



ESSAC

ECORRD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Draft minutes of the 4th ESSAC Meeting in Graz

Start : 9:30, 7 April 2004
End: : 16:30, 8 April 2004
Location : Institute for Earth Sciences (Geology and Palaeontology)
Room Nr.: 09.02 (ground floor), Heinrichstrasse 26, Graz.

List of participants:

ESSAC:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Jeroen Kenter | ESSAC chair-NL |
| Valentina Zampetti | ESSAC Science Coordinator |
| Werner Piller | delegate-Austria |
| Paul M. Knutz | alternate-Denmark |
| Kari Strand | delegate-Finland |
| Hans Brumsack | delegate-Germany |
| Hermann Kudrass | alternate-Germany |
| Rolf B. Pedersen | delegate-Norway |
| Luis Menezes Pinheiro | alternate-Portugal |
| Menchu Comas | delegate-Spain |
| Judith McKenzie | delegate-Switzerland |
| Julian Pearce | alternate-UK |
| Catherine Mevel | EMA, representative-France |
| Angelo Camerlenghi | delegate-Italy |
| Michael Wagraich | alternate-Austria |

INVITED OBSERVERS:

| | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| Jan Backman | ACEX exp. Co-chief |
|-------------|--------------------|

ABSENTS with notice:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Maria Ask | alternate-Sweden |
| Paul Wilson | alternate-UK |
| Gilbert Camoin | delegate-France |
| Benoit Ildefonse | alternate-France |
| Fatima Abrantes | delegate-Portugal |
| Eve Arnold | delegate-Sweden |
| Brindys Brandsdóttir | delegat-Iceland |



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

1. Welcome/introduction and objectives of the meeting

Kenter opens the meeting, welcomes the delegates to Graz and thanks Piller (Austrian delegate at ESSAC) for hosting the meeting and successfully organizing the Austrian ECORD membership. After "round the table" presentations by the participants, Piller provides some logistic information and announces the location and time of the ESSAC social dinner.

2. Discussion and approval of the agenda

Kenter introduces the draft agenda of the meeting. The draft agenda is approved after the following changes (see new agenda; encl. 1) are included:

- addition of a new item (item 18): Report on SPC meeting in Lisbon and summaries of upcoming IODP expeditions

- item 12 becomes Education and Outreach because no BGS representative is attending the meeting.

- Maria Ask cannot attend the meeting for personal reasons, therefore Kenter will present item 13: IODP media policy.

Further changes of the agenda will be reported in order of occurrence.

3. Approval of the Aix en Provence ESSAC #3 meeting

Kenter asks for the approval of the draft minutes of the 3rd ESSAC meeting. The revised minutes are accepted after the following comments by Mevel at the meeting are included:

Pag. 4 IMI must be substituted by leading agencies

Pag. 5 report on Dan Evans' presentation must be reported in inverted commas.

Pag 7 mailing list must be added in item 13.

Mevel suggests that particular attention should be paid to inserting personal references in the official minutes of the meetings. Comas stresses that the official record of personal comments, especially in the case of science party staffing process, might cause unpleasant situations. Kenter and McKenzie agree with Zampetti that an official form of recording motivations for such nominations must exist in order to inform absent ESSAC delegates. Kenter proposes to have a confidential part in the minutes for internal ESSAC distribution. Consensus is returned.

4. Transferral of ESSAC office to UK/1st October 2005; nomination of the new chair and vice-chair



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Pearce explains the UK position on the transferral of the ESSAC Office to Cardiff, 1st of October 2005. MacLeod will act as official chair and Pearce will support him as official replacement. Kenter reminds the delegates that last February the ESSAC Office met with the UK representatives to evaluate and plan the transfer of the ESSAC Secretariat from Amsterdam to Cardiff. He asks the ESSAC delegates for formal approval.

The transferral of the ESSAC Office to Cardiff with Pearce acting as a temporary replacement for MacLeod is approved with consensus.

Pearce informs the delegates that budget and post for the office have been organized and stresses willingness to preferably hire a non-British science coordinator. In addition, Zampetti will overlap with the new science coordinator for the first month (October 2005) to guarantee a smooth and efficient transferral. Pearce offered to host the next ESSAC meeting in Cardiff, consensus is returned. Due to the particular situation, the next ESSAC meeting will be co-chaired by Pearce and Kenter. Date of the next meeting: 24th-25th November pending the Tahiti shorebased party schedule.

Kenter informs the delegates that the nomination of the new ESSAC vice-chair has been discussed among the SPC members. They strongly support the candidature of Gilbert Camoin, French delegate at ESSAC. Pedersen objects that there has not been an "open" competition. Kenter explains that Camoin has not yet been nominated and stresses the necessity for candidates possessing a strong experience with the system. Brumsack proposes a rotational system for the office which will move from a small country to each of the three "bigger" countries in the future turns. Comas opposes stating that the visibility of the bigger countries towards their funding agencies is already fulfilled by the core depository, EMA, ESO and by the amount of slots in the expeditions. McKenzie proposes a rotational system that alternates a bigger country with a smaller country. Kenter highlights that the nomination of the vice-chair should be person and not country-based. The candidature of Gilbert Camoin as new ESSAC vice-chair is approved by ESSAC. Kenter will present a motion to the ECORD Council for final approval.

5. SWOT analysis for ESSAC

Kenter explains the result of the SWOT analysis for ESSAC.

Mevel presents an overview of the discussion held in the last ECORD-net meeting in Zurich stressing that the SWOT analysis was an internal review to improve the efficiency of the program. Comas replies that Spain is not part of the ECORD-net, therefore is not directly involved. Zampetti explains that ESSAC is part of ECORD-net through WP-6, therefore all the ESSAC countries are indirectly implicated in ECORD-net and their contribution is necessary. Mevel clarifies the interlink between ECORD and ECORD-net.



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

6. ESSAC DATABASE

Kenter and Zampetti summarize the "state of the art" for the ESSAC database.

ESSAC Science Coordinator is collecting ECORD publications for the database.

Kenter stresses the necessity of an ESSAC mailing list to directly and uniformly contact and inform the scientific community interested or involved in IODP. Camerlenghi explains his efforts in converting an Italian community into an ESSAC community, and agrees with Kenter that a unique portal is necessary. McKenzie comments that such an ESSAC mailing list should be used for announcements. Pearce adds that the website is a fundamental tool for improving information distribution in the community. Kenter urges delegates to provide complete national mailing lists by the 1st of June 2005. The ESSAC Science Coordinator will seek feasible ways to access and modify this mailing list directly on the web and to add an automatic subscribing mailing list on the ESSAC website.

7. ECORD newsletters #4

Mevel presents issue 4 of the ECORD newsletter. She announces that the new JOIDES Journal will officially report on expeditions and therefore such information will not be included anymore in the upcoming issues of the ECORD newsletters in order to avoid duplication. Kenter, on behalf of ESSAC, congratulates EMA for the high-quality content of this issue. Mevel asks ESSAC to provide EMA with an editorial board for the ECORD newsletters. Camerlenghi suggests seeking volunteers in the ESSAC community. ESSAC OFFICE will draft a call for applications. Mevel reminds that the deadline for the next issue is October the 5th.

8. ECORD/ESSAC web site

Zampetti announces that ESSAC and ECORD websites will merge. ESSAC webpage will be included in the official ECORD website.

9. ESSAC WorkShops and next EUROFORUM

Kenter reminds that during last ESSAC meeting in Aix en Provence, it was decided to promote and sponsor two workshops on two different scientific themes. He informs that ESSAC will support the "Deep Biosphere" workshop and adopt the "Paleoclimate change: high latitude and ocean circulation" workshop organized by UK-IODP. McKenzie presents the scientific goals, the structure and budget of the Deep Biosphere workshop. Approval and congratulations are returned by the ESSAC delegates. Pearce announces that UK will use 3k euro from the 15K euro allocated by EMA for the ESSAC workshops. This 3k euro will be used for the second part of the Arctic workshop planned for the fall. Therefore, 12k euro can be allocated to the Deep Biosphere workshop to cover travel



ESSAC

ECORDS Science Support & Advisory Committee

expenses. Comas presents a workshop proposal on "Lithosphere Deformation and Associated Processes at a Convergent Plate Boundary: Challenges for IODP drilling in the Mediterranean and Gulf of Cadiz". Kenter objects that proposals should tackle scientific themes and not specific geographic areas. Comas stresses that the "Mediterranean" will join together many from the European scientific community. Mevel replies that an unsuccessful workshop focused on the Mediterranean area has already been held. Brumsack advises Comas to improve the actual proposal by gathering together more scientists and data. Comas agrees with Brumsack and states that she is willing to further develop and nurture a proposal on geodynamic and solid earth pending ESSAC support. Kenter proposes to create an ESSAC working group (Comas, Camerlenghi, Pearce, Kopf) to improve it. Deadline: July 1st 2005.

MOTION 1: *ESSAC regards the Mediterranean as one of the most important target areas for ocean drilling, with a strong potential of involving both marine and land-based geoscientists in IODP. ESSAC proposes to establish a working group to initiate a combined European effort for identifying geoscientific problems of global importance. ESSAC encourages European science meetings (e.g. EGU) to serve as a basis for discussing potential target areas of high scientific impact in the Mediterranean. At a later stage ESSAC will establish dedicated workshops with the goal to initiate and nurture one or more IODP drilling proposal(s).*

Consensus is returned.

Purpose and performance of the biannual EUROFORUM were discussed. Following the next meeting in 2006 organized by Pearce in UK, thematic IODP workshops initiated by ESSAC in conjunction with the EGU might replace the EUROFORUM.

10. EuroMARC (EuroCORES for European Collaboration for Implementation of Marine Research Drilling)

Kenter updates the delegates on the status of the EuroMARC proposal. It has been accepted by LESC as a pre- and post-cruise coring program that will cover marine science coring, pre- and post-cruise activities. Kenter informs that key countries leading agencies have already committed to this program. Mevel adds that EU will provide extra funding. Piller expresses his doubts due to the fact that it is up to national science foundations to commit to this program. Kenter stresses the important role of ESSAC in establishing a connection between funding agencies and scientific communities.

11. ESF Magellan Workshop Series



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Kenter introduces the ESF Program Proposal for Workshops on Marine Research Drilling (Magellan Workshop Series). The ESF Magellan Workshop Series Program is an enabling program for coordinated workshops to stimulate and nurture high quality and innovative science proposals that maintain the European frontier role in international marine research drilling. We propose that a ESF Magellan Workshop Series Program be established to: Efficiently provide funds for 3 marine research drilling workshops per year; stimulate collaboration in marine drilling proposals at a European level and promote coordination of the European research drilling community. The major science areas identified are (i) Earth's Surface Environmental Change, Processes and Effects (ii) The Deep Biosphere & Sub-Sea-floor Ocean (iii) Solid Earth Cycles & Geodynamics. Kenter remarks that the two ESSAC workshops (item 9) will be considered as part of such a program. UK positions on the "Paleoclimate change: high latitude and ocean circulation" workshop implies that the costs of such workshop will be considered as of the UK contribution for this ESF workshops program. Kenter states that this item should be discussed by the ECORD Council.

12. Education and outreach

Mevel informs ESSAC on the upcoming outreach activities. ECORD will actively participate in EGU with the IODP booth, distributing new information flyers, gadgets and ACEX posters. In addition, a Town Hall meeting in conjunction with ICDP has been organized. During the press conference at the port call in Dublin, it will be announced that Ireland officially joined ECORD. A meeting to introduce IODP to the Irish science community will follow the press conference. Mevel announces that the EU agreed on funding a "workshop for teachers".

13. IODP media policy

Kenter introduces the new IODP Media Relations Policy Guidelines and Procedures. McKenzie stresses that problems and misunderstandings can arise with the media, but these cannot justify such a document, especially with such legalistic language. Camerlenghi states that there is a "media" problem and it is necessary to regulate information and image distribution. However, he agrees with McKenzie that the proposed document is too complicated.

The discussion results in the follow motion proposed by McKenzie and Brumsack:

MOTION 2: *ESSAC expresses its concern with the new IODP Media Relations Policy Guidelines & Procedures because, as*



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

written, it does not promote or encourage outreach. The procedures for interacting with the media are far too complicated to be useful for the average shipboard scientist to communicate with his local media. The legalistic language of the policy is possibly intimidating and unclear as to the length of time the policy remains active after the end of the cruise. Thus, ESSAC questions the need for such a detailed policy and wishes clarification.

Consensus is returned to motion 2.

Kenter will report to IODP on the opinion shared by the ESSAC community (Kenter sent a message to Nancy Light who, as a result, is redrafting the policy).

14. Staffing of Science Party in IODP

Kenter starts the discussion by describing the efforts of the ESSAC Office in drafting staffing concepts, procedures and guidelines. ESSAC Office is expecting National Offices and IODP-MI to further develop and provide comments on the proposed guidelines. Mevel stresses that flexibility for staffing is listed in the MOU. Kenter re-emphasize that National Offices have to exercise some flexibility with respect to staffing and choose to arrange a "trade" (including co-chief slots) with other National Offices. Brumsack remarks that flexibility should be applied also according to the expertise. Mevel concludes the discussion stressing that such topic needs to be discussed at level of leading agencies in the upcoming June meeting. (Kenter is continuing discussions with the National Offices, IODP-MI and IOs and will finalize guidelines following the Rome 24-27 May meeting).

15. Shipboard staffing balance

Mevel opens the discussion by explaining, on behalf of Dan Evans, the reason behind the delay for Tahiti MSP expedition. The correct vessel has not been found, yet. At the end of the upcoming month, ESO will check a new platform. If this vessel fits the technical requirements, the expedition will probably be scheduled for October, 2005. Comas provides ESSAC with some explanations concerning the non-invitation, despite the ESSAC nomination, of the Spanish scientist Braga for the Tahiti expedition 310. Kenter states that, at level of the ESSAC Office, he was aware that Braga agreed with the co-chiefs to request samples while not being officially part of the science party. Comas objects Kenter's statement stressing that Braga is unsatisfied with this situation. Kenter closes the discussion promising to sort out this misunderstanding.

Mevel explains the ECORD quota situation and announces that Italy increased the participation quota. Camerlenghi explains that INGV, CONISMA and University of Siena joined the Italian consortium for IODP.



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

She announces that Canada will continue to contribute at rate of current contribution for 3 years beginning from 2004. Mevel informs the delegates that Belgium and Ireland are joining ECORD. Even though nothing official has been signed, yet, Mevel asks that Belgium and Ireland are considered as member countries. Kenter points out that a Belgium scientist is already sailing in expedition 307.

16. Nomination scientific party for Cascadia Margin Hydrates, expedition#311

Kenter starts the discussion by displaying an overhead of enclosure 9 and listing the received applications for Cascadia expedition 311.

Pearce expresses UK preferences supporting the nominations indicated by Wilson via e-mail: for UK: 1. Michelle Ellis 2. Peter Jackson. Michelle Ellis is an impressive PhD student working with Tim Minshull who has very close active collaborative links with the proponents and co-chiefs. Peter Jackson has submitted a strong application and is experienced in the area. Ameena Camps would be an appropriate second for Jackson. In addition, he states that the participation of the two applicants from GEOTEK is conditional on funding for HYACINTH. The situation will not be resolved until late May with the only realistic source of funding coming from the US Dept. of Energy and this would provide support for GEOTEK personnel to participate as contractors rather than scientists. For Germany: 1. Teichert 2. Heuer; for France 1. Blanc-Valleron; for the smaller countries 1. Hellevang 2. Wortmann and 3. Lowe 4. Zykov. Mevel points out that there is only one French applicant, Blanc-Valleron, but with high expertise. Therefore, she is strongly supporting her candidature. Brumsack and Kudrass introduce the German applicants. They nominate as starred scientist Heuer and the choice between Pretzchner and Teichert will be up to the co-chiefs. Gillis has sent via e-mail preferences for Canada: Wortmann and Enkin. McKenzie stresses the high scientific value of Wortmann. Pederson supports the Norwegian applicant Hellevang. Kenter closes the nomination processes by listing the ESSAC nominees and attached conditions:

Conditions are that starred nominations have preference over non-starred and discussion is needed when IOs deviates from the ESSAC starred preferences.

-Germany:

Heuer*

Pretzchner

Teichert

2 of the 3 German listed scientists should be selected

-France:



ESSAC

ECORRD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Blanc-Valleron*

-UK:

Ellis*

Jackson*

Camps

2 of the 3 UK listed scientists should be selected

-Norway:

Hellevang*

-Canada:

Enkin*

Wortmann*

Chen

2 of the 3 Canadian listed scientists should be selected

Consensus is returned.

17. ACEX expedition

Jan Backman, invited speaker, gives a presentation on the scientific results of the ACEX expedition 302. Critical questions on the REVCOM report led to a lengthy and informal discussion, not reported (as agreed by the delegates) in these minutes.

18. Report on SPC meeting in Lisbon and summaries of upcoming IODP expeditions

Kenter starts the discussion pointing out that it is necessary to nominate a new SPC member representative of the smaller countries. He will serve no longer in the panel, since his mandate as chair of ESSAC will expire on October 2005 with the transferral of the Office to Cardiff.

Pearce, alternate for UK, Brumsack and Kudrass, respectively delegate and alternate for Germany are excused and leave the room. Kenter outlines that four members usually serve in the SPC panel, but only three have voting rights. He stresses that the possibility of rotating the voting right between the four candidates avoids inconveniences for conflicting situations. He highlights that valuable members are usually former SSEPs members. The following nominations are proposed:

Arnold, Pedersen and Camerlenghi. Camerlenghi announces that he is not available to serve in the panel. Pedersen leaves the room. Consensus is returned to Pedersen's nominee.

McKenzie proposes to organize a pre-ESSAC meeting for small countries the evening before the ESSAC meeting to deal with the small countries issues. Consensus is returned. Pedersen, Pearce, Kudras and Brumsack reconvene. Kenter informs that it is necessary to confirm the SSEPs chair nomination of Rudiger Stein. Rudiger was nominated by the SSEPs delegates as one of the three new chairs. Consensus is returned.



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Pearce proposes to invite SAS panel members to the ESSAC meeting to provide explanations and inform the delegate about the panels work and role.

Kenter suggests inviting Stein for the SSPEs and Ildefonse and Ferdelmann (co-chiefs) to the next meeting to give short presentations on SSEPs and expeditions respectively.

Kenter summaries the main motion of the SPC meeting in Lisbon. Pedersen stresses that more communication between SPC members and proposal proponents is necessary.

Zampetti asks to approve the request of USIO to access the entire list of applicants for expeditions 309 and 313. Consensus is returned.

19. IODP Management Forum and Retreat (Rome, 24-26-May-2005)

Kenter informs the delegate that the IODP Management Forum and Retreat will be held in Frascati the last week of May, and will be hosted by ESSAC. ESSAC has to submit an "ESSAC Position papers" for the Retreat agenda items. Mevel states that the actual structure of the program is too complicated. Camerlenghi adds that the time between the proposal ranking process and expedition scheduling is too long. Kenter outlines that the program must be science driven. He will draft this document and circulate it for input and comments to the Forum and Retreat ESSAC working group (McKenzie, Pedersen, Kudrass, Camerlenghi and Mevel). *(Kenter drafted the document and circulated it among the ECORD SPC members and EMA director for comments – the document clearly states that only part of the issues raised have ESSAC consensus; the document with all Rome discussion papers can be requested – on condition of confidentiality - from Kenter).*

20. New IODP SAS terms of reference

McKenzie reports that the SAS Panel TAP and ILP have been changed to EDP and IS-PPG, respectively. Therefore, it is necessary to confirm the members of the former panels and provide new candidates. ESSAC Office will contact the members of the former panels. Delegates will provide the Office with new candidates via e-mails.

21. Report on SPPOC

McKenzie gives a short presentation on the SPPOC executive summary.

22. EPSP non-voting member nomination

Nomination will take place via e-mail.

23. Upcoming Meetings



ESSAC

ECORD Science Support & Advisory Committee

Kenter lists the upcoming meetings displayed in encl.12.

24. Date and Place of the Next Meeting

Kenter proposes that the next meeting should be set in Cardiff on the 24th and 25th of November, pending the final Tahiti expedition schedule. Consensus is returned. Brumsack, on behalf of the ESSAC delegates, says goodbye to the Science Coordinator Zampetti as she will leave the ESSAC Office in October. Kenter declares the session closed and thanks Werner Piller for hosting an excellent meeting. (The ECORD Council in Stockholm decided to schedule both ESSAC and ECORD Council meetings back-to-back and moved the period and venue to Edinburgh November 23-25 but again pending the scheduling of Tahiti. In the mean time it looks as if Tahiti will be drilled this fall but no clear decisions on vessel and timing have been made).