Memo CP-D/346

Date: 11 November 2002

To: Distribution

From: M. Lammer

Subject: Proposals for CINDA 2001

1) Coding of references

In CINDA 2001, it is no more necessary to confine the parts of reference coding to certain columns and thus to use different codes in CINDA and EXFOR, because there are 23 columns (instead of 14) available for coding references, and reference fields (code, volume, page) are separated by commas as in EXFOR. Therefore I propose to use in the new CINDA system <u>the same reference codes as in EXFOR</u>. This concerns in particular:

- <u>journals:</u> CINDA coding should be e.g. NIM/A and not NIMA as in the old system,
- <u>conferences:</u> 10 character codes, when used in EXFOR (like 70HELSINKI), should also be used in CINDA,
- <u>report</u> codes, which were often truncated in CINDA to fit in the given field; typical examples are AAEC/AP-PR1986, or HEDL-TME78-100.

I believe that this is not only practical, but also reasonable to make full use of the advantages of a relational data base. As a consequence, the special CINDA codes could be omitted in EXFOR Dictionaries 5 and 7.

Distribution:

2) Conversion from old CINDA file

a) Fission quantities

When testing Viktor's CINDA retrieval program for the new format, I also partially checked the correctness and completeness of conversion from the old CINDA file. Although this was not yet a thorough check of reaction –quantity combinations versus the old CINDA quantities, I noticed that the following <u>fission quantities</u> (in the old CINDA format) can also be coded for <u>spontaneous fission</u> and should therefore in these cases be **converted with reaction (0,F)**: **NU, NUD, NUF, SFN, SFG, FPG, FPB, NFY, FRS, CHG**. Therefore, in the **conversion of these quantities**, the **energy field should be checked for "SPON"**.

b) References

If the above proposal (1), to use the EXFOR codes for <u>journals and conferences</u> also in CINDA, is adopted, then the CINDA codes should be converted to the EXFOR codes, where different.

In the case of <u>reports</u>, frequently codes have been truncated by omission of hyphens or other significant parts of the codes, in order to squeeze in the code or the page number. It has happened that, particularly with the introduction of using year-codes in the report number fields, that the complete report code+number became too long for the field provided in CINDA. Therefore I propose to correct such simple coding errors in the conversion, when possible. I know that the situation is more complex, because often also wrong codes have been used. Therefore I will provide in a separate memo a list of such coding truncations where corrections are simple and straightforward.