Relations between CERN and its users

ACCU reviewed possible procedures to ensure that members of the new body of users which is under consideration, would be fully representative of the user community.

CERN Review Committee

ACCU considered that there was no clear case for the proposition of the CRC to reduce the CERN Staff complement. ACCU was also opposed to the proposal to create a new status for certain categories of staff. ACCU expressed the fear that such measures would lead to a further decline in the services rendered to the users.

Office space

ACCU urged CERN management to immediately remedy the lack of office space for users. ACCU expressed its strong conviction that a redistribution of existing space allocated to the various Divisions would contribute to the establishment of a healthier situation.

Computer matters

ACCU repeated its regrets that restrictions based on nationality had to be introduced for the access to the newly installed supercomputer. ACCU requested CERN management to seriously consider alternative technical solutions whenever a future increase of the computing power would be subject to similar restrictions.

LEP Project

ACCU congratulated all those involved with the LEP Project with the successful end of the tunnelling work.

Next meeting will be held on 14 April 1988.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CERN USERS

Minutes of the thirty-first meeting held on 5 February 1988

Present : M. Albrow, W. Bartl, H. Boggild, P. Bordalo, K. Bos,
G.J. Bosson (Secretary), P. Darriulat, C. Fabjan, V. Goggi,
V. Gracco, P. Hulth, P. Igo-Kemenes, P. Jenni, E. Lillestol,
G. Sauvage (Chairman), C. Sciacca, H. Siebert, M. Werlen,
H. Zaccone.

Invited : N. Koulberg (item 4b), J. Thresher (item 4a).

Apologies for absence : J. Carter, K. Eggert, E. Higon-Rodriguez,
C. Kourkoumelis, E. Lilleshun, T. Mouthuy.

The Chairman welcomed Lillestol who was replacing Lilleshun, for this meeting only.

The Chairman announced that he had been informed that on 8 February the last few metres of the LEP tunnel would be excavated, marking the end of the tunnelling work. He extended on behalf of ACCU his congratulations with this event to all those involved with the LEP Project.

1. Adoption of agenda

   The Chairman said that he wished to add under the item "Follow-up of items discussed at previous meeting" the subject "Office space". He had invited Koulberg of EP Division to give a presentation of the present situation.

2. Apologies for absence

   These were as given above.

3. Minutes of previous meeting (CERN/ACCU/30)

   Thresher remarked that in the second paragraph of the item "Future computing policy" two sentences should be slightly reworded. The second sentence should read : "At the moment the CERN computing centre provided 25 units of IBM and compatible machines and 7 units in the DEC cluster", and the last sentence "These changes implied that the power of the computer centre could reach the 100 unit level".

   Hulth wondered why the lengthy discussion on the introduction of a CRAY computer at CERN had been compressed to half a page only in the minutes, ending with a statement which in his opinion did not reflect correctly the conclusions reached at the previous meeting. The Chairman agreed that at the meeting a strong conclusion against the introduction of access restrictions based on nationality had been reached, but the minutes had to reflect that members had given only a preliminary opinion as the subject had not been on the draft agenda. Also Carter, who had been absent at the previous meeting, had informed Thresher that she disagreed with the conclusions of the discussion. Hulth insisted that the summary should better reflect the strong
opposition articulated during the discussion. Siebert remarked that all members had been concerned that access restrictions based on nationality could be introduced, but that there had not been unanimity whether alternative solutions existed to solve the recognized computing needs. Boggild, Bartl and Sciaccia supported the opinion that the summary of the discussion should be reworded.

It was agreed that the last paragraph should be replaced by: "ACCU took note of the presentation on plans to increase the computing power of the computer centre. In discussing the planned installation of supercomputers at CERN, ACCU unanimously expressed strong concern that access restrictions based on nationality would be imposed on CERN; most members were strongly of the opinion that decisions on the use of such facilities should be made on the basis of scientific and technical criteria and should not be influenced by the nationality of the users concerned."

The Chairman remarked that the minutes of the last meeting mentioned that CERN management was expecting the role of ACCU to be redefined by 31 March 1988. This would imply that the present meeting would be the last one in its actual form. Darriulat confirmed, but added that there was no objection to one further ACCU meeting after that date if the new users committee would not yet exist, whenever the present members considered this useful for the user community.

4. Follow-up of items discussed at the previous meeting

a) Computer matters

The Chairman reminded members that it had been agreed at the last meeting to continue the discussion on the subject of restrictions in access to supercomputers at CERN not motivated by scientific or technical criteria, and that all members had been invited to make an enquiry amongst the users which they represented to obtain extended knowledge of opinions in the Member States.

Thresher referred to his announcement in the Computer Newsletter about the CRAY machine (see Annex A). He regretted the existence of the restrictions imposed by the licence, but added that these in his opinion would have an insignificant influence on the physics programme of the laboratory.

Hulth said that it had been evident from the beginning that a risk of access restrictions based on nationality existed. He feared that this risk had never been analysed seriously by CERN. Lillestol remarked that following some cases in Norway, Sweden and Japan during 1987 where companies had violated COMEX prescriptions, conditions for obtaining licences had become stricter than foreseen at the time of the decision by CERN to buy a CRAY computer. Hulth wondered whether the CRAY machine was efficient for computing in the area of particle physics: FNAL had decided to go for parallel processing. It seemed also difficult to him to develop code without having access to the computer. Thresher said that all experts agreed that CERN had obtained extremely good value for its money in the purchase of the CRAY. Lillestol wished to take a pragmatic view: he disliked the access restrictions which had to be introduced, but the real question was now how to proceed in future. Siebert added that at least half of CERN's computer power should remain free of any such restrictions. Thresher agreed, as otherwise experiments could be significantly hindered.

The Chairman proposed then that each member reported on the results of the enquiry amongst the users which they represented on the subject of restrictions in access to supercomputers at CERN not motivated by
scientific or technical criteria.

Bos said that 75% of the consulted Dutch users, acknowledging that it was the Director-General's mandate to decide on such matters, was of the opinion that CERN should not have bought the CRAY computer because of the access restrictions. Hulth reported that with very few exceptions all consulted Swedish users (some 40% of the community) had been strongly opposed to access restrictions based on nationality.

Zaccoone said that Thresher's announcement (see Annex A) had been tabled at a meeting on computer matters at Saclay, and that there had been little reaction. The Chairman added that his investigations amongst French users had not shown a strong opinion against acquiring the CRAY, the access restrictions being regretted but accepted. Albrow remarked that the British community tended to emphasize the need to increase the computing power and for that reason had been in favour of CERN acquiring a CRAY computer. He understood that the L3 collaboration which was considered as an interesting test case because of its composition, had accepted the imposed restrictions.

Fabjan reported that the matter had been discussed twice in meetings of the EP senior staff: it was felt that the conditions for the CRAY use were unpleasant but that the major increase in computer power through the CRAY machine was vital for a correct functioning of the laboratory. Jenni added that a more open discussion had been requested when in future technical choices had to be made.

Bartl said that the Austrian community, as well as the Austrian authorities, were in principle against the imposed restrictions, but were willing to accept them in the present circumstances on the understanding that CERN would do its utmost to ensure that the effects would be as mild as possible. Werlen remarked that the Swiss users had a similar position. Bordalo said that the Portuguese community was against the access restrictions, but was confident that they would have little effect in the daily life of the laboratory.

Sciacca said that no formal survey under Italian users had been made. The few dozen physicists whom he had contacted had unanimously expressed discomfort, but had wondered what possible alternatives would have existed. They had voiced the opinion that the issue should have been discussed at the beginning. Boggild remarked that he had spoken with most Danish users who had all been against restrictions as CERN had been and should remain an outstanding example of international collaboration. The Danish community wished that CERN management would take it as a lesson for the future.

The Chairman summarized the reports with the statement that the users regretted that access restrictions based on nationality had been introduced, but that these at their lowest possible level were accepted by the majority of users in view of the need to increase the computing power. However, whenever further increases in power would be envisaged in future, CERN should aim for technical solutions avoiding such restrictions as users gave high priority to the openness of CERN.

Gracco wondered whether the opinions expressed at the previous ACCU meeting, had been taken seriously by CERN management. Thresher assured him that this had been the case although members had been able to express just their personal views, and added that the result of the discussion at the previous meeting had influenced the final negotiations which determined the level of restrictions imposed.
Bos complained that the VM service on the IBM machines had been bad recently and asked what would happen if the CRAY would be added. Thresher recognized the poor performance of the VM Service, which was due to overloading of the Service particularly during the day, some serious problems which had arisen during the start of operation after the Christmas break and manpower shortages; the installation of the CRAY machine would be accompanied by a small increase in staff. Bos referred to a recent article in Nature which indicated that the CRAY model bought by CERN would be the end of the production line. Thresher said that CERN's CRAY could be converted to a model CRAY-2 without extra cost to the laboratory.

ACCU repeated its regrets that restrictions based on nationality had to be introduced for the access to the newly installed supercomputer. ACCU requested CERN management to seriously consider alternative technical solutions whenever a future increase of the computer power would be subject to similar restrictions.

Thresher then turned to the steering Committee which had been set up to guide the preparation of a document on CERN computing needs in the nineties. The members of the Committee were Billinge (for accelerator divisions), Dydak (for research divisions), Ferguson (administrative computing), Sacton (needs of outside users), Williams (study coordinator and editor of the report) and himself as Chairman. A first meeting had been held where it had become clear that the report needed to be wide ranging to cover the various kinds of use of computers at CERN and to account for both hardware and software needs. It was hoped to have a first version of the report ready by the end of the year.

Albrow suggested to discuss the item at a future open meeting of ACCU before the report was written and ideas fixed. Thresher wondered whether it would be preferable to discuss with a written document in hand, but was willing to consider any suggestions, the only importance being an efficient flow of ideas. Bos pointed out that networking would be in future crucial; Thresher remarked that the importance of this point had already been recognized by the steering Committee.

b) Office space

Koulberg gave a summary of the space situation in EP Division as given in Annex B.

Goggi added that the 4100 users represented an estimated 2900 full time equivalent persons; under extreme (and unlikely) conditions this number could be minimally 1500. This implied that a fair share for EP of existing space at CERN should be about 40,000 m² rather than the present 23,000 m²; which left each user with 2 m² of space. The Chairman pointed out that the full time equivalent number will increase since the installation of the LEP experiments was starting.

Siebert considered the present distribution of office space over the various divisions intolerable and discriminatory against the users. Fabjan wished explicitly to reiterate his statements at various earlier ACCU meetings that he felt embarrassed how users were treated by CERN in matters of office space. In his opinion CERN-wide sharing of office space would contribute to a better situation.

Bartl, Boggild, Lillestol and Sciacca stated that it was now up to CERN management to act. Whatever the conversion of the number of users to full
time equivalent persons was, there was an evident need for at least the 750 m² mentioned by Koulberg. They were convinced that a fair distribution of office space over divisions would help finding such space.

ACCU urged CERN management to immediately remedy the lack of office space for users. ACCU expressed the strong conviction that a redistribution of existing space allocated to the various Divisions would contribute to a healthier situation.

The Chairman asked all members to consult their home community and to provide at the next meeting any available information in confirmation or in addition to the figures presented at this meeting.

5. Relations between CERN and its users

The Chairman said that following the discussions at the previous meeting, he had addressed a letter to all members containing a number of questions related to the representativity of the members of the present ACCU and the future user committee. (See Annex C for the text of the letter, the answers received and a summary of the latter). He proposed to have a short discussion on each question.

Question 1. Do you consider yourself at present to be representative for your country’s user community, or to be acting ad personam?

The answers showed a situation which was better than anticipated, at least half of the members already being fully representative.

Question 2. If you consider yourself to be representative, please
a) describe the nomination procedure, including possible improvements (or even complete changes);
b) describe the ways of receiving input from your community and feedback to it, including again possible improvements.

and

Question 3. If you consider yourself to be acting ad personam, which procedure could you imagine in future to assure representativity: e.g. elections (who can vote, who is eligible), nomination by national physical society (or its sub-group on particle physics). Which mechanisms should be used for input from and feedback to the user community?

As to the nomination procedure it became evident from the discussion that the structure in the various Member States was very different and that a detailed formal procedure to nominate members, valid for all Member States, could not be found. However it was agreed that the common aim of all procedures was to achieve that the person(s) proposed to represent a Member State on the users committee were fully representative of the user community of that Member State, and were recognized as such by the scientific authorities of the Member State concerned. It was decided that the Chairman would write a letter on this subject to all members who would then pass it on to the relevant authority in their country.

Concerning distribution of the summary and full text of the ACCU minutes, the Secretary explained that he had not received authorization to have the summary included with the Research Board Minutes. Darriulat said that he would take this up with the Director-General. As to the full text, each ACCU member should in
due course prepare a list of addresses (e.g. directors, team leaders, libraries). Albrow said that all members should be encouraged to find ways to have from time to time meetings of their community.

Question 4. How do you see the relations of the members of the users committee with the national Delegates to the CERN Council?

There was agreement that good, yet informal relations were important, e.g. through ACCU members and Council Delegates receiving all agendas of meetings of both bodies. However, Darriulat was opposed to any formal link between the users committee and Council, as would be the case in Lillestol’s suggestion to make the chairman of the users committee an ex-officio member of Council. Bartl insisted on the possibility of a link between both bodies. The majority view was that the users committee should be advisory to the Director-General which would not inhibit a member of the user committee to contact his Council Delegate whenever he judged this desirable. Darriulat remarked that the new user committee would be created after consultation of SPC, restricted ECFA and possibly other bodies.

Question 5. It seems useful to balance ACCU membership also with respect to items like experiments, type of home institute, percentage of presence at CERN. How could this be achieved?

It was generally felt that additional constraints on ACCU membership as indicated in this question would make the nomination procedure too complicated. Also the idea indicated in the answer from Portugal to nominate not only members, but also deputy members was not supported in the discussion. The question was raised whether a member who could not attend a meeting due to e.g. illness, could be replaced; it was agreed that this should be made possible. As to the position of Chairman, the idea that he/she should be elected by the committee members amongst themselves was retained.

Question 6. Would you agree that members are nominated formally by CERN’s Director-General implying that the committee remains advisory to him?

The answers to this question were positive.

6. Any other business

Lillestol regretted that there had been no time to discuss in detail the recommendations of the final report of the CERN Review Committee. He wished, however, to raise the point of reducing the number of CERN Staff members as proposed by the CRC. He considered that the report had not made a clear case for such action and feared that if implemented, it would lead to a further decline in the services to users. He also wished to give full support to CERN management to oppose the proposal to divide CERN staff in two classes.

The other ACCU members supported Lillestol. Darriulat welcomed the comments made and invited members to communicate them also to their respective Council delegates.

ACCU considered that there was no clear case for the proposition of the CERN
Review Committee to reduce the CERN staff complement. ACCU was also opposed to the proposal to create a new status for certain categories of staff. ACCU expressed the fear that such measures would lead to a further decline in the services rendered to the users.

7. Items for agenda of next meeting

On proposition of Lillestol and Bos, it was agreed to continue discussions on the recommendations of the CERN Review Committee at the next meeting. CERN management should be invited to explain what course of action they intend to follow.

Darriulat said that he wished to discuss the proposed user office in more concrete terms. It was so agreed.

8. Date of next meeting

It was agreed to hold the next meeting exceptionally on a Thursday; the date being 14 April at 2 p.m. sharp.

G.J. Bossen
1. GENERAL NEWS

1.1 Announcement about the Cray X_MP/48

In June 1986 the CERN Council agreed that CERN should acquire a Cray X_MP/48 computer, for delivery in the autumn of 1987. In the intervening period, there has been a series of intensive negotiations between CERN and Cray Research on the one hand and the US Administration on the other, in order to determine the terms of the export licence without which no supercomputer such as the Cray may leave the USA. I am happy to announce that these negotiations have reached a successful conclusion, and that our new supercomputer is now being installed.

Two aspects of the negotiations are particularly pleasing. In the first place the US Administration accepted that CERN provide its own guarantees on the access and use of the machine, without any national authority being involved. Secondly, the need to have the results of our work freely available to all was recognised, as was the openness of CERN and its essential, international character. We were left in no doubt that they understood fully the importance to us of keeping restrictions on the use of the Cray to the very minimum.

Since the Cray will be used only for work to do with the approved CERN programme, the licence places no restrictions of any kind on access to the scientific output of the Cray. Furthermore, there will be no restriction on who may develop code for use on the Cray, and it is accepted that there can be a completely free exchange of information on the details of the programs being developed. The only significant restriction is that passwords for the Cray should not be given to nationals of certain, mainly Eastern European, countries; however, jobs containing code written by such individuals for the experiments may be submitted to the computer by authorized password holders working on the same experiment. The licence also contains requirements that we secure the computer physically, but the step had become necessary to protect the valuable equipment already installed in the Computer Centre. It must be emphasised that the Director General has made a clear commitment that any breach of security or misuse of passwords will be met by serious disciplinary action.

While it is much regretted that any restriction is necessary, it has been stated explicitly that the conditions obtained are without prejudice to our coming back at some later stage, when there has been some experience in operating the Cray at CERN, to negotiate improvements in those conditions.

Relevant personnel have been informed as to how the licence condition should be implemented in practice. Applications for Cray accounts should be made through the User Consultancy Office, which will provide the necessary assistance.

J.J. Thresher, Director for Computing
1. Sharing of space (offices and labs) at CERN:
   - Total space available on CERN sites 108 198 m²
   - EP Division has 22 714 m²

2. Evolution of Personnel and Space between 1978 and 1988
   - In 1978, for 2151 people, we had 16 600 m²
   - In 1988, for 4642 people, we have 22 714 m²

3. Present additional requested space:
   - In December 1987, we needed: 750 m²
   - In February 1988, it is up to 1000 m² (*)

4. Future needs:
   - Increase in the number of permanent people on LEP experiments
     - In January 1988: 325
     - next Summer: 440
     - by Summer 1989: 520
   - More people will be joining LEAR experiments.
   - Extra lab. space for LEP will be found within present Hall space.

(*) Note that with more than 500 extra full-time people by Summer 1989 we will need a further 500 m², thus bringing the total surface needed to 1500 m².

5. EP space policy:

   Offices and labs are made available only for experiments or technical services (very few people not directly connected with the CERN approved programmes have space (altogether 300 m²)).

   For each programme (LEP, UA, SPS, LEAR, SC), we have a list describing the distribution of space and people with their profile of presence at CERN (ref. copies 4 and 5).

   A survey of the space is performed every year with each group leader.

   In EP, we have 929 offices for 540 Staff Members, plus 750 Associates registered at 100%. For each group we have checked that we have more than 1 permanent person per office (copies 6, 7).

   EP areas are spread all over CERN, it is thus compulsory to have a redundancy of general services in different parts of the site (secretariats, Conference rooms, Xerox...).
It may be of interest to note that EP hosts about 4100 visitors compared to 80 for all other Divisions together.

Ageing of the buildings and barracks has rendered expensive any move within the Division.

In the years 1982 to 1986, we have recuperated and reallocated approximately 1500 m$^2$ within the Division, by squeezing all the groups into less space. This possibility however reached its ultimate limit.

6. Building 32

This new building together with the steps described above enabled to make available almost all the space needed for LEP experiments. Yet, the situation in 1985 (see copy 8) showed that after the reallocation of 3000 m$^2$, we were already short of 400 m$^2$. The extra surface provided by the new building corresponded to the requirement in 1985.

Presently, we are in a situation where it is impossible to provide any space at all.

N. Koulberg
10 February 1988
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demande</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Area (Omega)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lear / Isolde</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niinikoski</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charpak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righini</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querrou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>No Total</td>
<td>Titulaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEPH</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELPHI</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP/3</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAL</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1'338</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp.</th>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>H²</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>H²</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEPH</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1'250 H²</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4'36 H²</td>
<td>1'688 H²</td>
<td>2'650 H²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELPHI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1'669 H²</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5'98 H²</td>
<td>2'667 H²</td>
<td>3'070 H²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP/3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1'543 H²</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5'79 H²</td>
<td>2'128 H²</td>
<td>3'040 H²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>797 H²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>443 H²</td>
<td>1'240 H²</td>
<td>3'750 H²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>Bur.</td>
<td>$M^2$</td>
<td>Labs $M^2$</td>
<td>Total $M^2$</td>
<td>Halls</td>
<td>Nb. Total Tit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>400 $M^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>220 $M^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>200 $M^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2'236 $M^2$

457 personnes

Don't 52 staff
Occupancy in 1987
75 persons at CERN 100% of time

5.1 office
HELIOS - NA34
Occupancy in 1987
43 persons at CERN 100% of Time
33 offices
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**Evolution de l'ESPACE depuis 1978**

Fin 1977 nous avions 16438 m² de bureaux / labos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Année</th>
<th>Batiments</th>
<th>Reçu</th>
<th>Rendu</th>
<th>Remarques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>2867 m²</td>
<td>580 m²</td>
<td>EF (540) DD (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Zone Ouest</td>
<td>130 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>168/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>968 m²</td>
<td>EF (Horipurg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>210 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>270 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>+150 m² de Halles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>60 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enseignement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>250 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>OPHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>577/578</td>
<td></td>
<td>470 m²</td>
<td>destruction baraque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>360 m²</td>
<td>360 m²</td>
<td>EF OPHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>500 m²</td>
<td>420 m²</td>
<td>EF DELPHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>180 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>60 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 m²</td>
<td>d’ Ateliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Divers</td>
<td>470 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>redistribution 577/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>197 m²</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76 m²</td>
<td>Comité Abraagam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>345 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>UH2 Isolde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fin 1987 nous avions 22 6179 m² de Bur. / Lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reçu</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6179 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to follow up our discussions at the last ACCU meeting concerning membership of a future CERN Users Committee. It emerged that the scientific community in each country should be responsible to nominate members, avoiding members to act ad personam, but also avoiding the Committee to become a kind of mini-Council necessitating obligatory consultation of the community before each meeting. The aim should rather be that nominated members have sufficient authority in their countries and are entrusted with user matters. To achieve this, representativity of the members is a key issue.

At the meeting we agreed that each ACCU member should answer a number of questions on this subject, referring specifically to the situation in his own country. These questions follow below; you are of course free to add any comments you consider helpful. To allow the preparation of a compilation of your answers in time, please send your answers to our Secretary, G.J. Bossen before 18 December.

1. Do you consider yourself at present to be representative for your country’s user community, or to be acting ad personam?

2. If you consider yourself to be representative, please
   a) describe the nomination procedure, including possible improvements (or even complete changes);
   b) describe the ways of receiving input from your community and feed-back to it, including again possible improvements.

3. If you consider yourself to be acting ad personam, which procedure could you imagine in future to assure representativity; e.g. elections (who can vote, who is eligible), nomination by national physical society (or its sub-group on particle physics).
   Which mechanisms should be used for input from and feed-back to the user community?

4. How do you see the relations of the members of the users committee with the national Delegates to the CERN Council?
5. It seems useful to balance ACCU membership also with respect to items like experiments, type of home institute, percentage of presence at CERN. How could this be achieved?

6. Would you agree that members are nominated formally by CERN's Director-General implying that the committee remains advisory to him?

Yours sincerely,

Gilles Sauvage
Chairman ACCU
Dear Dr. Bossen,

These are the answers to the questions concerning ACCU membership.

ad 1) I am the representative nominated by my country's user community.

ad 2) a) We nominate ACCU-Representatives by vote of the "Vorstand" which is the supervisory committee of the Institute of High Energy Physics Vienna (it is the only one in Austria).
   b) Our ACCU-Delegate must report to this "Vorstand" and gets advice from them. In addition to that he contacts the national physicists for the ACCU-Meetings. Special national meetings are proposed for the future to discuss ACCU-Agendas.

ad 4) The ACCU-Members should work in close contact with the national CERN-Council-Delegates.

ad 5) It should be obligatory that an ACCU-Member works partially at CERN. Only then he can see the needs of the experimental work.

ad 6) This question includes two items:
   a) Formal nomination by the Director General of CERN. We would propose a formal approval by the Director General of CERN of the person nominated by the national selection body as communicated by its chairman.
   b) Advisory function of ACCU or CUC to the Director General. This could continue to be the case, but as more financial responsibility has been shifted directly to the national laboratories and/or universities, it seems appropriate that they should have more direct influence on matters concerning day-to-day performance of experiments.

In particular, we would like to propose a veto power of ACCU for certain CERN actions in order to be reconsidered by the CERN-Management.

W. Bartl
ACCU Representative
Dear Dr. Sauvage,

The role of ACCU or CUC has been discussed with the Austrian physicists and the following general points came up:

1) ACCU members should be nominated from the country and formally approved by the Director General of CERN.
2) The new ACCU Committee should be able to suspend decisions from CERN in order to be reconsidered.
3) The ACCU Chairman should report to the Council.
4) The ACCU Chairman should be selected from the ACCU members and formally approved by the Director General.

Yours sincerely,

W. Bartl
ACCU Representative of Austria
Sir,

I just received your letter concerning the membership of a future CERN Users Committee. Here are some remarks concerning my own experience.

I was chosen to become a member of ACCU by H. Levent of the FNRS in Brussels while I was still busy with my Ph. D. This is, to my mind, the first problem, because I was a bit young and I knew almost no Belgian physicists, except those in the experiment I was working in. This is because I left my university just after my studies to start a thesis at CERN. I almost worked more often outside Belgium than inside. I think that due to these two problems I was a bad representative of Belgian users community.

The second problem I met was to try to get in touch with possible CERN users in Belgium by means of letters sent to the different institutes. I got almost no answers and certainly no remark or question to ACCU. I had a little bit the feeling that people were not interested to be represented at CERN and to take advantage of this fact. Most of the time I was acting ad personam.

For the future, I see no way of improving this situation due to the lack of feed back.

I think that a membership to the CERN Users Committee based on experience and collaboration would be more useful. In this case the committee would hear about the problems encountered by the different collaborations and secondly there would be a little feed back because it could be done inside the collaboration by means of collaboration meetings etc... The people in the collaboration would also be more concerned if the problems they have with CERN could be expressed at ACCU (or CUC) and resolved. I think at least that this is a chance for them that they could use.
Finally, concerning my participation to the present ACCU, I will be back at CERN from my military service by the beginning of January 1931.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Thierry Hostinsky
Belgium ACCU representative.
Dear Sir,

Here is my answer concerning Switzerland to the questions of the ACCU chairman concerning membership of a future CERN Users Committee. Please excuse my late answer, I though some consultation was clearly needed before.

1. I am the Swiss representative to ACCU.

2. The forum of Swiss high energy physicists meets annually and also, if needed, on the request of its coordinator. It deals with all matters concerning Swiss high energy physics community and was foreseen especially for coordination.

   a) The Swiss candidates to ACCU are proposed by the coordinator of the above forum to the CERN's Director-General who decides. It would be possible to have an election by this forum, on proposition of its coordinator, so as to assure full representativity, as it is already the case for ECFA members for example. (see also answer to question 6).

   b) I give a short report of ACCU activities at the annual forum which allows also an organized way of receiving input from the Swiss community and feed-back to it. Direct consultation or mail, if necessary, is used.

   Improvement is possible: more meetings may be difficult to arrange but, at minimum, one could have one permanent contact in every institute. The availability of the ACCU minutes in computerized form, accessible by every one, would ease quick reactions.

4. Contact between the future Swiss representative to CUC and the "physicist" delegate to the CERN council can easily take place at the annual meeting where both give reports.

5. Better representativity and some open sessions should solve the problem. The number of representatives should stay at most two per country. Although it should not duplicate already existing channels, one could imagine, so that the desired type of expertise is available, apart from the representation by country, a limited number of members elected by the whole or relevant community of users.

6. There is a strong preference for an independent committee (as for example at FNAL).
Yours Sincerely,

M. Werlen
Dear Gilles,

the following answers to your questionnaire come from Karsten Eggert and myself. Karsten is in hospital this week and has asked me to send off these answers also on his behalf.

1) somewhere in the middle

2a) proposed by Gutachterausschuß (Advisory Committee on HEP to the Bundesforschungsministerium)

b) personal contacts.

Improvements: Distribute notes together with Research Board reports or similar, as discussed. Also once or twice per year a letter to all institutes, with main topics review and invitation to open meeting.

3) elections during an assembly of German users at CERN. Candidates called for by letter to institutes and open invitation, in coordination with Gutachterausschuß.

4) Frequent discussions welcome from our side. Need not be formalized.

5) Some balance on the national level can be achieved over the years. Internationally it will just have to come out naturally.

6) Yes. Anyhow, is there a sensible alternative??

Sincerely yours,
Dear G.J. Bossen,

Here are some answers to the CUC-questionnaire

1) The answer is both yes and no - I feel responsible for my country's User Community, but the present nomination procedure is somewhat arbitrary and the communication with the community is not too good, one of the reasons being that ACCU has not been taken too seriously until now. If ACCU/CUC is strengthened this will certainly improve things.

2-3) The present nomination procedure is that the person leaving ACCU talks with some "reasonable" people (including some group leaders) and finds a substitute.

   The section for particle physics in the Danish Physical Society is in its present form and function not adequate for a nomination procedure. I would suggest that a panel of group leaders from all the Danish groups participating in CERN-based experiments together with the CUC member leaving the Committee agree on the nomination, and that this panel together with the CUC member handle the input from - and feed back to - the User Committee.

4) The CUC member should know the Council delegates (and vice versa) and be in a position to discuss matters of common interest.
5) I think this should be left for the individual countries to decide, but the CUC member leaving the Committee should have the problem of overall balance in mind.

6) Yes, - but I foresee that most countries, including Denmark will probably only provide the necessary (one or two) number of names.

Best regards,

Hans Bøggild

Hans Bøggild
VALENCIA, 8 DE FEBRERO DE 1988
ATT.: MR. G. BOSSEN/ DIVISION PE, CERN
FROM E. HIGON/ IFIC, VALENCIA, SPAIN

IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH THE AUTHORITIES WE ARE STUDYING THE BEST WAY TO
NOMINATE THE SPANISH MEMBER OF THE 'CUC' COMMITTEE.

BEST REGARDS,

E. HIGON

61071 IFIC E

61071 IFIC E
419000A CER CH

INP.5077
08.02.88/09:12
Dear Gilles,

These are the answers to the ACCU questionnaire.

1) - As you know, France has two members at the ACCU. One is coming from the IN2P3, the other is the representative for the Département de Physique des Particules Élémentaires de Saclay. So, I consider myself to be the representative for users of Saclay.

2) - 3) I was nominated by the direction of my laboratory. Communication with the community is not very good. I have been very rarely contacted by users.

A way to improve representativity is to modify the nomination procedure. ACCU member could be nominated by the direction of our laboratory and by a group of physicists, for example Saclay group leaders of groups participating in experiments at CERN. This new procedure would sensibilise users to the role that the ACCU can play.

The existence of open sessions once a year at CERN, as suggested in the preliminary draft for improving relations between CERN and its outside users, would also improve communication between CUC member and community.

4) - CUC members should have informal discussion with national Delegate to the CERN Council on specific problems only.

- 5) It seems difficult to balance ACCU membership with respect to experiments, type of home institute. At least, CUC members should have to know well CERN and be involved in CERN experiments.

- 6) Yes.

Sincerely yours,

H. ZACCONE

Adresse : CEN-S DPh-PE-SEPb - 91191 GIF-sur-YVETTE CEDEX - Tél. : (6) 908 - Téléx PHYPEL 692 112 F
Reply to Accu Questionnaire
Jont Carter (UK)

1) I consider myself to be a representative of the UK user community.

2) a) Accu members are nominated in the UK by the RAL Users Advisory Committee (UAC). This Committee consists of one representative from each institute in the UK active in high energy physics. It seems a satisfactory procedure.

b) Accu members report on recent and forthcoming events to each meeting of UAC. These reports are circulated to each UK institution through the UAC minutes. Input from the community is received via UAC meetings and by individual approaches.

4) It would presumably be useful if the members of the users committee and delegates to the CEEN Council from a given country briefed one another from time-to-time about important issues.

5) At present, a balance could be achieved by selecting from more than one candidate nominated by a country for each vacancy on Accu.

6) Yes.
Dear Gillis,

I apologize for being late with the answer to your questionnaire.

U.K. representative on ACCU

1) We consider ourselves largely representative of the UK user community.

2) (a) The Particle Physics Committee, a U.K. Committee of the Nuclear Physics Board of the Science & Engineering Research Council (SERC) submits a few names to the CERN D.G. and learns the final choice to him (I believe). This seems to be a satisfactory procedure.

(b) In the UK we have a so-called Users Advisory Committee (UAC) presently chaired by Dr. R.M. Turnbull. The Committee meets 2-3 times per year, usually at Rutherford Appleton Lab. The ACCU members are automatically members of this committee also; we report to it and it can ask us to express its views at ACCU meetings.

3) In addition to the official UAC channel we are sometimes contacted directly by individual users to discuss some point they wish to have raised.

4) ACCU member + national council delegate should have an informed relationship to discuss matters of importance—no need for any formal link here.

5) In UK one ACCU member is a committee, the other a CERN "resident". This works well. One is University, the other in National Lab. (RAL). One is LEP, the other non-LEP. It balances out.
6) I think it reasonable that the formal nomination is by the Director General, and that the committee remains advisory to him. I cannot believe any alternative would work.

Best regards,

Mike Albaum
G. J. Bosson  
CERN  
CH-1211 GENÈVE 23  
SUISSE/SWITZERLAND

C. Kourkoumelis,  
Physics Lab.,  
104 Solonos St.,  
Athens 10680,  
Greece

ANSWERS TO THE ACCU QUESTIONNAIRE  
BY G. SAUVAGE 1/12/87.

1. I was nominated by the DG. I consult often  
with the other Greek users and they know  
that they can bring me their problems  
in connection with ACCU. It has been done  
in the past and I have reported their problems  
accordingly.

3. a) Unfortunately nowadays everything in Greece is  
highly politicised. So I am afraid that elections  
etc. would lead to someone who is biased  
towards a political party and not for the  
interest of the users committee.  
Therefore the best way for nomination I can  
presently see is the following:  
The DG or his representative consult with a  
number of well known Greek physicists who  
have done experiments for years at CERN. Upon  
their suggestions the DG makes himself the  
nomination.

b) The community is quite small and one can  
get enough input by talking to a few  
(10-15) people. It is also true that interested
people, if they have a specific problem they will go by themselves to the representative.

4. There should be a collaboration, but I am not sure if the national Delegate would like to make public the Council discussions. Sq 6 are answered in 3a).

Chou, Kunme Cj

C. Kourkoumelis /Greece
Dr. Gilles Sauvage  
ACCU Chairman

Dear Gilles,

I am trying to answer to your letter of December the 4th. I must first remark that I felt sometimes somewhat embarrassed since many questions cannot be answered straightforwardly with a yes or no.

Situations are fairly complex and also very different from one country to the other.

In the following I'll pick up your points in the same order.

1) I consider myself not only acting "ad personam" but also representing, at least partially and without any formal duty, the views of the Italian physical community.

2) a) the nominations to ACCU have been up to now been made to CERN Directorate by the INFN President and the INFN Executive Board.
   b) within the INFN structure there are official bodies where the physicists community is fully represented.

   They have the task to advise the INFN Directorate on the whole of the physics program, on the status of research activities of INFN groups and on the financing of research programs.

   They meet regularly 5 to 6 times a year and their members are elected by all INFN physicists.

   Relations between these bodies and ACCU members have not been officially activated until now. This can easily be made with the agreement of INFN authorities.

   Informal relations have been kept constantly although not on a regular basis.

   In the future these committees could designate ACCU members and to them ACCU members could report regularly and receive input.

3) The choice of the appropriate nomination procedure should be left to each country under the sole restriction that the designated members be fully representative of the needs and views of their colleagues having research activities at CERN.

4) Informal relations only.
5) I would assume that if ACCU members are appointed following the indications of each national community of CERN users the appropriate balance will almost automatically be ensured. I would not enforce any detailed rule.

6) Yes, I don't see other reasonable possibilities without coming into conflict with the present CERN regulations.

Best regards,

Valerio Gracco
Dear Mr. Bosson,

These are my answers:

1) I feel acting as an Italian representative.

2) a) I have been chosen by INFN President.
   b) For the CERN users, actually, the only way of being informed of agendas and minutes is through the CERN weekly bulletin: in principle, users would have to contact me, but this has never happened since I am in the ACCU (1 year). A way of improving communications would be the distribution both of agendas and minutes to a mailing list which assures adequate coverage of the user community. I would suggest: a) INFN President; b) CERN Advisory Committee members; c) Directors of local sections; d) Presidents of Scientific Commissions, for a total of about 35 people.

3) Also if I do not consider myself as an "ad personam" member, to improve representativity I suggest the elections of ACCU members. I think that a reasonable compromise between representativity and practical feasibility would be to identify the voting "ensemble" in our INFN Directorate (President, Executive Committee, Directors of the various INFN Sections, plus some Ministerial representatives) composed of about 30 people who are in good contact with our nuclear and particle physics community.

4) I think that the relations (how not existing, as far as I know) between ACCU members and Council members have to be promoted. A minimal start up would be the mutual exchange of both agendas and minutes of meetings, from which some interaction could emerge on specific problems.

5) I think that the actual numeric and geographic composition is adequate. To invent criteria to be eligible as ACCU member seems to me very difficult, if not impossible: each national community is supposed to choose representatives well involved in CERN, with reasonable presence and knowledge of CERN environment.

6) I agree.

Best regards,

C. Sciacca
from Kees Bos

1. 90% ad personam
    10% representative

2. We are not allowed to travel for just one ACCU meeting, so it has to be someone resident at CERN. The membership rotates among these people (we are only a few)

3. By private discussions.

3. All H.E.P. in Holland is concentrated at NIKHEF. So the Staff meeting at NIKHEF should nominate someone, and ACCU meetings should be reported back into this Staff meeting.

4. The council delegate should receive the minutes of the ACCU meetings. Closer contact only if needed. (I have p.i. urged our delegate to question about the CRAY during the next comm. of Council meeting)
5. As it is done now by leaving the CERN administration some choice

6. Yes
8 January 1988

Dear Mr. Bossen,

I am sorry to answer your request of December 4 with such delay and I hope my suggestions can still be useful. I will give my answers in relation to your numbered questions.

1. I do consider myself as acting ad personam.

2. Does not apply.

3. For Norway, with a small community of CERN-users, I suggest the following procedure:

   i) as election time gets close, the ACCU member contacts the group-leaders at the different institutions asking them to discuss and agree on an election committee (not more than three members).

   ii) the group leaders will discuss within their groups possible candidates and forward the names to the election committee.

   iii) the election committee produces voting ballots based on the names suggested, distributes the lists through the group leaders who also return the notes in sealed envelopes.

   iv) the election committee counts the votes and presents the community with the results.

The procedure may seem long, but done efficiently, e.g. much of the communication by telephone, it should be rather simple and fast.

Eligibility for voting should be given to physicists who uses CERN, and is employed by the universities, the research councils or other institutions.

Communications concerning ACCU activities could be based on the following:

a) the minutes of the ACCU meetings should be sent, in full or only as a resume, to the group leaders and to other specified persons, including the CERN council member(s).

Mr. G.J. Bossen
ACCU
PE
CERN
CH-1211 Geneva
Switzerland
b) Important points on the ACCU agenda should be discussed with the different groups over the phone, or occasionally, in meetings or by visits of the ACCU member to those most concerned with the case.

4. For cases of special importance, the ACCU member should meet with, or at least discuss over the phone with the CERN council member. It is important that they act coherently in relationship with the CERN administration.

5. Each country should elect e.g. twice as many nominees as they will have representatives, and an election panel (committee) of ACCU should be given the responsibility of choosing from this group a membership covering all aspects of CERN use. In doing so, the panel should, as much as possible respect priorities given by the countries themselves. At least 50% of the ACCU members should spend more than 50% of their time at CERN.

6. If as was discussed at the last ACCU meeting and agreed by the Director General, CERN's management will make more use of ACCU and place members from ACCU in committees of interest, I find it reasonable that the ACCU members are nominated formally by the Director General of CERN, according to the list prepared by the ACCU election panel.

Please note that my address for 1988 is:

International Centre for Theoretical Physics
P.O. Box 586
I-34100 Trieste, Italy

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Endre Lillethun
Dear Colleague,

I am writing to answer the questions which have been formulated about the representativity of ACCU members.

Due to some personal problems, I could only answer now. I apologize and hope they will still be useful.

1.- There are about 30 physicists in my country working in High Energy Physics. In fact, in the experimental domain, there is only one Laboratory (LIP), the main dependency being at Lisbon (to which I belong) and the other at Coimbra. So I feel representative of the Portuguese physicist community.

2.a)- I have been nominated by the president of the Institution of my country which is responsible for the relations between Portugal and CERN. He is also an Experimental High Energy physicist.

b)- As it is a small community, I have contact with my colleagues almost everyday.

Of course, Portugal is a very particular case, and I think solutions must be different from country to country.

4.- The matters discussed in CERN Council and in CERN Users Committee are rather independent, so one should not impose a very close relationship between their members. In what concerns Portugal, once more, as people see each other quite often, information flows naturally.
5.- It is important that members come from different types of institutes, belong to different experiments, and so on, so that all ways of thinking be represented.

Countries should choose effective and supplant people; those with more than one member, should choose them belonging to different domains. Whenever it is felt that there is too much people representative of one domain, these particular members should give their place to supplants.

6.- The members being effectively chosen (elected or nominated) by their own countries, I think it is unnecessary that they be formally nominated by CERN's Director-General. One should rather report him on a new member after he has been accepted (see 5.) by the Users Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Paula Bordalo
Portuguese ACCU member
To ACCU secretary
G.J. Bossen

Dear Gerrit

This is my answer to the request of the situation of the way people are elected to ACCU.

1. Yes I consider myself as a representative of the Swedish users of CERN.

2. a. In the swedish case the ACCU member is proposed by the board of the section of particle physics in the Swedish Physical Society. This board is elected every 2 years and each member can only be elected two times in a row. Every particle physicists in Sweden has the right to vote. The board is among other things selecting the people going to international conferences and nominates the Swedish ECFA and RECFA members. The members of the board are all active particle physicists.

b. Before taking part to the ACCU meeting (up to now only once) I contacted the members of the board and had a discussion with them about the subjects in the agenda. I have also contacted many swedish physicists at CERN and in Sweden. I intend also (depending on the subject) to have discussions with our representative in the Swedish Natural Science Council as I did before the last meeting.

Every year in November the board is organizing a meeting of the Swedish particle physicists and at that meeting the ACCU representative is giving a presentation of what happend in ACCU. I have also written a summary in the newsletter given out by the Swedish CERN committee about the latest ACCU meeting. A copy of the minutes is sent to the secretary of the board of particle physics.

3. –

4. I think it is of great importance that the ACCU member should have contact with the national Delegates to the council.

5. I am not sure that this is a problem if each representative really has good contacts with the physicists from his country.

6. I think that the committee has to be advisory because of the CERN constitution. However, the delegates could also in principle be nominated by the Council.

Yours Sincerely

Per Olof Hulth
10 December 1987

Dear Gilles,

here a few answers to you letter dated 4th December 1987.

I have been selected by the EP Division Leader (and nominated by the Director General) as one of the two "inhouse" CERN user representatives.

There is quite some feed-back to the EP Senior Staff through discussions, and lately even through full reports, in EP Senior Staff Meetings. However there are no organized links between the normal EP Staff or Fellows and the CERN ACCU members. Some contacts took place on an individual basis only. This could be improved by having an open EP Physicist User Meeting.

The EP users are known, and one could indeed imagine that a real election could be made. But at least one of the two CERN CUC representatives should be a Senior Physicist in my opinion. Furthermore one should make sure that the two CERN CUC members represent the whole community, for example in the coming years by having one LEP and one non-LEP person.

Finally I think that CUC should have an advisory character to the DG in the same way as the committees for experiments (PSC, SPSC, LEPC).

Sincerely yours,

Peter Jenni
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Committee/Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by supervisory committee of HEP Institute Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>ad personam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by coordinator of forum of Swiss high energy physicists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>by Advisory Committee on HEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>by outgoing ACCU member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>one member by Saclay direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by Users Advisory Committee UAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>(mainly) representative</td>
<td>by INFN president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>mainly ad personam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ad personam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by president of institution responsible for relations between PT and CERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by board of section of particle physics in Swedish Physical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>by EP Division Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Input/Feedback</td>
<td>Possible Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>to/from supervisory committee</td>
<td>special national meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>to/from annual forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- election by forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permanent contact in each institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computerized ACCU minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distribute ACCU summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Research Board minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>once/twice per year progress report to all institutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open meetings at CERN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>to/from UAC meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>feedback through CERN Weekly Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distribution of ACCU agendas and minutes to some 35 people (adequate coverage of user community)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>input from and feedback to elected bodies advisory to INFN Directorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nomination by these bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>to/from board and Natural Science Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to/from annual meeting of HEP physicists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through newsletter of Swedish CERN Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>to/from EP Senior Staff meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open EP physicist User Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>election with certain constraints by EP Users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. nomination procedure to become representative

AT -

BE - replace ACCU membership by nationality through membership by collaboration

CH -

DE - by assembly of CERN users

DK - by panel of group leaders and outgoing member to/from panel

FR -

GB -

GR - CERN consulting senior users personal contacts

IT -

NL - by NIKHEF staff meeting to/from staff meeting

NO - by vote of CERN users, prepared by group leaders - distribution of ACCU minutes to group leaders etc.

PT -

SE -

CERN -
4. ACCU/Council

5. Balancing
   ACCU membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Action/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>- close contact  - ACCU member to work (partially) at CERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>- contact at annual forum  - not more than 2 members per country  - some additional experts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>- informal frequent discussions - to be taken into account at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>- delegates to know each other and discuss  - to be taken into account at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>- informal discussions  - ACCU members to be involved in CERN experiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>- briefing one another  - present procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>- collaboration  - solved by nomination procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>- informal relations  - present situation (1/2 members per country) ok  - members to work partially at CERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. exchange of agendas and minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>- ACCU minutes to Council delegates  - present procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- closer contact if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>- discussion of important items  - present procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>- no close relations  - nomination of member and deputy-member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>- contact important  - not a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Advisory to DG

AT - formal nomination by DG
- ACCU veto to allow reconsideration in special cases

BE -

CH - independent committee

DE - yes

DK - yes

FR - yes

GB - yes

GR - yes

IT - yes

NL - yes

NO - yes

PT - no formal nomination by DG

SE - yes or nominated by Council

CERN - yes