

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST ST WORKSHOP

H. Laeger

This summary and the conclusions are based, on one hand, on the ten-minute session summaries presented by the eight chairmen at the last day of the Workshop, on the other hand, on the results of the opinion poll which was conducted after the Workshop and to which two-thirds of the participants responded. Furthermore, it includes elements from the six months organization period prior to the Workshop. Unavoidably, it also contains highly subjective opinions from its author. Be aware of this when reading these lines.

The mere fact that the management of the Division decided to go for a workshop had an immediate positive effect. From the very beginning, this generated lively discussions on the best possible content of the Workshop and gave rise to basic questions of the type: *who* are we in the context of CERN, *what* are we doing and *how* are we doing it ? Trying to find answers to these questions created a stimulating atmosphere for reflections on our tasks, working environment, objectives, methods, difficulties, possible improvements, and similar issues.

One delicate initial task was to define the criteria for the selection of participants from the Division. It was finally decided that every participant should make a presentation and be proposed by the Group Leader. We are aware that only 20% of the divisional staff could participate, and the management is thinking about actions aimed at the remaining 80%. At an early stage of the preparations, we realized that this was an excellent opportunity for targeted training. The proposals for training were taken up by nearly half of the concerned staff. They developed communication skills with noticeable results in *Written Communication*, *Making Presentations* and *Chairing Meetings*. Many thanks to the CERN Education Services, in particular to F. Fabre and her team, who managed to honor all our training requests with great flexibility.

On the organization of the Workshop proper, we simply relied on the experience of the SL Division with their *LEP Performance Workshop*, and this proved successful. I would like to express my gratitude to S. Myers, J. Poole and M. Truchet for their help and truly useful advice.

Now, let's come to the presentations given by the staff of our Division, in total 34. Firstly, the large majority of the presentations was of excellent quality. This is true for the content and for the form. Secondly, all participants got a picture of the diversity of the tasks and of the responsibilities the Division has with respect to the running of CERN. Thirdly, clearly visible and most impressive, the leitmotiv running throughout all sessions was related to quality, to efficiency, and to methods and procedures for their achievement. Fourthly, the presentations generated lively discussions during and after the sessions. Last but not least, our divisional management has apparently listened to the staff and implemented first changes only one week after the Workshop. Undoubtedly, we will see further positive actions in the near future.

It is impossible to give a fair summary of a rich three-day Workshop in a few lines. Therefore, please read this paragraph for what it is: a poor enumeration of some of its key words. Realistic and controlled management of resources, truly professional project management, well-defined objectives and responsibilities are widely accepted as desirable. The question, however, is: Is this a reality? A global approach to contracts and to projects from the very beginning, precise specifications, uniform procedures, anticipation of problems, balanced treatment of technical and of financial and legal aspects, association of external experts, are getting good attention in some domains but are insufficiently dealt with in others. We have real competence with various technologies and, for some domains of activity, clear ideas about how and where to go. However, standardization needs to be improved and collaborations reinforced within the Division as well as CERN-wide. Efforts are made

for overall economy of envisaged technical and financial solutions which include investment, operation and maintenance. This is not usual practice at CERN, and CERN management should give stronger directives. ST Division needs to adopt the same approach as the Accelerators which it serves, and be at the forefront of available technology, in order to be able to provide services of the highest quality and reliability.

We were fortunate to count eighteen guests from other divisions or from outside who kindly accepted to join part time. Thirteen of them opened a window to their work by giving exciting talks on other services, contracts, specific present and future technologies, accelerators, experiments and the physics behind all this. Not only was this interesting by itself, but it indicated links between our and their activities and, most important, generated higher motivation for our tasks.

Finally, when glancing through the answers to the opinion poll, it seems that the overall satisfaction with our first ST Workshop is high. Though there are some items for which changes and improvements are proposed, I come to the conclusion that a possible future workshop could essentially be run the same way. The frequency of such a divisional workshop could be once every two or three years, and the years without should be spent to cater for the other 80% of our staff members.