

**11th Meeting of the
Ecord Science Support & Advisory Committee
(ESSAC)**

26th – 27th October 2008
Fürstenzimmer, Hotel am Schloss,
Tübingen, Germany



1. Introduction

1.1 Call to order, introductions

G. Camoin welcomed all ESSAC delegates, observers and invited guests to the 11th ESSAC Meeting in Tübingen. He thanked S. Kunze and J. Erbacher from IODP Germany as well as R. Stein and M. Kucera for the organization and logistics of the meeting at the Tübingen castle.

The ESSAC meeting started with the self-presentation of each participant.

1.2 Welcome and meeting logistics

J. Erbacher gave an overview about the general logistics as indicated in the agenda book.

1.3 Discussion and approval of the Agenda

G. Camoin turned the ESSAC delegates attention to changes in the agenda:

The merging of item 1.4 "Items since the 10th ESSAC Meeting" and item 1.6 "ESSAC Office news"; the additional presentation of the updated IODP-MI statistics in item 2.3 "Science Steering Evaluation Panel"; the announcement of the Deep Sea Frontier meeting report under item 3.1 "EMA-ECORD Council meeting" or alternatively under item 10.5 "Open discussion on the current state of the IODP"; the additions of items 7.1.6 "Shatsky Rise" and 7.1.7 "Bering Sea" under item 7. "Nominations and Staffing" as well as of the SASEC panel nomination under item 7.2 "SAS panel nominations"; and the deferral of the workshops reports 10.1.1 "Acquiring high to ultra-high resolution geological records of past climate change by scientific drilling" and 10.1.3 "Lithospheric heterogeneities, hydrothermal regimes and links between abiotic and biotic processes at slow spreading ridges" to the next ESSAC meeting.

The ESSAC delegates approved the agenda.

Note: *The workshop report 10.1.2 Ocean Drilling for Seismic Hazard in European Geosystems was also deferred, as M. Ask, the workshop organizer and Swedish ESSAC delegat did not attend meeting.*

ESSAC Consensus 0810-01: ESSAC approves the agenda of its 11th meeting on October 27th -28th, 08, in Tübingen, Germany.

1.4 Items since the 10th ESSAC Meeting and 1.6 ESSAC Office news

B. Wolff-Boenisch summarised the action items that the ESSAC Office fulfilled, he undertakings that have been done during the reporting period from May to October 08, and the impetus to new initiatives, which was given by the ESSAC Office.

Part of these undertakings (and the fulfilment of the related action items) are centralised in the respective thematic themes, and details are given by the respective lecturers (for example: action items regarding SAS panel matters have been presented under item 2.2 to 2.4, etc.).

Great Barrier Reef

Regarding the staffing of that expedition, the ESSAC Office issued a call on June 23rd, 08 with an August 15th, 08 deadline. The application process via the ESSAC webpage was tested in parallel to the "traditional" application via email. The application process was accepted by the users and therefore deemed as adequate to use as only valid application

process in the future, with the exception of applications for short-term calls due to the restricted time frames.

The ESSAC Office accepted 27 valid applications out of 29 received. Regarding the ESSAC Action Item 0805-11 and the ESSAC Consensus 0805-05, the applicants' CVs had been sent to the respective National Office/ESSAC delegates in the forefront of the deadline. 5 out of 10 countries concerned gave recommendations to help other ESSAC delegates to better judge the applications. According to the ESSAC consensus 0805-05 7 countries out of 17 ranked in agreement with the ESSAC procedures. The ESSAC Office compiled and made an arithmetic ranking and sent the result to the Nomination and Staffing (N&S) Subcommittee on September 11th, 08. The subcommittee made a priority list after reviewing the candidate's CVs on following criteria: 1. expertises, 2. recommendations of the National Offices, 3. berth quotas, and 4. discussions within the subcommittee. The list was sent to ESO and the ESSAC delegates on September 19th, 08.

NanTroSEIZE

2 calls for the NanTroSEIZE expeditions 319 and 322 were issued on September 11th, 08 with a first October 15th, 08 deadline. The received number of applications at the time of the meeting was 6 applications (2 not acceptable so far) for expedition 319 and 11 applications for expedition 322.

Due to potential changes in the expedition schedules, the ESSAC Office sent an announcement concerning an extension of the deadline to November 06th, 08.

B. Wolff-Boenisch pointed out that so far only applications from G, F, UK, CH and FIN had been received. She asked the delegates to reconsider, if calls generally mostly reached the paleoclimatology community. If so, this would be a problem for expeditions based on solid earth themes.

IODP SAS Panels

Several calls had been issued to anticipate the rotation of ECORD SAS panel members 2 meeting head:

STP - ESSAC Action Item 0805-08: A call was sent June 20th, 08 with a first September 15th 08 deadline, then with a second Deadline in October 15th, 08 after discussion with UK IODP. For the replacement of the STP chair M. Lovell, 2 applications have been received. 1 application was particularly recommended by the UK National Office.

SSEP - ESSAC Action Item 0805-10: Regarding the replacement of Tim Elliott (UK) a call has been sent October 06th, 08 with a February 15th 09 deadline.

EDP - ESSAC Action Item 0805-09 is currently on-hold as the ESSAC Office is still waiting for clarification of the needs of the panel members and the status of L. Wohlgemuth.

M. Riedel asked for clarification regarding applications from Canada for SSEP, as he was informed that Canadian scientists would be interested to serve in this panel. G. Camoin explained that the next SSEP member will be a scientist from the UK, but that Canadian scientists should apply as alternates and that their applications would be very welcomed.

Other nomination and staffing issues

During the reporting period from May to October 2008, the ESSAC delegates received several information and request from the ESSAC Office: The delegates received the staffing lists for Canterbury (on 26.06.08), for Wilkes Land (on 10.07.08) and for EqPac 320 and 321 (on 09.09.08). The results of the delegates' replies to the following request were:

Looking for an alternate for SSP Meeting, Busan, Korea (20.05.08) - 5 responses (20.05. - 21.05.08);

Looking for an alternate for EPS Meeting, Hanover, Germany (27.05.08) - 5 responses (27.05.08);

Request for nominations for new a new New Jersey Co-chief (19.06.08) - feedback from 1 delegate, who nominated 2 scientists who have been then contacted by ESO.

Scholarships

Regarding the ESSAC Action Item 0805-12 (to establish criteria for the evaluation of the ECORD scholarship application), the ESSAC Chair invited on August 30th, 08 the Education & Outreach (E&O) Subcommittee to meet electronically in order to discuss this action item. B. McConnell sent a document as an opener and B. Wolff-Boenisch established a list with key issues to be addressed in order to establish the criteria. The criteria to evaluate applications for ECORD Scholarships have been set up at this meeting and are presented under item 8.4. "Subcommittee report, discussion and future actions".

Summer School 2010

According to the ESSAC Consensus 0805-08 a call to host an ECORD Summer School in 2010 has been issued in October 06th, 08 June with a 30th April 09 deadline to give potential organisers sufficient time to organise a school. The fact that the budget for the Summer School(s) had been augmented by the ECORD Council was announced in the call.

Summer Schools and other funding resources

During last ESSAC meeting the ESSAC Office has been asked to explore, if the European Community (EC) has instruments to fund summer schools (ESSAC Action Item 0805-14). The investigations showed that the EC does have possibilities to fund summer schools, but that these instruments are integrated in much bigger ventures such as Network of Excellences (NoE), Integrated Projects (IP). Another possibility would be to establish a Marie-Curie project. However, in those projects the summer schools are only one instrument among other education packages. Regarding Support Actions (SA) or Coordinated Actions (CA), summer schools would have to be integrated as a (educational oriented) work package. In this connection D. Hauglustaine and M. Hama from ESF have been invited by the ESSAC Office to discuss about Summer Schools with the ESSAC delegates.

Note: C. Mével called on the ESSAC delegates to consider to apply for a Marie Curie project in the future.

ECORD Grants

Regarding the ESSAC Consensus 0805-09 and the ESSAC Action Item 0805-21 (ESSAC envisages to create short-term ECORD post-graduate grants), the Chair invited in August 30th, 08 the E&O Subcommittee to meet electronically, in order to discuss the matter. B. McConnell sent a document as an opener and B. Wolff-Boenisch established a list with key issues to be addressed in order to establish the criteria. The criteria to evaluate applications for ECORD Scholarships have been set up at this meeting and are presented under item 8.4. "Subcommittee report, discussion and future actions".

ECORD publication lists

The ESSAC Office sent an email to the ESSAC delegates on July 17th, regarding the updates of the national publication lists (ESSAC Action Item 0805-17). France and Germany sent an update and a link, respectively to the ESSAC Office. The ESSAC Office sent list and link to A. Miller, Manager of the IODP Publication Citation Database, on October 18th, 08 (ESSAC Action Item 0805-18). B. Wolff-Boenisch checked the database, which is being updated.

Announcements on the ESSAC Webpage

All issued calls have been announced on the ESSAC web page. Additional information has been published such as the call for proposals for ESF Magellan WS Series, for the Integrated Courses, the EU Workshop CAREX (Deep Biosphere and Extreme Environments) and the Position Vacancy of IODP-MI President/CEO.

Under NEWS and WORKSHOPS - MEETING – EuroForum, the EGU 2009 Session Beyond 2013 - the future of European Ocean Drilling Research has been published as well as the related sessions: 1. New findings and achievements in ocean and continental drilling (IODP-ICDP) and 2. European Collaboration for Implementation of Marine Research on Cores (EuroMARC). The IODP INVEST Conference scheduled for September 09 is also advertised.

Under PARTICIPATION - SAILING - Submit Proposals - the Engineering Development Proposals have been announced.

Under EDUCATION - RESSOURCES - Scientific - the Magellan WS Reports can be found.

1.5 ESSAC 09 budget

G. Camoin summarised the current ESSAC budget as indicated in the agenda book.

The total budget increased by 6.3 % (+ € 9.000) for FY09 compared to FY08, but the overall evolution of the ESSAC budget is characterized by a decrease of ECORD contribution of € 25.647 (- 14.4 %) over the last two years, following the rotation of the ESSAC Office from Cardiff to Aix-en-Provence.

2. IODP News

2.1 Lead Agencies and Implementing Organizations

C. Mével presented the latest news regarding the Lead Agencies and Implementing Organizations.

Lead Agencies

Beside the current IODP members USA and Japan (Lead Agencies) and ECORD as contributing member, China, an associate member (\$ 1M) is considering to increase its contribution as the Memorandum ends in FY08. Korea is also considering to augment its current contribution (\$ 0.3 M). In addition ANZIC (Australia-New Zealand consortium) will join IODP in FY09 as an associate member, \$ 1.4 M (1/4 membership) and India will probably also join IODP in FY09 as an associate member (\$ 1 M).

Mr Bement, Director of NSF, met with Mr Tokai, Minister of MEXT, in May 08. Both announced, that the US and Japan are willing to continue the drilling programme after 2013 and that the Lead Agencies want to set up the structure to discuss about the post 2013 by creating an International Working Group.

A special meeting of the IODP Council is organized in January (after the SASEC meeting) to discuss the strategy. The IODP-MI has also set up an "ad-hoc" committee to discuss the future; the next meeting will be held in Washington DC in October 29th to 30th, 08.

The new director for Ocean and Research Division is Hiroshi Ikukawa. Masahiko Hori has replaced Kazuya Shukuri. Masahiko Hiro will attend the next ECORD council meeting.

Both Lead Agencies have announced that their current funding does not allow to run the ships 12 months a year. Both are aiming at ~7 to 8 months a year. They are seeking for other funds to pay for the day rates when the ships are not operating for IODP. To facilitate the communication with ECORD, the Lead Agencies have offered to send representatives at the ECORD council meetings.

News from IODP-MI

The contract for the Sapporo office was extended to March 2010. M. Talwani will leave IODP-MI in June 2009. The Board of Governor has opened the position with a search committee, chaired by B. Taylor. The first interviews will be organized at AGU inauguration of the Ocean hall at the Smithsonian, Washington DC end of October. The IODP Town hall meeting at AGU is scheduled for Tuesday December 16th, 08.

USIO

There have been changes at the management level: J. Fox and J. Baldauf were replaced by a transition team (M. Malone, E. Grossman, A. Klaus). The acting IODP director at TAMU is S. Bohlen from August 1st, probably until May 09. The position will be then advertised.

The JOIDES Resolution refit has been delayed again: The ship is now expected to leave the shipyard late January 09, and start IODP operations in March. J. Miller is acting as SODV project manager and supervising the work done in the Singapore shipyard.

Ocean Drilling Consortium

The task of the Ocean Drilling Consortium is to develop a joint program with industry outside of IODP, which is funded by industry, but of mutual benefit for industry and scientists, to use the JOIDES Resolution time. The scientific programme has been discussed at several workshops, with representatives from academia and industry. A proposal was submitted this fall to all potentially interested companies such as Statoil, Petrobras, EXXON-Mobil and others. The background of this initiative is to drill 4 months per year during the 4 remaining years of the program. Topics of common interests are: 1. Rifted margins: structure and evolution of deep water basins, 2. Reservoirs: origin, architecture and properties and 3. Source rocks: distribution and origin of organic carbon strata.

However, there are still a number of questions and legal aspects to solve, such as: 1. Are the companies interested in participating in such a consortium? Is JR operated by USIO outside of IODP, etc.? In parallel, the USIO is also looking for commercial jobs and several options have been considered, which are: 1. discussions with FUGRO, 2. possibilities to lease the ship for testing equipment or 3. Korea is interested to lease the ship for gas hydrate drilling. The principal difficulty is to negotiate the date when the ship will be available as the date is not firm yet.

Regarding the joint program with industry, the question still remains, if the overall industry is really interested, as their stakeholders have their own agenda.

C. Mével reported that the proponents' list mentions only American scientists so far. However, scientists from other countries could be included due to their specific expertises. J. McKenzie asked who is going to decide (e.g. TAMU), which scientists even outside IODP, could partake. Her question was backed by N. Koç, who asked why there should be only US scientists selected, as there would be already cooperation existing between Norwegian scientists and Norwegian petroleum industry. She could not understand that Statoil, which is mainly owned by Norway was not there. She continued to ask how the selection process

takes place. M. Comas asked if Repsol had been contacted in the run-up to the meeting. G. Camoin asked the same concerning TOTAL. C. Mével explained that a lot of company representatives had been invited, but most of them did not show up. The proposal had been sent to many more potential participants. P. Clift thought that albeit it has not been clear, that the meeting was very open. C. Mével continued that it has been stated by M. Talwani, that the meeting was open to every scientist, even non-IODP members such as Brazil, but when she saw the proposal she realised that only US scientists had been there, so she was wondering who finally decided who was going to participate. The proposal is a document with topics and signed by a few people. C. Mével had the feeling that the right mechanisms still have to be established in order to make sure that the right people are present. If an oil company would suggest a specific scientist with whom they usually work, then this scientist would probably be considered. Currently the decision process is not clear yet. R. Stein asked, in case a consortium would be established, if an open announcement in some journals could be expected so that everybody would have the chance to apply. C. Mével replied that the final selection process has not been defined, that this was the message to convey to the community.

CDEX

A problem with the azimuth thrusters was identified during the maintenance of the Chikyu and was apparently solved. CDEX recently announced the schedule for 09 viz. 1. preparation for fixing gears: 22/10, 2. dry dock in Sasebo (two gears will be changed): 26/10 - 14/11, 3. move to Kobe Port where other six gears will be changed (used by floating crane): end of February 09. 4. sea trial of gears and finish the repair work in early March 09. The Chikyu should be then available for IODP in May 09 (150 days instead of the previously planned 180).

The NANTROSEIZE Management Team is discussing the impact of the relevant change on the FY09 programme (compare item 7.1.5 NanTroSEIZE riser expeditions).

CDEX is also looking for commercial work to pay for the day rate when the ship is not operating for IODP. There are other government agencies in Japan, as well as Japanese and international companies, which might be interested in renting the ship.

KCC repository

The legacy core redistribution to the KCC repository will be completed on December 28th, 08. KCC is planning to have a ceremony on December 29th, 08. Mr. Kato, the President of JAMSTEC will attend this ceremony, as well as Hans Christian Larsen. CDEX is expecting a good media coverage in Japan.

2.2 SAS Executive Committee – SASEC

C. Mével presented her report about the decisions taken during the last SASEC meeting which was held in Beijing last June 08.

IODP Workshops

The workshop “Acquiring high to ultra-high resolution geological records of past climate change by scientific drilling” was held in Potsdam from September 29th to October 1st 08 and was supported both by IODP-MI (\$ 75-90 K) and by ICDP (\$ 30 K).

The workshop “CO2 sequestration” has not yet found additional support and therefore will not be held in 08.

Long-term thematic evaluation

The final report of the long-term thematic evaluation "climate variability" is now posted on the IODP website.

Regarding the evaluation of "Ocean Crust Formation and Structure" (4 IODP expeditions 304, 305, 309 and 312, and 2 highly relevant late-ODP legs 206 and 209) the meeting was held on October 2nd to 3rd, 08 in Zürich, and hosted by Gretchen Früh-Green, SPC member.

Regarding the SASEC Consensus 0806-05, SASEC accepted the SPC Consensus 0803-20 to conduct the next thematic review in FY 09 on Initial Science Plan Theme I: the Deep Biosphere and Subseafloor Ocean. This will include, but not be limited to reviews of Expeditions 301, 307, 308 and 311. Suggested members of the review panel will be determined by e-mail discussion led by J. Hayes.

FY 09 Program Plan

At its January 08 meeting which was held in Santa Cruz, SASEC had decided to set up a "Budget Subcommittee" to look at the Program Plan in more detail. The FY09 Program Plan has been distributed very late, (a week before the meeting) because of uncertainties on the ship schedules. The crux of the matter, the FY09 is very difficult to evaluate and therefore SASEC is currently focussing that the costs for the "big meeting" are taken into account.

Chikyu

SASEC is concerned about the lack of an alternate plan for the Chikyu and reaffirms in its Consensus 0806-03 the IODP commitment to maximize riser drilling with Chikyu over the next five years. The program is presently constrained to one riser operational area with 3-D seismic coverage (i.e., NanTroSEIZE), and that area has other logistical limitations (e.g., Kuroshio Current). SASEC encourages acquisition of 3-D site survey data for other potential, highly rated projects in order to provide other opportunities to utilize riser drilling. Any future riser drilling is critically dependent on such data.

C. Mével reaffirmed that SASEC was concerned that there would not be an alternate plan for the Chikyu, as the Kuroshio current is still very strong. The project management team should have to discuss alternate sites. SASEC insists of the need to discuss that issue. So far the NanTroSEIZE experiment could not be implemented (compare also topic in item 2.3 Science Planning Committee – SPC – and Operations Task Force – OTF). The Costa Rica project do have 3D seismic coverage yet.

Proposal submission

There is a concern that people get discouraged to submit proposals because of the current situation of the drilling ships. In its Consensus 0806-11 SASEC encourages the community to continue to submit proposals for drilling within the current program and in preparation for renewal of the Program. Truly innovative ideas can still be incorporated into the current phase of drilling. SASEC is particularly interested in receiving preliminary proposals for new and innovative projects that can influence the direction of the Program beyond renewal. In addition, SASEC encourages submission of Ancillary Program Letters (APL) for targets of opportunity that may arise as the drilling vessels transit between expeditions. In the Consensus 0806-12 SASEC recommends that the Science Planning Committee (SPC) implement procedures to provide more specific feedback to proponents, particularly in terms of their potential success in prioritization for drilling, and to streamline the processing of proposals forwarded to them from the SSEP.

C. Mevel explained the background of these considerations. The problem was that some proposals in the system would probably never get drilled. Therefore it was important to

inform the proponents of this possibility instead of continuing to encourage the proponents to send addenda etc. J. McKenzie asked how many proposals could be realistically drilled before 2013. She thought that it would be fair for the proponents to have an idea what the timeframe was, in order they then could realistically assess what and how many proposals could be drilled. If a new science plan would be established, when new proposals should be sent, though a lot of proposals now drilled originally were deriving from the old program.

G. Camoin referred to the current discussions in SPC and about the plan to drill more proposals by streamlining and reducing the drilling plans of proposals to assure that a maximum of proposals could be drilled. This of course would have many implications regarding the operations and other issues. On the other hand the proponents that have been asked, if they really needed all drillings sites to achieve the scientific objectives, replied that they would be able to reduce the number of drilling sites in order to make the expedition happen. C. Ravello present at the last SPC meeting was asked if she would be able to reduce the number of drilling sites. She stated that she was not only willing to do so, but also able to reduce the sites by about 30 to 40 % at short notice without changing the scientific objectives. This implies that they are possibilities to increase the number of proposals drilled before the end of 2013. The 31 proposals currently staying at OTF are a really concern for SPC at the moment.

C. Mével added that the last issue mentioned by G. Camoin was also a concern for SASEC. SASEC calculated that assuming 8 proposals are supposed to be drilled per year, 4 expeditions per year could be implemented within a 4-years-programme that in total about 16 proposals could be finally drilled.. The question if the scientists should be encouraged to submit proposals would then arise by keeping in mind that the relevant proposals would be considered during the next programme. Or would not it be better, as put up by C. Mével for discussion to cancel everything and to start from the scratch. A new program and new scientific ideas might need a new start. M. Comas asked, if there was a historical memory in the IODP panels, which would include to re-visit older proposals in the system, because if not the panels could change the criteria for proposal selection in 3 or 4 years. G. Camoin confirmed that there was a panel memory existing. R. Stein inquired about the potential number of drilled proposals in the future, as a prioritisation has to be done. G. Camoin said that if a descoping mechanism could be implemented and applied then more than 16 proposals could be drilled, only for the JOIDES Resolution (compare item 2.4 "Science Planning Committee", flexibility in implementation). R. Stein thought that it is important that the people continue to submit proposals or pre-proposals like it is planned for example to do for the next Artic workshop in Bremerhaven (compare item 10.). Pre-proposals would not be that much work, that it is more to put the idea together. However, for the future of IODP it would be of importance to have these proposals in the system and to demonstrate the magnitude of and the interest of the community out there and the need for drilling. He took the Artic as an example, that if this topic would be an important themes in the future post 2013, then it would be very important to show the funding agencies the existing need of further oceanic drilling. G. Camoin mentioned that proposals would be also deactivated at SPC level. With regards to R. Stein's aspect of keeping proposal in the system, B. Wolff-Boenisch added that it was needed to maintain the proposal pressure, in order the funding agencies would have a prove that interest was still existing. However, one of the major important problems was to reduce the proposal numbers. It was getting hard to continue to deal with those amounts of proposals. Proponents of potential unsuccessful proposals should be clearly informed. R. James added that the UK just discussed that issue a week ago and that there has been a consensus that proposals should continue to be submitted to show that IODP is a dynamic a active program. Fantastic proposal could move through the system very quickly. This was corroborated by G. Camoin. C. Mével agreed, but added that the quick proposals then ended at OTF and could not implemented because of lack of ship-time. She liked to point out that proposal pressure was also a very tricky situation, as on the one hand you want to show that there is major interest, but on the other hand the funding agencies stated already that they wanted a new program and not business as usual. So if you do no want business as usual you have to generate new ideas and proposals, which are different of whose which are in the system. J. McKenzie suggested of thinking of a strategic idea and think ahead of what could be the new topics. C. Mével and

G. Camoin thought that the Artic would be a good example for such an approach and a potential topic of the new science plan.

M. Riedel said that IODP had already asked the proponents to significantly cut down their proposals and promised to them to give the ship-time back in the past. So he was wondering, taking the past into account, that the proponents would accept this cut back and the promise to come back later, when the ship is back in the area. G. Camoin specified that in these days OTF would not promise to come back, that it would be drilled now or never.

Post 2013

SASEC decided to chose Bremen as the venue for the INVEST Conference on September 23rd to 25th 09, Bremen.

The steering committee consisting of Christina Ravelo (Co-chair), Wolfgang Bach (Co-chair), Jan Behrmann, Bob Duncan, Katrina Edwards, Sean Gulick, Fumio Inagaki, Heiko Pälike, Ryuji Tada, Gilbert Camoin was recommended to seek guidance, possibly in the form of liaisons, from national funding agencies and other funding sources, regarding the evolving nature of plausible future structure and funding level of a new ocean drilling program.

SASEC (Consensus 0806-09) recognizes that IODP is entering a new framework of doing business. The ocean drilling facilities use is no longer sufficiently funded by, nor therefore limited to, scientific drilling. IODP-MI and the Implementing Organizations (IOs) are currently entertaining industry and national drilling projects, and consortia. The possible mix of funding/projects, and what falls within or outside international scientific drilling, is under discussion.

SASEC envisions the possibility of a mixed mode of funding for a renewed program of ocean drilling, including government science appropriations, industry-science consortia, and contracts with industry and/or other government agencies. SASEC requests that the IODP Council, IODP-MI Board of Governors and the IOs consider forming a working group to frame the possible scope and structure of a post-2013 ocean drilling program, and how such a program might be formulated/proposed/funded/contracted.

The next SASEC meeting will take place in Lisbon from January 20th to 21st, 09 and be hosted by F. Abrantes.

2.3 Science Steering Evaluation Panel – SSEP

G. Camoin gave a summary about the outcomes of the 10th SSEP Meeting in Busan, Korea in May 08. In total 16 proposals have been reviewed. The dispositions for those proposals are the following:

Table of reviewed proposals at the May 2008 SSEP meeting in Busan, Korea (source: H. Pälike).

Star rating statistics regarding the proposals forwarded to SPC since May 07 are as follows: In May 07 4 proposals had been forwarded to SPC: 1 with 4 stars, 1 with 3 stars, 1 with zero stars and 1 APL with zero stars, also. In November 07 8 had been forwarded to SPC: 1 with 5 stars, 5 with 4 stars, 1 with 3 stars, 1 APL with zero stars. In May 08 2 proposals had been forwarded to SPC: 1 with 5 stars and 1 with 4 stars. This results in 2 5 stars proposals, 7 4 stars proposals, in 2 3 proposals and in 3 zero stars proposals from in total 14 proposals.

Regarding the renewal of the program, SSEP was asked to provide some input regarding the identification of new challenges and major scientific questions and themes. The panel members were requested to prepare their contributions in time for the next SSEP meeting, which will be held in November 08. Such input could be then wrapped up through white papers including items such as, what has been achieved, what still should be achieved, and what new science is missing in the current Initial Science Plan.

2.4 Science Planning Committee – SPC – and Operations Task Force – OTF

Current operational situation of the Program (FY09-10)

G. Camoin started with the latest news of SPC by presenting the current operational situation of the Program (FY09-10).

Operational situation (FY09-10)

FY 2009 On September 15th, 08, the Ocean Leadership updated the status of the JOIDES Resolution delivery and concluded that further delay in delivery had become inevitable. USIO has indicated that the ship will sail from Singapore by the end of January 09. The implications of this date have been evaluated, but a likely outcome is that the Canterbury Basin and Wilkes Land expeditions would not occur as scheduled.

Revised FY 09 operational situation of the JOIDES Resolution

N. Koç asked how sure it was, that the JOIDES Resolution would be operative again on the dates given at the meeting. G. Camoin said he got the information from J. Allan, who had been in Singapore and who confirmed that the electrical work had been finished at the last SPC Meeting. B. McConnell asked if expeditions of Canterbury and Wilkes Land had to be that close together and G. Camoin confirmed that both expeditions were closely coupled, because of their geographical neighbourhood. M. Riedel reminded, that in case the port call for the EqPac expedition would be in Victoria, Canada, that this would be very important for IODP Canada to know in order to promote IODP in Canada and that the national office of Canada would be very grateful to receive help from ECORD for this event. He further pointed out that there was the Canadian 734-APL currently in SSEP that could be potentially piggybacked with the Juan de Fuca Expedition. G. Camoin suggested to drop a message to IODP-MI to speed up the process, so that it could potentially be forwarded to SPC in March 09.

Revised FY09 operational situation for JOIDES Resolution.

Revised FY 09 operational situation of the *Chikyu*

The *Chikyu*'s return date to IODP operations is planned for May 09. The availability of a floating crane and repair-work personnel associated with the thruster gear replacement had forced this delay.

CDEX cannot simply move the ~180 days of currently scheduled operations forward by two months. The currently scheduled operations (March to August 09) span two Japanese fiscal years (~1 Month in JP FY H20 which ends March 31st, 09 and ~5 months in JP FY H21 which begins April 1st, 09). The new operational period will be entirely in JP FY H21. As Japanese platform operating funds cannot be carried forward across fiscal years, the net effect is that only ~150 days can be allocated to upcoming operations (i.e., we are losing the ~30 days of time previously allocated to JP FY H20). These new operations would run from ~May through September 09.

The NanTroSEIZE Project Management Team (PMT) have been asked to discuss the effects of this loss of 30 days and re-prioritize operations as necessary. They will have this discussion via email and report back to OTF. Once OTF has the PMT recommendations, OTF can examine and discuss these recommendations and determine the most appropriate IODP operations for *Chikyu* for this upcoming period of operations.

Operational situation of the Program in FY10 and beyond

MSPs

Besides the Great Barrier Reef Expedition, which may start at the beginning of FY10, there will be no MSP operation in FY10. After FY10, ECORD desires to implement one MSP for each fiscal year.

Chikyu and NanTroSEIZE

The scheduling beyond FY09 is seen as problematic, particularly with regard to the ability to achieve the primary objective (deep fault) due to uncertainties of the Kuroshio Current. One option is to consider a commitment to another riser project, such as the Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project (CRISP).

There will be no *Chikyu* operations in FY10 (most will be in FY09 and FY11).

Regarding future prospects for riser drilling beyond NanTroSEIZE, the question occurs of what should be done in FY11 to FY13, if the Kuroshio current prevents Chikyu riser drilling at site C0002, as no alternate deep drilling site has been identified in the region?

Furthermore, there are no other riser projects ready to be implemented. The CRISP (Costa Rica Seismogenesis Project) proponents have submitted a proposal to NSF to fund a 3-D survey and OTF has been asked to look at the feasibility of CRISP and report to the SPC in March 09.

The SPC wishes to see necessary actions toward the process of readying this proposal for operations. The SPC requests that IODP-MI and the platform operator scope this proposal to assess key operational necessities for implementation.

JOIDES Resolution

The FY10 schedule is uncertain and dependent on the location of non-IODP contract work.

Proposal pressure

Based on the proposal statistics made for the 1st April, 08 submission deadline, it appears that there is a relatively low number of proposals requiring riser drilling. The current way of generating and nurturing riser proposals has not worked. There is also a low number of MSP proposals.

Lifetime of proposals at SPC

Some proposals that perennially rank low, and probably will never rank high. Proponents should be given this information. SPC will discuss the option of deactivating proposals at its March 09 meeting. The committee does not want to set up a specific set of rules for deactivating proposals instead the decision would come from discussion.

Procedures for SPC proposal handling

For Tier 1 proposals:

(1) Highest priority proposal for an ocean basin; (2) important to complete by 2013; (3) reside at OTF for two or three years; (4) ready for drilling.

For Tier 2 proposals:

(1) High priority proposal for an ocean basin; (2) re-evaluated at each ranking meeting; (3) ready for drilling.

At its March 09 meeting, the SPC intends to review and rank: (1) new proposals that have been forwarded by the SSEP, (2) existing proposals residing with the SPC, and (3) all Tier 2 proposals that are residing with the OTF and that are not on any OTF-approved schedule for FY09 or FY10 (SPC Consensus 0808-25).

In March 10, and at subsequent ranking meetings, the SPC will normally rank: (1) new proposals forwarded by the SSEP, (2) existing proposals residing with the SPC, (3) the Tier 2 proposals that have been residing with the OTF and that are not on an approved schedule at the time of the SPC meeting.

Proposal 728-APL2

A revised ancillary project letter (728-APL2) with a drilling plan based on a single hole has been proposed for piggybacking on the Great Barrier Reef Expedition (Proposal 519-Full2), and based on the likelihood that the drilling platform will transit through Torres

Strait. The APL is supported as an add-on to the Great Barrier Reef drilling, subject to review and approval by both the SSP and EPSP.

SPC requests that site GoP-01 should be included in the 519-Full2 program plan contingent on the GBR drilling platform transiting through Torres Strait, and contingent on Site Survey Panel and Environmental Protection and Safety Panel approval.

Flexibility in implementation

A more flexible implementation may provide better opportunities to achieve top science objectives while operating under operational realities for the remainder of this program and for renewal, e.g. with the current mode of expedition scheduling 3 or 4 of the top 8 proposals with planned drilling in the northern Pacific could be completed in FY10. This would leave 4 or 5 top proposals un-implemented if the ship leaves the Pacific after FY10. It appears that it would be possible to descope some proposals, streamline them, maintain the high priority science objectives, and get them implemented via hybrid legs with flexible expedition length. This would allow more Pacific proposals to be implemented before renewal.

The combination of environmental windows, restricted scheduling, and urgency in moving forward rapidly with science after a hiatus and in advance of renewal, provides an incentive to implement expeditions in a different way than the standard expedition model. There will be flexibility, initiated by reviewing immediately northern Pacific proposals currently residing with the OTF and under consideration for possible scheduling in FY10.

SPC requested, that the IOs provide guidance about expedition flexibility, including ramifications of combining expedition objectives and/or staffing and crew rotation to implement various length expeditions and/or combined science parties and/or short-term port calls for crew and scientist rotation. SPC also asked, that the funding agencies and PMOs provide information about what financial impact the above flexibility options might have. Last, but not least SPC requested, that the SSEP considers how proposals might include additional information about objectives achieved with respect to the overall proposal objectives with streamlined drilling plans.

Ocean Drilling Consortium (ODC)

The ODC workshop was held in June 08 and attended by academic and industry representatives. The goal of the ODC was to use the *JOIDES* Resolution during the four months of the year when it will be unavailable to the IODP, to pursue goals of mutual interest in academia and industry. The ODC's nine-member steering committee has almost finished a proposal, which was presented to energy companies.

The companies would then decide whether or not to buy into the consortium. The timeline for the ODC is: (1) submission of proposal to energy companies in September 08, (2) decision on whether the ODC will proceed in May 09, (3) the possible first four-month block of ODC drilling could start in June 10 and (4) the possible second four-month block of ODC drilling could start in June 12.

Future role of the Industry-IIS PPG

The key elements of the group's mandate was (1) to promote IODP proposals to address industry-relevant objectives within the context of the ISP, (2) to develop effective links between academic and industry scientists, (3) to engage industry professionals as ambassadors in communicating and promoting IODP activities.

Major achievements of the IIS PPG included: (1) its recommendation of the formation of an Industry Task Force independent of the SAS and the PPG, which effectively became the ODC, (2) its contacts to advise IODP-MI on the "right" people to engage in the ODC at various companies, (3) its encouragement of future Arctic drilling and the Arctic workshop,

(4) the industry-IODP meeting in Tokyo in summer 2007, (5) the promotion of a South Atlantic IODP proposal submitted as part of the rifted margins Mission, (6) its identification of industry-relevant proposals within the SAS.

SPC recommended, that the IODP maintains a permanent industry-related group within the SAS, which should: (1) not be a PPG, (2) need a clear mandate, (3) need strong leadership from academics with deep, established interactions with industry.

Complementary Project Proposals (CPPs)

A CPP is defined as an hybrid IODP project with substantial external funding, that, (1) has a scientific focus linked to the ISP, is of interest to academic scientists, and consistent with IO contracts and memoranda (e.g., oil exploration is not permissible), (2) has substantial sponsorship from a third-party (minimum of 70 % for POCs at the time of drilling), but does not have to be a "collaboration", (3) has a compelling scientific focus, (4) is intended to be completed on an IODP platform operating under normal IO contracts, (5) contains an additional proposal section (within the normal length limit) explaining the benefit of the third-party contribution and/or collaboration and (6) is reviewed by the SAS, but in a streamlined way.

Suggested procedure for the SAS in dealing with CPPs included, that (1) proposal submission follows all normal guidelines and deadlines, (2) the CPP requires a description of, and pledge for, financial commitment, (3) some flexibility regarding standard practices (i.e., coring, logging, sampling) and (4) the SSEP would evaluate the CPP as it would any other proposal.

In its SPC Motion 0808-21, the SPC decide that if would make a decision on a CPP by either forwarding it to the OTF, or declining it. This would be done at the SPC meeting, which immediately followed the SSEP meeting and that forwarded the proposal.

N. Koç asked if there would be any priority given to these proposals in the IODP proposal pipeline. C. Mével thought that there is a doubt, that these proposals ever will be submitted. M. Comas challenged the concept by outlining, that it would be rather interesting to submit CPPs, in order to pay the sailing berths. She asked about the new aspect of these constructs and what would be the sample distribution policy in the future? N. Koç was concerned about the 70 % that the industrial partners should pay as they could have all by paying 100 %.

Program renewal activities and timelines

The INVEST meeting will take place on September 23rd to 25th, 09 in Bremen. The timeline for the science planning part of the program renewal process is as follows: (1) start of the INVEST renewal conference in September 09, (2) publication of the INVEST proceedings early 10, (3) transformation of INVEST outcomes into the science and implementation plan, (4) 1st draft of the new science plan late 10, (5) internal and external review of science plan, (6) complete the new science plan fully in 11, approval by national science boards (US/JP/EU) in 11/12 and finally (7) approval of the science/program plan by the funding agencies in 12.

The national science planning processes has started. The lead agencies met in September to discuss the planning, the IODP Council will meet in January 09 and the SAS external committee on hybrid funding is starting now. The SAS external committee was formed by the IODP-MI President charged by the Board of Governors.

In preparation of the INVEST Conference, besides the EGU session and the related workshop, that will be held in April 09 in Vienna, the Japan Drilling Earth Science Consortium (J-DESC) will host a domestic big meeting in fall 08, at which discussions will focus on renewal of the IODP beyond 2013, and the future of ocean drilling.

3. ECORD News

3.1 EMA - ECORD Council

C. Mével reported that the ECORD chair rotates every six months and as of October 1st, 08 that the new ECORD chair will be Chris Franklin (UK) and the vice-Chairs will be Severino Falcon-Morales (Spain) and Fernando Barriga (Portugal) as incoming vice-Chair. The last ECORD council meeting was held in June 5th and 6th, 08 in Paris.

The ECORD Council approved the ESSAC nominations for the different SAS panels. In its motion 08-01-4 the ECORD Council approved the FY09 budget of € 152 500 presented by ESSAC. This budget included € 20 000 for Summer Schools support; € 15 000 for scholarships for the FY09 Summer Schools; € 18 000 to support the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme; € 5 000 to support 'over-quota' participation of ECORD scientists at IODP-MI workshops and € 10 000 for travel support for keynote and invited speakers at the 09 ECORD Conference. The ECORD Council endorsed (ECORD Council motion 08-01-10) the ESSAC recommendation to fund the Urbino and Bremen 2009 Summer Schools at a level of € 12 500 and € 7 500 respectively.

The ECORD Council had expressed to the Lead Agencies the difficulty to continue funding at a very high level a programme, which is accomplishing very little. There has been an ECORD-Lead Agencies meeting in Beijing, prior to the IODP council meeting. The necessary to have a long term perspective on the funding and not on a yearly basis was expressed. It was decided that, ECORD would pay its full participation (3 P.U. = \$ 16.8 M) until 2010 and then reconsider its position, based on what the programme has accomplished. ECORD is aiming to implement one MSP expedition per year during the last three year of IODP to increase its visibility and facilitate the renewal.

The ECORD-Net

The ECORD-Net ended in August 31st 08. It received € 2.7 M over 57 months. The last meeting took place in Den Haag, September 08. Currently EMA is finalizing the report for the EC.

As part of WP2, a workshop for potential new members was organized by NERC in Edinburgh, May 28th to 29th, 08. The workshop included presentations about the structure of ECORD and IODP, and the science programme. Representatives from following countries took place: Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Israel, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Ukraine plus a few young scientists from ECORD member countries such as Denmark, Portugal and Belgium.

Deep Sea Frontier Initiative (DSF)

ECORD has been promoting the Deep Sea Frontier initiative. There is currently an open call in the 09 work plan of the 7th. Framework programme. The deadline for this call is January 8th, 09. A maximum of € 1 M can be attributed. There has been a meeting of the DSF steering committee in Barcelona on October 6th, 08 with the aim to get organized to answer the call. Participants of that meeting were Miquel Canals (University of Barcelona, Spain), Catherine Mével (CNRS-IPGP, France), ECORD, Jürgen Mienert (University of Tromsø), Ralf Schneider (Kiel, Germany) IMAGES, Phil Weaver (NOC, UK), HERMES-HERMIONE, Paolo Favali (INGV), EMSO, Pierre Cochonat (IFREMER), ESO-Net, Antonio Dell'Anno, representing Roberto Danovaro (CONISMA, Italy), Achim Kopf, representing Antje Boetius (MARUM, Germany) and Ben De Mol (University of Barcelona, Spain). It was decided that A. Kopf will lead the proposal, with the support of the Bremen group.

A first list of work packages has been elaborated

- WP1 Lithosphere - biosphere interaction
- WP2 Biogeochemistry & microbiology of marine ecosystems
- WP3 Sedimentary processes
- WP4 Geofluids, gas hydrates, and relevance for (natural) environmental Change
- WP5 Climate change & response of deep-sea biota
- WP6 Sustainable use of deep-sea resources
- WP7 Mission-specific subseafloor sampling
- WP8 Infrastructure & Synergies (in situ measurement, data base?)
- WP9 Management

There is a discussions going on, regarding the WP leaders

It was agreed that the duration of the project should be 2 1/2 years. The first year will be devoted to organize a workshop at the WP level. A major workshop will be organized in the second year. The remaining time will be used to produce a document.

R. James asked if EU contacts had been established in the past. C. Mével replied that there were plenty of contacts between ECORD and the EU. She pointed out, that the termination of the ERA-Net had implications regarding travel funds that for example B. Brandsdottir from Iceland was not able to partake in the meeting, because these travel funds derived from the ECORD-ERA-Net. C. Mével felt concerned about the potential success of the proposal submission, as the call text would be open for misinterpretation. B. Wolff-Boenisch thought, that the fact, that scientific drilling was in the call text could be interpreted as positive sign, as if the EU would had wished to exclude the drilling community in the 7. Framework Programme, the important keyword "scientific drilling" would not have been included in the call text. The key issue would be, that different scientific communities such as for example the biodiversity community represented by HERMES, the scientific drilling community or other communities would be pushed to collaborate together and that it would be up to the communities do decide whether this was a good idea or whether there were sufficient overlaps between the communities to work together.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-01: C. Mével will send to the ESSAC Office a list including the detailed work packages in preparation of the response to the EU coordination action call.

Done: *After C. Mével has sent a list with 9 work packages to the ESSAC Office, A. Kopf asked the Office to wait before circulating that list to the ESSAC delegates, as a new work package list was under way and the old list had been changed for the most part. As the final work packages have been elaborated in a very late stage, the ESSAC Office send the list to the ESSAC delegates 2 days after having received the list and exposed the problem of delaying further proposal writing due to potential changes in the work package leader.*

Outreach

There has been an IODP booth at the IGC in Oslo, Norway in August 08. The new ECORD brochure "answers" arouse interest in the conference attendants.

EUROGIA

EUROGIA is a EUREKA scheme, a pan-European initiative to fund R&D. It is a "la carte" programme, funded at the national level, through industry and governments. EUROGIA is a cluster of EUREKA, focussing on energy domains such as oil and gases, biomasses, solar, wind, CO₂, hydrogen and geothermal technologies but also on education and training and information and communication technologies aspects. The cluster brings together large companies, very often competitors, along with SMEs, research institutes and universities, sharing both the risk and benefits of innovation. A representative from EUROGIA+ will attend the Bremerhaven workshop.

Aurora Borealis

Aurora Borealis is supported via an EU Support Action named ERICON. The Kick-off meeting took place in Berlin December 3rd, 08. ECORD is a partner.

ECORD Vision

The ECORD steering committee has been mandated to prepare the discussions at the next ECORD council meeting. There should be a new, innovative Science plan with societal relevance. Related questions are for example: What structure is the best adapted to fit the science plan? Should we seek for partnership with industry? What are the relationships with other programmes (e.g. DSF concept)? Is the relationship worth with the European Commission?

3.2 ESO

D. McInroy reported about the current MSP activities. Expedition 313, New Jersey, was planned for May 09. Some tender responses have been received and the contractual discussions are ongoing with the preferred contractor. Once a start date has been agreed, the current Science Party will be asked to continue participation. ESO will then contact the PMOs with details of the staffing shortfall (for example Steve Hesselbo, UK has withdrawn as Co-chief. The PMOs assistance will be sought to repopulate the Science Party. Currently ESO is in discussion with a potential new Co-chief scientist.

GBR

The GBR expedition is planned for September 09. The expedition depends on the timely implementation of the New Jersey expedition. More than 1 tender responded to the call. The contractual discussions are ongoing with the preferred contractor. ESO has applied for a new drilling permit from the GBRMPA (for time extension and greater number of holes). The GBRMPA is satisfied with ESO Environmental Management Plan. NERC has signed a Deed of Agreement with the GBRMPA. The GBR expedition is approved by the SSP. The current co-chief scientists are Jody Webster (Australia) and Yusuke Yokoyama (Japan).

The future

2 MSP expeditions are planned in 09 (NJ and GBR), the 2 corresponding science parties in 2010. ECORD has expressed the desire to implement every year a MSP Expeditions viz. for 11, 12 and 13. Currently there is 1 MSP proposal within OTF, the Late Pleistocene Coralgall Banks 581-Full2 proposal. Other MSPs currently in IODP SAS system are (1) New England Margin Hydrogeology (637-Full2), (2) Chixculub K-T Impact Crater (548-Full3), (3) NW Pacific Coral Reefs (615-Full2), (4) Baltic Sea Basin Paleoenvironment (672-Full2) and (5) Central Arctic Paleoceanography (708-Pre).

M. Riedel asked for clarification if the timely implementation of New Jersey in May 09 would be crucial for the starting of the Great Barrier Reef expedition in fall 09. G. Camoin confirmed this time interrelationship.

3.3 EMA- ESO-ESSAC Meeting

P. Maruéjol summarised the last activities of the ECORD Education and Outreach team, which met in Aix-en-Provence in August 08. The main function of this team is to integrate outreach activities between the different ECORD bodies, so that ECORD speaks with one sole voice to IODP-MI and partners. Discussion themes dealt with publications, the draft and calendar of the next ECORD Newsletter #11, the new planned ESO brochure, the core replicas of the cores from the PETM and the K/T boundary, the expeditions ACEX, Tahiti, and Superfast Spreading Rate Crust 2, the coordination and update of the ECORD and ESSAC web sites, the exhibition of different ECORD/IODP booth (the EGU 2008, the 33rd IGC and the AGU 2008) as well as the promotion of IODP and ECORD at the site <http://www.rtcc.org/2008/html/res-oceans-2.html> of RTCC (Responding to Climate Change), which is accredited as an official observer to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process.

The next meeting will take place in January 15th to 16th, 09, in Paris.

P. Maruéjol continued to report about the last IODP Outreach Task Force meeting which was held on October 2nd to 3rd, 08 in Washington DC, USA, and convened by Nancy Light (IODP-MI). The purpose was to communicate about different outreach activities with the different IODP partners CDEX, USIO and ESO-EMA to maintain an integrated team. Topics have been the communication plans of IODP 2009 expeditions, the IODP both for the AGU 2008 (#2213), which will be equipped with a video wall, new formats of the Town Hall meeting (see Forum on iodp.org), the new web site of the JOIDES Resolution (<http://joidesresolution.org>), the School of Rock during the Juan de Fuca Expedition mid 2009, The Teachers at Sea Program of the Canterbury Excursion.

3.4 ESSAC representatives and National Office reports

The ESSAC delegates reported about their activities in their countries.

F. Abrantes announced that the next January SASEC meeting will take place in Lisbon and the next ESSAC meeting in Sesimbra, Portugal (see also item 12. "Next meetings").

E. Erba reported that the 4 different Italian research agencies finally signed a consortium contract, but that the situation still remains difficult.

The finish delegate K. Strand explained that Finland will have an annual meeting together with the ICDP community, that there is an Artic Sea proposal with a finish proponent and that from November 12th to 13th 08 an International Polar Year Conference took place in Espoo (<http://projects.gtk.fi/polaarikokous/ENGLISH/>).

M. Comas reported about several Spanish IODP activities: a photo exhibition, a new Spanish brochure, an IODP booth at the national geological conference in Gran Canaria, which takes place every 4 years and an invited talk.

B. McConnell explained that the Irish national office has to cope with a very small budget, which is mainly used for ground up developments such a scholarship for students; Ireland sent 2 extra students to the Urbino Summer School. Regarding the SAS panels the Irish national office has no money to spend.

N. Koç reported that the Norwegian web page would soon be available and that a meeting with Statoil took place.

J. McKenzie said that IODP Switzerland tried to bring both communities, IODP and ICDP more together, as both communities are very active. There will be meeting in February 21st, 09 with the keynote speaker D. Hodell, who is involved in both programmes IODP and ICDP. Since early 2008 Switzerland is also a member of ICDP.

R. James reported on the next IODP UK meeting in 2009 in London. She invited all delegates to come.

M. Riedel explained that the Canadian national office has to reapply every 2 years for IODP grant continuation. Like Switzerland and others Canada tries to merge both communities, IODP and ICDP, as there are overlaps between these communities. The same applies for the IMAGES and MARGINS programmes, but it would be difficult to get the community together, as the Canadian community was very compartilised. 3 students attended the Urbino Summer School. M. Riedel announced that he had the intention to apply to host an ECORD Summer School in 2010.

G. Camoin mentioned that a French IODP meeting will take place in December 08. C. Mével added that France would join ICDP next year.

J. Erbacher reported that the Germany's contribution of about € 5.3 M IODP to IODP is secured for the end of the program. IODP Germany prepared the DFG mid-term report. In the last 5 years about 130 IODP related projects with a volume of about € 2.5 M. had been funded by the DFG. About 450 papers with German participation has been published, among them 60 % had an impact factor between 3 to 4. In Germany, the German Scientific Earth Probing Consortium, GESEP (GESEP) has been funded.

C. Mével added that ECORD has approached ICDP to seek for potential collaboration. In most of the ECORD countries both programmes established common meeting etc. It would be important to establish common activities also at the European level.

4. ESSAC highlights on ECORD proposals

J. Harff as a co-proponent presented the IODP Proposal #672-Full2 Baltic Sea Paleoenvironment

ESSAC Action Item 0810-02: ESSAC encourages ESO to contact the lead proponents of the IODP Proposal #672 – Baltic Sea - in order to support and to discuss operative issues related to the improvement of the technical aspects of the proposal.

5. ESSAC highlights on IODP expedition planning

P. Clift presented the outcomes of the DPG Monsoon

6. Breakout sessions

The three ESSAC subcommittees met to discuss the topics on the agenda. The results are given in the respective items.

7. Nominations and Staffing

7.1.1 Quotas

G. Camoin presented the new berth quotas, which included New Jersey and the EqPac expeditions, but not the Bering Sea, Canterbury Basin and Wilkes Land expeditions as the final staffing of those expeditions was not yet finalised.

| Member | Financial contribution % | Entitlement | Berths | Balance |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|
| France | 24.8% | 36.2 | 30 | (-) 6.2 |
| Germany | 25.9% | 37.8 | 38 | (+) 0.2 |
| UK | 24.8% | 36.2 | 35 | (-) 1.2 |
| Sum | 75.5% | 110.3 | 103 | (-) 7.3 |
| | | | | |
| Austria | 0.6% | 0.8 | 0 | (-) 0.8 |
| Belgium | 0.2% | 0.2 | 1 | (+) 0.8 |
| Canada | 1.1% | 1.6 | 5 | (+) 3.4 |
| Denmark | 3.1% | 4.5 | 3 | (-) 1.5 |
| Finland | 0.5% | 0.7 | 2 | (+) 1.3 |
| Iceland | 0.2% | 0.3 | 0 | (-) 0.3 |
| Ireland | 0.8% | 1.1 | 0 | (-) 1.1 |
| Italy | 1.8% | 2.7 | 6 | (+) 3.3 |
| The Netherlands | 1.8% | 2.7 | 4 | (+) 1.3 |
| Norway | 4.9% | 7.2 | 4 | (-) 3.2 |
| Portugal | 0.6% | 0.9 | 1 | (+) 0.1 |
| Spain | 2.4% | 3.5 | 6 | (+) 2.5 |
| Sweden | 4.0% | 5.8 | 6 | (+) 0.2 |
| Switzerland | 2.5% | 3.6 | 5 | (+) 1.4 |
| Sum | 24.5% | 35.7 | 43 | (+) 7.3 |
| | | | | |
| Total ECORD | | 146 | 146 | 0,0 |

Showned staffing quotas table on October 28th, 2008: Includes the New Jersey and both EqPac expeditions, but not the Bering Sea, Canterbury and Wilkes Land expeditions.

7.1.3 Canterbury and Wilkes Land Expeditions

G. Camoin reported that the Science Party of both expeditions are already in place. The Chief Scientists and the science participants have been informed of the new schedule for their expeditions. The Chief Scientists and the science participants have been asked to check if they are still able to participate. If any of them drop out, the best way to re-fill their positions would be to staff from existing nominations or to issue a new and/or a limited call. Meanwhile, the co-chiefs confirmed that they would be able to continue in their role based on the new dates.

7.1.4 Great Barrier Reef

Before L. Lourens presented the decision process, on how the Nominations and Staffing Subcommittee made the final priority list for the Great Barrier Reef Expedition, G. Camoin left the meeting room, as he was deemed conflicted as GBR applicant. B. Wolff-Boenisch compiled the grouping results of the ESSAC delegates. The final table, including the ECORD quota balances, the specific applicants' expertises and the additional comments on applications from the relevant delegate and/or national office (5 out of 10 concerned) were sent to the members of the ESSAC Nominations and Staffing Subcommittee on September 11th, 08. The subcommittee made a priority list and took into account that (1) France has a very large negative quota balance (-4.0), which justified three berths. (2) Besides G. Camoin, P. Gouze has been selected, because it was judged, that he would bring another unique expertise to the team, i.e. enlarges the scientific scope. (3) P. Deschamps was preferred to G. Cabioch, because of its expertise (dating will be as important for GBR as it

was for Tahiti). (4) The UK had three strong candidates, but given a quota balance of 0.0 three berths could not be justified. (5) Germany had three strong candidates, but given a small negative quota balance of -0.5 three berths were not justified. T. Felis was preferred to T. Brachert, because a strong expertise in carbonate sedimentology was already ensured by other applicants. Austria did not have one berth yet. As Austria nominated a very appropriate candidate, who received a strong support from W. Piller, the subcommittee proposed to select Sanders among the top 8 candidates. Unfortunately Spain is very overquoted, which could not validate a berth.

The final list was sent back to the ESSAC Scientific coordinator, who sent it to ESO, and to the other ESSAC delegates, September 19th, 08.

L. Lourens mentioned that the subcommittee had to cope with the absence of different members and that the timeframe to make up the final priority list was very short. He appreciated that some of the national offices had made recommendations. He was aware that the berth quotas for small countries were important, though of course were not always fair.

M. Comas asked if the quotas of the future expeditions had been taken into account. L. Lourens disagreed. He explained that the subcommittee started to make up the list, when Spain already had a very high berth quota, even when the Canterbury and Wilkes Land had been cancelled during the nomination process.

B. Wolff-Boenisch pointed out that she had been aware of the very narrow time frame the subcommittee had to cope with. For the Shatsky Rise Expedition there would be sufficient time for the Nomination and Staffing Subcommittee to make up the priority list. In the case of the GBR, the delegates had 3 weeks to rank. In the future the time designed for the grouping exercise could be shortened, in order to leave enough time to the subcommittee to discuss the final list. She added that the persons on the N&S Subcommittee should anticipate potential absences in the future and inform the members of the subcommittee. She emphasized the importance of the recommendations of the national offices, as those recommendations went directly into the decision process. As mentioned 5 national offices only commented on their national candidates.

J. McKenzie mentioned that the Austrian candidate was very well chosen, however the subcommittee was not aware that another Austrian candidate had been selected for sailing on another cruise. She thought, that the subcommittee should also consider the gender balance in the future, as in the case of the Great Barrier Reef expedition, no woman had been chosen though suitable applications had been received.

L. Lourens asked if the subcommittee would get the priority list back from ESO. B. Wolff-Boenisch informed that the ESSAC Office had not been contacted yet. Currently the co-chiefs would consider all priority lists received from all Program Member Offices (PMOs). Then they would make up the final list. If the final list would differ from the one sent to ESO, then the Implementation Organisation would come back to the ESSAC Office and to the subcommittee for reconsideration. R. James asked for clarification, if only the 8 preferred candidates' CV has been sent to ESO. B. Wolff-Boenisch replied that the whole list with all CVs, with the exception of the "0 star" applications (as decided by ESSAC at its 9th meeting), had been sent to ESO. R. James continued to ask, if highly ranked candidates not part of whose 8, but with an expertise missing elsewhere (viz. if potentially candidates the US or Japan would not meet the needed expertise), could be nominated, i.e. could ECORD sent more than 8 scientists. B. Wolff-Boenisch confirmed, that in the case of unfilled berths there was the potential of having more than 8 ECORD scientists on an expedition. R. James continued to ask, who would sort out the overall balance between ECORD, the US and Japan. B. Wolff-Boenisch said that in this case the co-chiefs would make a list and if they would be aware that for example an important expertise for achieving the scientific goals of the expedition is only found in ECORD then the co-chiefs could suggest that person, though the respective country already had 8 berths filled. This happened with the Wilkes Land

Expedition, when G. Camoin negotiated 10 berths. Discussions concerning berth distribution among the IODP partners are also topics between the different PMOs.

M. Riedel had a comment and a general questions regarding the grouping of students' applications as he stated that students generally have a minor chance to get chosen. He asked if it would be possible to ask for ESSAC or ECORD an additional training position on board. B. Wolff-Boenisch clarified that an additional berth (8+1) was not possible, but that of course it would be up to ESSAC and the subcommittee to decide, that a berth would be assigned to a young student (7+1) in the future. M. Riedel confined its suggestion by saying that this has not to be happen for every expeditions, but at least for very strong young candidates. B. Wolff-Boenisch suggested that this could be also done by the national offices through a specific recommendation of an outstanding student. If ESSAC would consider such a decision, then the ESSAC delegates should rethink their way of grouping, as young scientists cannot get a publication list comparable to that of a senior scientists. P. Clift commented on a student's perception, that European students would be preferred to non-EU students. He explained that he told the students that the system was based on expertise and was fair. G. Camoin confirmed that the system is based on expertise and fair when he had reenter the room.

7.1.5 NanTroSEIZE riser expeditions

G. Camoin reminded that the deadline of the NanTroSEIZE expeditions 319 and 322 call has been deferred (Nov. 06.11.08) and that so far only few applications were received (see also 1.4 "Items since the 10th ESSAC Meeting" and 1.6 "ESSAC Office news").

7.1.6 Shatsky Rise

The co-chiefs of the Shatsky Rise Expedition will be Will Sager (lead proponent) and Yoshiyuki Tatsumi. The start of the staffing must be done as soon as possible. The proposed timeline is the following: 1) call for applications in early November 08, 2) deadline for applications: December 29th, 08, 3) the final priority list has to be sent to the USIO on February 15th, 09. This only gives 1.5 months to PMOs to evaluate, and rank the applications. USIO will get only 2 months and the scientists may have as little as 4.5 months advance notice before the expedition.

7.1.7 Bering Sea

G. Camoin explained that, when the Bering Sea Expedition was removed from the schedule in May 08, it was not placed back on the schedule. Therefore, all scientists and co-chiefs invitations were cancelled. This was in contrast to what was done for the PEAT expeditions. The USIO and the PMOs recently agreed to try to re-assemble the same science party through the following procedure: (1) check with the previous co-chiefs (Takahashi, Ravelo) to see if they are willing to participate, (2) check with the Chief Scientists to see, if they agree with attempting to re-assemble the previous science party, (3) check with all previously accepted scientists to see, if they are still willing to participate without making any commitment, (4) and depending on their responses, to determine, whether to (a) simply re-invite all the previous participants, (b) to fill gaps from the preexisting nomination pool or (c) to start from scratch (new call for applications).

In the meantime both co-chiefs have been re-invited and both have accepted again).

J. McKenzie asked about the status of the current berth quotas, because they would be very important to be considered by the subcommittee regarding the final priority list. Moreover, because of the uncertainties of the different expeditions, the staffing and therefore the berth quotas could be changed. G. Camoin explained that the current berth quotas were calculated on the basis of the final staffing. Expeditions, which are not at this

stage, such as the Canterbury Basin Expedition with possibly 2 French and 1 Canadian scientists who may decline the invitations, had not been taken into account. J. McKenzie asked if in the case of the Canterbury Basin Expedition, the 3 positions would be open again, implying a re-evaluation from the subcommittee. G. Camoin agreed, but explained that the co-chiefs would revisit the original priority list and the respective CVs formerly sent to ESO, and propose alternatives for these 3 candidates, ESSAC having then to accept or to argue. J. McKenzie agreed and said that the subcommittee has to be prepared, especially in view of these imbalances, in order to balance them out and to decrease these negative quotas. G. Camoin reminded the ESSAC delegates, that when a co-chief is replacing one candidate (which has for example declined the invitation) by another on the list, the Implementation Organisation has to come back to the ESSAC Office and ask for agreement, before they can take the final decision. B. Wolff-Boenisch added that this was the reason why ESSAC was establishing a priority list.

In this context L. Lourens asked for clarification regarding the subcommittee's mandate and how to act regarding recommendations of national offices. G. Camoin explained, that in some case the national offices would recommend candidates sometimes not. In the case there has been a nomination, the subcommittee could add an external view on the CVs and then both, national office and subcommittee could discuss about a special candidate or if the national office is open for another candidate.

7.2 SAS panel nominations

7.2.1 SASEC

G. Camoin remembered the ESSAC Consensus 0805-04: ESSAC decides the extension of G. Wefer's term at the Science Advisory Executive Committee (SASEC) for two additional meetings. In the meantime G. Wefer agreed to stay on SASEC for one more year at the June meeting of the ECORD Council.

7.2.2 SPC

J. Behrmann (Ger) and G. Camoin (F) should rotate off after the August 09 SPC meeting. J. Behrmann will be replaced by R. Stein, who will become ESSAC Chair on October 1st, 09. G. Camoin reported that he has been asked by the next SPC Chair to stay for one more meeting at SPC (until the March 10 meeting) as his expertise on shallow-water carbonates will be needed at the next two SPC ranking meetings.

| |
|--|
| <p>ESSAC Consensus 0810-02: ESSAC approves the extension of G. Camoin's term at SPC for one more meeting (until the March 2010 meeting) as his expertise on shallow-water carbonates will be required at the next two SPC ranking meetings.</p> |
|--|

7.2.3 SSEP

G. Camoin showed an overview of the current SSEP panel member composition. T. Elliott (UK) will rotate off from the SSEP after the May 09 meeting. A call for applications has been distributed and posted on the ESSAC web site. The applications will be reviewed by the N&S ESSAC Subcommittee, which will recommend nominations.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-03: A call for application for the nomination of new SSEP panel members has been widely distributed on October 6th, 08 with a February, 15th, 09 deadline and posted on the ESSAC website; the applications will then be reviewed by the Nominations and Staffing ESSAC Subcommittee, who will recommend nominations.

7.2.4 STP

G. Camoin informed the ESSAC delegates, that M. Lovell has rotated off from STP. The deadline for applications has been extended to October 15th, 08. There are 2 UK applicants Cedric John (London) and Marc K. Reichow (Leicester).

C. Neal, incoming Chair of STP contacted the ESSAC Office to request if D. Schmitt (Canada), current alternate of N. Vigier (F) could stay the complete length of N. Vigier's (F) planned term and become the current delegate. He suggested that N. Vigier could join STP later, i.e. at the end of D. Schmitt's term. The ESSAC Office contacted N. Vigier, who recently gave birth to twins, and she agreed with that proposition.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-04: The ESSAC Office will send to the ESSAC delegates the applications received for the replacement of the outgoing STP ECORD member. The ESSAC delegates will vote on the applications and send their votes to the ESSAC Office, which will then inform the applicants and the ESSAC delegates about the final results.

7.2.5 SSP

Three ECORD members were supposed to rotate off after the July 09 meeting: C. Gaedicke (Ger), G. Lericolais (F) and A. Holger-Lykke (DK). G. Lericolais has been recently appointed as Vice-Chair of this panel (Feb 09). He will therefore stay until July 12 as Vice-Chair and then Chair of the SSP. For the two other members, a call for applications will be widely distributed and posted on the ESSAC web site; the applications will then be reviewed by the N&S ESSAC Subcommittee, who will recommend nominations.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-05: A call for the nomination of new SSP members will be issued to replace the outgoing members C. Gaedicke (GER) and A. Holger-Lykke (DK). The call for applications will be widely distributed and posted on the ESSAC website; the applications will then be reviewed by the Nominations and Staffing ESSAC subcommittee, who will recommend nominations. The ESSAC office will contact SAS panel chairs for guidance regarding the expertise needed in that panel.

7.2.6 EDP

Based on the ESSAC Consensus 0805-03, the terms of J. Thorogood (UK), R. Person (F), L. Wohlgemuth (Ger) and M. Ask (Swe) at the EDP have been extended until June 09, June 09, January 09 and January 10 respectively. This new scheme was suggested by the four ECORD panel members in order to avoid loss of expertise in that panel. Since then, L. Wohlgemuth (Ger) has been asked to prolong his term, because of his rare expertise on ultra-deep drilling (KTB site).

ECORD should get a Vice-Chair position on that panel when Miyairi-san rotates off and B. Ussler becomes the new Chairperson.

ESSAC Item 0810-06: The ESSAC Office will contact L. Wohlgemuth (GER) regarding the extension of his term in that panel, as requested by the EDP Chair.

ESSAC Item 0810-07: The ESSAC Office will contact the ESSAC delegates to identify a potential Vice-Chairperson for EDP in 2010.

Because of the rotation of G. Wefer and because it is such an important position J. McKenzie suggested that ESSAC starts to think about, whom from the smaller countries

could be suggested. G. Camoin remembered that 2 years ago in Cardiff H. Weissert had been considered, but that the ESSAC Delegates could reconsider their suggestion. J. McKenzie thought, that it was fair to reconsider this in light of the importance of that position in order to get the right person. It is something that the subcommittee can re-visit with all delegates. J. McKenzie suggested that all delegates make recommendation and G. Camoin agreed in order to establish a pool of alternates.

ESSAC Item 0810-08: The ESSAC Office will seek nominations of scientists from “small countries” to replace G. Wefer at SASEC after the July 2009 meeting of that panel.

Nominations and Staffing (N&S) subcommittee report, discussion and future actions

L. Lourens summarised the discussions of the subcommittee. He raised a general question regarding the co-chief nominations, as he felt that the subcommittee had no information about who had been nominated before. G. Camoin reminded him that all ESSAC delegates had been contacted for the New Jersey co-chief nomination, because of S. Hesselbo's withdrawal. He also explained that in general the co-chiefs would be nominated by the SPC members. It was in his responsibility as ESSAC chair to decide to inform the ESSAC delegates. He also pointed out that this was not custom in all PMOs, but as only 4 ECORD members were involved in SPC, he preferred to involve ESSAC in these matters. B. Wolff-Boenisch added that the staffing lists for the planned expeditions had been distributed to the ESSAC delegates and that in the future ESSAC delegates will be able to check the staffing, in order to make suggestions or decisions. G. Camoin explained that for all proposals sitting at OTF, SPC members suggested co-chiefs and finally the IOs have chosen the co-chiefs. Usually the co-chief was one of the lead proponents and one who was not on the specific proposal.

J. McKenzie and L. Lourens made the recommendation to consider the gender balance for SAS panels and expeditions in the future. The ESSAC delegates agreed with this suggestion.

| |
|---|
| <p>ESSAC Consensus 0810-03: ESSAC will consider in the future the gender balance as an additional criterion for the nomination of SAS panel members and science party members.</p> |
|---|

8. Education and outreach

8.1. Summer Schools

8.1.1 Past Global Change Reconstruction and Modelling Techniques Summer School, Urbino, July 2008.

L. Lourens reported about the 2008 Urbino Summer School, which was held from July 15th to August 03rd, 08, and focused on the evolution and dynamics of Cretaceous and Cenozoic climates.

L. Lourens mentioned, that the organisers of the Urbino school would envisage to reduce the lengths of the summer school from 3 to roughly 2 weeks.

8.1.2 ECORD Summer School on Deep Subseafloor Biosphere, Bremen, September 2008

R. Stein informed the ESSAC delegates about the 2008 Summer School in Bremen (September 1st to 12th, 08). Aims of the school were to (1) educate PhD students and

young PostDocs in one of the major topics of IODP, the Deep Subseafloor Biosphere, (2) bring them in touch with IODP at an early stage of their career (3) prepare them for participation in IODP expeditions, by taking them on a "virtual ship" and (4) train them in core logging and scanning techniques. Program - first week

The lectures focused on several key topics related to the deep biosphere: (1) Subsurface microbial life (Lecturers: J. Parkes, B. Jorgensen, K. Edwards, F. Inagaki), (2) Bioenergetics (Lecturers: S. d'Hondt, W. Bach), (3) Subsurface carbon cycle (Lecturers: T. Ferdelman, G. Bohrmann, V. Heuer) and (4) Technologies (Lecturers: A. Teske, K. Hinrichs, B. Engelen, A. Schippers, H. Cypionka). The program of the second week dealt with the "virtual ship" experience, viz. (1) group-based practicals in the IODP Bremen Core Repository (BCR) applying logging instruments (Multisensor Core Logger, XRF Scanner, Linescan Imaging and Colour Scanner), (2) core logging and splicing, core description, (3) shipboard techniques for counting cells and for initial interstitial water chemistry (supervisors: U. Röhl, H. Kuhlmann, T. Westerhold, F. Lamy, B. Engelen, M. Kölling, T. Ferdelman). All participants presented their own work in 15 minutes talks.

GLOMAR and MARUM plan to address the three major topics of the IODP Initial Science Plan in a recurring three years cycle of summer schools taking advantage of the unique "virtual ship" facilities in Bremen. Following an "Earth History" topic in 2007, and a "Deep Biosphere" topic in 2008, for 2009 the ECORD Summer School on "Geodynamics of Mid-Ocean Ridges" will take place.

R. Stein commented that only Germans, Italians, Swiss and Danish applied for the summer school.

8.1.3 ESF Magellan Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science

J. Erbacher gave an overview of the ESF Magellan workshop series: 9 workshops had been funded, involving about 226 scientists. 8 IODP proposals had been fostered or nurtured by these workshops. In 2008 the following workshops took place: "Ocean Drilling for Seismic Hazard in European Geosystems" August 8th to 20th, 08 in Luleå, Sweden; "Lithospheric Heterogeneities, Hydrothermal Regimes, and Links between Abiotic and Biotic Processes at Slow Spreading Ridges", September 10th to 12th, 08, in Montpellier, France; and "Climate History: From Speculation to Reality" in Bremerhaven, Germany, from November 02nd to 05th, 08.

The workshop COCARDE "Cold-Water Carbonate Reservoir Systems in Deep Environments" is already scheduled for 2009 and will be held from January 21st to 25th in Fribourg, Switzerland.

The ESF Magellan Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science call had been issued in February 08. Then, there had been some confusions and the call taken away from the web site. Now the call has been back at the web site and announced as a permanent call. So far nobody had responded yet to the call, however the organisers of the Urbino Summer School considered to apply.

G. Camoin asked, if the ESF by its ESF Magellan Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science call would consider something separated from the ECORD summer school or if one could imagine to have a combined funding of an both ECORD Summer Schools plus ESF Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science, as the costs of the summer schools increase. J. Erbacher answered that this had still to be discussed at the ESF, but that theoretically there would be no reason why it could not happen. G. Camoin added that regarding the ECORD Summer Schools there might be more than 2 applications in the future. As the ECORD budget would not increase, the tapping of other additional resources would gain in importance. J. Erbacher added that a purely IODP-oriented summer school would be difficult to fund via the ESF, but that a mixed model could be applied and a general science

marine drilling oriented summer school could be funded. E. Erba asked for clarification regarding the funding of the ESF workshops and the planned ESF Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science. J. Erbacher explained that the ESF exclusively co-funded these events. Moreover, the ESF workshops should be preferentially located in a ESF country, whereas the ECORD Integrated Courses on Ocean Drilling Science should be held in an ECORD country.

8.2 Distinguished Lecturer Programmes

B. Wolff-Boenisch reported about the Distinguished Lecturer Programme FY 07-08. B. Ildelfonse sent an informative report about his experiences as an ECORD Distinguished Lecturer to the ESSAC Office. J. McKenzie wrote a report, which had been attached to the ESSAC 11th agenda book and published in the last ECORD newsletter # 11.

A call to apply to host an ECORD Distinguished Lecturer with a September 30th, 08 deadline was issued on July 2nd, 08. In total 34 applications from 14 countries were received by the ESSAC Office. The interested institutions applied via doodle. An application was from the US. Compared to the DLP 2007/2008, the number of applications remained constant. With exception of only 4 institutions and hosts, all other applications come from institutions, which had not applied in 2007. The ESSAC Office received an application from Bulgaria. For the first time an application derived from industry. P. Clift and A. Kopf already started to coordinate their schedules.

In her slides B. Wolff-Boenisch showed an overview table with all interested hosts, among them an institution from the US. A discussion arose, if institutions outside ECORD could apply to host an ECORD Distinguished Lecturer.

G. Camoin thought that it would be great, if ECORD could "export" the ECORD Lecturers to non-ECORD countries outside Europe. J. McKenzie demurred that the ideas would be great, but that ESSAC should stay reliable, as it would be very difficult to arrange the trip around fixed seminar programs. From her experiences it was not easy to schedule the lecturer series and, that is the reason for example that she did not give her lecture yet in Southampton or in Iceland. She stated that she was willing to continue her lectures, till the budget had been consumed.

ESSAC Consensus 0810-04: ESSAC decides that non-ECORD partners can apply for the ECORD Distinguished Lecturer Programme and that the 08/09 ECORD Distinguished Lecturers should be poised to travel outside the ECORD and European countries.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-09: The ESSAC Office will inform the 08/09 ECORD Distinguished Lecturers to consider applications to host an ECORD Lecturer 08/09 outside the ECORD and European countries.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-10: The ESSAC Office will inform the USIO, that the ECORD Lecturers 08/09 will consider applications to host an ECORD Lecturer outside the ECORD and European countries.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-11: The ESSAC Office will gather information, if IODP-MI plans to organize another DRILLS series.

8.3 ECORD Publications

8.3.1 ECORD Newsletter # 11

P. Maruéjol reported about the next 16-pages ECORD Newsletter, which has been released in early November 08. The regular topics include updated information from ECORD bodies (Council, ESO, EMA, ESSAC) and groups (Outreach & Education, ECORD-Net), reports of workshops and conferences, such as the highlight of IODP Proposal 581-Coralgal Banks. Special topics were the "Navigating the Data Ocean" (C. Graham) and an interview by A. Gerdes, the report of J. McKenzie "Travels of an ECORD Distinguished Lecturer" and the "Report on Monsoon DPG", by P. Clift.

The future ECORD newsletter # 12 will be released in mid-April, 09 at the 2009 EGU. The authors' deadline is planned for March 15th, 09. Current contribution suggestions are (1) from ESO about the New Jersey Shallow Shelf and the Great Barrier Reef Environmental Changes, (2) from the ECORD-Net reporting on the completed project and (3) from G. Camoin presenting results from the Tahiti Sea Level, (4) about Engineering Proposals (J. Thorogood - EDP), (5) about ECORD Publications review and an overview of the NanTroSEIZE Phase I.

Note: The ECORD newsletter # 11 is available on-line at: <http://www.ecord.org/pub/nl>

ESSAC Action Item 0810-12: The ESSAC Office requests that P. Maruéjol sends the link of the new *JOIDES Resolution* web page to the ESSAC delegates.

8.4 Education and Outreach (E&O) Subcommittee report, discussion and future actions

B. McConnell summarised the output of the discussion of the subcommittee who considered six items in the breakout sessions. Two were action items from ESSAC 10th (Stockholm), two had been requested by the Chair and two arose during the meeting.

ECORD Scholarships to attend summer schools (ESSAC Action Item 0805-12)

The subcommittee believe that the three documents currently requested, viz. a CV, a statement of interest, and a letter of support from the supervisor, are adequate. A publication list can be appended to the CV, but is not essential as the scholarships are aimed at very early-career scientists.

It is suggested that ESSAC delegates evaluating applications put emphasis on the statement of interest and letter of support, rather than the CV, and that this be made clear in the information for applicants. The statement of interest should include details on how the summer school will benefit to the applicant's research. Applicants should ensure that the letter of support also includes details regarding the available institutional support. Letters of support may be checked for authenticity by the national delegates before an award is made. Applicants will be asked to confirm during the application process that they can be identified on the ESSAC website for publicity purposes. They will be required to submit a short report on their summer school experience for possible inclusion on the website or in the ECORD newsletter, to raise awareness of the scholarship scheme. National offices or delegates will be asked to ensure these reports are provided.

National offices or delegates should not provide recommendations, as applicants are unlikely to have a national profile yet and conflicts of interest may arise.

The scholarships should not be apportioned between summer schools; the best (currently 15) should be selected on merit nor should they be required to match the country quotas of sailing berths. Of course, successful applicants have to be accepted by the summer school to get the grant.

All ESSAC delegates should participate in ranking all applications (as specified in ESSAC Consensus 0805-06), except when a conflict of interest applies. No rigid relative scoring system is proposed, but an emphasis on the statement of interest is suggested. Participation of all delegates in the ranking will help balance out any individual anomalies in judgement.

The subcommittee recommends that National offices seek to establish extra scholarships for good candidates who are unsuccessful applicants to ECORD.

B. Wolff-Boenisch reminded the ESSAC delegates, that at the last ESSAC meeting the delegates realised the heavy workload of judging about 50 student's CVs, which look alike. That is why the E&O subcommittee proposed to 'neglect' the applicant's CVs and to focus on the letter of interest, which includes the candidate's interests. In this way the students would have to better elaborate their letter of interest and explain why they apply for the scholarship. R. Stein asked, if the students already got the information that the letter of support is the more important document. G. Camoin clarified that the students will be informed in the future. B. Wolff-Boenisch suggested establishing a checklist for the applicants for guidance.

ECORD Scholarships for applicant from non-ECORD country

The group agrees that a scholarship should be available for a non-ECORD student but not reserved at the expense of a better ECORD applicant. Non-ECORD applicants should be assessed on the terms for the general scholarships outlined above. It is considered appropriate to limit the non-ECORD scholarship to applicants from European countries so that the normal level of funding would be able to cover the student's expenses and their participation would not be dependent on additional funds.

The subcommittee recommended to grant an ECORD scholarship to a student from a non-ECORD country, provided that the CV is sufficiently good enough.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-13: The Education and Outreach subcommittee will summarise its discussions at the 11th ESSAC Meeting regarding the criteria to be applied for the selection of future ECORD Scholarship applicants. This document will be distributed to all ESSAC delegates for further discussion and approval, before the next call for applications.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-14: The ESSAC Office will establish a first draft for a checklist including the items that the ECORD Scholarship applicants will need to take into consideration.

ECORD Grants

The ECORD grants should cover especially analytical costs and travel support for studies on DSP, ODP or IODP material and/or data. (ESSAC Action Item 0805-21 and ESSAC Consensus 0805-09)

The subcommittee suggests that the grants be awarded to young researchers (doctoral students and first-cycle post-docs) working in ECORD countries only. The grants can cover costs of travel and living expenses to visit a laboratory or material store, analytical costs and associated consumables. The grants will not cover major capital purchases, nor expenses for conference attendance (see discussion report below).

The subcommittee suggests that € 10,000 to € 15,000 be split between three grants, one to each theme of the Initial Science Plan.

Application

The application should take the form of a mini-proposal. This should include: a detailed description of the proposed work, the research objective, the data or material to be worked on, and the expected value to be added, the project partnership, researcher CV, supervisor letter of support, statement of access to facilities in host and home institution. The proposal should also include the total and requested costs, and the funds available from other sources.

Ranking

All ESSAC delegates should rank the applications, except when conflicts of interest arise, the ESSAC office will compile the rankings and the E&O subcommittee will then check and award the grants. Ranking should consider especially the following questions: is the proposal a good idea? Is it achievable in the time and money available? Are the required facilities guaranteed? Is it strongly supported by supervisor and host institution?

Monitoring

The proposed work is to be completed within 15 months of the grant award. A report is required at that stage, including a balanced budget, details on the data and new interpretations generated, and any resulting publications in press or preparation. The report, or a derivative of it, should be suitable for inclusion on the ECORD website and in the newsletter, as it is public data material.

R. Stein commented on the idea that the future ECORD grants should only be used for lab visits and consumables, but for example not for conference attendances presenting results of an IODP related study. B. McConnell refined the idea that presenting IODP results at a conference, would not be excluded, but that the grants should be more used to attain results, to encourage work on IODP material. R. Stein said that especially PhD students could not apply for conference participation funding, at least not in his institute. B. Wolff-Boenisch agreed that this was a good argument, however it should have to be assured that people apply for the work on sample material and not only for travelling. R. Stein suggested that ESSAC should at least not exclude this option. G. Camoin and M. Wagreich suggested the phrasing "only in certain cases when travelling is related to the".

R. James thought that if the aim would be a publication, then using the funds to cover a travel to attend a conference would not be the solution and ESSAC would then not fulfil the criteria established. She thought that if the German System would not allow for paying student a conference, then there would be a fundamental problem with the system. R. Stein explained that travel money could get included in a research proposal, but that it would be good to have an additional source. B. Wolff-Boenisch demurred that a paper would already be a raving success and that the outcome of the grant should be at least a report. R. James said that if it would be possible to publish the respective results, ECORD and IODP should be acknowledged. B. McConnell thought that the grant would be very important as students for example in Ireland, would know about all the different possibilities that IODP could provide. This would be another way of highlighting the programme.

G. Camoin asked the ESSAC delegates if they would also consider a student, who had been chosen to sail and he or she would now apply for future work on the future material sample or if the delegates would only consider applications for working on data and material obtained in the past. B. McConnell thought that both possibilities would be acceptable.

E. Erba asked J. McKenzie how grants are distributed at the International Association of Sedimentologists. J. McKenzie reported that 10 grants, each with a sum of € 1000 are granted and that the money was not made available for attending conferences. It was mainly for undertaking field work, doing or in some cases paying analyses (such as isotope analyses), visiting labs and for related travel costs. J. McKenzie said that the students usually would indicate a total budget as they would have money from elsewhere and that they only would need extra money. Basically the association would be able to fund everybody who applies. Regarding the application, the main issue was about motivation. The candidates would have to explain why their research is important, why they need the extra money and how this grant would help in their careers. No Postdocs, only PhD students are granted. The applicants would have to prepare a report and would not get the money until they had send the receipts of their expenses plus the report. B. Wolff-Boenisch confirmed that this was exactly the issue, that the subcommittee had been wondering how to circumnavigate dispenses of unrelated costs.

G. Camoin asked about the average minimum amount that the subcommittee envisage, in order he could propose the sum to the ECORD Council. He thought that very nice results could be obtained in a short period with that money. The subcommittee suggested a total sum ranging from € 10 000 to 15 000 portioned in about 3 to 5 grants (at least 1 grant in each IODP topic). There was a suggestion not to fix the budget for a grant. B. McConnell thought, that it was necessary to indicate a certain sum, in order the applicants could plan and also because the people might think that the grant is not worthwhile. B. Wolff-Boenisch thought to start with a smaller amount such as € 2000 per grant would be better in order to test the inquiry of that grant, as in the beginning the grant had to be communicated. E. Erba proposed to split the grant, 2 grants per IODP topic in order to get more grants.

G. Camoin asked the ESSAC delegates about their thoughts to open the grants to non-ECORD countries. B. Wolff-Boenisch said that currently the subcommittee considered the ECORD scholarships as door opener for the non-ECORD countries and the ECORD grants as a more prestigious instrument for the ECORD country members. G. Camoin added that in either case the grant had to be revisited after a year.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-15: The Education and Outreach subcommittee will summarise its discussions at the 11th ESSAC Meeting regarding the creation of ECORD grants and its criteria. This discussion paper will be distributed to all ESSAC delegates for discussion, for changes in the wording and for approval, before the final decisions will be taken at the next ESSAC Meeting in Sesimbra, Portugal.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-16: The ESSAC Office will establish a first draft for a checklist including the items that the ECORD grant applicants will need to take into consideration.

Teachers' workshop at EGU

The Chair asked the group to consider the possible organization of a Teachers' workshop at EGU 2010. At the same time, the group received an enquiry from Eve Arnold (Sweden) about the possibility of ECORD supporting a teachers' course on Marine Sediments, possibly in Bremen or at EGU 2010. Michael Wagreich (Austria) volunteered to help coordinate such an event and to contact Eve Arnold to discuss possibilities.

M. Wagreich told the ESSAC delegates that he already talked with J. Erbacher and that J. Behrmann could be one the speakers to give lecturers for teachers. The theme of workshop is currently the marine sediments. B. McConnell told the ESSAC delegates that he is excluded, as he could not go to the EGU. J. Erbacher stated that he could contact J.

Behrmann to check if he is interested to help with the organization of the workshop. J. McKenzie agreed to help.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-17: The ESSAC Office will provide information to M. Wagreeich regarding the GIFT Teacher Workshop, which was held at the EGU in 2007.

Do calls reach the right people?

Arising from discussion at the meeting of the low numbers of ECORD applicants for NanTroSEIZE expeditions 319 and 322, the Chair asked the group to consider whether calls reach the right people. While the group cannot comment on the efficiency of National Offices in circulating calls, it believes that there are valid reasons for a lack of applications from some countries, particularly the smaller countries. They may not have an active research community in the field of a particular drilling expedition. In the specific case of NanTroSEIZE, there was also some comment that uncertainty over the Chikyu timetable discouraged applicants.

J. McKenzie reported from a Swiss scientist and a young student, who loved the cruise. Both had said that it had been a wonderful experience. J. McKenzie carried on that it was a great opportunity to sail with NanTroSEIZE. J. Erbacher reported that the reason why Germany had a good number of applicants was not only the fact that Germany would have a large community, but also that the German office would actively contact potential candidates after having launched the respective call. The Office would try to ensure to have at least 4 applicants per expedition. He thought that the national offices would have to do their job and go directly to the people. B. Wolff-Boenisch mentioned that she would distribute IODP information for some countries, but not for all and that in some countries the direct contact would be imperative for an application.

Interface with EMA outreach

There was a brief discussion to clarify the respective roles of the E&O Subcommittee and the EMA outreach program. There were no issues or concerns arising.

9. ESSAC highlights on European Science Foundation (ESF) Programs

D. Hauglustaine presented the ESF-EuroMARC programme and the ESF science strategy to provide high level and high quality foresight and advice on science, research infrastructure and science policy issues. He presented also the ESF Collaborative Research Tool Kit, which is based on the extensive science management experience of the ESF (e.g. the management of 30 EUROCORES Programmes, the EURYI Scheme, ESF Research Networking Programmes as well as COST Actions) and conceived as a tool for national and international research programmes.

B. Wolff-Boenisch asked about this tool and if it would provide a service that has to be paid after use. D. Hauglustaine agreed. B. Wolff-Boenisch continued to ask, if one could imagine that a good way to integrate the ESF management experience in a project was to integrate the ESF directly in the beginning of a project for example as a work package. She asked if the scientific coordinator of Aurora Borealis had been recruited this way. D. Hauglustaine confirmed both questions.

J. McKenzie was wondering if and how both programmes EUROCORES and the Magellan Workshop Series could be combined. D. Hauglustaine approved that this was envisaged and that both steering committees started to talk about this idea. He thought that joint summer schools could be a starting point. J. Erbacher reminded the meeting attendees that both

programmes used to together in the past, then drifted away and that it would be logical to merge them again.

10. Workshops, communication and vision

10.1 Conference and workshop reports

All former scheduled workshops reports (10.1.1 "Acquiring high to ultra-high resolution geological records of past climate change by scientific drilling", 10.1.2 "Ocean Drilling for Seismic Hazard in European Geosystems" and 10.1.3 "Lithospheric heterogeneities, hydrothermal regimes, and links between abiotic and biotic processes at slow spreading ridges" have been adjourned to the next ESSAC Meeting.

10.2 Upcoming conferences and workshops

10.2.1 Arctic Ocean History: From Speculation to Reality

R. Stein presented the current planning of the workshop "Arctic Ocean History: From Speculation to Reality", a workshop scheduled from November 02nd to November 05th, 08 in Bremerhaven, Germany, at the Alfred Wegener Institute (AWI). Co-convenors of the workshop are B. Coakley (University of Alaska, Fairbanks/US) and R. Stein (AWI Bremerhaven/Germany).

95 people from Europe, Canada, US, Japan, Korea, and Russia will participate, 140 applications were received in the run-up to the workshop.

The three-day meeting is planned with a day with presentations in plenary session about (1) history, stratigraphy and paleoenvironment and (2) tectonics including the latest results from ACEX, (3) data base (site survey), (4) organisational and technical needs, (5) collaboration between academia and industry and (6) unsolicited ideas, information and speculations. The second day will include working-group discussions (WGD) with different topics (1) thematic WGD about paleoceanography, plate tectonics, Gakkel Ridge petrology/geochemistry and methane hydrates, (2) regional WGD about Lomonosov Ridge, the Alpha-Mendeleev Ridge, the Chukchi Plateau, the Morris Jessup Rise, the Yermak Plateau, the Eurasian Shelf Seas and Mackenzie. The last day presented the WGD and results in the plenary session. The workshop is funded by the ESF (ESF Magellan Workshop Series), the US Ocean Leadership, the Nansen Arctic Drilling (NAD) board, the Arctic Ocean Sciences Board (AOSB), and by industry sponsorships (BP Exploration, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, Norwegian Petroleum Directorate, Shell and StatoilHydro).

ESSAC Action Item 0810-18: An ESO representative is invited to attend the Arctic Ocean Workshop that will be held in Bremerhaven, Germany to consider the potential MSP initiatives in the Arctic Ocean.

10.2.2 Next Magellan workshops

J. Erbacher summarised the current status of the Magellan Workshops Series and the budget available.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-18: G. Camoin and R. Stein will send a proposal to the ESF Magellan Workshop Series to apply for the funding of the workshop, which will be held at the University of Vienna immediately after the EGU 2009.

10.3 Beyond 2013 - The Future of European Ocean Drilling Research

Following the ESSAC Consensus 0805-10, by which ESSAC recommended the organization of an EGU Session in April 09 in Vienna, Austria, immediately followed by a workshop dealing with the future of the European scientific drilling, G. Camoin and R. Stein, prepared electronically the session and the related workshop. The proposed interdivision session had been supported by all contacted EGU divisions, namely SSP, OS, TS, CL, BG and GMPV. The Steering Committee is the following: W. Bach (IODP) - Univ. of Bremen, Germany, J. Behrmann (IODP) - IFM-GEOMAR, Kiel, Germany, A. CAMERLENGHI (IODP) - Univ. of Barcelona, Spain, J. Erbacher (ESF Magellan) - BGR Hanover, Germany, U. Harms (ICDP) - GFZ, Potsdam, Germany, J. Kenter - Chevron-Texaco, US, H. Paelike (IODP) - NOC, Southampton, UK, R. Schneider (IMAGES) - Univ. of Kiel, Germany.

The description of the session is as follow:

The Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) is funded for the period 2003–2013, and is now starting to plan for ocean drilling beyond 2013. A community-wide (US, Europe, Japan, Asian and Oceanian countries), major conference "INVEST - IODP New Ventures in Exploring Scientific Targets" addressing all international IODP partners is planned for September 23rd to 25th 09 in Bremen, Germany (More information at <http://www.iodp.org>) to discuss future directions of scientific ocean drilling. The outcome of the conference will be a contribution to a science plan that will be drafted in 2010 to define new goals and strategies to effectively meet the challenges of future ocean drilling.

At its last meeting, ESSAC, the ECORD Science Steering an Advisory Committee, discussed the opportunity to organize a session at the EGU General Assembly 2009 in Vienna, Austria (April 09), followed by a 1 to 2 days workshop, specifically addressing the future of European scientific drilling research with the objective to sharpen the European interests in the future IODP and to prepare the INVEST Conference.

The key items that should be addressed during the EGU Session and the workshop should especially include: (1) The future of ECORD (science, technology, management), (2) new research initiatives and emerging fields in scientific drilling, (3) relationships between IODP and other programs (e.g. ICDP, IMAGES etc.), (4) collaboration between academia and industry, (5) new technologies and the Mission Specific Platform approach, (6) and additional topics to be defined based on participants' propositions.

This EGU session and the related workshop are open to all scientists with an interest in scientific drilling and to representatives from industry. The EGU Session should be organized on the morning of April 24th, 09. The related workshop should be held at the Geocenter of the University of Vienna on April 24th afternoon and April 25th, 09.

Note: *The session and the workshop announcement has been posted on the ESSAC web page on September 18th, 08 and on the EGU website*

(http://www.cosis.net/members/meetings/skeleton/view.php?p_id=381)

ESSAC Action Item 0810-19: The ESSAC Office will issue a call for abstracts for the SSP18/CL64/GMPV23/TS9.3 session "Beyond 2013 - The Future of European Scientific Drilling Research" at the EGU General Assembly 09.

10.4 Subcommittee report, discussion and future actions

R. Stein summarised the outcomes of the subcommittee discussion.

In the forefront of the 11th ESSAC meeting following topics (I) preparation of the 2009 EGU session and the workshop "Beyond 2013 - The future of the European scientific drilling" (ESSAC consensus 0805-10) as well as (II) to evaluate the need for support (e.g. letter or other format) from large European institutions to the IODP renewal phase, had been put up for discussion.

Regarding topic (I), additional items were discussed, viz. (a) the nominations of potential invited speakers for whose topics, listed in the EGU session announcement, (b)

suggestions of additional topics to be discussed at the workshop and (c) organization of a web forum to seek inputs from the European scientific community. Following key items of EGU Session/Workshop should be addressed: (1) the future of ECORD (science, technology, management), (2) new research initiatives and emerging fields in scientific drilling, (3) the relationships between IODP and other programs (e.g. ICDP, IMAGES etc), (4) the collaboration between academia and industry, (5) new technologies and the Mission Specific Platform approach as well as (6) additional topics, which should be defined based on participants' propositions.

The key items 1 to 6 were discussed in more detail. Regarding key item (1) the future of ECORD (science, technology, management), it was decided that this item should be the overall theme of the EGU session and that the session should be open to all scientists with an interest in scientific drilling, including young scientists and scientists who are not currently involved in IODP and ECORD. Additionally there was a consensus that presentations/overviews about ongoing and future ECORD/IODP activities would be useful and needed. Suggested candidates for an invited talk were G. Camoin, C. Mevel, J. Ludden and H.C. Larsen.

Concerning the key item 2 new research initiatives and emerging fields in scientific drilling it was suggested that the session should consist of a critical review of existing innovative science/ proposals in the system, of presentation on IODP highlights as well as on open questions such as for example on "what questions we could answer?" "What are the gaps, i.e. what are important overall goals of the ISP, which could not be reached and should be included in a post 2013 programme"? Suggested candidates for an invited talk were T. Elliott and J. Behrmann.

In "new research initiatives and emerging fields in scientific drilling" addressed by key item 3, it appeared that Arctic Ocean Drilling would be a major challenge for the next decades. This is reflected by the fact, that the topic has been listed as major topic at the INVEST 09 Conference. It was deemed suitable that a summary about the outcomes of the Arctic Drilling Workshop in Bremerhaven in November 08) could be presented by R. Stein or M. Jakobsson. For the topic "understanding of geohazards and geosystems" A. Camerlenghi was suggested.

Other scientific challenges, which could be achieved only by ocean drilling, would be the long-term evolution of life (deep and surface biosphere). Potential candidates for an invited talk had been S. d'Hondt, A. Boetius and B.B. Jorgensen.

For item 4 the relationship between IODP and other programs (e.g. ICDP, IMAGES etc), the review of past and future joint IODP/ICDP initiatives, the revisit of ICDP/IODP proposals in the system (e.g. New Jersey, Chicxulub) and the discussion about relationships between IODP and IMAGES was proposed. Nominated candidates were J. Morgan, R. Schneider, D. Hodell, F. Amselmetti, A. Kopf and Dick Kroon.

L. Lourens commented that ice coring community should be involved in the future discussions.

Another key item had been the collaboration between academia and industry (5). In this context the long-term strategically significant industrial initiatives EUREKA/EUROGIA was deemed as a good model for the future. It was envisaged to invite G. Marquette for an invited talk. Depending on other suggested joint academia/industry research initiatives in key areas and key topics other invited speaker such as for example T. Wagner or J. Kenter had been considered.

In the key topic new technologies and the Mission Specific Platform approach, overview talks about different technologies (i.e. seafloor drill rig MeBO, BGS Rock Drills, "Aurora Borealis") were planned. N. Biebow, D. Evans or U. Harms could be potential keynote speakers.

It had been suggested to discuss also the future of IODP science and funding, as the JOIDES Resolution will only be operative between 6 to 7 months/year, the Chikyu between 4 to 6 months/year and one MSP expedition will per year. Therefore the science community would have to re-think not only about the scope, but also about the funding of the overall program.

Another important aspect of the future program should be the continuation of the training of young scientists. In the past ODP/IODP has been crucial for shaping an excellent community of young scientists. It was envisaged to strengthen this role in a more coordinated way.

As a result of the subcommittee discussions it had been suggested to organize a web forum to seek inputs from the European scientific community for the INVEST Conference. This web forum would give to all people interested in scientific drilling the possibility to be included in the discussion, especially if they could not attend the EGU. As part of the web forum the creation of a questionnaire posted on the ECORD website was planned. Regarding the content and the structure of the questionnaire, it was decided that the community should have the chance to comment on IODP achievements and perspectives, IODP and ECORD structures, IODP problems, relationships between academia and industry, relationships between IODP and other drilling/coring programs, technical needs, etc. Additionally the web forum should be announcement in ECORD Newsletter.

B. Wolff-Boenisch asked about the content and the structure of the web forum and the questionnaire, in order that the ESSAC Office could find or opt for a technical and organisational solution.

Furthermore it was discussed to evaluate the need for support (e.g. via a letter or other format) from large European institutions to the IODP renewal phase. It had been suggested that ESSAC should send a request to the large European institutions/national agencies asking for writing support letters for the continuation of scientific ocean drilling program beyond 2013. It was been decided that the letter should be formulated after the outcome of the EGU 09 session.

A discussion began regarding the timing of that letter when for example it should be send to the funding agencies. J. Erbacher explained that in Germany such a letter would be sent in combination with a funding request and not earlier. R. James asked for clarification as she thought that the letter would be send before April 09 from ESSAC pointing out the successes in IODP. She was not sure, if the delegates were talking about 2 different types of letters. G. Camoin agreed that there were 2 different types of letter and that the steering committee had planned a letter similar to the one of Woods Hole, viz. to show the interest and the excitement of the scientists. R. James thought that part of the message should include that the JOIDES Resolution was important for drilling. R. Stein asked R. James why she was thinking that this letter should be written before April 2009. She replied that because the UK funding agencies were already considering and thinking about the renewal and that therefore the letter was already more urgent than thought. G. Camoin argued that the letter would be gaining in importance after the workshop in Vienna in 2009, as there would be a better overview about what the community wanted and the respective ideas better bundled. This letter would be sent directly before the INVEST conference. The idea was to invite people from the funding agencies to come to visit the INVEST conference and to see what happens. If the letter would be send to earlier the effect of evoking interest would be diluted. M. Riedel asked about who should receive the letter. G. Camoin continued to explain that the idea was that ESSAC would send information to the national institutions, which might be not involved in the program and no major IODP player. Potentially such a letter would quicken interest to these institutions. M. Riedel stated that in Canada no funding institution would be interested in such a letter, that they would say that the program might be exciting, but that there was not money for such a programme. G.

Camoin replied that in other countries this would be different, that in France for example this kind of letter would be very much needed to continue the program. M. Riedel suggested that if he would get a letter from European institutions and ESSAC which would contain an invitation for CANADA to join the program, that then he would have something in hand and could go to the Canadian Ministry. G. Camoin thought that such a kind of support was no a problem. That were was no custom-tailored solution. J. Erbacher asked about the potential impact. He thought that the letter would be to early as the program renewal would only be in 2013. G. Camoin explained that the NSF and MEXT already met and that the community should make noise to show that the future scientific topics would to already discussed in September 2009. B. Wolff-Boenisch corroborated that the handing of that issue was subjected to cultural difference as in Germany indeed such a letter would only go together with an important proposal. M. Riedel thought that there was still four more years going down the river until the program would come to an end and a lot of governments would change meanwhile. He did not believe that funding agencies could commit four years in advance. G. Camoin insisted that the funding of the program would be already discussed in early 2010, which was only 15 months from now. J. Erbacher suggested to rethink about a complete new programme and that was why he mentioned earlier in the discussion the importance of the program's structure first and not the funding. He believed that the funding agencies would only fund something new and would fund something similar to the old program that had not worked well, that this would be the challenge for the future programme.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-20: The ESSAC Office will establish a web forum before the EGU 09, to seek inputs from the scientific community to on the future of IODP. The proposed discussion items and thoughts will be bundled, synthesized and will help in the preparation of the "Beyond 2013" Workshop and the INVEST Conference.

ESSAC Consensus 0810-05: ESSAC will prepare a letter of support for the continuation of IODP, after the EGU 2009 Session.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-20: The draft of the letter of support for the continuation of IODP will be distributed to all ESSAC delegates. After final drafting the letter of support will be distributed widely in the community and sent to all ECORD funding agencies and stakeholders.

10.5 Open discussion on the current state of the IODP (ESSAC Delegates)

A main topic of the open discussion was the increasing costs of the program.

J. McKenzie demurred that the program was now competing with emerging research field such as with nanotechnology or other topics. The program would have to demonstrate it capacities and the breakthrough obtained in the past. That is why the letter would be very important. She pointed out the problem of the poor outcome despite the excessive costs. G. Camoin reminded the ESSAC delegates that there were people in Europe who would consider the idea of a separate European programme. The problem would be first the administrative costs, as the IODP administration would be to heavy and second the residence time for proposals. M. Riedel thought that the future programme could include mini legs using MeBO, that this would be a suitable tool especially for small countries to keep them in the system. That in short time a lot of science could be done. G. Camoin reminded him that this should have been the spirit of IODP in the beginning. That flexibility was missing. In the case of the JOIDES Resolution only now discussions about the flexibility were starting now at the SPC level. The program would be like a continuation of ODP, viz. 2 month 1 leg. J. Erbacher thought that one should be careful to overemphasize these mini legs, because one would not need such a program like IODP to finance mini legs. Proposals

for such operations could be send else where, a MeBo leg would only costs about € 1/2 Mio. and a country such as Australia could find funding outside of IODP. J. McKenzie said that the big advantage of IODP would be its structure and that this structure should be kept as an umbrella, that it has not to be that costly.

12. Next meetings

ESSAC #12, May 09

The next meeting will take place in Sesimbra, Portugal. F. Abrantes presented the location and invited all the delegates to take part at the 12th ESSAC Meeting in Portugal.

ESSAC Action Item 0810-21: The ESSAC Office will make a poll in doodle to determine the dates of the 12th ESSAC Meeting, which will be held in Sesimbra, Portugal.