

4-C-MEMO Nr. 2/9

Panda

From: N. Tubbs

19th March 1970

Subject: Institutes dictionarySee
4C-3/22
~~22/5/75~~

We have just checked the Laboratory dictionary in three different IAEA versions against the June 1969 CINDA dictionaries. Due to the merge with the IAEA mailing list, it has increased in length from about 415 laboratories to 600 (version received on tape, 16th March 1970). Of the laboratories added, perhaps 30 at most will ever produce neutron data; so far almost none has done so, or the work would have been included in CINDA and hence in the CINDA dictionaries.

The EXFOR and CINDA agreements do not cover mailing lists: the CCDN proposes that the common Laboratory and Reference dictionaries should henceforth contain only

1. Laboratories and Reference sources for which entries exist, have existed or are about to exist in CINDA, one of the data files, or RENDA;
2. If NDS feel strongly about this, country abbreviations from those countries which have not produced data.

The attached list contains more precise proposals for deletions, together with suggested changes where we think there may have been errors.

Assignment of "Laboratory of Origin"

We would also like to have a clear agreement on the criteria for deciding which laboratory is to be entered for a particular piece of work and which centre shall code it, since there is a risk of serious confusion if two centres feed the same data into a four-way exchange.

1. We believe the present agreement is that data shall be coded only by the centre whose service area contains the laboratory of origin;
2. The formula proposed below for deciding which laboratory is to be entered for a given data set will, we hope, be acceptable to the other centres. The possible cases (decision based on the material published) are :

(a) The 'credits' in the article published give the laboratory containing the facility as the address of all the authors. There may or may not be a footnote giving a different laboratory as the current address of one or more authors. We propose that the laboratory containing the facility should be the one coded. Laboratory reports may not mention the authors' affiliation explicitly: in such a case it would be understood that the authors are affiliated to the laboratory publishing the report.

loc. of origin.

(b) Some of the authors (but not the first) are listed in the credits as coming from a laboratory other than the one whose facility was used (example: faculty members of a university joining in groups working at a nearby national laboratory). We consider that the laboratory coded should be the one containing the facility.

understand!

(c) The first author's address is given in the credits as a laboratory other than that whose facility was used, while at least one of the authors come from the laboratory containing the facility. CINDA practice has been to enter the laboratory of the first author: while this choice may appear arbitrary, it is at least unambiguous, and we suggest that it be adopted for data coding also.

(d) An itinerant group uses the facility of another laboratory. The work is published under the name of the itinerants' laboratory. We propose that this should be the one coded.

Obviously it is possible to produce special cases to justify a preference for a particular rule on laboratory coding, and this is quite reasonable. What must be done, however, is to make a firm rule now and stick to it for EXFOR exchange and any CINDA entries made in connection with data coding.

1. Listing

Distribution:

- A. Abramov (5 copies)
 - S. Pearlstein (" ")
 - J. Schmidt (" ")
- CCDN

The Institutes list for CINDA and the data files

The following is a partial list of the additions made since June 1969: we feel doubtful about many of them and would like all those for which NDS do not hold data to be deleted. We have not included Russian institutes, assuming that some selection has already been made.

ABC	CIN	IFM	KUS	QUE	VNA
AIP	CIR	IFS	LAH	RAM	WIT
ALU	CNM	IIA	LDD	RAW	WRØ
ARL	CNU	IIB	LFC	SEØ	YØN
BAG	CØD	IID	LFE	SKU	UCD
BBU	CØU	IIK	LØU	SLØ	AED
BLA	CRB	IPN	LUL	QUC	SHI
BMW	CTI	IPR	MAD	SUK	UWI
BNG	PUJ	ISE	NAØ	TAC	CNR
CAB	CZI	ISI	NBM	TAS	(IIU)
CAF	DAL	ITA	NHH	TEL	(SCU)
CBE	DØU	ITB	NIL	UBA	UWA
CEA	ELU	ITM	NSU	UCC	
CEC	ENA	IVI	NTU	UCV	
CEE	FIL	JAS	ØRS	UEF	
CEM	FYM	JCE	PAU	UGM	
CEN	(GKS)	JEN	PEL	UPA	
CEP	GRA	KBU	PTC	UPR	
CHE	IDF	KØS	PMA	UNE	
CHU	IEA	KPS	PMR	URJ	
	IEN	KUD	PØT	URR	
		KUK	PRA	USF	

- 2 -

There are also some errors or possible errors still in the 16th March 1970 version :

- ✓ - 1USACAU and CUA for Catholic University of America.
Leave CUA? OK Delete CAU 300040
- ? - 2ITYCNB is misleading: BØL is used for CNEN Bologna, and the university does not produce nuclear data. OK if we are not using both in address list.
- ✓ - Is ADE related to AUF (Adelaide)? NO
- ✓ - Is the address of 1USAAND ~~Berrien or Derien~~ Springs?
Berrien Springs (as in list) is correct!
- ✓ - 2NEDFLU should be deleted. Data from Utrecht University is entered under UTR. Sorry we need that code (address) not = Utrecht University.
- ✓ - Is 1USAGEC not in fact located at GEV? no, two different locations and labels
- ✓ - 2GERGEE should be deleted. An abbreviation KIG exists already for Geesthacht: it was chosen to sort next to KIL owing to the close connection between KIG and KIL. OK change GEE to KIG
- ✓ - JEN should not be used again: it was once applied to KJL.
change JEN to JES
- ✓ - RIY is a misprint for RUK RLY, already used in CINDA.
OK change RIY to RLY
- ✓ - There is a good reason why no distinction is made between 2SWDSTD and STK: we have often found it impossible to assign the origin of a reference, hence preferred simply AE. We would like AE reinstated and STD and STK removed. Sorry we need both STD and STK.
- ✓ - Why has TNC been deleted? Surely this is an error? Not deleted!
It hasn't! it is still in - see line 151!
- ✓ - CEN Limeil is an annexe to Saclay. We have in the past been [CEN is Brasserie side] asked to index them as SAC. Delete 2FR, LIM?
delete LIM
- ✓ - Why is WPI deleted? It has one CINDA entry.
Not deleted! See line 172! Not deleted.
- ✓ - The Krakow Laboratories seem to be satisfactory in their final version (IFJ and UJK). However, it is worth asking whether any data have been received from the university. If not, it would be simpler to leave KRK rather than replace it by IFJ. leave as is.
- ✓ - In general we feel it is bad practice to change an abbreviation just because an institute changes its name. ICD and CJD is an example.
Sorry about that!