



**EUR-OCEANS Network of Excellence  
Network's Steering Committee meeting  
Brest, 13-14 June 2006**

*Participants:*

M. Barange (PML, United Kingdom)  
O. Bonilla-Findji (Oceanopolis, France – present only on 14 June 2006)  
Y. Børsheim (University of Bergen, Norway – representing F. Thingstad)  
P. Cury (IRD, France – present only on 14 June 2006)  
J. De Macedo (FIST S.A., France – Administrative and financial coordinator)  
R. Diekmann (University of Hamburg, Germany - representing M. St John)  
M. Diepenbroek (University of Bremen, Germany)  
C. Fox (CEFAS, United Kingdom)  
P. Freon (IRD, France)  
C. Gernez (CNRS, France – Executive Director, non-voting)  
S. Ghiron (Oceanopolis, France)  
I. Grigorov (CNRS, France)  
R. Harris (PML, United Kingdom)  
R. Lampitt (NERC-NOC, United Kingdom)  
C. Lancelot (ULB, Belgium)  
L. Legendre (CNRS, France – Deputy Scientific Director)  
C. Le Quere (NERC-BAS, United Kingdom)  
K. Lochte (IfM-GEOMAR, Germany)  
P. Monfray (CNRS, France)  
E. Murphy (NERC-BAS, United Kingdom)  
J. Ruiz (CSIC-University of Cadiz, Spain)  
S. Ruiz (CSIC, Spain – representing C. Duarte)  
I. Siokou-Frangou (HCMR, Greece)  
S. Sundby (IMR, Norway)  
P. Treguer (CNRS, France - Scientific Director)  
T. Tschumi (University of Bern, Switzerland – representing F. Joos)  
D. Turner (University of Göteborg, Sweden)

*Excused:*

C. Duarte (CSIC, Spain)  
F. Joos (University of Bern, Switzerland)  
F. Köster (DIFRES, Denmark)  
K. Richardson (University of Aarhus, Denmark)  
M. St John (University of Hamburg, Germany)  
F. Thingstad (University of Bergen, Norway)

## **1. General introduction**

P. Tréguer welcomed the participants at the European Institute for Marine Studies (IUEM, Plouzané), where the EUR-OCEANS office is located.

- *What does the European Commission expect from EUR-OCEANS?* Presentation by C. Fragakis

C. Fragakis recalled the effort made by the three external reviewers to help EUR-OCEANS improve its functioning, especially on the management aspects. He acknowledged that the EUR-OCEANS response to the reviewers had been satisfactory, but that some management issues needed addressing at this meeting. He stressed the expectations from this NSC meeting in this regard, and clarified that decisions on governance are on the responsibility of the Consortium.

He also pointed out that the integration within the NoE had to be strategic, administrative and scientific.

- *What do we want for EUR-OCEANS (including results from the May 2006 Forum)?* Presentations by P. Treguer and L. Legendre

P. Treguer presented the context, then L. Legendre gave an overview of the positive and less positive aspects in the main developments of the past 6 months, concerning Workshops and meetings, the Web Forum “How to improve EUR-OCEANS?”, the cooperation with MarinERA and the two other marine NoEs, and the annual review.

- *General discussion*

- K. Lochte thanked L. Legendre for the good summary of the numerous, but apparently somehow dispersed, achievements of EUR-OCEANS. The need for centralised information and an easy access to all the services offered to the community was stressed. Most comments on this topic were related to the EUR-OCEANS website. C. Gernez explained the current revision of this website, conducted along two lines: technical advice (including on ergonomics and graphical design), and recruitment of a Web editor. The need for a clear strategy regarding the website was stressed, as was a clear definition of EUR-OCEANS’ mission more generally. The need for the development of specific tools not yet offered by other programmes, and also of synergies with other European projects was mentioned. It was suggested that the private area of the website was unnecessary and inappropriate. Its removal could be envisaged after a thorough review of the current content of this area. It was also suggested that, when possible, contacts with the PIs by phone or during workshops would be effective, as electronic communication is not always effective or appropriate.

- A small working group including PIs, and WP/System Leaders and Assistants will be set to assist the Executive Director and the webmaster in the revision of the website, and to prepare a short document explaining to PIs “what EUR-OCEANS can do” for them<sup>1</sup>.

## **2. Report on the responses to the reviewers, changes proposed to the network**

- *Presentation by P. Tréguer*

P. Treguer recalled the context of the review, the two main suggestions made by the reviewers regarding management issues, and the reactions from some NSC members on these points, expressed by e-mail before the meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Action 1 (Appendix 1)

*- Discussion*

- Reacting to a comment by P. Treguer in his presentation, C. Fragakis clarified that the external reviewers were not expected to have access to the Consortium Agreement, which is also the case of the European Commission, because that document is internal to the consortium.
- On the question of the respective roles of the NSC and the EC, several NSC members suggested re-balancing of these roles, i.e. that the NSC make the decisions and the EC implement them. There was general agreement on the need for this change. The required modifications of the Consortium Agreement should not be a barrier to this. Several NSC members were not in favour of an external person chairing the NSC or the EC, but they agreed to the principle of an elected chair, on a rotational basis.
- A small group composed of K. Lochte, M. Barange, and L. Legendre was formed to prepare proposed changes to the Consortium Agreement, to be discussed on the second day of the meeting.

**3. Improving internal cooperation within the network: fostering active participation of PIs in the network's governance and more generally in all the network's activities**

*Chair: Roger Harris*

*- Presentation by R. Harris*

R. Harris listed a number of suggestions aiming at improving the participation of PIs in the network's activities.

*- Discussion*

- Several members of the NSC stressed the importance of analyzing the outcome of the questionnaire on performance indicators, which was sent to PIs in January 2006, and that of the Web forum open in May 2006. It was also recommended to give more feedback to the PIs on these initiatives, as well as on the other forums or surveys launched by various WPs.
- Several NSC members advocated increased support for workshops, both in terms of financial support and number of supported workshops. On the other hand, the risk was recognised for EUR-OCEANS to be seen as a workshop funding agency, and a reasonable balance between a selective process favouring strategic workshops to fulfil the objectives of the network, and support for a good number of workshops that further the science of the community, was recommended. Such a balance could be reached by endorsing workshops which would likely have existed without EUR-OCEANS, and supporting financially the organisation of innovative and integrative workshops. It was also recommended that explanations be given when rejecting a request for workshop endorsement or organisation. This vision is to be included in the PIs document (see Action 1).
- In answer to the expressed need for a clearer strategy within Themes and Systems, J. Ruiz recalled the importance of the "Deconvoluted JER matrix" document which sets tasks for both Themes and Systems.
- Some NSC members suggested that workshops be organised specifically to write new proposals, e.g. to FP7, in order to obtain funds for research. C. Fragakis was not in favour of such initiatives, but would rather welcome workshops aiming at discussing gaps in knowledge, and leading to a review paper and possibly, as a by-product, a new proposal.

- It was stressed that besides the opportunity to obtain funds for research, the attraction of a European project is also the opportunity to exchange views and good ideas on science. A financial support to small, integrative projects would be, in that sense, an asset offered by EUR-OCEANS to its community. C. Fragakis was in favour of such small projects on the condition that the research conducted underpins integration.
- It was agreed to present all these opportunities (workshops, small projects, and also participation in the public outreach programme, etc) clearly in a short document to PIs, accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation which could be shown in Member Organisations. This will be prepared by the working group mentioned in point 1.
- R. Harris concluded the session by thanking the NSC members for a very good discussion. He stressed the importance of allowing PIs and other scientists to make proposals in order to enhance the collaborative approach. These proposals should be encouraged through the short document.

#### **4. Improving internal cooperation within the network: strengthening linkages and communication between WPs and Systems (including activation of Task Teams)**

*Chair: Patrick Monfray*

*- Presentation by P. Monfray and L. Legendre*

P. Monfray introduced the session and L. Legendre recalled the new principles of the deconvoluted JER matrix.

*- Discussion*

- Several NSC members thought that there is too little interaction so far between WPs and Systems, mainly due to a lack of information. For instance, some System Leaders are not in contact anymore with the representatives of their System in the WP Task Teams, and hence are not informed about all the activities organised in these WPs. L. Legendre recalled that the main tool for information was the six-month reporting from WPs and Systems before and during each NSC meeting. It was suggested that these reports be provided more in advance, and to dedicate more time to discuss them at future NSC meetings.
- It was recognised that the matrix construction of WPs and Systems had been difficult from the start. This should not mean a global coverage of all Themes in each System: there may rather be a specific focus on a given Theme in some Systems, and reciprocally Themes could conduct case studies on a particular aspect in the Systems. Common interests among Systems should also be identified.
- Several NSC members stressed the importance of involving and activating Task Teams, and to maintain a connection among their members. Assistants were also seen as playing a key role in an efficient communication among WPs and Systems. The idea of a longer Assistants meeting at the time of the next PIs annual meeting was strongly supported.
- P. Monfray presented some views of the dynamic modelling database developed by WP3.1, and available online. Most NSC members found this database very useful and were in favour of developing similar interactive tools in other WPs. J. Ruiz stressed the need for including as well in the database future needs in terms of modelling and feedbacks from Systems. It was also suggested to connect the WP4 initiative on key species vital rates to the WP3.1 database.
- As a conclusion, it was proposed and agreed to initiate a discussion by e-mail on common interests among Themes and Systems, and to continue it during a whole day at the next NSC

meeting<sup>2</sup>, where the Assistants would be invited. It was suggested to increase the budget for Task Teams meetings, and also to take advantage of the annual PIs meeting to hold meetings of the Task Teams, thus saving travel costs.

## **5. Specific actions to improve internal communication**

*Chair: Corinne Le Quéré*

- *Communication among the NSC*: Most NSC members agreed that there were too many e-mails exchanged related to EUR-OCEANS, and that this was mainly due to the fact that some recipients send their replies to all. It was proposed to announce important discussions or votes by e-mail, with a link to a forum section on the website where a debate could take place without overloading mailboxes. This forum could either be in the private area of the website, or, if such area was removed, on a page accessible only through the link provided by e-mail<sup>3</sup>. It was also suggested that the Executive Director put the recipients of the messages in the “blind copy” (Bcc) field, so that no one could reply to all<sup>4</sup>.

C. Le Quéré suggested using phone or video conferences more frequently.

All NSC members agreed to maintain a frequency of two physical meetings of the NSC per year, with at least two other meetings being held electronically.

- *Communication between the NSC and the PIs*: The background communication is done through the website, the Web News and the quarterly newsletter, while the day-to-day communication is done through e-mails and forums. It was suggested to improve the quality of the newsletter, and to print the issue coinciding with the annual PIs meeting each year, the other three issues being distributed in an electronic format. The printed Newsletter would have updates from each WP and System, including research highlights.

It was agreed to print and distribute by post a short document on “What EUR-OCEANS can do for you?”<sup>5</sup>.

S. Ghiron presented the video-conference tool developed by WP10, and mentioned another tool, developed by CERN and available for free. It was proposed to use such tools for scientific conferences, and possible for meetings of the Task Teams and the Executive Committee.

C. Fox suggested providing a list of NSC members and their contact details on the website so that PIs and other scientists could find it easily. C. Gernez indicated that this is scheduled in the revised website.

## **6. Evaluation of the level of participation of MOs: towards a better integration of the Member Organisations; the membership issue: preparation of the November NSC meeting**

*Chair: Ioanna Siokou-Frangou*

*- Presentation by I. Siokou-Frangou*

I. Siokou-Frangou recalled the main points of the discussion held on the same topic at the previous NSC meeting (Gatwick, November 2005). She also recalled the responses made to three of the

---

<sup>2</sup> See Action 2 (Appendix 1)

<sup>3</sup> See Action 3 (Appendix 1)

<sup>4</sup> See Action 4 (Appendix 1)

<sup>5</sup> See Action 5 (Appendix 1)

reviewers' comments related to the level of participation of MOs. She proposed a list of points for the discussion.

*- Discussion*

- It was recognised that two different levels should be considered: the involvement of PIs, and that of Member Organisations (MOs). The questionnaire on performance indicators sent to PIs in January 2006 could be used as a basis for the assessment of PIs' involvement. The difficulty was stressed of discussing the membership issue without a clear vision on the long term integration: if EUR-OCEANS is to lead to a virtual pan-European institute, then the number of participants must probably be reduced compared to the current membership, but if the long term goal is to build a lasting network, then the membership can probably remain with a higher number. Another option would be to form a core group of highly involved MOs, and a number of "satellites" or associated MOs with a lower level of participation. It was also stressed that the situation of MOs is highly variable with regard to lasting commitment: Universities for instance cover many fields of research, and cannot commit to a lasting integration in all topics. Most NSC members agreed that the benefits of a long term commitment should be more clearly shown to MOs, as they often see their participation in European projects as a loss of control of their own research teams. This could be done by demonstrating to the MOs that EUR-OCEANS is an exciting framework for science, which provides services to the community (e.g. by providing reserved access to specific facilities to Network members).
- It was suggested that the unanimity rule for the votes of the General Assembly on a number of topics be modified, including the membership issue.
- A working group composed of C. Fox, I. Siokou-Frangou, P. Freon and C. Gernez was formed to work on the membership issue and present an analysis during the next NSC meeting<sup>6</sup>. The questionnaire on performance indicators, and also the comments made by the MOs in the first annual financial report should form the basis for this analysis.

**7. The 2006-2007 budget: how to focus it on the long term goals of EUR-OCEANS. Proposals to be forwarded to the EC for submission to the General Assembly**

*Chair: Pierre Fréon*

*- Presentation by C. Gernez*

C. Gernez presented a table showing, for each category of expenses, the amount allocated for the full duration of the project, the amount spent in 2005, and the proposed allocation for 2006.

*- Discussion*

- It was agreed to allocate funds to a call for data rescue activities within WP2.2, and to form a selection committee including System leaders to evaluate the proposals submitted within that call.
- The decision of the Executive Committee to allocate part of the unspent funds initially allocated to equipment and consumables within WP2.1 to a "project officer" position was accepted (an appointment has already been made following a decision made by the Scientific Director during the WP2.1 workshop in Paris in December 2005; the successful candidate will start in August 2006).
- It was proposed and agreed to fund both the visitor and the host institution when granting a mobility allocation.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Action 6 (Appendix 1)

- More generally, it was agreed to increase the budget for 2006 and 2007, as these years will be the period of full activity of EUR-OCEANS. It was agreed to focus the funds on the central functioning of the network, and to support in priority activities whose benefit can be spread to as many participants as possible, e.g. by supporting small integrative projects and the necessary meetings of active groups (Task Teams, Assistants, etc). It was recognised that the figures provided so far do not allow for precise decisions on the allocation of funds, and that C. Gernez should prepare a revised table showing, on a multi-annual basis, (i) the fixed expenses (Assistants, PhDs and post-docs) and (ii) the other expenses, indicating the degree of freedom<sup>7</sup>.
- It was also agreed to prepare a short document explaining the budget and how funds can be spent, to be put on the website and circulated among Assistants<sup>8</sup>.

### **Wednesday 14 June 2006**

---

#### **7. The 2006-2007 budget: how to focus it on the long term goals of EUR-OCEANS. Proposals to be forwarded to the EC for submission to the General Assembly (continued)**

*Chair: Pierre Fréon*

A working group composed of P. Treguer, C. Le Quéré and C. Gernez was asked to examine the suggestions made regarding the allocation of funds, and to present a proposition after lunchtime.

#### **7. The 2006-2007 budget: how to focus it on the long term goals of EUR-OCEANS. Proposals to be forwarded to the EC for submission to the General Assembly (continued after lunchtime)**

*Chair: Pierre Fréon*

*- Presentation by C. Le Quéré*

C. Le Quéré presented the results of the synthesis made by the working group during lunchtime. It was proposed to increase the budget to 2,5 million Euros for 2006 and 3,5 million Euros for 2007 (with approximately 2 million Euros spent in 2005, and 2 million expected to be spent in 2008). It was confirmed that 50,000 Euros would be allocated annually, for two years, to data rescue activities conducted by WP2.2. A list of high priorities was proposed: organization of workshops, mobility actions, summer schools, website, communication, and public outreach. A list of second priorities was also proposed: organization of symposiums and Assistants meetings (respectively 50,000 and 30,000 Euros allocated for the rest of the duration of EUR-OCEANS), small projects (150,000 Euros allocated, two calls to be organised), post-docs (allocation of remaining funds, and organization of a call for two-year grants in 2006, and another call for one-year grants in 2007). It was proposed that WP and Systems Leaders keep their remaining funds initially allocated to the recruitment of their Assistants, and use it for outsourcing some activities where needed. It was also proposed that WP2.1 keep the remaining 20,000 Euros initially allocated to equipment and consumables to support inter-comparison exercises.

*- Discussion*

- The proposed increase of the budget was unanimously approved by the NSC, as were the list of high priorities (organization of workshops, mobility actions, summer schools, website, communication, and public outreach; precise amounts will be allocated to these activities later on, based on an assessment of the needs by the concerned Leaders) and the list of second priorities

---

<sup>7</sup> See Action 7 (Appendix 1)

<sup>8</sup> See Action 8 (Appendix 1)

(organization of symposiums and Assistants meetings, small projects, post-docs). It was also unanimously approved that WP2.1 keep the remaining 20,000 Euros initially allocated to equipment and consumables to support inter-comparison exercises.

- A detailed, pluri-annual budget will be provided by C. Gernez to the NSC shortly, and discussed electronically<sup>9</sup>.
- C. Fragakis proposed to extend the duration of the project by six months (without any financial consequence) to compensate the late start of it. No decision was made yet on this question.

## **8. Mode of operation of the EC and NSC (Consortium Agreement, articles 7, 8, 9). Proposals to be forwarded to the Executive Committee for submission to the General Assembly**

*Chair: Karin Lochte*

K. Lochte presented the proposed changes to the Consortium Agreement and the corresponding deliverable to be included in the revised Joint Programme of Activities, as a consequence of the discussion held the day before (see Appendix 2). The changes and the deliverable were approved unanimously by the NSC, as well as by the members of the Executive Committee present. The request for amending the Consortium Agreement will be forwarded to the General Assembly as soon as possible, with a letter explaining that the proposed changes are in response to the reviewers' comments, and are considered by the NSC and the EC as improvements in the management structure of the network<sup>10</sup>.

It was suggested again to modify the unanimity rule for the votes of the Assembly on a number of topics. C. Gernez recalled that this rule came from the model which was used for the Consortium Agreement. Several NSC members were in favour of presenting the two requests to the Assembly together, but others expressed their concern that the consultation on the unanimity rule could jeopardize the vote on the mode of operation of the NSC and the EC. A vote was held, and it was decided to present the requests separately to the Assembly (6 votes in favour of coupling the requests, 10 votes in favour of separating them).

## **9. How to engage the PIs at the network level: Review of advancements of WPs: existent and planned linkages to other WPs; major new projects**

*Chairs: Karin Lochte and Javier Ruiz*

*- Presentation by K. Lochte and J. Ruiz*

The major points of the reports were synthesized, and “naive questions” were raised on each WP.

### WP1.1 Sharing facilities

It was suggested to assess more thoroughly whether EUR-OCEANS PIs and associated scientist actually use the sharing facilities database, and possibly to organise a workshop or a training session on this database and the services it provides, and/or to dedicate a session at the next annual PIs meeting to it. C. Fragakis stressed the need for more visibility of the added value of EUR-OCEANS actions regarding sharing facilities. Such added value could lie, in addition to the fact that the mobility programme provides funds for technical training, in model agreements for shared use provided to all interested MOs.

### WP1.2 Mobility and communication

---

<sup>9</sup> See Action 7 (Appendix 1)

<sup>10</sup> See Action 9 (Appendix 1)

It was suggested that S. Ruiz contact people within EUR-OCEANS with experience of editing and printing newsletters, with a view to improving the quality of the newsletter and to print 1 issue annually.

It was proposed and agreed to modify the Awards programme as follows. In replacement of the two existing Awards, one Award would be granted for the best poster presented by a PhD student during the annual meeting, and another would be given to the best PhD student within MOs (including PhD students not funded by EUR-OCEANS)<sup>11</sup>. In addition, the recipient of the latter award would receive a mobility grant.

#### WP2.1 Observing systems

R. Lampitt confirmed that the attendance at the two workshops organised by WP2.1 (Paris, December 2005, and Monaco, April 2006) was excellent, and that the presence of Alan Edwards (European Commission) at the Monaco workshop was much appreciated. The links with the newly funded ESONET Network of Excellence are currently problematic as no water-column oceanography person is involved in the Steering Committee or in leading WPs. R. Lampitt has been advised not to withdraw from the consortium as yet despite this difficulty.

Within WP2.1, there is a great potential for inter-calibration exercises, in particular in relation to the US Orion project.

#### WP2.2 Networked databases

Funds are needed for data rescue (including funds to buy data, and to send skilled people to the laboratories where the data are held).

M. Diepenbroek submitted a request for the organisation of a workshop on the rescue and integration of zooplankton data, to be organised jointly with the SESAME Integrated Project in Villefranche-sur-Mer in November 2006. M. Barange informed the NSC that a similar workshop had been funded by GLOBEC in Spain in November 2005. It was agreed that the WP2.2 workshop request should be re-submitted for the deadline of 2 October 2006, with details on how it is different or complementary to the GLOBEC workshop held in 2005.

#### WP3.1 Model interfacing

Only little interaction with the PIs has been possible so far, except with model developers, because of the effort needed for the development of the database (that effort was partially outsourced). More interactions will be organised in future in concert with the Model Interfacing Task Team.

C. Le Quéré suggested that a short document be written to describe the EUR-OCEANS scientific priorities for each WP and System, in order to allow PIs to better focus their activities and be prepared to respond to future internal calls. The NSC agreed on such initiative, and C. Le Quéré will coordinate it<sup>12</sup>.

It was stressed that WP3.1 should act as a bridge among the various aspects or components of modelling within the network, and that there should also be links to the rest of the community.

#### WP3.2 Global Ocean

The WP3.2 workshop held in Villefranche-sur-Mer in April 2006 was successful, and will lead to a position paper. C. Le Quéré indicated that the strategy leading to Deliverable 18 has changed due to the cooperation with CARBOOCEAN and IOCCP, thus delaying the preparation of the deliverable. The need for more time to discuss interactions among WPs and Systems during the next NSC meeting, and also the annual PIs meeting, was stressed again.

#### WP3.3 Earth System

The work is progressing as planned. WP3.3 met in Bern the week before the NSC. One or two joint publications are planned, and coordination with WP2.2 is being organised for data storage.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Action 10 (Appendix 1)

<sup>12</sup> See Action 11 (Appendix 1)

M. Barange suggested that the model results from WP3.3 be topics for future Fact Sheets.  
C. Le Quéré indicated that she approached Christine Klaas (AWI, Germany) for the organisation of a Summer School on global modelling, to be organised jointly by WP3.2 and 3.3 in 2007.

#### WP4 Ecosystems end-to-end

The participation in the forum discussion on the importance of temperature in ecosystem models has not been satisfactory, nor has there been good feedback from PIs on the questionnaire regarding key species vital rates. Some NSC members suggested that more clarity be brought to these queries (e.g. clear criteria to define vital rates, information on potential benefits linked to the questionnaire), and that other initiatives be taken to activate the PIs and bring them together on small projects, instead of only asking them for inputs. Such actions could be initiated before the workshop on parameterization planned in March 2007. L. Legendre recalled that in the deconvoluted JER matrix context, Themes should not go through Systems to ask for information.

In near future the status of the desk study on vital rates will be made available to all EUR-OCEANS members and a coupling of the meta-database to the model interface of WP3.1 is envisaged.

#### WP5 Biogeochemistry

A Summer school is planned, as well as two workshops.

#### WP6 Ecosystem approach to marine resources

The work is progressing well, and the involvement of PIs in the activities is good. Two films have already been or are being produced on topics relevant to WP6, several workshops have taken place, and a Summer school is organised in June 2006 in Denmark.

P. Cury suggested to find a way to promote intermediary, exciting results from the WP, and it was proposed to do so the Newsletter by dedicating a specific section to this type of information<sup>13</sup>.

#### WP7 Within-system integration

The objectives of this WP were refined during the Gatwick NSC meeting, and it is now agreed that the activities should focus on sharing generic approaches among Systems to enhance integration within each System and across Systems. These activities are conducted in a joint effort with WP3.1.

L. Legendre stressed that concrete action was needed to bring the people together. P. Monfray proposed that initiatives for WP7 be discussed by the Modelling Task Team, which was initially set up for WP3.1 only but could act as WP7 Task Team as well.

Several NSC members suggested that several approaches, including comparative approaches between Systems but also model interfacing approaches, be implemented by WP7 (in close link with WP3.1), as this Theme is very broad.

Links with WP2.1, e.g. for the development of new sensors, will be established in future.

#### WP8 Training for researchers and other key staff

The PhD and post-doc programmes are running well, and a web forum allows for debate and exchanges among the students and fellows. An inventory of the PhD students supervised by PIs on topics relevant to EUR-OCEANS is being conducted. Two Summer schools are planned in 2006, and a call for Summer schools to be held in 2007 has just been opened, as well as a call for Floating universities.

#### WP9 Transfer to socio-economic users

Fact Sheets n°1, 2 and 4 are printed, and n°3 is in press. These Fact Sheets will be sent by post to the identified socio-economic users, along with a questionnaire on their needs and the topics they would like to see addressed in future Fact Sheets. Additional information on each Fact Sheet is available on the WP9 web pages. Interactions with the users will be established after the analysis of the results of the questionnaire.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Action 12 (Appendix 1)

P. Cury suggested that each System writes at least one Fact Sheet.

#### WP10 Public outreach

Several films have been and are being produced by Oceanopolis or other aquariums. The website [www.eur-oceans.info](http://www.eur-oceans.info) is constantly evolving.

A press conference on ocean acidification was organised in Paris on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2006, involving J. Orr (CEA), J-P. Gattuso (CNRS), P. Treguer and E. Hussenot (Oceanopolis). This conference had a very good impact in the national media, with several articles published, a few programmes on the radio, and several television programmes including on main channels in prime time. Similar conferences will be initiated in other countries; one is already planned in Sweden. It was recognised that organising press conferences in capitals rather than in smaller cities was more efficient in attracting journalists.

O. Bonilla suggested that PhD students and post-doc fellows be associated to WP10, e.g. by asking them to provide content for the web pages.

The film on ocean acidification was shown. C. Le Quéré emphasised the need for better consideration of gender issues in future products<sup>14</sup>.

### **10. How to engage the PIs at the network level: Review of advancements of Systems**

*Chair: Christiane Lancelot*

#### *- Presentation by C. Lancelot*

A table was shown presenting the main initiatives of each System in terms of endorsement of activities by EUR-OCEANS, link with international activities, integration of ‘within System’ activities, interaction with EUR-OCEANS Task Teams, and problems encountered. This table is copied in Appendix 3.

#### *- Discussion*

- Links between the Arctic and Nordic Seas System and the Southern Ocean System could be envisaged through the International Polar Year (IPY); this will be discussed at the next NSC meeting. The Arctic and Nordic Seas System is also engaged in the “North Atlantic cluster”, with the North Atlantic Ocean and the North Atlantic Shelves Systems. Future joint initiatives are planned.
- C. Fox regretted the absence of feedback from the NSC on the Shelf Seas workshop report circulated in 2005; the same applies to the Mediterranean System modelling workshop report. It was suggested and agreed to submit similar reports in future to the Modelling Task Team for discussion and feedback.
- L. Legendre asked for clarification on BASIN and its linkages to EUR-OCEANS. R. Harris explained that the BASIN initiative had started before EUR-OCEANS, and acknowledged the strong support from the NoE (e.g. by supporting the Reykjavik meeting in March 2005). The newly funded Specific Support Action on BASIN will allow for the organization of four workshops to discuss a common strategy between Europe and the USA. L. Legendre confirmed that EUR-OCEANS was ready to grant further support to BASIN if needed.
- C. Fox called for more interaction among System Leaders and the representatives of each System in the WP Task Teams.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Action 13 (Appendix 1)

- In response to a question by S. Sundby (Arctic and Nordic Seas), C. Fragakis confirmed that links with Canada, the USA and Russia within that System were welcome, although no funds could be granted to this collaboration within EUR-OCEANS.
- The dialogue with socio-economic users will be enhanced within the Baltic Sea System.
- A majority of Systems Leaders mentioned the general lack of motivation of the PIs to participate in Systems activities, mainly due to the lack of clear mission and expectations, the lack of funds for joint research, and also the lack of feedback after reporting to WPs.
- In conclusion, it was suggested to stimulate the involvement of PIs by:
  - within each System, enhancing the synergy between national programmes by funding joint activities (e.g. synergy between national IPY plans to implement ICED); this could be done through workshops or field work;
  - trying to develop any EUR-OCEANS activity (scientific review, joint publication ...) in such a way that PIs can see an added value from their participation.

## **11. How to engage the PIs at the network level: Workshops, Summer Schools, PIs and General Assembly meetings: general discussion and agenda for 2006 and 2007**

*Chair: Philippe Cury*

*- Presentation by P. Cury*

P. Cury recalled the list of workshops, meetings, conferences and summer schools already held or to be held in 2006 and 2007. He presented a more detailed schedule for the 2007 PIs annual meeting, the General Assembly meeting, and the next NSC meetings.

*- Discussion*

- It was agreed to use a numerical ranking system for the next evaluation round of workshops proposals, as a simple assessment as “favourable” or “not favourable” was not considered very effective.
- It was suggested to organize the physical meeting of the General Assembly in 2007 either (1) jointly with the annual PIs meeting, or (2) jointly with the NSC autumn meeting. A vote was held, and option (2) was chosen (10 votes in favour) in order to allow for interactions between the NSC and the General Assembly.
- It was proposed and agreed to organize the annual PIs meeting in April rather than in March 2007.
- The next NSC meeting will be held on 22-24 November 2006, and C. Le Quéré offered Cambridge as a venue.
- The spring NSC meeting could be held back-to-back with the annual PIs meeting, with half a day of break between the two. An additional meeting could be held by video-conference a few weeks after, in case there is a need for the preparation of the responses to the annual review comments. Decisions on these matters will be made during the next NSC meeting.

## **12. Conclusions of the meeting**

P. Treguer thanked the participants. The meeting was closed at 16:30 pm.

## **Appendix 1: Action points**

**Action 1** [Executive Director]: Setting up of a small working group including PIs, and WP/System Leaders and Assistants to assist the Executive Director and the webmaster in the revision of the website, and to prepare a short document explaining to PIs “what EUR-OCEANS can do” for them.

**Action 2** [Themes and Systems Leaders]: Initiate a discussion by e-mail on common interests among Themes and Systems, and continue it during a whole day at the next NSC meeting.

**Action 3** [Executive Director]: Announce important discussions or votes by e-mail, with a link to a forum section on the website where a debate could take place without overloading mailboxes (either in the private area of the website, or, if such area was suppressed, on a page accessible only through the link provided by e-mail)

**Action 4** [Executive Director]: Put the recipients of the messages in the “blind copy” (Bcc) field in future correspondence.

**Action 5** [EUR-OCEANS office]: Print and distribute by post the short document on “What EUR-OCEANS can do for you?”

**Action 6** [Executive Director and members of the working group]: Activation of the working group composed of C. Fox, I. Siokou-Frangou, P. Freon and C. Gernez and work on the membership issue. Presentation of an analysis during the next NSC meeting.

**Action 7** [Executive Director]: Prepare a revised table for the budget showing, on a multi-annual basis, (i) the fixed expenses (Assistants, PhDs and post-docs) and (ii) the other expenses, indicating the degree of freedom. Circulate it among NSC members for an electronic discussion.

**Action 8** [Executive Director]: Prepare a short document explaining the budget and how funds can be spent, to be put on the website and circulated among Assistants.

**Action 9** [Scientific Directors and EUR-OCEANS office]: Forward the request for amending the Consortium Agreement to the General Assembly as soon as possible, with a letter explaining that the proposed changes are in response to the reviewers’ comments, and are considered by the NSC and the EC as improvements of the management structure of the network.

**Action 10** *WPI.2 Mobility and communication*: Modify the Awards programme as indicated in point 9.

**Action 11** [C. Le Quéré (coordination) and NSC members]: Prepare a short document to describe the EUR-OCEANS scientific priorities for each WP and System, in order to allow PIs to better focus their activities and be prepared to respond to future internal calls.

**Action 12** *WPI.2 Mobility and communication*: Include a specific section in the Newsletter dedicated to the promotion of intermediary, exciting results from WPs and/or Systems.

**Action 13** [WP10 and Gender Equality Council]: Improve consideration of gender issues in future outreach products.

## **Appendix 2: Proposed changes to the Consortium Agreement and corresponding deliverable**

Given that proposals to the *Parties* for the approval of any amendment of terms of the *Consortium Agreement* require a unanimous decision of the *Parties* (Consortium Agreement, Articles 6 (3) ix and 6 (5)), the *Network's Steering Committee* asks the *Executive Committee* to request the *General Assembly* to amend the *Consortium Agreement* as follows:

### **Article 8 (2)**

Replace:

The *Executive Committee* is responsible for the overall direction of the *Network*.

By:

The *Executive Committee* is responsible for the current affairs of the *Network*, and for the implementation of the decisions made by the *Network's Steering Committee* and, if necessary, approved by the *Assembly*.

### **Article 9 (2)**

Replace:

The *Network's Steering Committee* shall be responsible for the current affairs of the *Network*, and for implementing the decisions made by the *Executive Committee* and approved by the *Assembly*.

By:

The *Network's Steering Committee* shall be responsible for the overall direction of the *Network*, and for the integration within the *Network*.

### **Article 9 (3)**

Replace:

The *Network's Steering Committee* shall be chaired by the Scientific Director. The Deputy Scientific Director shall be the vice-chair.

By:

The *Network's Steering Committee* shall be chaired by one of its members, on a rotational basis.

**Corresponding deliverable.** The *Network's Steering Committee* asks the *Executive Committee* to request the *General Assembly* to amend the *Consortium Agreement* as indicated above. (Month 18)

### Appendix 3: Synthetic table from Systems reports

	Arctic & Nordic seas	Shelf seas	North Atlantic	Baltic Sea	Mediterranean	Southern Ocean	Upwelling
<b>EUR-OCEANS Endorsement</b>	Setup of 2 symp. 1. Foodweb dyn. & biogeochem. fluxes in arctic 2. Ecosystem Dynamics Norw. Barents sea	May 2006	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting in March 2006	System workshop Ecosystem overview and Modelling → identification of 4 challenges	Workshop Med. Mar Ecos. Model. → identific of unknowns → integration activities	Set-up of ICED (Integrated analyses of circumpolar climate interactions and ecosystem dynamics in SO) Workshop funded by EUR-OCEANSS	Well advanced due to the existing ECO-UP IRD program. New area: Iberian pen. Several meetings
<b>Link with international activities</b>	Globec ESSAS (Ecosyst. Studies of Subarctic seas)		METAOCEANS	BALTEX (Earth system modelling)/Globec/Geohab/ICES →Baltic res. Progr: Developing an integrated view on the Baltic ecosystem: Challenges for modelling Base for FP7	SESAME	ICED=joint Eurocean/Imber/Globec/S CAR/SCOR +links with SOLAS/CLIVAR/CLIC/CCAMLR/GEOTRACES + link with IPY	EUR-OCEANS/ECO-UP + regional projects (e.g. BENEFIT : Angola, , Namibia, South Africa)
<b>Integration of 'within syst.' activities</b>		WP4: vital rates survey	Planned joint meeting for clustering activities of 'North-European' systems	4 challenges: Eco. Reconstr. in the last century Use of knowledge for scenario building Use of models for designing field exp. interaction between models and empirical form., Process studies to identify the gaps of knowledge and models	based on modelling workshop outcomes	Planned wkshps: - Current issues in SO modelling - Data mining for both modelling and observations -Coordination of field work	SPACC/GLOBEC synthesis wkshop on upwelling systems
<b>Interaction with EUR-OCEANS Task Teams</b>	Global scale ROMS Circ. Model	AMEMR	WP4: Basin specific support WP9: fact sheet METAOCEANS		To be based on modelling workshop outcomes	WP5: Fe cycling	WP6: vision paper 'Scientific challenge to move towards Ecosystem oceanography
<b>System problems</b>	Extent to non-European arctic regions Integration of biogeochemist and ecosyst. PI's Too few PhD & post-docs	Late recruitment of assistant	Engaging PI's in system activities. Low communication		Undefined role of PI's Lack of links & feedbacks with Task leaders. Clarification on mandates	Engaging PI's in WPs activities	Funds for dedicated research in Iberian Associated members