

# Designing FAIR Workflows at OLCF

Building Scalable and  
Reusable Ecosystems  
for HPC Science



Sean R. Wilkinson  
Patrick Widener  
Sarp Oral  
Rafael Ferreira da Silva

**Disclaimer.** This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at ORNL, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. ORNL is managed by UT-Battelle LLC on behalf of the U. S. Department of Energy.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by agencies of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

**License.** This report is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

### Preferred citation

S. R. Wilkinson, P. Widener, S. Oral, R. Ferreira da Silva, “*Designing FAIR Workflows at OLCF: Building Scalable and Reusable Ecosystems for HPC Science*”, Technical Report, ORNL/TM-2025/4241, November 2025, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17290392.

```
@techreport{fair-olcf-2025,  
  author = {Wilkinson, Sean R. and Widener, Patrick and Oral, Sarp and Ferreira da Silva, Rafael},  
  title = {{Designing FAIR Workflows at OLCF: Building Scalable and Reusable Ecosystems for HPC Science}},  
  year = {2025},  
  publisher = {Zenodo},  
  number = {ORNL/TM-2025/4241},  
  doi = {10.5281/zenodo.17290392},  
  url = {https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17290392},  
  institution = {Oak Ridge National Laboratory}  
}
```

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	THE FAIR PRINCIPLES . . . . .	4
2.2	FAIR COMMUNITIES . . . . .	5
2.3	CHALLENGES AT HPC CENTERS . . . . .	6
2.4	EXISTING US DOE EFFORTS . . . . .	6
2.5	EOSC-LIFE FAIR WORKFLOWS COLLABORATORY . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>FAIR ECOSYSTEM ARCHITECTURES</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	REPOSITORIES . . . . .	8
3.2	REGISTRIES . . . . .	9
3.3	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE . . . . .	9
3.4	AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION . . . . .	10
3.5	METADATA STANDARDS AND INTERCHANGE FORMATS . . . . .	10
<b>4</b>	<b>PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE FOR OLCF</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	REPOSITORIES . . . . .	11
4.2	REGISTRIES . . . . .	13
4.3	COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE . . . . .	14
4.4	AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION . . . . .	14
4.5	METADATA STANDARDS AND INTERCHANGE FORMATS . . . . .	15
<b>5</b>	<b>ENCOURAGING ADOPTION OF FAIR AT OLCF</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>FUTURE DIRECTIONS</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

High Performance Computing (HPC) centers, such as the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility (OLCF), provide advanced infrastructure that enables scientific research at extreme scale. These centers operate with unique hardware configurations, specialized software environments, and elevated security requirements that differ substantially from what most users encounter on their local systems. As a result, users often develop customized digital artifacts that are tightly coupled to the specific configuration of a given HPC center. Although necessary, this practice can lead to significant duplication of effort as multiple users independently create similar solutions to common problems.

The FAIR Principles, which stand for Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable, offer a framework to address these challenges (Section 2.1). Initially designed to improve data stewardship, the FAIR approach has since been extended to encompass software, workflows, models, and infrastructure. By encouraging the use of rich metadata and community standards, FAIR practices aim to make digital artifacts easier to share and reuse, both within and across scientific domains.

Many FAIR initiatives have emerged within individual research communities, often aligned by discipline, such as bioinformatics or earth sciences. These communities have made progress in adopting FAIR practices, but their domain-specific nature can lead to silos that limit broader collaboration. To overcome this, we propose that HPC centers play a more active role in fostering FAIR ecosystems that support research across multiple disciplines. This requires designing infrastructure that enables researchers to discover, share, and reuse computational components more effectively.

In this report, we build on the architecture of the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC) EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory [1] to propose a model that is tailored to the needs of HPC environments. Rather than focusing on entire workflows, which are often difficult to reuse due to rapid changes in HPC infrastructure, we emphasize the importance of making individual workflow components FAIR. This component-based approach better supports the diverse and evolving needs of HPC users while maximizing the long-term value of their work.

The sections that follow present a conceptual architecture for implementing a FAIR ecosystem at OLCF, describe existing capabilities and gaps, and outline a strategy to encourage adoption among the user community.

## 2 BACKGROUND

To design effective FAIR ecosystems for HPC environments, it is important to understand the foundational principles and existing efforts that inform this work. This section introduces the FAIR Principles, explores how various research communities have implemented them, and outlines specific challenges that arise in the context of HPC centers like OLCF. We also review related initiatives within the US Department of Energy and examine lessons learned from the EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory, which serves as a model for our proposed approach.

### 2.1 THE FAIR PRINCIPLES

The “Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable” (FAIR) Principles for making digital objects Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable were first established to improve the management and stewardship of data [2]. There have been a number of other efforts in this space, some of which even sound

similar or related to the word “fair”, such as the CARE Principles [3], the Fair-code software model<sup>1</sup>, the TRUST Principles [4], and several distinct efforts which use the name “SHARE Principles” [5, 6]. What makes FAIR unique and distinguishes it from other peer initiatives is that, rather than making data easy for just humans to use, it places specific emphasis on enhancing the ability of machines to automatically find and use data, in ways that also happen to support reuse by humans. To accomplish this, FAIR focuses on metadata in order to make data

- Findable, so that metadata and data are findable for both humans and computers (e.g., persistent identifiers, rich metadata, indexing/registering);
- Accessible, so that users know how to access the data (e.g., clear access protocols, being able to access metadata even if the data have disappeared);
- Interoperable, so that data can be used by applications and workflows for analysis, storage, and processing (e.g., machine processable metadata using standards); and
- Reusable, so that data reuse is optimized via comprehensive, well-described metadata (e.g., metadata standards, data usage licenses, provenance).

Since that original publication, FAIR’s focus on metadata has found broad application beyond data to research software [7], computational workflows [8], open hardware [9], Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) models [10], and even facilities and instruments [11]. In fact, in 2021, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) performed some of the earliest research on applying FAIR to workflows [12], and OLCF hosted a lab-wide workshop on the topic [13]. OLCF was also instrumental in recent efforts to enumerate the FAIR Principles for computational workflows formally [14], following in the same format and even the same journal that previously published the principles for data [2] and research software [15].

Following the FAIR Principles helps make research artifacts more easily discoverable, shareable, and reusable. These principles improve collaboration, transparency, and efficiency in scientific research by ensuring that artifacts like code and data are well-documented, allowing them to be reused effectively across different studies and disciplines both by humans and machines. There may be challenges in implementing the FAIR Principles [16], but they do play an important role in facilitating reproducibility, accelerating discoveries, and supporting long-term stewardship of research artifacts. Their adoption helps researchers maximize the impact of their artifacts while fostering open science and innovation.

## 2.2 FAIR COMMUNITIES

The FAIR Principles focus on metadata practices to be implemented by vaguely defined “communities”; the various publications have all deliberately left this up to interpretation. In practice, these communities tend to gather by domain (e.g. bioinformatics, geosciences, and agriculture). Such efforts have improved sharing and reusing artifacts within their respective disciplines, but these domain-based communities can end up functioning as silos. This hampers sharing and reusing artifacts as well as the adoption of the FAIR Principles themselves across computational research areas.

For example, the bioinformatics community has made significant strides in developing FAIR repositories such as the European Nucleotide Archive [17]. Similarly, the geoscience community has developed metadata-rich repositories such as Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS) [18],

---

<sup>1</sup><https://faircode.io/>

which provides comprehensive access to satellite and remote sensing data while supporting research in areas such as climate change, natural disasters, and ecosystem monitoring. However, interoperability between these repositories remains limited, reducing the potential for cross-domain collaboration.

## 2.3 CHALLENGES AT HPC CENTERS

HPC centers present additional challenges not present in commodity computing environments that must be addressed when implementing FAIR Principles [19]. In order to provide resources to users who require greater scale to “get science done”, HPC centers frequently deploy infrastructure with exotic hardware architectures, cutting-edge software environments, and stricter security measures as compared with users’ own resources [20]. Variability in system architectures, ranging from CPU-based clusters to GPU- and TPU-accelerated platforms, complicates software portability and reproducibility. Furthermore, interdisciplinary and inter-project collaboration within and across HPC centers remains challenging due to security constraints, data governance policies, and technical barriers. As a result, users often create, configure, and customize digital artifacts in ways that are specialized for the unique infrastructure at a given HPC center. This means that the research artifacts produced at HPC centers have limited potential for reuse by others unless they are shared in ways that are discoverable by other users of those HPC centers.

## 2.4 EXISTING US DOE EFFORTS

Several efforts in the United States (US) Department of Energy (DOE) share the common goal of advancing scientific research by providing cutting-edge computational, data, and networking resources to support interdisciplinary collaboration: Integrated Research Infrastructure (IRI) [21], Framework for Accelerating Science and Scientific Training (FASST) Framework [22], and National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource (NAIRR) [23]. These initiatives focus on improving access to HPC, data management, and security frameworks to foster cross-disciplinary research and enable more efficient, data-driven scientific discoveries. They emphasize the importance of open science principles and FAIR, ensuring that research data and tools are accessible and reusable. These efforts are more concerned with enabling the autonomous laboratories of the future, however, rather than the human users of HPC facilities.

## 2.5 EOSC-LIFE FAIR WORKFLOWS COLLABORATORY

The EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory is a European initiative aimed at enhancing the FAIRness of scientific workflows in life sciences [1, 24]. It provides a collaborative platform, including WorkflowHub [25], that enables researchers to share, develop, and execute workflows across various life science domains, ensuring that data, tools, and computational resources are well-documented and standardized for broader use. It leverages the EOSC to foster collaboration between institutions and projects, promote transparency, and improve the efficiency of research through the integration of diverse data sources and computational tools. The initiative is crucial for supporting reproducibility, advancing data-driven discoveries, and accelerating innovation in European life sciences.

In this report, we argue that users could increase impactful scientific output if HPC centers enhanced their unique environments with a FAIR-based strategy similar to the one pursued by EOSC-Life. We observe that a focus on FAIR workflow components may be more impactful than focusing on FAIR for entire workflows. We also propose a general architecture and discuss how to encourage adoption by users.



### 3 FAIR ECOSYSTEM ARCHITECTURES

Constructing a FAIR ecosystem is an ambitious undertaking because such an ecosystem has many moving parts, including data, software, hardware, services, and most importantly, users. Luckily, there is an existing ecosystem for us to analyze to abstract some of the general design patterns to inform our own designs, which are detailed in Section 4. The EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory provides an example for constructing an ecosystem that incorporates FAIR “all the way down” to aid domain scientists to produce impactful scientific artifacts that are shareable, discoverable, and reusable. A diagram depicting many of the moving parts is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory [24].

Although the EOSC-Life Collaboratory was constructed specifically to meet the needs of European life scientists, it does accurately portray many of the complications shared by domain scientists in general and, we argue, those faced by the users of HPC facilities. There are some key differences, however. The EOSC-Life Collaboratory focuses mainly on the practice of open science, and life scientists try to maintain infrastructure for as long as possible to avoid breaking the pipelines they have constructed. This results in a stronger focus on applying FAIR to workflows as a whole.

We argue that FAIR ecosystems for HPC centers are better served by focusing on the sharing, discovery, and reuse of **workflow components rather than entire workflows**. This is partly because HPC workflows are often short-lived due to being customized for HPC resources with short design lifetimes (due to the rapid pace of hardware and software innovation). For example, the flagship machines at centers like OLCF are designed for a lifespan of 5 years; after that, executing the same workflows on a machine’s successor is almost guaranteed to fail. Having witnessed this process repeatedly, we have noticed that workflow

components themselves are less likely to break, but they will have to be re-plumbed to port the workflow to the new machine. Another reason for focusing on components is that, in our experience, it is extremely rare to locate an existing off-the-shelf workflow that exactly matches your needs. Users at HPC centers come from a variety of scientific disciplines, so it is unlikely that any particular workflow will match the needs of other users exactly. Because these users are all solving challenges in trying to scale using the same HPC resources, however, it is much more likely that solutions to separable pieces of problems will be reusable across disciplines, supporting a component-based approach.

For these reasons we propose to focus on applying FAIR to workflow components, making sure they are well-described by rich metadata. This strategy requires a combination of repositories, registries, computing infrastructure, authentication/authorization, and metadata standards. This also allows us to abstract many of the details from Figure 1 into the simpler Figure 2, which depicts an abstract FAIR ecosystem at an HPC center.




Figure 2: Illustrated examples of a FAIR ecosystem in action at an HPC center. Dashed lines (—) show the registry’s records tracking components wherever they are. Dotted lines (···) show services in an on-prem cloud monitoring the registry and component repository for updates and providing support such as databases to supercomputer jobs. Solid lines (—) show that the supercomputer can consult the registry to locate components and request the service infrastructure to retrieve external artifacts if needed [19].

### 3.1 REPOSITORIES

Repositories, roughly speaking, are places where *things* are stored; this is in contrast to registries (see below), which are where *records* of things are stored. Registries and repositories provide curation and best practices for recording workflows [26]. Workflow components are what workflows are made of, which can include various forms of data (e.g. simulation output, trained AI/ML models, and provenance) and software (e.g. scripts, programs, and computational workflows). Having a robust repository system aligns with IRI-style distributed, collaborative science and its aims for creating a seamless, interoperable research infrastructure across DOE labs.

The FAIR Principles do not imply openness, but we also recommend following open science princi-



ples [27] when possible by enabling integration with externally hosted public repositories (e.g. Conda<sup>2</sup>, Spack<sup>3</sup>, Docker Hub<sup>4</sup>, TensorFlow Hub<sup>5</sup>). Security or scale concerns may not allow for open dissemination or integration, however. HPC centers typically handle their own user identity management, and those operated by US Government entities must conform to well-specified security policies. Scale of workflow components tends to be more a technical issue; centers typically address these through data transport middleware designed for large scale (e.g. Globus [28]) and specialized repositories (e.g. DataFed [29]) which can encapsulate both data transport and storage capabilities. These concerns can also take different forms for commercial cloud compute providers than at leadership-class HPC centers where the ability to scale in compute and data is a goal in itself.

### 3.2 REGISTRIES

Registries, as mentioned previously, are places where records of artifacts are stored, and they can be distinct from the repositories that contain the artifacts described by the records. A well-designed registry such as WorkflowHub [25] is critically important for enabling a FAIR ecosystem anywhere, but particularly as illustrated in 2, they are crucial. Registries complement repositories by maintaining metadata records for workflow components, ensuring the discoverability and interoperability of research artifacts via metadata and Persistent Identifiers (PIDs) such as Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs). In this case, the registry stores metadata about the artifacts as well as where they are stored, allowing users to search for artifacts relevant to their needs across repositories both internal and external to the HPC center.

### 3.3 COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Computing infrastructure, although not digital, must still be described by rich metadata. Reproducibility and reusability rely on preservation and discovery of the computing contexts in which workflows are executed. It is therefore important that metadata about the resources and infrastructure provided by an HPC center be made available and exportable in useful forms. Tools such as FlowCept [30] help to capture provenance about execution and environment that should be stored and linked to the workflow components. Reproducing execution context is a critical enabler for the seamless cross-center data exchange and workflow portability that IRI needs.

Following the model of the EOSC-Life Collaboratory [1] requires infrastructure for *service* execution, separate from but adjacent to HPC supercomputing resources. Infrastructure provided by Kubernetes<sup>6</sup>- and OpenStack<sup>7</sup>-based platforms, for example, enables persistent services for automatically testing workflow component viability as well as continuously indexing and updating registries in response to artifact updates in repositories. Commonly available services running on instances of these platforms also reduce the need for workflows to deploy their own versions (e.g., a key-value store). Validation and benchmarking services help align with NAIRR, ensuring that AI/ML models trained on HPC resources remain FAIR-compliant and reusable even as the FAIR Principles are updated in the future.

---

<sup>2</sup><https://anaconda.org/anaconda/conda>

<sup>3</sup><https://spack.io/>

<sup>4</sup><https://hub.docker.com/>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.tensorflow.org/hub>

<sup>6</sup><https://kubernetes.io/>

<sup>7</sup><https://www.openstack.org/>

### 3.4 AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION

Authentication and authorization via Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) mechanisms protect sensitive workflow components while maintaining accessibility for authorized users, ensuring that only the right users can access and use certain components. This is an underappreciated aspect of the “A” in FAIR, which stands for Accessibility. Although FAIR is frequently used in conjunction with open science principles, as we noted above FAIR does not strictly imply openness, which is a fact that even seasoned FAIR practitioners can forget.

Rich metadata about workflow components should include information about who can use the components, and this usually falls under the “R” for Reusability. When that metadata is made available in the registry, it can feed appropriate authentication and authorization procedures that fall under the “A” in FAIR. These problems are not unique to HPC environments, but they must still be solved in FAIR ecosystems for HPC. Authentication and authorization mechanisms, including federated identity management solutions such as OAuth<sup>8</sup> and OpenID Connect<sup>9</sup>, facilitate the secure cross-institutional collaboration necessary for distributed, collaborative computational science.

One of the other important requirements is that the workflows should not hardcode any credentials either through workflow specification files or programming; credentials must be kept separate [31]. This problem affects the reproducibility and reusability of workflows and their components.

### 3.5 METADATA STANDARDS AND INTERCHANGE FORMATS

Metadata standards and interchange formats are the glue that holds the whole ecosystem together; they play a crucial role in enabling FAIR at all scales [19]. The EOSC-Life Collaboratory’s WorkflowHub<sup>10</sup> [25] uses a rich metadata framework for findability with inter-registration integration with sister registries for containers and tools using Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and shared PIDs. Tools and workflows are marked up with metadata standards from Bioschemas [32], encouraging the enrichment of metadata by workflow and tool developers, including licensing and provenance metadata. Despite recent work to establish a standard workflow management system (WMS) terminology [33], a number of challenges remain, so we recommend abstract Common Workflow Language (CWL) [34] as a canonical representation of the workflow. WorkflowHub imports and exports the exchange standard Workflow-RO-Crates [35], facilitating automatic builds for each of its entries, regardless of whether the management system natively supports it. The architecture here follows that example closely not only because it helps make workflows “good” [36] but also because this architecture seeks to integrate directly with WorkflowHub, in alignment with FASST’s efforts to streamline scientific workflows and training mechanisms.

## 4 PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE FOR OLCF

Having provided an overview of a FAIR ecosystem’s architecture in Section 3, we now propose concrete details for implementing such an ecosystem for the users of OLCF. We model this implementation after the example of the EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory, taking into account that there are different constraints and needs of OLCF’s users.

One major difference for OLCF is that its users may want or require higher levels of security and privacy

<sup>8</sup><https://oauth.net/2/>

<sup>9</sup><https://openid.net/developers/how-connect-works/>

<sup>10</sup><https://workflowhub.eu/>

than the open science model used by EOSC-Life. For example, users may wish to keep their code or datasets private for a time (e.g. embargo) until results have been fully analyzed and published. Users might also be required to keep their research artifacts secret (e.g. export control).

Recall that in Section 3, we abstracted the details away from Figure 1 in order to present the general patterns in Figure 2. We now add details specific to OLCF in order to produce Figure 3. In this section, we propose implementations for each of the main “parts” which remain: repositories, registries, infrastructure, and services.




Figure 3: Illustrated example of emerging FAIR ecosystem at OLCF. This is a concrete version of Figure 2 in which specific infrastructure and services at OLCF are named explicitly. Note that “OLCF Registry” (orange center object) does not exist yet; this is a key difference between the two figures.

## 4.1 REPOSITORIES

As outlined in Section 3, repositories are places where *things* are stored, and we have argued that the things of interest for an HPC center are workflow components, rather than whole workflows. A workflow itself may be conceptualized as the formal specification of the data flow and execution control between executable components, expected datasets, and parameter files. Workflow components can be executables and data. Examples of executable components include scripts, code, tools, containers, or workflows themselves remotely or locally executed, and native or third party; an example data component could be a reference dataset such as the Human Reference Genome [14].

We argue that the individual workflow components are more likely to be useful across scientific domains than entire workflows, which means that a focus on storing workflow components is more likely to benefit

the users of OLCF, who represent a diverse collection of scientific disciplines. As shown in Figure 1, the EOSC-Life Collaboratory incorporates a number of different repositories for different types of components, most of which are for open science. These include:

- code repositories like GitHub<sup>11</sup>,
- container repositories like DockerHub,
- software repositories like BioConda<sup>12</sup>,
- workflow repositories which are WMS-specific like Intergalactic Utilities Commission<sup>13</sup> for Galaxy<sup>14</sup> and nf-core<sup>15</sup> for Nextflow<sup>16</sup>, and
- generalist repositories such as Zenodo<sup>17</sup> where nearly any type of artifact may be stored.

As mentioned previously, not all users of OLCF perform open science. For those who do perform open science, all the same component repositories used by EOSC-Life are readily available to store their components. Figure 3 depicts a solution which satisfies the additional constraints by providing private component repositories inside OLCF for code and data using solutions already present at OLCF.

**Constellation**<sup>18</sup> [37] is a scalable, flexible, and extensible data infrastructure developed and hosted by OLCF to support scientific discovery through data sharing, reproducibility, and collaboration. Among other features, it provides a DOI minting service, which would allow it to serve as a generalist repository for published research artifacts. Constellation is typically used for datasets, but there is no reason why it cannot be used to host compiled executables, pre-built containers, trained models, and the provenance data from specific workflow runs. In this way, Constellation could serve as a foundational platform for hosting arbitrary artifacts – including workflow components – across scientific domains, offering standardized metadata, persistent identifiers, and APIs that facilitate discovery, access, and reuse by both humans and machines, thus bridging siloed research communities and supporting open science at scale.

OLCF already provides **GitLab**<sup>19</sup> to its users for collaborating on code development, as a local alternative to GitHub. This is a valid code repository for storing source code, scripts, tools, workflow specifications and small datasets and parameter files for testing and demonstration purposes.

Additionally, **DataFed**<sup>20</sup> [29] is a lightweight, distributed scientific data management system developed by OLCF that spans a federation of storage systems within a loosely-coupled network of scientific facilities. In Figure 3, DataFed is shown as a service, but it facilitates “data development” in a sense. As such, it bears mentioning here as a data repository for data that have not yet reached the publication stage but which OLCF users might wish to share with each other.

<sup>11</sup><https://github.com>

<sup>12</sup><https://bioconda.github.io/>

<sup>13</sup><https://galaxyproject.org/iuc/>

<sup>14</sup><https://galaxyproject.org/>

<sup>15</sup><https://nf-co.re/>

<sup>16</sup><https://www.nextflow.io/>

<sup>17</sup><https://zenodo.org/>

<sup>18</sup><https://doi.ccs.ornl.gov>

<sup>19</sup><https://gitlab.ccs.ornl.gov/>

<sup>20</sup><https://datafed.ornl.gov>

## 4.2 REGISTRIES

As outlined in Section 3, registries are places where *records* of artifacts (“things”) are stored. Because FAIR is essentially about metadata and persistent identifiers, registries are the “secret sauce” of a FAIR ecosystem. This is because when users register their artifacts in a registry designed with the FAIR Principles in mind, their artifacts immediately become more Findable, Accessible, and Reusable. In fact, the sub-principle F4 from the original paper is that “(meta)data are registered or indexed in a searchable resource” [2].

The EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory incorporates several different registries to enable searches across the different repositories that store their artifacts, as shown in Figure 1. The registries were all developed specifically for the European life-sciences infrastructure for biological information (ELIXIR) project, and they include:

- bio.tools<sup>21</sup>, a curated online resource that provides standardized information and metadata about bioinformatics tools and software to support research and tool discovery [38, 39],
- BioContainers<sup>22</sup>, an open-source platform that provides standardized, containerized bioinformatics software to facilitate reproducible research and easy tool deployment [40], and
- WorkflowHub, a domain-agnostic, FAIR-compliant registry for describing, sharing and publishing scientific computational workflows [25].

Unlike the previous case for repositories, **OLCF currently has no corresponding registries**, which is why the “OLCF registry” is highlighted in orange in Figure 3. As mentioned earlier, the FAIR Principles call for a registry not by name, but by description. For this reason, any strategy for constructing a FAIR ecosystem for OLCF users must necessarily include a registry.

Currently, the only option for OLCF users to register workflow components is to use WorkflowHub, which will mainly serve the needs of the users who work in open science. WorkflowHub is free to use, and it is publicly available as a website which also provides an API. Access to artifacts themselves may be controlled so that they remain “private”, but WorkflowHub still shows that the artifacts exist. This is by design; it is a more advanced consequence of the FAIR principles. As mentioned previously, however, OLCF users sometimes have reasons that prevent making their artifacts fully open to the entire world immediately. Additionally, the features needed to search WorkflowHub for workflow components that can execute on the unique infrastructure at OLCF is still in the “feature request” stage. For these reasons, OLCF needs to deploy its own registry in-house to meet the needs of its users.

A few options for standing up a registry immediately come to mind.

There are at least three options for how to do this:

1. leverage DataFed as a “metadata repository”, either directly or by developing a user interface backed by DataFed as storage;
  2. develop our own registry completely from scratch, which is usually the most labor-intensive option;
- or

---

<sup>21</sup><https://bio.tools/about>

<sup>22</sup><https://biocontainers.pro/>

3. deploy our own instance of WorkflowHub inside OLCF, most likely as a containerized service running on Slate.

More information may be required in order to make a full recommendation, however.

## 4.3 COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE

As mentioned previously, even though computing infrastructure is physical rather than digital, it must still be described by rich metadata. Reproducibility and reusability rely on preservation and discovery of the computing contexts in which workflows are executed. It is therefore important that metadata about the resources and infrastructure provided by an HPC center be made available and exportable in useful forms. In fact, the supercomputers at HPC facilities should be treated as scientific instruments, to which applying the FAIR Principles has recently emerged as an active area of research [11, 41].

The model of the EOSC-Life Collaboratory separates service execution from HPC supercomputing resources, as shown in Figure 1. OLCF is very well positioned to emulate this model already. As shown in Figure 3, OLCF provides OpenShift<sup>23</sup> on **Slate** to provide users the capability to deploy their own services (e.g. databases, workflow management systems) adjacent to the **Frontier** supercomputer that persist beyond the end of individual Frontier batch jobs. Thus, OLCF already have the capability right now for deploying services that automatically test workflow component viability, for example, just like the EOSC-Life Collaboratory. One key difference is that because OLCF provides self-management capabilities to its users, it does not provide shared common services (e.g. a multi-user key-value store).

One way in which OLCF exceeds the model of the EOSC-Life Collaboratory is that it has been developing the **Secure Scientific Service Mesh (S3M)**, which provides API-driven infrastructure to accelerate scientific discovery through automated research workflows [42]. It integrates near real-time streaming capabilities, intelligent workflow orchestration, and fine-grained authorization within a service mesh architecture to enable secure and flexible programmatic access to HPC resources. By providing an API that allows intelligent agents and experimental facilities to provision resources dynamically and execute complex workflows, S3M significantly reduces traditional barriers between OLCF's users, its computational resources, and other experimental facilities.

## 4.4 AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION

The FAIR Principles advocate for robust authentication and authorization procedures as a crucial element of the "Accessible" principle. This is particularly true for sensitive data, AI models trained on sensitive data, software for handling sensitive data, and other kinds of workflow components that cannot be made openly available. Ensuring that data is accessible to the right users under the right conditions aligns with FAIR's goal of maximizing the value of artifacts while respecting privacy and security concerns.

Despite the fact that much of the research conducted using the EOSC-Life Collaboratory is open, the Collaboratory does provide Life Science Login<sup>24</sup> to ensure that only the right users can access artifacts and resources under the right conditions.

OLCF provides multiple security enclaves which are completely separated from each other, even at the account level. From a user's perspective, each of these enclaves can still be considered its own FAIR ecosystem. There is nothing about FAIR which implies openness; accessibility in the FAIR sense refers

<sup>23</sup><https://docs.openshift.com/>

<sup>24</sup><https://lifescience-ri.eu/ls-login/>



to the fact that everyone in a given “community” can access artifacts and resources over protocols that provide capabilities for authentication and authorization. Some of the ways in which FAIR practices such as persistent identifiers and metadata figure into security for a facility would likely be more useful to facility staff such as system administrators, rather than users. System administrators are still part of the ecosystem, as shown in Figure 1, but those discussions are beyond the scope of this report.

We do not suggest any changes from current design at this time that would be visible from the perspective of an OLCF user.

## 4.5 METADATA STANDARDS AND INTERCHANGE FORMATS

Finally, metadata standards and interchange formats hold the entire ecosystem together through their importance in enabling the “Interoperable” part of the FAIR Principles. It is challenging to provide recommendations for OLCF here, however, for social reasons that are discussed in Section 5. For now, we recommend following many of the practices established by the EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory.

In particular, the WorkflowHub registry [25] sits in the middle of everything, as shown in Figure 1, and it is enabled by judicious choices for metadata standards like Bioschemas [32] and interchange formats like RO-Crate [43]. WorkflowHub uses the Global Alliance for Genomics and Health (GA4GH) Tools Registry Service (TRS) API [44] to integrate with sister registries; OLCF will likely wish to use the same framework so that it can integrate its internal registry of the future with WorkflowHub, too.

Although WorkflowHub supports workflows of all kinds from all workflow management systems, some systems provide extra features through deeper integrations. Although there is no universal way to build a workflow, we do recommend abstract CWL [34] for a canonical representation of the workflow because of its deeper integrations with WorkflowHub. CWL is also supported by a number of workflow management systems that target very different execution platforms (e.g. cloud, Java Virtual Machine, containers), which provides hope that workflows composed in CWL might have a longer lifespan. When it is time to package workflows and their components, WorkflowHub imports and exports using exchange formats RO-Crate [43] and Workflow-RO-Crate [35], the latter of which facilitates automatic builds for each of its entries, regardless of whether the workflow management system natively supports it.

As mentioned previously, it is difficult to make recommendations on behalf of the entire community of OLCF users for social reasons, namely that FAIR delegates exact implementation details to “community standards” that should be chosen by communities themselves. We discuss these social issues in the next section.

## 5 ENCOURAGING ADOPTION OF FAIR AT OLCF

The OLCF serves a broad and diverse scientific community of users and provides access to some of the world’s most powerful HPC resources. This community generates valuable datasets, AI models, software, and other artifacts across a wide range of disciplines, from climate modeling and materials science to molecular biology and astrophysics. To accomplish this, the users frequently solve the same problems individually for which solutions might, in an ideal world, already exist, even for the unique systems at OLCF. Such problems include adapting file reads and writes for the shared filesystems, tuning parameters to optimize parallel performance, connecting persistent services from Slate to Frontier, and many other small tasks. Solving these problems produces artifacts that could be reused and improved upon by others, maximizing impact beyond even originally intended purposes. The FAIR Principles provide guidelines that help make artifacts shareable, discoverable, and reuseable by others, but their adoption by OLCF’s users is a problem of its own.

Despite the clear benefits of FAIR practices, their widespread implementation within the OLCF user community remains inconsistent. This is due in part to deeply rooted research norms, varied domain-specific data practices, and the perceived cost or complexity of adopting new standards. Driving cultural change in such an environment requires not only policy guidance and technical support, but also a systematic approach to shifting community behaviors and incentives.




Figure 4: Strategy for Culture Change. Image credit: <https://www.cos.io/blog/strategy-for-culture-change>.

In this context, the “Strategy for Culture Change” proposed by Brian Nosek in a 2019 blog post<sup>25</sup> provides a useful framework. Nosek suggests that sustainable cultural transformation can be achieved by altering the default behaviors in a system through three coordinated levers: infrastructure, incentives, and norms. Applying this framework to the OLCF community offers a pathway to embed the FAIR Principles into standard research workflows gradually, making the FAIR choice not only possible, but easy and rewarding.

The diagram shown in Figure 4 illustrates an approach that works from the bottom up, showing that for us to encourage adoption of FAIR among OLCF users, we must first make adoption possible, especially at the infrastructure level. As we showed in Section 4, OLCF already possesses most of the pieces to construct a FAIR ecosystem. The most glaring hole that is missing is a registry for tracking components. **OLCF needs a registry to make a FAIR ecosystem possible.**

After making adoption possible, Nosek recommends that OLCF make adoption easy. More often than not, OLCF users are highly technically skilled in addition to being leaders in their scientific fields. It is a lot to ask these users to become FAIR experts, too! We can “make it easy” by providing simple user interfaces to walk them through what would otherwise seem like very complicated processes for registering and sharing their artifacts, or for finding relevant existing artifacts they can reuse. Some efforts are already underway, such as the **FlowCept** tool [30] for capturing provenance about a workflow’s execution and environment; we should also provide interfaces for storing and linking to the workflow components themselves. The API for **S3M** is a user interface that is designed to simplify some very complicated systems on behalf of the user.

<sup>25</sup><https://www.cos.io/blog/strategy-for-culture-change>

In both cases, adopting FAIR practices is already possible, but OLCF is providing tools and services that make adoption significantly easier.

Next, Figure 4 shows that OLCF should make FAIR adoption normative, which requires psychology beyond the scope of this report to fully explain. The example given by Nosek for shifting norms is to **make the desired behaviors visible**, such as when journals adopt badges to acknowledge authors who preregister their studies and share their data and materials. Those awarded badges become signals to other researchers as they read the articles both that their colleagues do these behaviors (descriptive norm setting) and that the journal values these behaviors (prescriptive norm setting). At OLCF, we might spotlight certain projects in newsletters or at the monthly user group meetings to increase visibility for the desired behaviors. Visibility is critical for accelerating adoption among those who are willing but who have not yet adopted.

For those users who are not quite as willing, the remaining two steps of the strategy attempt to make adoption rewarding before ultimately making adoption required. Colloquially, this is also known as the “carrot and stick” metaphor<sup>26</sup>, which evokes imagery of leading a horse either towards a positive incentive (eating a tasty carrot) or away from a negative consequence (being forcefully thrashed with a stick).

Positive incentives for users include the creation of reward systems that recognize and incentivize researchers for sharing their components. This can be achieved through citation and attribution mechanisms which formally acknowledge the contributions of those who make their computational resources, data, or code available for public use. At an HPC center like OLCF, however, there are other currencies available, too, such as increased allocations and job priority. Allocations (measured in node-hours) and job priority (measured in wait time) both represent ways to **reward time back to users who actively work to save time for other users**. It will be important to balance such rewards against potential resulting disincentives, such as users’ equating reuse of shared components with reduction in resources available to themselves.

Rather than utilizing “negative incentives”, however, OLCF would most likely enact and enforce policies to make adoption required among the final users who have still held out. Receiving allocations of resources at OLCF could be conditioned on FAIR compliance and participation in the workflow component and research artifact-sharing ecosystem. Currently, allocations are frequently awarded at no cost to researchers or are governed by proposal processes funded by US taxpayers. Artifacts resulting from that usage should (perhaps after some embargo period to protect intellectual investment pending publication) be freely available and reusable. Researchers will want assurances that they will be appropriately credited for their efforts, and so implementation of such mandates will require careful consideration.

The incentives for OLCF to construct a FAIR ecosystem and encourage its adoption are important, too. Not least among these incentives is to uphold the mission of OLCF itself, which is to accelerate scientific discovery and engineering progress by providing world-leading computational performance and advanced data infrastructure. The FAIR Principles maximize the value and impact of research artifacts [14], which is critically important for artifacts that are the products of hundreds of thousands of node-hours on a Top500<sup>27</sup> machine like Frontier [45]. It is prohibitively expensive to reproduce such artifacts, when it is possible to reproduce them at all without access to a leadership-class supercomputer. Frontier is a time-sensitive scientific instrument with a finite lifespan; avoiding recomputing results not only speeds time to discovery for subsequent studies, but it also frees the machine to continue crunching numbers on behalf of new artifacts that could lead to additional discoveries. In short, the benefits of adopting FAIR allow Frontier to produce more results that can lead to more scientific discovery, thereby increasing the overall scientific impact of Frontier and of OLCF.

<sup>26</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carrot\\_and\\_stick](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carrot_and_stick)

<sup>27</sup><https://top500.org>

## 6 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Having discussed in previous sections why and how FAIR relates to HPC centers in general and OLCF in particular, we now similarly connect and relate FAIR with the recently announced American Science Cloud (AmSC).

At the time of this writing, not much is publicly known about the AmSC beyond what has been revealed by the One Big Beautiful Bill [46], which defines it as “a system of United States government, academic, and private sector programs and infrastructures utilizing cloud computing technologies to facilitate and support scientific research, data sharing, and computational analysis across various disciplines while ensuring compliance with applicable legal, regulatory, and privacy standards.” A bundled summary of its enclosing section provides a little more information, however:

This section provides funding for partnerships between the National Laboratories and U.S. industry to organize DOE data for use in artificial intelligence and machine learning models. DOE must also initiate seed efforts for self-improving artificial intelligence models for science and engineering using this data. These models must be provided to the scientific community through a system of programs and infrastructure using cloud computing. This section also allows this data to be used to develop next-generation microelectronics.

From this information, we can deduce that the future AmSC may have quite a lot in common with the EOSC, the website<sup>28</sup> for which states that “[t]he ambition of the European Open Science Cloud, known as EOSC, is to develop a ‘**Web of FAIR Data and Services**’ for science in Europe.” This sentence is intended to evoke the “Web of Linked Data” [47] concept introduced in 2006, as updated by the FAIR Principles published 10 years later [2]. Interestingly, the European Commission began pursuing EOSC in 2015, which now provides 10 years’ worth of potentially relevant insights for constructing the AmSC.

In Sections 3 and 4, we repeatedly referenced insights and patterns from the EOSC-Life FAIR Workflows Collaboratory when designing a FAIR ecosystem for workflows for HPC centers and for OLCF. Without loss of generality, these same arguments and recommendations would apply to the broader AmSC, from what is currently known. The AmSC does seem to place greater focus on AI / ML models than the EOSC-Life ecosystem shown in Figure 1, however, and so for that, we recommend following the work of the DOE-funded HPC-FAIR project [48].

HPC-FAIR was a multi-institutional project that aimed to develop a generic HPC data management framework to make both training data and AI models of scientific applications FAIR [10]. The framework was designed to centralize HPC-related datasets and AI models within a unified hub and to ensure interoperability through a standardized representation and vocabulary (ontology) for both data and models. The project also implemented automated workflows for streamlined data processing, model access, and benchmarking, and it focused on optimizing data harnessing efficiency through advanced techniques like deep reuse and compression-based analytics [48].

In a nutshell, the application of the FAIR Principles at every level of an ecosystem – be it inside OLCF or a much more geographically distributed system like the AmSC – is crucial for enabling autonomous, self-assembling workflows. Although Large Language Model (LLM)s have proven capable of generating performant code on demand [49], the value of building from vetted components has been a cornerstone of software engineering for quite some time. For any human- or machine-based system to build from components, those components will inevitably need to be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable,

---

<sup>28</sup><https://eosc.eu/eosc-about/>

which immediately implies that many of us who lay the groundwork now **must learn FAIR or waste time reinventing it**. FAIR is certain to be a critical enabler and accelerator of the construction of the AmSC.

## References

- [1] C. Goble, S. Soiland-Reyes, F. Bacall, S. Owen, A. Williams, I. Eguinoa, B. Driesbeke, S. Leo, L. Pireddu, L. Rodríguez-Navas, J. M. Fernández, S. Capella-Gutierrez, H. Ménager, B. Grüning, B. Serrano-Solano, P. Ewels, and F. Coppens, “Implementing FAIR Digital Objects in the EOSC-Life Workflow Collaboratory,” Mar. 2021. doi: 10.5281/ZENODO.4605654. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4605654>
- [2] M. D. Wilkinson, M. Dumontier, I. J. Aalbersberg, G. Appleton, M. Axton, A. Baak, N. Blomberg, J.-W. Boiten, L. B. da Silva Santos, P. E. Bourne, J. Bouwman, A. J. Brookes, T. Clark, M. Crosas, I. Dillo, O. Dumon, S. Edmunds, C. T. Evelo, R. Finkers, A. Gonzalez-Beltran, A. J. Gray, P. Groth, C. Goble, J. S. Grethe, J. Heringa, P. A. ’t Hoen, R. Hooft, T. Kuhn, R. Kok, J. Kok, S. J. Lusher, M. E. Martone, A. Mons, A. L. Packer, B. Persson, P. Rocca-Serra, M. Roos, R. van Schaik, S.-A. Sansone, E. Schultes, T. Sengstag, T. Slater, G. Strawn, M. A. Swertz, M. Thompson, J. van der Lei, E. van Mulligen, J. Velterop, A. Waagmeester, P. Wittenburg, K. Wolstencroft, J. Zhao, and B. Mons, “The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship,” *Scientific Data*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 160018, Mar. 2016. doi: 10.1038/sdata.2016.18. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>
- [3] S. R. Carroll, I. Garba, O. L. Figueroa-Rodríguez, J. Holbrook, R. Lovett, S. Materechera, M. Parsons, K. Raseroka, D. Rodriguez-Lonebear, R. Rowe, R. Sara, J. D. Walker, J. Anderson, and M. Hudson, “The care principles for indigenous data governance,” *Data Science Journal*, vol. 19, 2020. doi: 10.5334/dsj-2020-043. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-043>
- [4] D. Lin, J. Crabtree, I. Dillo, R. R. Downs, R. Edmunds, D. Giarretta, M. De Giusti, H. L’Hours, W. Hugo, R. Jenkyns, V. Khodiyar, M. E. Martone, M. Mokrane, V. Navale, J. Petters, B. Sierman, D. V. Sokolova, M. Stockhause, and J. Westbrook, “The TRUST Principles for digital repositories,” *Scientific Data*, vol. 7, no. 1, May 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41597-020-0486-7. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0486-7>
- [5] “Principles for conducting research in the arctic,” Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee, Washington D.C, Tech. Rep., 2018. [Online]. Available: [https://www.iarpccollaborations.org/uploads/cms/documents/principles\\_for\\_conducting\\_research\\_in\\_the\\_arctic\\_final\\_2018.pdf](https://www.iarpccollaborations.org/uploads/cms/documents/principles_for_conducting_research_in_the_arctic_final_2018.pdf)
- [6] S. S. Jordan, H. M. Matusovich, J. M. Case, L. Benson, D. A. Delaine, R. L. Kajfez, S. M. Lord, M. C. Paretti, E. T. Young, and Y. V. Zastavker, “Share: A framework for secondary qualitative data analysis,” *Studies in Engineering Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 125–133, 2024. doi: 10.21061/see.175. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.org/10.21061/see.175>
- [7] W. Hasselbring, L. Carr, S. Hettrick, H. S. Packer, and T. Tiropanis, “FAIR and Open Computer Science Research Software,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1908.05986, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.05986>
- [8] C. Goble, S. Cohen-Boulakia, S. Soiland-Reyes, D. Garijo, Y. Gil, M. R. Crusoe, K. Peters, and D. Schober, “FAIR Computational Workflows,” *Data Intelligence*, vol. 2, no. 1-2, pp. 108–121, 2020. doi: 10.1162/dint.a.00033. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1162/dint.a.00033>



- [9] N. Miljković, A. Trisovic, and L. Peer, “Towards FAIR Principles for open hardware,” Feb. 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6506428>
- [10] E. A. Huerta, B. Blaiszik, L. C. Brinson, K. E. Bouchard, D. Diaz, C. Doglioni, J. M. Duarte, M. Emani, I. Foster, G. Fox, P. Harris, L. Heinrich, S. Jha, D. S. Katz, V. Kindratenko, C. R. Kirkpatrick, K. Lassila-Perini, R. K. Madduri, M. S. Neubauer, F. E. Psomopoulos, A. Roy, O. Rübel, Z. Zhao, and R. Zhu, “FAIR for AI: An interdisciplinary and international community building perspective,” *Sci. Data*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 487, Jul. 2023. doi: 10.1038/s41597-023-02298-6. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02298-6>
- [11] A. Johnson, R. Julian, M. Mayernik, C. Mundoma, M. Murray, A. Ranganath, and G. Stossmeister, “FAIR Facilities and Instruments Workshop #1 Report: Exploring Persistent Identifier Needs, Barriers, and Incentives,” National Center for Atmospheric Research, Tech. Rep., 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://opensky.ucar.edu/islandora/object/technotes:601>
- [12] M. Wolf, J. Logan, K. Mehta, D. A. Jacobson, M. C. McDevitt, A. Walker, G. Eisenhauer, P. Widener, and A. Cliff, “Reusability First: Toward FAIR Workflows.” Oak Ridge National Lab. (ORNL), Oak Ridge, TN (United States), 09 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1827005>
- [13] S. Wilkinson, K. Knight, O. Kuchar, K. Mehta, M. Shankar, and M. Wolf, “Official report on the 2021 computational and autonomous workflows workshop (CAW 2021),” Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), Oak Ridge, TN (United States), Tech. Rep., 03 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1862119>
- [14] S. R. Wilkinson, M. Aloqalaa, K. Belhajjame, M. R. Crusoe, B. de Paula Kinoshita, L. Gadelha, D. Garijo, O. J. R. Gustafsson, N. Juty, S. Kanwal, F. Z. Khan, J. Köster, K. Peters-von Gehlen, L. Pouchard, R. K. Rannow, S. Soiland-Reyes, N. Soranzo, S. Sufi, Z. Sun, B. Vilne, M. A. Wouters, D. Yuen, and C. Goble, “Applying the FAIR Principles to computational workflows,” *Scientific Data*, vol. 12, no. 1, Feb. 2025. doi: 10.1038/s41597-025-04451-9. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-025-04451-9>
- [15] M. Barker, N. P. Chue Hong, D. S. Katz, A.-L. Lamprecht, C. Martinez-Ortiz, F. Psomopoulos, J. Harrow, L. J. Castro, M. Gruenpeter, P. A. Martinez, and T. Honeyman, “Introducing the FAIR Principles for research software,” *Scientific Data*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 622, Oct. 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41597-022-01710-x. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01710-x>
- [16] S. R. Wilkinson, G. Eisenhauer, A. J. Kapadia, K. Knight, J. Logan, P. Widener, and M. Wolf, “F\*\*\* workflows: when parts of FAIR are missing,” in *2022 IEEE 18th International Conference on e-Science (e-Science)*. Salt Lake City, UT, USA: IEEE, Oct. 2022. doi: 10.1109/eScience55777.2022.00090. ISBN 9781665461245 pp. 507–512. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/eScience55777.2022.00090>
- [17] D. Yuan, A. Ahamed, J. Burgin, C. Cummins, R. Devraj, K. Gueye, D. Gupta, V. Gupta, M. Haseeb, M. Ihsan, E. Ivanov, S. Jayathilaka, V. B. Kadhivelu, M. Kumar, A. Lathi, R. Leinonen, J. McKinnon, L. Meszaros, C. O’Cathail, D. Ouma, J. Paupério, S. Pesant, N. Rahman, G. Rinck, S. Selvakumar, S. Suman, Y. Sunthornyotin, M. Ventouratou, S. Vijayaraja, Z. Waheed, P. Woollard, A. Zyoud, T. Burdett, and G. Cochrane, “The european nucleotide archive in 2023,” *Nucleic Acids*

- Research*, vol. 52, no. D1, pp. D92–D97, 11 2023. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkad1067. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad1067>
- [18] H. Ramapriyan and J. Behnke, “NASA’s Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS) and FAIR - A Self-Assessment,” in *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts*, vol. 2020, Dec. 2020, pp. IN044–08. [Online]. Available: <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2020AGUFMIN044..08R>
- [19] S. R. Wilkinson and P. Widener, “FAIR Ecosystems for Science at Scale,” in *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing 2025: The Power of Collaboration*, ser. PEARC ’25. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3708035.3736097. ISBN 9798400713989. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3708035.3736097>
- [20] K. B. Antypas, D. J. Bard, J. P. Blaschke, R. Shane Canon, B. Enders, M. A. Shankar, S. Somnath, D. Stansberry, T. D. Uram, and S. R. Wilkinson, “Enabling discovery data science through cross-facility workflows,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 2021. doi: 10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671421 pp. 3671–3680. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671421>
- [21] W. Miller, D. Bard, A. Boehnlein, K. Fagnan, C. Guok, E. Lançon, S. J. Ramprakash, M. Shankar, N. Schwarz, and B. Brown, “Integrated research infrastructure architecture blueprint activity (final report 2023),” US Department of Energy (USDOE), Washington, DC (United States). Office of Science; Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Berkeley, CA (United States), Tech. Rep., 07 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1984466>
- [22] U.S. Department of Energy, “Frontiers in artificial intelligence for science, security, and technology initiative,” 2025, accessed: 2025-03-27. [Online]. Available: <https://www.energy.gov/science-innovation/energy-science-research/frontiers-artificial-intelligence-science-security-and>
- [23] —, “National artificial intelligence research resource,” 2025, accessed: 2025-03-27. [Online]. Available: <https://www.energy.gov/science-innovation/national-artificial-intelligence-research-resource>
- [24] S. R. Wilkinson, J. Gustafsson, F. Bacall, K. Belhajjame, S. Capella, J. M. F. Gonzalez, J. F. Tande, L. Gadelha, D. Garijo, P. Grubel, B. Grüning, F. Z. Khan, S. Kanwal, S. Leo, S. Owen, L. Pireddu, L. Pouchard, L. Rodríguez-Navas, B. Serrano-Solano, S. Soiland-Reyes, B. Vilne, A. Williams, M. A. Wouters, F. Coppens, and C. Goble, “An Ecosystem of Services for FAIR Computational Workflows,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.15988>
- [25] O. J. R. Gustafsson, S. R. Wilkinson, F. Bacall, S. Soiland-Reyes, S. Leo, L. Pireddu, S. Owen, N. Juty, J. Fernández, T. Brown, H. Ménager, B. Grüning, S. Capella-Gutierrez, F. Coppens, and C. Goble, “Workflowhub: a registry for computational workflows,” *Scientific Data*, vol. 12, no. 1, May 2025. doi: 10.1038/s41597-025-04786-3. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-025-04786-3>
- [26] R. Ferreira da Silva, R. M. Badia, V. Bala, D. Bard, T. Bremer, I. Buckley, S. Caino-Lores, K. Chard, C. Goble, S. Jha, D. S. Katz, D. Laney, M. Parashar, F. Suter, N. Tyler, T. Uram, I. Altintas, S. Andersson, W. Arndt, J. Aznar, J. Bader, B. Balis, C. Blanton, K. R. Braghetto, A. Brodutch, P. Brunk, H. Casanova, A. C. Lierta, J. Chigu, T. Coleman, N. Collier, I. Colonnelli, F. Coppens, M. Crusoe, W. Cunningham, B. De Paula Kinoshita, P. Di Tommaso, C. Doutriaux, M. Downton,

- W. Elwasif, B. Enders, C. Erdmann, T. Fahringer, L. Figueiredo, R. Filgueira, M. Foltin, A. Fouilloux, L. Gadelha, A. Gallo, A. G. Saez, D. Garijo, R. Gerlach, R. Grant, S. Grayson, P. Grubel, J. Gustafsson, V. Hayot-Sasson, O. Hernandez, M. Hilbrich, AnnMary Justine, I. Laflotte, F. Lehmann, A. Luckow, J. Luettgau, K. Maheshwari, M. Matsuda, D. Medic, P. Mendygral, M. Michalewicz, Jorji Nonaka, M. Pawlik, L. Pottier, L. Pouchard, M. Putz, S. K. Radha, L. Ramakrishnan, S. Ristov, P. Romano, D. Rosendo, M. Ruefenacht, K. Rycerz, Nishant Saurabh, V. Savchenko, M. Schulz, C. Simpson, R. Sirvent, T. Skluzacek, S. Soiland-Reyes, R. Souza, S. R. Sukumar, Z. Sun, A. Sussman, D. Thain, M. Titov, B. Tovar, A. Tripathy, M. Turilli, B. Tuznik, H. Van Dam, A. Vivas, L. Ward, P. Widener, S. Wilkinson, J. Zawalska, and Mahnoor Zulfiqar, “Workflows Community Summit 2022: A Roadmap Revolution,” Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tech. Rep. ORNL/TM-2023/2885, Mar. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7750670>
- [27] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, *Open Science by Design: Realizing a Vision for 21st Century Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018. ISBN 978-0-309-47624-9. [Online]. Available: <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/25116/open-science-by-design-realizing-a-vision-for-21st-century>
- [28] I. Foster and C. Kesselman, “The globus project: a status report,” in *Proceedings Seventh Heterogeneous Computing Workshop (HCW’98)*, 1998. doi: 10.1109/HCW.1998.666541 pp. 4–18. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/HCW.1998.666541>
- [29] D. Stansberry, S. Somnath, J. Breet, G. Shutt, and M. Shankar, “Datafed: Towards reproducible research via federated data management,” in *2019 International Conference on Computational Science and Computational Intelligence (CSCI)*, 2019. doi: 10.1109/CSCI49370.2019.00245 pp. 1312–1317. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSCI49370.2019.00245>
- [30] R. Souza, T. J. Skluzacek, S. R. Wilkinson, M. Ziatdinov, and R. F. da Silva, “Towards lightweight data integration using multi-workflow provenance and data observability,” in *2023 IEEE 19th International Conference on e-Science (e-Science)*, 2023. doi: 10.1109/e-Science58273.2023.10254822 pp. 1–10. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/e-Science58273.2023.10254822>
- [31] G. von Laszewski, W. Brewer, S. R. Wilkinson, A. Shao, J. P. Fleischer, H. Pitkar, C. R. Kirkpatrick, and G. C. Fox, “Towards experiment execution in support of community benchmark workflows for HPC,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.22294>
- [32] A. Gray, C. Goble, and R. Jimenez, “Bioschemas: From potato salad to protein annotation,” in *ISWC 2017 Posters & Demonstrations and Industry Tracks*, ser. CEUR workshop proceedings, N. Nikitina, D. Song, A. Fokoue, and P. Haase, Eds. Germany: RWTH Aachen University, Oct. 2017, the 16th International Semantic Web Conference 2017, ISWC 2017 ; Conference date: 21-10-2018 Through 25-10-2018. [Online]. Available: <https://iswc2017.semanticweb.org/paper-579/>
- [33] F. Suter, T. Coleman, İlkey Altıntaş, R. M. Badia, B. Balis, K. Chard, I. Colonnelli, E. Deelman, P. Di Tommaso, T. Fahringer, C. Goble, S. Jha, D. S. Katz, J. Köster, U. Leser, K. Mehta, H. Oliver, J.-L. Peterson, G. Pizzi, L. Pottier, R. Sirvent, E. Suchyta, D. Thain, S. R. Wilkinson, J. M. Wozniak, and R. Ferreira da Silva, “A terminology for scientific workflow systems,” *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 174, p. 107974, 2026. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2025.107974>. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167739X25002699>

- [34] M. R. Crusoe, S. Abeln, A. Iosup, P. Amstutz, J. Chilton, N. Tijanić, H. Ménager, S. Soiland-Reyes, B. Gavrilović, C. Goble, and T. C. Community, “Methods included: standardizing computational reuse and portability with the Common Workflow Language,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 54–63, Jun. 2022. doi: 10.1145/3486897. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3486897>
- [35] S. Leo, M. R. Crusoe, L. Rodríguez-Navas, R. Sirvent, A. Kanitz, P. De Geest, R. Wittner, L. Pireddu, D. Garijo, J. M. Fernández, I. Colonnelli, M. Gallo, T. Ohta, H. Suetake, S. Capella-Gutierrez, R. de Wit, B. P. Kinoshita, and S. Soiland-Reyes, “Recording provenance of workflow runs with ro-crate,” *PLoS one*, vol. 19, no. 9, p. e0309210, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0309210>
- [36] R. Ferreira da Silva, D. Bard, K. Chard, d. W. Shaun, I. T. Foster, T. Gibbs, C. Goble, W. Godoy, J. Gustafsson, U.-U. Haus, S. Hudson, S. Jha, L. Los, D. Paine, F. Suter, L. Ward, S. Wilkinson, M. Amaris, Y. Babuji, J. Bader, R. Balin, D. Balouek, S. Beecroft, K. Belhajjame, R. Bhattarai, W. Brewer, P. Brunk, S. Caino-Lores, H. Casanova, D. Cassol, J. Coleman, T. Coleman, I. Colonnelli, A. A. Da Silva, D. de Oliveira, P. Elahi, N. Elfaramawy, W. Elwasif, B. Etz, T. Fahringer, W. Ferreira, R. Filgueira, J. Fosso Tande, L. Gadelha, A. Gallo, D. Garijo, Y. Georgiou, P. Gritsch, P. Grubel, A. Gueroudji, Q. Guilloteau, C. Hamalainen, R. Hong Enriquez, L. Huet, K. Hunter Kesling, P. Iborra, S. Jahangiri, J. Janssen, J. Jordan, S. Kanwal, L. Kunstmann, F. Lehmann, U. Leser, C. Li, P. Liu, J. Luetzgau, R. Lupat, J. M. Fernandez, K. Maheshwari, T. Malik, J. Marquez, M. Matsuda, D. Medic, S. Mohammadi, A. Mulone, J.-L. Navarro, K. W. Ng, K. Noelp, B. P. Kinoshita, R. Prout, M. R. Crusoe, S. Ristov, S. Robila, D. Rosendo, B. Rowell, J. Rybicki, H. Sanchez, N. Saurabh, S. K. Saurav, T. Scogland, D. Senanayake, W. Shin, R. Sirvent, T. Skluzacek, B. Sly-Delgado, S. Soiland-Reyes, A. Souza, R. Souza, D. Talia, N. Tallent, L. Thamsen, M. Titov, B. Tovar, K. Vahi, E. Vardar-Irrgang, E. Vartina, Y. Wang, M. Wouters, Q. Yu, Z. Al Bkhetan, and M. Zulfikar, “Workflows Community Summit 2024: Future Trends and Challenges in Scientific Workflows,” Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tech. Rep. ORNL/TM-2024/3573, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13844759>
- [37] S. S. Vazhkudai, J. Harney, R. Gunasekaran, D. Stansberry, S.-H. Lim, T. Barron, A. Nash, and A. Ramanathan, “Constellation: A science graph network for scalable data and knowledge discovery in extreme-scale scientific collaborations,” in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 2016. doi: 10.1109/BigData.2016.7840959 pp. 3052–3061. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData.2016.7840959>
- [38] J. Ison, K. Rapacki, H. Ménager, M. Kalaš, E. Rydza, P. Chmura, C. Anthon, N. Beard, K. Berka, D. Bolser, T. Booth, A. Bretaudeau, J. Brezovsky, R. Casadio, G. Cesareni, F. Coppens, M. Cornell, G. Cuccuru, K. Davidsen, G. D. Vedova, T. Dogan, O. Doppelt-Azeroual, L. Emery, E. Gasteiger, T. Gatter, T. Goldberg, M. Grosjean, B. Grüning, M. Helmer-Citterich, H. Ienasescu, V. Ioannidis, M. C. Jespersen, R. Jimenez, N. Juty, P. Juvan, M. Koch, C. Laibe, J.-W. Li, L. Licata, F. Mareuil, I. Mičetić, R. M. Friborg, S. Moretti, C. Morris, S. Möller, A. Nenadic, H. Peterson, G. Profitti, P. Rice, P. Romano, P. Roncaglia, R. Saidi, A. Schafferhans, V. Schwämmle, C. Smith, M. M. Sperotto, H. Stockinger, R. S. Vařeková, S. C. Tosatto, V. de la Torre, P. Uva, A. Via, G. Yachdav, F. Zambelli, G. Vriend, B. Rost, H. Parkinson, P. Løngreen, and S. Brunak, “Tools and data services registry: a community effort to document bioinformatics resources,” *Nucleic Acids*

- Research*, vol. 44, no. D1, pp. D38–D47, 11 2015. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkv1116. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkv1116>
- [39] J. Ison, H. Ienasescu, P. Chmura, E. Rydza, H. Ménager, M. Kalaš, V. Schwämmle, B. Grüning, N. Beard, R. Lopez, S. Duvaud, H. Stockinger, B. Persson, R. S. Vařeková, T. Raček, J. Vondrášek, H. Peterson, A. Salumets, I. Jonassen, R. Hooft, T. Nyrönen, A. Valencia, S. Capella, J. Gelpí, F. Zambelli, B. Savakis, B. Leskošek, K. Rapacki, C. Blanchet, R. Jimenez, A. Oliveira, G. Vriend, O. Collin, J. van Helden, P. Løngreen, and S. Brunak, “The bio.tools registry of software tools and data resources for the life sciences,” *Genome Biology*, vol. 20, no. 1, Aug. 2019. doi: 10.1186/s13059-019-1772-6. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1772-6>
- [40] F. da Veiga Leprevost, B. A. Grüning, S. Alves Aflitos, H. L. Röst, J. Uszkoreit, H. Barsnes, M. Vaudel, P. Moreno, L. Gatto, J. Weber, M. Bai, R. C. Jimenez, T. Sachsenberg, J. Pfeuffer, R. Vera Alvarez, J. Griss, A. I. Nesvizhskii, and Y. Perez-Riverol, “Biocontainers: an open-source and community-driven framework for software standardization,” *Bioinformatics*, vol. 33, no. 16, p. 2580–2582, Mar. 2017. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btx192. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btx192>
- [41] R. Julian, A. Johnson, M. Mayernik, C. Mundoma, M. Murray, and A. Ranganath, “FAIR Facilities and Instruments Workshop #2 Report: Recent Progress, Remaining Challenges, and Emerging PID Strategies,” NSF National Center for Atmospheric Research, Tech. Rep., 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://opensky.ucar.edu/islandora/object/technotes:42004>
- [42] T. J. Skluzacek, P. Bryant, A. Ruckman, D. Rosendo, S. Prentice, M. J. Brim, R. Adamson, S. Oral, M. Shankar, and R. Ferreira da Silva, “Secure api-driven research automation to accelerate scientific discovery,” in *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing 2025: The Power of Collaboration*, ser. PEARC ’25. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2025. doi: 10.1145/3708035.3736072. ISBN 9798400713989. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3708035.3736072>
- [43] S. Soiland-Reyes, P. Sefton, M. Crosas, L. J. Castro, F. Coppens, J. M. Fernández *et al.*, “Packaging research artefacts with RO-Crate,” *Data Science*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 97–138, Jul. 2022. doi: 10.3233/DS-210053. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3233/DS-210053>
- [44] H. L. Rehm, A. J. Page, L. Smith, J. B. Adams, G. Alterovitz, L. J. Babb, M. P. Barkley, M. Baudis, M. J. Beauvais, T. Beck, J. S. Beckmann, S. Beltran, D. Bernick, A. Bernier, J. K. Bonfield, T. F. Boughtwood, G. Bourque, S. R. Bowers, A. J. Brookes, M. Brudno, M. H. Brush, D. Bujold, T. Burdett, O. J. Buske, M. N. Cabili, D. L. Cameron, R. J. Carroll, E. Casas-Silva, D. Chakravarty, B. P. Chaudhari, S. H. Chen, J. M. Cherry, J. Chung, M. Cline, H. L. Clissold, R. M. Cook-Deegan, M. Courtot, F. Cunningham, M. Cupak, R. M. Davies, D. Denisko, M. J. Doerr, L. I. Dolman, E. S. Dove, L. J. Dursi, S. O. Dyke, J. A. Eddy, K. Eilbeck, K. P. Ellrott, S. Fairley, K. A. Fakhro, H. V. Firth, M. S. Fitzsimons, M. Fiume, P. Flicek, I. M. Fore, M. A. Freeberg, R. R. Freimuth, L. A. Fromont, J. Fuerth, C. L. Gaff, W. Gan, E. M. Ghanaim, D. Glazer, R. C. Green, M. Griffith, O. L. Griffith, R. L. Grossman, T. Groza, J. M. Guidry Auvil, R. Guigó, D. Gupta, M. A. Haendel, A. Hamosh, D. P. Hansen, R. K. Hart, D. M. Hartley, D. Haussler, R. M. Hendricks-Sturup, C. W. Ho, A. E. Hobb, M. M. Hoffman, O. M. Hofmann, P. Holub, J. S. Hsu, J.-P. Hubaux, S. E. Hunt,



- A. Husami, J. O. Jacobsen, S. S. Jamuar, E. L. Janes, F. Jeanson, A. Jené, A. L. Johns, Y. Joly, S. J. Jones, A. Kanitz, K. Kato, T. M. Keane, K. Kekesi-Lafrance, J. Kelleher, G. Kerry, S.-S. Khor, B. M. Knoppers, M. A. Konopko, K. Kosaki, M. Kuba, J. Lawson, R. Leinonen, S. Li, M. F. Lin, M. Linden, X. Liu, I. U. Liyanage, J. Lopez, A. M. Lucassen, M. Lukowski, A. L. Mann, J. Marshall, M. Mattioni, A. Metke-Jimenez, A. Middleton, R. J. Milne, F. Molnár-Gábor, N. Mulder, M. C. Munoz-Torres, R. Nag, H. Nakagawa, J. Nasir, A. Navarro, T. H. Nelson, A. Niewielska, A. Nisselle, J. Niu, T. H. Nyrönen, B. D. O'Connor, S. Oesterle, S. Ogishima, V. Ota Wang, L. A. Paglione, E. Palumbo, H. E. Parkinson, A. A. Philippakis, A. D. Pizarro, A. Prlic, J. Rambla, A. Rendon, R. A. Rider, P. N. Robinson, K. W. Rodarmer, L. L. Rodriguez, A. F. Rubin, M. Rueda, G. A. Rushton, R. S. Ryan, G. I. Saunders, H. Schuilenburg, T. Schwede, S. Scollen, A. Senf, N. C. Sheffield, N. Skantharajah, A. V. Smith, H. J. Sofia, D. Spalding, A. B. Spurdle, Z. Stark, L. D. Stein, M. Suematsu, P. Tan, J. A. Tedds, A. A. Thomson, A. Thorogood, T. L. Tickle, K. Tokunaga, J. Törnroos, D. Torrents, S. Upchurch, A. Valencia, R. V. Guimera, J. Vamathevan, S. Varma, D. F. Vears, C. Viner, C. Voisin, A. H. Wagner, S. E. Wallace, B. P. Walsh, M. S. Williams, E. C. Winkler, B. J. Wold, G. M. Wood, J. P. Woolley, C. Yamasaki, A. D. Yates, C. K. Yung, L. J. Zass, K. Zaytseva, J. Zhang, P. Goodhand, K. North, and E. Birney, "Ga4gh: International policies and standards for data sharing across genomic research and healthcare," *Cell Genomics*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 100029, Nov. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.xgen.2021.100029. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xgen.2021.100029>
- [45] S. Atchley, C. Zimmer, J. Lange, D. Bernholdt, V. Melesse Vergara, T. Beck, M. Brim, R. Budiardja, S. Chandrasekaran, M. Eisenbach, T. Evans, M. Ezell, N. Frontiere, A. Georgiadou, J. Glenski, P. Grete, S. Hamilton, J. Holmen, A. Huebl, D. Jacobson, W. Joubert, K. McMahon, E. Merzari, S. Moore, A. Myers, S. Nichols, S. Oral, T. Papatheodore, D. Perez, D. M. Rogers, E. Schneider, J.-L. Vay, and P. K. Yeung, "Frontier: Exploring exascale," in *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, ser. SC '23. ACM, Nov. 2023. doi: 10.1145/3581784.3607089 p. 1–16. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581784.3607089>
- [46] J. C. Arrington, "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," House Bill H.R. 1, 119th Congress, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1>
- [47] T. Berners-Lee, "Linked data," 2006, accessed: 2025-08-27. [Online]. Available: <https://www.w3.org/DesignIssues/LinkedData.html>
- [48] C. Liao, X. Shen, M. Emani, T. Vanderbruggen, and P.-H. Lin, "HPC-FAIR: A Framework Managing Data and AI Models for Analyzing and Optimizing Scientific Applications," North Carolina State University (NCSU), Tech. Rep., 09 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/2504172>
- [49] P. Valero-Lara, W. Godoy, K. Teranishi, P. Balaprakash, and J. Vetter, "ChatBLAS: The First AI-Generated and Portable BLAS Library," in *Proceedings of SC 2024-W*, ser. Proceedings of SC 2024-W: Workshops of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2024. doi: 10.1109/SCW63240.2024.00010 pp. 19–24. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SCW63240.2024.00010>