# EG-GNDS Report

D. Brown (BNL)

#### EG-GNDS

- GNDS analog of ENDF formats committee
- Charged with:
  - Maintaining format (manuals, tutorials, etc.)
  - Training
  - Promoting format & tools
- Deliverables:
  - Initial GND version
  - Collaborative platform
  - Training workshops

#### How decisions made

- Aim for consensus in all things
- If not possible, we vote. Only Governance Board gets to vote
- Governance Board made of 2 people from each data project:
  - ENDF: Mike Dunn (SpectraTech, formerly ORNL) and Jeremy Conlin (LANL)
  - JENDL: Kenji Yokoyama and Osamu Iwamoto
  - JEFF: Fausto Malvagi (CEA, France) and Oscar Cabellos (NEA, France)
  - IAEA: Andrej Trkov and Arjan Koning (IAEA, neither present)
  - CENDL: Liu Ping and Haicheng Wu (CNDC, China)
  - ROSFOND/BROND: no names submitted

### Report from May 2017 WPEC Meeting

- 1. Introductions, especially of the Governance
  Board
- 2. Reviewed minutes from unofficial meeting at ND2016
- 3. Reviewed mandate
- 4. Reviewed decision process of group
  - Consensus first,
  - if fail, GB votes
- 5. Received reports from SG-38 (closing) and SG-43 (opening)
  - SG-38 format specs close to completion, due by ENDF/B-VIII.0
  - SG-43 begins Tuesday
- 6. DELIVERABLE: Initial specifications & implementation due with ENDF/B-VIII.0 release, anticipate late fall 2017

- 7. Reacted with mild amusement at NEA management's name change of GND (it kind of makes more sense than our original name): GND -> GNDS
- 8. Reviewed GNDS training & outreach needs
  - consensus view is to do nothing until we have an actual format
  - will need Users' Manual once specs done
- 9. Reviewed operations of ENDF Formats Committee
  - Format change workflow
  - We will adapt to it GNDS (consensus view)
  - Uses GForge tracker system at BNL
  - Use GForge or GitHub to manage EG-GNDS format change workflow? ACTION: will test our decision making system on this question in next month, via internet

# Choosing a collaboration platform: GitHub vs. GForge

	Popularity	Useability	Stability	Ownership of stored stuff	Features	Access control	Legal issues
GForge			Tie	Tie	Tie	Tie	None
GitHub	Winner!	Winner!	Tie	Tie	Tie	Tie	Must be open source

#### **Other criteria:**

Accountability of maintainer: if system goes down, are we a priority? (GForge wins here) Optics of ownership: this is an international collaboration... It looks bad if owned by BNL or a private company. (Both GForge and GitHub lose!)

# Choosing a collaboration platform: GitHub vs. GForge

		Popularity		Useability	Stability	Ownership of stored stuff	Features	Access contro	0
	GForge				Tie	Tie	Tie	Tie	None
	GitHub	Winn		A Datak ting up		Must be open source			
	<b>Other criteria:</b> by May what status of setup is.						Forge wins here)		
С	ptics of ow	vners	<i>hip:</i> tł		ernational ge and Gitl		on lt loo	ks bad	if owned by BNL