



MARCOM+ Steering Committee and Advisory Board Meeting Den Haag, The Netherlands 14&15.06-2011

Day 1: Steering Committee meeting

- **Welcome**

The project Coordinator welcomed the participants and thanked the local host for the arrangements

- **Review of MARCOM+ activities and achievements, deliverables to be completed**

The project manager presented the review and preview of MARCOM+ activities in accordance with the description of work. Individual partners commented on the deliverables to be completed till the end of this year (presentations from CIESM and ESF-MB constitute attachments to this report).

- **MARCOM+ technical review and extension**

The project manager presented the outcome of the technical review and the intention to seek for a project cost-free extension (due to the decision of the consortium to organize the project's concluding event together with the EMAR2RES project final event).

- **Update on the EMAR2RES, EUROMARINE, SEAS-ERA, JPI OCEANS initiatives**

ESF-MB presented the developments of the EMAR²RES initiative. The EMAR²RES future structure will be most likely linked with the future MARCOM Forum.

ICES presented the developments of the EUROMARINE project. There is a clear advantage for both the initiatives to work out long-term cooperation links (MARCOM providing a stable, long lasting framework, EUROMARINE may supplement the biological sciences activities in MARCOM+).

EATIP presented the latest developments of the JPI Oceans initiative. The JPI is recognized as a possible recipient / contractor for the products of the future MARCOM Forum and has articulated interest in a close cooperation.

- **Preview of MARCOM 2011 activities per Panel, future timeline**

The panel chairs presented the expectations of the three remaining expert panel meetings.

Another attempt to engage the European Parliament's intergroup for marine and coastal issues into the MARCOM process was requested. For the PI panel it is also considered relevant to invite DG ENV. MOVE and MARE

MB-ESF noted that the European Commission plans to organize workshops on the societal challenges addressed in the future Common Strategic Framework (e.g. food security, green energy, resource efficiency, green and smart transport). Marine science / innovation issues are underrepresented.

- **Presentations of possible models of the future Marine and Maritime Science and Technology Forum**

A synthesis of conclusions from the expert panel meetings was presented by the project manager. The leader of task 4.3. 'assessment of the modalities and instruments to best address the sustainability of the Partnership' (MB-ESF) presented a proposal of the future Forum's ToRs and a list of key questions on the Forum's scope and operational issues (the presentation constitutes an attachment to this report).

- **Discussion on the future Marine and Maritime Science and Technology Forum**

The consortium agreed on the following points:

- The aim is not to establish a new organization but to design a long-term collaborative mechanisms;

- The chairmanship of the Forum should be a rotating function (possibly with a two-year term or with a one-year term with a possibility for a re-election);
- The Steering Committee of the Forum will comprise the Forum member representatives and operate on both reactive (respond to external requests) and proactive (proposals for advice activities) principles;
- The Forum's scope of work should not be limited to the worked-out list of marine/maritime areas of common interests. The list is regarded as example areas of key issues concerning both marine and maritime science communities and is to serve as a kick-start identifying the scope of interest; the list is expected to be extended as new issues of common interests emerge;
- The Forum's scope of work will not be limited only to but focus on the cross-over (marine – maritime) topics;
- The EU's Integrated Maritime Policy will be one of the key reference points for the Forum;
- The Forum's Steering Committee should meet on demand, possibly back-to-back with major events (of the 'underrepresented' maritime/industry side, if possible), however there should be at least one meeting per year;
- The Steering Committee will be open for new networks (especially from the underrepresented maritime side); involvement of new organizations will be discussed case by case. The strength of the Forum is the non-national/Pan-European/regional focus. Some networks may be engaged for a specific emerging topic / project; An observer status may be given to an external organization e.g. representing a specific sector/field or institutions serving national interests;
- Advice / recommendations which are provided for free are not valued. Sustaining the Forum without significant recognition and commitment from the European Commission may be questionable over a long term.

A secretariat function (possibly rotating) will be needed to coordinate the Forum's activities.

The parties have not yet reached a conclusive agreement regarding the following issues:

- Whether the secretariat function should rotate together with the rotating chair. If so, probably with an overlap between current and next secretariat to ensure transfer of knowledge and procedures;
- Whether participation in the Forum's Steering Committee should mean an obligatory financial or in-kind contribution;
- Whether the Secretariat should be provided by the organisation chairing the Steering committee (in kind contribution, so called "light model") or whether it should operate with a dedicated budget (so called "heavy model"). The Coordinator will make an inquiry with the Commission regarding possibilities of future co-financing.

- Whether the secretariat should be decentralised between partners (each partner committing itself to a specific secretariat task e.g. website, organization of meetings).
- It became clear from the discussions that the MARCOM+ partners need a general discussion on the functions envisioned by a secretariat, as some partners considered a small and administrative focused secretariat, only taking care of simple administrative tasks, a limited website, organisation of yearly SC meeting, etc. While other partners foresee the need for a professional secretariat capable of organising other types of events (e.g. “Incubator”-events, where specific issues are addressed between industry and scientists), preparing documents, ensuring consultation processes, representing the Forum in other fora, “marketing” towards potential clients, etc.
- the minimal “light model” will require (i) the Steering Committee to make recommendations and (ii) the partners (interested in a given topic/activity) undertake the work, i.e.: prepare the process for the establishment of working groups, run working groups, conduct reporting and engage in the process for approval of their output as a product of the Forum.

Final ‘Tour de Table’

There are several options for the future MARCOM Forum:

Option 1: “light weight” solution with annual meeting spawning subsequent activities on joint ventures on the expenses of partners; rotating Chairmanship with rotating secretariat or distributed secretariat solution; two year terms for the Chairmanship;

Option 2 a): annual meetings in conjunction with annual meetings of partner organizations and with flexible meeting schedules as required according to requests or genuine activities; rotating Chairmanship with distributed secretariat on partners’ expenses (in-kind or cash flow, T&S), or permanent secretariat on partners’ expenses;

Option 2 b): annual meetings in conjunction with annual meetings of partner organizations and with flexible meeting schedules as required according to requests or genuine activities; rotating Chairmanship with distributed secretariat on the EC’s expenses (funding for staff and T&S) or permanent secretariat hosted at the EC and on EC’s expenses; option for a termed secretariat there with nomination of staff by the Chair; two year terms for the Chairmanship;

CIESM: inquiry and discussion with the EC on option 2b) should be done; advice for free will not be heard; since MARCOM + is the brainchild of the EC they can be approached for funding; the expected workload is beyond what can be performed on a regular basis and is voluntary; the location of the secretariat (hosted by the EC or not) is not a central issue; CIESM is not in favour of a “triumvirat” solution (current, past and future chairs) as it would lock in the horizon for too long ; a part-time secretariat will suffice the needs; it has to be enquired with the EC whether our advice will be welcomed.

EUCC: much in line with previous comments; there will be limited or no success without funding and that be a clear message to the EC.

EATIP: a membership fee along the option 2a) or a “slim” organization model should be preferred; the EC is likely to pay for advice but not for a secretariat; the best option is to create internal commitment for running the SC and a Forum conference, that is a one-year term for the Chairmanship plus in-kind for the man-months required for a secretariat.

EUROGOOS: has preference for a distributed secretariat solution with clearly defined roles and functions; roles could rotate but extra efforts would be needed to sustain the network cooperation; another option favoured is a rotating secretariat along with the Chairmanship;

Marine Board ESF: it is not realistic to ask the EC for funding of the secretariat activities, but the model envisaged by partners will require extra efforts. A two-year term for the Chairmanship is supported while a rotating secretariat will require overlap, it should be with the Chairmanship; the final design should be based on the functions to be defined; a light structure is preferred and it is recommended to identify a small number of topics/areas before the end of the MARCOM+ project to form the focus of the early activities of the Forum. This will ensure it hits the ground running..

EFARO: the workload will be considerable; a distributed system is favoured but with all partners to be involved; the final model should be advertised to the EC as offering advice; it is recommended to piggyback on existing frameworks for resources.

SC Meeting participants:

Frederic Briand (CIESM)

Torgeir Edvardsen (EATIP)

Maud Evrard (ESF-MB)

Laura Giuliano (CIESM)

Adi Kellermann (Coordinator)

Fritz Koster (EFARO)

Denis Lisbjerg (EFARO)

Mike Mannaart (EUCC)

Kostas Nittis (EUROGOOS)

Niall McDonough (ESF-MB)

Wojciech Wawrzynski (ICES)

Day 2: Advisory Board meeting

- **Welcome**

The Coordinator welcomed the meeting participants and passed the apologies of two Advisory Board members received last week. Due to these last-minute cancellations the members absent will be asked to provide their views and comments via e-mail.

- **Review of MARCOM+ activities including the technical review and extension**

The project manager presented the project's achievements, deliverables to be completed until the end of 2011, expert panel findings and the timeline of future developments. The initial structure of the Marine and Maritime Science and Technology Forum was also presented as a summary of the recent Steering Committee decisions. The presentation constitutes an attachment to this report.

The meeting participants agreed that there is a need for the consortium to take time to define the future Forum's vision and mission. These views should be put into a broader societal context and communicated to the Commission with a view of obtaining feedback on what the expectations are. The work agenda of the future Forum should be agreed between the consortium and the Commission.

Sybille van den Hove mentioned that experience of similar activities from the past point that the Commission is in principle not willing to co-fund a secretariat function in a long term (there are however a few exceptions such as the Global Earth Observation System of Systems).

Joan Albaiges suggested that the vision of the Forum might be underpinning the Innovation Union strategy as it bridges major issues between sectors. The issue to finance coordinating structures of European projects in a long run is also a challenge to SEAS-ERA and the 'JPI Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans'. Without some initial finances for a consolidating structure, these initiatives have a high chance to fade away.

Torgeir Edvardsen stated that all the research sectors compete for funding against each other. Therefore it is vital to join forces and express marine and maritime issues in a coordinated and a pro-active way.

Sybille van den Hove mentioned that communication will be an important task for the Forum's Steering Committee. Its background, vision, mission and offer have to be communicated to the potential 'clients'. Funding will have to be allocated for such communication activities. One example (a success from the Hermione project) is to find the right entry point in order to organize an informative lunch meeting open to anyone from DG MARE (and others, if interested).

Adi Kellermann presented the plan to revamp the MARCOM web portal so that it becomes a place to go for the news in the marine/maritime research sector. The new website can be structured upon the main areas of common interests. It was noted that this should be done in cooperation with the EurOcean information centre and overlaps with other similar websites should be avoided.

- **Links with the SEAS-ERA and the JPI OCEANS initiatives**

Joan Albaiges presented a summary of the recent SEAS-ERA / JPI-Oceans developments. The presentation constitutes an attachment to this report.

MARCOM+ - SEAS-ERA links have to be strengthened. Coordinators of both activities will make sure both the project communities receive updated information. MARCOM+ coordinator will be invited to present the proposals for the structure of the future marine and maritime science partnership at the 1st SEAS-ERA Strategic Forum (07/09/11, Brussels).

AB Meeting participants:

Joan Albaiges (SEAS-ERA)

Torgeir Edvardsen (EATIP)

Maud Evrard (ESF-MB)

Adi Kellermann (Coordinator)

Denis Lisbjerg (EFARO)

Sybille van den Hove (Median SCP)

Wojciech Wawrzynski (ICES)