

Meeting on the OECD-NEA High Priority Nuclear Data Request List

Donald L. Smith

Moderator for the Ad Hoc Group

WPEC 2004

Aix-en-Provence, France

Introduction

- Charge

At the 2003 WPEC meeting (Coronado, CA) WPEC endorsed the organization of a meeting of evaluation project representatives to review the HPRL in order to improve procedures as well as content

- Response

An ad hoc group of eight nuclear scientists met on 9-10 October 2003 at NEA Headquarters to discuss the HPRL situation --- the group generated suggestions for improving the request list procedures, as well as content, and recommended an approach and timetable for implementation

Meeting Participants

D. Smith (ANL-Illinois, USA), Moderator

T. Fukahori (JAERI-Tokai, Japan)

A. Koning (NRG-Petten, Netherlands)

G. Manturov (IPPE-Obninsk, Russia)

R. McKnight (ANL-Illinois, USA)

C. Nordborg (OECD-NEA, Paris, France)

G. Rimpault (CEA-Cadarache, France)

H. Takano (JAERI-Tokai, Japan)

Major Topics Discussed - 1

- Concept of dual lists: general and HP requests
- Criteria for inclusion of requests in these lists
- Criteria for eliminating requests from these lists
- Organization of WPEC Subgroup C
- Resources for the review of requests
- Outreach to and feedback from data user and producer communities (Internet, etc.)
- Maintenance of request lists
- Website formats and content
- Checklists of criteria to use in request reviews

Major Topics Discussed - 2

- Schedule for implementing new procedures
- Japanese experience in adapting existing HPRL to the needs of that country (Fukahori)
- “Justification” for inclusion of requests
- Role of “Impact” in defining need for requests
- Discussion of some key nuclear data areas (e.g., medium energy) as examples of how existing requests might be handled in the new approach
- Discussion of measurement vs. evaluation in deciding how requests might be satisfied
- Frequency of future request reviews
- Benefits of a (3rd) list of “satisfied” requests

Main Conclusions from Meeting - 1

- Two request lists should be maintained: “general” and “high priority” (maybe a 3rd)
- Total number of requests will be reduced significantly by more stringent criteria
- High priority requests need to be justified by quantitative sensitivity studies and extensive supporting documentation
- Subgroup C should have two technical representatives from each data project (one each from data user and producer communities)

Main Conclusions from Meeting - 2

- A network of technical consultants is needed to offer guidance in reviewing requests for inclusion or elimination
- Both “general” and “high priority” requests need to be subjected to periodic review to be qualified for continued inclusion
- Subgroup C should establish an effective mechanism for interacting pro-actively with both requesters and providers of nuclear data to insure currency of request lists

Work of Ad Hoc Group Since Meeting

- NEA Nuclear Data Bank is upgrading the “HPRL” website based on meeting recommendations (Nordborg)
- The Japanese data project is reformatting certain existing requests in accordance with meeting recommendations (Fukahori)
- Argonne is seeking an example of a well documented HP request (McKnight)
- Argonne and TSI Research are examining existing fusion requests in the framework of the new guidelines (Smith and Cheng)