

Beyond the ENDF format: Documentation and governance

NEA/WPEC Sub Group 38
10-11 December 2013

Dennis P. McNabb

 Lawrence Livermore
National Laboratory

LLNL-PRES-XXXXXX

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC



There are many open source communities that have developed copyright standards for broader use

- Copyright licenses for code and documents are similar, but not the same
 - Software, databases, manuscripts are typically treated by the same laws
 - Legal issues are different because dissemination and use practices are different
 - There are good standard available: Creative Commons, GPL, BSD
- Copyright license standards tend to fall into a few categories of interest to us:
 - Public domain: No rights or give up all rights – anyone can use, e.g. scientific facts
 - Attribution: Anyone can use, but must attribute source, e.g. journal articles
 - Attribution-ShareAlike: Anyone can use, but must attribute and any derivatives must have the same copyright
- ShareAlike locks everyone into the license - all modifications or extensions
 - Works well when community you are trying to benefit all want to use the same license
 - Reduces legal hassles when many entities are contributing to a project
 - Wikipedia is an example where these features are obviously desired

My version of David Brown's proposal for GND/new format

- Format and API specifications: Attribution-ShareAlike
 - We want our nuclear data community to all adopt the same specifications to improve sharing and cross comparison to differentiate the format itself and distribute multiple versions (no derivatives are expected)
- Data handling and data manipulation tool sets: Attribution (BSD)
 - We are providing tools to ease adoption, reduce infrastructure costs by sharing in the development of these tools
 - We expect folks within the larger nuclear science community to use these tools in their own different products (e.g. TALYS, NJOY)
 - These codes have already been released under different licenses
 - They may even want to charge money for these products
 - However, as scientists we do want credit for our work!

Concern I have with an Attribution license is that joint development requires a Copyright License Agreement

Is it joint or does one institution need to take responsibility?

Wikipedia governance: A model for governing format, API?

Goal is to get very large base of contributors, but avoid biases and vandalism

- Anyone can join, but folks can be kicked out
 - Advantage of permissive copyleft is that you don't need a licensing agreement!
- Has 3 levels of “editors” with different levels of ability
 - Initial: edit unprotected articles
 - Confirmed: move, edit semi-protected articles, receives voting rights
 - Good standing: allowed to “rollback” articles if they think edits have made things worse
- Administrators (voted in -- requires ~75% of vote)
 - Sys admin privileges, delete articles, block accounts (kick folks out), edit protected articles
- Bureaucrats (voted in – requires ~75% of vote)
 - Add/remove administrators, ...
- Arbitration Committee (requires experience as an admin, voted in)
 - Meets to resolve disputes and problems as they arise

Taverna governance: A model for governing infrastructure?

Goal is to create open source workflow software tools

- Users (Anyone)
 - Open way to report bugs, make feature requests & suggestions
- Contributors (Anyone who submits a Contributor' License Agreement)
 - Can contribute code, documentation, tests, web site improvements, etc.
 - Do *not* have write access to repository
- Committers (Contributors in good standing can request committer status from Maintainers who decide yay or nay)
 - Have write access to part of the repository
- Maintainers (Chosen by Project Lead Group)
 - Responsible for a code module, gatekeeper
- Project Lead Group (Chosen by PI who was funded to create Taverna)
 - One member from each institution participating in project

There are some other questions we need to answer before we can finalize licenses, decide how to organize

- Do we want control which official versions that are released? Or do we want to allow many different versions of the GND format standard to co-exist?
- Is it a controlled community with membership lists? Or is it an open community, no membership?
 - Can anyone join, subject to good behavior? Or do folks need to be invited?
- How do we want our work to be credited, cited?
 - How do we want databases to credit our work?
 - How do we want codes to credit our work?
- Do we want the same or different governance structures for standards and codes?