



PAPER FOR DISCUSSION CONCERNING POSSIBLE CONTINUING BASIS
FOR FUTURE INDSWG MEETINGS.

1. The original method of convening INDSWG meetings was ad hoc and involved obtaining government nominations on each occasion.
2. It now seems that the work of this group has reached the state when a continuation of the activities can be confidently expected. Therefore some arrangements for continuity appear desirable.
3. There remains, however, some uncertainty as to the directions in which development will be greatest, e.g., the balance is not yet clear between discussions of programmes of measurements in progress or in the planning stage and discussions on data already measured and advice on compilation. It is hoped that feasibility and usefulness of planning-type discussions and the availability of the necessary information to form a basis for these, will soon be seen to have been clearly demonstrated.
4. The two smaller meetings of a specialist nature, held since the third INDSWG meeting (on compilation work and needs for measurements of γ), have been very useful. It is not yet altogether clear to what extent the work hitherto undertaken by INDSWG itself should be delegated to specialist groups, convened either occasionally or regularly.
5. There therefore remains a need for some flexibility and, perhaps, for some reduction of the frequency of INDSWG meetings if the delegation of work to specialist groups increases. With this qualification, however, some system of ensuring continuity now appears to be desirable.
6. In connection with arrangements for continuity there remain problems connected with the size of the group and of geographical representation. It is still felt that a group of 12 - 15 specialists, in addition to Agency's secretariat members, is optimum.
7. In certain geographical areas it may be possible to arrange a rotation of representatives among member states. This has already occurred in Scandinavia and appears applicable also in the area of Latin America (Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, etc.) as well as Eastern Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, etc.). The Agency's initial choice of countries to have participants in INDSWG is, admittedly, arbitrary and this problem must be faced.
8. There are also other countries not so easily grouped in areas (Australia, Israel, etc.) where some direct or indirect representation may appear desirable.
9. If the amount of work involved were felt to be sufficient to justify it, it would be possible to envisage a two-tier structure analogous to the General Conference and Board of Governors of the IAEA. Then there could be rather infrequent meetings of a rather large number of countries who could select a smaller working group of optimum size. However, it is probable that this solution is premature, but there does appear to be some problem in these respects of the Nuclear Data Working Group's operation.