

Prime Minister ①

CC BX

ce R

PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Waleys has seem to have secured a good outcome on the term of reference, at the expense of lengthening the timescale a bit.

CERN REVIEW

You will also wish to see Sir Robin Nicholson's note at Play A. Agree to ask for a report in November?
MEAT 25/12

At the meeting of E(A) on 18 December it was agreed that the UK should continue to press for a radical review of CERN with the objective of securing significant reductions in CERN expenditure. At the CERN Council meeting on 20 February, attended by Mr Walden and Professor Mitchell, agreement was reached on a review which will examine, among others, the option of a reduction of 25% in the present level of subscriptions. I attach a copy of Mr Walden's report and the subsequent Parliamentary announcement. Copies of the minute and attachments go to colleagues on E(A).

K.J.

yuo
me

K J

Department of Education
and Science

27 February 1986

SECRETARY OF STATE

CERN REVIEW: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL MEETING ON 20 FEBRUARY

1. You will have seen the Parliamentary Answer (copy attached) that I gave on Friday 21 February reporting the successful outcome of the extraordinary session of the CERN Council convened the day before at the request of the UK. I thought I should report a little more fully; and you may think it appropriate to inform the Prime Minister and colleagues on E(A).

2. We have secured:

- (i) unanimous agreement to a review;
- (ii) an assurance that it will examine the -25% option among others;
- (iii) that the review team will report within a year.

3. The going was difficult. Apart from ourselves, there was a unanimous belief that a 25% cut was unrealistic, and a strong resistance to any mention of it in the terms of reference, partly on the grounds that it might prejudice the result of the review. Only by insisting that this was an essential condition for the UK did we secure a guarantee (in the form of a footnote to the text, backed by a letter from the President of the CERN Council to the review team) that the 25% option would be considered, along with others.

4. In my judgement it would have been impossible to secure both this point and our preference for the completion of the review by the end of this year (effectively November). We tried for this too, but others were quick to claim a contradiction between our wish for a radical review by high level people (still to be approached and appointed); and on an unrealistic timescale.

5. As I explained to you on the telephone, it seemed to me that intransigence on both fronts simultaneously could have endangered the fragile consensus we had painstakingly built up, and leave us with no prospect of an early and radical review, and no adequate reason for quitting CERN. I therefore agreed, reluctantly, with the view of the other 13 members that the review team should report within a year, rather than by the end of 1986.

6. We shall take a close interest in the members of the review team to ensure that eminent people, including industrialists, engineers, and financial expertise are well represented, and that the field is not left to practitioners of high energy particle physics. We shall also prepare a memorandum, to be submitted to the review, on matters we want it to consider.

research and people interested in other
mb
/continued....

7. Our strongest argument in persuading the other 13 countries to accept a review at all was not the need for a cost-cutting exercise (though many agreed with the need for that too), but the need to redeploy scientific and financial effort from this rarified field, either domestically, or into European collaboration in areas of more immediate economic benefit. A number of delegations who had reacted with suspicion to our initial proposal, ended by thanking the UK publicly for grasping the nettle. There is an obvious parallel here with the restructuring and rationalisation that has been successfully carried out by many of the research councils in this country.

8. Professor Bill Mitchell, the Director of SERC, deserves credit for his performance during these intensive and difficult negotiations.

J. J. H. -

GEORGE WALDEN
25 February 1986

GCSE Examinations

Dr. Glyn asked the Secretary of State for Education and Science what action he has taken to ensure that sufficient preparations have been made for the new GCSE examinations with regard to teachers' courses; how many mode 1 syllabuses have been approved; and how he proposes to make them available by the autumn term.

Mr. Chris Patten: The Secondary Examinations Council, the GCSE examining groups and the local education authorities have all combined to provide a programme of preparation for the new examination courses which is unprecedented both in its scale and in its scope. The Department is making a substantial financial contribution. Mode 1 syllabuses in those subjects for which there are subject national criteria fall to be approved by the examining groups and the Secondary Examinations Council. Mode 1 syllabuses in other subjects fall to be approved by the examining groups in the first instance. The Secondary Examinations Council announced on 18 February that 76 syllabuses had been approved. All syllabuses must be approved by May 1986 at the latest. Both the examining groups and the Secondary Examinations Council are on course for that target. The distribution of approved syllabuses to schools is a matter for the examining groups.

CERN

Mr. John Mark Taylor asked the Secretary of State for Education and Science when he expects to announce a decision on the future level of British participation in CERN.

Mr. Walden [*pursuant to his reply*, 4 February 1986, c. 114]: On 20 February at the invitation of the Council of CERN I attended an extraordinary session at which it was unanimously agreed, following the proposal made by the United Kingdom, and on the basis of a resolution put forward by the President of the Council, Professor Kummer, to conduct a comprehensive independent review of the organisation. The resolution and accompanying explanatory note are as follows:

"CERN REVIEW"

THE CERN COUNCIL

Recognising

the growing importance, for all European states regardless of their size, of political, economic, scientific and technological collaboration;
the necessity of fundamental scientific research of high quality both for the advancement of knowledge, and for future economic and social prosperity;
the success of the scientific collaboration in CERN which has given Europe a leading position in the world in the field of particle physics;
the growth of scientific opportunity in this and other fields, and the consequence for priorities both nationally and internationally;
the need for governments to review from time to time the distribution of financial and human resources over the existing scientific activities so as to ensure responsiveness to new scientific and technological developments;
the duty, with limited publicly-provided resources, of seeking improved cost-effectiveness and better value for money.

Having regard to

the desirability of maintaining also in the longer term the high quality and international character of CERN science and technology, and a programme in which LEP experiments as well as other ones, including smaller experiments, can find a place;

possibilities within the existing CERN Convention for engaging and enlarging other sources of funds and resources;

the possibilities for improved worldwide co-ordination of investment plans for accelerators and of their use;

the possibilities for improving efficiency within CERN and the need to match staffing cost-effectively to programme requirements;

the importance of realising LEP phase 1 and taking into consideration the completion of LEP to its full design energy.

Decides to appoint an ad hoc consultative group of external personalities to conduct an in depth comprehensive review of CERN with the following task:

to advise the Council how human and material resources, employment conditions, structure, operations and future use and development of facilities might be developed to operate with maximum cost effectiveness and value for money at alternative levels of funding by present Member States, and to assess their consequences for the CERN programmes and for the services to Member States*;
to assess the possibilities for engaging and enlarging other sources of funds and resources;
to report within one year findings and recommendations to the CERN Council and hence to the governments of the Member States.

Asks the Director-General of CERN and his staff, and other organs and committees of CERN, to provide such information and other collaboration as the Review Group may request.

*The Delegation of the United Kingdom requests the consideration of alternative levels of funding by present Member States ranging from constant contributions at 1986 levels to contributions reduced by 25 per cent expressed throughout in 1986 real terms, over the next 5-7 years. [The President undertook to ensure that the review group examined this option.]

Cern Review: Explanatory note

1. The Group should be composed of five to seven persons and might include scientists engineers and industrialists. Members should be chosen for their breadth of experience. One member would be named as Chairman. Chairman and other members should be ready to devote the appropriate time for this task. Chairman and members would be appointed by the President of Council on behalf of the CERN Council, taking into account proposals made by the Governments of Member States, and after consultation with Committee of Council.
2. The group would have its own full-time secretariat attached to the Chairman of the Group.
3. It would be for the group to decide on its procedures. The group would be free to examine any possibilities it chose. The Group should take account of the Scientific Policy Committee and of the progress of other relevant reviews such as CERN's own internal review programme including that of Professor Rubbia's group.
4. It would be open to the Group to commission further professional help (e.g. management consultant services) with the approval of the President of CERN Council.
5. The cost of the review will be evaluated and the manner in which it will be financed will be decided on the basis of a proposal made by the Chairman of the group in collaboration with the President of Council and of the Director-General of CERN."

Schools (Capital Allocations)

Mr. Steen asked the Secretary of State for Education and Science (1) what is the capital allocation for 1986-87 for wholly supported schools in the public sector in Devon;

(2) what is the capital allocation for voluntary aided schools in Devon for 1986-87, expressed (a) in total and (b) as a percentage of the total money made available in Devon by way of capital allocation for education;

(3) what is the capital allocation for 1986-87 for wholly supported schools in the public sector in Cornwall;



000
WO937

PRIME MINISTER

28 February 1986

CERN REVIEW

attached (E(A) 85) 25th
Mr Walden has achieved the mandate you gave him in your summing up of the E(A) discussion on CERN of 18 December with the exception that the review is to be complete "within a year" rather than by the end of 1986. I think Mr Walden's arguments for gaining, in negotiation, a mention of the Kendrew 25 per cent cut rather than getting the review by the end of 1986 are sound.

2. The only problem is that if we **do not** like the review, we will not be able to give notice to withdraw until 1987 and we will not actually withdraw until 31 December 1988. Hence we will participate fully in the cost of building CEP but we are not able to use it!

3. My advice is that, in replying to the Secretary of State, you ask for a report on the progress of the review in, say, November 1986 so that if it is going badly, Ministers could consider the merits of giving a conditional notice of withdrawal (UNESCO style) in December 1986 so that withdrawal would take effect (if the review was unsatisfactory) on 31 December 1987, thus saving a year's nugatory expenditure.

4. I am copying this minute to Sir Robert Armstrong.

MBN

SIR ROBIN NICHOLSON
Chief Scientific Adviser



CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

Sh19



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

3 March 1986

Dee Rob

CERN REVIEW

The Prime Minister has seen your Secretary of State's minute of 27 February, enclosing Mr. Walden's report of the outcome of his discussions leading to the CERN Council's agreement to a review.

The Prime Minister was glad to note that the agreement to a review had been secured and that this will examine the option of a reduction of 25 per cent in the present level of subscriptions. She has noted that if we do not like the conclusion of the review, we shall not be able to give notice of withdrawal until 1987, and not able actually to withdraw until the end of 1988. She has therefore asked for a report on the progress of the review in November to allow Ministers to consider, if necessary, the merits of giving conditional notice of withdrawal by the end of this year so that withdrawal could take place at the end of 1987.

I am copying this letter to the Private Secretaries to Members of E(A) and to Sir Robin Nicholson and Michael Stark (Cabinet Office).

Zer
Mark Addison

MARK ADDISON

Rob Smith, Esq.,
Department of Education and Science

CONFIDENTIAL

ECU