Summary of the simulation steering meeting of 24/5/2011:

https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=136686

* There were some news about SPMB discussions:
- grid cost monitoring: HEPSPEC06 has (unspecified) problems and a different approach was sought where jobs would provide detailed cost information to AMI, which could help find problems
- plan to move quite soon to 64-bit releases: 50% more memory in 16.6.4 against 10% gain in CPU which would improve job turnaround time; 32 & 64 builds from 17.0.1 and 64 bit builds only from 17.1.0 except maybe HLT. But would good if we test 64bit builds fully - if we're using 32bit builds on our own, there's good chance some problems will crop up

* Overlay workshop around 13th June

* Agenda for P&P week
- concentrating on MC10B vs data comparisons
- I was also asked **if it would be a good idea to get a report from trigger** MC/data comparisons (I said yes, of course :)

* MC11 production in August might be slightly delayed

* mechanics of geometry packages for MC11 upgrade simulation were discussed

* Geant 4.9.5 beta release expected for June

Trigger issues:

* I was asked to find the savannah request for the configuration in fast simulation jobs - turns out there is no request, but Simon sent me a thread with Joerg and Tomasz
- this was seen as a good solution
- Just to point out a potential issue: from Joerg & SImon's thread, I get the impression there is a worry about keeping all trigger configurations of official samples in the database (which seems right). I think these fast sim samples would violate the principle and would nevertheless be used for physics results.

* I mentioned ideas about simulating trigger menus and parametrized efficiency etc, and pointed to Simon's note. This was recognized as an important problem than will become critical, but no brilliant ideas came out of it.

* I mentioned the noise suppression was turned on in simulation but not online

- I was asked to find out more info on the size of these effects - emailed Mansoora and Michael B.
- from David, I understand the bigger effect was calo towers vs topoClusters, so expect only a small effect - probably just means that analyses will need to account for this in trigger efficiency
- question: are we now using this online? How much data did not have it?

* I also mentioned the FEB hole and ramping LAr HV and that L1Calo doesn't simulate this
- turns out offline doesn't simulate dead cells from trips, and they see this as an analysis issue
- I'll need to educate myself on what the L1Calo simulation does and plans for the FEB issue

* finally I was asked about having a trigger report during P&P week concentrating on data/MC comparisons
- I think this would be a good idea, even though some of this may already be covered in some other trigger talk
- I assume this could be 1 talk in a simulation session, with someone reporting for all the slices

Daniel seemed happy that there was someone from trigger reporting to the group.