JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The next meeting will be held at 9.30 am† on Thursday 27 March 1975 in the East Wing Conference Room*, R1, Rutherford Laboratory.

AGENDA

1.	Minutes of the previous meeting	JLPEC/M3
2.	Matters arising except those on the agenda	Action Sheet
3.	Final Specifications and preamble	JLP-EC3
4.	Mechansims for project control	JLP-EC4
5.	Staffing policy	
6.	Any other business	

David Baugh

19 March 1975

* take lift or stairs to the top (2nd) floor of R1; turn right and continue to the far end of the corridor.

† Both AERE and RL start the Easter Break at 11.45 am. Buses leave the bus park at 11.55 am. The meeting will not go on beyond 11.30 am.

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 1975

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

ACTION

1 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (JLPEC/M3)

1.1 The minutes of the meeting of 4 March 1975 were approved, subject to the substitution of A.F. Shephard for J.T. Wright under Action for paragraph 2.1 and the substitution in the last line of para 4.1 of "could" for "would".

2 MATTERS ARISING

CW/PRW 2.1 Drs. Williams and Whitehead said they would present a paper listing the equipment to be bought in the first year at the committee's next meeting.

EC7

2.2 Dr. Hobbis said that he, Dr. Williams, Dr. Whitehead and Mr. Ashby had visited Culham for discussions with the Astrophysics Research Division staff (Appleton Lab) whose diagnostic experience could be useful. Dr. Lomer said he had been to Culham for discussions with Dr. Pease who had agreed that Culham could accept one or two people for training under the guidance of e.g. Dr. N. Peacock. Dr. Lomer saw such an attachment as aiding both Culham and the JLP.

2.3 Mr. Smith reported that Mr. Shephard had been in touch with Mr. Major, D. of I., who had accepted the need to import both lasers from abroad and had not required copies of the tender documents. Mr. Major had also suggested that should there be problems in obtaining the small laser from commercial sources it might be worthwhile seeking a quotation from Culham Laboratory. The committee accepted Dr. Whitehead's view that the Culham apparatus, constructed for Culham experimental purposes, was not intended for use to the standards required by the JLP.

2.4 Dr. Hobbis reported that he had discussed with Mr. Bowles the problems of joint staffing in relation to industrial employees. Mr. Bowles agreed that an attempt should be made to seek Trade Union acceptance that industrials from both laboratories should work side by side in spite of different conditions of service, although it would be important to wait for an opportune moment for discussions. Dr. Lomer agreed with this approach and he and Dr. Hobbis undertook to suggest to Mr. Bowles and Mr. Fenning that they should discuss the timing of TU discussions with their respective Labour Managers. The Secretary was asked to keep the subject on future agendas until

WML
LCWH

Secretary

ACTION it had proved possible to reach a conclusion.

3 MECHANISMS FOR PROJECT CONTROL (JLP-EC4)

3.1 The committee had before them a note by Dr. Lomer comparing the levels of financial delegation within the Rutherford and Harwell Laboratories.

3.2 Dr. Hobbis reported that before receiving Dr. Lomer's note he had discussed RL financial delegations with Dr. Stafford and with Mr. Miller on the basis set out in paragraph 3.2 of the minutes of the committee's previous meeting. As a result the Rutherford Laboratory would propose that expenditure up to £25K would be authorised by the Project Leader, subject to the item falling within the overall project definition approved by the Management Committee, and that following a minuted decision of the Management Committee the Project Leader would authorise expenditure in excess of £25K. The committee was pleased to note this development.

3.3 Mr. Jenkins said he and Mr. Wright had reached agreement on a broad front on joint accounting arrangements although there were certain matters outstanding which would be discussed further between Finance Branches.

3.4 The committee noted that in practice it was likely that exactly equal staff and capital contributions from the two organisations would not be possible and that some cash transactions would be needed to resolve inequalities. A definition of equal contributions was therefore needed and Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Wright were invited to include it in a draft letter of intent for consideration by the committee. An Exchange of Agreements would follow later which might be subject to DES, DOE and MOD examination.

JJ/JTW

3.5 Mr. Wright said that any Agreement should define a procedure for the disposal of assets at the end of the Joint Project. He thought that as a general rule the party not seeking termination should have priority to acquire the assets if so desired, using a valuation basis still to be agreed. He proposed that if neither party wished to acquire the assets the new building should remain the property of the UKAEA (on paying the SRC 50% of the Treasury valuation) and that other assets should be disposed of on the open market with receipts being shared equally. The committee endorsed these proposals provisionally, subject to the reservation that it need not be essential for the SRC to surrender its interest in the new building at the end of the JLP as it was conceivable that it would be suitable for another SRC purpose.

4 STAFFING OF LASER PROJECT 1975/76 (JLP-EC5)

4.1 The committee briefly considered a paper setting out details of the 31 posts planned to exist within the Project by April 1976. Dr. Williams said that in drawing up the paper he and Dr. Whitehead had listed posts on a functional rather than a grade basis. No names had been included and posts had been marked to show whether the holder was in post (P), nominated (N) or still required (R). It had been informally agreed that Dr. Whitehead would concentrate on the Scientific and Dr. Williams on the Engineering Programmes but there would

ACTION no rigid barrier between them.

4.2 Dr. Lomer observed that for AERE nomination of individuals could only begin formally when the project had been officially approved; at that stage staff would have to be prised away from other projects. Dr. Hobbis said that this was also true for the RL. It was agreed that the paper provided a good framework for discussion at the committee's next meeting when it was hoped to identify more staff in the N category.

4.3 Dr. Hobbis drew the committee's attention to the possibility that university colleagues not at present in close contact with the project might gain the impression that staffing was being planned without consulting the universities: it was not intended to ignore their interests and members were asked to avoid giving a contrary impression to anyone.

5 FINAL SPECIFICATION AND PREAMBLE; INVITATIONS TO TENDER (JLP-EC3)

5.1 Dr. Whitehead confirmed that a sentence had been added to the specification preamble seeking information from manufacturers on beam coherence, intensity, uniformity and switching times.

5.2 The committee noted the content of the final versions of the specification for the glass laser systems as set out in JLP-EC3.

5.3 Mr. Smith reported that the tender invitation had been issued: the closing date was 15 April 1975. The committee noted that CILAS had asked to be given an opportunity to tender for both lasers and that GE had stated their intention to present their tenders by hand and to keep a team in the country for about 5 days for associated discussions.

5.4 The committee felt it was undesirable to accept the pressure which could result from the presence of a GE team while this tender was being considered and decided (a) to extend the closing date for the receipt of tenders to 22 April (giving GE the option of sending their tender to Dr. Gaunt in Washington by the same date if they were concerned over possible delays in the normal postal systems), thus anticipating a request by CILAS for an extension and (b) to invite GE to send their team here for discussions during the week
MS beginning 12 May. Mr. Smith was invited to make the necessary arrangements, including contacting Dr. Gaunt.

5.5 Dr. Whitehead said that GE had put three questions to him which he had replied by telex after consulting Dr. Williams and Mr. Smith. His replies had been to confirm (a) that tenders should be sent to Harwell as agent for both the RL and AERE (b) that a Helium liquifier should not be costed within the tender and (c) that for the laser amplifier the matching hardware should not be included in the tender, although it could be specified separately if the Company wished.

6 NEXT MEETING

6.1 The committee agreed to meet next at the Rutherford Laboratory on

Wednesday 16 April at 9.30 a.m.

M H Woods

Directorate
AERE Harwell
Ext 2502

9 April 1975

JOINT LASER PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Actions arising from the meeting on 27 March 1975

Name	Reference	Action
C. Whitehead) P.R. Williams)	M4 item 2.1	Prepare list of equipment to be bought in the first year.
L.C.W. Hobbis) W.M. Lomer)	M4 item 2.4	Discuss timing of TU consultations with their respective senior managements.
Secretary	M4 item 2.4	Keep TU consultation as a continuing item until a conclusion was reached.
J. Jenkins) J.T. Wright)	M4 item 3.4	Prepare draft letter of intent. (financial control)