



GNDS Discussion

Nathan Gibson, Caleb Mattoon & David Brown



National Nuclear
Data Center

CSEWG Meeting, Nuclear Data Week 2024

6 November 2024



@BrookhavenLab

CSEWG has a stated goal of releasing ENDF/B-IX in GNDS (only)

CSEWG has a stated goal of releasing ENDF/B-IX in GNDS (only)

Adoption is slow, will we make it in time for ENDF/B-IX?

The case for maintaining ENDF

- **ENDF is often “good enough”**
- Rare to find a format that could not be squeezed into ENDF
- **GND S adoption is slow**
- Processing codes moving along
- Evaluation codes are very far behind
- **Are we spreading ourselves thin?**
- New formats for FPY, MT=9XX, MF34 covariances
- Do we have to do two formats?
- **Forced adoption implies forced spending**
- **Lots of ENDF tools on the market**
- many are new (PyNE, DeCe,..)
- ENDF formal grammar

Program specific drivers of GNDS formats

CSEWG's Golden Rule:

The program that has the gold () makes the rules

- **DNN R&D:**

- Active interrogation (tighter coupling between structure & reaction + coincidences)
- reactions off-stability (an activation library)

- **NR, NE:**

- TSL Covariance
- **Everyone:**
- UQ – full pdfs; all covariances on everything (& how to get it all to fit); random realizations

Most are easier to do in GNDS, but none are impossible to kludge an ENDF solution

Big (non-program specific) GNDS format drivers

Codes (and formats) must be constantly re-invented

(or become stagnate & then obsolete)

- This cannot be allowed to happen to core codes (for processing or for evaluation) - Issue is not specific to GNDS or ENDF
- GNDS adoption has been slow
- GNDS is more pleasant to work with (even if it is not perfect)
- Few GNDS tools (FUDGE, MCGIDI, AMPX, YAHFC & TALYS formatters)

GNDS is Open Data and AI/ML friendly

(well, more friendly than ENDF)

- FAIR – Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable
- FARR - FAIR AI Readiness & Reproducibility
- ENDF would require significant changes to include more metadata, provenance, etc., information
- GNDS has this better metadata and preserves processing chain data dependencies, but it is untested
- No codes currently have proper support for FAIR, FARR type data

Other questions of a GNDS-only world

- **What is the purpose of the CSEWG Formats & Processing Committee?**
 - More emphasis on Processing & discussing what additional we should store
 - Still need to coordinate GNDS formats
- **Have we given say Russia or China the permission through the EG-GNDS process to veto US formats & processing needs?**
 - If this were to happen, would we really go along with what EG-GNDS “requires”
- **What is the support for evaluators?**
 - There is very limited support for GNDS formatting in evaluator codes
- **Bringing ENDF evaluation wisdom from ENDF-102 to GNDS?**

Whether we move to a GNDS-only world or a parallel ENDF/GNDS world, do we have a plan and the necessary resources?

Thoughts from the Executive Committee

- Processing cross-comparison exercises to bring everyone up together
 - A role for the Formats & Processing committee
 - IAEA/NEA coordinated exercises?
 - NCSP funding possible (but not this FY, there's a CR right now)
- Need an inventory of where we are with GNDS for all the labs for all the needs (processing and evaluators).
- We need a plan and possibly more resources. We can't proceed unless we have a better picture where we are.