MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2007 AT THE RUTHERFORD APPLETON LABORATORY

Council Members present: Peter Warry (Chairman)
                           Keith Mason (CEO)
                           Keith Burnett
                           Marshall Davies
                           Mike Edmunds
                           Philip Greenish
                           Philip Kaziewicz
                           Anneila Sargent (by video link)
                           Richard Wade
                           Colin Whitehouse

Office of Science and Innovation: Paul Williams

In Attendance: Tim Bestwick (for Item 2)
                Jeff Down
                Paul Hartley
                Jim Sadlier
                Andrew Taylor
                Chris Thompson (Council Secretary)
                John Womersley (for Item 4)
                Ruth Jeans (Minute Secretary)

ITEM 1: MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING HELD ON 24 APRIL 2007
       STFC(2007)29

1.1 The minutes were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting, and were signed by the Chairman.

1.2 It was agreed that a summary of the Council awayday would be circulated to members. Action: Secretariat

ITEM 2: ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING
       STFC(2007)30

2.1 (Action 3 - International Advisory Committee): A revised paper outlining the proposal to establish an International Advisory Committee was presented by Richard Wade. This Committee would be mandated to advise Council on the international competitiveness of STFC’s science and technology programme and carry out assessments specifically requested by Council.
2.1.1 Council agreed that the first meeting should take place in one year’s time, with following meetings being decided by Council on an adhoc basis when advice was required. These decisions should be reflected in the Terms of Reference.

   **Action:** R Wade

2.2 **CLIK:** Following discussion at the Council Awayday, Tim Bestwick had been invited to present an outline plan on the future of CLIK. Tim Bestwick explained that it was proposed to form a new company to replace CLIK, (*Campus Innovation Ltd*) to provide venture capital, venture services and IP management, as well as building on the commercial activities currently undertaken by CLIK.

2.2.1 Council agreed that this was an attractive proposal in principle. However there was concern that the level of funding proposed was insufficient to deliver the planned initiatives. Council also noted the difficulty in calculating an exact value for CLIK’s IP. Tim Bestwick pointed out that the investment figure of £6M was the funding required for the first “pump-priming” phase. Substantial funding would be required (up to £40M) for the following phases, which could be raised from sources other than government.

2.2.2 A more comprehensive proposal was required before Council could endorse the plans. It was agreed that the proposal should be developed, (with financial input from Jeff Down), and submitted to the CLIK Board for its approval before being presented to Council at its meeting on 25 July.

   **Action:** T Bestwick
   / J Down

2.2.3 Paul Williams also advised the Executive that OSI should be informed of the detailed proposal as early as possible in the planning stage.  **Action:** T Bestwick

2.3 **(Action 7- Commercial Fund):** Paul Williams confirmed that the STFC was free to submit a proposal to OSI for the creation of a commercial fund at any stage.

2.4 Actions 2; 10; 11; 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; and 20 had been completed and noted by Council.

2.5 Actions 4; 5; 6; 8; and 12 were still outstanding, and would be addressed at a future meeting.

**ITEM 3: COUNCIL’S OBJECTIVES**

3.1 Jim Sadlier presented a set of objectives distilled from discussion at the Council’s recent awayday.

3.2 Council noted the paper, but agreed that a shorter, more focussed set of SMART objectives was now required, to demonstrate connectivity with other sets of STFC deliverables and including more detail on how these objectives would be met.

3.3 Council requested that the objectives should be developed accordingly, (seeking expert advice on cross-sector issues where appropriate), and re-submitted to
Council in four to six months time. This revised document would act as the primary set of objectives which other sets of deliverables would be based on.  

**Action: J Sadlier**

3.4 The Chairman had also prepared a summary “mission statement” which he agreed to circulate to members for their information.  

**Action: Secretariat**

**ITEM 4: LARGE FACILITIES ROADMAP**  

4.1 John Womersley, (Director, Science Strategy), gave an oral update on the status of the OSI Large Facilities Roadmap and the criteria used to select STFC’s “long” list of 20 priority projects from the 74 projects included in the Roadmap.

4.2 John Womersley pointed out that within the 74 projects, a number did not meet the criteria for funding from the Large Facilities Capital Fund, but were included for “completeness”. Space projects had not been included on the Roadmap as they were not treated as capital projects. Also a number of projects had been incorporated in other roadmaps (e.g. ESFRI Roadmap), but were not necessarily priorities for UK science.

4.3 John Womersley also reported on the Large Facility Capital Fund prioritisation process, its timeline and its link to the Roadmap projects. Council noted that if a project had not been included on the Roadmap, it was unlikely to get funding from the Large Facility Capital Fund. It was also noted that HM Treasury had permitted OSI to proceed with forward planning for the next CSR period, but funding would not be available until 2010 onwards.

4.4 J Womersley went on to outline the work plan being prepared for the newly appointed Science Board. Council agreed that it would be advantageous for the Chairman of the Board Sir Peter Knight, and his deputy to attend the July Council meeting, to discuss progress in identifying the priorities.  

**Action: Secretariat**

4.5 Council agreed that details of the process for populating the Roadmap and STFC’s plan for involvement should be placed on the STFC website at an appropriate time. However, careful thought must be given to the most suitable way of informing the science communities of the criteria used to decide on the priority projects, and be able to demonstrate how these projects were consistent with STFC’s objectives.  

**Action: J Womersley**

4.6 Andrew Taylor added that matters relating to the European Spallation Source were in hand, and agreed to circulate more detailed information to members.  

**Action: A Taylor**

**ITEM 5: CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S REPORT**  

**ESA Centre**

5.1 Keith Mason updated Council on the negotiations taking place to establish an ESA Centre on the Harwell Science and Innovation Campus. He stressed the importance of having an ESA presence in the UK, and outlined the advantages and scope of the
KE-related activities proposed for the Centre. If negotiations were successful, he was confident that the Centre would prove to be a vital part of the integral plan for the Harwell Campus, and would provide a key opportunity to kick start the Campus project. Keith Mason also believed that this would be an opportunity for the UK to develop new capabilities, as well as committing to existing ESA programmes.

5.2 He outlined the activities being considered, most of which had a significant Knowledge Exchange context. These included:

**STFC Space Exploration programmes:**
- advanced robotics R&D; advanced power sources; sample curation; expertise in planetary protection.

**Advanced Applications:**
- climate change & monitoring; integrating data from ESA with ground-based capabilities;
- New space-based capabilities with potential commercial applications.

5.3 A working group had been set up to examine the scope of the initiative and it would be submitting recommendations to OSI and ESA in the near future for agreement on what could be implemented. Negotiations had so far gone very well, the prospects were very exciting and Keith Mason was confident that the Centre would pay for itself - if the right decisions were taken. Issues that may need to be addressed included resistance from other ESA member states and facilities.

5.4 Council questioned the funding implications for STFC. Keith Mason stated that one option was for STFC to provide the land and the infrastructure, and ESA to provide the capital items. However to be successful, the UK would need to demonstrate its commitment by increasing its contribution to the Global Monitoring for Environment and Security programme (GMES), in addition to providing ongoing support for the climate programme and maintaining the UK share in the ESA Exploration programmes (ExoMars). So far, there was an independent CSR bid from BNSC for a space technology centre to be located on the Campus, and STFC had included a space exploration bid in its CSR submission.

**Exploration**

5.5 Keith Mason went on to report on recent developments and some fundamental changes affecting the ESA ExoMars project, which could result in a significant increase on the original estimates. A number of options to keep costs down were being explored, and a decision would be expected by the end of the year.

**ITEM 6: DIAMOND BOARD REPORT**

6.1 Richard Wade reported that he had been invited by Gert Materlik to attend a recent Diamond Board and a meeting of the DLS Remuneration Committee as an observer, before taking his place as a member of the Board.
6.2 Council discussed his observations, and agreed that now that the Diamond project was entering the operational phase it was even more essential to develop closer and more constructive interactions with the Diamond Board and Wellcome Trust. Council also agreed that a Diamond report should be presented at each Council meeting as part of the Science Programme report.  

**Action: R Wade**

**ITEM 7: FINANCE REPORT**

7.1 Council noted the Finance paper. Council also noted that the final PPARC and CCLRC Annual Accounts for 2006-07 would shortly be approved. Although PPARC Council would then cease to exist, CCLRC would continue as a “shell” entity for a further two years. OSI would make a decision shortly as to the CCLRC composition of Council during this period.  

**Action: P Williams**

**ITEM 8: BUSINESS RISK AND CONTINUITY**

8.1 Jim Sadlier reported that the STFC Delivery Plan would be finalised by the end of June. The Quarter 1 Scorecard Report would be available shortly after, and the documents would be circulated to Council members by 6 July.  

**Action: J Sadlier**

**ITEM 9: CSR 2007 – DRAFT DELIVERY PLAN**

9.1 Keith Mason reported that each Research Council had been asked to prepare a draft plan setting out its ambitions for the CSR 2007 period, focussing on the programme that could be delivered against four financial planning scenarios. (This was set against the likelihood of limited funding being available, once 80% Full Economic Costs and the Cooksey recommendations had been taken into consideration).

9.2 Keith Mason pointed out that in order to deliver a full programme of new priority initiatives as well as existing commitments, STFC would require an uplift of 17%. Council noted the work in progress to produce the STFC Delivery Plan, and the assessment of the impact against each scenario.

9.3 Paul Williams suggested that an approach to scenario planning would be to focus on one scenario, and explain what STFC would deliver across the whole programme. The document submitted to OSI should be explicit about which activities would be lost from, or added to the ‘core scenario’ in the other cases.

9.4 Council recognising that there would be the need for rigorous prioritisation. It also accepted that STFC would have to make some difficult decisions and stressed the importance of handling the outcome of the CSR very sensitively.

**ITEM 10: DIRECTORATE REPORTS**

10.1 Council noted the progress reports presented.
10.2 Chairman specifically asked for a short report from the Facilities Development and Operations Directorate on the latest scientific developments e.g. European Spallation Source and Hydrogen Fuel Cells.

10.3 Colin Whitehouse gave a brief update on the KE Directorate. He reported that the HSIC ITN process was progressing well, although one of the project partners from one of the bidding teams had withdrawn.

ITEM 11: DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

11.1 The dates of the 2007 Council meetings were noted, and the Secretariat was asked to arrange dates for 2008 which should include one meeting at the Daresbury Laboratory and one at a key university. **Action: Secretariat**

11.2 It was also agreed that short science presentations should be included on Council agendas, starting in 2008. **Action: Secretariat**

ITEM 12: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 New Advisory Committees: Phil Kaziewicz pointed out that although he had been invited to be a member of the Economic Impact Advisory Board and the Council Group for the Harwell Science & Innovation Campus, he had so far not received any information on them. He asked for details to be provided as soon as possible. **Action: C Whitehouse**

12.2 Council papers: The Chairman informed the Executive that he wished to have Council papers distributed to members at least 3 working days before Council meetings. Any papers received later than 3 days would not be included in the agenda. **Action: Secretariat**

12.3 Publicity issues: Following recent press articles, members pointed out the importance of being kept informed of any relevant publicity issues, and asked for guidance on how they should react to requests for comments if approached by the press. It was agreed that the Executive would ensure that Council was notified of any relevant issues that arose, and would provide advice on the line to adopt. However it was recommended that where possible, any approach from the press should be directed to the Press Office, Keith Mason or to OSI.