Best Practices for Review of Contributions to Open Source Projects





July 2017



Open Source Overview

Development Process / Governance

Licenses

Community Engagement



Open Source Overview

- Public agencies moving to an open source approach.
- government.github.com



 Department of Defense, NASA, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, National Park Service



Open Source Overview

Ideal for projects supported by public agencies.

- **Transparency:** code readily available to the community of users.
- Cost-effectiveness: builds on common tools, share modules
- Longevity: community effort, not tied to single developer



Development Process

Tied to governance, since need to clearly specify authority for review of code



Bettenburg et al. 2015 Empirical Software Eng.



Development Process



- Stable master
- Active development branch
 with frequent commits
- Periodic releases



GitHub for Code Review

- Issues to initiate discussion of new features
- Pull Requests to propose code for review. Iterative process, merge to dev.
- Wiki can help organize priority features for development



www.nicoespeon.com



Code Review Example: OSADP



- Funded by USDOT Intelligent Transportation Systems Dynamic Mobility Applications program
- Upload access request form. Review by OSADP administrator
- Staging to private GitHub repository



Code Review Example: OSADP



- **Review** by OSADP staff, following release checklist
- Public Release on itsforge.net
- Collaboration only by designated project members on private GitHub repository



Code Review Example: OSADP

Release Checklist (partial)

- Has the source code been verified and deemed functional and stable?
- Is the source code technically reviewed and inspected to ensure that no malicious code is embedded?
- Have you verify to ensure no executable files or personal information are included?
- Is the source code scanned for virus and no infected file found?
- Is complete open source code base or assets (code, files, images, tables, data...) included?
- Is a LICENSE.txt file included with a open source license terms and conditions such as Apache 2.0?



Code Review Example: Node.js

• Very large project, >8,000 pull requests.



- Users use the JavaScript tool, may add Issues
- Collaborators review code, rights to commit and merge pull requests. Designated by CTC
- Core Technical Committee (CTC) meet weekly, consensus seeking. Membership by CTC nomination.



Code Review Example: Node.js



- Development originally within one company (Joyent)
- Node.js Foundation sponsors some of the time of the Technical Committee, but Collaborators not funded
- Collaborators may be volunteer or given company time to support the open source project



Code Review Example: vegan

- R package with small group of developers, relatively large number of users (800 weekly downloads)
- No formal governance structure, no explicit code review process
- Users engage via Issues, R listserv, Stackoverflow





Code Review Example: vegan

- Developers are academics, working on personal time
- Strictly volunteer code review process

↔ Code ① Issues 14 î¶ Pull requests 1	III Projects 0 III Wiki Insights 🕶
Filters - Q is:pr is:open	Labels Milestones
🕅 1 Open 🖌 115 Closed	Author - Labels - Projects - Milestones - Reviews -
 Allow for ordicluster and related function suppression of plotting × enhancement #206 opened on Oct 10, 2016 by gavinsimpson 	ons to return details of what was drawn and allow work-in-progress 2.5-0



Code Review Example: <u>ActivitySim</u>

- Users use the modeling tool
- **Developers** contribute code / documentation
- **Committers** review code, designated by PMC
- Project Management Committee (PMC) composed of funders, provide oversight. PMC Contractor crucial.
- Funders may be part of PMC





Choose an open source license

Which of the following best describes your situation?



The **MIT License** is a permissive license that is short and to the point. It lets people do anything they want with your code as long as they provide attribution back to you and don't hold you liable.

jQuery, .NET Core, and Rails use the MIT License.



The Apache License 2.0 is a permissive license similar to the MIT License, but also provides an express grant of patent rights from contributors to users.

Android, Apache, and Swift use the Apache License 2.0.



The GNU GPLv3 is a copyleft license that requires anyone who distributes your code or a derivative work to make the source available under the same terms, and also provides an express grant of patent rights from contributors to users.

Bash, GIMP, and Privacy Badger use the GNU GPLv3.



Contributor License Agreements (CLA)

- "Intellectual Property Assignment Agreement"
- States you are entitled to contribute code/documentation, willing for it to be used in distributions and derivative work
- Cannot withdraw permission
- Requires recordkeeping and maintenance of agreements
- May be more burdensome than needed for VisionEval



CLAHub

Contributor License Agreements on GitHub

Easily add a Contributor License Agreement to your GitHub project, let contributors sign it, and see at a glance which pull request authors have signed your CLA, and which haven't.



Summary

- Engage the community with clear wiki, active issues page, consider discussion board
- Develop governance structure which establishes the roles and responsibilities of users, developers, and collaborators/committers, as well as an oversight body composed of funders.
- Develop code review process which is clear, fair, and public
- Clearly document tools, provide guidance for developers
- Agree on a license which meets the needs of the VisionEval



Community Engagement

Discussion forums

TravelWorks	Modeling Tools	Resources	Forum	Home
TravelWorks Forum				
Categories				Topics
Evaluating Outputs				7
Developing Inputs				10
Modeling Design & Theory				2
Installation & Running RPAT				0
Applications and Examples				0

JOIN or Log In



Community Engagement

Listservs, developer and user

Google	Search for me	essages 🗸		
Groups	4	6		
My groups Home Starred	Stan users n 35 of many topics	all categories All tags Latest Top Categories		
r Favorites	general X We're N	Торіс	Category	Users
Click on a group's star icon to add it to your favorites	rstan ar By Ben	new_CppObject_xp no valid constructur in 2.16	RStan	B
 Recently viewed Stan users mailin Government Ope ggplot2 Shiny - Web Fram mozilla.support.fir 	bayesp By Jona	Von_mises documentation suggestion	General	(2) (2) (2)
	shinyst By Jona	Sampler error in rstan on Mac that doesn't reproduce on other computers	General	S B 🤋
	By Jona	Schema for callback writers: one step towards retiring CSV	Developers	🛆 🐲 🤰 🏶 😒
		Seriodic Gaussian Process - covariance matrix not positive semidefinite	General	d) 🔕 🌏
		Installation problems on Mac-no bin folder created	General	🕒 🏶 🖪



Community Engagement

Issues page

📮 nodejs	s / node				•	Э Watch ▼	2,302
<> Code	① Issues 697	ן Pull requests 279	Projects 5	🗐 Wik	i Insigl	hts 🕶	
Filters -	Q is:issue is:open		Labels	Mileston	ies		
() 697	Open ✓ 4,934 Close	d		Author •	Labels 🔻	Projec	ts 🕶 🛛 🛚
① Re #14	-enabling V8 snaps 171 opened 3 hours ago	shots discuss V8 Engine by ofrobots					
() do #14	c: process.umask c 169 opened 4 hours ago	oc unclear doc process by jsumners	question				
① chi #14	Id_process, *nix, st 166 opened 8 hours ago	dio undefined when k ^{by niieani}	ernel nofile limi	t hit <mark>child_</mark>	process		
() no #14	de_zlib.cc assertion	n failure npm windows thiessen 🕆 9.0.0	zlib				
() do #14	c: better documen 158 opened a day ago by	t `shared` build build	doc help wanted	test			



To VisionEval



