

Pixel local-reco conditions for CRUZET and 90X/91X MC

Tamas Almos VAMI¹ for the Pixel Group

¹ Wigner RCP, Budapest



AlCaDB meeting



90X MC tags

*Templates are not used in 90X:
for the not radiated detector
the Generic Reco works fine*

Validation plot by Janos:

<https://indico.cern.ch/event/607515/#32-phase-1-pixel-template-upda>

LA is updated and queued on 10th of March with the following tags:

SiPixelLorentzAngle_forWidth_phase1_mc_v2

SiPixelLorentzAngle_phase1_mc_v2

SiPixelLorentzAngleSim_phase1_mc_v2

Any other tag was prepared much earlier (end of 2016)

91X MC tags

LA/GenErr/Templates are uploaded and planed to be queued today

SiPixelLorentzAngle_forWidth_phase1_mc_v2

SiPixelLorentzAngle_phase1_mc_v2

SiPixelLorentzAngleSim_phase1_mc_v2

SiPixelGenErrorDBObject_phase1_38T_mc_v2

SiPixelTemplateDBObject_phase1_38T_mc_v2

GT update should follow the approval of this PR:

<https://github.com/cms-sw/cmssw/pull/17722>

Conditions for data taking

Right now all of the pixel tags are Phase0 tags

What should be the naming strategy?

We have tags that are named like
SiPixelLorentzAngle_2009_v1_hlt or
SiPixelGainCalibration_2009runs_express or
SiPixelFedCablingMap_2009_v1_hlt etc

Should we continue these or create a new tag everywhere?

Do we need validation for the hlt/express tags?

Conditions for data taking

The conditions for data taking are the same for the 90X MC

We have to update the data tags for

LA (_hlt, _express, _offline)

GenErr (_hlt, _express, _offline),

Template (_hlt, _express, _offline)

GainHLT (_hlt, _express, _offline) // GainOffline (_hlt, _express, _offline)

Cabling map (_hlt)

SiPixelQuality (_hlt, _prompt, _offline)