1984-01-20

To: Distribution

From: H.D. Lemmel and O. Schwerer

Subjects: 1.) Dict. 36, branch-code PAR with DE and SPC
            2.) Dict. 36, diff. fission-neutron yield data
            3.) Column heading definitions in BIB section
            4.) Dict. 25, Units DPS/MUAHR
            5.) Reference coding for Jadernye Konstanty
            6.) Family Flag J (Dict. 24)

───

    We appreciate very much the proposals received. We wish to comment
on some of them. In certain cases, further discussions may be required
at the technical data centers meeting to come.

                                        Clearance: J.J. Schmidt

Distribution:

1. S. Pearlstein, NNDC   NDS: D.E. Cullen
2. N. Tubbs, NEA-DB   D. Gandarias Cruz
4. V.N. Manokhin, CJD   M. Lammer
                                       H.D. Lemmel
A. F.E. Chukreev, CAJaD   K. Okamoto
E. H. Tanaka, Study Group   M. Oshomuvwe
M. B.S. Ishkhanov, CDFE   V.G. Pronyaev
                                       J.J. Schmidt
    A. Hashizume, RIKEN   O. Schwerer
                                       M. Seits

                                       3 spare copies

1. Dict. 36, branch-code PAR with DE and SPC

Reference: CP-C/110 item 1.)

It seems to be correct that in many existing EXFOR entries (most of them from Areas 1 and 4), the branch code PAR, when combined with DE or SPC, is redundant and should be removed. However, we are not sure whether these quantity codes can be removed totally from Dict. 36. I remember the case that DA/DE data of alfa particles were separated into contributions from two alfa groups, so that the combination of the codes PAR and DA/DE appear to be justified, provided the DATA table contains two secondary energies, e.g. E referring to DE and E-LVL referring to PAR. There may be more such cases. For a solution we feel that the existing examples must be analyzed individually, but we do not have sufficient time.

As an interim measure we shall mark the codes in question as obsolete, but with the understanding that the obsolete flag may be removed again if we encounter legitimate cases. It may be advisable to agree on a joint effort to clean up these quantities and to retransmit them if necessary.

2. Dict. 36, differential fission-neutron yield data

Reference: CP-C/110 item 3.)

The Lexfor entry on fission-neutron spectra data says that such data should be coded as

PR,DE,N   with the dimension 1/E

It had been the understanding that combinations like NU/DA and NU/DE should not be used. Note that the dimensions should be 1/A and 1/E, although most of the data will be relative with no dimension.

It seems that the quantity code NU should be understood as abbreviation of MLT,N for the case of neutron-induced fission (though, when NU was introduced, the code MLT did not exist).

We have one case where NU/DE is correct, because DE does not refer to the energy of the secondary neutron but to the alfa particle from ternary fission (with appropriate explanation in the expansion):

PR/TER,NU/DE,A

3. Column heading definitions in BIB Section

Reference: CP-C/111

We agree to this proposal.

4. **Dict. 25: Units DPS/MUAHR**

Re Memo CP-C/107

Proposed were

> KDPS/MUAHR
> MDPS/MUAHR

for 10^3 resp. 10^6 decays per second per micro-Ampère-hour.

We propose, <u>not</u> to use these codes but rather to use only

> DPS/MUAHR

with appropriate exponents in the numerical data. Our main argument is, that the unit-codes must be self-explanatory, as none of the center provides an expansion of these codes to customers. (In the given case, this argument may be more essential than the principle of maintaining numbers and units exactly as given by the author.)

5. **Reference coding for Jadernye Konstanty**

Reference: CP-A/38+39

We welcome the proposal to consider YK as a journal rather than a report. This has the advantage that the journal code YK may be explained to the user by its 'expansion' whereas a report YK- was difficult to be identified by the users.

However, we noticed that Jadernye Konstanty continues to have a most unfortunate numbering of issues:

> YK 4(48) 1982
> YK 5(49) 1982
> YK 1(50) 1983
> YK 2(51) 1983

This creates a problem:

- For the user's benefit the numbering in EXFOR must be the same as on the cover, so that the user can identify it in the library.

- The EXFOR coding for journals does not permit a coding as it stands. Possible is

> <u>either</u> YK,4,(48),82 which reads as issue 48 of volume 4 which is misleading,

> <u>or</u> rather YK,4/48,82 which reads as volume "4/48" which may be as close as possible to the numbering on the cover. (Note that parentheses are not permitted in the volume field.)

We will therefore include in Dict. 5 under YK that the issue number 4(48), as an example, must be coded as volume 4/48.

May we ask CJD and CAJaD to try to convince the editors that Jadernye Konstanty should be issued in the standard way of journals such that the previous issue-numbers 51,52... be continued as real volume-numbers.

6. Family flag J in Dict. 24

Reference CP-C/108

We agree to the proposed flag J for MASS in Dictionary 24.