Section F (Current)

****

F. Data Calibration and Cooking

Adopted at the June 7, 2001 Business Meeting
R. Schumacher, presiding

I. The responsibility for calibration and cooking of CLAS data rests with the Collaboration as a whole, which includes the Jefferson Lab Hall B staff and all member institutions. Primary responsibility for calibration and cooking of a given data set rests with the Run Group which took the data. Each Run Group shall designate an Analysis Coordinator to expedite the process of calibration, cooking, and analysis. Primary responsibility for providing working software tools for this purpose rests with the Off-line Technical Working Group defined below.

II. Off-line Technical Working Group

A. Each major software element of the off-line CLAS software (to be listed below) will have a long-term employee of Jefferson Lab or a member University who has the following responsibilities:
   1. Continued improvement and maintenance of the software package.
   2. Ensuring that the software is applied properly to each data set, although the final judgment as to the validity of the output rests with the Run Groups.
   3. Training of new calibrators/cookers who wish to use the CLAS software.

B. A suitable person is generally NOT a short-term post-doc or graduate student, but rather someone who has a long-term position and who will likely be available for the duration of the CLAS program. Membership of this group can change, but the intention is that each of the senior persons have a long-term commitment to this task.

C. Each major software element should have both a person with the principal responsibility, but also a vice-principal person to help maintain and improve the codes, documentation, and procedures. These latter persons can be at the level of post-docs and graduate students.

D. It is NOT the function of the Off-line Technical Working Group to provide the manpower to run the calibration and cooking jobs. The manpower must be provided by the Run Groups.

Needs (small) update to reflect the current structure.

III. Governance

Moved to become point IV

The Coordinating Committee will discuss progress made in CLAS calibration and cooking. In the event of scarcity of resources such as manpower or computing facilities, it is in this forum that decisions about resource allocations should be made. Service Work commitments of the Institutions can and should include providing manpower towards these needs.

Section F (Proposed)

Updated to reflect the current structure.
Text body almost unchanged

II. CALCOM and Software Working Groups

A. Each major software element of the off-line CLAS12 software will have a long-term employee of Jefferson Lab or a member University who has the following responsibilities:
   1. Continued improvement and maintenance of the software package.
   2. Ensuring that the software is applied properly to each data set, although the final judgment as to the validity of the output rests with the Run Groups.
   3. Training of new calibrators/cookers who wish to use the CLAS12 software.

B. A suitable person is generally NOT a short-term post-doc or graduate student, but rather someone who has a long-term position and who will likely be available for the duration of the CLAS12 program. Membership of this group can change, but the intention is that each of the senior persons have a long-term commitment to this task.

C. Each major software element should have both a person with the principal responsibility, but also a vice-principal person to help maintain and improve the codes, documentation, and procedures. These latter persons can be at the level of post-docs and graduate students.

D. It is NOT the function of either the CALCOM or the Software Working Group to provide the manpower for running the calibration and cooking jobs. The manpower must be provided by the Run Groups.

Stays as point IV.

IV. Governance

The Coordinating Committee will discuss progress made in CLAS calibration and cooking. In the event of scarcity of resources such as manpower or computing facilities, it is in this forum that decisions about resource allocations should be made. Service Work commitments of the Institutions can and should include providing manpower towards these needs.

III. Data Processing

Essentially simplified.

Given the considerable resources involved, each pass of processing a Run Group data set is approved using the following procedure.

Support current practice but also future possible refinements. Reference: current charges to the committee.

A. The Run Group completes and documents all the steps in preparation of data processing following guidelines defined by the Collaboration.
B. The readiness for data-cooking is reviewed by a committee of five members designated by the CCC. The mandate to serve in such a committee is for a minimum of two years or four reviews (renewable). No more than half of the committee can be replaced at any given time to ensure a consistency within these reviews.

Define responsability

C. The committee will report recommendations to the CCC. The CCC will decide upon the approval to proceed with data processing.
D. After the data cooking, the Run Group complements the documentation with all the available information for the best use and preservation of the processed data.
E. The same committee reviews the complementary documentation and reports recommendations to the CCC. The CCC will decide upon the completion of this pass of data processing.

Formal step instrumental in resource allocation, data preservation and release of scientific results. Template envisioned.

F. Potential conflicts in the resource allocation are managed at CCC level.

Section D (Current)

****

D2. Bylaw Governing the Release of CLAS Scientific Results
Prepared by ad-hoc committee on Talks
Barry Ritchie, Chair
Approved by the full membership, October, 1998

1. **Scope of this by-law**

   The release of scientific results to the public is governed by the procedures spelled out in this bylaw. This bylaw covers the results to be shown to the public by CLAS members in all cases, and the release of results to other scientists and to the public at large.

2. **Definition of "scientific result"**

   The definition of what constitutes a scientific result is of necessity vague. An operational definition may be that a scientific result is any finding, in and of itself, of sufficient interest to warrant public presentation in a seminar, conference, workshop, or publication. All decisions concerning the appropriateness of releasing information should be addressed by discussion in physics working groups if at all possible. The Coordinating Committee is the final arbiter of what constitutes a scientific result for the purposes of this bylaw, and that ruling is binding on collaboration members.

   a. Examples of scientific results that require the use of the procedure outlined in Section 3 include cross sections, polarization observables, identification of new resonances or states, and analyses based on items such as these.
   b. Examples of results that are not considered covered by the procedure in Section 3 include intermediate analysis results that in and of themselves do not permit preliminary or final conclusions to be drawn (e.g.: acceptance calculations, un-normalized invariant mass or missing mass histograms.)

3. **Procedure for release of scientific results**

   A scientific result will be approved for public release using the following procedure.

   a. The author(s) of the result will present the result to the appropriate PWG for discussion and critique. This presentation should generally be at a PWG meeting, but the PWG may elect to authorize the review in another manner.
   b. The PWG, upon agreement with the result to be released, will authorize the author(s) of the result to present the results to the full CLAS Collaboration for a period of 30 days for review and comment. The Chair of the PWG will determine the means by which the results are to be presented for review, and will advise the Chair of the Coordinating Committee of that mechanism.
   c. (M) All comments and criticisms should be given to the author(s) in writing.
   d. After the 30-day review period has expired, the Coordinating Committee will decide if the result is acceptable for release. The author(s) of the result will receive comment from the Coordinating Committee on the reasons for its decision.
   e. A PWG may add preliminary results to its archives provided the results are clearly labeled as preliminary. These preliminary results are then available for public presentations using procedures and policies described under other applicable collaboration bylaws. These results need only be considered by the PWG as outlined in step (a) above and do not require steps (b)-(d) above.
   f. Upon release, the PWG will add the results to the working group archive of approved results.
   g. In exceptional cases, the PWG can request that the Coordinating Committee allow immediate release of a scientific result.
   h. (N) Results should not normally be communicated to non-CLAS members until they are reviewed and approved by an analysis review committee.

Add a point to promote standards to improve efficiency and data preservation

Section D (Standard Method - Proposed)

4) **Procedure for the definition of standard methods**

Last meeting version.

a. In the preparation of a scientific result, the exploitation of standard methods for the treatment and analysis of both data and simulation are encouraged in order to facilitate the approval process, consistency in the released analyses, and long-term data preservation. During a physics analysis review, non-standard methods require justification and dedicated scrutiny, while already approved standard methods require just a proper use verification.
b. Examples of potential standard methods are: fiducial volume cuts, momentum corrections and kinematic fitting, particle identification, radiative corrections, simulation event generators and background subtraction.
c. A proposal to adopt a new standard method can be submitted to the relevant PWGs by a group of collaborators or even a single author if endorsed by the PWG. A standard method will be approved by a committee designated by the interested PWGs with one representative for each PWG and two or more members selected from a permanent pool of experts (detector and software). A new standard method could complement, partially revise, or supersede a previous existing standard method.
d. A standard method should be provided with a note explaining the procedure, the range of validity and data set of applicability, the parameters to be tuned to the desired precision, a metric to validate its correct use (i.e. check-plots), tags of keywords identifying the topic and a public code.
e. A library of the approved standard methods is overseen by the PWGs to provide the available state of-the-art methods as a reference for physics analyses and related reviews.