

## **The WPEC High Priority Request List for Nuclear Data**

for discussion at the WPEC meeting on 13-15 May 2003 in San Diego, USA.

C. Nordborg, NEA

In November 2002, the NEA sent around a few questions concerning the future development of the WPEC High Priority Request List. Only four persons/institutes answered the questions, so the summary below is based on a rather limited material. Does this lack of response reflect the general interest in the list or only the interest in the list in its present form?

**It is clear that the existing request list needs to be revisited, as it does not contain all the necessary information.** This is a statement that is common to all four answers. For example, the requesters name and why (for what specific application) the request was made, should be mandatory. Fields, indicating on-going experimental or evaluation work, should also be added.

In addition, there seem to be a consensus on the fact that there shouldn't be about 480 "high priority" requests. The list could still contain many requests, but the number of high priority requests should be limited and clearly marked. The preferred way to proceed in this case differs between the answers. Two persons/institutes prefer to start from scratch and create a new list, whereas the other two answers indicate a preference for a revision of the present list. In both cases **we would need to organise a meeting with a limited number of selected persons who would revise the existing list or who would establish a new list.**

The need to prioritise and/or rank each request is commonly recognized. This should preferably be performed during meeting suggested above. **Each application area should have its internal prioritisation/ranking.** A proposal to have a ranking system with a linear "decay time" has been proposed, in which the ranking is lowered each year, unless the requester renews his request. In this way, unsupported or "forgotten" requests would "slide off" the priority list after a number of years.

A question, whether we need **separate lists for measurement and evaluation requests**, was posed. Again there was no consensus among the answers. For ease of maintenance, it would be preferable to have one list, in which each request is clearly marked (in a retrievable field) whether it is for a new measurement or for a new evaluation. An evaluation request could spawn a new request for a measurement.

The list should continue to be accessible on-line for people to provide feedback and comments on each request. The list has now been open for about 6 months and we have not yet received one single comment or update! So, there seem to be a passive interest in the list (consultations and retrievals), but unfortunately not a general active interest. In order for the list to "live", **we also need participation of people who can and will perform work related to the requests and who will indicate that through on-line feedback to the list!**

Once we have re-organised and/or revised the present High Priority Request List, **we also need to agree on mechanisms on how to maintain the list.** How do we for example:

- identify people who could work on a specific request?
- organise regular reviews/updates of the list?
- decide when a request is fulfilled or when it should be removed from the list?

**In conclusion**, I feel that, if we are going to advance with the High Priority Request List, we **urgently need to call a meeting** where a limited number of well-informed and well-prepared nuclear data users get together to revise the existing list or to establish a new list. If you agree, I would appreciate if you could come to the next WPEC meeting prepared to suggest names of persons who should participate in such a meeting and when they are available for a meeting. Normally, such a meeting should be held in Paris.