

ALADIN CSSI-ST-LTM meeting

Friday 2 October, Athens

T. Kral

Preliminary draft for the bureau meeting

Modified by MT, GB, and CF (8/10/09)

List of participants

CF	Claude Fischer	France
NP	Neva Pristov	Slovenia
AB	Alica Bajic	Croatia
AB	Andrey Bogatchev	Bulgaria
TK	Tomislav Kovacic	Croatia
AD	Alex Deckmyn	Belgium
YW	Yong Wang	Austria
MJ	Marek Jerczynski	Poland
GB	Gergely Boloni	Hungary
MT	Martina Tudor	Croatia
PB	Pierre Bénard	France
PT	Piet Termonia	Belgium / CSSI Chairperson
TK	Tomas Kral	Czech Republic / ACNA
DK	Dijana Klaric	Croatia / LACE
JM	Jean Maziejewski	France
PP	Patricia Pottier	France

Note : PM could not attend the meeting due to personal constraints. He was in contact by email with PP during the morning.

1. Opening

The chairperson PT opened the meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- DK proposed to shift point 8 of agenda (Opening a suggestion box for the next MoU) after the point 5.

3. Review of events since the last LTM meeting

PT reported on the most important points discussed in the PAC meeting.

- PAC recommended that 4-year plan should be rewritten for physics and maintenance issues still in 2009
- PM found that there is lack of manpower for DFI and SURFEX subjects, however SURFEX open MP was identified as one crucial problem at the moment
- Alex Deckmyn became CSSI member for EPS and predictability
- MF will work with HIRLAM on short term solutions for outflow issue for the operational

- HARMONIE system, further there will be scientific work on finding long-term solutions
- 14th October will be bureau meeting and GA will take place on November 12-13th in Istanbul.
- YW expressed that he would appreciate if the PAC minutes could be distributed earlier before LTM meeting and also he would appreciate a possibility to know what issues are CSSI representatives going to present on PAC meeting.
- CF recalled that it generally takes about 2 months to finalize minutes of PAC meeting and also that CSSI-LTM meeting is the only way how to propose discussion topics that can be passed to PAC via PM.CF reminds that there is no direct mechanism.
- It was proposed to put more discipline in distributing documents.

4. ALADIN/ALARO/AROME planning

4.1 follow-up of the convergence days actions

- PT reported that things are bit delayed but we are satisfied with the scientific and technical progress, we expect a quite smooth progress
- DK mentioned that LACE would support a stay of one Belgian staff in Prague for convergence action related with 3MT and one in MF for physics-dynamics interfacing
- PP recalled there will be no more entry fee from Turkey in the Aladin central budget in 2010 (since this entry fee was totally channeled through the budget in 2008 and 2009)

4.2 and 4.3 4-year plan and 2010 work plan

- work on the plans is still in progress. There was a lot of governance activity and redaction work due to many comments by HIRLAM at PAC meeting, with a tight calendar for these actions which is not optimal for planning.
- LTMs insisted on having 2010 workplan before end of 2009
- CSSI has the intention to be more proactive in its planning and coordination with the other bodies
- the PM's planning calendar was discussed and it indicates that workplan will be finalized in 2010 but LTMs will receive various demands of CSSI members for listing their manpower contributions before the end of 2009.
- YW expressed his feeling that deadline for final version in the 17th December 2009 is too late, PT responded that by being part of the planning process (as set out on the calendar by the PM) LTM's will be informed well in advance about the required manpower well before December.

CSSI takes notice of the 4-year plan (i.e. with the alteration on maintenance and physics) and agrees with the calendar for the establishment of the 2010 ALADIN work plan as set out by the PM.

5. HIRLAM-ALADIN common actions

5.1 maintenance issues (status, recent developments)

- lots of discussions on maintenance issues took place in Utrecht during HMG-CSSI meeting with some side discussions
- CF reported that unlike HIRLAM, MF has centralized maintenance system with regular phasing exercises. HIRLAM proposed more decentralized system in more networking

way however, it is not possible to transpose completely this logic to Aladin given the common IFS-ARPEGE phasing. There were also strong requests for quality assurance (QA) supposing less frequent export cycles but with better meteorological validation. Aladin gave proposals for this and we are waiting for the feedback

- DK proposed it that we should insist that HIRLAM will give us not only the answer but also procedure for the next year
- PT concluded that technical issues are now on the paper and it's time for HIRLAM to come with some initiative.

CSSI would appreciate input from HIRLAM even before Bureau meeting to push the things forward

5.2 physics in HARMONIE

- PT reported about outflow issue at PAC meeting. Since only HIRLAM is experiencing significant outflow problems (MF's Arome model has overactive convection and outflows as well, but not at a level preventing it from operational use), it was proposed that in a short term MF will help HIRLAM to find optimal tuning acceptable for operational purposes in HARMONIE system and there will be more scientific research going on afterwards in a long term.
- CF recalled that MF contacts are well known to Hirlam and are ready to provide support. CF stated that he was not aware of any recent problem of lack of communication and thus assumed that this collaboration was satisfactory at present
- PB and AB mentioned that the outflow issue can be a multiform problem as there are many possibilities of what can be wrong (e.g. preparation of surface initial files, porting problems, bugs in the code and so on ...). PB indicated that some MF scientists also wonder whether these outflows might not just be an overestimated feature of an actual physical reality, rather than a totally fictitious problem.

The conclusion of CSSI is that the scientific problem has to be addressed (long term research). A research program for examining the outflow issue, following the recent modifications of the 4-year plan, will be setup in order to identify the exact origin of the problem.

6. Scientific and technical issues

6.1 Phasing news

- common cycle 36 with IFS was finalized in the early summer
- interim cycle 36t1 will be prepared over Nov-Dec this year with big contribution on the side of observations. KY will clean all DFI versions that are not used anymore. PT proposed that the basic version of DFI should be preserved for research purposes (action on PT to contact CF and KY with more details). Further contributions are dynamic terms in DDH, ALARO physics, contribution by HIRLAM for linearized map factor for big domains with semi-implicit schemes (to be confirmed by Hirlam coordinators).
- cycle 36t1 is targeted as a quality assured export cycle, next interim cycle 36t2 will be prepared over April 2010 and common cycle 37 over Jun 2010
- MF proposed to experiment with 3 week rotation of phasers. Besides the traditional 6 week stays, there could be pairs of phasers staying at MF for 3 weeks with a few days overlap (for exchange of information). The experimental trial of this rotation strategy will be done for interim cycle 36t2. For the common cycle 37, a standard phasing strategy with full 6-week stays will be used with more experienced phasers involved.

6.2 SURFEX issue

- CF informed that REK wrote a summary of recommendations and specifications for the evolution of ARPEGE/ALADIN-SURFEX interface. The remaining question is about manpower and organization of the work. CF mentioned that MF is looking for manpower and collaboration on this topic, and wishes to start work in 2010. CF sent a message that any member that could provide a relevant expert to contribute to this work would be extremely welcomed. However, this is a very specific task that requires an expert in the OpenMP parallelization.

Conclusion is that CSSI recognized that the SURFEX optimization issue is a crucial problem. The bottleneck now is to find a relevant manpower. LTM's are invited to check if local skilled people in their teams could contribute to this.

7. Projects update

7.1 SRNWP Interoperability and verification

- DK reported that it was decided to do all tasks related to interoperability in MF. This year all SRNWP duties were fulfilled according to the plan.
- CF added that next year 901 configuration will be extended in order to read new geometries and fields in GRIB2 format. Further, there will be work on implementation of converters. CF explained that REK (CSSI coordinator for system aspects) is only available for background support. Unfortunately, no precise Aladin contact for coordinating the technical work and ensuring the interactions with the other consortia could be identified. CF presently acts mostly as such; AB also has accepted to get involved in this coordination.
- CF also emphasized that we need a more stable core work group for conversion issues and he also stressed that we should find an optimal balance between scientific complexity of conversion issues and the practical implementation, especially for surface aspects.
- Regarding verification, DK recalled that, except ALADIN-France, there is no other reference version of ALADIN for verification project. Thus, LACE is planning to re-run operational models and evaluate the scores starting from the 1st January 2009 in order to setup ALADIN reference considered in the SRNWP verification project.
- MJ informed that Poland is planning to contribute to the research on verification and propose some new verification methodologies.
- CF added that, after the ALADIN-France model is switched off, MF probably would provide data from AROME-France for the verification project.

7.2 Convergence issue

- convergence issue was discussed in the point 4.1

7.3 RC-LACE projects

- there was no time left for this item

8. Opening a suggestion box for the next MoU (was discussed as point 5)

- On behalf of PM, PT expressed his feeling that current ALADIN governance structure may not be optimal for the forthcoming years. Thus we should take the time to reconsider the possible reorganizations before next MoU. LTMs will have a chance to express their proposals contacting CF (Support Team) or PM himself before the Bureau meeting. DK informed that PM's idea is that CSSI should have more power (in the spirit of HMG).

Presently CSSI members are only scientific experts but in the future they could be more in a management position. Another addressed issue was that some LTMs don't have a real power in their institutes.

In the further discussions there were different inputs from different people:

- YW proposed that there should be a meeting in the spirit of SAC meeting in ECMWF where LTMs could directly express their interests.
- DK emphasized that we should also think of new financing scheme. For instance, with the present flat-rate system it is not possible to hire a person for purely technical work like code optimization.
- MT proposed that it should be specifically mentioned in MoU that people responsible for minutes should be obliged to provide the minutes in a reasonable time. PP explained the sometimes quite crucial role of the minutes. Those taken at each General Assembly are finalized after the meeting and approved officially at the beginning of the next G.A. This approval process ensures that decisions taken during the meeting can be traced back and can be enforced afterwards. CF summarized the comments by MT (on getting timely the minutes of meetings), YW (minutes and communication between the bodies) and PP (the approval mechanism) by stating that these comments all stress the need to improve the more formal process of communication and documentation in the Aladin project.
- PT expressed his feeling that the question is if we want to work more in a structured way or more in a flexible way. The current organization of CSSI is less centralized which has benefits of more flexibility. If we put too much structure in our work we may lose the advantage of flexibility.
- GB proposed that we should have a bit more structure to be able to ask more responsibility from the directors and give more power to the LTM's. They should be more involved in the declaration of manpower so that they are tied more to the project.