

ALMA BOARD
First Meeting 24-25 February 2003
National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA

MINUTES OF MEETING
as approved by Board 27 March 2003

Attendees

Board Members

R. Booth
C. Cesarsky
R. Dickman
R. Giacconi
J. Hesser
P. van der Kruit
A. Sargent
R. Wade

JAO & Project

S. Guilloteau
R. Kurz
M. Rafal
M. Tarenghi
P. Vanden Bout

Executives

I. Corbett
P. Donahoe
E. Hardy
D. Hofstadt
F. Lo

Observers

L. Avery
L. Bronfman
J. Cernicharo
T. Hasegawa
M. Ishiguro
G. Sanders
C. Wilson
A. Wootten

1. Introduction

After a short welcome address from W. van Citters, NSF Director of Astronomical Sciences, R. Dickman temporarily took the Chair.

2. Membership

- a) On behalf of ESO, C. Cesarsky announced the ESO appointees for the Board as P. van der Kruit, C. Cesarsky, R. Booth and R. Wade.
- b) On behalf of NSF, R. Dickman announced that the NSF appointees for the Board were: R. Dickman, R. Giacconi, J. Hesser, and A. Sargent.
- c) The Board as appointed designated P. van der Kruit as Chairperson and R. Dickman as Vice Chairperson.
- d) P. van der Kruit then took the Chair.
- e) ESO designated P. van der Kruit to speak for ESO and NSF designated R. Dickman to speak for NSF.
- f) The Board noted that R. Giacconi represented AUI, and C. Cesarsky represented ESO at the Board, and that the Secretary is I. Corbett.

3. Terms of Reference

The Board unanimously adopted the Terms of Reference (attached as Version 1.0 dated 24.02.03) agreed by ESO and NSF.

4. Rules of Procedure

The Board discussed voting Rule 7.3 and unanimously agreed that decisions would be carried with the support of at least two thirds of the members present and voting,

except for financial matters. With this revision to the draft, the Board unanimously approved the Rules of Procedure (attached as Version 1.0 dated 24.02.03).

5. Notes of Teleconference of 30 January and Matters Arising

- a) These were approved. R. Dickman requested that people should be referred to by last name plus initial.
- b) Matters arising were dealt with in the agenda of this meeting.

6. Closed Session

- a) The Board moved to a closed session to discuss the order of business and the offer of appointment to a new Director. The Board agreed that I. Corbett, P. Donahoe and F. Lo should attend the closed session.
- b) During the closed session the Board agreed the draft order of business, with the discussion of matters related to antenna procurement, Chile, and Japan to be taken in restricted session, without observers. The Board heard the report of the Search Committee and unanimously agreed that Massimo Tarenghi should be offered the post of Director from 1 April 2003. The Executives were urged to expedite the negotiations and appointment.

7. Restricted Session

- a) For this session, P. Vanden Bout, M. Tarenghi and S. Guilloteau plus R. Kurz and M. Rafal joined the attendees of the closed session to discuss the NAOJ proposal received 12 February 2003.
- b) P. Vanden Bout presented the initial JAO assessment of the NAOJ proposal.
- c) The restricted session was suspended, to be resumed later in the meeting. The attendees, above, were joined by the observers.

- 8. The draft Agenda was adopted without change.

9. Director's Report

- a) P. Vanden Bout gave an oral presentation in which he updated the December 2002 quarterly report, outlining progress with the two prototype antennas and on preparations for construction and site work to start in Chile. He stressed the need to have access to the land for the OSF and its access road by 01 April 2003 if the schedule was to be adhered to.
- b) M. Tarenghi described the management structure of ALMA and the work of the Integrated Product Teams (IPT). He outlined the key project milestones and again stressed the importance of being able to start building the roads on 01 April.
- c) The Board noted that the IPT presentation and the next quarterly report will be sent to AMAC members as soon as possible.

- d) The Board noted that there will be an 'ALMA Week' in June. The Board asked the Executives to ensure that members of the community were kept informed and involved in ALMA, and noted that this was a responsibility of the Executives and not of the JAO.

9. AUI/NRAO Report

M. Rafal reported that AUI staffing for ALMA was now around 100 FTE, that they were recruiting a Business Manager to be based in Santiago, and that they had rented additional space in Charlottesville.

10. ESO Report

- a) R. Kurz reported on progress in Europe, on the formation of the European ALMA Board and the expanded European Science Advisory Committee, each with one representative per Member State.
- b) The Board noted that A. Neves had joined ESO, prospectively to be the European Project Manager from 1 July 2003.

11. Interactions between Executives

- a) I. Corbett reported that AUI and ESO were working on a formal exchange which set out how they would work together to discharge their obligations under the Bilateral Agreement and how they would interact with each other and the JAO. A Working Group has been set up to study a range of issues connected with the tasks to be carried out in Chile and the optimal organizational structure to carry them out. Membership comprised 3 appointees from each of AUI and ESO plus the Director.
- b) The Board asked for a progress report from the Executives at their next meeting.
- c) It was noted in passing that documents placed on the ALMA Web site were not subjected to control and the Board asked the JAO to establish a process to control the placing of documentation on the ALMA Web site.

12. Project Plan

- a) P. Vanden Bout presented the Project Plan, dated 10 February 2003, with Annexes, including the 2003 Budget + Programme Plan.
- b) R. Wade noted that contingency had fallen to below 10%. In response P. Vanden Bout stated that costs and allocation were still being studied with a view to increasing contingency to at least 10%.
- c) R. Giacconi, noting that many costs could still change, suggested that there should be a baseline review for the November 2003 AMAC.

- d) The Board unanimously approved the Project Plan of 10 February 2003 as Version 1.0, recognizing that it is a 'living document' to be placed under change control. It was agreed that the JAO would produce revisions in consultation with the Executives, and present them to the Board for approval. A new Version number and the date of Board approval would be recorded.
- e) The Board unanimously approved the 2003 Budget and Programme Plan. It was agreed that the Project Plan main text should be a public document.

13. Progress in Chile

- a) This discussion took place in a restricted session. The Board noted progress to date on the various land issues and the urgency of access by 1 April. The Board expressed concern over the lack of written confirmation of the actual sums of money AUI and ESO were expected to pay, and over the continuing lack of a decision on whether the ESO Supplementary Agreement required parliamentary ratification.
- b) The Board agreed that a decision on the site of the ALMA Santiago Office could only be made after further studies on its size and scope. The JAO was asked to continue this work with the ALMA Operations Group.

14. AMAC

The Board agreed the current membership of AMAC and noted that the meeting postponed from January would take place in Socorro on 24/25 March. R. Dickman agreed to coordinate the production of a revised charge for this meeting, which would be put to the Board for approval by written procedure.

15. ASAC

- a) There is to be a meeting of ASAC on 2-3 April. The Board agreed that this should take place with the current ASAC membership, noting that the membership of the European ESAC would decide on the European membership of ASAC after that meeting.
- b) The Board asked the JAO and ASAC Chair to prepare, no later than 10 March, a draft charge for the ASAC meeting. R. Dickman agreed to coordinate the production of a charge, which would be put to the Board for approval by written procedure.

16. ASAC Interim Report

C. Wilson gave a short interim report on recent ASAC activities:

- reviewed science implications of proposed upgrade to baseline correlator;
- provided science examples of calibration requirements for polarisation, relative flux calibration and bandpass calibration;
- reviewed progress on software issues.

She noted that ESAC has also participated in European outreach activities for ALMA.

17. Conclusion

The remainder of the meeting took place in restricted session, and discussed the NAOJ proposal and antenna procurement.

18. Signature of Bilateral Agreement

At 13:30 on Tuesday 25 February the Director General of ESO signed the Bilateral Agreement in the presence of J. Bordogna, Deputy Director of NSF, the Board and attendees. The Agreement had previously been signed R. Colwell, Director of NSF, who could not be present on 25 February.

19. Conclusions and Actions

The 'Conclusion and Actions' agreed at the conclusion of the meeting are attached and form part of these minutes.

20. Next Meetings

The sequence of meetings as agreed on 30 October in Santiago, and subsequently circulated widely, is reproduced below.

ALMA Board Meetings

All teleconferences at 17.00 Garching time

Telecon	Tuesday December 3, 2002	
Telecon	Thursday January 30, 2003	
Face to face	February 24-25	NSF, Washington
Telecon	Thursday March 27	
Telecon	Tuesday April 29	
Face to face	May 26-27	Garching
Telecon	Thursday July 3	
Telecon	Thursday August 7	
Telecon	Thursday September 25	
Face to face	Nov 3-4	Santiago, Chile

ALMA BOARD

First Meeting 24 – 25 February 2003

Summary of Conclusions and Actions

1. The Appointees to the Board are:

ESO	NSF
P van der Kruit	R Dickman
C Cesarsky	R Giacconi
R Booth	J Hesser
R Wade	A Sargent

2. The Board designated P van der Kruit as Chairperson and R Dickman as Vice Chairperson. The Secretary is I Corbett.
3. The Board noted that P van der Kruit was designated to speak for ESO, as a signatory to the Bilateral Agreement, and R Dickman to speak for NSF.
4. The Board noted that C Cesarsky represented ESO as the European Executive and R Giacconi represented AUI as the North American Executive.
5. The Terms of Reference proposed by ESO and NSF were adopted by the Board, and will be noted as Version 1 dated 24 February 2003.
6. The Rules of Procedure proposed by ESO and NSF were approved by the Board with the voting majority required changed to two-thirds, and with that change will be noted as Version 1 dated 24 February 2003.
7. The Board approved the offer to M Tarenghi of the position of Director, from 1 April 2003, and asked the Executives to expedite the appointment.
8. The Board thanked the Key Personnel Search Committee for their report and asked the Committee to proceed with the remaining appointments as quickly as possible in coordination with the Director.
9. The Board noted the progress reports from the Director and the Project Manager.
10. The Board noted that discussions were taking place between the Executives on implementing the overall arrangements for carrying out ALMA as provided for in the Bilateral Agreement, and requested a progress report at the May Board meeting.
11. The Board endorsed the Project Plan dated 10 February as Version 1 of a document which would be put under change control.
12. The Board agreed the process for changing the Project Plan.

13. The Board endorsed the proposed 2003 Budget and Programme Plan, and the Long Range Plan as set out in Version 1 of the Project Plan.
14. The Board noted progress in Chile, and expressed deep concern over the lack of decision on the ratification process for the ESO Supplementary Agreement.
15. The Board asked ESO, NSF, and the JAO to prepare alternative scenarios to cope with continued delay in ratifying the ESO Supplementary Agreement.
16. The Board asked the JAO to carry out further studies with the ALMA Operations Group to define the size and role of the ALMA Santiago Office.
17. The Board asked the JAO to establish a process to control the placing of documentation on the ALMA Web site.
18. The Board noted the AMAC membership for the meeting on 24/25 March. The Board will approve a revised charge to AMAC by written procedure.
19. The Board asked the JAO and ASAC Chair to prepare, no later than 10 March, a draft charge for the ASAC meeting on 2/3 April for Board approval by written procedure.
20. The Board agreed that Japan should be invited to send 3 observers to ASAC and 2 to AMAC.
21. The Board endorsed the goal of the JAO to procure the production antennas to a single design which has been prototyped and evaluated.
22. The Board, following the presentation and discussions on antenna procurement, asked the JAO to proceed with the preparation of the production antenna bid package for RFP/CfT to be delivered to the Executives no later than 1 September 2003 in preparation for the final decision on procurement modality.
23. The Board asked the Secretary to prepare notes on the videoconference of the Japanese Negotiating Team, and circulate them to the Board when agreed with all participants.
24. The Board asked the JAO to prepare a written response to the Japanese proposal, to be incorporated in the reply to be sent by the Board to NAOJ as soon as possible.
25. The Board asked the JAO to study the NAOJ proposals further and report to the March 27 Board teleconference, with the goal of arranging a teleconference of the Negotiating Team between 27 March and the Board teleconference on 29 April.
26. The Board agreed to a face-to face preparatory meeting of the Japan Negotiating Team on or around May 8 at a 'neutral' venue.

27. The Board agreed to set the mandate for the Japan Negotiating Team at their meeting on 26/27 May.