Opinion Poll

1) Organisation before the Workshop
Preparation, information, deadlines, templates, training

- Good
- Excellent organisation - Congratulation committee !
  How the papers were going to be treated, could maybe be more clearly explained (some confusion concerning the template). The convocation to a person in the AS division (who was in the state of panic the day before the workshop) might be possible to schedule better.
- The preparation was adequate. The training was also very useful. However the templates could have been better in the sense that they were a little confusing.
- Difficultés pour obtenir des "guests" les informations utiles et nécessaires à leur enregistrement au séminaire.
- ok
- Neither comments nor suggestions
- Excellent
- There was a confusion between some templates. 2 examples of the same topic were not identical. The rest was ok.
- OK
- Too much confusion on templates
  Good preparation / information
- Very good
- Excellent secretarial preparation.
  Excellent logistics preparation.
  Templates for abstracts and papers to be improved and fully available on time
- Excellent, especially the training
- Les cours d'expression écrite étaient tres utiles
- I consider very good the preparation, the information and the training. The three courses were very useful to prepare the articles, and to prepare the presentation.
- The training was very helpful. The templates has been a little bit confusing because it seemed as there have been several different templates going around. The deadlines have been fair. The provided information have been sufficient.
- The preparation, information and the training was excellent. Especially the training helped a lot to make a good paper and to give a good presentation. The deadlines were finally good also because the deadline for the paper was postponed into January. The original deadline before Christmas was by far too short.
  The templates were rather bad. I am sorry. Finally a lot of the formatting we discussed during the course were not fixed in the template for the paper. Moreover automatic chapter numbering and so on was not supported. So the authors were obliged to change the template if they wanted to use this functionality. It would be nice if this will be better prepared for next time.

2) Organisation during the Workshop
Transport, logistics, technical and secretarial services

- Good
- No problems
- Transport & logistics were very well organised.
- ok
- Neither comments nor suggestions
- Excellent
- OK
- OK

Opinion Poll

– OK
– Very good
– No particular problem encountered.
  Secretariat, logistics and technics seemed to work fine
– Excellent.
– Excellent.
– Everything perfect.
– The organisation was in my opinion perfectly done.
– Excellent

3) *The ALPINA Hotel and Conference Facilities*
Location, services, rooms, food / Disposition, technical facilities, auxiliaries

– Very, very bad, bad services from the hotel personnel, bad food, and in general I think we must not return to this hotel.
– No problems!
  VIP-table at the meals: is it really necessary? It's quite pleasant to share the table with these people.
– The hotel was adequate and also the food. The room was not very suited for this kind of presentation because of the disposition of the overhead projectors and the placing of the chairmen. Besides it was a little cumbersome being 3 days in a basement with no natural light as the room was underground.
– ok
– The only requirement I'd like to express is that the Hotel don't provide an efficient Ethernet connection so that we should be able to show other "things" that the usual slides or power point shows
  For all the others it was perfect and comfortable
– Technical facilities: excellent
  Hotel: can be better (but acceptable)
– Water bottles on the tables during the conferences would have been appreciated.
– Too little of food for lunches.
– OK but for the restaurant service.
– Excellent
– This hotel is very good for our needs.
  There is only the problem with the disposition of the overhead projector, the screen and the speaker (impossibility for the speaker to stand behind the projector and to face the public).
– Location, Services and rooms very good. Restaurant services average.
  Disposition, technical facilities, auxiliaries very good
  Proposal to organize social dinners and events also outside the Hotel with some typical French/savoyard menus.
– Excellent.
– The room was very nice. The food was a bit too much, the service was not very good, but is not a relevant problem.
  For the people that use the transparencies was difficult to use them because the projector was not at the correct high. Maybe a way to solve this is to have both projectors in the table. But then it is necessary a big screen in the middle.
– The location, the services and also the food have been good. The room was heated too much and there was no possibility for regulating.
  The disposition of technical facilities was sufficient but the projectors for transparencies have been too far away from the audience.
– Hotel, food, service etc. everything very nice. For the technical facilities it would be good to have a room where you do not have the overhead projector in your back but as usual in front of you.

5) *The Workshop*
Concept, Structure, ST and other participations, discussions, proceedings

- Good
- The concept of the workshop is still very good, and I think all objectives are reached. The arrival of more clever people in the division will create harder competition to participate, which does no harm. Can a more lively discussion be stimulated? Many participants ask no questions.
- The idea of the Workshop is very good because it gives us the opportunity of getting to know the activities of the rest of the division. The participation from the other divisions were enlightening only to a certain extent as the detailed explanation of the physics principles surpass me. I have no knowledge of the proceeding being available at this time.
- Souhait émis par un "guest" : " vous devriez donner à chaque participant un badge afin que nous puissions plus facilement les connaître".
- Eviter de présenter des sujets redondants, (gestion technique centralisée et management des bâtiments) qui pourraient être intégrés dans la réalité comme dans les exposés.
  Se concentrer d'avantage sur le savoir faire et le métier plutôt que sur l'incontournable pyramide architecturale des couches de communications; ce qu'elles ont à communiquer serait plus passionnant.
  Laisser d'avantage de temps pour les questions des auditeurs, car les questions comme les réponses sont des indicateurs utiles pour déceler l'intérêt et améliorer les performances.
  Inviter un ou des représentants DSU ou service juridiques du CERN pour exposer le contexte particulier du CERN en matière de relations avec l'extérieur (juridique, diplomatique, commercial, social, qualité)

- No specific comments.
- Good for structure and concept concerning invited people see later.
- OK
- Too many themes related to the Controlled Access.
- OK
  More time for discussions.
  Too much presentation on subject slightly different.
- ST presentations generally good and interesting and well done (I am still impressed by Enrico Cennini's presentation) but the financial guy and other "high level" CERN guys obviously did not - sorry for my coarse language - give a hint if we ordinary staff understood anything or sae something from guest slides, Sorry to say but that was the impression I got.
- The Session Secretaries should take notes of the discussions and prepare a digest to be included in the proceedings (severe selection with only pertinent contributions for the proceedings).
  Find a way that all contributions appear in the proceedings, including those of the invited speakers. These speakers should be told, at the time when invited, that they are to deliver a paper. It looks also acceptable that instead of a paper, their Powerpoint presentations are used, but in this case they have to prepare their presentation "to be useable for the proceedings".
- Very good.
- Peut etre un peu trop de sessions par jour, journées tres chargées.
  Sujets proposés pas assez représentatifs de l'ensemble ST.
- I liked very much the structure, the short presentations give clear concepts, and the 5 min of discussions allows some feedback without break the rhythm.
- The concept and the structure of the workshop have been very tight. The choice of the participants and their presentation covered almost all interests. The proceeding and the discussions suffered always a little bit under the time pressure.
- So far I have not received the proceedings thus I cannot give a comment. The concept and structure was very good. The time for discussions was sometimes too short. It was a pity that some of the external speakers spoke three times longer than it was foreseen.

6) Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of ST Staff Members

Which theme(s) was (were) most interesting (useful, enlightening, relevant) for you and your work? Why?
Should it (they) be developed further? How and when?

– Industrial Controls, Information systems
– Themes which invites to more cross-group collaboration (outsourcing methods, quality measurement/assurance). I found also design aspects for LHC- in all presented fields, very interesting, as being our dominating, principal objective.
– Alarm systems, Access Control, Quality and GMAO
– LHC themes
– All presentations were interesting and in the future the same policy to be retained (few paper to reject and a large majority to accept)
  for some presentations (few) a larger period has to be foreseen (20 min ?)
– "Tri-generation" by J. Kuhnl-Kinel: some information about this new technology, interesting way of presentation, fair conclusions.
– Cooling and Ventilation for LHC; it's connected to my project.
– Those related to quality and maintenance. I have enrolled the quality interest group already.
– All contributions were in one way or another informative and thus useful.
  Some contribution hinted to "dysfunction" in some areas. Are corrective action foreseen?
  In coffee discussions, it appeared that some participants could not really follow some subjects, and the importance of some messages was misjudged.
– The technical themes were all interesting for my work because it gave me the feeling that there is a common denominator in the various fields. In ST all the technical aspects are being further developed in the Technical Interest Groups.
– Coordination, parce que c'est un sujet essentiel au moment du workshop
– All them were interesting because give me a global vision of the work done in the division.
– There have been a lot of interesting presentations. But even more important for me was to learn about the structure and to get to know the people from the other groups especially because of the many new arrivals and due to the restructuring of some groups.
– The greatest impact on me had the presentation of B. Pirollet "Tour de Réfrigération Tests de Réception". This approach should be done for many more systems in ST and in general for CERN (risk analysis etc. to minimise downtime). For the TCR this is particularly interesting for the definition of alarms and instructions coming along. This analysis already implies all the important data to decide which alarms are needed and how the repairing can be efficiently organised. You get even almost a guarantee of 100% Real Alarms.

Which theme(s) was (were) pretty useless? Why? Should it (they) be suppressed in the next workshop?

– A bit more, selection in alarms-, control architecture- and access control topics.
– There were no useless themes for me, as they allowed me at least to connect an activity with a person.
– La carbonatation et la corrosion des armatures de béton n'existent elles qu'au CERN ? Il semblerait que le CERN étudie tout seul ce problème, que font les autres organismes dans ce domaine? Les écoles d'ingénieurs et les entreprises en génie civil n'ont elles pas encore découvert ce phénomène ? Si tel est le cas, il faudra encore présenter ce sujet au WS_00… et déposer un brevet!
– No theme in particular, but in my opinion it would be more interesting if only one talk per topic would be given at a time. Indeed there were too much similar talks given on the same topic. Moreover I wonder if a talk given on a specific topic for which no progress has really been registered from the last Workshop is really needed…
– Espaces verts / batteries sur véhicules
– Since I am quite new in CERN, it is quite nice for me to get information relating all of the ST activities and therefore non of them was useless. Maybe some presentations were inconclusive
– None

- Useless is the wrong word but for me the presentations concerning 'Access Control' and 'Safety Alarms' have been less interesting and too many with almost the same subject
- In my opinion there was no presentation useless. There were some things I already knew but from most of the themes I gathered new and interesting information about the work in ST.

Which theme was missing?

- More electricity the next year !
- Electricity
- A theme could possibly be organised on the specific works done by our Students (Engineers, doctors, Fellows…) in the framework of our LHC projects and others…
- A global presentation about quality at CERN.
- Human Resource Management
- Electricity, LHC avancement
- I was missing a presentation about the personnel development at the ST division and for CERN in general
- The electrical service was under represented. At least one more talk concerning their new SCADA system would have fit into the control session.

7) *Themes, Subjects, Sessions, Presentations of Invited Speakers*

*Which theme(s) was (were) most interesting (useful, enlightening, relevant) for you and your work? Why?
Should it (they) be developed further? How and when?*

- Real applications and research made at CERN that is applicated in medical systems etc.
- How the physics division sees us, and what they expect from us (M Price), I found very useful. Physics results, delivered to a non-expert audience (Rolandi) was also excellent.
  Phil Bryant is simply a brilliant speaker (and well prepared).
- All were very interesting and more and more useful.
- Administrative session to be reduced to one invited people
  Discussion with directors to be better prepared
  Technical presentations excellent to continue-
- I appreciated the physics related topics. Some more would be fine.
- Sécurité sur chantier
- The last one about the medical related subject was interesting. It would be interesting to know more about the spin-offs of CERN.
- Myers, Hatton, Faugeras, Bryant
  The subject "Faugeras", i.e. LHC overall picture/implications/procedures/co-ordinates should get HIGHEST PRIORITY at the ST WS 2000.
- The presentation on the medical application because it gave me a big motivation to continue improving my work.
- Wenninger, et sa motivation
- All them were interesting. Was an opportunity to learn for whom we work, who pays, how we buy, about physics, about spin-offs of CERN, about the experiments …
- The sessions 'Physics' and 'Accelerators' have been very interesting to me because it will help to understand better the entire technical complexity of LEP. Also the presentations in the management session have been helpful to get an idea about the financial situation for LHC and CERN in general.
- The physics session and the discussions with the two directors were the most interesting parts in the sessions of the invited speakers. This allowed to learn about the activities and needs of the people in the LHC project outside ST. This should be reinforced. There are e.g. some technical details that will also

affect the operation in the TCR depending on the decisions of LHC. So we have to get in contact with them more often and now.

Which theme(s) was (were) pretty useless? Why? Should it (they) be suppressed in the next workshop?

– Presentations speaking about the very low budget at CERN…..
– The standard rules for purchasing were nothing new. The "finance" presentation was simply not prepared.
– The presentations from the "Management" session were very boring and brought no added value. They showed lack of preparation for the presentation and largely exceeded the time limits, in spite of the efforts from the chairman. They did not announce what they were going to speak about and performed an exercise of improvisation talking among themselves that "bored everyone to death".
  They could have been very enlightening and so I don't think they should be removed from the workshop. However they should be asked to announce a topic and respect the time limits like everyone else.
– Planning at CERN (or something similar).
– I would not say any of them useless but the quality of some of those presentations was poor.
– Naudi, Lindecker
– The presentation of the new Technical director….maybe I was expecting too much…some motivation
– Again, useless is for me the wrong word, but some of the presentations could have been more efficient if they would have been better prepared.
– Especially the topics presented by the speakers from the management of CERN did not really bring important news to me. However, I think they could report very interesting subjects in the workshop but they should be given a topic from the organisation committee that fits into the workshop and that is very specific.

Which theme was missing?

– Un retour d'expérience d'un client satisfait ou non à la suite de prestations fournies par la division ST.
– Accelerator physic concept and technology
– LEP Dismantling, INB procedures and implications
– None I can think of
– I would have been interested in a more general presentation concerning the organisation and co-ordination within the LHC project. This would have allowed us to compare their approach with our. Also there are some technical (engineering) topics missing from the LHC. Concerning e.g. their approach for control systems and data transmission etc. So we could have found synergies with the people working on the LHC as we did within ST during the workshop.

8) *The Conclusions*
Did the sessions "conclusions" reply to your expectation? Modifications and/or follow-up suggested?

– I wished hear some words from our leaders about the trends to follow in our work.
– They were not so much conclusions, but were anyway pleasant and interesting to listen to. The General Services (R.Charavay) merited being a "real" and independent topic.
  What about asking conclusions from a complete outsider?
– I had no expectations for the conclusions, but the discussion with the directors was animated and interesting.
– Dans la mesure ou il y aura un prochain ST WS, et pour "sortir" du style des 2 premiers, peut-on envisager que le prochain séminaire fasse l'objet d'un thème commun pour tous les groupes y compris

  A la veille du LHC et de ses expériences le thème porterait précisémment sur la manière dont les participants envisagent l'organisation de leur unité pour les besoins du LHC+Exp., les moyens qu'ils

possèdent, ceux dont ils ont besoin et ceux qui leur faudra pour mener à bien leurs activités. Idem pour le personnel, les contrats, etc..

Je vois dans cette possibilité un audit complet de la Division fait par son propre personnel. Bien entendu toutes les activités doivent êtres examinées, au préalable, par un groupe de travail qui aurait surtout à charge de veiller à leur bonne répartition au sein de la division.

– Je souhaite faire un commentaire personnel sur le WS lui même que je considère comme une excellente vitrine pour présenter les compétences et le professionnalisme de la division et, à ce titre, il faudrait inviter d'avantage de "clients" des autres divisions du CERN, à intégrer aux participants ST dès le début du WS.

Si il y a un futur WS, les thèmes présentés devraient essentiellement être orientés par type d'activité vers les grand projets (démantèlement du LEP, réalisation du LHC, consolidation d'autres accélérateurs) pour montrer l'engagement des ressources de la division au profit du futur du CERN. La maintenance du patrimoine existant restant la mission de base de la division ST.

– Yes. I have no comment in particular.

– Conclusion has to be a real conclusion or resume of all presentations and to be prepared at the end of the workshop

Congratulation to the organisers for the excellent workshop !-

– Ok

– Ok

– Yes

– ST Conclusions: These were not conclusions, but essentially independent talks by the three speakers. Either we want conclusions, a very challenging task, or we call the session differently.

Conclusions: A. Scaramelli presented real conclusions. Useless contributions from the two directors. Their participation is good in principle, but could we make better use of their presence (prepare subjects for discussion with them?)

– Yes, I believe that some conclusions are being followed-up and therefore we should wait and see.

– J'ai trouvé ce 2eme STWSHP tres reussi et plus efficace que l'annee derniere

– I expected more from the conclusions. But clearly the presentations are done before the conference, so, are really conclusions? I saw them more as a general vision of each one of the fields (general services, accelerators and LHC) than a conclusion.

– The conclusions have been quite short. More interesting has been the following discussion with Mr. May and Mr. Wenninger.

– The ST conclusions were not really conclusions. I would have expected a summing up of the presented topics and an outlook and propositions for the ST future in some details. The conclusions of Scaramelli were perfectly conclusions as I would expect them. However, he was only able to give a general vision. More details should have been in the ST conclusions as I already mentioned.

The directors gave a good vision of the future of ST and CERN.