

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting will be held on 18 February at 3 p.m. in the Director's Conference Room, Building R 1, Rutherford Laboratory.

AGENDA

1. Minutes of the previous meeting. JLPEC/M1
2. Matters arising.
3. Report on tender exercises JLPE - EC2
 - (i) glass laser systems
 - (ii) diagnostics and experimental equipment
4. Mechanisms for project control.
5. Staffing policy and procedures.
6. Any other business.

12 February 1975

David Baugh

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 18 February 1975

Present: Dr W M Lomer - Chairman
 Dr L C Hobbis - Vice Chairman
 Mr J Jenkins
 Mr M Smith
 Dr C Whitehead
 Dr P R Williams
 Mr J T Wright
 Mr M H Woods)
 Dr D J Baugh) Secretariat

ACTION

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (JLPEC/M1)

The references in paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 to the DTI and Department of Trade and Industry were corrected to read D of I and Department of Industry respectively. Apart from this the minutes were accepted as a correct record.

2. MATTERS ARISING

2.1 Dr Lomer reported that J Major of the D of I had been consulted informally about the tendering proposals for the medium and high power lasers. After discussion it was agreed that the tenders should be issued with the closing dates as presently envisaged and that concurrently the appropriate documentation with a covering statement on the single tender action should be sent to the D of I.

PRW &
 CW

2.2 Dr Williams and Dr Whitehead brought the Committee's attention to the specifications (JLP-EC2) revised as a result of the previous meeting (JLPEC/M1) paragraphs 2.2-2.4). In addition to these revisions the statement about contrast had been removed. To include it might inject a development programme into what was essentially a turnkey contract. Professor Bradley, however, held the very strong view that reference to contrast should be made. It was agreed that in a preamble it should be stated that contrast was an important feature, that contrasts of the order 10^{-5} were desired, but that no reference should be made in the specifications themselves. It was also agreed that the preamble should invite manufacturers to comment on how they would achieve an acceptable contrast.

PRW &
 CW

2.3 Dr Whitehead reported that as a result of the CILAS visit, he and Dr Williams still believed that CILAS could not meet specifications 2 and 3 adequately and that single tender action with GE was still justified. There had been little or no advance in CILAS disc technology since last October, however, CILAS had been awarded a French Government development contract, and it was thought that given the opportunity would probably tender. It was agreed that CILAS should be informed immediately by letter that

- (i) the tender documents would be sent out shortly
- (ii) the project management believed that they could meet specification 1
- (iii) the project management believed they would be unlikely to meet specifications 2 and 3 or an acceptable timescale and suggesting, therefore, that they might not wish to tender for 2 and 3.

on

2.4 Dr Williams reported that Professor Bradley was in general terms happy with the specifications but would like Dr Key to see them. This was agreed.

PW

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CW

It was also agreed that the relevant staff at Culham should be asked to comment. It was agreed that if possible comments from Dr Key and Culham should be obtained within a week and if possible the tenders should be sent out by 25 February.

PRW &
CW

3 REPORT ON TENDER EXERCISE - DIAGNOSTIC AND EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT (JLP-EC2)

3.1 Dr Williams presented the paper, a provisional list of experimental and diagnostic equipment identified by the working party of the SRC Steering Committee. The total estimated price of this equipment was £450,000. Tender action had been initiated on items totalling about £250,000. Firm quotations had been received for items totalling £120,000. Mr Wright pointed out that the breakdown of estimated cost against subheads appeared to be in some respects different from that given in the paper approved by the AEA RGMB. It was pointed out that the list gave no timescale. However, it was agreed that care must be taken and that once Treasury approval had been obtained the boundary conditions for such matters should be examined.

PRW &
CW

3.2 The committee noted the progress made on the provisional list and asked Dr Williams and Dr Whitehead to identify those items, consistent with technical and financial boundary conditions for the first year to enable early action to be taken once approval was given. Dr Whitehead was asked to consult Culham on these matters.

4 MECHANISMS FOR PROJECT CONTROL

4.1 Dr Lomer opened the discussion. He considered that once approval had been given it would be desirable to keep the project as free running as possible. Since the approval by AEA committees would be given against a specified breakdown of expenditure heads, specific authorisation of spend would normally be given by the project manager. Also the majority of the spent would be in the two large laser contracts. Since initially most of the purchases would go through AERE contracts branch there would be considerable advantage in avoiding duplication and the need for financial co-ordination by using one financial system and keeping one set of (AERE) books (available to all levels of SRC project management). If this was agreed, then the control below Management Committee level came down to deciding the level of signing power of the project staff.

spend

4.2 Normal AERE practice is for the project officer to be able to sign to the limit authorised at the time management approved the project. The project officer is required to consult a project committee if any variation of the scheme as approved is proposed. He may in any case wish to consult a project committee for advice as circumstances demand. However, once approval of a clearly specified project has been given he may strictly speaking have full formal authority to sign up to the limit of funds approved, usually including contingency.

4.3 Dr Hobbs commented that this system was much looser in that it relied more heavily on the details of the initial approval than that operated by the R. L. Hitherto major approved schemes were controlled by a management committee which advised the Director on expenditure above his normal delegation. An important function was to keep the Director informed. Typical membership would be, the Director, a deputy with his full delegated authority in his absence, the project manager, the project officer, representatives from Laboratory finance and administration, user representatives, UKAEA contracts representative, representatives from SRC London office finance and operating divisions.

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

of
Dr Hobbis thought that Dr Stafford would be willing to go to a higher level if delegation before such a management committee was consulted, but whether he would be willing or be allowed to go so far as the AEA system was at present uncertain.

4.4 Dr Lomer commented on the membership and function of the project management committee. The membership he thought was already too large and if duplicated by AEA 'opposite numbers' would be cumbersome. He questioned whether such a committee had a well defined function. He felt that once a clearly defined project had been approved that some small body should exist which could release all the funds. He considered that the present committee - the JLPEC was that body. Dr Hobbis pointed out that he envisaged that the detailed supervision of the capital projects would be carried by an executive sub committee (of the project management committee) whose membership duplicated that of the present meeting with in addition a university user representative.

WML

4.5 Dr Lomer said that he would write to Dr Stafford on these matters and report to the next meeting. Dr Hobbis commented that after considering the alternatives he was inclined to the solution of using a single (AERE) set of books, however, he would like to discuss further with Dr Stafford and report to the next meeting.

LCWH

5 STAFFING POLICY

PRW &
CW

5.1 It was agreed that the next step was for the two establishments to identify a list of names for the project, to look at where the gaps were and how they might be filled. Dr Williams and Dr Whitehead agreed to draw up such lists in preparation for discussion.

5.2 The committee noted for future discussion that the different pay and conditions for industrial employees at the two establishments could give rise to problems.

6 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

6.1 It was agreed that the next meeting should be held on Tuesday, 4 March, at 2 p.m. in the Directors Conference Room, R1, Rutherford Laboratory.

21 February

David Baugh

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Actions arising from a meeting on 18 February 1975

Name	Reference	Action
P R Williams C Whitehead	M2 item 2.1	Write covering statement on proposed tender action for transmission to D of I.
J T Wright M Smith	M2 item 2.1	Write to D of I to inform of proposed tender actions on glass lasers.
P R Williams C Whitehead	M2 item 2.2	Write preamble to the specifications stating the importance of contrast, etc., and inviting the manufacturers to comment on how they would achieve an acceptable contrast.
M Smith P R Williams C Whitehead	M2 item 2.3	Write letter to CILAS suggesting that they might not wish to tender against specifications 2 and 3.
P R Williams	M2 item 2.4	Send specifications 1, 2 and 3 to Dr Key. Contact him by telephone to get his reaction.
C Whitehead	M2 item 2.4	Consult Culham about the specifications 1, 2 and 3.
P R Williams C Whitehead M Smith	M2 item 2.4	Unless comments from Key and Culham etc require significant changes which require approval of the committee send out the tenders if possible by 25 February.
P R Williams C Whitehead	M2 item 3.2	Identify these items of experimental and diagnostic equipment consistent with the technical and financial boundary conditions for the first year. Dr Whitehead to liaise with Culham
W M Lomer	M2 item 4.5	Write to Dr Stafford about the mechanisms for project control.
L C W Hobbis	M2 item 4.5	Discuss the possibilities of using the AEA financial system for the day to day business of the project.
P R Williams C Whitehead	M2 item 5.1	Draw up lists of people from the RL and AERE to fill posts in the project.

21 February 1975

David Baugh