


arXiv:hep-ex/0312033v1 10 Dec 2003

QCD AND HADRONIC INTERACTIONS EXPERIMENTAL SUMMARY OF MORIOND '03

P.Mättig
University of Wuppertal
Wuppertal, Germany



The broad progress in QCD studies during the last years is summarised.

1 QCD evidence: The last 24 years

Next year's Rencontre de Moriond can celebrate the 25th anniversary of the direct observation of the gluon. With this discovery in e^+e^- collisions at DESY¹ in 1979 QCD became the accepted theory of strong interaction and boosted the confidence in the Standard Model. Twenty - four years later the status of QCD is excellent. The only free parameter α_s is measured in a lot of observables and different kinds of reactions yielding consistent values and an overall precision of 2-3% . As a function of Q^2 the strong coupling exhibits the expected strong energy variation, the most apparent evidence for quantum corrections in gauge theories. Also the gluon self coupling has been directly observed and found to agree with theory.

The progress in understanding QCD over the last two decades is expressed in the shrinking uncertainty of $\alpha_s(Z^0)$ as shown in Fig. 1. Whereas before LEP it was not known to better than 20%, during the last 10 years the uncertainty was reduced by an order of magnitude.

Having praised the huge successes, let us turn to the basic limitation of QCD tests: the beautifully displayed running of α_s , meaning a large value at low Q^2 , causes it its precision to be limited to 'some percent'. Theoretical uncertainties and experimental signatures are far more complicated than those for electroweak processes. The precision on α_s is some factor 200 below the one for the weak coupling, not to speak of α_{em} .

Both progress and difficulties are reflected in the main directions in experimental QCD:

1. Fix the one free parameter $\alpha_s(Z^0)$.




Figure 1: Evolution of the value of α_s collected from various talks by S.Bethke and the Particle data group

2. Develop models for long - distance contributions by invoking additional symmetries or universal parameters motivated by QCD, which have to be experimentally constrained.
3. Search for deviations from QCD as evidence for the New Physics.

Theoretical progress² is substantial, however experiments can easily match it. Since the discovery of gluon jets an astounding experimental progress provides completely new ways to test QCD: a huge extension of the kinematic range, highly dense QCD matter, an increase of luminosity by several orders of magnitude and high precision detectors to study special (heavy) flavours. All this progress was reflected at this conference. Here we will summarize the experimental contributions at this conference starting with the highest energy scales and then turning to lower and lower ones, before discussing searches for New Physics.

2 The value of α_s

One of the most exciting features of QCD is the relatively rapid variation of its coupling with the energy scale. It is intimately related to confinement and asymptotic freedom that are so unique to QCD. Whereas up to recently α_s has been determined in individual experiments at only one particular value of Q^2 , recent experiments span a large enough energy range with sufficient precision to observe this running. At this Rencontre such measurements were reported from HERA and LEP. Measurements are based on jet - rates at different E_T^{jet} ³ and F_2 ⁴ at HERA , or event shape analyses at different c.m. energies at e^+e^- colliders, either from LEP alone⁶ or combined with resurrected JADE data⁵.

These measurements display beautifully the running of α_s . Assuming its QCD evolution with Q^2 , they can be combined to yield $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ as listed in table 1. These values are in excellent agreement with each other, although they use very different procedures! In addition they coincide with individual measurements at single energies.

One notable aspect of these results is the dominance of the theoretical uncertainty over the experimental ones. This emphasizes the need for a better theoretical understanding. Since one tries to combine $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ from various methods and experiments to obtain the 'world average', it also points to the need for commonly accepted and reliable procedures to estimate values and uncertainties.

Table 1: Values of α_s from measurements of energy variations of QCD observables. In case of the F_2 results, the theory error includes the model dependence. The first error on F_2 from H1 includes both statistical and systematic effects.

Method	ref	$\alpha_s(M_Z)$ (errors: stat, syst, theo)
Jet rates HERA photoproduction	3	0.1212 ± 0.0017 $^{+0.0023}_{-0.0031}$ $^{+0.0028}_{-0.0027}$
Jet rates LEP	6	$0.1196 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.0010 \pm 0.0049$
F_2 HERA (H1)	4	$0.1150 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.0051$
F_2 HERA (ZEUS)	4	$0.1166 \pm 0.0008 \pm 0.0048 \pm 0.0053$

3 A word on QCD uncertainties

Estimating theoretical uncertainties means extrapolation into something unknown - evidently a delicate effort. However, without proper estimation of those uncertainties QCD tests will be virtually impossible. A deviation would always be attributed to the lack of higher order QCD calculations.

Current QCD uncertainties are par convention estimated by varying the QCD scale between [0.5,2]. That this is not always sufficient has been shown at this conference for calculations of the Higgs production cross section and of γ production at the LHC ^{7,8}. For both processes uncertainties estimated in lower order calculations were grossly underestimated. These discrepancies may just be accidental, however, they may point to the need of performing a systematic study of LO vs NLO vs NNLO calculations to find ways of estimating theoretical uncertainties.

Having said this, it should be clear that whatever procedure one defines, theoretical uncertainties will not have a well defined probability assigned as the experimental uncertainty.

It as an encouraging initiative that theorists and experimentalists within the LEP - QCD group ^{6,9} collaborate to define a procedure for consistently estimating the theoretical uncertainties of QCD measurements. Maybe it should be extended to other QCD processes as well.

4 Heavy Quark Production

The production of heavy quarks is a beautiful test ground of QCD for experimental and theoretical reasons

- It allows rather firm theoretical predictions since their masses are large compared to the QCD scale Λ , rendering perturbative expansions rather safe.
- Because heavy quarks are suppressed in the fragmentation process, the measurement of a charmed or bottom hadron in a jet can almost unambiguously be associated to the production of charm and bottom quarks at a hard scale.

The additional interest in heavy quarks is that in many extensions of the Standard Model they are a harbinger of New Physics. Charm, even more so bottom physics, and in the future top quarks will be focal points of current and future collider experiments.

The lightest of these heavy quarks is the charm quark. And indeed, cross section measurements from $\gamma\gamma$ interactions and ep - collisions are in agreement with the theoretical NLO predictions ^{10,11}, which, however, still have sizeable uncertainties of $\sim 30\%$. More detailed studies allow the discrimination between models. For example, in a recent measurement ZEUS found that in resolved photoproduction charm jets tend to be aligned with the photon direction as expected from QCD calculations.

Agreement with the much safer theoretical expectations of $\sim 5\%$ uncertainty is also found for pair production of top quarks¹². Such measurements can only be performed in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at the Tevatron. Run I experiments at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV yielded a precision of some 25%. For Run II at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV the cross section is expected to increase by about 30%. For the first time top quarks have been observed at these high energies. Within the limited statistics the cross section measurements by CDF and D0 agree with the prediction. With higher luminosity these will become an interesting QCD test.

Whereas data and theory coincide for the lightest and the heaviest of the heavy quarks, measurements of the cross section for bottom quarks appear to be higher than QCD predictions. This is known since several years and disagreements of some 3-4 standard deviations between QCD NLO predictions and experiments have again been shown at this conference. The measurements are performed in the different parton environments of $p\bar{p}$, $\gamma\gamma$, and ep interactions^{13,10,14}, in different kinematical regions, and applying different methods of bottom tagging and are therefore difficult to compare in detail. Comparing instead the ratios of observed and expected yields, one finds that almost in all circumstances three to four times more bottom quarks are produced than expected. As a side remark, the J/ψ yields of HERA-B is in good agreement with the theoretical expectation¹⁵.

The consistently higher measurements are stunning. However, theoretical evaluations^{16,17} performed a couple of years ago show that at least the CDF data are consistent with theory, if QCD effects are more carefully included, such as resummed NLL calculation merged with a NLO fixed order calculation and the non-perturbative part of the bottom fragmentation function. Accounting for these, reduces the ratio data over from 2.9 to 1.7 which can be accommodated by theoretical uncertainties.

A word on the non-perturbative part. The best measurements of bottom hadronisation have been obtained in Z^0 decays at LEP and SLC. These measurements are usually parametrised within PYTHIA using the Petersen et al. fragmentation function with just one free parameter ϵ_b . This ϵ_b is then assumed for other kinds of collision. However, at this stage one has to be careful: ϵ_b is not a fundamental parameter but is specific to a certain version and parameter set of PYTHIA. This can be seen in Fig. 2a where the average scaled energy $\langle x \rangle = 0.714$ measured at LEP and SLC is reproduced by combinations of the QCD scale parameter Λ_{PYTHIA} and ϵ_b . For extracting the bottom cross section in $p\bar{p}$, $\gamma\gamma$, and ep interactions, one has to integrate over a range of hard scales different from M_Z . The bottom fragmentation function at these energies have to be evolved and therefore depend strongly on the QCD scale Λ as shown in Fig. 2b. Such different fragmentation functions may lead to quite different acceptance corrections and thus different apparent cross sections when bottom hadrons are selected via lepton energies or decay lengths. Therefore the LEP results have to be applied with great care.

In an alternative procedure, following theoretical suggestions the non-perturbative hadronisation has been unfolded from the energy distribution of bottom hadrons in $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^0$ at LEP and SLC in a model independent way¹⁸. Using the NLO calculation for bottom quarks, the de-convolution of the hadronisation into bottom hadrons was derived by developing the observed energy distribution of bottom hadrons into moments. The results disfavour the commonly used Petersen et al. fragmentation function but show that the Bowler and Lund parametrisations fit best.

After the critical theoretical comments^{16,17} it appears appropriate to reanalyse the data such that the hard corrections and non-perturbative effects are properly taken into account. It is a rather unfortunate situation that experiments maintain to show results exhibiting significant inconsistencies with theory without attempting a reanalysis.




Figure 2: a. Correlation of the parameters ϵ_b and Λ_{QCD} leading to $\langle x_b \rangle = 0.715$, b. $\langle x_b \rangle$ as a function of the c.m. energy for various combinations of Λ_{QCD} and ϵ_b

5 News from inside the proton

Decreasing in Q^2 , there are new precise data on the strange quark structure function¹⁹. Vector meson production in electro- and photoproduction are in good agreement with perturbative QCD^{20,21}. New results were presented confirming the cross section dependence on the transverse spin of the incoming proton²². This interesting observation has no obvious QCD explanation, but models with special assumptions can accommodate the data

A lot of interest in diffractive processes has been stirred after the surprising discovery at HERA that a sizeable fraction of events are produced by the exchange of a colour neutral object, traditionally deemed pomeron. Since then a much more detailed insight into diffractive physics both at HERA and the Tevatron has been obtained indicating a large gluonic component in the exchanged pomeron and allowing one to extract diffractive parton densities²³ in inclusive diffractive deep - inelastic scattering. They can be consistently applied to dijet and open charm production showing that factorisation holds within HERA. However, transferring them to diffractive processes in $p\bar{p}$ collisions in a straight forward manner does not work. Double diffractive processes have been measured at the Tevatron Run II²⁴. These processes are interesting in view of ideas on the production of Higgs bosons through these processes²⁵. Ideally the very good mass resolution from the scattered protons leads to a rather narrow Higgs signal. However, a crucial question is, if further particles are scattered into the detector under small angles which might blur the signal.

6 How colour flows

One of the fundamental assumptions in experimental studies of QCD is the correspondence between the observable hadrons and the underlying partons, the concept of Local Parton-Hadron Duality²⁶. Several studies indicate that this is true even down to very low Q^2 . The $\ln(1/x)$ distribution in e^+e^- events reflects very nicely the expectation both at an individual energy and for the c.m. energy dependence^{5,6}. Also a more detailed look into the fraction of particles perpendicular to the event plane of three jet events accords with the expectation¹⁸.

Recently studies have been performed on the non - leading colour flow in events with four partons. These studies have been driven by the observation of W - pairs at LEP. When both W - bosons decay hadronically, colour may flow not only between the quarks from one W, but there is the less likely flow between partons from different W - bosons. Its probability cannot be calculated from first principles, but rather models have to be invoked. Based on LPHD, the favoured method at LEP is to study, if the hadron flow between quarks from different W - bosons is enhanced. The measurements are inconclusive as to the existence of colour reconnection,

Table 2: Qualification of models of colour reconnection using four - jet events at the Z^0 and in W - pair production events at LEP. For the LEP combined W - pair measurement the difference in standard deviations of the observed flow to the model is also listed.

Model	at Z^0	in W -pair events
ARIADNE	ruled out	agreement (-2.1σ)
RATHSMAN	ruled out	not considered
HERWIG	ok	agreement (-2.6σ)
SJOSTRAND-KHOZE I	not considered	ruled out (-5.2σ)

however, allow the rejection of some models²⁷.

Colour can also be reconnected in Z^0 decays with two hard quarks and two hard gluons. To enrich those events with rapidity gaps in jets are selected and compared to models²⁸. The experimental key issue is to distinguish quark from gluon jets, which can, for example, be achieved by identifying bottom quarks.

Comparisons to models at the Z^0 and in W - pairs are listed in Table 2. The different environments at the Z^0 pole and in W - pair production also lead to different consistencies with data, for example for ARIADNE. It means (not unexpectedly) that in the different environments colour is reordered differently. This complicates any extrapolation of results obtained in Z^0 decays to W - pairs. Otherwise it would help estimating possible distortions in reconstructing the W - mass from fully hadronic decays at LEP.

7 Hadronization

The large amount of data from Z^0 decays at LEP and its cleanliness will for a long time be the outstanding source of information on how and which hadrons are formed inside a jet. At this conference new data from $\gamma\gamma$ interactions confirming the diquark model²⁹ were presented.

An insight into the space - time picture of hadronisation can be obtained by Bose - Einstein correlations. At LEP a lot of measurements have been performed mainly using $\pi^\pm\pi^\pm$ pairs. Recently L3 and OPAL have observed Bose Einstein correlations in π^0 pairs³⁰. At face value the correlation length and strength measured by OPAL exceed those of L3. However, it may just reflect the different kinematical selections and thus a dependence of the correlation on the specific kinematics. It is of particular interest, if Bose - Einstein correlations also exist between particles coming from different W bosons pairs. Because of the potential distortion of mass measurements of the W boson, substantial effort has gone into searching for these correlations. Whereas three of the LEP experiments see no effect, DELPHI claims an enhanced correlation of a pair of equally charged pions of similar momentum³¹.

The existence of glueballs is a fundamental prediction of QCD, for which, however, one has found at most indirect evidence. There are suggestions that, apart from dedicated spectroscopic experiments, glueballs may show up in processes with hard gluons. Since the gluon self coupling is significantly stronger than its coupling to quarks, the hope is that some of the many gluons produced coalesce into a glueball. Such a hard gluon can be a gluon jet emitted in e^+e^- interactions or a virtual gluon in photon - gluon fusion in ep collisions. ZEUS has analysed the mass spectrum of the $K_s^0K_s^0$ system in such events³². As can be seen in Fig. 3a, in addition to the known a_2 and f_2' they point to an enhancement at a mass of 1726 MeV where no standard hadron exists. With their preferred background parametrisation the $\sigma \times$ Branching ratio for these three resonances appear to be fairly similar.

By crossing the t - channel photon - gluon fusion of ep collision one obtains the s - channel




Figure 3: $K_s^0 K_s^0$ mass spectra. a. from photon-gluon fusion at ZEUS, and b. in gluon jets at OPAL (the simulated signal around 2.25 GeV shows the sensitivity to an excess reported earlier by L3).

diagram for e^+e^- annihilation into a $q\bar{q}g$ event. The $K_s^0 K_s^0$ mass spectrum has been studied in gluon jets by L3 and OPAL³³ at LEP. Neither of them observes a peak around 1720 MeV (Fig. 3b).

This does not necessarily disprove the ZEUS enhancement, since the processes may, who knows, imply a different sensitivity to glueballs. No doubt, a confirmation of the X(1726) in an gluonic environment would be extremely interesting! Still, a justification of the shape of the background with data instead from Monte Carlo would be more convincing. For example, one might test if the $K^+ K^-$ shape can be reproduced by the simulation or if yields for f_2' production in the $\pi\pi$ and $K_s^0 K_s^0$ decay modes are consistent.

8 Hadron decays

The energy scale of hadronisation and hadron decays is the same. However, in hadron decays the system starts from two (or three) well defined quarks at a low energy scale. In these decays soft gluons play an essential role. Since these can (as yet) not be calculated from first principles, theorists invoke models based on QCD and additional symmetries. The heavier the participating quark is, the more reliable the model is. For the perturbative treatment the essential requirement is $\Lambda/m_Q \ll 1$. In fact the heaviest top quark does not need a model at all, since it decays before forming hadrons. For the bottom and somewhat less for the charm quark the Heavy Quark Effective Theory has provided a rather precise understanding of decay properties. Alternatively, for the up, down and strange quarks, each having a mass less than the QCD scale Λ_{QCD} , models based on chiral symmetries have been developed.

This substantial theoretical progress is accompanied by a stunning experimental progress. The experimental precision on decay properties of bottom and charm quarks, but also on the light hadrons is extraordinary. Branching ratios of 10^{-6} are now routinely measured. I am aware that I do all these measurements utterly injustice in just skimming them. In general these measurements are in very good agreement with the expectations. However the new level of precision also poses new and very detailed challenges to the theoretical understanding.

Results on the pionium lifetime³⁴ and the πN scattering length³⁵ restrict the parameters of chiral perturbation theory. Measurements on kaonic atoms³⁶, respectively rare K_s^0 decays³⁷ were reported.

Several dedicated experiments, like FOCUS³⁸, CLEO³⁹, BABAR^{40,41}, E-835⁴², or multi-purpose experiments like CDF and D0⁴³ collected a huge number of charmed events pinning down charmonium transitions, CKM suppressed and rare charm decays.

Of course, one of the main directions in today's high energy physics is the understanding of

CP - violation in bottom decays. The huge data sets collected with BABAR and BELLE provide a wide range of measurements. None of these clearly deviate from the expectation, although some results, if confirmed with higher statistics, may indicate that we fail to understand some aspects. The study of CP violation is complemented by a broad program of exploring the bottom hadrons. BABAR, BELLE and CLEO improve the precision of the CKM matrix^{44,45}, and determine tiny branching fractions of Bottom mesons^{46,47,48,49,50,51,52}, CDF and D0 show the way towards measuring B_0^S mixing⁵³. This is really impressive progress!

9 Heavy Ion Collisions

Up to now we were going down in Q^2 . It is unclear which Q^2 determines the measurements on Heavy Ion collisions presented at this conference. Experiments at the SPS are continuing to evaluate their data for the many potential signatures of the quark - gluon plasma like strange particle production⁵⁴, J/ψ suppression⁵⁵, hyperon production⁵⁶, fluctuations⁵⁷, charm production with new detectors⁵⁸.

Whereas some of these are consistent with the quark - gluon plasma, others are not. The search for a deeper understanding of Heavy Ion collisions has now turned to the higher energies of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider RHIC. The focus of RHIC at this Rencontre were on the existence and structure of jets. In brief, the main observations at the RHIC experimenters are^{59,60}

- a. Jets have been seen in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV.
- b. Jet production is suppressed in central $Au - Au$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV (deemed 'jet quenching').
- c. For central collisions and $p_T \sim 2-4$ GeV mesons are produced as often as baryons, and baryons only a factor ~ 1.3 more often as antibaryons⁶¹.

These observations are very intriguing: jet production would mean a partonic interaction, whereas jet quenching in the dense medium of central high energy nuclei collision might point to energy losses of the partons due to gluon interaction. Thus at RHIC densities partons, instead of nuclei would interact.

At this stage a few remarks from the perspective of a high energy physicist. First of all, the jets discussed at RHIC are identified by a leading particle with a p_T of some 4 GeV. I.e. the jet energy is only marginally above those energies where jets were observed for the first time by evolved statistical arguments in the very clean e^+e^- environment by Mark II⁶². They are substantially less energetic than the clear jets at higher energy e^+e^- collisions or $p\bar{p}$ collisions.

The evidence for jets in pp collisions resides on

- same side correlations showing an enhanced production of particles of 2 - 4 GeV at a distance $\Delta\phi \sim 0.2$ in azimuth angle from the trigger particle,
- enhanced particle activity at $\phi_{trigger} - \pi$,
- charge correlations between the trigger particle and the high p_T particle around the trigger both of opposite and (significantly less pronounced) same charge.⁶³

Since 35 years we do know that jets will be produced in NN collisions of 200 GeV. However, they will exist over a high pedestal of minimum bias events. On this basis, are the observations at RHIC sufficient to prove that what they see are jets? All the above observations are consistent with the existence of jets, however, they can also be due to simple resonance decays. The parameters of the same side correlations point to two - particle masses of $M^2 \sim 2 \cdot 4 \cdot (1 - \cos 0.2)$,

i.e. $M \sim 0.5$ GeV, typical of resonances. Resonances could also explain opposite sign charge correlations of the leading particles. The correlation at opposite ϕ may well reflect a trigger bias.

A key question is then how much of the observed effect is due to jets, respectively resonance decays. Assuming the extreme that all the effect are due to resonances, then also the claim of jet - quenching in Au-Au would have to be reconsidered. It needs more detailed studies to really establish that a significant portion of the observed correlations are due to jets. To exclude that the observed structure just reflects some trigger bias or statistical correlations, it would be reassuring if the data are compared with a statistical distribution of resonances *before* decays.

Accepting the existence of jets at RHIC, those observed in $Au - Au$ collisions show some unexpected properties. Whereas for peripheral collisions the proton/pion ratio of ~ 0.15 is as small as in e^+e^- jets, this ratio is ~ 1 for jets in central collisions, at least for p_T between ~ 2 and 4 GeV. This may be even explainable by the abundance of protons in the initial state. However, also the yield of antiprotons is about the same as the one for π^- in central collisions for $p_T \sim 2 - 4$ GeV. This is in sharp contrast to high energy jets in other environments and calls for new ideas on the physics in high energy collisions.

Several contributions⁶⁴ at this Rencontre provided additional experimental facts and attempts of an interpretation. The outstanding question is, if the observed structure arises from hard interactions at the quark - gluon level and not from purely hadronic interactions, or from a mixture of both. As pointed out at this conference, the planned measurements on d-Au collisions will provide additional input, but then in particular those extending to higher E_T .

10 QCD and Beyond the Standard Model Physics

The Standard Model is almost unchallenged, with the possible exception that the finite ν masses may already be outside its limits. Anyway, the Standard Model has conceptual deficiencies: the proliferation of fermion generations and the similarity of its interactions, the naturalness problems etc. call for a larger theory. Now, that the Standard Model has been so beautifully confirmed in the 100 GeV range, the focus of High Energy Physics shifts more and more to the search for new effects. What can QCD measurements reveal about New Physics?

In general the sensitivity of QCD processes is less than those from the electroweak measurements due to the inherent theoretical uncertainties in QCD predictions, as becomes evident from comparing the precision on α_s to the one on G_F or α_{em} , and (not unrelated) to the worse experimental resolutions, apparent by comparing jet to electron or photon resolutions.

The caution in interpreting deviations in QCD distributions as evidence for new physics can be seen, for example, in the distribution of dijet masses from the Tevatron⁶⁵. Uncertainties in the parton distribution functions, jet energy resolutions etc. dilute the significance of any possible effects. The excitement of the mid 90s about an apparent deviation of high E_T jet production, which in the end could well be explained by alternative parton distribution functions, is still a warning. At this conference we were reminded of uncertainties due to the insufficient knowledge of the pdfs in view of potential signals of small extra space dimensions⁶⁶ at the LHC.

Still, in some cases purely hadronic processes do constrain theories beyond the Standard Model. LEP results on colour factors from four - jet rates⁶ allow one to exclude a light gluino as anticipated for some SUSY parameters. Another possibility is the search for bumps in the dijet mass. Whatever the pdfs really are, whatever the energy resolution, in all circumstances the mass distribution should be smooth. Measurements by CDF and D0 does not show any such enhancement⁶⁷ and can be translated into limits on models like excited quarks or technicolour particles^{65,24}.

11 The other part of the Standard Model

Looking beyond QCD, LEP measurements on the W - mass²⁷ and Tevatron data^{12,68} on the top mass continue to improve the Standard Model parameters. Indeed, they continue to support a light Higgs boson, although it may have gained some weight⁶⁹. The direct LEP limits constraining the Standard Model Higgs mass from below and the Standard Model radiative corrections from above, let the allowed mass range for the Standard Model Higgs boson shrink to a rather small region. However, to explore this range, or find out that the Higgs sector is different, will still take some time. Recent Tevatron results on neutral Higgs bosons in the decay $H \rightarrow W^+W^-$ or doubly charged Higgs bosons do not reach a sensitivity to any reasonable model⁷⁰.

Whereas as yet measurements of W and Z bosons and top quarks are rather limited, the accumulating luminosity at the Tevatron will open new perspectives. Since the cross sections of W and Z production are theoretically well understood⁷¹ they may become a reference process for the luminosity at pp collider, an important ingredient for precision physics at a higher level. Top decays will become a very active field of research at the Tevatron. They are sensitive to electroweak and strong couplings and may reveal effects beyond the Standard Model. First measurements with the Run I data have been performed⁶⁸.

There is a significant sensitivity to new physics models from the LEP and Tevatron data. The most popular extension of the Standard Model is supersymmetry. However, no signal has been found in any variant of supersymmetry^{72,73}, be it R_p conserving or violating, gravity or gauge mediated. Within the constrained MSSM with just five free parameters the results can be translated into a limit on the lightest supersymmetric particle, a dark matter candidate, to be heavier than 46 GeV.

Less well defined theoretically, with a larger range of possible parameter sets are other models for Beyond the Standard Model physics. Also for leptoquarks, a Z' , or other models, no signal has been found^{74,65}. A possible substructure, as parametrized by contact interactions can be excluded, depending on the detailed interaction, for scales up to 10 TeV.

12 The future: near and far

Our field is moving fast and new experimental opportunities are opening up. Insights into many questions as yet unsettled questions will soon be possible on several frontiers.

- RHIC is coming into gear,
- PEP-II and KEKB are improving their luminosities even further to unprecedented levels,
- Tevatron is on its way to select several fb^{-1} ,
- and HERA-II and CESR-c are about to start.

Extrapolating into the near future, we see that possible highlights at Moriond 2006 will include precision measurements on the top and W mass of 2 GeV, respectively a few 10s of MeV, yielding a significant constraint on the Higgs mass. With some luck, the Tevatron may even conclude on the Higgs mass with direct measurements.

In 2007 a new era in High Energy physics will begin with the start of data taking at the LHC. This heralds the beginning of a rather complete exploration of the TeV scale. As was discussed in⁷⁵ with an even modest start-up, LHC will dwarf all existing data sets. With 1 fb^{-1} (i.e. 3% of the perceived luminosity at the first LHC year), for example, some 7 million $W \rightarrow e, \mu\nu$, 80,000 $t\bar{t}$ pairs decaying semileptonically will be produced. Once a few 10s of fb^{-1} have been collected, a Standard Model Higgs could be observed whatever its mass is⁷⁶.

And beyond? The transcontinental consensus sees a linear e^+e^- collider as the next project after LHC start - up. This is underlined in documents from ACFA, HEPAP and ECFA. Launching this truly world-wide accelerator will still require some way to go. However, a first step is made. Recently, for the first time a government has officially given support to this project. The German government decided firstly to contribute several hundreds of millions Euros to a Free Electron Laser built on the technology developed for the Superconducting TESLA option. In building this facility a significant insight into the industrial production of SC cavities will be gained. Moreover it states that 'DESY will continue its research work on TESLA in the existing international framework, to facilitate German participation in a future global project'. It is now our task to convince our respective governments of the value of this exciting next project.

Acknowledgments

The Rencontre de Moriond 2003 was again an inspiring meeting, for which I would like to particularly thank Jean Trinh Tanh Van, Yuri Dokshitzer and Boaz Klima. In preparing this talk I profited from numerous discussions and help from a lot of people. To name a few, I am grateful to John Butterworth, Susanna Carbrera, Peter Jacobs, Katharina Klimek, George Lafferty, Gavin Salam and Bernd Surrow. Etienne Auge and the whole secretariat gave me a lot of support. Finally I enjoyed technical assistance in preparing this write-up from Andreas Kootz and Uwe Müller. Special thanks go to my fellow theoretical summary speaker Lynne Orr for illuminating discussions.

References

If no explicit reference to a paper is given, they refer to presentations at the conference.

1. R. Brandelik et al., TASSO collaboration, *Phys. Lett.* 86B (1979) 243;
D.P. Barber et al., MARK-J collaboration, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (1979) 43, 838;
Ch. Berger et al., PLUTO collaboration, *Phys. Lett.* 86B (1979) 418;
W. Bartel et al., JADE collaboration, *Phys. Lett.* 88B (1979) 171.
2. L. Orr.
3. P.van Mechelen, hep-ex/0305073.
4. N.Werner, hep-ex/0305109.
5. S.Kluth, hep-ex/0305023.
6. G.Rudolph.
7. N.Harlander and W.B.Kilgore, hep-ph/0305204.
8. C.Schmidt, hep-ph/0306130.
9. G.Salam, private communication.
10. A.Böhrer, hep-ex/0305029.
11. A.Bertolin, hep-ex/0305050.
12. S.Cabrera, hep-ex/0305066.
13. E.Kajfasz.
14. K.Klimek, hep-ex/0305266.
15. P.Conde, hep-ex/0305020.
16. J.Binnewies, B.A.Kniehl, G.Kramer, *Phys. Rev.* D58 (1998) 034016.
17. M.Cacciari, M.Greco, P.Nason, *JHEP* 05 (1998), 007
M.Cacciari, P.Nason, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*89 (2002) 122003.
18. E.Ben Haim.
19. M.Tzanov, hep-ex/0306035.
20. K.C.Voss, hep-ex/0305052.

21. D.P.Brown, hep-ex/0306058.
22. B.Surrow.
23. P.van Mechelen, hep-ex/0306024.
24. M.Gallinaro, hep-ph/0304211.
25. R.Peschanski, hep-ph/0306024.
26. Ya.I.Azimov, Yu.L.Dokshitzer, V.A.Khoze and S.I.Troyan, Z.Phys C27(1985)65
27. A.Straessner, hep-ex/0304031.
28. M.Giunta, hep-ex/0305063.
29. C.H.Lin, hep-ex/0305013.
30. W.J.Metzger, hep-ex/0304025.
31. N.van Remortel, hep-ex/0305014.
32. S.Paganis, hep-ex/0305056.
33. G.Forconi, representing the L3 Collaboration, proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy, Brookhave, 1997
OPAL Collaboration, Physics note PN357 (1998).
34. D.Gotta, hep-ex/0305012.
35. Ch.P.Schuetz, hep-ex/0305121.
36. P.Gianotti, hep-ex/0305010.
37. C.Cheshkov, hep-ex/0306012.
38. D.Y.Kim, hep-ex/0305046.
39. M.S.Dubrovin, hep-ex/0305006.
40. B.Meadows.
41. G.Wagner, hep-ex/0305083.
42. N.Pastrone, hep-ex/0306062.
43. A.Korn, hep-ex/0305054.
44. A.Warburton, hep-ex/0305080.
45. A.Limosani, hep-ex/0305037.
46. G.Vuagnin, hep-ex/0305040.
47. P.Pakhlov.
48. M.Wang.
49. J.E.Duboscq, hep-ex/0305069.
50. M.Pivk.
51. A.Kuzmin.
52. T.Coan.
53. L.Vacavant, hep-ex/0307037.
54. M. van Leeuwen, nucl-ex/0306004.
55. H.Santos, hep-ex/0306004.
56. G.Bruno, nucl-ex/0305033.
57. H.Sako, nucl-ex/0305011.
58. G.Usai, hep-ex/0307085.
59. J.Velkovska.
60. P.Jacobs.
61. B.Hippolyte, nucl-ex/0306017.
62. G. Hanson et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 35: 1609 (1975).
63. P.Jacobs, private communication.
64. W.Busza, C.Salgado, A.Drees, T.Pierog, U.Wiedemann, J.Nagle, S.Panitkin, proceedings of this conference.
65. J.Hays, hep-ex/030757.
66. S.Ferrag.
67. M.Begel, hep-ex/0305072.

68. R.Zitoun.
69. LEPEWWG/2003-01.
70. Qizhong Li, hep-ex/0306006.
71. T.Dorigo, hep-ex/0306008.
72. S.Braibant, hep-ex/0305058.
73. A.Safonov, Fermilab-conf-03/153-E (2003).
74. C.Goy.
75. G.Bruno.
76. K.Mazumbdar.