MINUTES OF THE FIFTY FIRST MEETING HELD AT
10.00 HRS ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2012 AT THE RUTHERFORD APPLETON
LABORATORY

*Council Members present:* Michael Sterling (Chairman)
Gill Ball
Martin Barstow
Marshall Davies
Julia Goodfellow
Michael Healy
James Stirling
Ian Taylor
Will Whitehorn
John Womersley

*Dept Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS):* Graeme Reid

*In Attendance:* Gordon Stewart (*Executive Secretary to Council and Executive Director, Corporate Services*)
Grahame Blair (*Executive Director, Designate Programmes*)
Sharon Cosgrove (*Executive Director Strategy, Performance and Communications*)
Matt Griffin, (*Chair, Science Board*)
Janet Seed (*Acting Executive Director, Programmes*) –afternoon session only
Andrew Taylor (*Executive Director, National Laboratories*)
Jane Tirard (*Executive Director, Finance*)
Rt. Hon David Willetts MP (*Minister for Universities and Science*) for items 1 – 3 only
Nicola Blackwood MP, (*Oxford West and Abingdon*) for items 1 – 4 only
Oliver Christian (*Private Secretary to Minister Willetts*) for items 1-3 only

*Apologies* Sharon Bonfield (*Council Secretariat and Minute Secretary*)

David Price
1. WELCOME AND CONFLICTS REGISTER OF INTEREST

1.1. The Chairman welcomed all attendees to the meeting including Matt Griffin, the new chair of Science Board and Grahame Blair, Executive Director Programmes (Designate), who were attending Council for the first time. A special welcome was extended to Minister Willetts and Nicola Blackwood MP. Apologies had been received from David Price who was unwell.

1.2. The Chairman asked Council members to declare any conflicts of interest and reminded members of the need to keep the Executive Secretary informed of any changes to their personal register of interests; no declarations were received at this time.

1.3. All attendees introduced themselves to the Minister and Nicola Blackwood by invitation of the Chairman.

1.4. The Chairman invited the Minister to address Council.

2. MINISTERIAL COMMENT

2.1. The Minister expressed his appreciation of the work of the Research Councils and the cutting edge, world class science that STFC carries out and funds. He commented in particular on the ability of STFC’s science to capture the public’s imagination.

2.2. The Minister noted that the Haldane principle was one of the critical reasons for the success of British science. Accordingly, whilst he appreciated the opportunity to attend Council to take part in the discussion, he noted he would not take part in any discussion regarding funding decisions.

2.3. The Minister noted the Prime Minister’s visit to Daresbury in autumn 2011, and commented on the potential of the Daresbury and Harwell Campuses and their status as Enterprise Zones. The minister referred to the recent investment for e-infrastructure at Daresbury and to the opportunity for ESA to locate more of its operations to the UK (subject to ongoing discussions).

2.4. The Minister reminded Council of the importance of the science ring fence in the context of tough public spending constraints. He noted that capital was however outside the ring-fence but assured Council that he continues to highlight this issue to the Treasury (HMT). He commented that the recent RCUK Capital Framework exercise would be very helpful to draw upon for discussion with HMT. He went onto say that the Research Councils need to continue to be “nimble footed” and flexible in order to secure any additional resources should they become available.

2.5. The Minister noted the importance of keeping the case for science in the public eye. The Minister asked Council to consider what more could be done to get even wider public interest in STFC’s Science.
2.6. Ian Taylor referred to the current under-utilisation of ISIS in terms of operating days and asked the Minister how STFC should tackle this. Whilst the Government had protected flat cash for science, John Womersley noted that increases in costs, including electricity and inflation, meant that within the current funding envelope allocated through the Large Facilities Funding Mechanism, it not possible to operate ISIS for the planned 120 days. The Minister recognised the pressures but noted the positive developments such as the new Element 6 investment on the Harwell Oxford campus and the importance of such developments to HMT.

2.7. Martin Barstow referred to the difficulties that can occur between Universities and the research base in sharing of equipment and facilities, when they are competing with one another for students. Martin suggested that it would be helpful for a clearer position from HEFCE on this matter. The Minister noted that Government had inherited a system that they were trying to rebalance, where universities both collaborate and compete; he felt that they needed to do more to work on collaboration on the research side but should still be able to compete on the teaching side.

2.8. Marshall Davies asked the Minister what STFC could do to help ensure that investment in science was better translated into industrial success. The Minister noted that there was a growing acceptance of the need for an industrial strategy and that the work that was being done to deliver a “mixed economy” on the campuses was the way forward for STFC. He invited STFC to contact him if any obstacles were encountered with expanding the campuses in this respect. He noted MRC’s success through the Life Sciences Catalyst in collaboration with TSB and noted that this could be a model for STFC to look into in a different field.

2.9. In discussion regarding a future CSR, the Minister was asked if there will be preference given to funding UK national post graduate students in future years. David Willetts responded by saying that nobody had yet come up with a smarter post graduate funding system compared to the current one.

3. CEO Report to Council

3.1. John Womersley presented his report to Council, highlighting STFC successes in the last six months as well as challenges and risks going forward.

3.2. John highlighted the discovery of the Higgs Boson and explained how this was underpinning a series of communications activities. Building on the Westminster event, a programme of events are continuing which have included an event at the House of Commons and others planned for the Welsh Assembly, the Scottish Parliament, an ATLAS film at BAFTA, the Cheltenham Science Festival and a major Science Museum Exhibition in 2013.
3.3. Other scientific highlights included the new EXCALIBUR X-ray detector, developed for Diamond Light Source which has medical applications and the first images that have been received from the DES camera which was developed with UCL and is installed on telescope in Chile to explore the nature of dark energy.

3.4. STFC continues to carry out a broad range of activities in public engagement and John highlighted STFC's involvement with the European Astronomy Journalism Prize awarded in September. John emphasised the on-going impact of these activities noting that university applications in Physics have risen by 8% in 2012.

3.5. STFC consistently measures the impact of its science areas and John informed Council that STFC are now jointly collecting data with EPSRC and the Institute of Physics on the output and international ranking of UK research in all the science areas that we support.

3.6. STFC are delivering on Government e-infrastructure investments and the Hartree Centre is now up and running with the UK’s fastest computer (the UK’s only Petaflop system). New machines and visualisation screens have been installed and are due to be commissioned by the end of October 2012. In the DIRAC project, five STFC-funded university systems have been installed and are working, with the machine at the University of Edinburgh being ranked in the world top-20. John explained that work is ongoing with Hartree and GridPP, Hector and JANET to create wide area networks between all of the HEIs.

3.7. An IBM Collaboratory at Daresbury has been established with IBM delivering support in both business development and technical areas to get new machines up and running, developing a pipeline of potential users of the EnCore “HPC on demand” service, offered by IBM’s partner OCF. The principles of a partnership at Daresbury with Unilever have also been agreed and signatures were expected soon.

3.8. John informed Council of the latest position regarding the future governance models of the ISIC and the Satellite Applications Catapult Centre at Harwell. The UK Space Agency, Technology Strategy Board (TSB) and STFC are agreed that it is appropriate to transfer as much as possible of the current ISIC function to the Catapult but agree that it is important also to find a way of involving existing ISIC Members. They also agreed that an overall coordination framework for the Space cluster activities at Harwell should be developed. The Catapult Delivery Team have been tasked with developing a clear business plan for presentation to the TSB Board in November 2012. John informed Council that he is keeping a close eye on this work.

3.9. John outlined other areas where STFC are working with the TSB including
Launchpads (currently looking at Advanced Materials/Manufacturing and Space), provision of offices for TSB/Knowledge Transfer Network personnel at STFC campuses and the development of Business and Innovation support packages around Catapult centres; links with TSB lead technologies across STFC’s key sectors, continue to be developed.

3.10. In the context of the wider benefits of STFC science and facilities, John mentioned recent research by EDF Energy at the ISIS facility which has contributed to sustained energy security by extending the life of two nuclear power stations by five years, enabling uninterrupted electricity generation and the deferment of £3 billion in decommissioning and replacement costs.

3.11. John highlighted a recent study to examine the value of MRI technology and noted MRI scanners today use STFC’s breakthrough technology in superconducting magnets. John further noted that 2.5m MRI scans were performed in 2010, which is a three fold increase over a decade and that equipment manufacture contributes £100m pa to UK GDP and saves £100m each year by improving the treatment of slipped discs.

3.12. Cobalt Light Systems, an STFC spin out company, had developed laser scanning technology which could detect the contents of bottles and containers. John noted that this has now passed EU certification tests (ECAC) and that trials at major European airports (Heathrow, Madrid, Frankfurt) are being carried out. This technique also has potential for medical applications including non invasive detection of osteoporosis.

3.13. John informed Council that the Marblur Website was being launched on 1 October 2012 as a new initiative to match scientific expertise with industrial applications. Council were informed that STFC were running 6 competitions based on RALSpace technologies.

3.14. John updated Council on recent stakeholder interactions, including visits to SciTech Daresbury by Richard Leese, Derek Twigg MP and Jeremy Clayton; a visit to Harwell Oxford by John Harries CSA, Wales; a high level visit to RAL by Siemens UK CEO with the potential for strategic partnership on accelerator projects; additionally John has visited and met with stakeholders at AWE and e2V, the Kurchatov Institute, and the Russian Academy of Science in Moscow and together with RCUK CEOs met with Vince Cable and Lord Heseltine.

3.15. John updated Council on the status of restructuring within STFC; the 2011-12 voluntary and compulsory redundancy scheme has been completed and the new senior management team were now in place with the arrival of Grahame Blair, Executive Director Programmes.

3.16. A review of Corporate Services Directorate, led by Gordon Stewart, was now underway and a report on the “as is” situation with a recommended way forward was expected by the end of October from Price Waterhouse Coopers. The next steps would be to review the recommendations and establish a project team to draw up a business case to determine the
actual shape of any change programme.

3.17. Based on the outcome of a joint action plan with BIS following the Department’s Partner Organisation Review carried out in 2011, John was pleased to inform Council that STFC’s rating had been upgraded from amber/red to amber/green in all areas, including reputation, financial management, management behaviours and quality of objective setting. There were no outstanding actions or areas of concern and it was agreed by BIS that no follow up review was required.

3.18. John updated Council on progress against the Delivery Plan scorecard progress. Most of the 92 Delivery Plan deliverables are on target with the remaining slippages manageable across the 4 years of the CSR.

3.19. John also commented on the positive upward trend of the Council self-assessment survey when compared with the results of 2011 survey.

3.20. Noting that a well managed organisation manage everything well including Health and Safety, John informed Council that STFC had launched a corporate H&S Improvement Plan, reflecting his personal commitment to lead in this area. This builds on the positive 2012 independent Santia Health and Safety systems audit report and identifies 3 key corporate health and safety objectives to be delivered in 2012/13: improved quality of risk assessments, near-miss reporting and radioactive material record-keeping.

3.21. John noted that over 19 STFC projects would be included in the RCUK Capital Framework. In addition following a meeting with the Minister, Research Councils were preparing nine one-page summaries of investment opportunities that complement the RCUK strategic framework.

3.22. John updated Council on the status of the Square Kilometre Array project; site selection was completed with roughly 2/3 of the telescope antennas to be installed in South Africa and 1/3 in Australia. Professor Phil Diamond had been appointed as Director General and the new headquarters building is under development at Jodrell Bank and due to be inaugurated in early 2013. The challenge for STFC now is to secure a good outcome for the UK in allocation of work packages. STFC, UK universities and industry should all benefit and opportunities are being discussed for links to the Hartree Centre.

3.23. John discussed briefly the STFC programmatic review and reminded Council that this is a broad review of all of STFC’s activities conducted by Science Board. He emphasised that this is a science-driven process with strong community involvement and consultation, positioning STFC to take advantage of science opportunities and this has been well communicated both internally and externally.
3.24. John noted that STFC was preparing for the Triennial Review and was working closely with RCUK. He noted that the STFC Council sub-group had been established to work with the Executive in preparation for the review.

**Secretary’s Note:** The Minister left the meeting at 11.20hrs.

3.25. Council noted the CEO report and supporting paper which contained scientific highlights provided by the Programmes and National Laboratories Directorates.

4. **Science Board Report – SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: MANAGEMENT/POLICY**

4.1. Matt Griffin presented his report which Council noted. Matt informed Council that in future he will be presenting some science highlights ahead of his regular report to Council.

4.2. Ian Taylor asked what arguments were being put forward for the next stage of investment for the LHC, now that the Higgs had been discovered. Nicola Blackwood commented that there was a danger that members of Parliament could assume that the Higgs had been found so the “job is done” at CERN. James Stirling noted that much further work was needed to learn from the discovery and test whether the Higgs properties really agreed with the standard theories. Graeme Reid observed that whilst the LHC at Parliament event was very successful, the participants were only there because they were already enthusiasts. He stated that it is going to be hard for Particle Physics to make the case alone.

4.3. John Womersley noted that the discovery of the Higgs had unlocked many more questions, such as dark matter and dark energy and agreed that whilst there is much interest as to what comes next, the discovery itself should be capitalised on to explain that, for example, without the LHC we wouldn’t have MRI scanners.

4.4. Nicola Blackwood noted that all MPs were worried about the standards of teaching in local schools, and that CERN’s excellent schools/teaching programme should be used as evidence in the next CSR.

4.5. Martin Barstow commented that there is a vast amount of activity at CERN that is not being taken up universally by the Department for Education.

**Secretary’s Note:** John Womersley and Graeme Reid left the meeting at 11.30hrs to accompany the Minister whilst he visited the International Space Innovation Centre (ISIC).

4.6. Ian Taylor stated that the funding of facilities could become a political issue and he believed that Council needed to put forward the arguments
strongly before this becomes a problem. Marshall Davies commented that the UK has invested £400m in ISIS and was not getting a return on its investment, even with relatively small marginal operating costs.

4.7. The Science Board welcomed the Open Access to Research Publications policy but warned that it will not be without cost (estimated to be ~£2m to STFC). Science Board have agreed to keep a watching brief to assess the implications.

4.8. Matt informed Council that much work was taking place on the Programmatic Review which this time will be assessing the quality of all of STFC’s programmes in terms of science, operational effectiveness, impact, alignment with Council’s strategy, future opportunities and overall programme balance within a realistic financial envelope.

4.9. This will be a detailed review carried out by Science Board sub-groups; all aspects of STFC’s programme is under assessment including Particle Physics, Astronomy, Nuclear Physics, Facilities, Technology Programme, Impact Programme and STFC institutes and departments. The decision making criteria includes, excellence, economic and societal impact, leadership and synergies.

4.10. The review is now well underway with a well-defined schedule and Science Board are scheduled to recommend a programme to Council in May 2013. Science Board will also be carrying out some scenario modelling i.e. impact of a sub-optimal CSR.

4.11. Matt reported that the relationship between STFC and the UK Space Agency (UKSA) is now on a stronger footing. Recently a Science Board sub-group had reviewed the scientific priorities of four instrument proposals on the ESA Juice Mission and agreed a statement on the ESA mandatory Science Programme for the forthcoming ESA ministerial meeting.

4.12. In response to a question by Ian Taylor about the liaison between ESO and ESA, Matt informed Council that there is some complementarity between the two e.g. on GAIA and ExoPlanet.

4.13. Science Board had provided advice to the Executive on the RCUK Capital Investment Framework by reviewing the draft framework document. Science Board had discussed options and identified items that have high priority and are suitable for implementation in the event of a capital windfall. Science Board had agreed to periodically review the framework and in particular highlighted the need to take into account associated long term resource requirements for these types of capital projects.

4.14. Science Board will be establishing a review of Neutrons and of Photons. A well informed strategy for future neutron provision needs to be developed. The international Photon scene is changing very rapidly and
Science Board has judged that a similar review will be required for Photons but possibly in slower time.

4.15. Science Board carried out a review of the updated advisory structure which had been put in place one year ago. This was a light touch review which concluded that the new structure was working reasonably well with some successes i.e. the programmatic review process, use of sub-groups of core and non-core members and the establishment of a good working relationship with UKSA. There were a few key areas to work on and it was too soon to assess whether the desired financial savings on administration had been achieved. James Stirling congratulated Science Board on its success.

4.16. Matt informed Council that Science Board were keen to extend peer review throughout STFC so that only the highest performing functions will be funded.

5. Council Survey

5.1. Council noted the positive outcome of the recent self-assessment survey. Council agreed that no additional action plan was necessary as the outcome demonstrated that the action plan established after last year’s survey were working effectively and Council should continue to do what they are doing.

Secretary’s Note: Council attended a lunch hosted and attended by RALSpace staff members which included a PowerPoint presentation on the work of the department by Richard Holdaway, Director, RALSpace and an exhibition of RALSpace technologies.

6. Introduction to Afternoon Session and Opening Comments

6.1. The Chairman welcomed members back to the meeting and welcomed Janet Seed who attended for the afternoon session only.

6.2. The Chairman and Council conveyed their thanks to the staff of RALSpace and to Andrew Taylor, Executive Director, National Laboratories for the very positive lunchtime presentation and exhibition which he organised.

6.3. The Chairman invited Ian Taylor to comment on the Minister’s visit. Ian stated that his impression was that the Minister is clearly on the side of science. It was still unclear what was going to happen to funding beyond 2015/16 but Ian warned Council that 2012/13 will be a difficult year because of the upcoming election.

6.4. It was noted that the Minister responded well to John Womersley’s analysis of the output and international ranking of UK research in the areas we support.
6.5. Graeme Reid commented that this was useful information for those with a scientific background but the argument had to be made to the man on the street as well. Will Whitehorn supported this up by stating that we should be looking for the application of science all of the time; seeing the other aspect gets through to the public.

6.6. John Womersley responded to Matt Griffin’s previous comments about peer review (minute 4.16) and noted that all of STFC’s discretionary programme is reviewed and that the Programmatic Review covered all in-house research programmes, the innovation programme and STFC’s science carried out in the laboratories (with STFC centres also reviewed by EIAB); John noted that facility beamtime was peer reviewed and that the Corporate Services Department had recently commissioned an efficiency review with external assurance.

6.7. Referring back to the discussion about the Large Facilities Funding Model, John informed Council that the LFSG were making efforts to go back to individual users to establish forward requirements. John did not think it would be appropriate to challenge the process until the outcome was known, early in 2013. In parallel the facilities are writing up their requirements, taking advice from the programmatic review advisory panels and Science Board. Grahame Blair will be involved in the process.

7. Campuses – SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: COMMERCIAL

7.1. Tim shared with Council an agreed campus position statement between STFC, NERC and BBSRC on the definition of a national campus. Council noted this collaborative effort.

8. Impact Report – SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: MANAGEMENT

8.1. Sharon Cosgrove noted that the 2012 Impact Report had been circulated as a draft. There was an ongoing discussion between BIS and STFC about content and style and the report was next due to be discussed at the forthcoming BIS Six-Monthly Bi-lateral Review Meeting on 4th October 2012.

8.2. Sharon asked Council members for feedback on the draft and explained the BIS expectation that new material should be reported. STFC were awaiting guidance on the timescale for the official launch and it was thought that the publications schedule might be before Council’s November meeting.

8.3. Council commented positively on the report and agreed to contribute any
suggestions or comments to Sharon by correspondence and also agreed that due to the timescales involved that the Chairman could sign off the final copy. Sharon Cosgrove agreed to send the report to the Chair with changes highlighted, copying in Council members.

Action: Sharon Cosgrove

8.4. Martin Barstow commented on the positive way that the report described the impact of the facilities but queried if there was a way of capturing the impact of university based research. Council felt that universities should be encouraged to share Impact case studies and other information prepared for the REF as long as this was consistent with the REF timetable.

8.5. James Stirling commented that it was an uplifting report but in his opinion slightly undersells the impact of the post graduates that we train and their impact on the economy.

9. Finance Report

9.1. Jane Tirard presented the Finance Report and reminded Council that data for Quarter 1 had been circulated to them during the summer and that she was reporting at this meeting on the financial position as at July 2012 (period 4).

9.2. Council noted that the net resource position was £6.1m (4%) below the profiled budget of £160.6m.

9.3. There was a £5m underspend on resource in Programmes Directorate (£5m) which relates to the reconciliation of grants accrued in 2011/12 and final actual expenditure. (This distorts the actual 12/13 grant spend-to-date). Reconciliations and final grant payments will be completed by the September grants run, after which there may be some modest differences between accruals and payments but overall the budget will be back on track and the situation is unlikely to have any year end impact.

9.4. The Diamond Light Source cash drawdown has been £1m less than expected and as a result the budget will be reduced by £860k.

9.5. There was a £1.8m underspend in Business and Innovation Directorate mainly due to expenditure occurring later in the year than originally anticipated with respect to Proof of Concept Grants and Centres spend. Additionally there has been a delay in recruiting to 3 posts; the budget has been reduced accordingly.

9.6. The National Laboratories are £1.3m over budget which is predominantly due to the CRC Carbon Tax and expenditure on Lasers for Science neither of which were included in the original budgets; the LFSG has approved the use of the Diamond Light Source under-spend for Lasers for Science. The Carbon tax was held centrally until there was a better understanding of
the amounts involved but both of these amounts will now be reflected in the revised budget. In addition to Carbon Tax other money had been held centrally for contingencies; unfunded technology staff and the Cockcroft institute all of which would now be released.

9.7. Net capital was £5.1m below the profiled budget of £38.1m, mainly due to a £3.8m underspend by Scientific Computing Department which relates to a slippage in the e-infrastructure project. This project is being closely monitored and at this stage the project is still expected to come in on budget at the year end. Programmes Directorate have an underspend of £1.5m which is due to accounting adjustments and outstanding reconciliations on grant payments from 2011/12 relating to GridPP. These are being resolved and are not expected to impact the year end outturn.

9.8. Council noted the overall financial position against the profiled budget in the report with no specific questions or issues and were satisfied that Executive Board would be reviewing and ratifying the underspend position at its next meeting.

9.9. The Universal Chart of Accounts conceptual design has been agreed across all of the Councils. Jane noted concern about the amount of additional work this would involve and the estimated associated costs (c.£6m) as the project is hugely complex. Jane felt that STFC had no choice but to comply, as to maintain two sets of accounts would cost ~£40k per month. Realistically could only be ready around start of 14/15.

9.10. As a result of being part of the Government banking system, we now have been asked to provide daily cashflow forecasts. Jane stated that whilst this will inevitably be challenging to get it right, it is not a huge issue for STFC as it does not include payroll, grants and international subscriptions. The tolerances for BIS are £15m per day and for every Partner Organisation within 5% per month. We have been given six months to “perfect” the process. There is a reputational risk to STFC, at a time when STFC is trying to reduce administrative costs it is going to add to workload; it is also a risk financially due to penalties.

9.11. The Shared Service Centre (SSC) has been audited by PWC and have generally concluded that stabilisation has been achieved, with a number of caveats and over 100 recommendations. Ownership of the SSC is about to change (75% BIS, 25% Partner Organisations) which will result in a change in governance. Charging mechanisms have yet to be agreed.

9.12. BIS have commissioned Deloittes to carry out a financial management review of the Research Councils. They are looking for good practice in financial management. Jane reported that there is a swell to move us to tighten up on everything, because resources have such a long way to stretch.
9.13. STFC delivered the Annual Accounts on target to the year end timetable, although it was a huge challenge. BIS have stated that they are looking to bring forward the timetable by a further week next year. Jane was concerned that these timescales will not allow STFC to produce a quality document. All Government departments were to lay their accounts by early June/July; STFC laid by 5 July. BIS found it difficult and didn’t lay until recently. They had enormous difficulty in presenting consolidated accounts.

9.14. Marshall Davies stated that along with other Research Councils he had voiced his concerns about this at the meeting of Audit Committee Heads of Partner Organisation. This was also raised at STFC’s Partner Assessment. Graeme Reid commented that Government accounting systems have always changed and Government is very keen on creating uniformity across Government in order to achieve economies.

9.15. Gill Ball congratulated Jane on the structure of the report and noted that she found it enormously helpful to be able to read the accompanying paperwork in advance.

9.16. Ian Taylor noted the difficulties that Jane and Finance Department were working under; Jane said that she felt supported by the Executive and Council in this respect.

10. Minutes of Last Meeting

10.1. Council approved the minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2012 and the Chairman signed these as a true record of that meeting. Council were satisfied that the redacted minutes presented to Council would be suitable for publishing on the STFC website.

11. Actions and Matters Arising

11.1. There were no outstanding actions on the Council action register.

12. CSR and Triennial Review Sub-Group – SOME REFERENCES IN THIS SECTION HAVE BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: MANAGEMENT

12.1. The Council sub-group had met on the 12 September 2012 at University College London. All sub-group members had attended the meeting; Matt Griffin, Chair of Science Board (by telephone) and Sharon Cosgrove and Andrew Taylor from the Executive were also in attendance.

12.2. The sub-group had discussed the backdrop against which it is working. It was noted that the programmatic review would be the basis for STFC’s CSR planning. The group agreed to focus on the known requirements for the Triennial Review as it was likely that the CSR could be pushed back to
15/16 but recognised that there would be a link between the two.

12.3. They discussed RCUK’s management relationships with their institutes and it was agreed that STFC’s institutes were very firmly ‘in house’ and are why STFC is unique in provision of national and international research infrastructures.

12.4. Graeme Reid reaffirmed that the Triennial Review will be challenging, robust and rigorous. There was likely to be an emphasis on customer satisfaction with key users and stakeholders contributing to the results; the review will be looking for a clear joined up view of the RCs; results will be published.

12.5. Graeme Reid explained that the Triennial Review is likely to commission written evidence initially, and noted the need for a “pithy” message about what the Research Councils do, that can be understood by a lay reader. Graeme Reid offered to read and comment on any messages constructed and provide advice on how these could be improved.

12.6. Julia Goodfellow commented on the good communications planning around the Review. She noted however that there appeared to be a gap in terms of identifying what STFC wanted to achieve from the review. Julia acknowledged that the RCUK Capital Investment Framework paper went someway to answering this but noted the outcome of the Programmatic Review would not be known until May 2013. Matt Griffin noted that by November, as the information from the advisory boards comes in, there may be some emerging information from the Programmatic Review which will give the broad sense of direction of travel but a clearer articulation will not be available until May 2013 at the earliest.

12.7. James Stirling commented that the communications plan would go a long way to addressing the need to bringing the community on side, noting that there may be a point when we need to seek help from the community to defend STFC.

13. **RCUK Capital Investment Framework**

13.1. Janet Seed presented the paper and Council noted the STFC identified priority areas for future capital investment.

13.2. Martin Barstow questioned why ESA Space Mission's were not included in the document and Janet explained that traditionally space missions were not capital and were looked at as part of the programmatic review.

14. **EIAB**

14.1. Will Whitehorn noted that EIAB had not met since the last meeting. It would however be looking at some interesting projects at its next meeting
on November 8th and anticipated bringing proposals to Council in January.

15. Health and Safety


16. REMCO Report –THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: STAFF

17. Future Meeting Dates

17.1. Council noted the futures dates and locations of meetings for the remainder of 2012 and for 2013.

18. AOB –THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REDACTED AS PROTECT: MANAGEMENT

Meeting closed at 15.50 hrs.