

ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CERN USERSMinutes of the nineteenth meeting, held on February 14, 1984

Present : A. Bamberger, W. Blair, J.J. Blaising, G.J. Bossen (Secretary),
F. Bradamante, G. Damgaard, P. Dalpiaz, D. Favart, J. Feltesse,
R. Klapisch, K. Kleinknecht (Chairman), A. Klovning, G. Leder,
M. Mazerand, J. Panman, P. Sonderegger, H. Suter, H. Taureg,
J. Timmermans, D. Websdale.

Invited : I. Butterworth (items 4a) and b)), R.N. Milligan (item 4e)),
E. Roebuck (item 5).

Apologies for absence : A. Hallgren, J. Thompson, A. Filippas.

The Chairman said that it had not been possible to complete the procedure for nomination of ACCU members in 1984/85 in time and that hence the meeting had been called with the 1983 members. He welcomed Sonderegger who represented the Staff Association in succession to Zavattini.

1. Adoption of agenda

With minor reordering, the draft agenda was approved.

2. Apologies for absence

These were as given above.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting (CERN/ACCU/18)

The Secretary apologized for the minutes being available only shortly before the meeting, due to a chronic work overload of the Fellows and Associates Service. Websdale commented that, for being useful in the preparation of the following meeting, minutes need to be available much earlier. Klapisch wondered whether some form of abbreviated minutes (e.g. a one page document with a list of topics discussed and of ACCU's recommendations) rather than the full text of the discussions could solve the problem. The Chairman considered such a summary insufficient, and proposed to discuss an improved timing with the Secretary after the meeting. ACCU agreed.

4. Matters arising from the minutes

a) CERN computing policy

Butterworth summarized the situation as follows, apologizing that he would necessarily need to be somewhat vague as CERN was in the middle of a re-appraisal of its computing policy. The report "Computing at CERN in the LEP Era" which had been discussed at the previous ACCU meeting, had reported the conclusions of a CERN internal working group, under the influence of the ECFA Computing Working Group. It had been widely

distributed, and CERN had received a large number of comments. It seemed that some readers had got the impression that the report contained a description of a finally approved CERN policy. Butterworth stressed that this was not the case, and that it had never been planned to implement all recommendations. CERN was now with the help of the comments received assessing what items the user community thought to be most important. In this context, a special meeting of the LEP Experiments Committee had recently been held. It had emerged that the expectations of the LEP experiments are far beyond the investments foreseen in the report, a guess estimate being a cost of the order of 100 to 150 MSF if all requested by these experiments were implemented. For example, it was requested that for each LEP experiment computer power equivalent to 12 IBM-168 computers should be made available. If one added to these requirements, those of the $p\bar{p}$ programme, which contains two experiments comparable in size to the LEP experiments, CERN should until 1988 multiply by six its present computer capacity which is equivalent to about 13 IBM-168's. Butterworth said that these demands could certainly not be met, but that, on the other hand, an expenditure on computing of 20 to 25 MSF until 1988, as had been discussed until now, was evidently inadequate. CERN would thus probably have to alter the balance of its expenditure in favour of computing; this implied, however, that other areas would have to suffer. CERN was now working on an update of the report which should specify what CERN could provide. He warned that most likely this would be less than the total of the propositions in the original report. He expected the update to be available at the end of March/beginning of April.

Butterworth then informed the meeting that a committee on the level of directors of European laboratories had been set up to coordinate computing resources. Its Chairman is W. Hoogland (NIKHEF), the other members being I. Butterworth (CERN), N. Cabibbo (INFN), M. Froissart (IN2P3), E. Lohrmann (German Gutachterausschuss), J. Sacton (ECFA), R. Schött (DESY), J. Thresher (RAL), R. Turlay (Saclay), P. Zanella (CERN), the Secretary being M. Hine (CERN). The committee had already met once to discuss networking, and it had decided that the GIFT project should go ahead, using VAX computers. The next meeting was scheduled for the end of March to assess the off-line capacity in the Member States. This was of particular importance as CERN insisted that the two-to-one ratio between non-CERN and CERN computing power remained after a possible increase in the CERN computing power. In answer to a question by Taureg, how the Non-Member State participation in the CERN experimental programme was dealt with in the committee, Butterworth said that membership of the committee could be extended in a later phase, and that the committee for the moment was restricted to persons who were in a position to commit resources. He added that the L3 experiment was at present organizing its own computing activity. Dalpiaz, supported by Bradamante, expressed the fear that, if CERN spends large sums of money on computing, its unique facility to deliver protons for experiments may suffer. Also the availability of extended computing resources at CERN could lead to all experiments wishing to use it to produce results first whereas the same results could be obtained with a delay of not more than a few months using the computing power in the Member States. He reminded the meeting that the Italian community had been under pressure from CERN to improve on its computing power, but he was afraid that this would not be used since CERN was increasing its own computing capacity. Butterworth answered that he shared the concerns expressed, and that for that reason, CERN was insisting on the two-to-one ratio mentioned before. He added that networking had a high priority. CERN had already increased the support in this area by creating a Communications Systems

Group in DD Division, headed by D. Lord.

The Chairman remarked that the cost for network links in Europe was three times higher than in the USA, and wondered whether CERN had any possibility to influence the European PTT administrations, e.g. to obtain a special tariff for scientific communications. Butterworth commented that there existed the Foundation for the Exchange of Scientific and Cultural Information by Telecommunication (FISCIT), based in Zurich, which sought to lobby for such special rates and that CERN was in contact with them. The Chairman said that it seemed that the sub-committee on high energy physics which had been created after the summit-meeting of presidents and prime ministers in Williamsburg, had raised this issue. Butterworth and Klapisch agreed that this would be a good way to tackle the problem and promised to follow it up.

Feltesse supported by Panman remarked that networks would need to be of good performance in speed and quality, including satellite communication, as both data and programmes would need to be transmitted; also a very efficient electronic mail system would be necessary. Butterworth said that it was CERN's top priority to provide gateways so that networks would be able to communicate with each other; he believed that people would have to continue to carry data tapes with them.

Dalpiaz wondered whether, to begin with, items like the preprint list and list of seminars, could be made available to all universities through a network. Taureg said that both the text of the Weekly Bulletin and the Preprint list is already available under WYLBUR.

Websdale asked whether it was true that the LEP experiments requested mainly an increase in CERN's central computing capacity, whereas the original report foresaw an about equal increase for central computing power at one hand and interactive computing at the other. Butterworth replied that the LEP experiments were requesting increases in both.

The Chairman summarized the discussion with the statement that positive developments had been made: firstly, the contact person for communication links with the outside was now known (D. Lord), and secondly that an update of the recommendations of the report "Computing at CERN in the LEP Era" would be available at the end of March/beginning of April. Butterworth added that other positive elements were the approval of the GIFT project, the creation of the network group and microprocessor support group, increased support for FASTBUS software and the decision to introduce at CERN the VM/CMS system.

ACCU welcomed these developments and decided to continue the discussion at its next meeting.

b) LEP experiments

The Chairman remarked that the discussion on this subject at the previous meeting has been based on the document "Preliminary information on the organization of experiments performed around LEP by joint research bodies", which by now was outdated.

Butterworth confirmed that there had been much opposition to the document from all sides including Finance Committee. For that reason CERN had elaborated a new document to be signed by institutions participating in LEP experiments, which was an instrument of understanding rather than a formal agreement. For participation from

Non-Member States a more formal agreement remained necessary. Up to now only a few instrument of understanding documents had been signed, but Butterworth said that he considered the discussion leading to signature to be at least as important as the signature itself, since it made clear to everybody including the funding bodies how much they would have to invest.

Leder asked whether the text of all instrument of understanding documents would have to be identical, and also when CERN expected all of them to be signed. Butterworth answered that basically the documents would be all the same, but that e.g. the text concerning insurance need to be adapted to the legislation in each country. CERN was not pressing for quick signature because of delicate internal discussions in some countries, but expected all documents to be signed by the end of 1984. Leder's question whether funding bodies or universities would have to sign the instrument of understanding documents, was answered by Butterworth with the remark that that depended on the country concerned.

Butterworth stressed that there was no intention on CERN's behalf to change its standing policy towards experimental groups from its Member States. Most of the text of the instrument of understanding was codification of already existing practices, made necessary because of the scale of the LEP experiments together with the fact that CERN was a minority participant in these experiments.

ACCU expressed its satisfaction about the developments since the last meeting.

c) Office and laboratory space for visiting teams

Blair informed the meeting of the developments since September 1983. He regretted to announce that the Z building will become available in winter 1985/86 rather than spring or summer 1985, as preparations had taken longer than expected. Around Easter 1984 the start would be the transfer of the offices in barracks 577 and 578 to 40 container-type barracks which will be located on the parking space near building 168. The existing barracks would then disappear from the site in May. The loss of parking space would be limited to some 20 to 30 places, as most of the parking space near the LIL building would become available again. He announced that it was foreseen to place a high-class barrack (pavillon) near building 28 to house mainly members of the OPAL collaboration. Blair reminded the meeting that even after construction of the Z building, the office and laboratory space situation would not be luxurious, due to the ever increasing number of users.

Klapisch added that the formal procedure to obtain a loan of 9 MSF from FIPOI for the construction of the Z and reception buildings had been started after a decision by the Finance Committee in October 1983. No final answer could be expected before the end of the summer, as the Swiss authorities needed approval by parliament. Hence, until that time only preparatory work could be done as described by Blair. The transfer of COOPIN, INTERFON and the Staff Association offices to other premises was under study, Klapisch said. Overall, he considered that important progress to a more satisfactory space situation was being made.

The Chairman remarked that a possible computerised access system (discussed in the context of the new reception building) had met with negative remarks. Klapisch commented that the Directorate had discussed this item and that it had decided that the policy of free access to the

main CERN sites should not be changed. However special measures needed to be taken for access to radiation areas and to the "island-sites" like the surface level buildings of UA1 and UA2, where it was necessary to know at any moment the number of persons in such areas for safety reasons. He emphasized that it was not CERN's intention to create a police system, but merely to ensure the safety of everybody through a simple and efficient access system which would be identical for CERN staff and the users.

Blair stated that he was happy to hear the Directorate's policy. He informed the meeting that he was representing EP Division in a working group under the Chairmanship of Sagnell who had written a report on possible access procedures. Klapisch commented that comments and ideas of users were very welcome.

ACCU recommended that the present freedom of movement should be maintained and decided to discuss the matter further at its next meeting.

d) Reorganisation of workshops

Klapisch reminded the meeting that it was CERN's intention to close part of the mechanical workshops as they were used infrequently. To settle the details, a review was being made. Blair added that in practice it was not very easy to agree on the details.

ACCU decided to postpone a discussion to its next meeting.

e) Health insurance arrangements for users

Milligan recalled that the previous meeting had discussed a letter which he had received from AUSTRIA, proposing a scheme for short-term health insurance, and that he had announced that another proposal, which would be a general complementary insurance, could be expected. This second proposal had now been received (see Annex A), formulated for the particular case of Italy: Italian users of CERN nominated at the beginning of each year would be covered against serious illnesses and accidents occurring outside Italy with a yearly franchise of 200 Swiss francs per year per case, the premium being 300 Swiss francs per year per person. He added that AUSTRIA was prepared to extend its proposal to other Member States, if these wanted to join the scheme.

Bradamante remarked that the latest AUSTRIA proposal went largely in the right direction and that it was now being discussed within the INFN.

Mazerand informed the meeting that after discussions which she had had with a representative of Europe Assistance, this company was offering an arrangement for a premium of 550 French francs per year per person (see Annex B). Klapisch stressed that this arrangement did not cover not the same risks as the AUSTRIA proposal; the emphasis in the case of Europe Assistance was more on hospital treatment and immediate transport back to the home country.

In reply to a question from Blaising, Bradamante confirmed that a minimum number of insured persons was necessary before AUSTRIA would implement its proposal. In Italy he expected payment of the premium to be made by the INFN, if this would be legal. He added that all users should seriously contemplate taking an additional insurance as proposed by AUSTRIA as it was known that, even if users certified on their

registration form for Unpaid Associates that they were covered against medical expenses, this turned out sometimes to be inadequate.

Blaising said that he thought it would be useful for the French community to join the scheme proposed by AUSTRIA to the Italians, taking into account that the premium would only be a very small part of the overall travel expenses. He wondered whether CERN could require users to join this insurance, to ease procedures in the Member States.

Bamberger remarked that the problems which some German users had met in the past, were solved now through support by the Universities (Beihilfescheme). However practice was very different from one Land to another, and a conference had been called to try to agree on a common practice to be applied everywhere. Hence he did not think that the AUSTRIA proposal was of interest to the German community.

Klapisch invited members to make the proposals largely known in their countries.

ACCU took note.

f) Membership of ACCU in 1984/85

The Chairman informed the meeting that no proposals for replacement of outgoing members had been received from France, Italy and Greece. As to Spain, formal confirmation of a proposal was awaited.

ACCU asked the necessary action to be taken to enable the appointment of its 1984/85 members in time before the next meeting.

5. Language courses

Roebuck, Head of CERN Language Courses, distributed copies of the brochures and application forms for the English and French courses at CERN, together with statistical information on students, course hours, teachers, costs involved, etc. (Annex C).

He invited members to study these documents and to contact him for further details if necessary.

He said that the Language Courses were one of the six programmes of courses at CERN centrally organized by the Education and Training Services in PE Department. Languages taught regularly were English and French, whereas in the past German and Russian had been offered (until 1975) and Italian (upon special request). The re-introduction of German courses was envisaged (two courses being under way at present at the specific request of a Division).

As the item has been put on the agenda in response to comments that not enough courses in French were available at CERN, he would concentrate on these.

The staff strength teaching French had increased from 2.00 man years in 1975 to 2.75 at present, all teachers having the status of Paid Associates on either 100% or 75% contracts.

In the same time span the number of students had increased by about 50%, almost all of them being Fellows, Associates and Students, at CERN for a limited time and therefore needing a French course as soon as possible after

their arrival. Spouses were also entitled to enrol, as it was recognised that they often needed French more than the partner working at CERN.

A new but considerable source of demand was from recently engaged non-French speaking Staff Members, taken on in Divisions like SB where the working language was usually French. These new Staff Members had to be given absolute priority. As for other applicants, the only objective criterion for priority, when demand exceeded supply, was chronological order of enrolment, but attempts were made to give preference to candidates with least previous knowledge of French and with the shortest projected stay at CERN.

To meet the increase in demand, apart from the gradual increase in the number of teachers, together with temporary increases of contracts from 75% to 100%, another important measure was taken in summer 1977; courses were organized on a termly basis instead of an annual basis (September-Christmas/Christmas-Easter/Easter-Summer) to take into account the needs of people arriving throughout the year with peak periods in September and January.

Other possible ways of offering more courses could be envisaged. The most obvious - an increase in the number of teachers - was not feasible for two reasons. Before taking on extra teachers to meet an upsurge in demand, the question of what happens when numbers decline should be asked. Any increase in numbers of teachers or percentages of contracts also would aggravate the annual deficit which has stood at about 90 KSF/year over the past four years.

The Chairman asked why the fees were not increased to solve at least part of the budgetary problems. Roebuck answered that they had indeed been increased this year from 4 to 5 Swiss francs per hour, a rate comparable to that of Migros and Coop (about 5.50 SF/h), Cours Industriels, Cours commerciaux (about 3.50 SF/h), whereas private language schools in Geneva charged 16 to 20 SF/h.

After pointing out that Language Courses were the only centrally organized training activity for which either the individual participants or their Divisions had to pay, he agreed with Taureg that the fees should remain at a reasonably low level, as the majority of students were not remunerated by CERN and had to pay for the courses themselves.

Questions were also asked by Klapisch and Mazerand about the possibilities of employing either students or wives of physicists. Roebuck was very sceptical about such an approach. Outside persons had indeed been hired for evening courses in the past but this could not be a permanent solution, all the more so because efficient team-work was essential to the effectiveness of the courses, especially since the teaching material was almost exclusively "home made", commercially produced courses having been found to be completely unsuitable for CERN personnel.

To conclude, in answer to a final question from the Chairman, Roebuck confirmed that at the moment, due to the structure and the priority system, no new arrival who wanted to learn basic French had to wait longer than three months before he could start a course at CERN. If, for example, no vacancies existed immediately for someone arriving in October, a place was guaranteed in January. Applicants who could not wait that long were informed about the other possibilities in Geneva and nearby France, since Roebuck himself kept in contact with these schools.

ACCU took note.

6. Any other businessa) Restaurants

Dalpiaz said that the quality/price ratio in the CERN restaurants (in particular restaurants no. 1 and 3) was decreasing to such extent that one was better served in the Meyrin shopping centre and in Saint-Genis. Suter reminded the meeting that this subject has been discussed in ACCU previously and that the conclusion of an enquiry by the responsible CERN services had been that there was no reason for complaints. Bradamante admitted that quality was not easy to discuss, but that one could certainly find cheaper food off-site. He mentioned in particular that restaurant no. 1 was unable to offer a reasonable service during weekends and night-hours when the accelerators were running, and hence a relatively high number of users came to this restaurant. This had already lead to embarrassing quarrels with the restaurant staff. Klapisch said that a more permanent monitoring seemed desirable, and that the presence of an ACCU representative on the Restaurant Supervision Committee could be envisaged.

The Chairman proposed to take the matter up with Milligan.

b) CERN economies programme - EDF contract

Blaising reminded the meeting that in the context of the CERN economies programme, CERN had for the last two winters concluded a special contract with EDF which allowed EDF to cut off the electricity during a certain number of critical days. He would like to hear at a coming meeting a detailed assessment of the advantages and problems, both for CERN and its users, based on the experience gathered so far. The Chairman added that he had been contacted by the Norwegian user community which had made complaints, that they had recently lost non negligible amounts of travel expenses. Klapisch said that in the first winter there had been almost no problems as the critical days happened to occur during the accelerator shutdown. However, last autumn the situation had been different, and the SPS coordinator, W. Kienzle, had been asked to document the inconveniences. On the other hand, one should not forget the financial advantages for CERN, as the savings were in reality much more substantial than 4 MSF, as had been anticipated. CERN would need such savings to find 19 MSF in its budget, which were needed for the antiproton improvement programme. Websdale stressed that CERN should recognise that its own savings are offset, at least partially, by extra travel expenses of the users.

c) Cars

Timmermans raised a problem which had occurred with a blue R4 rented to a group: the customs had imposed a fine on a driver because his name had not been mentioned on the list of admitted drivers for that car and the absence of an "ordre de mission". He asked for clearer and less restrictive rules. Blair said that these cars could only made available cheaply because of the restrictions on their use. He thought the rules to be clear and saw the problem rather in their communication to the users. He offered to discuss the problem with Timmermans, and proposed to deliver a statement at the next meeting.

d) Tunnel

Blair then informed the meeting that the Director of Administration had proposed to reduce the opening hours of the tunnel under the Route Nationale, in order to make savings in the manpower necessary for its operation. The Director of Administration expected the saving to be 50% (based on statistics for the period March - May 1983) if the present regular opening hours of 07.30 - 23.00 on 7 days per week were reduced to a regular opening of 10 hours on 5 days per week. Blair commented that more facts and figures were needed to take into account the differences in use during fixed-target physics, collider physics and accelerator shutdown periods. Taureg mentioned the already existing problems for passing the tunnel during the night; the personnel responsible for the unlocking needed absolutely to be reminded of the procedure. Blair said that in the proposals under discussion, it was assumed that the tunnel would be opened outside working hours in the 5 minutes following a request. He invited comments to be addressed to him within a fortnight.

e) Hostel

Websdale said that arrangements in the new hostel were considered very positive with the exception of the opening hours of the reception. The present opening hours of 9-12 and 14-17 did not give participants at e.g. a LEP meeting the possibility to see the reception open; to keep the reception open during lunch-time would solve the problem. Klapisch acknowledged the problem, but regretted that due to manpower shortage the solution offered by Websdale could not be envisaged. He would raise, however, the point again at the coming meeting of the Housing Committee.

Klapisch added that shortly a kitchen would be installed including refrigerators and a micro-wave oven. Also at each floor one room would be equipped with a TV set and comfortable chairs. Also a terrace would be available on the top of the building. He considered the installation of a refrigerator in each room to be too expensive and expressed the hope that no conflicts amongst users would arise who would have to share a refrigerator. Klapisch announced the formal inauguration of the new hostel by the time of the next meeting.

f) Telephones

The Chairman wondered why the French P. et T. telephone booths in the North Area which offered an appreciated possibility for phone calls back home outside working hours, had been locked. Blair said that he would enquire.

7. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was fixed on Friday, 4 May 1984 (afternoon).

Closing the meeting, the Chairman expressed his thanks to the outgoing members for the work accomplished.

Our guarantee will be limited to the amounts not reimbursed by the Italian Social Security and not exceed 90 % of the expenses invoiced. In addition, there will be a franchise of Sw.Fr. 200,-- per case and/or per calendar year (i.e. if medical expenses occur within one calendar year for a serious illness and an accident, the franchise will be deducted twice; if medical expenses occur for a serious illness from September 1984 to March 1985 e.g., the franchise likewise will be deducted twice).

E) Annual Premium

Sw.Fr. 300,-- per person, payable in advance.

F) General Conditions

The conditions concerning health insurance (excluding death and invalidity benefits) according to our Agreement N° 605/ADM with CERN shall apply analogously, unless contradicted by the present offer.

This offer is valid until 1984 06 30, for a minimum number of 200 persons, and subject to the approval of the competent insurance authority.

We are at your disposal for further discussions in this matter, and thus, look forward to hearing from you.

Your sincerely,

AVSTRIA

VERSICHERUNGEN A.G.
KORNGASSE 6/A
1010 WIEN

ABONNEMENTS ANNUELS

A qui s'adressent-ils ?

Un abonnement annuel Europ Assistance peut être souscrit au profit :

- d'une famille entière: les parents, leurs enfants de moins de 25 ans et les ascendants vivant sous le même toit;
- d'un couple, sans enfant (ainsi que l'enfant qui pourrait naître dans les 12 mois);
- d'une personne seule.

Tous les bénéficiaires doivent être domiciliés en FRANCE métropolitaine. Aucune limite d'âge n'est imposée. Dans chaque formule, il est également possible d'abonner 1 ou 2 véhicule(s) ainsi qu'une caravane ou une remorque.

Quels sont les pays et déplacements couverts ?

Tous les déplacements en FRANCE à partir du domicile et tous les voyages d'agrément dans 33 pays*: Europe y compris l'URSS (partie européenne), la Turquie, Israël, le Maroc, la Tunisie. Les déplacements à l'étranger de plus de 3 mois consécutifs ne sont pas couverts.

Les bénéficiaires d'un abonnement annuel ont droit à une réduction de 20% sur tout abonnement temporaire souscrit pour une destination non couverte par l'abonnement annuel.

* voir groupes de pays

ABONNEMENTS TEMPORAIRES

A qui s'adressent-ils ?

- L'abonnement temporaire peut être souscrit au profit d'une ou plusieurs personnes physiques ayant leur domicile en France métropolitaine.
- Le même abonnement peut également couvrir les véhicules (groupes I, II, III, ...). Le tarif véhicule s'applique aux caravanes et aux remorques de plus de 350 kg.

Quels sont les pays et déplacements couverts ?

- Chaque abonnement pour l'étranger couvre la France, les pays du groupe choisi et tous les pays des groupes précédents figurant au tableau.
- L'abonnement temporaire prend effet à plus de 25 km du domicile.
- Tous les déplacements professionnels ou touristiques sont garantis.

ASSISTANCE AUX PERSONNES

1. Organisation et prise en charge du rapatriement dans un service hospitalier proche du domicile, par avion sanitaire, avion de ligne, train 1^{re} classe, ambulance, sous surveillance médicale constante si votre état le nécessite.
2. Mise à disposition d'un billet d'avion ou de train 1^{re} classe pour un membre de la famille inscrit au contrat afin de se rendre au lieu d'hospitalisation de l'abonné rapatrié.
3. Remboursement des frais médicaux payés à l'étranger à concurrence de 25.000 F par personne abonnée en complément de tout organisme de prévoyance.
4. Mise à disposition d'un billet aller/retour d'avion ou de train 1^{re} classe pour un membre de la famille d'un abonné hospitalisé + de 10 jours au cours d'un déplacement.
5. Mise à disposition d'un billet aller/retour pour un abonné en cas de décès en France d'un de ses proches parents (conjoint, père, mère, enfant, frère, sœur, grands-parents).
6. Prise en charge du rapatriement du corps d'un abonné décédé en cours de voyage.
7. Avance de caution pénale à concurrence de 40.000 FF et d'honoraires d'avocat à concurrence de 5000 FF.
8. Assistance "Urgences": Communication des coordonnées de médecins de garde, recherche d'une ambulance, dépannage serrurerie, participation aux frais d'aide familiale à domicile en cas d'hospitalisation, et aux frais d'hébergement à la suite d'incendie, dégât des eaux ou cambriolage.
9. Assistance Conseils et Assistance Parents (tous les jours ouvrables de 10 heures à 19 heures): service de renseignements téléphoniques concernant les démarches administratives et juridiques d'ordre privé et la vie quotidienne des enfants.

(Les points 8 & 9 sont réservés aux abonnements annuels).

La liste des se
Europ A
qu
que vous po
mettra t

M. Dubosson
Banque Régionale de l'Air
St Genis
tel (023) 42 11 94

- Madame MAZERAND,

Je vous confirme notre adhésion Méditerranéenne, concernant la convention que nous avons en accord avec EUROPE-ASSISTANCE pour les non-résidents habitant dans nos pays Européens et également Européens d'origine. Pour une prime annuelle de 560 FF, le rapatriement s'effectue dans leur pays d'origine dans les mêmes conditions que les citoyens Français. En résumé les personnes que vous désirez assurer seront couvertes dans les mêmes conditions que les Français et je vous joins également un duplicat relatant les conditions d'assistance prévues. Pour les modalités d'adhésion, il suffit de nous faire parvenir les caractéristiques du futur abonné et nous nous chargeons du reste. Je reste à votre disposition pour tous renseignements complémentaires.

LANGUAGE TEACHERS : Number of posts 1975 - 1984

		%						TOTAL POSTS
		45	50	60	70	75	100	
1975 / 1976	English		1		2	1		2.65
	French		2				1	2.00
1976 / 1977	English					4		3.00
	French					3		2.25
1977 / 1978	English					4		3.00
	French					3		2.25
1978 / 1979	English					4		3.00
	French					3		2.25
1979 / 1980	English					3	1	3.25
	French					3		2.25
1980 / 1981	English					3	1	3.25
	French					3		2.25
1981 / 1982	English					3	1	3.25
	French					3		2.25
1982 / 1983	English					3	1	3.25
	French					2	1(temp.)	2.50
1983 / 1984	English	1 *				2	1	2.95
	French					1	1 1(temp.)	2.75

* 1 teacher on a 75% contract as follows :

English ~45% German ~ 30%

NUMBER OF NEW REQUESTS FOR ENROLMENT (FRENCH)

	at 30 Sept.	at 31 Jan.	at 30 April	TOTAL	
				French	English
1979 / 1980	87	+ 48	+ 23	158	81
1980 / 1981	78	+ 39	+ 12	129	47
1981 / 1982	73	+ 25	+ 27	125	99
1982 / 1983	92	+ 57	+ 32	181	73
1983 / 1984	114	+ 64		(178)	(123)
average '79 / '83	82.5	+ 42	+ 23.5	148	75

