

Proposed Agenda for WPEC Subgroup 33 Meeting

November 24, 2009

8.30 – 9.00 Welcome and review of minutes and actions from last June meeting (M. Salvatores)

9.00 – 9.30 Updated proposal for common adjustment exercise, including comments received so far (G. Palmiotti)

Short presentations will follow, from each participant to the exercise, on methods and data that will be used. Please, indicate cross section data files to be used, methods and codes used for experiment analysis, methods and codes for sensitivity coefficient computation, covariance data to be used, and methodology for adjustment. Please, plan 15 minutes presentation plus 5 minutes for discussion.

9.30 – 9.50 NRG

9.50 – 10.20 CEA

10.20 – 10.40 CIAE

10.40 – 11.00 Coffee break

11.00 – 11.20 INL

11.20 – 11.40 IPPE

11.40 – 12.00 JAEA

12.00 – 12.20 Jozef Stefan Institute

12.20 – 12.40 Follow up activities in Europe for SG-26 (A. Plompen)

Afternoon will be devoted to discussions on reaching agreement on the different issues that are still open. Each issue will have a discussion leader (proposal below). Please, for proposed discussion leader, plan to prepare a few viewgraphs to describe the problem and possibly suggest some solutions.

14.00 – 14.45 Integral experiments to be used (discussion leader: M. Ishikawa)

14.45 – 15.30 Isotopes and reactions, including mubar and fission spectrum, to be considered (discussion leader: C. De Saint-Jean or CEA representative)

15.30 – 15.45 Coffee break

15.45 – 16.30 Energy group structure (discussion leader: G. Manturov)

16.30 – 17.15 Covariance data (discussion leaders: G. Palmiotti and M. Herman)

17.15 – 18.00 Wrap up, next steps, and final conclusions (M. Salvatores)

Actions

1. All participants

To provide the two subgroup co-coordinators (massimo.salvatores@cea.fr, Giuseppe.Palmiotti@inl.gov) and the NEA (yolanda.rugama@oecd.org) with answers to the following six questions before the end of August 2009:

1. Does the proposed exercise make sense? Signal any general comments or suggestions!
2. Who from your organisation will actively participate in the work of the subgroup?
3. Are the proposed experiments adequate or should we have more/less/different experiments?
4. Is the proposed 33-group structure acceptable?
5. Should the reference system be limited to ABR or should we include more designs/experiments?
6. Is the proposed list of isotopes sufficient?

It appears that the participation to the proposed exercise will be rather large (JAEA, CEA, IPPE, CAEA, Jozef Stefan Institute, ANL, INL/BNL, CAEA)

Useful comments have been made on experiment to be used, on isotopes to be considered, on reactions to be included, and on common energy structure. Still some issues remain to be discussed and agreed:

a. For the energy structure it would be helpful if Gennady could distribute the 28 energy group structure used at IPPE. Just a reminder that the proposed 33 energy group structure is available at the subgroup website.

b. As for the integral experiments we personally favor to enlarge the proposed list to include at least ZPPR9 (Ivo ZPPR9 not ZPR9) with the benchmark model that can be provided by JAEA. For what concerns SEFOR and JOYO experiments, we think we should discuss that issue at the meeting.

c. As far as reactions the proposal to include mubar and fission spectrum is interesting. However, practical implementation should be discussed at the meeting

d. For the isotope list, there is a large consensus on not including minor actinides and fission products.

e. Cyril proposal of two steps (using a common covariance matrix first, and subsequently different in house covariance matrices) looks interesting. For the covariance matrix to be used in the first step, we can inquire on public availability of the recently compiled, by BNL, AFCI covariance matrix.

2. *JAEA (Ishikawa)*
IPPE (Manturov)
CEA (de St-Jean)
ANL (W.S. Yang?)
INL (G.Palmiotti)
NRG (D.Rochman)
China(?)

To provide, before 15 January 2010, the co-coordinators (copy NEA) with a paper describing the adjustment methodology used in each laboratory.

3. *G. Palmiotti*
C. de St-Jean
M. Ishikawa

To critically review of the above mentioned papers describing the different adjustment methodologies and to write a report of the findings by the end of June 2010.

Time-schedule

1. The following time-schedule for the subgroup deliverables was agreed:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Second half of 2009: | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide feedback on the specifications for the benchmarking of adjustment methods and finalise the specifications for the benchmarking of adjustment methods2. Write papers on the different adjustment methodologies used. |
| First half of 2010: | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. and start the benchmarking of adjustment methodologies.2. Review and document the pros and cons of the different adjustment methods used, based on the submitted papers (see above). |
| Second year | Complete adjustment exercise and compare results |
| Third year | Complementary analysis and write the final report. |