

Participants: R. Duc CEA-Saclay
A. Muret CEA-Saclay
B. A. Huber CEA-Grenoble
H. Lebius CEA-Grenoble

Begin of the meeting: 14h, 30.7.2001

In the first part of the meeting the actual situation of the quality project has been discussed. The summary report of the 2. quality meeting, which has been sent to all persons in charge for one of the six LEIF-projects, asking for their constructive participation in defining the specific quality rules, has found so far no response. As the definition of our needs requires the support of the parties involved, we proposed to re-vitalize the genesis of a LEIF quality referential and to form a new 'quality club', including possibly also younger scientists who are interested in this subject (see below). The participants of the meeting are convinced that due to the talk of R. Duc at the Berlin meeting the importance of a quality approach should be evident for the network members. One problem might have been that even with the examples given in the summary of the 2. quality meeting, it might have not become clear how to formulate a quality referential in praxis.

The following steps were decided in order to accelerate the preparation of the quality referential and the functioning of the network in general:

- 1) The preferred communication method in the network is the e-mail. However, it became evident that the method of acceptance and reply to these messages is poor. In order to enhance the efficiency a more stringent approach to communication by the network participants is desirable. An e-mail should be answered preferentially the day it arrived, but not later than after 3 days. Sometimes it is obvious for one member that he can not answer e-mails within three days, for example during holidays or conferences. Even in these cases, a response should be assured, either by automatic replies (stating a dead-line on which the e-mail will be responded) or by transferring the mail to a colleague who assures the response. It should also be mentioned that a response like 'I got your e-mail, I do not have the necessary information, but I will have it within two weeks' is much better than no response at all.
- 2) It seems to be important to decide, how to deal with communication black-holes. First of all, it should be made clear in the e-mail that a response is necessary. Second, a framework dealing in time with the black holes should be implemented. For example, a first reminder should be sent after a week, a second reminder after another week, and the final 'mobilizer' should be a telephone call after yet another week. Naturally these delays have to be discussed and probably also adapted to the special case.
- 3) For each project we proposed to nominate one person, who is in charge of the quality aspect of the project. These persons, working closely together with the persons in charge of the projects, make up the 'quality club' of the network. They will meet the first time during the 2nd annual meeting (15.9. 21:00). This 'quality club' will be in charge of creating the quality referential; one of its first tasks being to fix a date, at which the quality referential should be ready. We should also plan to do some training courses in quality procedures, and the 'quality club' should meet for a workshop in November. Naturally the quality club should be open to additional volunteers.

As a practical exercise, we discussed during the meeting the process concerning the beam-time distribution. This process, central to the future distributed installation, has to fulfill several demands:

- during the process all parties involved should be informed about the actual status
- accountability of all the documents submitted (by numbers and signatures)
- confidentiality should be preserved
- the receipt of important documents should be acknowledged

There are three major parties involved: the users, the infrastructures and the beam-time distribution committee, consisting of coordinator, secretary and jury members. A flow-chart was developed which will be discussed at the annual LEIF-meeting.

As a starting point, we qualified the different LEIF-projects by belonging to different categories of projects.

There are three different types pertaining to our network:

- logistical support: these are well defined in their objectives and costs, as they are running 'indefinitely', a finish date can not be given. This applies mainly to LEIF-projects 1 and 2.

Summary, Quality meeting, 30-31.7.2000, Grenoble

HL01/10a

- 'Realisation' projects: they have well-defined objectives, cost and finish dates. Typical examples are the production of databases in LEIF-projects 3, 4 and 5
- research project: the objectif is well-defined, but (typically) not the cost and finish date and the outcome is uncertain. A typical example might be the 'deceleration to eV-energies' as stated in LEIF-project 6.

Finally, the framework and the content of the talk of A. Muret, scheduled for the LEIF-meeting in Heraklion, has been discussed.

End of the meeting: 15h, 31.7.2001

H. Lebius