

**INTERNATIONAL ANTARTIC INSTITUTE ANNUAL SCAR MEETING
MINUTES AND PROCEEDINGS
Hotel Grand Chancellor
8 July 2006**

Session start: 9:00AM

PRELIMINARY PRESENTATION

1. Welcome (Sir Guy Green).

Announcement that today's proceedings are in two parts, a preliminary session followed by the inaugural meeting of the council. Members are reminded that at the IAI meeting in November 2004, 8 resolutions were passed. Resolution 1 specified that the meeting endorses in principal the establishment of IAI, and Resolution 2 specified that the institute shall comprise of a consortium of participating members.

2. Apologies:

Dr Eva Bucciarelli- Universite de Bretagne Occidentale and European Institute for Marine Studies

Professor Miquel Canals- Universitat de Barcelona

Professor Eugene Domack- Hamilton College

Professor Julian Dowdeswell -Scott Polar

Associate Professor Else Nost Hegseth- University of Tromso

Dr Patrick Mayzaud- Université Pierre et Marie Curie- Paris VI

3. Noting of proxies: Andrew McMinn for Esla Nost Hegseth
Patti Virtue for Patrick Mayzaud
Patti Virtue for Eva Bucciarelli.

4. Consideration of 4 motions: see paragraph 4 in agenda (of the council meeting)

Chair invites a motion in favor of motions 1 to 4

Motion moved by Guy Green, seconded by Andrew McMinn.

CHAIR invites discussion and vote.

Motion carried unanimously

Declaration made that the institute is officially established. Preliminary meeting is concluded. The inaugural IAI council meeting to resume at 9:15.

Resumption of session at 9:15.

INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE IAI

Declaration of inaugural meeting of IAI open, by Sir Guy Green.
Invites nominations for adoption of the full agenda.

Full agenda:

1. Election of chair:

Andrew McMinn nominates Sir Guy Green as chair (as an independent choice).
No other nominations. Guy Green accepts position as chair

Andrew McMinn asked for round table introductions of all persons present.

Chair -reminds delegates that only members of the council may move or second the vote on motions.

Chair projected the order of events as follows: motions will be introduced, moved, seconded, followed by general discussion. A motion shall be put before the council before a discussion takes place. After discussion voting will take place.

2. Establishment of Secretariat

Motion is that the offer is accepted (to resource and administer the IAI)

That the offer by the University of Tasmania to continue to resource and administer the IAI secretariat, directed by Professor Andrew McMinn, for a further three years, plus an additional two years subject to review, be accepted.

University of Tasmania offered to continue to resource the secretariat for an additional 3 years.

Nominated by Berry Lyons, Seconded Edith Fanta.

Discussion:

- ∞ Daryl Le Grew provides discussion on the position of the University of Tasmania, to the effect that they're very happy to continue in this function.
- ∞ Suggests secretariat as coordinator for further expansion and responsible for bringing networks together and the pooling of resources.
- ∞ Daryl Le Grew on behalf of the University of Tasmania accepts the Nomination, announcing that Andrew McMinn is to fill the position of secretariat.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn notes the future of the secretariat will need to be discussed again in a few years suggesting that secretariat could rotate among members or a levy created to fund independent secretariat.
- ∞ The chair surmises that a moving secretariat (rotating among institutes) and funding resources of the secretariat, should be investigated further by council. in the future.

Motion carried unanimously

3. Membership of IAI

Chair identifies two distinct parts.

First motion (see notes): a machinery motion (as described by Chair). The question was asked ‘is it necessary to define the criteria allowing the additional membership to IAI ’?. Chair stated that there does not need to be discussion now and membership will be considered by council on a case by case basis.

Motion 3.1 Admission of additional institutes (Schedule D)

That the Council may admit additional Members of the IAI - degree conferring institutions who have significant Antarctic research and education programs.

Nomination that 3.1 be discussed.

Moved by Wilhelm Hagen, seconded by Berry Lyons:

Discussion:

- ∞ Andrew McMinn cautions that size of IAI may become too big and that the consortium must remain manageable. He suggests criteria be defined to make it more manageable and inclusion of a wider range of institutions. Amc suggests the maximum size obtainable by the IAI be defined (and the type of organizations that will be involved) to be considered on a case by case basis. He cautions not on the exclusion of institutes from countries not represented (Eg: China, Netherlands, South Africa). Chair replies. Case by case basis stands.
- ∞ Bryan Storey questions ‘are there already other applicants?’. Patti Virtue replies with 1. University of Barcelona and 2. University of TROMSO. Andrew McMinn adds there are other organizations that have made IAI membership inquiries.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn suggests: If formal application is received the secretariat will circulate to all members of the council with recommendations, and await comments.
- ∞ Bryan Storey notes that currently there is no definition of both ‘significant’ and ‘Antarctic research’ is in place. The definition of ‘significant’ and ‘Antarctic research’ was not clearly resolved after some discussion. Andrew McMinn concludes discussion, reiterating that these are the words chosen.

Motion carried unanimously

3.2 Associate members (Schedule D)

Chair leads discussion relating to that of ‘cooperation and financial support’ required by IAI particularly with field studies and logistics. Chair states that associated members will not be members of the council and play no formal constitutional role.

Motion:

That the council admit as associate members organizations those institutes listed in the agenda (also see below), who have substantial interest in, or are able to make a substantial contribution to the institute.

Nominated by Andrew McMinn, second by Norpisah Matlsa.

Discussion:

- ∞ Yves Frenot notes that he is happy to see this concept, because of the related logistical support required by such institutes.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn makes similar comments to that of Yves Frenots, restating the importance of institute associates extending ability to provide support.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn comments that there are some organizations more desirable than others: therefore perhaps the secretariat should write to national Antarctic programs of the universities represented here to inform of what's going on and formally invite participation in the future. Nighat Johnson-Amin Q: have UNESCO and UN been approached? Reply by Andrew McMinn: 'not yet'.
- ∞ Michael Stoddart recognizes that with the present wording it is possible to admit an associate of an organization that has no interest in the IAI. Suggests rewording.

Chair invites interpretation and rewording of the motions to help facilitate that. Notes that concepts need to be defined first, before further direction taken.

Motion carried unanimously

Motion:

That the Scientific Committee for Antarctic Research (SCAR), Australian Antarctic Division (AAD), French Polar Institute (IPEV), Alfred-Wegener-Institute for Polar and Marine Research (AWI), Norwegian Polar Institute and University Center in Svalbard (UNIS), The Cousteau Society, International Polar Foundation, be admitted as Associate Members.

Invites motion that the above be admitted, moved by Berry Lyons, seconded Andrew McMinn.

Discussion:

- ∞ Patti Virtue states that Universities that are not degree conferring cannot be a full member.
- ∞ It was pointed out that UNIS has an Arctic charter which prevents Antarctic research. Patti Virtue explains that units from UNIS are credited by universities such as UTromso.
- ∞ The inclusion and involvement of SCAR was discussed with SCAR recognized as a supportive institution, with keen interest in IAI future.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn noted that all proposed associates are eager to be members.

Motion unanimously carried

Motion:

Members and Associate Members may withdraw their membership by giving notice in writing to the Secretariat

Moved by Berry Lyons, Seconded by Wilhelm Hagen

No discussion

Motion carried unanimously

4. Establishment of an academic coordinating committee:

Motion by Chair:

4.1: Academic coordinating committee (ACC)

That there will be an Academic Coordinating Committee (the ACC) comprising six members appointed by the Council for a term of two years.

Chair suggests that motion 4.1 and 4.2 be considered together

Amendment proposed by Patti Virtue to make 7 members (not 6 as envisaged), of which to include Bryan Storey.

Chair accepts.

Motion moved by Andrew McMinn, seconded by Wilhelm Hagen

Discussion:

- ∞ 4.1 and 4.2 motions to be discussed together:
- ∞ Berry Lyons questions the provisions for replacements, duration of term, how will they be replaced (altogether or staggered). Chair replies it is in the hands of the council (to make reappointments or replacements).
- ∞ Proposal made that at the first ACC meeting, they will adopt rules of procedure to answer these questions. Chair warns of having an overly large constitution. Chair agrees the committee can determine its own rules.
- ∞ Azizan Abu Samah proposes that a person from Malaysia be included in the ACC. In reply, the initial ACC is proposed to be comprised of 8, one of which will be from Malaysia. Andrew McMinn suggests that the number of people should not be set exactly now, and proposes that in the first year membership may be nominated to include others. He also points out that these numbers are from the initial call for nominations, and the deadline for nominations in the first round has passed. Therefore within the first year the ACC will likely to be expanded to include more people, focusing on a wider range of disciplines and nationalities.
- ∞ In ending discussion it was proposed that the first term be reduced to a period of 1 year.
- ∞ Motion development: Proposal from Malaysian that ACC numbers not to be limited. McMinn replies it is important to keep the numbers low. Proposal from chair that at this stage that reference to number of the ACC be removed to allow it to be less restrictive.

Motion: That in the current year the council appoints the stated 7 ACC members in the first instance for a 1 year term.

Motion:

That the functions of the ACC will include receiving and processing applications from Members for the delivery and approval of IAI courses/units and making recommendations to council for the approval of courses/units.

Chair notes that later in the discussion the question of who and numbers are further discussed.

Discussion

- ∞ Patti Virtue suggests that both a South American and Malaysian institute be included on the ACC, allowing a larger and more diverse group of people to be included.
- ∞ Discussion on membership continued. Patti Virtue identifies discipline, affiliation and geographic location of current nominated ACC. Discussion continues establishing regions and specialties missing from current ACC.

Major conclusions: that Bryan Storey was included in the initial ACC group.

Two further members suggested by Patti Virtue, Carlos Rios, Chile and Azizan Abu Razak, Malaysia.

Nine names now on the ACC. If there are no other nominations (Chair comments) can these persons be declared the ACC committee?

No dissent. They are declared

The ACC will comprise:

Those listed in the agenda, plus Carlos Rios, Bryan Storey, and Azizan Abu Samah.

Motion carried unanimously

5. Note change of sequence of meeting. Item 6: Memorandum of understanding (Schedule F).

Andrew McMinn proposes that those members present today sign the MOU later in the day. Changes will be made now, a revised version to be made available, then available to be signed by as many people as possible today. Those not signing today to return as soon as possible.

Motion 6.1: MOU Member (Schedule F).

Discussion

All members express that they are happy to sign it in principle. Question arose by Mitsuo Fukushi of 'who signs'? Andrew McMinn answered 'that the highest authority at the institution although this is depend on the individual institution. Normally it is the VC. Research institutes may differ.

It was noted that Associate members should be removed from schedule F. MOU to be modified

Mitsuo Fukushi discusses the problems of getting an MOU signed, and the institutions abilities to deliver courses. Some discussion occurred about Mitsuo Fukushis ability to sign. Resolution was that he was able to sign.

Terms of MOU: comments called for by chair.

Discussion

- ∞ Bryan Storey questions 'which language shall the course be delivered in?' General response from council is that this is something to be worked out in time.
- ∞ It is noted that in regards to note 5 in schedule, that it presently means that there is no ability for institions to increase fees. The response from council is that this is too specific for a MOU, discussion on what is legally binding and what is not? Who pays fees is an important consideration.
- ∞ Edith Fanta states that it is important that there is discrepancy in what is paid for at different institutions, and how to get that to work in an exchange program.
- ∞ Dato Dzulki Abdul Rafat suggests that international students should be treated similarly to local students (by the visiting institution) and that there should be a levy for international student fees. Wilhelm Hagen comments that this is for individual universities to work out, and that it is too specific for an MOU.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn explains that these notes are included to absolve the institution of excessive financial responsibilities.

The question of 'does this satisfy who pays what?' seemed to remain.

Resolution from the council: Note 5 of the memorandum should be removed (as previously suggested by Bryan Storey)

Motion adopted that: Annexe 1, 1.3 remain, and note 5 be removed

Chair reminds council members that: signing of MOU is a financial agreement to accept a student and not charge them basic fees (normal course fees) as the student will continue to pay fees at their home institution. Each university can decide how many students they will take (depending on resources), although they are obliged to enlist at least 1 IAI student.

Chair invites motion that council endorses new MOU

Motion moved by Bryan Storey, seconded by Andrew McMinn

Motion carried unanimously

Motion 6.2: MOU Associate Members (Schedule G)

Discussion called:

- ∞ Michael Stoddart comments: clarification of clause 4 is needed- ‘Valid termination of agreement’, if the agreement is validly terminated then the IAI member and association shall not be financially liable. Therefore if it is terminated invalidly it suggests financial reimbursement is applicable. But goes onto say that nothing in the agreement binds people to this. Concludes that wording is confusing and that there is no binding agreement.

Motion put by Michael Stoddart: The word validly is to be removed from both schedules F and G (clause IV).

Clause III, dot point 2: to removed the word members, and replaced with organizations

Also: In the preamble for the agreement with associate members:

Add: ‘and to facilitate the provision by associate members of support for the work of the institute’ to the end of preamble

Invitation for a motion that council endorses the MOU and is to be adopted by associate members ASAP

Motion moved by Berry Lyons, seconded by Bryan Storey

Motion carried unanimously

Proposal problem noted (by Michael Stoddart), about who signs and who has ability to make adjustments. Suggestion by chair: Authorization of the director of the institution to make minor drafting adjustments If required by a signing party (called a minor drafting adjustment) to accommodate parties. Or it can be done formally. The boundaries of the discretion are to minor drafting adjustments, or seek council authority at all times.

Andrew McMinn comments: if the changes are minor and it does not change the overall objectives of the MOU, the secretariat is happy to allow minor changes. Only where it invokes major changes would it need to come back to the council.

Motion:

That the director has authorization to make minor drafting amendments to accommodate the requirements of a member or associate member, and

otherwise it is to be referred back to council if major amendments are required.

Motion moved by Andrew McMinn, seconded by Berry Lyons.

Motion carried unanimously

Items 5 and 7: Presentation by Prof. Andrew McMinn

Presentation by Andrew McMinn (Power point presentation available)

- ∞ Outlined what the IAI is, its establishment, goals, benefits, and why IAI exists including discussion of the pertinence and high priority of field training and the possibility for Northern institutions to achieve much of this in an arctic context.
- ∞ Recent developments: Preliminary acceptance in the UNESCO twin program. Acceptance will include scholarships. Particularly valuable for introducing developing countries/non traditional Antarctic countries to the Antarctic sphere.
- ∞ Haste needed/work already achieved in the development of courses to enable enrolments. Endorsements before the end of the year important. Encouragement to produce the development of new courses.
- ∞ Guidelines in how to move forward on this: Joint badges of IAI and other member universities. But until a degree exists, there is no point to push this.
- ∞ Possibilities for/importance of staff sharing between institutions
- ∞ Need for defined terminology for degree delivery: **unit** is basic offering of university (lectures, tutorials and practicals) assessable by examination or other. **Course** is a prescribed set of units leading to a qualification. **Degree** is prescribed set of units leading to bachelor, master or PhD qualification.
- ∞ Participation in IAI can be at many different levels, depending on resources and desire. Basic level is the offering of a single unit within a prescribed course, with a significant Antarctic component. Secondary level is specific master offering (single IAI approved unit). Third level is the production of an IAI degree.
- ∞ All must have a physical location (university etc) – the IAI degree does not exist in limbo.
- ∞ Focus on high impact guest speakers to give courses/etc. Web delivery live online, with option to interact with the speakers. The technology required is currently available and can be made available to others.
- ∞ This course already in production at UTAS requires a lot of multimedia etc, which will be delivered to any other member institution etc for their own use. Encouragement for increasing this kind of exchange was discussed.
- ∞ This pattern would be desirable to keep throughout all IAI endeavors. High tech, high impact cutting edge material. Perhaps with a market for professionals to gain access to these facilities.

Adjournment to Join IPY consultative forum

Meeting resumes at 2pm

Chair explains that presentations by other members will follow, after which will be invited questions and comments including those for Andrew McMinn resulting from his presentation.

8. Presentations from council members

Patti Virtue introduces presentations:

8.1 Wilhelm Hagen

University of Bremen masters course (power point presentation available)

- ∞ Discussion of the change from the current master to proposed bachelor 3 yr degree (now established). Now specializing in masters program, some of which is already accredited and certified.
- ∞ Teaching will be in English (attractive to students from other countries).
- ∞ 500 euro stipend, available for students per semester not living in Bremen.
- ∞ Normal procedure is to follow on from the bachelor degree, not accepting students who have failed in other areas. 20 students per year accepted in the marine biology program.
- ∞ Discussion of 120 credit point system: four terms, 30 credit pts per term (describing not just contact hours but additional work. 1 term is 900 hrs. (1 credit pt is 30 hrs of work). Therefore 60 working hours per week. There are in break time (holidays), the opportunity to use that time for further courses, reducing overall contact hours per week.

NOTE: in power point, color of course modules listed denotes subject/discipline area.

- ∞ Presentation of course outline/module content. Courses have a multidisciplinary focus, with emphasis also on learning tools (hardware/software/equipment). Choices of topics are available within modules, facilitating specialization. Can accept in lieu of some modules a similar or related course at a foreign institution. A thesis like project (with defense) will be required and experience in negotiating grant proposals gained.
- ∞ A number of respected professors/lecturers are on board and the course uses the expertise of other organizations. Field trips are included, including experience on research ships (demonstrating early what to expect in future careers). The importance of this is discussed with regard to retaining students suited to this kind of work.

8.2 Carlos Rios.

Diploma in Antarctic programs (website available). Booklet provided for council members. One year post graduate program, with sights on a longer masters program. Information booklet provided to council members

- ∞ First project in Chile that would provide an avenue into this kind of Antarctic research.

- ∞ Strong desire for Chile to join the IAI, and the initiative and opportunities available therein.
- ∞ In general in South America the Antarctic is a little known entity, by participating in IAI there is a hope to change that.
- ∞ In light of this the program will focus on Antarctic geography, history (especially South American history), human activities and comparisons with other nations. Focus also on treaty system
- ∞ Course will be taught in Spanish.

8.3 Bryan Storey

Masters program at Canterbury University in New Zealand

- ∞ Antarctic specific courses have been in existence for already 5-6 years at undergraduate level.
- ∞ No official Antarctic degree, rather courses being credited to other degree programs.
- ∞ 14 week graduate certificate already exists including 10 day trip to Antarctic/ice.
- ∞ New program (masters) will be introduced in 2007, open to students after 3rd yr completion of 3 years undergraduate studies.
- ∞ 2 yr master of Antarctic studies; year 1 coursework, year 2 thesis.
Within year 1 coursework a student will take 50% Antarctic courses and 50% from other discipline (multidisciplinary approach)
- ∞ Antarctic studies courses are divided between the legal system, 12.5%, and the remainder 'Antarctica in the global system' (including earth, physical and life sciences).
- ∞ Targeted to students who have had an introduction to the Antarctic courses as an undergraduate.
- ∞ The thesis is to be on an Antarctic topic. If they go south, it is the context of another existing program, otherwise logistically it is too hard. This program will be open to the IAI.
- ∞ Minimum of 10, max 20 students at this stage.
- ∞ All courses will be in English.

Q: (Michael Stoddart): Are students rejected for undertaking field based work if there aren't enough places? A: yes, and it is clearly explained to applicants that there is no guarantees to going South.

Q (Berry Lyons): what financial support exists? A: NZ students are paying fees, little support exists. The cost will be approximately 1000 NZ dollars per year.

Q: can students register at Canterbury University just for attendance at specific modules, not all of it? A: yes. Q: What financial obligation is there? A: A 'By unit' price is most likely. Q: are there student restrictions at undergrad level? A: No. But for the 14 week course the limit is 16. Selection is based on merit. University of Canterbury is duty bound not to have more international students than NZ students or support will be withdrawn.

8.4 Patti Virtue presents on behalf of Eva Bucciarelli (Brest, France (UBO/IUEM) the Marine Science masters courses. See Power Point presentation

- ∞ MSc is 4 semesters (2 years) with a research project each year (smaller one- 2 months, then larger one in the second year- 5 months). 3 different marine masters programs, Biology, Chemistry and Geosciences. They're offering IAI courses within their existing Masters courses. Several units (total of seven) in various streams are directly applicable to Antarctic studies eg, "Evolution of the Southern Ocean", "Antarctic Circumpolar Current", "Greenhouse gasses – application to the Southern Ocean". *UBO/IUEM* will be offering these courses to IAI students. All units taught in French.

8.5 Guest presentation by Sandra Zicus– communications manager at ACE CRC (Tasmania).

- ∞ Discussion on the recent forum of the subantarctic, after which there was found to be a resounding need for future research. The need for long term monitoring was identified in many areas and disciplines, although determined to be difficult due to long term funding. It is proposed that this is an area in which IAI can take a role. On field experience courses, it's a chance to reproduce data at the same pace over time.
- ∞ Response of the council was very positive.
- ∞ The Chair discusses a related aspect of the subantarctic forum, that within it the subantarctic shall remain a distinct area. However, the Chair notes that for the IAI it will explicitly be including both, and the subantarctic bodies need to recognise this.
- ∞ Positive comments were heard from Daryl Le Grew and Ben Galbraith.
- ∞ Andrew McMinn also comments: most of the subantarctic islands have the highest rate of protection of any area on the earth, which means that there is limited access for research and teaching. At UTAS they are investigating running courses on Macquarie Island because it is more accessible. If projects are forthcoming that suit all parties and are interesting to the students (e.g. pest species) it will be an asset rather than a liability, and the ability to use those areas as education tools will be enhanced.
- ∞ Michael Stoddart comments: where national operators are involved, there needs to be a chief investigator who puts forward a project through a system of assessment, and this would only be approved if found to be of high standard. If students are going to undertake the work without a chief investigator it would be difficult to get long term commitment due to questions of data quality. Therefore it touches on national funding policy; involvement of PI's, and highlights the need for review of these funding policies (especially the practice of project funding rarely going beyond 3 yrs).
- ∞ Andrew McMinn comments: that it is not automatically a domain of the national Antarctic operators, such as in the case of Macquarie Island, administered by the Tasmanian government.
- ∞ Brian Storey comments: on the New Zealand aspect of this and in sub-Antarctic regions, and issues of quality control in lieu of highly trained scientists (when using students for long term data collection like this). General

consensus of the council is that a project leader of high standard is needed to oversee projects to ensure integrity of data and its later worth.

- ∞ Chair suggests that instead of a human being nominated as the chief or project officer, could it not be better allocated to an organization or organizational position, where it is a task of the position; whoever is incumbent in it. To which the council agreed.

8.6 Patti Virtue introduces email from Julian Dowdeswell, Scott Polar Institute, sending apologies and discussing his program. Email provided to council.

It is noted by the chair that it is drawn to the council's attention

Chair reopens the session to questions and comments, first to the presentation of Andrew McMinn.

Daryl Le grew comments: on the importance of this first stage to explore pathways, compare existing infrastructure and education programs, to interrelate and plan for the future.

Chair asks: Does council see law and policy as important educational areas for the IAI? The council responds favorably that this is an important part of the work to be done/teaching to be done (harks back to original mandate of council to focus initially on the physical and natural sciences). Note, law and policy is not social sciences. For a balanced education in this field it is an integral part of the area to be studied (comments chair). Andrew McMinn adds that they are important areas to those members present here at the council, and therefore in their teaching.

Bryan Storey comments on Andrew McMinn's presentation: the terminology used (course, unit etc) is confusing, and better development and streamlining is required (agreed by Andrew McMinn). He also comments on exchange agreements: the basis of the IAI is the exchanges, which in New Zealand is controlled tightly by immigration. In NZ exchanges need to be of an equal basis (one out, one in), therefore having this as an internal issue of the IAI that would be beneficial and therefore New Zealand doesn't need to deal directly with immigration and their governmental exchange agreements. Does this also affect others? Berry Lyons agrees in the US it may also be difficult with exchange immigration laws, and there needs to be equality in the exchange arrangements, also in financial areas.

Chair comments that the IAI is not a barrier to this but a facilitator, and it will work toward getting around these problems.

Wilhelm Hagen asks: what happens to students after they have completed a masters course in NZ, Bryan Storey replies that two criteria of the graduate program is that they go onto further research in the Antarctic areas, go onto work in the Antarctic area, or work in outreach in this area. Most students gain employment. There are a limited number of opportunities for work in the Antarctic arena, and he hopes that it leads onto further research.

Andrew McMinn comments on the IASOS experience. As long as students are trained well in a given discipline they diversify.

Berry Lyons adds: he sees two types of courses in the IAI institutions, and the ACC should be charged with identifying the more specific courses from the more general ones, and therefore should be looking at coordinating these, and looking at which direction to take things depending on requirements. The Chair comments that it is a new situation, therefore is not tagged under anything already in existence (the nature of IAI courses), and to give the IAI courses their own merits. Patti Virtue discusses the case for producing an international degree and adds that IAI students will study at more than one institute throughout their degree with the aim of producing young diplomats capable of thinking cross nationally, cross culturally.

Q: How to we get a degree from IAI and not bits and pieces from others?

Andrew McMinn responds, for example the new masters course put forward at UTAS could be a template degree to which others can adapt and mould their own, therefore creating an IAI degree format. The notion is put to the council. Comments include:

1. Standardization?
2. What template?
3. How does this affect already existing work/courses in other institution, should a new template be put forward over other existing ones?
4. A number of templates may exist alongside each other; tailored slightly differently at different institutions (law, biology strong etc).

Comments to the effect that two can stand side by side, and they're not mutually exclusive, students will have choices.

9. Other business

9.1 Institute website introduced by Chair.

Presented by Adam Steer

The following matters were discussed:

- ∞ Interim measures for communication of the IAI. Future web development, web needs to expand with evolving material and additions. Adam Steer spoke about the need for further and greater management of the web page. Members of the council need to provide feedback and comments about the web site.
- ∞ It was recognised that various questions need to be addressed, in particular in regards to languages and the development of a communication or a publishing group.
- ∞ It was made clear by all members that it is imperative for IAI to have a webpage and that it will act as the 'lifeline of the institute'. It will facilitate communication and provide basic information about units, courses and degrees available. Possible online enrolments. It was noted that it should act as a 'storehouse' of unit and course syllabus.
- ∞ Intellectual property issues; electronic colloquium that is organized on the web; language service; and staged approach is necessary on the outline structure of it.
- ∞ The chair noted that the scope of the responsibility of the secretariat has noticeable increased.

- ∞ Michael Stoddart stressed the importance for the web site to have an interactive face where course advisers and students can easily access the site and see the matrix of IAI course pre-requisites, course fees, structure etc.
- ∞ It was expressed that there needs to be more links to member institutions with a clear depiction of their relationship with the IAI.
- ∞ Adam Steer noted that substantial funding and expertise was require to achieve the objectives discussed.

9.2 Funding opportunities and potential of acquiring funds for IAI (Daryl Le Grew).
 Suggestions from members welcomed.

- ∞ Pooling of resources and information would be most welcome and shared amongst all parties. Specific attention needs to be given to government and international agencies, professional agencies, global philanthropies and other target group funding providers outside those of typical research grants.
- ∞ Suggestions should be canvassed from members, after which it should be the role of the Secretariat to ascertain the ways and means to apply these, eg. sources of funding.
- ∞ Chair notes there are some American institutions that would be interested in funding international education. In approaching funding bodies it was noted to take care not to over specify the Antarctic connection. Michael Stoddart suggests the Alfred P. Sloan foundation in New York. Andrew McMinn talks about the recent UNESCO student travel scholarships although comments that they're unlikely to be sustainable.
- ∞ Japanese delegates comment that the Japanese government may be an avenue for IAI for funding, particularly in relation to field course opportunities.
- ∞ Daryl Le Grew suggests some of the shipping companies and tourist operators may be interested (such as in offering berths).
- ∞ Michael Stoddart suggests the Global Environment Facility (UNESCO). But warns it is competitive and would need to be focused on a specific region. Bryan Storey notes he was successful with a GEF grant, but it was a long process and difficult.

9.3 Berry Lyons offers congratulations and thanks to Andrew McMinn and Patti Virtue for their hard work and efforts.

9.4 The chair recognizes the behind the scenes support team (Michael Stoddart, Daryl Le Grew, Ben Galbraith and Marcus Haward).

9.5 MOU's as amended are now printed, and after adjournment are available for signing.

Chair declares the meeting closed.

