

Take-home messages

Preamble

- This session was originally planned for further discussions
 - For topics touched during the meeting but that need more time
 - And for new topics and issues that emerge during the week
- Likely because of the new format, we had already plenty of discussions and we felt that there was need for neither further nor new discussions
 - Please speak up now if this is not the case!
- Let's then try to recall some "take-home" messages
 - At high level, avoiding details
 - Not a summary of the whole Collaboration Meeting!
 - This is the first draft, to be improved with the feedback in this session!

From the "Open Requirements" session

- We shall remember to include in CC the relevant experiments/users when opening Geant4 JIRA tickets on user requirements
 - To make them aware of what is going on
- Shall we add an explicit warning in our web page for the users to pick up the latest patch version available for a given version of Geant4?
 - E.g. G4 10.6.p03 vs. 10.6.p01
- To minimise unnecessary changes, in particular on physics:
 - Making the adoption of newer versions of Geant4 easier and quicker
 - Wish of separating between "technical" and "physics" developments

From the "Collaboration Matter I" session

- 4th General Paper
 - Agreed on the time schedule and organisation proposed
 - So far, Andrea Dell'Acqua and A.R. volunteer as possible editors
- Next major release
 - Improve in clarity and level of details our GitLab Merge Request
 - To be discussed today at the Steering Board how to enforce this

From "Development Tools" session

- Agreed to try out a Git-based database for Geant4 papers and presentations
- Geant-val: increasing number of contributors, whereas for the core maintenance & development still relying in one person
 - Proposal, to be discussed today at the Steering Board, to focus the WG "Physics Lists and Validation Tools" to it – or rename it "Geant-val"
 - The hope is to make the work on geant-val more visible and recognised so to attract new, young contributors

From "Geant4 kernel" session

- Lot of interest, both among the Geant4 members and the users, to know and understand more about the parallelisation capabilities of Geant4
 - In particular for tasking and sub-event parallelism

From "Geometry" session

- On-going developments
 - Surface-based geometry actively under development
 - Some progress also on the solid-based geometry and transportation in fields
 - On-going comparisons between solid-based and surface-based geometry models on GPUs for complex HEP detectors

From "UI and Visualisation" session

- Growing interest on Vtk
 - Choice between maintaining several tools or relying more on Vtk should be evaluated carefully based on person-power available

From "Basic/Extended/Advanced Examples" session

- Continuous effort to improve existing examples and introducing new ones
 - Both documentation (README file) and code are important!

From "Parallelisation of Initialisation" session

- First version of parallelisation of geometry achieved
- Preliminary work necessary for the parallelisation of physics achieved
- For G4 11.3, speed up due to parallel initialisation of geometry only, to be refined and completed with the physics one for G4 11.4
- Discussion on how to cope with too many and small files in our datasets for efficient HPC use

From "Computing Performance" session

- Always crucially important!
 - We rely heavily on monitoring and benchmarking computing performance
- More opportunities for improving computing performance from applicationspecific solutions, rather than general Geant4 developments
 - Examples from LHC experiments

From "R&D" session

- Progress of both AdePT and Celeritas, but still difficult to draw conclusions or even recommendations
- Postpone the delta assessment from December 2024 to Spring 2025
 - Aimed to be the last delta assessment by Geant4
 - To come up shortly with a proposed date and a set of benchmarks

From "Generic Processes and Materials" session

- ML FastSim investigations very active!
 - Very much experiment-specific, but, from our Geant4 side, we aim at sharing as much as possible tools, approaches and experiences that might be useful to other experiments and users
- Combined process vs. generic biasing
 - Agreed to leave the combined processes as they are
 - Special combinations to two or more processes aimed at reducing "interaction length" calls in granular geometries

rather than trying to recast them in the context of generic biasing

From "EM & HAD Physics" (plenary & parallel) sessions

- Sustained development effort aimed at improving the accuracy of our physics models, as well as to extend their physics coverage
- Two risks:
 - Balance between maintenance and development
 - Geant4 is used in production in many critical experiments
 - Active development is essential, but we shall avoid "noise"-type of changes (i.e. neither more precision nor faster execution)
 - Loosing critical expertise and knowledge
 - Only one solution: finding, training and retaining young collaborators!
 - On "finding", we are doing well so far, with a good dose of luck! Not sure it will last forever...
 - On "training", we are not doing progressing on either "internal notes" or "internal seminars" fortunately, our young collaborators are learning quickly by themselves...
 - On "retaining" them by offering stable positions is the most difficult part, with notable failures in the past, and the therefore the vital need of doing better!

Final: format of the next Collaboration Meeting

- Looking at posteriori at this Collaboration Meeting, with a free first session on Friday morning, we could have 2 more plenary sessions and no parallel at all
 - On Wednesday afternoon, a plenary EM session
 - On Friday morning, a plenary HAD session
- Shall we keep the same structure for next year?
 - For the first time ever, we completed and covered all our discussion items!
 - Having fewer and shorter talks should be an incentive to have more WG meetings at least few times per year
 - I have received a suggestion so far to have more questions of the type
 "Shall we do A or B?" during our presentations, and then decide on Friday
 - Leaving some time for thinking and making up our minds
 - Any other suggestions?