

MEMO CP-C/24

Date: September 23, 1977
From: V. McLane, C. Dunford
Subject: Dictionaries
Reference: Memos CP-C/20, CP-D/34, CP-D/35

1. The changes which we referred to in Memo CP-C/20 as not agreed upon were the following:
 - 1) The breaking up of Dictionary 33 into 4 dictionaries.
 - 2) The deletion of the code FY from Dictionary 32.
 - 3) The addition of the code 'ISOMER' to Dictionary 24.
 - 4) The change of the flag on the keyword HL to L
(This just occurred on the new update)

The first three changes were made in the update of June 25. These were changes adopted at the NRDC meeting in Kiev. The draft minutes of that meeting were sent out on July 21. According to the Protocol, no changes made at Four-Centre meetings are considered as adopted until a fortnight after receipt of the draft minutes.

In the meantime, on July 12, in Memo CP-C/15, we issued our counter-proposal on the particle dictionaries, therefore, we were not expecting these dictionary changes to be included in the June dictionary transmission.

Perhaps, in the future when major changes are made in the dictionaries, such as the proposed reformatting of Dictionary 8, the date on which the revised dictionaries are transmitted should be agreed upon so that codes can be modified.

2. With respect to the particle dictionaries, since there had been no final agreement to accept the four separate dictionaries, prior implementation of these dictionaries is not a valid argument against the NNDC proposal.

We feel the use of four dictionaries is clumsy and requires unnecessary duplication. However, if the other data centres feel they need four dictionaries, we will agree to the split.

The suggestion that Dictionary 13 could be modified to meet our requirements is a reasonable one. If that is done, care will have to be taken that any modifications are consistent with the other particle dictionaries, and vice versa. We may introduce such

MEMO CP-C/24 (cont'd)

a proposal in the future.

3. We have agreed to the proposed reformatting of Dictionary 8.
4. We agree to the addition of Dictionary 27 as a simple list of nuclides. We do not understand the proposal to specify the fields for which each nuclide is valid. Any such systematization of which we can conceive would be based on half-lives. Any dictionary match failure could only be interpreted as a warning. The criteria used for such flags should be approved by the EXFOR data centres.

Would NDS submit a detailed proposal specifying what flags they would like to include and the criteria to be used for setting such flags?

5. The dictionaries we proposed in Memo CP-C/20 were submitted as the basis for discussion only. We do not want them adopted at this time. If they are not useful to the other centres, then it is not urgent in any case. We would like a few months to study our own needs, after which time we will submit a final proposal.
6. We do not agree to the change of the flag on the data-heading keyword HL in Dictionary 24 to "L" as we do not agree with NDS's logic. The keyword HL can also be used as additional information, therefore, it belongs in Class 2. The keywords HL1, HL2, etc., can be used as independent variables. Therefore, we see no reason to change the flags, since the frequency with which a keyword is used as an independent variable has no effect that we can foresee on any programs.



Sol Pearlstein

1h

Distribution: H. Behrens
F.E. Chukreev
G. Dearnaley
H. Derrien
V. Manokhin
A. Marcinkowski
H. Munzel
S. Pearlstein
J.J. Schmidt
H. Tanaka
NNDC