

EUROPEAN ALMA BOARD 1ST MEETING

Garching, 11 November 2002

Present:

A. Freytag	<i>President of Council, Chair</i>
C. Cesarsky	<i>Director General</i>
M. Steinacher	<i>Finance Committee Chairman</i>
<i>No delegate</i>	Belgium
H. Jørgensen	Denmark
L. Vigroux	France
M. Metzger	Germany
G. Tofani	Italy
J. Bezemer	Netherlands
T. Lago	Portugal
C. Fransson	Sweden
S. Lilly	Switzerland
G. Gilmore	United Kingdom

In attendance:

I. Corbett	ESO
R. Kurz	ESO – European Project Manager
S. Stanghellini	ESO – for Item 2 only
J. Cernicharo	Spain – observer

AGENDA

1. The draft Agenda was adopted. The President of Council explained that since the Committee of Council had recommended enlarging the European ALMA Board to allow every member state to be represented, it had been recognised that the ex-officio membership of the President of Council and the Chairman of the Finance Committee could not be counted as member state representatives. The EAB therefore, subject to formal Council agreement, comprised 14 members.

2. The Board noted that meetings of the ALMA Board had been arranged for 2003 (copy of calendar attached) and requested that meetings of the EAB should be arranged, if necessary by teleconference, before meetings of the ALMA Board.

ALMA Meeting 29 – 30 October

3. The President reported that as the Phase 1 MoU had terminated on 30 September and the Bilateral Agreement had not yet been signed, because of delays in obtaining US State Department clearance, this meeting could not be considered neither an ACC meeting nor an ALMA Board meeting. Any recommendations made at this meeting would have to be referred to the ALMA Board, when established, for formal approval.
4. It was explained that the MoU had not been extended because (a) it only applied to Phase 1, which was now concluded, and (b) to have done so would have removed pressure on the US to complete clearance of the Bilateral Agreement.

Status of Negotiations with Chile

5. The Director General summarised the situation as set out in Cou-854 and Cou-857, both made available to the EAB. She noted that Chile would soon make a decision on whether or not Parliamentary ratification was needed. ESO was applying pressure at high level to influence the decision. ESO certainly did not want a debate in Parliament to revive memories of the abandoned 'astronomy law' which would have reduced ESO's current privileges and immunities. There was, however, a risk of further delay in making the decision to go through Parliament or not, with an impact on the project. So far the project had not been delayed.

Status of Bilateral Agreement

6. The President reported on the request for changes from the US State Department, and the meeting following the ALMA meeting which had agreed a consensus response from the ALMA Parties.
7. The agreed text of the Bilateral Agreement would be sent to EAB and Council members when available. If major changes were made the President of Council would decide if re-approval by written procedure was needed.

Project Plan and Management IPT

8. The Director General reported that it had been agreed that the Management IPT would include the European and North American Project Managers together with the JAO.

ALMA Budgetary Process

9. The Director General reported that it had been agreed that the draft annual budget, program plan and revised Long Range Plan required by Article 14.3 (c) of the Bilateral Agreement should be prepared by the JAO on the basis of input from the IPTs through the European and North American Project Managers. The JAO would then work in close consultation with the Executives to develop the drafts for the Board, so that the input to the Board is agreed by both Executives and the JAO.

Japan

10. The EAB re-affirmed the generally accepted position that Japan could only join ALMA on ALMA's terms, and that there could be no negotiations with Japan before the Bilateral Agreement had been signed.

JAO Recruitment

11. The Director General summarised the situation and said that interviews for the Director position were planned for end January 2003. The current interim JAO members will continue until 31 March 2003.
12. This raised the issue of due process for these appointments. The EAB was of the opinion that Council should delegate the necessary powers to the nominees to the ALMA Board to enable them to make decisions.
13. The EAB asked to be given the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the ALMA Board, when agreed. These, and more detailed Terms of Reference for the EAB, would be presented to Council at the appropriate time.

European Phase 2 Programme

14. R. Kurz gave a short presentation. Copies of transparencies are attached.
15. S. Stanghellini presented the status of the European Prototype Antenna. Copies of transparencies are attached.
16. The EAB expressed satisfaction with the progress reported.

Nominations to ALMA Board

17. In a 'straw vote' Wade and Booth were nominated. These nominations will be discussed at Council.

Process for Nominations to ESAC and ASAC

18. The EAB agreed that every member state should be represented on ESAC and that members should be appointed by the ESO Director General after consultation with the President, the scientific members of Council, and others, as is current practice with the STC. ESAC would be invited to nominate the 5 European members of ASAC to EAB and then Council.

AOB

19. The Director General reported on the very successful ALMA scientific meeting that had taken place on 8 November.

Dates for ALMA Board Meetings

Telecon	Tuesday December 3, 2002	
Telecon	Thursday January 30, 2003	
Face to face	February 24-25	North America
Telecon	Thursday March 27	
Telecon	Tuesday April 29	
Face to face	May 26-27	Europe
Telecon	Thursday July 3	
Telecon	Thursday August 7	
Telecon	Thursday September 25	
Face to face	November 3-4	Chile