MINUTES OF THE THIRTY EIGHTH MEETING HELD ON 25 JANUARY 2011 AT THE RUTHERFORD APPLETON LABORATORY

Council Members present: Michael Sterling (Chairman)
Gill Ball
Martin Barstow
Keith Burnett – by telecon
Marshall Davies
Philip Greenish
Mike Healy
Keith Mason
James Stirling

Dept Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS): Paul Williams

In Attendance: Tony Ryan (Chair, Science Board) – in part
Matt Griffin (Deputy Chair, Science Board)
Richard Wade (Chief Operating Officer)
Colin Whitehouse (Director, Campus Strategy)
Gordon Stewart (Director, Corporate Affairs & Executive Secretary to Council)
Jane Tirard (Director, Finance)
John Womersley (Director, Science Programmes)
Sharon Cosgrove (Director, Strategy)
Terry O’Connor (Director, Communications)
Mark Foster (Minutes Secretary)

Apologies: Philip Kaziewicz
Peter Knight
Will Whitehorn

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

1.1. Michael Sterling welcomed Council and attendees to the first Council meeting of 2011. The Chairman noted that Philip Kaziewicz, Peter Knight and Will Whitehorn had all passed on their apologies due to other commitments.

1.2. Attendees were reminded that they needed to complete, sign and return the form provided if they intended to use the RAL wireless access connection to the internet.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND REGISTER OF INTERESTS

2.1. The Chairman asked for any new conflicts that the members needed to declare since previous meetings. Keith Burnett’s status as a member of the UKAEA Board was noted given Agenda Item 10.
3. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – STFC(11)01**

3.1. *(minute 4.15): “guaranteed” to be replaced by “firm”.*

3.2. Subject to this amendment, the minutes were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting and were signed by the Chairman.

4. **ACTIONS AND MATTERS ARISING - STFC(2011)02**

4.1. Attendees were reminded that this was full business meeting and asked if there were any AOB items they wished to add to the agenda. See Item 17.

5. **FORWARD MEETING PLAN - STFC(2011)03**

5.1. Gordon Stewart described the proposal to move Business meetings of Council one month back in the planned schedule of meetings for the year to better align with Executive’s quarterly reporting cycles and thereby allow more timely reporting to Council to take place, especially with regard to finance.

5.2. It was explained that the transition should be straightforward, except that the 31 May meeting would be better timed to take place on 24 May.

5.3. The proposal was agreed and the schedule would be updated and circulated accordingly.

   **Action:** G. Stewart, Secretariat

6. **CSR UPDATE - (some references in this section have been redacted as referring to policy advice to government)**


6.1.1. Tony Ryan explained that Science Board had most recently met on 13 January and that this had been preceded in January by meetings of both PPAN and PALS. All these meetings included one agenda item in common, namely to address the open questions resulting from the known outcome of the 2010 CSR settlement.

6.1.2. In addition all groups had also considered the nature and structure of the current advisory bodies with a view to making efficiencies, and while agreeing that Science Board was a required body, and that some consolidation was desirable, proposals were continuing to be developed and were not being brought to Council at this time.

6.1.3. In overview, Tony noted that Science Board welcomed the recent announcement of the STFC budget for 2011/12 onwards.

6.1.4. He went on to detail the Science Board’s views with regard to: Universities and Technology in Universities; and ‘In-House’ STFC facilities. Science Board will continue to advise STFC on the ‘best balance’ of STFC facility and University based technology capability, and
this tended not to be a binary decision. However, in general, STFC facilities were the best place for building very large, sophisticated equipment given the concentration of expertise and staff.

6.1.5. Science Board noted to Council the excellent but potentially narrow scope of the planned Astronomy, Nuclear Physics and Particle Physics programmes and would continue to monitor the situation and look for opportunities to broaden their scope.

6.1.6. Science Board noted that the funding level proposed for the PRD programme was sufficient at the current time, although not large. This area was vital for ensuring that technical innovation in particle physics, nuclear physics and astronomy was not stifled.

6.1.7. Science Board welcomed the new fellowship scheme aimed at future leaders and suggested the possibility of a similar funding scheme for research being extended to new faculty hires with leadership potential. It was emphasised that the proposed name of this scheme should remain confidential until it was officially launched.

6.1.8. Science Board noted that STFC’s allocation of scarce capital resources should be carefully managed, particularly in the light of a similar squeeze in Universities. However, it was opposed to a minimum limit for small/medium items of research equipment (<£50k) within grants, but rather preferred that all equipment costs be justified on the basis of scientific need.

6.1.9. James Stirling asked if a £50k limit had been set. John Womersley reported that this was under discussion by an RCUK working group, but a fixed limit had yet to be finalised. Tony Ryan clarified that the type of equipment being specified by Science Board was along the lines of e.g. NMR machines, rather than e.g. print consumables.

6.1.10. Keith Mason noted that the area was one where tough decisions would be required, but the core guiding principle was an imperative to avoid increased duplication. Tony agreed with this position on behalf of Science Board.

6.1.11. Jane Tirard made it clear that any capital available was minimal and none was available for new commitments. Tony went on to describe the Science Board’s observations with regard to the UK Large Facilities, which in general had been the area that had taken up a larger part of the Science Board’s meeting on 13 January.

6.1.12. Tony emphasised that it was important to state that the opinion of the science community did not seem to be consistent with the recommendations that had been delivered by the RCUK Large Facilities working group. The STFC research communities had placed a higher scientific priority on development of ISIS than DLS in the 2009 prioritisation exercise, for example.

6.1.13. Marshall Davies asked whether this should be formally made clear to RCUK and RC colleagues. John Womersley clarified that Science Board was not observing that the recommendations of the Large Facilities
working group were wrong, but rather that they were at variance with the input STFC Science Board is receiving from its communities.

6.1.14. Whilst Science Board were disappointed with the proposed operational provision for ISIS, John noted that the Research Councils were continuing to work together towards improved operations in the longer term, with an important milestone being at the two year point before the new spending round in four years time. (See Agenda Item 7.)

6.1.15. With regard to ESRF, Science Board observed that the reduction in UK contribution from 14 to 10 per cent was a significant one. Whilst it recognised that this could be offset somewhat by the increased operation of DLS, there was some concern whether this would compensate ‘like with like’ for users, given the new beamlines that were currently planned for DLS. The community was keen to be free to submit proposals for time at ESRF without quotas, but rather be based on the beamlines most appropriate to each proposal, despite the reduced UK contribution.

6.1.16. Mike Healy reminded Council that Science Board had identified ESRF as one of its top priorities in 2009.

6.1.17. Tony Ryan noted that Council had recognised many of the issues that Science Board and John Womersley had raised, in particular the uniqueness of ISIS and the recommendation for rebalancing ESRF capabilities.

6.1.18.

6.1.19. Discussion returned to the report of Science Board. John Womersley noted the Science Board view that it was keen for STFC to ensure it was ‘playing to its strengths’ with regard to Futures, Collaborative R&D and Campus Centres and there was some concern, particularly within Universities, about the amount of input they had into these programmes. Tony Ryan noted that preparations for CSR10 had stressed the importance of the Science and Technology rather than Campus initiatives and related matters, although there was recognition that the latter had an important role to play in the wider process of competing for taxpayer funds.

6.1.20. James Stirling expressed some concern that the ‘Centres’ initiative was proliferating in scope, with recent papers suggesting as many as twelve in the pipeline, from an original base of six, and that there was a need to make decisions in the near term about which would actually progress.

6.1.21. Keith Mason observed that there was a need to better inform Science Board about these plans as there appeared to be a number of misunderstandings. It was agreed that a short paper and verbal report should be made to the next Science Board meeting. Keith Burnett emphasised the importance of this suggestion to ensure continued trust and understanding. Marshall Davies noted the importance of explaining the ‘why’ of these initiatives and their role in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the science programme, in addition to the ‘what’.

Action: K. Mason, C. Whitehouse
6.1.22. The Chairman stated that the item as a whole required a separate agenda item at a future Council meeting as soon as practicable.

**Action: G. Stewart, K. Mason**

6.1.23. Colin Whitehouse noted that there was a distinction to be made with respect to ‘TICs’ and ‘STFC Centres’. He further observed that the University sector had been increasingly promoting the need for collaborative working given their current financial pressures and such ways of working would become more prevalent. [Note: Tony Ryan had to leave at 3.00pm for another engagement, but was present for Item 6.2 below.]

6.1.24. Further discussion was held about the CSR outcome for ISIS and the future implications of the RCUK Facility Funding working group. This is summarised under Item 7.

6.2. **Vulcan 10PW Upgrade.** Michael Sterling noted that there was a major capital problem faced with regard to Vulcan 10PW Upgrade, and therefore a detailed discussion was held on this topic. The discussion is minuted separately from the Report from Science Board summarised under Item 6.1.

6.2.1. 

6.2.2. It was agreed that an integrated strategy with respect to lasers was needed to correctly align all significant projects. Tony Ryan noted that it was for Science Board to review and offer opinions on such a strategy at the Council’s March meeting. John Collier should be approached to develop this strategy.

**Action: Science Board/ T. Ryan /J. Collier**

6.2.3. Partly in this context, a discussion was held about the VAT liabilities of STFC now that the rate had increased to 20 per cent, and in particular the status of DLS as a separate limited company. Paul Williams noted that he had chaired a group considering this and other aspects of the DLS corporate vehicle and the group’s work had yet to be concluded.

6.2.4. Tony Ryan noted that the resource requirements created by duplication of administrative and other functions at DLS were potentially more severe than the reduction in capital that CSR had brought.

6.2.5. Phil Greenish called for an analysis of the potential savings and benefits from reduced duplication. John Womersley noted that he had undertaken a very preliminary analysis in the past which did suggest savings were available of the order of 10 per cent through rationalisation. Michael Sterling and Keith Mason called for a working group to be established to write a short paper for the next Council meeting built on the existing work carried out.

**Action: R. Wade / J. Tirard**

6.3. **Reaction to CSR Publication.** Keith Mason reported that reaction to the announcement of the CSR and Delivery Plan had so far been neutral to positive,
although a large number of audiences had been silent to date, in part because of the seasonal break.

6.3.1. Keith reported that he had appeared in front of the HC Science and Technology Select Committee on Wednesday 19 January along with three other RC CEOS: Alan Thorpe (NERC), David Delpy (EPSRC) and Rick Rylance (AHRC).

6.3.2. Terry O’Connor reporting that his soundings and monitoring of e.g. influential blogs, indicated generally positive reaction. Proactive consultation continued, however, with a presentation to the RAS Forum planned for Wednesday 26 January and engagement with the IoP at RAL the following week. Engagement with Universities and other learned societies, some in concert with EPSRC, were planned.

6.3.3. Terry noted that there were milestones in April and June that would be of particular relevance to ISIS and ESRF user groups.

6.3.4. Terry highlighted that the STFC Delivery Plan provided significant opportunity to develop public engagement with STFC’s science and its inspirational aspects and that this would be reflected in developing operational plans.

6.3.5. Martin Barstow reported that he understood that there was unhappiness about comments to the Select Committee about Northern Hemisphere ground based astronomy. Keith Mason noted that decisions about this were a consequence of the decision in 2001/01 to join ESO, and not a result of CSR10. This was agreed.

6.3.6. In this context, Keith Burnett observed that in general there was a likelihood that the ‘aftershocks’ of the decisions made and published in the Delivery Plan would begin to filter through to different communities at different speeds. Their recollection of the process that they had been through would fade in contrast to their local concerns. Therefore Terry and his team had a significant and important ongoing challenge.

6.4. Implementation Plan Progress - STFC(2011)04. Richard Wade reported that meetings were scheduled with all Directors w/c 31 January to consider all the issues raised by the Delivery Plan and look for input on specific implications for the Operating plan.

6.4.1. All Campus Centre business cases were being reviewed and all business units were going through a single review process. There may be an additional meeting of Science Board.

6.4.2. A draft Operating Plan would be delivered at the 22 February meeting based on this work and other details outlined in the STFC(2011)04.

Action: R.Wade

6.4.3.

6.4.4. Paul Williams noted that there would also be changes to the Research Council pension scheme, administered by BBSRC, and it was envisaged that these would be ‘by analogy’ with respect to Civil Service scheme
6.5. **Lessons learnt.** Keith Burnett observed that excellent effort had been put in by the Executive and Council, in particular given that this had been a very tight spending round, which he hoped would be an exception for the UK against recent trends.

6.5.1. Keith observed that two key lessons learnt were: the vital requirement for seamless co-ordination between Executive Board, Council and the CSR Working Group; and the value and importance of getting all the contentious issues out in the open as soon as possible.

6.5.2. James Stirling emphasised the importance of the community being constantly and consistently kept well informed of progress by the Executive and that the Communications Strategy had been vital in achieving this.

6.5.3. Paul Williams observed that over the three CSRs he had been part of with regard to the Research Councils, this was certainly the most effectively undertaken. In particular, the willingness of STFC to ‘take the world apart’ in formulating its arguments and scenarios had been critical, and the sort of corporate knowledge generated by this exercise should be retained by STFC for future reference and spending reviews. Equally important was the united front shown by RCUK and the Research Councils, perhaps exemplified by the outcome for the large facilities.

6.5.4. Keith Mason commended BIS for the improved degree of transparency in contrast to previous CSRs and hoped BIS would maintain this approach. He also recognised that tensions and exchanges at the latter stages of CSRs could be high and that the pressures faced by colleagues at BIS were no less than those inside STFC.

6.5.5. Richard Wade noted that every CSR he had experienced had been different and difficult in its own respect. However, he noted the commonality in all of them had been the efforts by BIS to improve their processes, and that their co-operative way of working under high pressure had paid high dividends most recently. He also commended the work of individuals and teams right across the Councils who had been working at the very limits of their personal resources at times, but had got through it successfully. An added benefit, as a result, had been improved inter-Council relations at many levels.

6.5.6. Sharon Cosgrove commented positively on the integration of BIS teams led by Paul Williams and Graeme Reid.

6.6. Michael Sterling noted the appreciation of Council to all parties for their efforts with regard to CSR10.

6.7. **RCUK Facility Funding - update –**

6.8. With respect to the discussions regarding ISIS held under Item 6., Richard Wade took the opportunity to explain how the future programme of the RCUK Facilities Working Group, whilst not having a direct impact of CSR10, had a
clear impact on the overall outcome, by:

6.8.1. Helping set the percentage of spend for facilities allocated within the overall allocation;

6.8.2. Establishing a ringfence around all the facilities with a view to maximising operations within the envelope.

6.9. Once the Facilities Funding Model is in place then the next steps will include a comprehensive Science Requirements document, developed under consultation with the communities of all the Research Councils.

6.10. Paul Williams noted that an interesting consequence of this will be to better understand who exactly the ‘community’ for facilities is in this context and the hierarchy of input into the decision making processes e.g. through other Research Councils. Keith Mason added that the communities would also need to be kept aware that the decision making process with respect to facility operation is not just a matter for STFC.

6.11. Richard Wade went on explain that the Project was still running to develop the Facilities Funding Models. Once data is tested on these models it could then be developed into a functioning Process.

6.12. It was noted that in order to reach this stage, the Councils would be operating ‘open-book’ accounting systems and this was a major new development, and sometimes a challenge.

6.13. The Process will inform planning beyond the CSR period, whilst also underpinning outcomes of CSR10.

7. **SSC UPDATE – STFC(2011)05** -

7.1. Jane Tirard noted that the Hyperion forecasting system had been used for the first time to create operational forecasts, and that we now had access to and were using a small subset (created by STFC) of the 2,000 reports available to query the data now contained within the SSC Oracle system.

7.2. Jane reported that Grants implementation was on track for go-live shortly. In advance of this transition, it was felt prudent to process the March Grants payments in February.

7.3. The forecast overall cost of the Project was £135m and the project itself was now rapidly ramping down towards the 31 March completion deadline.

7.4. Jane reported ongoing concerns with the service delivery from SSC and that she with STFC’s Financial Controller, Philippa Foster, had met with James Towner, David Bloomer and Nigel Bird from SSC w/c 16 January to discuss continuing difficulties at a number of levels. In order to encourage co-operation and maintain relationships, a formal complaint had not been made to SSC. The dialogue had led to effective communication of a number of issues and it was clear that some of the SSC team had not previously fully understood. It was mentioned that SSC had been focussed on meeting broad Key Performance Indicators to date, at the cost of delivering sufficiently high quality data throughput which was now creating its own issues.
7.5. Finance was the most critical of the outstanding problems, although issues existed across many of the functionalities.

7.6. While progress is being made, there were significant issues that needed to be address. For example the Fixed Assets module promised originally in July 2010 had still not been delivered, financial reconciliations were behind and in a very poor state, there were a significant number of invoices on hold and there was £15m of unidentified income to be accounted for. STFC has maintained resources in order to work with SSC to help resolve the current issues.

7.7. Marshall Davies noted that the Audit Committee would be considering the situation later in the week, but that the current position as described by Jane was very difficult. He paid tribute to the efforts of Jane and her staff in the face of many challenges.

7.8. Marshall Davies welcomed the open assessment and asked whether all Research Councils faced the same problems or whether SSC was resolving problems at different speeds for each. Jane reported that BBSRC and MRC had gone live just before the end December which had undoubtedly taken resources away and that some other Research Council were in a worse position than STFC. Marshall asked whether it would be sensible to move resources away from the Grants operational switchover work to address the more fundamental issues with regard to finance. Jane indicated that the type of resources were different so this was unlikely to be an effective approach.

7.9. With regard to the potential delays to the publication of Annual Reports due to a delay in final accounts, Jane reported that the aim was for four to five of the Councils to report before the Summer Parliamentary recess, and two to three afterwards and that BIS had accepted this although no documentation had been seen. Keith Mason noted that publication after recess did not mean they were ‘officially’ late but, rather, not as early as the Councils had previously managed.

7.10. Phil Greenish asked whether the end of March could still be viewed as a firm Project end date. Jane confirmed it was, but that there were several outstanding things yet to be delivered. Keith Mason noted that keeping to a tight end-March deadline (including transfer of the Grants system) was essential to remove one variable from the current tripartite relationship (SSC Ltd, SSC Project and Research Councils) such that increased focus could be placed on meeting the ultimate consumer (i.e. Research Council) requirements.

7.11. Keith reminded Council that having SSC in plan had been a benefit in approaching CSR negotiations and that, further, it was better to have defined a cross research council system, rather than have had a system imposed.

8. FINANCE REPORT (including in year reporting) – (some references in this section have been redacted as commercial in confidence)

8.1. Jane Tirard presented slides on the current financial situation for STFC and noted that the forecast figures presented had been largely produced through the new Hyperion system (Item 8.). With regard to STFC’s overall spend rate Jane reported that at 75% through the FY, spend was at 76% of Resource Budget
and 78% of the Capital Budget.

8.2. The resource forecast has reduced over the last few months

8.3. Jane outlined the concerns there were with the quality of the numbers, given the SSC problems highlighted above and the inability to use normal benchmarks to verify e.g. spend data or payroll data. It was noted that the issues with SSC were taking up a lot of Finance’s time at the expense of quality analysis and interpretation.

8.4. Jane highlighted other known problems with the data currently available to quantify Resource and Capital positions at Q3, including: 100s of invoices under query; GPC transactions not recognised though lack of receipts submitted; missing timecards (relevant to Project Spend); various miscoding and mis-mapping issues. A significant amount of work is being done by the internal STFC team to resolve these problems, Jane reported.

8.5. Michael Sterling welcomed the detailed description of the problems faced and noted that it was important for Council to be fully informed.

8.6. Gill Ball asked what degree of confidence there was that there would be no overspend, especially given that Council had discussed the dangers of this many times. Jane expressed confidence of greater than 80 per cent that overspend would be avoided. Gill asked what actions had been taken to ensure spend could be reigned in if an overspend began to look likely. Richard Wade noted that the were few programmatic changes that could be made to spend at this stage in the FY, but that there were certain operational actions that it might be possible to take at the end of the year.

8.7. Keith Mason emphasised that it was also important not to underspend, and Michael Sterling noted that such any underspend would not result in a surplus that could be spent elsewhere. Jane said that there was an aim to be in a much clearer position by the end of January and that Executive Board met regularly to keep track of the position. Jane added that BIS had been helpful in recognising STFC’s problems, but part of this was to ensure any problems were not deferred by STFC elsewhere or to the future and it thereby had to face up to the challenges with continued downward pressure on spend.

9. **CAMPUS UPDATE (JV progress etc) – STFC(2011)06**

9.1. Council welcomed a positive report. Colin Whitehouse and Keith Mason took questions. Colin noted that the Campus Away Day in late 2010 had been very positive in endorsing the plans and direction of travel of the Campuses.

9.2. Gordon Stewart noted positive reports from private sector partners that market conditions for commercial property had begun to look more positive than the very poor conditions reported for the last 2-3 years.

10. **AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT – STFC(2011)07**

10.1. Marshall Davies reported that the Committee currently consisted of five members with the recent addition of Gill Ball, and formally notified Council that
the membership would be allowed to return to its more normal four members, with permission, when Derek Chadwick’s term comes to an end once the preparation of the 2010/2011 Annual Report and Accounts has been completed. Council agreed.

10.2. Colin Whitehouse asked whether HMT guidance on business development activities and the requirement of NAO to perform an additional external audit had any impact on STFC’s operations with regard to Business Development, in reference to paragraph 4 of STFC(2011)07. Marshall observed that the STFC’s auditors were being rigorous in their coverage of all aspects of operations – hence the reference in the paper – but that no such problems were foreseen.

10.3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S REPORT – STFC(2011)08 -

10.4. Question were taken on the CEO’s report. Gill Ball asked whether the Executive Board Term of Reference 1.3 was appropriate as it appeared to give excessive powers of delegation for decision making. Marshall Davies noted terms 7.1 and 4.6 had relevance, and gave some reassurance in this context, but there could be concern that a subgroup of the Executive Board could reach a decision without appropriate overall agreement. At a minimum, agreement by electronic means was desirable.

10.5. Keith Mason noted that this was not the intent and the delegatory powers were meant to reflect those made by Council to Executive Board on certain issues, which in effect became an action of the Chairman. It was agreed that Keith would review the provision with a view to either deleting it or tightening the phrasing and report back to Council.

**Action: K. Mason**

10.6. Gill Ball asked for and received confirmation that Executive Board had a financial approvals limit of £5m and anything above this figure must be approved by Council.

10.7. Keith reported that progress with ISIC remained positive and the Project was on track for 31 March delivery. A Business Case developed by the ISIC Establishment Board had been submitted to BIS and, following the BIS review, was expected to go to the next EIAB along with the STFC’s Business Case for joining ISIC, part of the ‘Centres’ business case review process.

10.8. Mike Healy asked if there was enough time between the next EIAB meeting (17 February) and the next Council meeting (27 February) for sufficient consideration to be given to the matter in order for Council to reach a decision. Keith said that the documentation was available and could be circulated to Council in advance of EIAB.

**Action: K. Mason**

10.9. Michael Sterling asked how many participating companies had signed up to ISIC. Keith explained that receiving final commitment from participants would be an ‘all or nothing’ event nearer to the April deadline, given that a multi-partite agreement would be signed, but that one new public and one new private sector candidate had been added to the candidate list since the last update to Council.
Keith stated that he believed STFC joining as a partner was likely to be vital trigger to commitment by the other parties.

11. **OPERATIONS REPORT – STFC(2011)09**

11.1. James Stirling made a declaration of interest given his affiliation, but asked what progress had been made toward the establishment of a SKA Project Office and whether appropriate mechanisms were in place to ensure the independence of any decision making panel. John Womersley recognised the potential for partiality given that one proposal sited the Project Office on the Harwell Campus, and that Martin Barstow, Phil Kaziewicz and Tony Ryan had been appointed as the decision making body to assess the three 5-page bids received. This was welcomed.

11.2. James Stirling expressed concern that the Operations Report indicated (Para 48) that Science Advisory bodies to Council might be restructured during the next months, when oversight of the Operational Plans will be of primary importance and focus. Richard Wade noted that a short paper had been considered, but that no firm plans were in place. Keith Mason noted that there was pressure to reduce administrative overheads, but that any papers developed to date were only to help promote intelligent discussion rather than force premature change.

11.3. Gordon Stewart noted, as a point of information, that no paper had been submitted to this Council meeting as stated in Para 48 of the Operations Report.

11.4. Michael Sterling welcomed the fact that this activity remained a work in progress and noted that any changes to the advisory structures in place would require formal approval by Council.

11.5. Marshall Davies noted (in reference to Para 68) that there were potentially compelling reasons to keep the Opposition informed of STFC activities. Terry O’Connor stated that such activity was being kept under review.

12. **SCORECARD REPORT – STFC(2011)10**

12.1. Sharon Cosgrove noted that the Scorecard document format was being reviewed with BIS and a new draft would be available on 18 March 2011.

12.2. Marshall Davies asked for further details regarding 2.1.1 MICE which had been at Red for a considerable period. John Womersley noted that there was a commentary in Para 22 of the Operations Report, but summarised that the delay was the result of a late deliverable from a US supplier, that suitable reverse penalty clauses were in place and that appropriate political pressure was being applied via the US Department of Energy.

13. **HEALTH & SAFETY REPORT – STFC(2011)11**

13.1. Council noted the Health and Safety Report and Mike Healy asked what ‘information sharing’ with regard to incidents meant in practice, e.g. could this
just be an email? Richard Wade stated that the process was much wider than
that, and an array of dissemination methods were used, including H&S Bulletins,
targeted communications to H&S representatives, slides at Staff Forums and
more general internal communication mechanisms such as in.brief (newsletter)
and in.focus (intranet).

13.2. Colin Whitehouse noted that, as Chair of the Health and Safety Committee,
noteworthy incidents were communicated to the Director of Communications
and included in Staff Forums.

14. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING
14.1. Tuesday 22 February, RAL

15. AOB
15.1. In recognition of Paul Williams’ long standing support to and attendance at the
STFC and predecessor Councils, a short presentation was made as this was his
last meeting before moving on to other responsibilities within BIS. Council and
the Executive offered sincere thanks for his varied and invaluable contribution.