Index

The 12th ERVO meeting was held in the *National Oceanography Centre* (NERC) in Southampton between May 5th and 6th with the assistance of 23 members.

Chairperson

The Chairperson was Andreé Cattrijsse

Welcome

After the welcome from Geraint West and presentation,

Minutes of ERVO 2009

Minutes from ERVO 2009 were aproved

National Updates

The National updates were exposed with a poster session in the meeting room.

Sessions

Ship operations: in-house vs. outsourcing, André *Cattrijsse* + ALL

During the round table, the R/V operators explained their situation and some of the difficulties arising from the marine operation itself. The management of vessels of the different institutions in different countries varies, being their own or outsourcing service. The management of issues such as contracts for the crew, technicians, permits, etc., is generally common to all ships. However, some of them have problems with crew but the solution is out of their hands

André Cattrijsse opens the discussion, the participants explain what the model followed by the vessel operator of different institutions.

There are cases where the company is responsible for marine activities and crew matters; for example, in Ireland is a company, while in Germany there are several companies for different ships. In the regional vessels, however, the public administration is sometimes responsible, but in terms of payment day. In the case of Norway, outsourcing is done by the IMR for three different shipowners. Per's opinion is that private companies are not more efficient, but they are certainly more expensive, and have no experience in research vessels. In France, Genavir is responsible, but is close to being a "in house" solution, as Ifremer is the only user of Genavir, in a sense is a sort of solution for recruitment purposes?, and Ifremer "in house" is a good solution. In the case of R / V Marion Dufresne is different, is owned by the banks (?) and rented by the Polar Institute. In the CNRS the solution is in house, but for small ships. In general the solution of Ifremer is an "integrated effort" seeking for cooperation with other institutions, like IEO, Navy ...

Recently said that it is now difficult to have a full-time employment and that the government encourages outsourcing.

R/V Belgica is operated by the Belgium Navy, being the Federal Science Office the owner. The Navy is supervising dry docking, repairs and provides the crew. The different research programs as monitoring or fish stock assessment pass the funds for the ship time.

CNR Italia: Three of the ships are from an outside company, and the CNR rent all of them. The crew is external. The R / V Urania worked 320 days in 2009…

MRL, Finland: The services of a first external company were established due to a division at the Institute conducted years ago. The services were very expensive and it was made a public bid to reduce costs by 50%. Now the vessel is available for external projects and chartering. The R / V Aranda has only one crew and is operating between 120 to 150 days per year.

Cefas, UK: Outsourcing is a way of transforming the risks. Technicians are from the house. The crew is provided by P & O, and the company is obliged in case of problems or repairs to provide a boat under the same conditions

GEOECOMAR Romania: Our system is complex. The Research Ministry has 2 vessels. In the case of Istrios, the government pays crew and everything. Mare Nigrum is from Government (Black Sea National program) the crew for both ships are from GEOECOMAR. We have a separated Government support for each vessel. It is not possible in Romania for a private company to operate because it is not profitable.

CSIC Spain: Different ways depending on ship. We have an "In house" crew for Garcia del Cid, a navy crew for Hesperides and outsourcing for Sarmiento de Gamboa. There is a complex situation especially with those technicians contracted by external company.

Discussion

Discussion focuses on the problems when an external company is responsible for the contract and operation of the ship. It is clear that all operators and scientists prefer that the technicians are from the home institution. Concerning the crews and the operation, there are different opinions. For some operators the problems are safety rules, as a risk to the owner.

It starts another interesting discussion on the chartering of vessels. Some operators may rent the boat if there is a scientific interest. The rental rates must be competitive within the exploration market.

Following the first point in the discussion a comment is made about working conditions and standards used by outsourced companies. In some cases the contract with the external company sets the rules, such as salaries, responsibilities, etc., but usually the person responsible is administrative contract is lacking experience of the ship operators and the knowledge of the house. But although the company could sign a contract with "right" rules with the operator, the same company may not be socially correct on other ships of the company and this could lead to political conflicts with the operator of the administration (PN).

Jacques Binot notes the difficulties in explaining the administration and the special status of the operation of research vessels and scientific infrastructure management, these difficulties do not appear in other scientific infrastructure.

In the case of NOC, the four vessels operated by external companies with various finance, administration and insurance matters, only have a small profit margin. For technicians there is not outsourcing.

For some the in house solution is better but others prefer that this management is better done by “professional” people. The problem is to control the budgets.

COFFEE BREAK

Medical & sea survival training for scientists E. Koning + All

Erica Koning Introduce us to the OFEG meeting discussion on medical care and safety rules for OFEG ships.

Different operators explaining what the certificates or procedures adopted for the care and safety, ie medical certificates, and survival training.

In several countries a medical certificate (standard certificates as ENG1) are required, and in others not. The discussion is centered in responsibilities in case of illness or accident.

It is recommended having a medical certificate, besides having the necessary survival training. It also recommends a medical certificate and an envelope with the statement of allergies, pill taken, etc. About responsibilities, the captain and the owner are responsible for the people on board, and maybe this is an argument for outsourcing.

Another aspect discussed was the participation of scientists in the deck operations. In some countries, and because it is still a tradition, is allowed, the issue is more sensitive in cases of outsourcing, which represents a point of discussion. In Germany, for example, scientists are "passengers"in terms of insurance and law and therefore not allowed to participate in the deck operations

Due to the absence of existing regulation, it is important to have the documents, protocols for deck operations, procedures reviewed and approved by the case of an accident. We discuss experiences with inspectors. This problem is not well resolved in the majority of vessels and owners. Much more clearly are those areas where safety equipment is involved

Then Geraint West explains the discussion or conclusions of the working group a questionnaire submitted security code preguntapor ISOM and those interested in participating.

Lunch

New Builds

Replacement of R/V Discovery, E. Cooper

Eduard Cooper presents the R/V Discovery replacement project. Discovery was built in 1962 and refurbished in 1992. The contract was signed in March with C.N.P. Freire, Vigo, Spain and design of Skipsteknisk, Norway. The project specified an outsourcing requirement for procurement.

NMF will operate the ship, starting in 2014.

- The ship will be similar to James Cook but with significant difference.
- Here presents slides with draws and particulars of the ship. Will be not an ICES 209 ship.
- Will be minimal ice class just to get a long life because strength of hull
- Funding £75M (£from NERC)
- Special care on bubble sweep-down. Here explain the problems in this aspect (on procedures) that were with James Cook. In Discovery the bow propeller window will be reduced.
- Explain LOT-2 strategy

Replacement of R/V Belgica, A. Pollentier

Andreé Pollentier explains the process from feasibility study to be done.

The ship must be at least 60 m O.L. For this study the national needs were considered and were taken some international contacts with ESF, OFEG, Ifremer, and NIOZ…

The ship must be at least 60 m O.L. For this study the national needs were considered and were taken some international contacts with ESF, OFEG, Ifremer, and NIOZ…

The conclusions of the study are

- Multipurpose
- More accommodation
- Containers for labs
- DP
- Low noise ICES
- ROV

- Pelagic fisheries
- Ice class 1
- The preliminary technical specifications
- 65 m OL
- 17 m. Beam
- Propulsion diesel electric 4000 kW,
- Containers /Deck equipment
- Winches for 2000 m

The budget is €50M.

The operation –navy operated or not- must to be discussed but the equipment is operated by lab technicians, not by navy people. The navy "drives" the ship.

The situation concerning ships construction was more optimistic a decade ago. We seek an agreement with the Ministry slowly. It requires a design to show and see the progress of the project. Belgium has to follow in marine research, Universities and Institutes need a ship. "We thought we could offer our ship to other institutions in other countries for the feasibility study".

The philosophy outlined in the discussion was the construction of ships that could be shared with other countries, multi-operation. Co-financing could also be a way to have a real impact on programming, and Belgium now politically it is very important to enhance cooperation.

Arrangement of the budget is planned by the end of this year. The project in 2014

VLIZ New Regional coastal RV, A. Cattrijsse

The total budget, including VAT and scientific equipment is €12.5M

At the end of 2006 the concept was defined.

R/V Simon Stevin, 36 m LOA x 9.4m beam

10 crew/10 sci

Daytrips mainly

Replacement of Sonne, Klaus von Broeckel ***(NO Info in this presentation)***

Regional Barter, the BONUS case

By Andris Andrusaitis BONUS EEIG

It explains the design process, starting from 2004 as an ERA-NET project. In 2008, 12 funding agencies began a program in the Baltic to develop the necessary conditions for a joint Baltic Sea Research Project. Between 2007 and 2011 BONUS + implements a joint call for testing the collaborative arrangements.

2010 to 2016 BONUS-169 (?), deeper integration of training programs

Oct- 2009 EC approved legislative proposal BONUS-169

End of 2009, co-decision process by EC and EP started.

May 1st 2010 Start of 18 months BONUS 169 strategic phase

Funding 2010-2016 100 M€: EU 50 M€ plus national funding 50 M€. From this, the participants must contribute with 26M€, 12M€ reported as joint use of research infrastructures and 14M€ needed as additional (sectorial).

The work package relative to Strategic Phase is explained. Ship time is the most important piece in marine research, indicatively 3.2 M€ in BONUS+ projects. BONUS+ programs are also monitoring or sampling programs.

Scheme: The researcher proposes the service including working area, time and a justification for the calculation of ship-day price, etc.

(Small ships are more flexible and underused). The calculation of this price must be auditable. The call is similar to this of Eurofleets.

BONUS considers agreements with ship owners including auditable basis.

Upon receiving a proof that works was done, BONUS pays the 50% of the ship costs.

Benefits for scientists and for owners: active part (variable costs) versus dead part (fixed costs), finding new customers and establishing a competition with other ship owners.

Difficulties:

- Auditable way
- Opposition towards creation of a “common ship time market” must be overcome

Objectives: Integration of research infrastructures

Call: Tender will be published in June 2010. “Development of a methodology for research infrastructure integration”

Discussion

The Ships must be able to provide the service, sampling, etc. BONUS + is not closed to the Baltic, or on the scientific, nor vessel operators. No new investments in this step. We consider in this so-called ESFRI Call, a new RV in the Baltic. However, it is clear that ESFRI funding is not sufficient.

It is a real need for "cooperative confounding" for new Research Vessels.

The ship time of the schedule shown is not financed by the project (BONUS. These cruises are sampling, and are performed with their own vessels.

The discussion is centered in peer review for "scientific objectives" and a peer review for "feasibility on ship". The case of Eurofleet is also exposed. Agreement of ship operator with scientific team about objectives and capabilities must be done.

ERVO and EUROFLEETS tasks, *by André Cattrijsse*

Activity 1, Launch a European Strategic view on RV and equipment.

- Fleets coordination group
- Europe (not EC, EUROFLEETS)
- New investments list.

Activity 3, Eco-response and Eco design

- LCA Environmental Managing Plan
- Greening (specially regional fleet)

  Inputs on questionnaire

Activity 4, Operational issues

- Interoperability
- Coordinated scheduling.

Jacques Binot

: Acivity 1:

- Better coordination
- Evolution 10 coming years
- Marine board issue recommended updating

Discussion

Jacques Binot: EUROFLEET has a limited time life to be a coordination platform for ERVO. EUROFLEET don't want to control it. EUROFLEET has some defined objectives. Interoperability is an issue, and EF can write recommendations and databases, but has no ability to pay for "works" on interoperability or greening

*Andreé e*xplains the questionnaire on "How vessels are? " Some comments on the questionnaire. It is not for ISM certified vessels, it is for regional vessels. Efforts are applied for maintaining and upgrade ocean vessels but not for regional small vessels. This is an old fleet and effort must be done in this sense.

Some comments on where information is hold. Starting from Eurocean database, a document must contain information about the fleet, recommendations, certified ships, how many are certified, frequently asked questions, etc.

DipClear Diplomatic Clearance

By Rolland Rogers

MSK—UN MSR

Law of the seas

In 2009 UN asked to update the law and select a group of experts (GOE)

Some of the conclusions of this GOE are about the implementation of new technologies and a black list on non compliant researching states. The Convention still needs the development of specific guidelines relating to the deployment and operation of modern MSR technologies (e.g. Gliders, observatories and long term moorings.).

There is enough evidence from current Coastal States Practice to include in the new guide a short paragraph identifying that some DipClear applications will need to be accompanied by an appropriate environmental assessment. The adoption of the new UN MSR guidelines will increase both the benefits to the Coastal State and the costs to the Researching State**.**

Dip clear process

UNCLOS, UN Convention on the **Law of the Seas**.

UNCLOS article 76, extension of EEZ

Impact of scientific moorings, article. 76 (a picture of world with moorings)

Scientific moorings in Artic

"The IMO Guidelines for ships operations in Artic ice-covered waters"

"Draft Antarctic Bill"

MSR and capacity building, the possibility of MSR being licensed

EIA Environmental Impact Assessment

Indicators for determining good environmental status

- Underwater noise and other forms of energy
- Kill, capture, injures of protected animals
- Marine and coastal access bill 2009
- In England, Wales, N. Ireland 12 nm as "territorial sea"

Somebody needed for attending all this

Extension to other EC members

More expensive and complicated: simplify and collaborate with EC

Discussion

Eduard Cooper: Definition of noise levels

R.R: German and Dutch meet every year for these definitions

Eduard Cooper: Few acousticians will agree with the same definition of noise levels…

ISOM meeting

Geraint West

In the future will be IRSO (International Research Ship Operators). The 25th anniversary the meeting will be in Southampton.

ERVO Future discussion

André Cattrijsse explains the history of ERVO, starting from Marine Board (ESF) recommendations. ERVO meet together people involved specially in regional vessels operations. He shows the positive points of ERVO as interchange of experience, problems to be rise etc. One of these problems is an overlapping with ISOM which is growing, nowadays with less representation of small vessels.

The question for starting the discussion is: **Is ERVO a useful platform**?

For some of us, topics presented are very useful and travel to far countries for ISOM meetings is sometimes impossible. In ERVO is possible to get information from other groups.

Other question arising is how to be more useful, more interactive, day to day, more cooperative?

Geraint West explains ISOM workshops including MSR, Medical care; Safety rules… and explains the treated issues in ISOM. Exposed the results of the questionnaire presented in ISOM.

After this presentation is concluded, now we have more and useful information, most countries provide this information, and now it is more credible and statistically significant. To combine efforts in different aspects, in different groups, as well as Define priorities for combine some meetings (?). If ISOM is hold in Europe, then ERVO must be together with ISOM. Is difficult to explain to our boss the number of meetings we are attending.

Per N, The most difficult and significant is to build your network (Facebook). People appear and then disappear. In ISOM meeting are also involved regional operators. When in Europe, ISOM meeting is easy to combine with ERVO meeting. His statement is that ISOM or ERVO are not defined by the size of the ship but the area: world, Europe.

Agreement is done in incorporation of more countries and/or groups and that those topics could be worked more deeply:

J.B. presented clear definitions:

- Key item : best practice group
- No overlapping with other groups
- Find subgroups

It is important to find mediators, for example, co-finance and co-use of ship time, it is also useful contact with others for the construction or designing new ships, etc. Through these meetings opened the doors, as well as opportunities to enter this business, the exchange of information and problems. However, not all representatives of the vessels belong to ERVO.

The convenience or not of several meetings is discussed. For some, every meeting is useful: new contacts, more information useful etc. Big fleet operators must attend these meetings but other attendants could be organized in subgroups, by example, MED subgroup, Baltic subgroup, etc.

Eduard Cooper proposes to draw a map with countries in and out of ERVO. A list of operators is proposed. And to know what the reasons some operators are not attending all the meetings, to know if it is difficult to travel or are other circumstances for not attend the ERVO meeting.

Geraint points out that in las ISOM meeting were 60 people from 15 countries and that perhaps some of the European operators are not in ERVO meeting because they were in ISOM meeting.

Per N. it is important that some people of the country should be present in these meetings because information must to be transmitted to the other operators of the country.

Coffe Break

Abstract of discussion on ERVO future

The problem is the overlap of information and activities between the ISOM and ERVO meetings. The question is whether ERVO is useful. For most participants, in a sense, is useful. The solution probably is to try to complement the topics, working groups, etc., discussed in both meetings, but then the problem is for people who are not going to attend both meetings. People who could not travel to distant countries for meetings ISOM or other problems (too many meetings), ERVO is useful forum because issues are also discussed.

The discussion focuses on ERVO activities and the format of the meeting. At this meeting the national updates have been changed to a poster session. **Then agenda could be extended before the meeting.**

Some comments were "complementary" to others like ISOM (IRSO) or be a "meeting" of operators with fixed items added the themes of each meeting. It should become a more visible or targeted organization. Some others noted that the activities should continue to progress after the meeting, between meetings. However, although the interior looks like a good format, must be part of the production if the Marine Board is still working. One idea is to move the discussions, but in small vessels and equipment. Inviting more people ERVO. ERVO should be a more specific (MG).

The question is whether ERVO must become a more formal, more pro-active. In this sense we agree to be more professional. ERVO is not a legal organization and some of the procedures and format must be accepted before becoming a professional organization. But the problem is the overlap with other organizations.

Starts then a discussion about procedures on ERVO organization, chairman, vicechairman, and etc. rotation is needed.

One way to change this is to create working groups, and the first working group could work to define the internal organization of ERVO or model of the "new" ERVO and could be presented at the next meeting in 2011. (NP)

A.C. presents some slides about ERVO future organization.

- **Inhouse activities**
- **Create strategy / Set up objectives**
- **What time basis**
- **Re-organize?**
- **Member fee? Conference fee]**

Working group –look forward: Jacques Binot, Per Nieuwejaar

P.N.: Comment on Eurocean website. Portugal is paying. Per ask for a fee per year of ERVO members for construction of a more professional website: 2000€ per year.

Next ERVO Meeting

The next ERVO meeting (13th) will be at Oristano, Sardinia, Italy 3-5 may 2011. At CNR Institute of Coastal Marine Environmental.

Organized by CNR, Italy. *Giuseppe Magnifico*

Annex 1

Agenda of 12th ERVO Meeting

Tuesday 4th May

20:00 Icebreaker

Wednesday 5th May

9:00 Welcome G. West
9:10 Opening of ERVO 2010, Introduction, Approval of ERVO 2009 minutes A. Cattrijsse
9:30 Ship operations: in-house vs. outsourcing J. Breslin + ALL
10:30 Coffee break & national update posters
11:15 Medical & sea survival training for scientists E. Koning + All
12:30 Lunch
13:30 New Builds E. Cooper A. Pollentier A. Cattrijsse
14:30 Regional barter – the BONUS case A. Andrusaitis + All
15:00 Coffee break & national update posters
15:30 RV Design issues All
16:00 Eurofleets work packages and ERVO A. Cattrijsse + ALL
16:30 Tour of NOC facilities G. West
17:30 End day one

Thursday 6th May

9:00 ERVO way ahead All
10:30 Coffee Break
11:00 ERVO way ahead continued All
12:00 AOB All
12:15 Selection new vice chair Date & Place ERVO2011 All
12:30 Closing of ERVO 2010 & Lunch

Annex 2

Assistants to 12th ERVO Meeting

Name	Organization	e-mail	Country
André Cattrijsse	Flanders Marine Institute	andre@vliz.be	Belgium
Eduard Cooper	National Ocenography Centre	edc@noc.soton.ac.uk	UK
Geraint West	National Ocenography Centre	gerw@noc.soton.ac.uk	UK
Erica Koning	NIOZ	erica.koning@nioz.nl	Netherlands
Klaus von Broeckel	IFM-GEOMAR	kbroeckel@ifm-geomar.de	Germany
Michael Gilloly	Marine Institute	michael.gillooly@marine.ie	Ireland
Per W. Nieuwejaar	IMR	pern@imr.no	Norway
André Pollentier	RBINS-MUMM	a.pollentier@mumm.ac.be	Belgium
Sandra de Oliveira e Sá	Eurocean	sandra.sa@jct.mctes.pt	Portugal
Giuseppe Magnifico	CNR	giuseppe.magnifico@cnr.it	Italy
Juha Flinkman	Finish Env. Inst. / MRL	juha.flinkman@ymparisto.fi	Finland
Andris Andrusaitis	BONUS EEIG	andris.andrusaitis@bonuseeig.fi	Finland
Olivier Quédec	Ifremer	olivier.quedec@ifremer.fr	France
Arturo Castellón	UTM.CSIC	arturoc@utm.csic.es	Spain
Jacques Binot	Ifremer / EUROFLEETS	jacques.binot@ifremer.fr	France
Bill Meadows	Cefas	bill.medows@cefas.co.uk	UK
Aodhán Fitzgerald	Marine Institute	aodhan.fitzgerald@marine.ie	Ireland
Nigel Lyman	Cefas	nigel.lyman@cefas.co.uk	UK
Delcho Solakov	IO-BAS	dsolakov@io-bas.bg	Bulgaria
Stefan Florescu	GEOECOMAR	stefan.florescu@geoecomar.ro	Romania
Dan Secrieru	GEOECOMAR	dsecrieru@yahoo.com	Romania
Michael Ippich	RF	m.ippich@rf-bremen.de	Germany