PP CARMA web conference, 1st April 2020

Participants: A. Iriza-Burca (**AIB**), F. Fundel (**FF**), F. Gofa (**FG**), B. Maco (**BM**) D. Boucovala (**DB**), J. Linkowska (**JL**), A. Bundel (**AB**), F. Batignani (**FB**), A. Kirsanov (**AK**), M.S. Tessini (**MST**), P. Kaufmann (**PK**), V. Poli (**VP**), T. Gastaldo (**TG**), E. Minguzzi (**EM**), P. Bykov (**PB**)

Agenda

1. Status of the project / task advancements – overview (AIB).
2. Discussion of MEC template (AIB / All).
3. Information on Rfdbk (FF).
4. Other issues - remaining tasks / questions / other problems (All).
5. Discussions regarding a new webconference in ~1 month (All).

Minutes of the discussion

1. AIB presents the status of PP CARMA (project extension approved by SMC, remaining tasks)
- short overview of implementation status (MEC and Rfdbk) in each participating center; work is on-going
- regarding provision of observation data for use with MEC (data already available for SON2019 and DJF2020): Due to high computational resources needed for data processing, FF points out the need to make the data available with a smaller delay (5 days instead of entire season). FG mentions that activities related to observation availability for verification purposes will be performed by NMA (starting with summer of 2020). BM. proposes to make the data available with a delay of one week (7 days).

2. AIB presents the template available for everyone to use with the MEC system in order to produce their own feedback files from the model.
- FF raises the question of weather hourly files are needed for Common Plot verification purposes. It is agreed that 3-hourly files are in fact sufficient, with the mention that the system works the same also with hourly.
- FG inquires about the “blacklist file” necessary to process the observation files in MEC. FF confirms that this file can be empty, especially since the verification procedure will have a station list-based stratification.
- FG asks for some clarifications regarding the content of the model input files. AIB specifies that all model forecasts for one step (continuous/dichotomic, surface/model levels) must be merged into the same file, while FF clarifies that MEC prefers parameters on model levels instead of pressure levels.
- FG has some questions regarding the output directory structure. AIB clarifies that output directories are overwritten for experiments with the same name,

while for different experiments different sub-directories are created.
- FF is interested to know if the current template is only adapted for the 00 UTC run of the model. AIB confirms, mentioning that this point can be further investigated for adaptations.
- FG suggests to upload the list of parameters required as input into MEC on the WG5 repository for the project.
- FG inquires about the production/creation of specific files/links required by MEC using the template provided.
- AK mentions that on testing MEC in RHM they have encountered a run problem. AIB clarifies that it is most likely due to missing parameters in the input files. It is suggested that a mail be sent to the support team to further investigate this problem.
- AK raises questions regarding the content of the two constant files, model forecast files and observation files. AIB and FF clarify the issues regarding the content of the files. It is also emphasized that MEC cannot be used only with surface parameters (if upper air ones are missing), and surface parameters from one run cannot be combined with upper air parameters from a different run.
- AK is interested also in the usage of MEC for verification of ensemble forecasts. This has not been employed in the project until now and will be further investigated later on. Meanwhile, FF can suggest an example for this purpose.

3. FF presents the Rfdbk GIT repository which allows access to the verification package and scripts, along with the documentation web-site, which will be made available to all project participants.
- AIB will make available for Rfdbk a template similar to that used for MEC.
- FG mentions the current shiny server interface where NWP Test Suite results can be found at the moment.
- FG and AIB inform the participants that a different shiny server interface (similar to that used for the Test Suite) is being implemented by Theodoro Andreadis for the purpose of this project.
4. FG is interested in using the MEC + Rfdbk system also for verification of the ICON model. AIB mentions that first steps are to be taken in this direction for the NWP Test Suite, so more information will probably be available later this year. FF mentions that not many adaptations should be required for the usage of the system with ICON data.

5. AIB suggests a new webconference after the 4th of May, to check on the progress of the project.