

Q1 : Organisation before the Workshop

Good and clear organisation. OK the rest. Very good the course 'making posters'.

Very good.

Excellent, less stress for papers delivery.

Good, some problem in the definition of the time allowed to every speaker.

Pas de problème OK.

Good.

Unfortunate deadline for papers, very shortly after the holidays. The rest OK. In particular the training possibilities.

Janvier comme date n'est pas géniale. Trop d'activité à la fois. Templates super par rapport aux années précédentes.

Excellent as always.

Having participated in previous workshops I (I think so) did not need any information & training. O.K.

Tres bien.

OK.

Très bien.

Clearer guidelines should be given by the division leader on the message or information that he intend to give to the ST client.

OK !

Excellent.

Perfect.

I joined the workshop at the last minute, as far as I am concerned all that was quite OK.

Very clear, simple, effective.

It seemed to me more relaxed and less constrained as in the years before.

OK.

Q2 : Organisation during the Workshop

I could profite of these services and I've found everything well organised.

Good.

Excellent.

Good.

Très bien organisé. Merci.

Very good.

OK, as it has been the former years as well.

Excellent.

Excellent as always.

Good.

Est-il possible de changer de période de l'année ?

OK.

Très bien, il faut laisser un peu de souplesse dans les horaires sans trop de débordement.

OK.

Good !

Excellent.

Really good.

Quite fine.

OK. I did not have any problem.

Très bien.

Perfect, of course !

Q3 : The ALPINA Conference Facilities

OK the conference room. Please, serve the coffee in the poster room.

Absolutely appalling sound facilities, either the amplification equipment didn't work or no one knew how to use it. The conference room has several "blind spots" - from some seats it is impossible to see the screen where the slides are being shown.

Excellent.

OK.

Agréable, conviviale OK.

Good, except the problems we had with the microphones.

Apart form the microphones OK.

Excellent.

Not really at a professional level. More like a converted disco.

Very convenient, except for the microphones which occasionally failed.

Sonorisation à améliorer.

OK.

La sono n'était pas toujours stable. Le reste est correct.

Very good.

Good, except for the microphones.

Very good.

No comment.

Quite fine.

I think it was really suitable to our Workshop.

Good.

Remplacer les microphones.

Q4 : The ALPINA Hotel

Good position. I don't like skying, so I would rather prefer to change place (lakeside?). Rooms: OK.
Food: excellent.

Very good.

Good.

Food to be improved.

OK.

Very good.

OK.

Excellent.

Good for the Queen Vic pub. It would benefit from more lifts.

Good.

Très bien.

Particulièrement confortable! nourriture appréciée!

C'est correct.

Very good.

Good, but the coffee-breaks should be allocated to the poster rooms.

Excellent.

Très bien les chambres et les services. Nourriture pas excellente.

Excellent.

Perfect and very comfortable and elegant for what concerns the location and rooms. Sufficient for the food.

Good.

Q5 : The Workshop

Very interesting. Perhaps a little too dense. One suggestion: advise persons of the exact duration of their presentation some days before (avoid cuttings the same day).

Good idea, every group should participate fully, more time should be allocated to discussion. There should be fewer subjects with more time for discussion. The chairperson should be stricter with time allocation.

Excellent. Last afternoon to be improved.

The overall structure looked better than the previous years but lot of confusion on the time allowed to the different speakers. Some subjects where not coherent with the theme of the day.

Risque à l'auto-satisfaction : les activités de base de ST sont elles suffisamment soulignées ?

Very good concept. In particular I apreciated the variety of external speakers.

The concept seems still good to me. Some of the participants should practice their speech before Chamonix in order to respect the time limit.

Meilleure structure et mélange des orateurs ST et externe. Très agréable à suivre. Pour les proceedings, je propose de mettre sur le web aussi les présentations et les posters. Plus de temps pour les dicussions que les années précédentes - c'était bien.

Best year so far. In general the papers were more interesting.

Good. So far I have not seen the proceedings.

OK.

Je serais très intéressé de recevoir les proceedings.

Il ne faut pas changer la forme.

I think it was well conceived and comprehensive. The idea of the posters was very effective. The last day "external" conferences were very interesting.

See point 6)

Very good. I believe a bit more time should have been foreseen for some presentations and subsequent discussions. This could be done informally by session presidents by consulting informally each of the speakers to have an approximate idea how to distribute the overall available time.

I liked very much the poster sessions, and I appreciated the time allocated for questions.

The workshop was well designed and structured.

Q6 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Staff Members

Which theme(s) was (were) most interesting ?

Any technical matter regarding Technical Coordination interdivisional (LHC, ATLAS, ALICE, ...) or intradivisional (status of civil works,...). I guess they should be developed.

Most interesting: LHC related themes -> Special civil engineering presentations. A développer davantage : maintenance, les expériences.

LHC and contracts sessions.

For obvious reasons the one concerning the Optimisation of SPS cooling towers.

Suivi des contrats, opération , maintenance.

Plan Ass. Qualité, MP5.

Everything was interesting for me, especially for me as it was the first time I could go to the Workshop and as I am in the ST Division since not so much time.

Updates on the on-going and up-coming projects were very useful and shall be held more frequently for a bigger public in the division.

Not many were useful and even fewer enlightening. I am still in the dark over exactly what MO group do other than the TCR. Overall interesting though.

Though it is also good for people to report on the advancement of a project - giving a kind of a status report - it is more captivating to listen to something new, e.g. the use of Linux in some control project.

Conclusion session.

I was extremely happy to see an overview of the multiple activities of the division. I would propose that the themes having to do with the experiments, although they were well grouped, could be slightly grouped differently: themes having to do with the experimental areas, themes having really to do with the detectors, including safety.

Les sujets étaient très intéressants.

Some session's president should discuss more with their session's members: example: some people believed that they had 30 minutes to make their presentation and received only 10 minutes the day of the presentation.

Thursday morning was most the most interesting for me (for my work).

I found the overview of different themes and subjects concerning ST useful but especially those concerning its evolving role vis-a-vis the experimental community.

Q6 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Staff Members

Which theme(s) was (were) pretty useless ?

Sometimes I have the impression that some themes are repeated in many presentations. This year I've got this feeling for realiability (risk analysis, ...). Last year for quality. Perhaps this should be reduced unless this has been defined as point to stress during the workshop.

Session names such as "ST problems and solutions" does not give a positive image, I would rather prefer ST Challenges. Self-congratulation should be avoided.

Generalities as the Symons paper.

The one concerning the ST drawings.

Sujets anecdotiques : b2b.

C'est la première fois que les sujets étaient bien équilibrés entre les différents groupes, me semble-t-il.

Those which were presented the year(s) before and for which there has not been a technical breakthrough.

Nothing really useless this year.

Contract disputes: I don't consider it useless but quite repetitive.

I was not really interested in civil engineering, but I am not part of ST. Although I understand perfectly that the people have to have the opportunity to present their very valuable work, I would put even more emphasis on the subjects involving several parts of ST or having connections with many partners and let less time on particular subjects having little connections with the rest.

Q6 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Staff Members

Which theme was missing ?

I would have probably appreciated to hear something about the status and next steps of all the civil works sites. This theme was touched by many people, but I like it very much.

More involvement of ST-HM.

The future structure of ST division.

There was no missing theme; but considering that time is an invariant more discipline should be applied to some of the presentations so that time for questions & comments is not eaten away.

Already too much presentation. But a session should be devoted to the division itself and should promote the discussion on the ST organisation.

I think that most of the presentations were explanations about what HAD BEEEN done. I think that next time there should be some kind of matrix grouping, in subjects as today, but there should also be a grouping within the subjects for instance: 1. Things done (post information), 2. What to be done in the future (already decided) & 3. Proposals/suggestions/new ideas. I would say that 80 % of the presentations were information about things already achieved and 20 % about future projects. I saw almost no new ideas. Making this split will underscore the importance of thinking new.

None.

Maybe I would have liked to hear some more "technical" presentation, thus limiting a little bit the "management-related" ones, but this is a detail.

Q7 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Invited Speakers

Which theme(s) was (were) most interesting ?

Very interesting the presentation of the project status (LHC, ALICE, etc...). Very good the physics section.

Future projects for post-LHC. LEP to LHC physics.

All excellent, both LHC and physics related.

Not attended.

Interventions brillantes et tres intéressantes.

LEP to LHC physics. R&D future CERN projects.

Of interest to ST is of course the future projects, so that we can see what will come our way later.

The activities of EP and the experiments were very interesting, to hear what those will request from ST in the future.

They were all of interest but I could probably carry on living and working if I had not attended

The best 3 presentations were those of Mrs C. Jarlskog, J.P. Delahaye and M. Macri.

The session about the experiences (with their invited speakers) was very interesting. The last day conferences (i.e. about physics, particles and future possible accelerators) was definitely great.

Toutes les présentations auxquelles j'ai assisté étaient très intéressantes, à des degrés divers et tout ce qui concernait les accélérateurs puis les grands projets (LHC et expériences) ont été d'un grand intérêt, à la fois général, mais aussi pour la compréhension du travail et des activités de la division ST. Je me permets de faire deux remarques qui sont aussi le fruit de mon expérience d'autres conférences : 1. le temps prévu pour chaque présentation était un peu trop court: 20 à 25 min pour présenter et discuter un sujet est un minimum, ce qui permet de traiter les questions qui étaient nombreuses et intéressantes; 2. cela permet de gérer le temps des sessions avec plus de souplesse, en respectant l'horaire. Sinon, bravo, ce workshop a été très intéressant pour moi, et je remercie les responsables de la Division ST de m'avoir invité. Cela permet aussi de retrouver les "anciens", mais aussi de découvrir l'actuelle Division ST, avec beaucoup de jeunes, et d'apprécier ainsi le rajeunissement.

Les scientifiques nous ont bien passionnés.

Very interesting.

I found Friday interesting. Listening to ideas about future projects are of general interest, as well as talks about physics at CERN.

I greatly appreciated two of the external speakers : J-P. Delahaye and C. Jarlskog.

LHC progress report.

I think to have a presentation on theory is excellent.

Q7 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Invited Speakers

Which theme(s) was (were) pretty useless ?

Antimatter: the theme is very interesting, but I could hardly understand the presentation: It was for specialists.

Too detailed themes about physics.

The external speakers should be told to make a specific effort in order to give the essential message and not draw the audience under a pile of transparencies (ex: LEP physics).

The exposé of G. Rolandi was certainly not useless but its level was rather high.

The physics talks. Partly poor presentations. Should not be suppressed, but selected with great care.

Manufacturing and Test Folder.

Q7 : Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Invited Speakers

Which theme was missing ?

LHC-b status, of course.

Achats SPL ?

I would have liked to see the representatives of the accelerator exploitation (PS, SL) to tell us about there future expectations.

Q8 : Posters

Poster sessions were OK. But speaking sessions were so dense that the persons hardly stopped to look at posters. Suggestion: put the posters downstairs in the café where the coffee was served.

Impossible to see more than 20% of posters, however all presenters talked eloquently about their work. Next time there should be fewer posters, and presented in a place with better access and visibility, with more time to visit them.

Good, to be enlarged but with more dedicated time and space.

Not so useful: quite dispersive.

Tres bonne nouveauté - gros travail, local d'exposition trop petit, manque de temps consacré aux posters.

Good.

Set aside time to "official" poster sessions. Posters generally good. A bit more space in the poster area, though apparently difficult.

Excellent idea. Very interesting subject - well explained. The time to look at the poster or especially listen to the explanation of the speakers was too short.

Good quality.

The local where posters were displayed was not ideal; it did not provide the opportunity to look at them long enough in the presence of the authors.

Idée tres intéressante, à developper encore, devrait prendre plus d'importance.

Comme pour les présentations, il faudrait plus de temps pour profiter pleinement des posters (chaque poster représente un travail considérable, de plusieurs jours ou semaines!!).

Les posters étaient bien dans l'ensemble. Quelques uns peut être un peu chargés, mais intéressants. Il fallait passer beaucoup de temps pour les lire complètement. Il faudrait peut être prendre une heure sur les discussions de la conclusion.

Poor organisation and location of the poster session, otherwise the poster presented were of great quality.

Good, but the coffe-breaks should be allocated to the poster rooms.

I found the poster session interesting and useful in enrichening the scope of the workshop and I believe it should be given more visibility. A practical way of doing this would be by 'geographically' combining it with the coffee breaks.

Very good, the explanations were in the most cases excellent.

Posters are great. I would vote for a place where all posters could stay in display during the entire workshop.

I think it was a very good idea, as some topics suite better with posters than with talks. The quality of the posters was in my opinion high, as well as the competence of people explaining.

Good idea. More training and "deeper".

The posters sessions were clearly an added value to the Workshop. The exhibition place should be closer to the 'coffee break' place in order to stimulate the discussions around the posters.

Q9 : The Conclusions

Yes, maybe a little bit too long.

Yes, it replied to my expectation. No suggestion.

Non, the open discussion to be improved or suppressed.

I've attended only the first two days, therefore my comment is limited to that part of the Workshop.

Risque a l'auto-satisfaction.

Yes.

No. Hopeless. Drop it, and call the last part " Division leaders closing address" or something likely. Do not expect any senseful participation from the auditorium.

Some key topics shall be presented during the summing up at the start of the session, to focus and stimulate discussion. As it was organised only a discussion between the invited speakers and the division leaders took place. I think lessons learned from the talks during the week shall be discussed and a first exchange of ideas to solve certain problems mentioned.

Should be shorter and maybe a talk from DL about the future of the division and the relevance of the workshop may be better than the very long Q and A session.

By the time this session took place people were either tired or lacked the time to reflect upon what they had just gone through so that there was not much reaction. Suggestion : drop this session.

Les discussions lors de la conclusion me sont apparues longues. Peut être à cause de la fatigue ?

Yes I found it interesting but not overly animated.

Conclusions is extremely difficult. It all depends what is expected, congratulate people, pass a message to the external people, overview of the division. I really do not know for ST. What was done seemed OK to me. I had no overwhelming expectations on conclusions.