

Metadata Management in Scientific Computing

Eric L. Seidel
The City College of New York
eseidel01@ccny.cuny.edu

ABSTRACT

Complex scientific codes and the datasets they generate are in need of a sophisticated categorization environment that allows the community to store, search, and enhance metadata in an open, dynamic system. Currently, data is often presented in a *read-only* format, distilled and curated by a select group of researchers. We envision a more open and dynamic system, where authors can publish their data in a *writable* format, allowing users to annotate the datasets with their own comments and data. This would enable the scientific community to collaborate on a higher level than before, where researchers could for example annotate a published dataset with their citations.

Such a system would require a complete set of *permissions* to ensure that any individual's data cannot be altered by others unless they specifically allow it. For this reason datasets and codes are generally presented read-only, to protect the author's data; however, this also prevents the type of social revolutions that the private sector has seen with Facebook and Twitter.

In this paper, we present an alternative method of publishing codes and datasets, based on Fluidinfo¹, which is an openly writable and social metadata engine. We will use the specific example of the Einstein Toolkit, a shared scientific code built using the Cactus Framework, to illustrate how the code's metadata may be published in writable form via Fluidinfo.

1. INTRODUCTION

Data management is quickly becoming a challenge in large scale simulations and modeling as compute resources increase in size, and simulations integrate with observational and experimental data. Not only do these simulations produce increasingly large datasets, which must then be analyzed and categorized, but the codes themselves become

more and more complex, often being developed by distributed teams. The Cactus Computational Toolkit² is one such software framework, comprising over 500 software modules (known as *Thorns*), of which a subset must be compiled to produce a full simulation stack.

The Cactus Thorns specify their public interface using the Cactus Configuration Language (CCL), which describes the mechanics of the thorn, but provides little semantic data. This makes it difficult to determine which of the hundreds of thorns may be needed for a particular simulation. There are two standard methods for dealing with these ambiguities:

1. Detail the semantics of every thorn in documentation within the source tree. This is somewhat helpful when a user has already downloaded the thorn in question, but it does not help a new user discover useful thorns.
2. Collect documentation and use-cases for each thorn on the main webpage for the framework. This is much more helpful to new users in search of thorns, but it raises new issues. Who maintains the website and keeps the web-based documentation synchronized with the source code? Thorns are generally maintained by individual authors, not the community, so should all authors have write access to the web server? If so, how does one prevent authors from misrepresenting each other's codes? The end user is still presented a *read-only* interface, meaning a user cannot easily annotate and recommend useful thorns to others.

In the following sections, we will describe how Fluidinfo may be used to annotate these datasets in a writable manner, while preserving the safety and integrity of the author's original data. We aim to show that the concept of "tagging," as introduced by social networking services, is well suited to building and maintaining distributed scientific collaborations in the computational sciences. Our approach is based on loosely structured data, in contrast to other data formats used in metadata and semantic web research. Section 2 examines other approaches to similar problems. Section 3 describes the *Cactus Configuration Language*, which contains a substantial amount of Thorn metadata. Section 4 introduces Fluidinfo, the writable metadata engine, and its core concepts. Section 5 describes specifically our strategy for

¹<http://www.fluidinfo.com>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation of the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Copyright ©JOCSE, a supported publication of the Shodor Education Foundation Inc.

²<http://www.cactuscode.org>

publishing the Einstein Toolkit metadata to Fluidinfo. Section 6 investigates how the strategy presented in Section 5 may be adapted for publishing datasets as opposed to codes. Section 8 reflects on the educational value of this project, and the Blue Waters Undergraduate Petascale Education Program that supported it.

2. RELATED WORK

Before discussing our approach to solving this problem, let us examine other systems that could be used to support distributed collaboration. *RDFPeers* [3] is a distributed RDF repository designed to solve scalability issues faced by many centralized metadata stores. It uses a peer-to-peer architecture to spread metadata across many machines, and efficiently route queries to the appropriate machine. A distributed system like *RDFPeers* would be a natural fit for our problem, as it could encourage authors to maintain the metadata pertaining to their codes and datasets alongside the actual data; however, we feel that RDF as a data format may be excessively complex for our purposes. We believe that a simpler format based on social tagging, like that used by the Delicious bookmarking service³, would be sufficient for our needs. In particular, RDF is based on triples of *subjects*, *predicates*, and *objects*, whereas the tagging method we describe only needs *objects* and *attributes*. Clearly we could use RDF triples with a constant predicate `hasAttribute`, but we gain little by doing so and incur additional complexity.

The *Social Accessibility* [13] project attempts to help site-owners keep up with accessibility standards by crowdsourcing some of the work. It is comprised of three pieces: (1) a browser script with which end-users may register complaints about websites and receive patches, (2) a browser plugin to allow volunteers to investigate accessibility issues and submit patches, and (3) a server that stores the complaints and patches. When an end-user visits a website, the browser script searches the server for any applicable patches, retrieves them, and applies them to the page. The user's browsing experience is immediately enriched by the knowledge of the community with little effort on the user's part. This project appears to have a similar goal to our own, enriching content via collaborative editing, albeit applied to a different problem domain.

3. CACTUS CONFIGURATION LANGUAGE

The Cactus Framework [15, 7] is an open source, modular, portable programming environment for HPC computing⁴. It was designed and written specifically to enable scientists and engineers to collaboratively develop and perform the large-scale simulations needed for modern scientific discoveries across a broad range of disciplines. Cactus is well suited for use in large, international research collaborations. For example, the Einstein Toolkit Consortium [16] is a collaboration of over 60 researchers who use Cactus for research into relativistic astrophysics, and who maintain a core set of some 175 modules.

³<http://www.delicious.com>

⁴This section was adapted from a previous paper on the Cactus Configuration Language [1].



Figure 1: Cactus components are called *thorns* and the integrating framework is called the *flesh*. The interface between thorns and the flesh is provided by a set of configuration files writing in the Cactus Configuration Language (CCL).

3.1 Architecture

Cactus is a component framework. Its components are called *thorns* whereas the framework itself is called the *flesh* (Figure 1). The flesh is the core of Cactus, it provides the APIs for thorns to communicate with each other, and performs a number of administrative tasks at build-time and run-time. Cactus depends on three configuration files and two optional files provided by each thorn to direct these tasks and provide inter-thorn APIs. These files are:

- **interface.ccl** Defines the thorn *interface* and *inheritance* along with variables and aliased functions.
- **param.ccl** Defines parameters which can be specified in a Cactus parameter file and are set at the start of a Cactus run.
- **schedule.ccl** Defines when and how scheduled functions provided by thorns should be invoked by the Cactus scheduler.
- **configuration.ccl** (optional) Defines build-time dependencies in terms of provided and required capabilities, e.g. interfaces to Cactus-external libraries.
- **test.ccl** (optional) Defines how to test a thorn's correctness via regression tests.

The flesh is responsible for parsing the configuration files at build-time, generating source code to instantiate the different required thorn variables, parameters and functions, as well as checking required thorn dependencies.

At run-time the flesh parses a user provided parameter file that defines which thorns are required and provides key-value pairs of parameter assignments.⁵ The flesh then ac-

⁵Note that this parameter file is different from the file `param.ccl` which is used to define which parameters exist,


Cactus Thorn

Figure 2: Cactus thorns are comprised of source code, documentation, test-suites for regression testing, along with a set of configuration files written in the Cactus Configuration Language (CCL) which define the interface with other thorns and the Cactus flesh.

tivates only the required thorns, sets the given parameters, using default values for parameters which are not specified in the parameter file, and creates the schedule of which functions provided by the activated thorns to run at which time.

The Cactus flesh provides the main iteration loop for simulations (although this can be overloaded by any thorn) but does not handle memory allocation for variables or parallelization; this is performed by a *driver* thorn. The flesh performs no computation of its own — this is all done by thorns. It simply orchestrates the computations defined by the thorns.

The thorns are the basic modules of Cactus. They are largely independent of each other and communicate via calls to the Flesh API. Thorns are collected into logical groupings called *arrangements*. This is not strictly required, but strongly recommended to aid with their organization. An important concept is that of an *interface*. Thorns do not define relationships with other specific thorns, nor do they communicate directly with other thorns. Instead they define relationships with an interface, which may be provided by multiple thorns. This distinction exists so that thorns providing the same interface may be interchanged without affecting any other thorns. Interfaces in Cactus are fairly similar to abstract classes in Java or virtual base classes in C++, with the important distinction that in Cactus the interface is not explicitly defined anywhere outside of the thorn.

This ability to choose among multiple thorns providing the same interface is important for introducing new capabilities in Cactus with minimal changes to other thorns, so that different research groups can implement their own particular solver for some problem, yet still take advantage of the large amount of community thorns. For example, the original driver thorn for Cactus which handles domain decomposition and message passing is a unigrid driver called **PUGH**. More recently, a driver thorn which implements adaptive mesh refinement (AMR) was developed called **Carpet** [10, 9,

while the former is used to assign values to those parameters at run-time.

4]. Carpet makes it possible for simulations to run with multiple levels of mesh refinement, which can be used to achieve great accuracy compared to unigrid simulations. Both **PUGH** and **Carpet** provide the interface **driver** and application thorns can relatively straightforwardly migrate from unigrid to using the advanced AMR thorn.

Thorns providing the same interface may also be compiled together in the same executable, with the user choosing in the parameter file, at run-time, which implementation to use. This allows users to switch among various thorns without having to recompile Cactus.

Thorns include a `doc` directory which provides the documentation for the thorn in L^AT_EX format. This allows users to build one single reference guide to all thorns via a simple command.

3.2 Tools

As a distributed software framework, Cactus can make use of some additional tools to assemble the code and manage the simulations. Oftentimes each arrangement of thorns resides in its own source control repository, as they are mostly independent of each other. This leads to a retrieval process that would quickly become unmanageable for end-users (for example the Einstein Toolkit is comprised of 135 thorns). To facilitate this process we use a *thornlist* written using the Component Retrieval Language [11], which allows the maintainers of a distributed framework to distribute a single file containing the URLs of the components and the desired directory structure. This file can then be processed by a program such as our own **GetComponents** script, and the entire retrieval process becomes automated.

In addition to the complex retrieval process, compiling Cactus and managing simulations can be a difficult task, especially for new users. There are a large number of options that may be required for a successful compilation, and these will vary across architectures. To assist with this process a tool called the *Simulation Factory* [12, 14] was developed. Simulation Factory provides a central means of control for managing access to different resources, configuring and building the Cactus codebase, and also managing the simulations created using Cactus. Simulation Factory uses a database known as the *Machine Database*, which allows Simulation Factory to be resource agnostic, allowing it to run consistently across any pre-configured HPC resource.

4. FLUIDINFO

Fluidinfo is an openly writeable datastore, whose goal is to extend collaborative tagging to all forms of data. Designed around the metaphor of post-it notes, it is a collection of *objects* and *tags* at its core, with a complete set of *permissions* to give users full control over their data. Fluidinfo is developed and hosted by Fluidinfo Inc., a start-up company. This section will give a brief overview of the basic concepts of Fluidinfo; a more detailed discussion may be found in the official documentation [6].

4.1 Objects

One of the core concepts of Fluidinfo is that objects are completely anonymous, having no owner and no inherent




Figure 3: Visual representation of the Fluidinfo object for the song “Black Star” by Radiohead. Note the combination of tags from a variety of users, with primitive and opaque values.

meaning. Objects exist solely as a container for tags, which define their semantics.

4.2 Tags

Tags have owners and permissions, so while anyone can tag an object, tags may be read-only, read-write, or completely invisible to the outside world. When a tag is placed on an object, it may contain any value, and the type of value need not be consistent between tag-instances (although in practice this would be a good idea). Fluidinfo does, however distinguish between so-called *primitive* and *opaque* tag-values.

Primitive tag-values are a subset of the standard types found in many programming languages: integers, floating-point numbers, booleans, strings, the *null* value, and *sets of strings*. Note that arrays, or sets of anything other than strings are considered opaque values. Primitive values are useful because Fluidinfo allows indexing of these values, permitting more complex and specific querying of tags with primitive values.

Opaque tag-values include any type of value that is not considered primitive. This includes JSON arrays or objects, binary data, anything that can be assigned a MIME-type. Opaque values are not indexed, and therefore users cannot search based on the contents of opaque tags, merely their presence.

4.2.1 About Tag

If objects are anonymous and an instance of a tag may contain any value independent of the other instances, one may wonder how to identify a specific object. Fluidinfo allows objects to be uniquely identified by a *UUID* (Universally Unique Identifier⁶) and the so-called *about-tag*. The about-tag, `fluiddb/about`, is a unique, immutable tag that may optionally be provided when creating an object. This allows for an object to be given some basic semantic value without adding any user tags to it, which can be useful in establishing tagging conventions.

4.3 Namespaces

Tags can be grouped together in *Namespaces*. All of a user’s tags will live inside the user’s top-level namespace to avoid conflicts with other users’ tags, but sub-namespaces can be used to logically group tags. As an example, suppose the Fluidinfo user `eric` created a `rating` tag in his top-level namespace, the qualified name of that tag would be

⁶<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UUID>

`eric/rating`. If we look back at Section 4.2.1, we can surmise that there is actually nothing special about the about-tag, it is simply a tag belonging to the `fluiddb` user, who is guaranteed to never change the value.

4.4 Permissions

The core mechanic that allows Fluidinfo to be flexible is its *permissions* system. Each namespace and tag has an explicit set of permissions, describing exactly how users may interact with the item in question. This affords users fine-grained control over their data. They can publish it in read-only, read-write, or write-only form, or even transfer entire control of a namespace/tag to another user⁷. As an example of how these permissions can be used, let us examine how Fluidinfo creates new users. There is a tag, `fluiddb/users/username`, placed on the object representing a user, that tells Fluidinfo that such a user exists. The `fluidinfo.com` user has *create* permissions for this tag, so when a new user signs up on <http://fluidinfo.com>, the `fluidinfo.com` user creates a new object and adds the `fluiddb/users/username` tag to it, signifying that a new user has been created.

4.5 Fluidinfo Query Language

Fluidinfo includes a simple query language to allow users to search the datastore for specific tags and tag-values. There are five basic types of queries in Fluidinfo’s query language.

Presence queries are the simplest type. They check only for the presence of a tag on an object, and are written as `has <tag>`.

Numeric queries search for tags that have a specific value using the standard mathematical equality operators, and are written as `<tag> (=,<,>,etc.) <value>`.

Textual queries attempt to match the query text against the text contents of a tag, and are written as `<tag> matches <text>`.

Set contents queries check for the tags that contain the given string. Note the difference between set contents and textual queries: set contents apply to tags containing a *set of strings* while textual queries apply to tags containing a single string. Set contents queries are written as `<tag> contains <string>`.

Logical queries combine the above types using the `(,), and, or, and except` operators. This allows arbitrarily

⁷For a more detailed and complete list of the allowed permissions, visit <http://doc.fluidinfo.com/fluidDB/permissions.html>

complex queries, such as
`(has eric/seen and (eric/rating > 4 or
john/rating > 8)) except imdb.com/rating < 5.`

5. WRITEABLE METADATA ENGINE FOR CACTUS COMPONENTS

In this section we will describe the desired capabilities for handling metadata for simulation codes, such as the ability to support open data objects and metadata which can then be provided by any user, promoting community driven standards and enabling innovation. Such a system would allow researchers to annotate the codes with their opinions, experiences, or tips while preserving the integrity of the original data. Social networks have already solved a subset of this problem, but there is no equivalent system in use by the scientific community.

Foursquare is a location-aware social networking site. Users publish their presence at a physical location, e.g. a metro station, a restaurant, a school, and can add photos or tips for others. If the physical location does not exist, users can add their own selecting basic metadata to describe the site. Social features include the ability to see where your friends are and have been, and to read the tips left by others.

Learning from this flexible model we envisage similar tools for data that will encourage academic data to break free from the current constraints of rigid schema, proprietary and controlled databases and lack of social networking tools. The general scenario we envisage is described below, here for software components, although a similar methodology will work for general data sets.

1. Software components (e.g. Cactus Thorns) are added to Fluidinfo in the same manner as foursquare locations. Basic tags could for example be based on the Dublin Core [5], with fields for authors, software location, etc. These tags can only be edited by the original user unless specified otherwise. An object would be created in Fluidinfo for each software component, we suggest an about-tag convention of `CCTK:<arrangement>/<thorn>`; however, this is strictly optional as the thorns would also be identified by their tags. There could also be multiple objects for each thorn since they could be added by people other than the original authors.
2. Trusted experts or consortia can then tag thorns to provide a quality ranking, associate datasets generated by the thorn, or warn new users of an existing bug. For example, a maintainer for the Einstein Toolkit would tag Cactus thorns with the release for which they have been tested and verified. Users can then search for software which has been ratified by the Einstein Toolkit Consortium, or they could search for software that has been recommended by a trusted colleague.
3. A graduate student is working on a research project to develop a new ontology for scientific computing. She can easily add tags representing this ontology to the Cactus thorns, where the user community can test out her work without necessitating new servers, or without her having write access to the basic thorn tags.

We implemented a prototype of such a system for the Cactus Thorns, with a web front-end written in Python [8]. The initial set of metadata we extracted from each thorn came from the configuration files and the Readme, representing a subset of the functional and bibliographical metadata contained in each thorn, as seen in Table 1. These tags are added automatically by a Python script that parses the configuration and Readme files of a thorn. The intent is for thorn authors to run this script on their thorns, immediately populating Fluidinfo with a set of Cactus metadata. Once the basic set of metadata has been imported, we can begin to enhance the existing data by adding other relevant tags to the objects representing thorns.

The Einstein Toolkit is a small subset of all Cactus thorns, and thorns may be incompatible with each other, e.g. if they implement the same interface. Therefore it would be useful for users to know if any given thorn is part of the Einstein Toolkit; we can implement this quite naturally by creating an `einsteintoolkit.org` user⁸, which will tag all thorns in the toolkit with an `einsteintoolkit.org/includes` tag with the value set to `True`. Figure 4 illustrates what the resulting Fluidinfo object might look like.

Using this tag structure we created a simple web application, running on Google's AppEngine platform, to dynamically retrieve the objects representing the Einstein Toolkit, and insert the values into an HTML template for easy viewing of the thorn metadata. Figure 5 shows a sample page from this web application.

With these two sources of data we can already perform useful queries on the Cactus metadata. Cactus uses a tool called *GetComponents* [11] to automate the process of retrieving many thorns from different locations. To accomplish this, *GetComponents* essentially needs three pieces of information:

1. Where the thorn is located (URL).
2. How to retrieve the thorn (version control system).
3. Where to place the thorn on the local filesystem.

All of this data is contained in the Fluidinfo tags posted by the Python script⁹. So if we wanted to retrieve the Einstein Toolkit, we could dynamically generate a file in the CRL format *GetComponents* uses by querying Fluidinfo for all objects that have `einsteintoolkit.org/includes = True`, retrieving the tags

- `gridaphobe/CCTK/arrangement`
- `gridaphobe/CCTK/name`
- `gridaphobe/CCTK/url`

⁸Fluidinfo only allows the owner of a domain to create the user for that domain, so domain users can be more readily trusted.

⁹Cactus has a convention of placing thorns inside an `arrangements` directory with the structure `arrangements/<arrangement>/<thorn>`.




Figure 4: Visual representation of the Fluidinfo object for the Carpet module in the Einstein Toolkit.

Fully-qualified Tag	Description
gridaphobe/CCTK/arrangement	The <i>arrangement</i> the thorn belongs to.
gridaphobe/CCTK/authors	A list of all authors of the thorn.
gridaphobe/CCTK/description	The description of the thorn as found in the README.
gridaphobe/CCTK/implements	A list of <i>interfaces</i> the thorn implements.
gridaphobe/CCTK/inherits	The thorn (if any) inherited from.
gridaphobe/CCTK/name	The name of the thorn.
gridaphobe/CCTK/scm	The version control system used for the thorn's source code.
gridaphobe/CCTK/url	The URL where the thorn's source code is located.

Table 1: A sample of the tags used to describe Cactus thorns in Fluidinfo. The tag names are fully-qualified and assume the current user's name is gridaphobe.

- gridaphobe/CCTK/scm




Figure 5: A prototype of a web application that dynamically displays thorn metadata based on the tags stored in Fluidinfo. The Einstein logo in the top-right corner indicates that this thorn is part of the Einstein Toolkit.

The returned data could then be reformatted into a CRL file, and GetComponenters invoked to automatically retrieve the requested thorns¹⁰.

This is already a significant improvement over the current system of creating and distributing a thornlist, which is both tedious and error-prone, but we can go further and solve a problem that was previously unsolvable. The Einstein Toolkit thorns can all be compiled together; however, they are not all needed to run individual simulations. Researchers will generally only compile a subset of the Einstein Toolkit, including just the thorns needed to model their particular system. In this case downloading the entire Einstein Toolkit is superfluous, we would like to simply download the thorns that we *actually need*. Using the thorn configuration files, we can construct a list of the thorns we will need to download in order to use a specific *base set* of thorns, providing initial data, drivers, and other components of a simulation [1]. We can then dynamically retrieve the tags mentioned above for only this subset of thorns, and provide GetComponenters with a much smaller list of thorns to download. This also has the benefit of isolating the code in the source tree of any simulation to only that which is necessary.

If we wanted to implement a system like this on our own, we would have to setup a new webserver and database, define a schema to contain the data, create a REST API, and

¹⁰There are some issues not covered by this example, e.g. the directory structure of different git repositories, but none that could not be resolved by adding a few extra tags

then assign someone to maintain the database and server. If we additionally wanted the system to be writeable (or at least have individual thorns managed by their authors), we would then have to implement an authentication system as well, and our data would still be limited to some pre-defined schema. Fluidinfo allows others to add to our data, and we can *choose* whether to ignore it or to begin incorporating pieces into our applications.

6. FUTURE WORK

In the previous section we saw how to use Fluidinfo to store the metadata of Cactus thorns in a *writable* format, add tags to those thorns from a different source, and then use tags from both sources to solve a problem that previously could not be solved without setting up our own web server. We did, however, ignore one issue; the example only dealt with thorns uploaded by one user, whereas the Einstein Toolkit is comprised of thorns written by many different authors. Suppose we don't know who all of the authors are, how will we know which tags to retrieve? For example, the Carpet thorns are written by Dr. Erik Schnetter, but unless we know his Fluidinfo username, we won't know how to retrieve his tags. Fluidinfo does not currently support wildcards in the list of tags to return, so we *must* explicitly list the tags we want. So how can we best adapt our solution to the actual problem? There are two possible solutions:

1. Instead of using tags in the author's namespace, we could take advantage of Fluidinfo's permissions system to give all authors write permission to tags in a `cactuscode.org/CCTK` namespace. This way we would always retrieve tags from the trusted domain user. This solution detracts from the personalization of Fluidinfo though, since the tags are coming from a domain user instead of the author himself. In a sense this represents how we might solve the metadata problem on our own, but with the extra downside that we can no longer prevent authors from modifying each other's tags! Fluidinfo does not allow separate permissions per tag-instance, and this would become far too complex to manage regardless.
2. Create a `cactuscode.org/author` tag that would be applied to the objects representing the *users* in Fluidinfo who are authors of Cactus thorns. This way we can query Fluidinfo for the objects with the tag, and ask it to return the `fluiddb/users/username` tag, giving us a list of all Fluidinfo users who are also Cactus authors. Then we can proceed with the process described in Section 5. This solution has several advantages: (1) authors cannot modify each other's tags without explicit permission, (2) in the event of a *tag collision* (where more than one author has tagged a thorn) we can apply some filtering condition based on the thorn's own author list to determine which tags are most authoritative, (3) we are actually adding more data to the ecosystem by *tagging* the users as Cactus authors.

6.1 Other Datasets

Supercomputers are generating massive amounts of data on a daily basis, data which must be stored efficiently and then

classified so that it can be referred to and even cited. Our strategy in Section 5 can easily be adapted to solve this problem. Suppose we run a simulation of two colliding neutron stars and store the resulting dataset. We can now create an object in Fluidinfo to represent this simulation, and tag it with the machine used, number of cores, initial values, duration, and any number of other relevant statistics about both the simulation and the output. Then a PhD student uses our dataset in her thesis; she can tag the dataset in Fluidinfo with a `<student>/cited` tag whose value would be a list of all papers in which she cited our dataset (likely using DOIs). If she is consistent in tagging the datasets she has cited, we could perform interesting queries using Fluidinfo, i.e. we could quickly determine which supercomputers had contributed most to her work. Other researchers might tag the datasets with specific situations where they proved useful, or perhaps related datasets. With a writable, schemaless system, the datasets may be augmented in any fashion deemed suitable by users. This allows for use-cases the original publisher could not have conceived of to arise organically.

It is becoming clear that citing datasets produced by simulations will be essential for continued scientific progress, one need look no further than the NSF's Computational and Data-Enabled Science and Engineering¹¹ program. Ball and Duke have raised some important questions that will have to be answered for data citation to become widespread [2]. We would like to address the question of how the metadata can be stored in a manner accessible both to humans and automated scripts. By storing the metadata in a shared datastore like Fluidinfo, it is immediately available for consumption by scripts, and by extension easily converted into a human-readable page as we have demonstrated in this paper. We also gain the advantage of not being tied to any schema, allowing us to freely add more metadata whenever necessary. Finally, the writable nature of Fluidinfo removes the author's responsibility of linking to all papers that have cited the dataset. The author of a paper can simply tag the dataset in Fluidinfo!

7. CONCLUSION

Scientific research is increasingly dependent on the simulation of complex processes and, by extension, on the ability to organize, search, and refer to the datasets generated by simulations. We propose using writable metadata to distribute and maintain scientific metadata, and have shown one possible method of implementing such a system. More work will be required to investigate alternative systems, schemas, and interfaces, as well as to determine what would be an optimal solution. We hope that the scientific community will take this opportunity to start a conversation about how to manage the large amounts of data currently being generated by our research on a daily basis.

8. EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The research presented in this paper was performed as part of a year-long internship sponsored by the Shodor Educational Foundation¹². The program began with a two-week

¹¹<http://www.nsf.gov/mps/cds-e/>

¹²<http://www.shodor.org>

intensive introduction to HPC, covering parallelization issues, N-Body problems, MPI, and other computational science topics. Following the introductory session, the interns split up to work with individual mentors for the rest of the year. While not strictly related to Computational Science, the research presented in this paper was strongly supported and enhanced by the Blue Waters Petascale Internship, especially the focus on solving *real* problems.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Blue Waters Undergraduate Petascale Education Program, as well as Fluidinfo, Inc. The initial work relating to the Cactus Configuration Language was supported by NSF REU program (#1005165). We would like to thank Steven Brandt, Frank Löffler, and Erik Schnetter for their mentorship in the Cactus group, and Gabrielle Allen for suggesting the use of Fluidinfo for storing the thorn metadata. We acknowledge Nicholas J. Radcliffe, who created <http://abouttag.com> to generate visuals of Fluidinfo objects.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] Gabrielle Allen, Tom Goodale, Frank Löffler, David Rideout, Erik Schnetter, and Eric L. Seidel. Component specification in the cactus framework: The cactus configuration language. In *CBHPC '10*, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [2] A. Ball and M. Duke. Data citation and linking. In *DCC Briefing Papers*. Digital Curation Centre, 2011.
- [3] Min Cai, Martin Frank, Baoshi Yan, and Robert MacGregor. A subscribable peer-to-peer rdf repository for distributed metadata management. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web*, 2(2):109 – 130, 2004.
- [4] Mesh Refinement with Carpet.
- [5] Dublin Core Metadata Initiative.
- [6] Fluidinfo Documentation.
- [7] T. Goodale, G. Allen, G. Lanfermann, J. Massó, T. Radke, E. Seidel, and J. Shalf. The Cactus framework and toolkit: Design and applications. In *Vector and Parallel Processing – VECPAR'2002, 5th International Conference, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Berlin, 2003. Springer.
- [8] Python Programming Language.
- [9] Erik Schnetter, Peter Diener, Nils Dorband, and Manuel Tiglio. A multi-block infrastructure for three-dimensional time-dependent numerical relativity. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 23:S553–S578, 2006.
- [10] Erik Schnetter, Scott H. Hawley, and Ian Hawke. Evolutions in 3D numerical relativity using fixed mesh refinement. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 21(6):1465–1488, 21 March 2004.
- [11] Eric L. Seidel, Gabrielle Allen, Steven Brandt, Frank Löffler, and Erik Schnetter. Simplifying complex software assembly: the component retrieval language and implementation. In *TG '10: Proceedings of the 2010 TeraGrid Conference*, pages 1–8, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [12] SimFactory: Herding Numerical Simulations.
- [13] Hironobu Takagi, Shinya Kawanaka, Masatomo Kobayashi, Takashi Itoh, and Chieko Asakawa. Social accessibility: achieving accessibility through collaborative metadata authoring. In *Proceedings of the 10th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility, Assets '08*, pages 193–200, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
- [14] Michael Thomas and Erik Schnetter. Simulation factory: Taming application configuration and workflow on high-end resources. In *CBHPC '10*, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [15] Cactus Computational Toolkit.
- [16] The Einstein Toolkit.