OECD / NEA
Data Bank **7 April 2005**

Minutes from the WPEC Subgroup C (HPRL) meeting
Antwerp, Belgium, 4 April 2005.

Participants:
A. Plompen (chair), H. Henriksson (secretary), R. McKnight, C. Nordborg,
P. Oblozinsky, G. Rimpault, P. Rullhusen

Members of WPEC subgroup C:
USA: R. McKnight, D. Smith
Europe: G. Rimpault, A. Plompen
Japan: T. Fukahori, T. Iwasaki
NEA: H. Henriksson, C. Nordborg

Introduction

The new chair, A. Plompen opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. The proposed agenda was adopted. A summary of the subgroup activities since May 2004 was presented.

The content of HPRL

The group discussed the content of the present data request list and concluded that, due to the lack of progress (except in Japan) in reviewing old requests, it was necessary to start from scratch and move all old requests (including the ones in the list "to be reviewed") to an archive list. The Japanese would be asked to submit their requests taking into account the slight modification in the format proposed below under heading "HPRL web page".

The HPRL web page

The HPRL Web site, and especially the form for entering new requests, was reviewed with the dual goal of:
- considering possible changes needed to the content of the list, and
- improving the user-friendliness of the input page

Format (content) changes

The review of present HPRL web page for entering new requests resulted in an agreement on the need to:
- add a check box to indicate if the request is proposed as a high priority or a general request

- add a field indicating a date for when the request need to be fulfilled
- add a field providing a possibility to add general comments
- add a possibility to include attachments
- remove the field "type of information" indicating whether the request concerned a measurement or an evaluation, as the final product would always be an evaluated file

It was agreed that quantitative justifications were needed for high priority requests, whereas qualitative justifications would be sufficient for general requests.

Each request should ideally be linked to an application project. The meeting participants concluded that evaluation projects were not accepted as valid application projects.

It was also agreed to allow more than one requester for a request. If the NEA notices that a new request is very similar to an existing request, the NEA would stimulate a discussion between the requesters, with a goal of having only one joint request.

User-friendliness

It was agreed to
- insert titles to all retrieved lists
- add links to "comments" and "requester details" in the retrieved lists, instead of selecting them among the search criteria
- add dropdown lists in the "Nuclear data request submission form", especially in the cases of target, reaction and quantity.

Guidelines

The web guidelines for adding new requests were reviewed and it was noted that the NEA needed to update these guidelines, taking into account both comments already communicated to the NEA and modifications needed to reflect the agreed changes to the "Nuclear data request submission form".

The review process

The process for accepting new data requests was discussed. It was agreed to adopt the following procedure:
- Any submitted new request will first be scanned by the NEA for relevance and completeness.
- If needed, the NEA would communicate with the requester to obtain complementary information.
- Subgroup C will then review the request.
- If needed, subgroup C will ask external referees (the members of the HPRL list server or other experts) to help evaluating the validity and feasibility of a request.
- The request would finally be entered in the appropriate category: High priority request, General request or Rejected request.

The history of the review process, including the comments provided in each stage of the review, should be documented and available together with the request.

The review process for existing requests was discussed and it was suggested that a simpler annual review should be performed to verify that the existing requests were still valid, taking into account the indicated "date stamp" for each request.

Presentation of HPRL

The subgroup underlined the need to present and advertise HPRL at various workshops and conferences and stimulate evaluation and measurement activities to resolve the requests. The list should also be reviewed by each evaluation project at their (bi-)annual meetings and feedback should be communicated to the subgroup.

List of actions

The following list of actions was agreed upon at the meeting.

1. On the **NEA,** to update of the web page by the end of April 2005, to reflect the decisions indicated above.

2. On the **NEA,** to check that all requests follow the guidelines and the mandatory request submission form fields.

3. On **G. Rimpault,** to enter requests by the end of June 2005. (JEFF / Gen-IV)

4. On **R. McKnight,** to enter requests by the end of June 2005. (ENDF/ Gen-IV)

5. On the **NEA,** to contact the Japanese for an update of their latest request list, reflecting the changes in the submission form.

6. On the **NEA** to prepare a first version of the list by the end of August 2005.

7. On **A. Plompen,** to send out a request to the HPRL distribution list for volunteers to act as referees.

8. On **A. Plompen,** to discuss the HPRL reviewing with Arjan Koning concerning the existing Intermediate and High Energy Request List.

9. On **all**, to review the present HPRL web pages and send suggested modifications to the NEA.