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1) Pursuant to standing charge 1, ASAC should continue to assess the scientific outcomes and impact from Cycle 0. This should include some preliminary quantitative assessments, such as numbers of papers published and quantitative impact metrics, along with a qualitative assessment. Coordinate with the JAO and the regional ARCs, who would collect the necessary information.

2) Pursuant to standing Charge 2, ASAC should assess the status of Cycle 1 observations and progress made towards the Cycle 2 call for proposals. For Cycle 1, are the data meeting user expectations, modulo the best efforts approach to early science? Are the data being released to the PIs in a timely fashion? For Cycle 2 preparations, is the OT keeping up with the capabilities of the array likely to be listed in the call? Does the support from the ARCs continue to meet users’ needs?

3) With Cycle 0 and Cycle 1 proposal evaluation cycles completed, it is now of high importance to have a clear policy in place regarding the definition of duplicate observations for Cycle 2. The ASAC should work with the JAO and other interested parties to define what constitutes a "duplicate" observation.

4) The regional project scientists and the JAO will provide ASAC with materials, such as summaries, status updates, and other information of the completed and ongoing Development studies. ASAC should assess the scientific merit of these studies (e.g. discuss the uniquess for ALMA, the advantages and drawbacks of each capability, etc.), which will serve as a basis for further dialogue of the ALMA Development Plan.

5) As of December 2012, data from Cycle 0 are entering the archive for community use. ASAC should comment on the utility of the archive and also the usefulness of current user software, such as CASA. How easy is it to access and use data from the archive? Are there critical functionalities missing from CASA? ASAC should also comment on data management plans for large data sets.

6) Now that Early Science observations have been underway for well over a year, it is important to have a systematic assessment of the reproducibility of the array. The ASAC should comment on a plan from the JAO to test the reproducibility through repeated observations of well characterized targets with a range of relevant properties.