



Durham University

Author Experience

Peter Richardson

Introduction

- Our hope was that
Time dealing with GENSER << Time dealing with experiments
- Would save us time.
- No evidence for this, in fact we seem to waste more time dealing with GENSER.
- Initially we had a major problem getting agreement on issues which we felt were vital. The most important
- **GENSER is NOT ALLOWED to change code WITHOUT author permission.**

Current Situation

- We had believed that the agreements were being followed and the situation had improved.
- Following this week's meetings is it obvious that
 - Basic agreements have been violated
 - The results of the last review have not been acted on.
 - Major Problems remain.

From the last review

2. The reviewers expressed serious concerns about the manpower resources available to the coordinator. The rotation of librarians, which serve for 3-month terms before returning to their home Institute, prevents a solid and continued interaction with the MC developers. The training of the librarians who are in charge of the individual packages evaporates once they are gone, and a new period of training is required to allow the new ones to undertake their job. In past, this has prevented initiated tasks to be
3. Even in the cases of MC codes already included in GENSER, the interaction between developers and librarians has been judged to be in general insufficient. A closer collaboration, and a planning of the activity developed after consultation with the authors, would benefit the quality of the service, and would provide a necessary incentive for the authors to monitor more closely the progress of the work. For this to be possible, however, the concerns raised in point 2 would have to be addressed and solved.

From the last review

4. The support of the new generation of MC tools based on C++ (Herwig++ and Pythia 7) will demand an increased level of expertise, in view of the complexity of the general framework with which the codes are developed. This is one area where the GSG could provide a critical support both to the authors, and to the users. A possible area identified for this support is the documentation of the ThePEG, documentation which could enable more developers to adopt this common framework for their MCs, by reducing the learning path. Such a documentation would also facilitate the maintenance work of the GSG librarians. Other areas of work could include the development of a GUI for ThePEG.

5. The definition of the goals of the work packages should more closely reflect the needs of the end users and of the MC authors. This was felt in particular in the case of the MCDB development, with reference to the definition of what the database should contain and of the upload and validation procedures.

Future

- Dealing with GENSER has wasted a lot of my time and that of other generator authors.
- I'm not prepared for this to continue.
- We need improved management of the project and our concerns to be treated with the same importance as those of the experiments.
- If there is not significant improvement the general purpose community will reconsider its support and may withdraw.
- We need
 - More concentration on the core projects.
 - A well defined work programme
 - Community control rather than the agenda of a small group driving the projects.