

ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CERN USERSMinutes of the twenty-fifth meeting, held on 18 February, 1986

Present : W. Bartl, H. Boggild, M. Boratav, K. Bos, G.J. Bossen (Secretary), J. Carter, G. Damgaard, K. Eggert, C. Fabjan, P. Jenni, R. Klapisch, N. Koulberg, E. Lillethun, T. Mouthuy, F. Niebergall, G. Sauvage (Chairman), H. Taureg, H. Siebert, M. Werlen, H. Zaccone.

Invited : M. Ferro-Luzzi (item 8), G. Hentsch (item 7), C. Roche.

Apologies for absence : M. Albrow, W. Blair, F. Bradamante, J. Feltesse, V. Gracco, A. Hallgren, E. Higon-Rodriguez, K. Kleinknecht, A. Klovning, C. Kourkoumelis, G. Leder, D. Websdale.

Klapisch opened the meeting with the remark that for reasons of continuity, not only the user members appointed for 1986 had been invited to this meeting, but also those whose appointment had come to an end on 31 December, 1985. He explained that it had been the intention to hold the meeting under the joint Chairmanship of the outgoing Chairman (Kleinknecht) and the new Chairman (Sauvage), but that this had become impossible due to the absence of Kleinknecht who had fallen ill. He then introduced Sauvage to the meeting : he is a French physicist who as a member of the Orsay team had participated in the UA2 experiment and had recently moved to LAPP-Annecy where he was now involved in the L3 experiment.

Klapisch added that following the restructuring of some administrative services (which would be discussed later during the meeting), Roche had become his administrative deputy who would as part of his work make studies of subjects of interest to ACCU (e.g. on the question who could be considered as legitimate users of CERN). Roche would for that reason have a standing invitation to the ACCU meetings.

The Chairman thanked his predecessor for the important work which he had done for the users during the four years of his Chairmanship. He welcomed Koulberg who was replacing Blair as EP representative for this meeting only.

The updated list of members of ACCU is attached to these minutes (see Annex A).

1. Adoption of agenda

Klapisch said that he wished to inform ACCU of the budgetary situation of CERN. Eggert asked for information on the nomination procedure of the user members of ACCU. It was agreed to add both items to the agenda. The responsible director, Butterworth, not being available, it was also decided to postpone the item "CERN computing policy" to a following meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

These were as given above. It was noted that Italy had not yet proposed candidates to replace Bradamante whose membership had come to an end on 31 December, 1985, and that the first member from Portugal had not yet been nominated.

3. Minutes of previous meeting (CERN/ACCU/24)

Bos remarked that under "Services charged to users" it was recorded that

several members agreed that charging services made the users more responsible. He reminded the meeting that he had expressed his disagreement with such statements, and he requested his opinion to be recorded explicitly. With this addition the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 8 November 1985, were approved.

The summary of the present meeting as published in the Weekly Bulletin is reproduced in Annex B.

4. Nomination procedure of user members

Eggert said that he wished information on how CERN's Director-General made his decisions for nominations of the user members of ACCU.

Klapisch proposed to give an answer after a short description of the general framework of ACCU. Some ten years ago the need had been felt to create a possibility for users to dialogue in a structured way with CERN management on matters concerning the daily running of the Laboratory, as a complement to existing channels concerned with e.g. the research programmes. Since then the number of users had tripled, and ACCU had become the forum where CERN management could obtain first-hand information on how its policy decisions were experienced by the users. Moreover, ACCU had initiated some improvements, like the construction of the new hostel, and had its delegates in several CERN Committees, like the library committee. Klapisch remarked that it was evidently of utmost importance that there is a strong liaison of the user members with their base in the home countries. Coming back to the nomination procedure, Klapisch explained that the central body in each Member State concerned with particle physics research (or, in its absence, the outgoing user member) was asked to propose candidates via the Chairman of ACCU to CERN's Director-General. The Director-General took his decisions considering factors like the preference expressed by the Member States and a reasonable distribution over the different kinds of experiments. Klapisch added that this procedure was similar for all other CERN Committees except, of course, Council and its subsidiary bodies.

Eggert asked how the users were represented at FNAL. Taureg answered, that to his knowledge, FNAL's users committee had a very different role from that played by ACCU.

Eggert, supported by the Chairman, expressed the view that if the mandate were given to ACCU members by their home country rather than CERN's Director-General, the relations with the user community in that Member State would be stronger.

ACCU took note.

5. Matters arising from the minutes

a) Restructuring of CERN

Following the discussions at the previous meeting which had concentrated on the restructuring of the technical services (implemented by now) and on possibilities to restructure the EP/EF complex, Roche presented the present state of the restructuration of the administration. From 1981 until the end of 1985 the central administrative services under the responsibility of the Director of Administration had consisted of four Departments (Finance FI, Personnel PE, Documentation DOC and Management Information MI). FI and PE had on 1 January, 1986 become Divisions with in the case of FI some minor restructuring of the purchasing services and a transfer of the stores to ST Division. As to PE any changes would wait

for the nomination of a Director of Human Resources, to be discussed by CERN Council in the second half of February. The reorganisation of DOC and MI had been the subject of discussions in the Directorate and Management Board. Three alternatives had been considered :

a) no changes, b) merging of DOC and MI into one Division and c) dissolving DOC and MI, and integrating their different units into existing Divisions. Roche mentioned that he had recommended either of the first two alternatives, but the third one had been chosen by CERN management.

Roche said that, as it had not been possible to make cost effectiveness studies within the short time allocated, his task had been to integrate the units concerned in such a manner that it would allow for subsequent more definitive changes whenever necessary. Roche insisted that no a priori decisions had been taken, contrary to some uncontrolled rumors. He had recommended that a few people should start a study on the cost effectiveness of the whole of the CERN administration including the administrative units in the research and accelerator Divisions. The impact of modern office technologies and the historic justification for the present structure would be considered. It was hoped that within 12 to 18 months, a simplification of the CERN administrative services could be implemented. In this context, the present allocation of units to Divisions was not irreversible.

Roche added that it had also been decided to create three new units, Direction of Administration (DA), Direction of Research (DR) and Technical Direction (DT). These were staff task forces which were more conveniently attached to a Director rather than being part of a Division.

He then summarized the present allocation of the main units :-

from DOC to TH	Library
from DOC to ST	Mail Service
from DOC to DG Services	Translation and Minutes, Scientific Conference Secretariat, Publications and Exhibitions (including Photo service)
from DOC to DA	Text processing, Scientific reports, print shop
from MI to DA	Administrative Data Processing, Relations with Host States
from MI to DG Services	Forecasts and Statistics
from MI to DR and ST	Administrative and Technical Support

These transfers concerned some 140 persons of which 14 people were on an individual basis redeployed on new activities.

Roche repeated that a number of these allocations were temporarily pending the CERN-wide study which he had mentioned before. This applied e.g. to the photo service and the print shop where a study would have to conclude how these services could be made available most economically.

Bos expressed worries about the transfer of units like the printing shop to the DG Services fearing less support to those units. Roche remarked

that some 95 percent of the CERN staff had a post in a Division, headed by a Division Leader, and the remaining fraction was attached to the Director-General's office and services or to the Directors. One could imagine to convert this to a General Services Division, but CERN management had preferred to remain with DG Services with two main units (the first staff services, the second public relations oriented), each with its unit leader. Klapisch added that in his view it was a misconception to consider that staff in the DG Services was less defended than in the Divisions.

Taureg queried the necessity of the transfers which to a large extent were only a changing of name plates, without the prospect of higher productivity, but which had created bad feelings. Klapisch acknowledged this concern, but said that he believed that the ill feelings had decreased. Roche confirmed this, although in the beginning most of the staff concerned preferred no changes in the structure of the units, and quite a few remained unhappy.

Bartl wondered whether the services to the outside groups would improve. Klapisch believed that the restructuring would have a positive impact for the users, and he quoted as an example the small task force which formed the Direction of Research. Amongst the people assigned to this unit was a purchaser who should try to optimize cost effectiveness. Klapisch invited ACCU members to contact him with any suggestions in this area.

Fabjan and Siebert said that for the users the final decision on the scientific text processing unit, the printing shop and the photo service were of particular importance and asked ACCU to be consulted before further decisions were taken. Eggert remarked that the typing pool represented the best service which the users had; he expressed satisfaction concerning the presence of a purchaser in the Direction of Research.

The Chairman wondered whether TH Division was the best place for the library, much of the collection being related to experimental physics. Roche answered that there had been no change in the person in charge for the daily running of the library, whereas the acquisition policy was the domaine of the Library Committee (in which ACCU had a representative).

Roche said that CERN's external auditors had called for improvements in the administrative procedures leading to simplifications which would increase the cost effectiveness. In this context a Steering Committee on Administrative Informatics Policy (SCAIP) had been created under the Chairmanship of Butterworth with a mandate to look into both the hardware/software side and the procedures side in order to avoid dispersion of effort and proliferation and duplication of data bases. As a first result it seemed possible for EP Division to suppress a third of its paperwork by using the new personnel system.

ACCU took note of the information concerning the restructuring of the administrative services and recorded that there had been no time for cost effectiveness studies prior to the changes in structure. ACCU asked CERN management to be consulted before irreversible decisions were taken, in particular concerning the scientific text processing unit, the printing shop and the photo service.

b) Transport services

The Secretary said that he had been asked by Blair to communicate to the meeting that the Fire Service had agreed to maintain the existing

arrangements for transport services outside regular working hours.

Siebert wondered whether it would be possible to make transport to the airport and the railway station available outside normal working hours. Klapisch answered that CERN had no obligation to provide such a service, and he considered it a rather low priority within the present constraints. Carter insisted that the problem could be solved by sliding working hours of the drivers concerned.

Bartl remarked that time had come to consider transport arrangements to and from the LEP island sites.

c) Services charged to users

Klapisch reminded members that the level of the CERN budgets had made it necessary to charge an increasing number of services to users whose number had risen to 3500. He thought that time had come to define more carefully the concept of legitimate users which then should be followed by a discussion on the services which CERN would render to them. This would hopefully avoid measures to be taken piecemeal, like it had happened with EP stationery stores last year. Koulberg informed the meeting that EP Division had decided to offer again free of charge stationery to users, but only a limited number of small items.

Fabjan repeated that charging some kind of services to users created difficulties to them. Moreover he considered that some CERN support groups were discharging their financial responsibility onto the users; and he quoted as an example the installation of computer terminals in offices which was very expensive due to the price of the cable provided by DD. Taureg supported Fabjan on this point.

Eggert agreed that charging long telephone calls to users had had an educative effect, but that measures like closing stationery stores had only lead to a proliferation of private ones. He objected to charging users for storage space and radio-receivers ("beeps"). The last item was an important means of communication between the users and CERN staff; and there were legal difficulties for some universities to pay for them. Moreover, he experienced the details of the implementation of the charging procedure decided by EP Division as unfair. Koulberg said that 50 out of 200 receivers had been returned since the introduction of charging.

It was agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting, particularly concerning the suggestion of Klapisch to obtain a more precise definition of the word "user".

6. CERN budgets

Klapisch gave information regarding the CERN budget situation. The estimates for the total cost of the LEP project were now some 104 MSF higher (in 1986 prices) than the original budget. This had to be absorbed in the four years still remaining in the LEP financing period which meant an extra expenditure of 26 MSF per year. The total shortfall was comparable to the integral loss incurred because CERN had not, in the past years, been granted the calculated cost variation index on its budget. Recognizing these difficulties, the CERN Council had agreed to grant in 1986 a materials index higher by 1% than the calculated one. This meant some 7 MSF. Taking further into account some non-recurring incomes, there still remained a shortfall of some 15 MSF. The only way to absorb this was to cut by 15% the operating budget of the Organisation. The consequences of specific measures were presently studied and a decision was to be taken by the 15th of March.

Turning to specific Research Divisions, Klapisch remarked that for DD, a cut of 15% would have the inescapable consequence of reducing the CERN computing power in the years 87/88. For EP, the effective cut might well be much higher than 15% if supplementary allowances given in 1985 for LEP experiments and for UA1 were not confirmed in 86. Even a cut of 15% was a very serious matter and one was studying how to effect these cuts with the least damage to the scientific programme. Among specific targets for economies were travel money and minor building works. Regarding the spending allocations of research groups proper, it might be necessary in the future to define a core operating budget for each group (taking into account factors such as the number of personnel involved, the capital invested in the experiment and the number of operating hours). The core operating budget would commit no more than a fraction (maybe a half) of the divisional operating budget, the remainder being available for projects to be allocated according to priorities to be defined.

Klapisch remarked that the accelerator Divisions would also suffer cuts, not just the research Divisions.

He concluded that the situation was extremely difficult and called for delays of various plans by one or two years. This was a situation which had already happened in Member State institutes over the last few years. Although it would effect scientific life, he saw no reason for panic.

Niebergall asked if further reductions of the EP operating budget after 1986 were foreseen. Klapisch answered that the cuts introduced this year would remain, but that no additional restrictions were envisaged in the present boundary conditions. Niebergall wondered why measures had not been taken earlier. Klapisch explained that in the beginning of the LEP project there had been pleasant financial surprises which had lead Member States to believe that the project could succeed with less funds than foreseen. Niebergall asked whether the savings would be equally distributed over the experiments. Klapisch said that a uniform cut was not foreseen, and referred to the idea of a core allocation plus projectization which would take care of priorities. Solutions as stopping all physics for one year should be avoided, he said.

Eggert underlined that the financial problems of CERN were in parallel with those of the Member State institutes and considered that positive action was necessary to convince the Member State authorities to keep the budgets for particle physics at a reasonable level. Klapisch said that following the discussion on the British Kendrew Report CERN Council would consider on 19 February a proposal to set up a Review Committee consisting of 6 or 7 high level personalities who would in a year's time report on the aims and means of the Organization after 1990.

Bartl said that he was convinced that it would be very hard to obtain extra money for CERN in future years. The Chairman wondered whether savings on the electricity bill would be achieved through an increase in the number of critical days. Klapisch said that there was no intention for such a measure, but that rather the shares of French and Swiss electricity were discussed.

Fabjan, supported by Jenni and Taureg, said that it was not plausible that EP Division would take a cut twice as large as for other Divisions, and expressed the opinion that the cut of 4 MSF would have a devastating effect on the experimental programme.

ACCU took note that in order to finish LEP construction as planned, the operations budgets of the Divisions would have to be reduced. ACCU expressed concern that the large reduction of the EP budget would affect the

experimental programme of the Laboratory.

7. Public relations at CERN

Hentsch said that CERN was in a position where it had to do public relations for the particle physics community at large. For that, a yearly budget of less than 0,5 MSF was available, from which daily dealings with the media, publications and the programme of Saturday visits had to be paid. The latter had a budget of 120 kSF per year and attracted 17000 (out of 22000 in total) visitors which implied that for each Saturday visitor 7 SF was spent. Hentsch observed that presentation to the general public was largely done by non-physicists : out of the 120 CERN guides only 20 were physicists, the remainder technicians. Hence, the very reason for his presentation to the meeting was to explore ways of increasing the contribution of physicists in CERN's public relations effort.

Hentsch asked members to help in the following areas :

- finding physicists who volunteer to make a general presentation on CERN and particle physics to the public, during the week and on Saturdays
- offering constructive criticism on CERN's publications for the public
- reporting on reactions of the public on the Saturday visits
- building-up visit circuit at CERN by improving presentation of own experiment to the public
- getting (ex-)physicists interested in public relations function
- active participation of physicists in CERN's open days.

Moreover he asked for comments on the idea of creating a Visit Centre where, before a visit to the site, particle physics would be made intelligible to the laymen by way of a largely self-guided audio-visual tour.

The Chairman considered that the last open day had seen a good participation of physicists. Hentsch agreed. Eggert pointed out that a non-negligible amount of work was already done by physicists in the context of their experiments. He wondered whether anything was to be gained from a visits centre which he feared would be less lively than showing people around. Hentsch remarked that the centre would not replace the visits but would get the public prepared. Anyway CERN was not a very exciting place on a Saturday afternoon. Siebert asked what the cost of a visit centre would be. Hentsch answered that 1 - 2 MSF in total would be needed over a 3 year period.

Eggert wondered which efforts CERN was making towards presenting itself in the various Member States. Hentsch explained that in 1985 there had been a budget of 60 kSF for off-site exhibitions which had made it possible to organize three exhibitions. Eggert, supported by Lillethun, urged CERN to continue and possibly increase its efforts in this area.

Niebergall asked whether there existed mechanisms at CERN to react on publications in the media. Hentsch answered that each case was handled individually, whenever feasible. But the longterm answer to the problem was a steady flow of good basic information.

ACCU agreed to help increasing the commitment of the scientific community to

CERN's public relations effort. ACCU underlined the importance of CERN exhibitions in the Member States.

8. Urgent store request

Michele Ferro-Luzzi explained that up to now some 120 persons in EP Division had the signature rights for drawing items from the stores through urgent store requests, and that this number has led to external criticism as being too high. Hence, the management of EP Division was considering a new procedure which would leave the rules unchanged but would bring down to about a dozen the number of people authorized to sign these requests. It was intended to choose administrative officials occupying an office in geographical locations where the offices of physicists were concentrated. Ferro-Luzzi said that the change in system was not due to elements like honesty or behaviour of the users nor to the volume of urgent requests. He considered the present number of about 1200 requests per month reasonable, although the stores claimed that they could only cope with 1000 requests unless staff was moved from the standard queue to the special one. The new procedure would not necessarily make life easier for the users, although Ferro-Luzzi considered it to be an advantage that one could obtain the necessary signature always at the same place. He added that it was intended to introduce the new procedure in one or two months' time.

Eggert said that apart from failing to understand the advantages of the new procedure, he objected to the idea that a physicist would have to have the request signed by a member of the EP administrative staff who could not be in a position to judge the need and justification of the request. In his opinion the present system was working correctly, and he wished to remain with the existing system. His remarks were explicitly supported by Fabjan, Jenni, Boggild, Lillethun, and the Chairman. Jenni, supported by the Chairman, added that, if really necessary, other ways of reducing the number of persons with the relevant signature right should be investigated. Eggert remarked that to his knowledge there did not exist an imbalance between the number of persons in EP Division authorized to sign compared to the rest of CERN.

ACCU urged that the existing procedure for signature rights for urgent store requests in EP Division remained unchanged and asked the Chairman to contact Blair on this subject.

9. Any other business

Mouthuy said that checks by the guards in the evening had provoked long queues of cars which wanted to leave the site. ACCU decided to delay a discussion until it became clear whether this was due to a change in policy of the Organization or had been an accidental event.

10. Items for agenda of next meeting

The Chairman asked whether there were any subjects which members wished to be discussed, in addition to those already decided and the item "Coordination of dates of large collaboration meetings" on the present agenda which could not be discussed because of lack of time. Bos said that he wished to have a discussion on the availability of workshop facilities for technicians from outside institutes. It was agreed to make this an item for the agenda of the next meeting.

11. Date of next meeting

The date and time of the next meeting was fixed on Monday 7 July at 02.00 p.m. sharp.

G.J. Bossen

MEMBERSHIP OF ACCU 1986/87I. USERS

<u>AUSTRIA</u>	W. Bartl	(replaces G. Leder)
<u>BELGIUM</u>	T. Mouthuy	(no change, appointed until 31.12.86)
<u>DENMARK</u>	H. Boggild	(replaces G. Damgaard)
<u>GERMANY</u>	K. Eggert H. Siebert	(replaces K. Kleinknecht) (no change)
<u>FRANCE</u>	G. Sauvage H. Zaccone	(replaces J. Feltesse; Chairman) (replaces M. Boratav)
<u>GREECE</u>	C. Kourkoumelis	(no change)
<u>ITALY</u>	V. Gracco vacant	(no change) (replaces F. Bradamante)
<u>NETHERLANDS</u>	K. Bos	(no change)
<u>NORWAY</u>	E. Lillethun	(replaces A. Klovning)
<u>PORTUGAL</u>	vacant	
<u>SPAIN</u>	E. Higon-Rodriguez	(no change)
<u>SWEDEN</u>	A. Hallgren	(no change, appointed until 31.12.86)
<u>SWITZERLAND</u>	M. Werlen	(no change)
<u>UNITED KINGDOM</u>	M. Albrow J. Carter	(no change) (replaces D. Websdale)
<u>CERN</u>	C. Fabjan P. Jenni	(no change) (replaces H. Taureg)

II. CERN

Directorate	R. Klapisch
EP Division	W. Blair
PE Division	G.J. Bossen (Secretary)

III. CERN Staff Association

F. Niebergall (deputy P. Baillon)

COMMUNICATIONS
OFFICIELLES

OFFICIAL
NEWS

**SUMMARY OF THE 25th MEETING OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CERN USERS
held on 18 February 1986**

Restructuring

ACCU took note of a presentation concerning the restructuring of some administrative services, and asked to be consulted before irreversible decisions were taken.

CERN budgets

ACCU was informed that in order to finish LEP construction as planned, the operations budgets of the Divisions have to be reduced. ACCU expressed concern that the large reduction of the EP budget would affect the experimental programme of the Laboratory.

Public relations

ACCU was asked to help increasing the commitment of the scientific community to CERN's public relations effort. ACCU underlined the importance of CERN exhibitions in the Member States.

Urgent store requests

ACCU urges that the existing procedure for signature rights for urgent store requests in EP Division remains unchanged.

