collaborations internationally.

ACTION ESSAC: To provide information about the new Korean icebreaker.

Mével briefly overviewed the collaboration between ECORD and ICDP. The collaboration in the future looks still very promising in several ways: maintaining the scientific drilling Journal, potential joint project in Chicxulub, co-support of the Magellan+ program, shared vision on the concept of European drilling infrastructure...

Agenda Item 16. Report from Israel (N. Waldmann)

(See Israel report by N. Waldmann at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Nicolas Waldmann, from the University of Haifa, reported on the possible membership of Israel in the ECORD consortium. He gave an overview of the marine research conducted in Israel, the specificity of the geosciences community and the main science focus. The country has been involved in international collaborative project in marine research although projects were limited to the Middle East region. The university of Haifa hosts the Israel Marine Data Center (ISRAMAR) that is the national repository for oceanographic data.

Israel recently joined ICDP and conducted a drilling project in the Dead Sea. The main interest in joining ECORD is driven by the large discoveries of gas reservoirs in the eastern Mediterranean (covered by 2D and 3D seismic data surveys) especially the Israeli portion of the Levantine Basin. Scientific drilling is needed to better understand the area.

Waldmann reported on a collaborative agreement between several

universities to promote the idea of joining ECORD. A letter signed by all marine geoscientists in Israel was forwarded to the chief scientist at the Ministry of Science and Technology to convince him. A symposium is planned on November 20th to promote a possible ECORD membership and Mével is invited to present ECORD and IODP.

He concluded by giving an overview of the University of Haifa, and its “School of Marine Sciences” established 5 years ago and which is growing extremely fast.

Wefer asked whether Israel is thinking of specific projects. Waldmann replied that there are some ideas, in particular in the Eastern Mediterranean, but Israeli scientists will need some assistance to write proposals. Mével indicated that this can be organized by ESSAC.

Agenda Item 17. Report from Brazil (C. Mével)

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

Mével provided information on the situation in Brazil. She participated in the IODP delegation that visited Brazil last July. The visit was initiated by Petrobras (Adriano Viana) and included

- a meeting in Brasilia with representatives from various Ministries (Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI); Environment (MMA); Mines and Energy (MME); Foreign Affairs (MRE))
- a meeting in Rio de Janeiro at Petrobras Research Center with representatives of the science community

There is a strong interest, both from the science community and the Ministries, to join. Brazil has made the strategic decision to develop marine sciences. Brazil is currently in the process of buying two research vessels. There is a plan to create a big center on the model of JAMSTEC. But the community interested is still small and fragmented.

A delegation of Brazilian scientists visited France in September and on this occasion Mével met again with Brazilians interested in joining IODP. One possibility would be to join through ECORD. But before committing major resources, Brazil is mostly interested in developing collaborations that help educate their community. This can be done at the ECORD level: involve Brazil in support actions (summer schools, DLP), encourage labs in ECORD member countries to invite Brazilian scientists and collaborate on projects related to ocean drilling.

Agenda Item 18. Report from Russia (C. Mével)

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

Mével reported on the situation in Russia. S. Matul provided an update by Email. Shirshov Institute and others will submit a letter to Russian authorities (Ministry of Science and Education) asking the financial support for IODP. It is not known when a decision could be made, especially because of upcoming elections.

Agenda Item 19. Report from the Marine Board (Niall McDonough)
(See Marine Board report by N. McDonough at <http://www.ecord.org/c/access-council.html>)

Niall McDonough, Executive Scientific Secretary at the Marine Board Marine Board reported on Marine Board activities relevant to ECORD. He gave a general overview of the Marine Board, its structure, main objectives and high-level marine policy activities. It gathers 34 Member Organisations from 20 European Countries with the aim to bridge the gap between Science and policy. He presented recent MB publications.

Marine Board is actively focusing its efforts towards the future funding program Horizon 2020 and the JPI Oceans. In the current framework for Horizon 2000, marine research and seas and oceans sciences are not explicitly mentioned although they are everywhere and it is a major concern.

To promote marine sciences, the Marine Board is currently developing the *Navigating the Future IV* position paper, to be issued in May 2012. ECORD has already contributed to the text.

He stressed that the Marine Board and ECORD are sharing mutual interest in particular in the following areas:

- *Interests in ensuring support in Horizon 2020 and JPI Oceans*
- *Need to be strong in influencing politicians and policy makers – requires a sophisticated approach and identification of windows of opportunity*
- *Marine/Oceans community needs to speak with one voice (good progress with ECORD input to NFIV)*
- *Need to ensure cooperation on specific scientific activities, (e.g. sub-sea microbiology, marine biodiversity, climate (change) research)*

ECORD Council recognized the Marine Board as valuable partner to approach the EC and is willing to continue the dialogue.

