ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CERN USERS

Minutes of the sixteenth meeting, held on February 21, 1983

Present : A. Bamberger, W. Blair, J.-J. Blaising, G.J. Bossen, F. Bradamante, M. Buhler-Broglin, G. Damgaard, P. Dalpiaz, D. Favart, J. Feltesse, A. Hallgren, R. Klapisch, K. Kleinknecht (Chairman), G. Leder, R.N. Milligan, J. Panman, H. Schopper (part-time), H. Suter, H. Taureg, J. Thompson, J. Timmermans, Websdale, E. Zavattini.

Invited : E. Gabathuler, P. Zanella (Item 4), A.J. Naudi (Item 5a))

Apologies for absence : A. Filippas, A. Klovning

The Chairman welcomed Hallgren who had been appointed as member representing Sweden in succession to Grafström, who was no longer involved in experiments at CERN. On the subject of membership of ACCU, the Chairman asked if steps were being taken to appoint a Spanish user member. Klapisch said that he would arrange for the necessary action to be taken.

1. Adoption of agenda

With the addition of one item (Questions to the Director-General) and minor reordering, the draft agenda was approved.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting (CERN/ACCU/15)

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on October 28, 1982, were approved, with the following change in the last line of the second paragraph of 3d) on page 7 - "However this ... solved" replaced by "However this was now being done, and the problem is about to be solved".

3. Questions to the Director-General

a) LEP

The Chairman said that there were rumours that LEP was delayed for technical reasons but also due to a possible change to iron magnets in order to accelerate protons instead of electrons, and asked what were the facts.

Schopper said that he would start by outlining the changes with time of the schedule for LEP construction and first operation. In the original plan LEP had been due to come into operation at the end of 1986, assuming Council approval in summer 1981 at one of three possible budget levels. Council had approved LEP construction at a budget level which was 10 MSF per year lower than the lowest of these three levels, which introduced a delay in first operation of one year, to end 1987. A further delay of six months came from the fact that formal Council approval had been given in December, not June, 1981. Host country authorisation of civil engineering details was then needed before work could actually start, and while Switzerland had soon given the green light, authorisation by France,

where the procedures were more complicated because of the need to expropriate land for access pits and surface buildings, had been expected in autumn 1982 but had still not been given and was now hoped for by May 1983. This introduced a delay which could not be compensated by shortening the construction period. The official construction time for the pits and tunnel was 48 months, three months more than the original plan, although there was provision in the contract for extra payment to the contractors if the work was finished ahead of schedule. The environmental objections to the buildings at pit 4 might introduce further delays. Overall he estimated that there would be a delay of 6 ± 3-4 months in first operation. A new schedule was being worked out by the LEP Project staff. He emphasised that this did not imply any change in the overall programme for LEP construction, and also that the schedule for the preparation of experiments for LEP was very tight.

Turning to the second part of the question, Schopper indicated that concrete magnets had been ordered as foreseen, and no delay was envisaged. The success of the $p\bar{p}$ venture had led CERN management to look at possibilities for $p\bar{p}$ operation on a longer timescale. An option for LEP would be ep operation, and another possibility would be to put a second ring in the LEP tunnel, which would permit $p\bar{p}$ operation. However this would only be worthwhile if the available energy was higher than that which would become available at the Tevatron and was thus, say, 10 TeV. This implied using 10 Tesla magnets, which were not currently available (maximum 5-6 Tesla in the development laboratory) but might become available in 10 years' time. Thus CERN was considering starting a magnet development programme in collaboration with other laboratories, but no decisions had been taken yet. In any case, this would not influence the LEP construction schedule.

b) SPS schedule in 1983

Feltesse asked if there was any likelihood of the published schedule for SPS operation in 1983 being changed to alter the timing or amount of $p\bar{p}$ operation.

Schopper replied that the published schedule gave $p\bar{p}$ operation 43% of the running time (including machine development), leaving 57% for fixed target operation, and there was no intention to change the schedule.

Gabathuler confirmed this, and added that partly due to increased running time but also due to technical improvements, in 1983 $p\bar{p}$ collisions should exceed 100 nb^{-1} in 12 weeks as opposed to 27 nb^{-1} in 7 weeks in 1982. The SPS would start up in March with $p\bar{p}$ running till June, leaving the rest of the year for fixed target operation, as planned.

c) LEAR

Bradamante said that LEAR was a unique new facility at CERN, with sixteen approved experiments, and did not have much scheduled running time in 1983. He asked if parasitical running of LEAR during SPS $p\bar{p}$ operation could be envisaged.

Schopper explained that the bottleneck was the PS, and added that 1983 would be a peculiar year in the history of CERN since all accelerators including the ISR would have more running hours than ever before. Since 1983 was the last year of ISR operation, it had been agreed to give some priority to ISR operation once the needs of the SPS were met. 1984 should be a better year for LEAR since there would be no ISR, and in any case LEAR could always run at the same time as SPS fixed target operation.

Klapisch added that LEAR was scheduled to operate for 1000 hours in 1983, and that an additional 800 hours which could have been used for LEAR were scheduled for ISR operation. He pointed out that the AA/LEAR complex had to be tuned for first operation, and there was not yet an operations team for LEAR. In response to Bradamante's suggestion that LEAR should parasite on SPS $p\bar{p}$ operation in 1983, he commented that $p\bar{p}$ operation needed maximum beam for maximum luminosity, and that very few antiprotons could be taken away for any parasitic use.

Dalpiaz observed that LEAR required only a modest flux of protons (e.g. 10^5) but agreed that it was premature to consider parasiting SPS pp operation in 1983. He felt that it was more important to start reliable LEAR operation for physics as soon as possible.

d) Health insurance arrangements for Italian users

Bradamante said that there was a problem in health insurance cover for Italian users at CERN, as discussed at the previous meeting, which would be taken up again later in the present meeting. He wished to ask if the Director-General would be prepared to write an official letter to the Italian authorities on this subject, if in due course this was thought necessary.

Schopper pointed out that as Director-General he could write only to the Italian Foreign Ministry, which might not be the best way to solve the problem.

Blair commented that for some years there had been a different administrative difficulty between CERN and the INFN, and correspondence had not led to any conclusion. However verbal contact between the respective Directors of Administration had led to this problem being discussed on a face-to-face basis by the appropriate CERN and INFN staff, and to a solution. He recommended similar action if necessary in the case of the health insurance problem.

e) LEP experiments

Feltesse asked if it was true that one of the four provisionally approved LEP experiments would be stopped. Schopper categorically denied this rumour.

4. CERN computing policy

Gabathuler reported as follows on the present state of thinking at CERN on planning for the future in the computer field. LEP itself and LEP experiments would present new demands on computing, and there was not a lot of money in the CERN budget to cope with this. In the last year three working groups had been studying different aspects, namely:-

i) LEP experiments and data acquisition
ii) Networks, and communications generally inside CERN and between CERN and outside laboratories
iii) the CERN Computer Centre and its services

The working groups comprised both CERN staff and outside users, including representatives of the LEP experiments. Basic ground rules were a) to remain with the policy that not more than one third of the computing for any experiment should be done at CERN, the rest being done in collaborating institutes and b) to assume the existence of systems such as CERNET and

INDEX or improved versions thereof. The different working groups were preparing recommendations, and the draft reports would soon be ready for submission to the Steering Committee, which would look at the overall situation, assign priorities, assess feasibility, and make recommendations to the CERN Directorate.

He indicated some of the probable recommendations as follows:-

a) to give considerable attention to data communications links between CERN and outside institutes
b) to standardise on DEC VAX equipment for on-line use
c) to develop and introduce the FASTBUS system

With regard to recommendation b) he explained that although it will continue to be CERN policy to use equipment from two computer manufacturers rather than to standardise on one, as at present both in the Computer Centre (CDC and IBM) and with on-line computers (DEC and Norsk), however there had been heavy pressure from LEP experimental groups to standardise on DEC, there being at present 70 DEC and only 10 Norsk machines in the European institutes involved.

Concerning recommendation c) he indicated that FASTBUS was basically ten times faster than CAMAC, and was even faster for lateral communication between units, since there was no tree structure such as in CAMAC. FASTBUS had been used successfully on a prototype basis in EMC.

Turning to the CERN Computer Centre, he said that an increase in capacity, perhaps by a factor of two in five years, was under consideration, while remaining with the one third/two thirds rule indicated earlier. One possibility for LEP was for a collaboration to bring a large main frame computer of its own into the Computer Centre. A new concept being studied was that of personal work stations, e.g. PERQ or APOLLO, but this field was still in its infancy.

Zanella added that the Computer Centre was under continuous pressure to provide services, and while the present batch and WYLBUR services were acceptable, CERN was behind in the field of interactive computing. He believed that personal work stations would in time provide the answer, but that this was some way off. He pointed out that another working group recommendation was to change from WYLBUR to the IBM VM/CMS system, as used in outside centres with IBM equipment such as RAL. Another possibility was to instal a VAX in the Computer Centre as a central service machine. He singled out the problem of communication between computers (both on site and off site) as an area requiring attention, and said that the possible introduction of a new and faster network facility in a few years' time would be of great advantage both for LEP experiments and for the LEP machine.

There followed a long series of questions, suggestions and comments from users, which may be summarised as follows.

Dalpiaz stated that good communications facilities between outside institutes and computers at CERN, both central and experimental, were very important for all experimental groups, and several members spoke in support of this. Zanella welcomed these remarks, and commented that the problem was complex, due to different communications standards at the levels of computer interfacing and national PTT systems. Gabathuler added that another working group recommendation was to have a single senior person at CERN as contact person for communications links with the outside.

Dalpiaz asked if the introduction of FASTBUS would mean the end of the large amount of CAMAC equipment at CERN. Gabathuler explained that this was not so, since FASTBUS would be used only for those parts of the experimental equipment where speed was vital. The key issue was the FASTBUS-CAMAC interface.

Blaising said that the need for good communications links from outside institutes applied also to access to on-line computers in test beams. Gabathuler pointed out that CERN could not supply all the computers for test beams, but provided that the DEC and NORD standard was respected, support would be possible.

Kleinknecht queried the wisdom of standardising on DEC to the exclusion of Norsk Data for on-line computers for LEP. Gabathuler explained that for non-LEP experiments CERN would continue to provide the necessary back-up facilities for both, however the recommendation to standardise on DEC for LEP experiments came from the LEP experimental groups, and in CERN's present budget situation this recommendation was likely to be followed. The Director-General remarked that in the present CERN budget situation it would not be possible to continue supporting too many parallel activities.

Panman pointed out another consequence of good and user-friendly communications links between outside institutes and computers at CERN. At present it was very difficult to develop at the home institute software for experiments. By improving communications links this could become easier, and might well lead to more computing for experiments being done outside CERN. Gabathuler and Zanella agreed, but reiterated the standardisation difficulties (interfaces, PTT standards) indicated earlier.

Leder remarked that standardisation of off-line programmes and computer systems was as desirable as standardisation of on-line facilities. Gabathuler observed that a lot of off-line computing could be done on the DEC-VAX on-line computers, and pointed out that CERN could not provide manpower to help with programming a wide range of off-line computers.

Thompson commented that in off-line programme development it would be a big advantage to have the same operating system on different computers, and asked if there was any interest at CERN in universal operating systems such as UNIX. Zanella said that UNIX was not easy for the casual user and also not efficient for certain applications, e.g. data acquisition on VAXs, and that the concept of a universal operating system was a dream, at least at a high level. Universal operating systems were conceivable at the micro level, but standardisation of this sort at a higher level could be not envisaged in the foreseeable future.

Feltesse pointed out that standardising on VAX would present problems for French institutes. No French group at present had DEC computers since these were considered as American by the French authorities. Gabathuler said that DEC was considered as a European manufacturer by CERN.

Feltesse asked whether the outside institute or CERN would be responsible for the communications link. Gabathuler replied that if the outside institute wished to assume responsibility this would be acceptable to CERN, but added that policy in this area was not yet decided.

Dalpiaz stated that in his view it was unwise to have only VAX computers, and that CERN should also support those of a second manufaturer.

The Chairman closed the discussion by thanking Gabathuler and Zanella for their report and participation, and asked if the preliminary version of the working group reports could be circulated to members. Gabathuler said that these would be sent to Blair for circulation. He added that the most important message was that CERN could not provide all the computing power and development manpower that would be needed in the future, and stressed that there were opportunities for institutes to develop software and hardware for the benefit of the whole European community, citing Uppsala's pioneer work on FASTBUS as an example.

5. Matters arising from the minutes

a) Visiting team accounts at CERN

The Chairman said that the discussion at the previous meeting had been prompted by Naudi's letter of August 6, 1982 (see CERN/ACCU/15). The discussion had shown that down payments were unlikely to be possible, and he asked if it was envisaged to introduce a surcharge for late payment.

The Director-General said that this had to be seen in the context of the overall financial situation at CERN. The approved CERN budget actually exceeded the amount which the Member States were due to contribute, since interest on the payments received from the Member States was assumed to finance the difference. This was possible if all Member States paid promptly, which was unfortunately not the case in practice. Because of this, the auditors had examined CERN's finances, and in the course of this examination had drawn attention to the fact that the debt on visiting team accounts amounted to 5 MSF, which was thus essentially an interest-free loan by CERN, which the CERN budget could not afford. The CERN administration had therefore come to the conclusion that late payment of bills by visiting teams would have to be subject either to interest or to a surcharge.

Klapisch remarked that the initial proposal, namely that visiting teams should make down payments, had turned out to be illegal in most Member States, hence the proposed solution of surcharge or interest on late payment of bills.

Bradamante pointed that late payment was not due to physicists, but to delays in national administrations, and asked if CERN could put pressure on the appropriate Member State authorities. The Director-General replied that this had already been done via the discussion in Finance Committee, and added that the most effective action would be to charge interest on late payments.

After the tea break, Naudi stated that it was envisaged to introduce a 10% surcharge on any bills for which payment was not received within three months of the date of issue of the bill. After some questions from members he explained that it was proposed to apply a surcharge at the rate of 10% per annum on the number of days by which payment was later than three months. Several members felt that 10% was a rather high rate. Klapisch suggested that an alternative would be to charge no interest if the bill was paid within three months, but if the bill was paid late to charge interest at 5% as from the date of issue of the bill.

Websdale asked what was the basis for CERN's proposal. Naudi read out the following extract from the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting of December 14, 1982 - "The Finance Committee took note of document CERN/FC/2581 and of the Management's intention to introduce a surcharge of some 10% in those cases where the delay between the issue of an invoice and the date of actual receipt of payment is longer than three months". He added that so far this year bills on visiting team accounts had been paid more promptly than in the past, and it was hoped that this would continue.

Buhler-Broglin proposed that there should be a lower limit for the sum due, because of late payment, below which no bill would be sent, to minimise bureaucracy. Naudi said that the new system would be introduced, and applied, with care. However the situation was that on an annual turnover of 22-25 MSF on visiting team accounts, in the last year or two each day throughout the year there were outstanding bills of 5-6 MSF, and action had to be taken.

Taureg suggested that in the limit CERN could refuse to accept new orders from institutes which were consistently very late in paying bills. Naudi said that this had not been done to date.

The Chairman summarised the discussion as follows. Members agreed that late payment of bills should incur a financial penalty, but appeared to favour a system whereby interest was charged at 5% from the first day for bills not paid inside three months, rather than 10% as from three months as proposed by Naudi.

b) The CERN economies programme

Klapisch reported that CERN management, having devoted considerable attention in recent months to the Materials Budget and possible economies, was now studying the staffing situation at CERN in detail. Following decisions at the Council meeting in December 1982, it was likely that 100-150 new staff could be recruited over the next two years, and while this would not quite match the number expected to leave over that period, there were clear indications that some CERN activities were now understaffed, and priorities would have to be assigned. LEP, the existing accelerators, and the CERN infrastructure, could all use more staff, and one consequence which appeared inevitable was a decline in CERN manpower in support of fixed-target physics. At later meetings he would give further details of any consequences for users.

c) The new CERN Hostel

Milligan informed members that the new Hostel was coming into regular use as from that evening. Two floors were now ready, and the remaining two floors would shortly also be available. Bearing in mind the amenities, the room rate for the new Hostel had been fixed at 29 Swiss francs per night for the standard rooms with showers, and 35 Swiss francs per night for the larger rooms with complete sanitary installations. He added that as from March 1 the rates for the rooms in Building 5 (unchanged for two years) would be increased from 22 to 23 Swiss francs per night (single room) and from 34 to 36 Swiss francs per night (double room), the rates per bed for the Annex (Barracks) remaining unchanged at 14 Swiss francs (single) and 7 and 6 (double and triple respectively).

d) Health insurance arrangements for users

Blair summarised the information which had been received from members since the previous meeting (see Annex I). He said that the only country with a general problem (for Switzerland) was Italy, as indicated at previous meetings, however there was a similar problem (for Switzerland) for technicians and young physicists (usually students) from Germany and the Netherlands. He added that in some cases reimbursement was according to home country rates, which might not be adequate to cover actual expenses, especially in Switzerland.

Websdale asked how long and short visits were defined. Blair replied that this varied from country to country, and referred to the written information received (Annex I) for the details.

Bamberger outlined the situation for German users as follows (see Annex I for fuller details). For those below a certain income there was compulsory insurance (the case for technicians and young physicists usually students). For those above this income, health insurance was not compulsory, but the employer gave certain benefits and the individual took private insurance to cover the rest. The problem concerned the compulsory insurance for the first category, which was not valid for Switzerland since there was no health insurance convention between Germany and Switzerland. While for such persons it was possible for the employer to grant extra benefits, the practice varied from one part of Germany to another, and the matter had been raised for clarification at the federal level.

Timmermans said that the problem for technicians and students from the Netherlands was identical to the German problem.

Hallgren said that for Sweden there was a similar problem, but only for students.

Milligan mentioned that users could join the CERN-Austria health insurance scheme at a cost of 314 Swiss francs per month (cover for the whole family) or 157 Swiss francs per month (user only, aged under 40) (1982 rates).

Leder observed that the basic problem was the absence of a health insurance convention between Switzerland and other countries. Suter explained that in Switzerland there was no compulsory medical insurance, only private insurance which most people took. There was thus no basis for a convention with Switzerland.

Several members commented on the potentially high cost of hospitalisation in Switzerland, and Leder asked if CERN could provide a fund to guarantee medical treatment for users in emergencies, Klapisch said that was not foreseen in the CERN budget.

Bradamante pointed out that there was a need for insurance to cover the medical consequences of accidents and illness for users when at CERN, perhaps to complement national schemes, and indicated that the present Austria cover was too comprehensive and too expensive to meet the needs of many users. He suggested that negotiations be opened with Austria to provide reduced cover of this sort. Dalpiaz added that another disadvantage of the present Austria cover was that it could not be stopped when the user was not at CERN - the Austria cover was not needed when the user was back in the home country.

Milligan said that members should reflect on what arrangements they would like Austria to offer, and let him have suggestions in writing before the next meeting. Blair commented that since only 100 of the present 2500 or so Unpaid Associates had taken Austria cover, the discussion indicated that there was a potential market to satisfy.

The Chairman asked members to make suggestions to Milligan in writing as a basis for discussion with Austria on a revised scheme to meet users' needs.

e) Office and laboratory space for visiting teams at CERN

Buhler-Broglin reported that the working group was still studying the problem of office and laboratory space at CERN. As far as assembly hall space was concerned, recommendations to CERN management were being prepared. The office and laboratory space situation was still under discussion, and there was no progress to report at present. The working group was due to present its report to CERN management in March.

6. Communication of information to users by CERN

Leder explained that he had requested that this item be placed on the agenda, for the following reason. Due to the CERN budget restrictions a discussion of the CERN economies programme was now a regular item at each ACCU meeting. Frequently several items were mentioned in the meeting, and user members were expected to comment as to whether changes would be acceptable to users. No member could be an expert on all the different aspects of the topics presented in this way, and he asked that CERN management announce such proposals in advance of the meeting, to permit members to brief themselves by discussions with colleagues and their home administrations, as appropriate.

Klapisch said that major topics were in fact discussed at several meetings, for example the proposed action on late payment of bills on visiting team accounts had now been discussed at two meetings, and in the past the question of charging official telephone calls lasting more than fifteen minutes to group accounts had also been discussed on several occasions. In his view ACCU should be consulted on sensitive issues, which had been done.

Leder cited the suppression of gas support for SPS experiments, which had not been discussed in advance, and repeated that he would prefer that members had time to discuss with colleagues rather than be expected to give an immediate reaction to a change.

Buhler-Broglin remarked that one should distinguish between items of detail, and policy decisions. In his view policy decisions should be taken only after proper consultation in ACCU, probably over two meetings for the reasons given by Leder, while items of detail could be communicated without discussion. He explained that the EP divisional budget for supporting physics experiments had been reduced from 20 MSF to 15 MSF in 1983, and that while CERN group budgets were reduced accordingly, the groups still had freedom to use their funds either for materials (electronics, gas etc.) or for subsistence payments for visiting physicists. This gave a certain flexibility in the sharing of costs inside a collaboration, according to the possibilities at each institute.

Klapisch supported the view that ACCU should discuss items of policy, not details.

Leder observed that the reasons for CERN to make economies were evident, but if the consequence was that certain expenditure would be transferred from the CERN budget to national budgets, it was necessary to indicate this well in advance, since the home institutes also had to plan their budgets.

The Chairman suggested that any change in details should be announced by CERN in an official letter to the holders of the 295 visiting team accounts.

Buhler-Broglin said that in future in preparing experiments groups would be asked to specify in advance what support they requested from CERN - e.g. an on-line computer, electronics from the pool, etc. - and the situation should then become more transparent.

Taureg remarked that there was a real communications problem if no members of a group were at CERN in a period of six months or so, and thus could not learn about changes. Buhler-Broglin pointed out that if this were so, communications inside the collaboration should be improved.

Klapisch considered that there were three levels of decision making, according to the level of the problem - major policy decisions were taken by CERN management, while medium level decisions were taken at divisional level, and decisions on details could be taken at group/ collaboration level. He believed that within the overall constraints decision making should be done flexibly, but agreed that CERN should make an effort to communicate better at an early stage at all three levels.

Websdale said that all items where the financial burden was likely to shift from CERN to users should be put explicitly on the agenda of future ACCU meetings, for discussion before decisions were taken.

The Chairman closed the discussion by expressing the hope that communications would be better in future.

7. Financial conditions of users

8. CERN Fellows and Associates Programme

9. Any other business

In view of the lateness of the hour, the Chairman proposed to hold these items over to the following ACCU meeting, and this was agreed.

10. Next meeting

The next meeting of ACCU will be held on Tuesday, May 3, 1983 at 14.00 in the Director-General's Conference Room, sixth floor, Main Building.

W. Blair

ANNEX I

Ref.: PE/PM/FA/246

Date: 18th February, 1983
(revised 15th March,1983)

M E M O R A N D U M

Copy to/Copie à:

To/A : ACCU members

From/De : W. Blair

Subject/: Survey of health insurance arrangements for users
Objet

At the October 28, 1982 meeting of ACCU it was agreed that members should provide me with answers to the following questions on health insurance:-

i) is there any insurance problem for nationals of their country who come to CERN?

ii) is the insurance equally valid for Switzerland and for France?

iii) who pays the premium?

iv) what is the extent of the cover for a) long visits?
b) short visits?

v) are family members covered?

vi) what are the provisions in case of death or disablement through accident when at CERN?

vii) are non-CERN accidents (e.g. skiing) covered?

Copies of the replies which have been received are attached. I have prepared a table summarising the replies, and should like to make the following comments:-

a) In some cases the answer in the table is a (minor) simplification for ease of presentation.

b) The only country with a general problem (for Switzerland) is Italy, as indicated earlier.

c) For two countries (Germany and the Netherlands) there is a problem for technicians and young physicists, and the same problem may exist also for Swedish students.

d) In several cases reimbursement is according to home country rates, and this may not cover actual expenses, especially for Switzerland.

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	France (CEA)	France (CNRS)	Germany	Greece
(i)	No convention A-CH join Austria	No	No	No	No information received	No (problem for some categories (see text))	Situation being clarified
(ii)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
(iii)	Institute	Institute	State	CEA		User	
(iv) a)	100%	Costs reimbursed at Belgian rates	?	Costs reimbursed at French rates		Varies according to scheme	
b)	100%		?				
(v)	Yes for long visits	Yes	Yes for long visits	Yes for long visits		Yes	
(vi)	Repatriation then state cover	As in Belgium	As in Denmark	As in France		As in Germany	
(vii)	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes as iv)	

	Italy*	Netherlands	Norway	Sweden	Switzerland	United Kingdom
(i)	Yes	No (problem for some categories, (see text))	No	"Hotel" cost at hospital not covered	No	No
(ii)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(iii)	State	User	State	State	User	RAL**
(iv) a)	Costs reimbursed for treatment in France only	100% but no dental cover	?	100% but see (i)	Varies according to scheme	100%
b)			?			
(v)	Yes as (iv)	Yes	Yes for long visits	Yes for long visits	Yes, by their own insurance	Yes for long visits
(vi)	As in Italy (?)	As in Netherlands	As in Norway	As in Sweden	As in Switzerland	As in U.K.
(vii)	Yes, in France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes for long visits

* Present situation, discussion underway to improve matters

** No insurance as such, all expenses paid by RAL

Health insurance arrangements for unpaid Austrian visitors

1. There is no convention between Austria and Switzerland on insurance schemes.

2. For those who subscribe to the "Austria" insurance scheme there is no difference between Switzerland and France.

3. Premium for "Austria" is paid by the institute via the Austrian Academy of Science.

4. In principal the medical costs are covered for both short and long term visits.

   a) For long term visits the institute pays the premium for "Austria", which covers 9o% of the costs, the remaining 1o% is normally covered by the Austrian social insurance scheme (Gebietskrankenkasse).

   b) For short term visits the institute pays the cost and is reimbursed for the costs of the equivalent treatment in Austria from the "Gebietskrankenkasse".

5. For long term visits family members are covered via "Austria".

6. In case of death or disablement the institute takes the risk for bringing the unpaid visitor back to Austria, where an application is subsequently made to the normal Austrian social insurance.

7. Non CERN-accidents (e.g. skiing) are coveres in the same way as described in 4.

Louvain-la-Neuve, le 7 février 1983

UNIVERSITE CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN
INSTITUT DE PHYSIQUE

MEMORANDUM

To : W. Blair, ACCU Secretary
From : D. Favart
Subject : Health Insurance and Financial conditions survey

The following information is valid for IISN (Institut Interuniversitaire des Sciences Nucléaires) personnel going to CERN and should normally apply to any university personnel as well.

I. Health Insurance

i. There does not seem to be any severe insurance problem for nationals staying at CERN less than two years.

ii. Health insurance coverage in France and Switzerland is provided, for up to a maximum of 24 months.
It requires the Social Security Office in Belgium to be notified two months in advance.

iii. Premium is paid by the Institute.

iv. Same risks are covered, as in Belgium. However, the refund (hospital bill, medical act, ...) are based on belgian rates and might be inadequate for expenses incurred in Switzerland.

v. Family members are covered.

vi. Working accident and consequences are covered at CERN like at home.

vii. Private life accident are not covered.

II. Allowances for stay at CERN

a) Short term (up to a month)

FB 1000 (FS 40) per day plus air travel (economy)

b) Long term

FS 890 (single) per month
or FS 1300 (married couple) per month.

D Favart

CHEMIN DU CYCLOTRON, 2
B - 1348 LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE, BELGIQUE
TELEPHONE: 010/41.81.81
TELEX: 59065

R 10.2.83

Danish health insurance arrangements for CERN users.

1. Short term visits (< 12 months)

Accidents are covered by the danish state
Medical expenses are covered by the research council.

2. Long visits (> 12 months).

People living in France are covered by EEC - regulations (also family members).
People living in Switzerland can join the swiss health insurance according to a danish - swiss convention (21. may 1954). This again includes family members.

A pension in case of disablement is part of the normal danish pension system.

(Version 28/1-92)

JANUARY 17, 1983

M E M O R A N D U M

To : W. BLAIR
From : J. FELTESSE (SACLAY, FRANCE)
Subject : Answers to your letter of the December 1, 1982, with regard to a survey of i) health insurance
ii) financial conditions of users

Please find the answers to the questions concerning health insurance as well as an updating of the ECFA reports. Number are only valid for C.E.A. (Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique) i.e. Saclay people. I guess that numbers for CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique) will be provided to you by Blaisin.

i) is there any insurance problems for nationals who come to CERN?
NO

ii) is the insurance equally valid for Switzerland and for France ?
YES, for an accident when at CERN

iii) Who pays the premium ? CEA

iv) What is the extent of the cover for
a) long visits ?
b) short visits ?
THE SAME

v) Are family members cover ?
YES, for the transportation between their residence in Paris area and Geneva area, provided the names are written in the "Ordre de Mission". There is no special insurance for the family during the visit.

vi) What are the provisions in case of death or disablement through accide when at CERN?
- physicists, engineers : 356.000 FF + 71200 FF per child
- technicians : 213.000 FF + 42600 FF per child

.../.....

vii) Are non-CERN accident (e.g; skiing) covered ?

NO, only the transportation between residence and CERN.

viii) any other relevant information ?

Except for work injury (question ii)
Reimbursement of medical expenses in Switzerland based on the standard French rate.

A. Bamberger, 21.2.83

Reply to the health insurance survey:

There are two categories of insurances:

1.) Below a certain income (3500.- DM brutto) there is a compulsory insurance. In general this would apply for technicians and young physicists.

2.) Once the limit is surpassed the health insurance is not compulsory. The employer grants benefits, covering 50% or more, depending on the legal states and the number of children. Usually the individual joins a private insurance scheme covering the rest.

Case 1:

i) Yes, the individual cannot leave the compulsory insurance scheme. The recompensation, if any, does not cover the expenses.

ii) No. A social insurance convention regulates the cover of cases in France. There is no such convention between Switzerland and Germany. Therefore medical treatment in Switzerland is not covered. However, there are cases known where the insurance did cover the expenses. Only a minimal amount (~2 1/2 of the total sum) is recompensated.

iii) The individual and the employer to equal parts. The individual may however join a private insurance scheme on his own cost.

iv) The insurance has to have a written statement about the termination of the stay in the foreign country.

v) Yes.

vi) If the accident happens on duty the employer will have to take care for provisions.

vii) Non-ern accidents can in principle be covered, if the provision was made in form of a written statement being on vacation. This is usually not practicable. The cover of non-ern accidents may indeed create difficulties.

viii) There is the possibility, that the employer grants benefits for the individual being in a compulsory insurance scheme. Employees of the federal government the benefit is usually granted, however there is a case known, where the country rejected the benefit.

to case 2 :

In the past the cover by benefits from the employer created not much trouble. Lately however the expenses should not surpass certain limits as given by an index of the organisation of medical doctors.

The answers concern the part which is covered by the private insurance scheme.

i) Yes, if the case implies major treatment or hospitalisation, for instance delivery of a child or surgery. The insurance urges this to be done in the home country, but it seems to be negotiable.

ii) There are no major differences of insurance coverage for Switzerland and France

iv) The periods up to 3 month can be covered under the pretext being on vacation. For a period of one year the insurance has to be notified and the cover has to be negotiated from case to case

v) in general yes

vi) if the accident happens on duty the employer will have to take care for provisions.

vii) Yes, under the conditions given in iv).

viii) For individuals being at Cern for a longer periode, it is preferable to discontinue the private insurance scheme and join a local insurance (i.e. Austria)

HEALTH INSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS for ITALIAN USERS

As mentioned at the last meeting, the situation is evolving, INFN has attacked the problem (it was on the agenda of the Board of Directors on Oct. 22, 1982), and hopefully an acceptable configuration will come out, although the times involved seem to be geological.

At present, however, I can answer to the questions you circulated on Dec 1, 1982, only on the basis of the actual situation, which is absolutely unsatisfactory.

i) Yes, definitely. In the absence of a convention between Italy and Switzerland, the Italian National Health Service does not cover medical expenses incurred in Switzerland. In case of illness a accident one has to pay personally for hospitalization and related expenses, and then there exist theoretically the

possibility of applying to the Regional Administration for a contribution to the expenses one has done, on a case by case basis.

Consequently, for what regards medical expense in Switzerland, the answers to questions iv), v) and vii) are negative.

ii) Coverage is adequate for France, as well as for any country belonging to the European Community.

A certain bureocratic procedure is requir to the Visitor before each single travel.

iii) the participation to the National Health Service Scheme is compulsary by law for all workers, and the premium is paid partly by the employer and partl by the Visitor, in the form of deduction applied to his gross salary.

iv) no difference for the Visitor, in the European Community.

v) Yes, in the European Community

vi) In principle, the official channel to handle accidents occuring when working

at CERN exists, namely INAIL, the Istituto Nazionale Assistenza Infortuni sul LAVORO, a section of the National Security System. In practice, I have personal experience only of a single case, an Associate from Trieste, and in this case the procedure has been extremely long and complicated, and the outcome not entirely satisfactory.

v ii) Yes, in the European Community.

Health Insurance arrangements for Dutch users when at CERN.

As I already mentioned in the meeting of July 1st. 1982, there are two kinds of insurance:

1) an obligatory insurance for people with an income below a certain level. Only few people are concerned, mainly technicians.

2) a private insurance subscribed to by most if not all the physicists.

Answer to the questions:

ad i,ii) As opposed to what I first indicated in the July 1st. meeting, there is a small problem with regards to the obligatory insurance scheme. Also in this case is the coverage limited to the Common Market states, i.e. NOT in Switzerland. The few people concerned are therefore urged to use part of their daily allowance to subscribe to a travel insurance scheme.

ad iii) The user pays the premium: for a married + 2 children this amounts to SFr. 285.- per month.

ad iv) In case of long visits the obligatory scheme is no longer applicable and the user has to subscribe to a private insurance scheme.
There is no difference between the cover for long and short visits. The coverage is globally comparable to the Austria coverage, but is in most cases up to 100% of expenses. However normally there is no cover for the dentist.

ad v) family members are covered as well, of course when premium is being paid for!

ad vi) In case of death or disablement, the same rules apply as for civil servants in The Netherlands. The fact that one is working at CERN does not make any change.

ad vii) Non-CERN accidents (like skiing) are covered in the same way as other accidents.

* concerning health insurance. for cern users from sweden.
* all (reasonable) medical expences (including travelto doctor
* or travel doctor -patient, prescripted drugs etc)
* are coverd. the =hotel cost = at hospital is not covered.
* this is equally valid for france and switcerland and also
* for accidents and sickness outside working.
* for long visits (after change of duty staition) family
* members are also coverd.
* thgere is no special premium for this. the person should
* have held a position for at lest 6 months at the institute
* students who normaly have only short term contracts if any
* are not covered.

* iam sory for the long delay
* allan hallgren
* gustaf wernwers intitut
* uppsala
* sweden

* ∓
23698z cern ch
* 76088 gwi s

R 16.2.83

* w. blair
* pe-div.

ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE POUR LA RECHERCHE NUCLÉAIRE
EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH

SIÈGE: GENÈVE, SUISSE

CERN
CH-1211 GENÈVE 23
SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

Téléphone: GENÈVE (022)
Central/Exchange : 83 61 11
Direct : 83

Votre référence
Your reference

Notre référence
Our reference

CERN, February 17, 1983

Dear Mr Blair,

Sorry to answer so late to your memo about health insurance survey.

The situation in Switzerland is particular in the sense that health insurance is a private business. Therefore the situation varies from case to case. Usually, the health insurance is valid in all countries, and covers non-professional accidents (professional accidents are covered by a separate, mandatory insurance) within the usual limits. Family members are covered by their own insurance. The premium is paid by the individual.

I am not aware of any financial problem for swiss visitor at CERN. As the cost of living is about the same in all swiss big cities, the salaries are well adapted, also for Ph.D students.

Yours,

H Suter

H. Suter

Télex: 2 36 98 CH – Télégramme: CERNLAB-GENÈVE

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR VISITORS TO CERN

Here are the answers to the questionnaire as concerns insurance cover for UK visitors to CERN. I also enclose USER NOTE 268 (Revised) which serves as a guide to the overall insurance situation.

(i) IS THERE AN INSURANCE PROBLEM FOR UK NATIONALS WHO COME TO CERN?
- No.

(ii) IS THE INSURANCE EQUALLY VALID FOR SWITZERLAND AND FRANCE?
- Yes.

(iii) WHO PAYS THE PREMIUM?
- No Policy Premium as such. Expenses paid by RAL

(iv) WHAT IS THE EXTENT OF COVER FOR
(A) LONG VISITS?
(B) SHORT VISITS?
- Essentially the same medical benefits as if visitor were working in UK.

(v) ARE FAMILY MEMBERS COVERED?
Only during long term attachment of > 1 year.

(vi) WHAT ARE THE PROVISIONS IN CASE OF DEATH OR DISABLEMENT THROUGH ACCIDENT WHEN AT CERN?
- same as if visitor were working in UK.

(vii) ARE NON-CERN ACCIDENTS (E.G. SKIING) COVERED?
- On long term attachment - No problems in France, Switzerland
- On short term attachment - Not covered while on leave from duty.

(viii) ANY OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION.
See RAL User Notice 268 (Revised). This note can be used as a guide to the manner in which visitors to CERN are covered.

D.M. Websdale
Member of ACCU