

To : See distribution below
Date : 28th May, 1975
From : Nigel Tubbs *NAT*
Subject : CINDA publication scheme.

At last week's meeting of the CCDN Committee, the questions of CINDA literature coverage and publication frequency were discussed. The Committee made the following recommendation :

"The Committee discussed ways of reducing CINDA publication costs. They recommended, for consideration by the four centres, an alternative to their proposal for a two-year publication cycle. The Committee would prefer to split the book into 'early' and 'late' volumes, containing publications before and after January, 1970. The cumulation of more recent references would be published annually with a single supplement, while the volume containing pre-1970 publications should stand for several years."

The arguments I can see in favour of this type of split are :

1. The 'early' and 'late' volumes would be of roughly equal size : a retrieval of all blocks including an entry published since January, 1970 yielded just under 52,000 entries : the 'late' volume might have 51,000 entries when entries with 'no-book' flags are skipped. The sum of the two volumes would be slightly larger than at present unless we took measures to prevent blocks which span the cutoff date appearing in both volumes.
2. It was agreed at the recent 4-Centre meeting to concentrate on compiling data published since 1970. The same priority will be assigned at CCDN for filling gaps in CINDA. The result of this will be that the 'late' volume can be expected to change rather rapidly, while relatively few pre-1969 publications will be indexed, and users will lose very little if the pre-1969 volume is frozen for, say, three to five years.
3. After this time, a new set of CINDA volumes would be produced, and the cut-off date could be moved forward. It will not be too many years before CINDA splits into three volumes, and this procedure could ensure that the regular 'late' volume stays a reasonable size (and price).

./...

Distribution

Dr. V. Manokhin (5 copies)
Dr. S. Pearlstein (5 copies)
Dr. J. Schmidt (5 copies) ~~_____~~

4. The argument against an 'early/late' split was that we wanted to get the file clean, the blocking done, and the data links recorded before making the split and freezing the 'early' volume. It seems likely that the centres will continue to have more urgent problems than cleaning up pre-1970 entries, while blocks containing a link to EXFOR will anyway appear in the 'late' volume.
5. CINDA is still growing at the rate of 10-12,000 entries a year, and most of these entries bear some relation to blocks already in the file. These new additions to existing blocks can be presented more tidily with a one-year publication cycle : redundancy between supplements and the main volume has always been irritating to users.
6. I would be in favour of including some new pre-1970 entries in the late volume. This means that centres making such entries must use an agreed reader symbol so that they can be identified : I suggest 'S' for NDS and CJD (already in use), 'R' (recent) for NNCSC and '3' for CCDN. One can then decide whether the reference should appear in the book : probably a Phys. Rev. article should and an old progress report should not.

In any discussion of what should or should not appear in the book, or how the book should be published, I think it very important to maintain the distinction between the book and the computer file. For example :

- Data links could appear only in short form (flags) in the book, or not at all : it is rather important to keep the full data index lines in the file. Personally I prefer them in the book as well.
- "Trivial" references in the book may be irritating, and should be removed with 'no-book' flags, or even by a killer algorithm in the book production program : "remove everything with 'NDG' in the comment" for example. The same references should remain on file as an indication of coverage, especially when cross-checking against other indices.

The file becomes a much less useful tool for computer detective work, statistics, and administration of EXFOR compilation work, if information is dropped on the grounds that people who read the book are not interested.

The Committee made it clear that they were stating their own preference in the question of CINDA publication, and did not wish to impose their solution to a problem which was of interest to the management of all four centres.

DAF/324-0

NOTE FROM CENTRAL REGISTRY

ATTACHED ENCLOSURE WAS RECEIVED WITHOUT COVERING NOTE

FROM: Anton Schiefel
OECD

ADDRESSED TO: Schmidt

DESPATCHED ON: 75/04/07
rec'd 75/05/09

SUBJECT : 4 Centre Memo

- Schmidt
- Calamand
- Alrse
- Kimmel
- Bentley