Minutes of the 206th Energy Calibration Meeting held on 16 February 2001

1 MBI status

Federico Roncarolo presented the status of the MBI remapping. Many parts of the apparatus have been improved with respect to the first campaign (for instance the Hall probes are significantly more stable), and most of the hardware preparations are complete. It should be possible to start performing test maps in $\sim$ 1 week's time.

Federico has also resurrected the analysis code of Juan Palacios from the first campaign.

2 2000 energy file status

Guy Wilkinson explained the status of the 2000 energy file production. The 'final' preliminary file was released a couple of days prior to the meeting, and had already been digested by ALEPH and DELPHI.

Since the meeting further checks have been performed, details of which are included in the transparencies. These have revealed nothing alarming. An outstanding issue was the discrepancy between the LEP/experiment miniramp synchronisation, as observed by DELPHI and OPAL. DELPHI saw a narrow distribution of 2-3 seconds width, whereas OPAL saw a much larger spread. This has subsequently been understood to be caused by a drifting OPAL clock throughout the run, and is not thought to have any practical consequence.

The principle of the error assignment was discussed in the meeting. It was agreed to assign a 15 MeV uncertainty from the flux loop, based on the plots shown by Pete Renton in the previous meeting. Errors specific to 2000 from the BFS and possible miniramp problems would also need considering. This work has since been done and details are included in the transparencies, together with the full error matrix. The total error on $\mathrm{E_b}$ is 25 MeV.

Guy will draft a short note describing the energy determination and the error assignment.

3 Spectrometer sawtooth

Esther Barbero-Soto presented an analysis of the recent sawtooth models of Joerg Wenninger within the context of the spectrometer measurements. As expected from the discussion in the previous meeting, the 'state of the art' model (v5c) gives very similar results to the default, naive model. This is because the (significant) corrections involved happen to largely cancel.

Joerg reported that progress had been made in the comparisons with Mike Hildreth. Small bugs had been found in both sets of code concerning the implementation of calibration factors and misalignments. These have been corrected and another iteration is underway – full convergence is hoped for between the models. It is not expected, however, that there will be significant changes to the existing corrections.

4 Next meeting

To be announced.

Guy Wilkinson, 22 February 2001.