

EXFOR Formats Manual “Facility”

(N. Otsuka, 2016-03-29, Memo CP/D-899)

Addition to CP-D/899 (summary): This memo proposes coding of the location of the facility (i.e., the second field of the keyword FACILITY) as mandatory when the location is known but without asking retransmission due to this change..

Currently addition of an institute code in the second field of the keyword FACILITY is mandatory only when there are two or more institutes under the keyword INSTITUTE. Due to this rule, it is not very trivial to extract EXFOR entries from experiments performed at an institute. I would like to propose the following changes:

FACILITY. Defines the main apparatus used in the experiment. See also **LEXFOR, Measurement Techniques**.

1. Keyword must be present except when not relevant. At least one of the keywords METHOD, FACILITY, DETECTOR, or ANALYSIS must be present with coded information. Within this restriction, coded information for FACILITY is optional.

2. ~~If coded information is given it may be given in:~~

~~either of the general forms (see page 3.2) with code(s) from Dictionary 18,~~

~~or a facility code from Dictionary 18 may be followed by an institute code from Dictionary 3, which specifies the location of the facility. When two or more institutes are given under the keyword INSTITUTE, then a facility code is always followed by the appropriate institute code. If the location of facility is unknown, this has to be mentioned in free text.~~

2. The format of coded information is: (facility, institute).

Facility Field: a code from Dictionary 18. This field must be present.

Institute Field: a code from Dictionary 3, which specifies the location of the facility. This field must be present except when the location is not known. ~~If the location of facility is unknown, this has to be mentioned in free text.~~

...

I do not ask retransmission of existing entries only due to this proposed change.

The current last sentence of the item 2 (If the location of ...) was added when we discussed this question in the NRDC 2009 meeting (CP-D/557). If we introduce the proposed new change, absence of the second field will always means that the location of the facility is unknown, and therefore we do not need this sentence anymore.