

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting held on 4 March 1975.

Present: Dr W.M. Lomer  
 Dr L.C.W. Hobbs  
 Mr J. Jenkins  
 Mr A.F. Shephard - for Mr Smith  
 Dr C. Whitehead  
 Dr P.R. Williams  
 Mr J.T. Wright  
 Mr M.H. Woods)  
 Mr D.J. Baugh)                      Secretariat

Mr M. Smith sent his apologies.

ACTION

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (JLPEC/M2)

The word 'if' was corrected to read 'of' in the second line of page 3. Apart from this the minutes were accepted as a correct record.

2. MATTERS ARISING

- 2.1 Mr Wright reported that a letter drafted with the help of Dr Whitehead and Dr Williams about the proposed glass laser tender actions had been sent to Mr Major, Department of Industry. The specifications had however not been ready. No reply has been received. It was agreed that copies of the tender documents should be sent to Mr Major, with a covering note.
- 2.2 Dr Whitehead reported that a preamble to the specifications for the glass lasers indicating the importance of contrast had been written.
- 2.3 Dr Williams reported that, having forwarded the glass laser specifications, he had been in touch with Dr Key by telephone. At that stage Dr Key had not been able to give a detailed criticism, but had not found major faults. Dr Key would be visiting for discussions with Quantel next week.
- 2.4 Dr Whitehead reported his and Dr William's reactions to comments on the glass laser specifications received by letter from Culham. The committee considered these comments and as a result agreed that a further sentence should be included in the preamble seeking from the prospective manufacturers, information on the beam coherence, intensity, uniformity and switching times.
- 2.5 Dr Williams reported that Dr Bret, Director of Quantel and of Energetics, a company with no financial links, would be visiting on 12 March 1975. It was for straightforward commercial reasons, the size of the company, that Quantel would not be invited to tender for the high power laser (specifications 2 and 3). It was agreed that there was no need to write to Quantel along the lines of the letter to CILAS or to delay action as a result of the visit. CILAS had not replied (yet) to the letter which had indicated that unless a suitable response was forthcoming they would not be invited to tender for the high power systems.

JTW

CW

PRW CW  
MS  
SECRETARY

- 2.6 It was agreed that the specifications, having been seen and approved by Dr Lomer and Dr Hobbis, should be sent out with tender invitations by 7 March. The secretary was asked to include the final documents in the papers of the next meeting.
- 2.7 Dr Williams and Dr Whitehead reported that the action to identify experimental and diagnostic equipment had not been done. It was necessary to consult with the universities and Culham, and to widen this action to include in it the overall project definition.
- 2.8 Apart from the action retained on the action sheet other matters were taken on the agenda.

### 3. MECHANISMS FOR PROJECT CONTROL

- 3.1 Dr Lomer reported that Dr Stafford had agreed that one set of (AERE) project accountancy books should be kept. Regular returns would be fed to both the SRC and AERE project officers. Day to day project management and control would be the same for both SRC and AERE staff. However, from the point of view of the SRC financial control structure, because for instance the SRC and not the AERE is subject to VAT, there would be a problem of translation of the AERE returns. It was agreed that the Project Officers should not be concerned with these differences although the Rutherford Laboratory and AERE Finance Branches would need to ensure they were taken into account. Mr Jenkins agreed to discuss with Mr Wright the details of how the system might operate.
- 3.2 Dr Hobbis reported that a similar definitive position had not been reached on control of the capital projects. However, he believed that two significant moves from the present Rutherford Laboratory position would be possible. These were
  - (i) that £25K (at present £10K for the Rutherford Laboratory) should be the level of delegation above which a management committee would have to be consulted, and
  - (ii) that this level should be available not only to the Director, but should be exercised by the project officer with appropriate levels below that.

This he believed would be a workable and satisfactory system. The proposal met with the general satisfaction of the Committee. Dr Hobbis agreed to put this proposal to Dr Stafford and to report back to the next meeting.

- 3.3 Dr Lomer reported that he had also raised with Dr Stafford the levels of delegation for the operating budget. If a single set of AERE books were kept it would be desirable to reach a position where AERE and Rutherford Laboratory staff were on an entirely parallel basis, by operating an AERE type project with specified Rutherford Laboratory signatories. This would require small changes in the normal Rutherford Laboratory levels of delegation for these staff. Since initially most of the spend would be in the capital project this was not urgent. Dr Hobbis thought Dr Stafford would be willing to agree the required changes.

JJ &  
JW

.CWH

- 3.4 The committee went on to discuss what an equal financial involvement by the SRC and AEA might mean. Would items be purchased by a single party and assigned equally to both or would certain items be assigned to one or the other party? How would inventories, asset numbers be dealt with? On the capital side if AERE for security reasons must own the building and the major lasers how is the 50 - 50 involvement to be achieved? From questions like these the committee went on to raise the distinction between purchase and ownership, the legal implications and responsibilities (e.g. for safety), and how and by whom (the joint project or by one or other of the parties?) they would be exercised. What would happen on dissolution of the project? It was clear that many of these questions would need to be the subject of a formal 'Agreement' by the two parties. Dr Hobbis and Mr Wright were invited to look at these from the viewpoint of their respective organisations.

LCWH &  
JTW

#### 4. STAFFING POLICY

- 4.1 Dr Lomer reported that Mr F.W. Fenning, Deputy Director of AERE, felt that until the new building was available, the project should try to manage with a very small workshop component and to work back to the shops in the parent laboratories. While the project was housed in building 488 it would be unwise to staff with half and half, SRC, AERE industrials. Dr Whitehead and Dr Williams stated that the intention was not to have a production workshop as such. However, they felt it necessary for there to be a close support shop (both in 488 and the final building) where the project's craftsmen could go to make pieces before fitting them. Eventually there would be 10 men, 5 mechanical and 5 electrical, though in 488 the number would be less.

- 4.2 During the discussion a number of points were raised. These included
- (i) in 488 industrial manning entirely from AERE, possibly with industrials removed from the 'equal manning' considerations,
  - (ii) secondment from SRC to AEA,
  - (iii) mechanics from one, electricians from the other parent body,
  - (iv) continuity was important and craftsmen should not be changed when the Project moved into the new building ~~firm~~ B488.

Dr Hobbis reminded the committee of the present industrial dispute at the Rutherford Laboratory which was partly due to the use of contract labour. All the above points had serious difficulties. It was agreed that the eventual solution, which would ideally aim to draw craft effort from both the SRC and AERE, would have to be agreed with the Trade Unions. Dr Lomer agreed to have further discussions with Mr Fenning on these matters and of the involvement of the Trade Union side. Dr Hobbis agreed to do likewise in the Rutherford Laboratory.

WML &  
LCWH

- 4.3 Dr Hobbis reported that the Rutherford Laboratory Division Heads Committee had discussed the staffing of the Laser Project posts. Some of the possible candidates had been identified. Dr Williams and Dr Whitehead were asked to prepare a paper on the posts and staffing of the project.

PRW &  
CW

posts

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 5.1 It was agreed that the next meeting should be held on Tuesday 25 March at 2 p.m. in the Director's Conference Room, Rutherford Laboratory.

5 March 1975

David Baugh

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Actions arising from the meeting on 4 March 1975.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Action</u>
P.R. Williams C. Whitehead	M2 item 3.2	Prepare a draft project definition, in particular identify those items of experimental and diagnostic equipment consistent with the technical and financial boundary conditions for the first year. Dr Whitehead to liaise with Culham.
J.T. Wright	M3 item 2.1	Send copies of tender documents to Mr Major, Department of Industry, with a covering note.
C. Whitehead	M3 item 2.4	Include in the preamble to the glass laser specifications a sentence seeking information on beam coherence, intensity uniformity, switching times etc.
P.R. Williams C. Whitehead M. Smith	M3 item 2.6	Having shown the final versions of the specifications to WML and LCWH send out the tenders to the agreed firms by 7 March.
Secretary	M3 item 2.6	Include final specifications in papers of next meeting.
J. Jenkins	M3 item 3.1	Discuss the details of the system for a single set of financial books etc. with the AERE finance branch and AERE acceptance of Rutherford Laboratory signatures for purchases etc.
L.C.W. Hobbis	M3 item 3.2	Put proposals for control of the capital projects as detailed - paragraph 3.2 to Dr Stafford. Report to next meeting.
L.C.W. Hobbis J.T. Wright	M3 item 3.4	Discuss with respective Laboratory's administration the preparation of a formal agreement defining the responsibilities of the AEA and the SRC. In particular investigate the problems of ownership of assets, especially at dissolution of project.
W.M. Lomer L.C.W. Hobbis	M3 item 4.2	Discuss with appropriate colleagues the problems of the industrial staffing of the project, and the timing of consultation with the Trade Unions.
P.R. Williams C. Whitehead	M3 item 4.3	Prepare paper on staffing and posts of the project.

5 March 1975

David Baugh