



Lessons Learned Discussion

David Brown & Gustavo Nobre



National Nuclear Data Center

Mini-CSEWG, 13-15 Aug, 2024

Fuller Lodge, Los Alamos, NM



@BrookhavenLab

ENDF/B-VIII.1 will be an amazing library

Even so, things did not always go smoothly. We want to learn what worked and what didn't so ENDF/B-IX will be even better.

So we made a poll. The topics mainly deals with items that the CSEWG Secretariat (the NNDC) can deal with

Please take our poll:

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=YB5WiXXcKEyhyS6NiHAZayuJbhx-IhBAU_UppUgBNVhUOEJFVUo4REU1MIg4V0hRMkwxVkrVR05VWS4u

We are attempting to cover many topics (in random order): Code of conduct, Executive Committee, Library development (evaluation reviews, the CI/CD system, the library release process), & Communication

CSEWG Operations



It should take about 10 minutes

Lessons learned: who gets credit?

- In the past, have had instances where the authors of a major evaluation were removed from the lead author by someone making minor corrections
 - Careless at best, unethical at worst
 - That said, evaluators should have the freedom to “remix” evaluations
 - Where is the line? How do we give suitable recognition for prior work?
- How do we give credit to data validators?
- How do we give credit to the experimenters?
 - If you did an experiment 50 years ago, but it still is in the dataset for an ENDF evaluation, that probably doesn't make you a co-author
 - If you did an experiment recently that dramatically impacted a new evaluation and participated in the evaluation process, then you should be a co-author
- When should an evaluator also be a big-paper coauthor?

Lessons Learned: competing evaluations

- Ideally, should be a collaborative process from the start: Transparent, collegial, technical, constructive
- Our goal is to provide the user with the best (from technical perspective) final library. This does not preclude a personal evaluations “prevailing,” but collaborative efforts are more likely to lead to good end products.
- No one (or no lab!) owns a certain evaluation. Others can and should be able to “remix” evaluations and make them better.
- We don't want to needlessly replicate efforts, so coordination is needed!
- Should PMs be involved to ensure unique evaluation assignments? Or should they be explained to that sometimes there will be duplicate efforts and that a non-adoption of an evaluation does not signify wasted investment?

Lessons Learned: EC decision process

- This time we had a few technically (and emotionally) challenging decisions: ^{239}Pu , TSL.
- We would like to think we made the correct technical decision with professionalism and care.
- Process:
 - closed door deliberations with evaluators, SME's and EC (improves signal to noise)
 - Evaluators presented competing options
 - EC rendered pragmatic technical decisions (translation: everyone was angry except the end users)

Lessons Learned: release process

- We MUST have official processing reports generated for each processing code, for all files in all sublibraries of a given Beta release
- Should NNDC also distribute official sets of ACE files (in addition to ENDF-6/GNDS) for each Beta/final release?
- How do we report testing? Especially proprietary/classified testing?
 - Currently all open testing is collected on a private (EC-only accessible) sharepoint
 - All proprietary/classified testing delivered a “thumbs up/down” if anything at all was communicated