

Minutes of the 13th ALADIN LTM meeting
October 9, 2012, Helsinki
17:00 – 19:30

Participants

ALADIN Program Manager : Piet Termonia

LTM or deputy LTM, possibly from a remote location, using video-conference:

Algeria : Abdelhak Razagui (from Toulouse)

Morocco : Karam Essaouini (dep.)

Austria : Yong Wang (dep.)

Poland : Marek Jerczynski

Belgium : Alex Deckmyn

Portugal :

Bulgaria : Andrey Bogatchev (dep, from Toulouse.)

Romania : Simona Tascu (dep.)

Croatia : Alica Bajic

Slovakia : Mikal Nestiak (dep)

Czech Rep. : Jan Masek & Petra Smolikava (dep.)

Slovenia : Neva Pristov

France : Claude Fischer

Tunisia :

Hungary : Roger Randriamampianina

Turkey : Ersin Küçükcaraca (dep)

LACE Program Manager : Dijana Klaric

Support Team : Patricia Pottier

CSSI Members welcome : none

Excused : Maria Monteiro (Portugal), Hichem Fehri (Tunisia)

1. Opening

Piet Termonia opens the meeting with a round table of the participants : Andrey and Abdelhak are attending via a video-conference from Toulouse. All countries but Portugal and Tunisia are represented.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda is adopted with a rescheduling of the points, in order to make sure we have enough time for the more crucial ones.

3. Points of attention from PAC

The main points are detailed in the preparatory document (9th_PAC_minutes_final.pdf).

• *Licences for GLAMEPS*

The use of GLAMEPS for research is free of licence for the ALADIN partners. For commercial use and operational guarantees on availability of GLAMEPS products, during joint meetings with HIRLAM (HAC) it was proposed to introduce the notion of “GLAMEPS products partners” : an ALADIN (or HIRLAM) partner can belong to it if he contributes to the maintenance or to the operational facilities (manpower or SBUs for computer time at ECMWF).

As a comparison, no licence is needed for research use of LAEF and its commercial use is driven by the ALADIN MoU royalty policy; OpLACE is also given for free, as soon as it isn't extra cost for LACE (in terms of manpower or computer costs).

Dijana underlines that the ALADIN community produces good products and that our know-how has always been shared with HIRLAM free of charge. Claude adds that if many ALADIN partners are interested by the GLAMEPS products, they should be self-consistent and would be willing to provide manpower for maintenance. Thus we consider that ALADIN, as a consortium, complies the “GLAMEPS products partners” HIRLAM requirements.

Piet proposes that, at the next HAC, ALADIN asks to join the “GLAMEPS products partners” as a consortium. This proposal will be put on the GA agenda and discussed during the Bureau Meeting.

- Who is our end user?

During the PAC meeting, M. Staudinger asked for the forecasting procedure to be part of the end-users enquiry. This was not included in the action by Joao Rio, who only identified the application per sector in the different institutes and not the procedures how the data is used. The original aim was to establish a list of applications and identify their corresponding verification measures. PM reminds that the aim of the verification force is to develop and provide tools, not to give verification numbers; that remains the responsibility of the individual partners.

He will ask Joao for a possible extension of the inquiry to the forecasters to see whether forecasting procedures can be included. The strategy will anyhow be discussed with Christoph Zingerle.

- ARPEGE production (see point 5)

During PAC, Alain Joly gave an extensive presentation of the proposed change and its outcomes ; the contributions of the LTMs were reported by the PM and he stressed that their efforts were very much appreciated by PAC and MF. Three weeks after the PAC meeting, MF decided that the ARPEGE schedule will not be changed in 2012. However, the question will be reopened in the coming years, after the porting of MF production on its new computer and the change of the model resolution (2014 at the earliest).

Piet asks the LTMs to remain aware of some possible additional tests to be done for 2014.

Claude adds that the very-short ARPEGE production might still be part of the discussion that we will have in 2014 (in addition to the useful messages already passed).

- Position of ACNA and verification TFL

Not discussed due to lack of time.

4. Rolling work plan

- Explanation of the aim

PM reminds that we agreed with HIRLAM on a common gliding plan, valid until the end of the MoU : this “rolling” plan will no longer be rewritten from scratch every year but just adapted from the previous one. A first version of the gliding plan was prepared by Claude, Jeanette and Piet. Patricia made this first draft version available to all HMG/CSSI members on googledocs (chosen to make our collaborative editing easier). The HMG/CSSI members are filling the list of prioritized common tasks (without manpower) that ALADIN and HIRLAM commit to do or to coordinate together and the list of related activities. The redaction is ongoing, through cross exchanges by topics between relevant HMG, CSSI members and LACE area leaders.

The LTMs will then need to go through the document and add the manpower : of course, not everybody is forced to have the same priorities nor to participate to all topics.

Piet insists on the document to be ready by the end of October (it will be presented at the next GA, mid-November).

- Man power commitment

Once the validation by the HMG/CSSI members is done, Patricia will make a version of the rolling plan available for the LTMs on googledocs. Once identified with their google account, the LTMs will fill the on-line rolling plan with the manpower they commit for their team. This should be completed by the end of October.

Next week, Patricia will send to the LTMs a message explaining how to share a document on googledocs (a test document will be shared with existing LTM google accounts and the LTMs who don't have a google account should create one and let Patricia know about their new account identification).

The primary goal of this rolling plan is to simplify the annual redaction; since it is a rolling plan it will be used for the remaining span of the current MoU (until 2015) and will only need small incremental adjustments every year. We focus this year on the content of this plan. Manpower contributions will be

included but, if the time remains too short, the estimates may not be optimally accurate. PM will explain this to the GA.

5. 00-UTC LBC production

- Wrap-up

See point 3.

6. Technical progress & plans; cycle OOPS

Claude invites everybody to read the preparatory document (Doc_MF_PP_Cycles.pdf) that contents the details of the cycles and the calendar.

The next phasings are planned at the very beginning of 2013 (CY39T1) and over March/May (CY40) (Claude did already send the call for 2013 phaser candidates, for over the first semester of 2013, from January through beginning of June mostly). Then, due to MF porting on its new computer, there will be no other phasing in 2013. The change of computer will also affect the remote connections (of course, those who have a remote access to MF's NEC computer will get a similar access to MF's new computer, but they will have to get familiar to it).

The current source code management tool (clearcase) will also be changed to GIT. The GCO team has developed a top layer on GIT, reproducing the clearcase functionalities (GIT-tools). There is a 25-30 page documentation in French about GIT-tools. Those planning to contribute to the cycles should be aware of the tight calendars for contributions (December for 39T1) and start identifying staff willing to learn about GIT and the user tools that will become operational in MF's SCR next year (a French/English fluent staff might be welcome for translating the technical note about GCO's new GIT-tools).

Jan asks if/when Cy38T1 export cycle will be declared.

Before addressing CY38, Claude explains that a very comprehensive validation of ARPEGE/AROME has been done for Cy37T1 that could be the basis of an export version. However, the decision is pending on ALARO validation. Since Filip Vaňa left CHMI, it is not clear who validates ALARO before an export cycle is declared. The level of validation (either the single forecast test from mitraille, or a full meteorological validation based on some scores ?) expected for ALARO before declaring an export cycle should also be defined. Neva mentioned that for a start, the mitraille single forecast test could be fine, provided it is playing the reference ALARO configuration promoted for use by the ALARO team. Claude answers that this is fine but only if the ALARO team takes itself care of the updated mitraille versions locally, since the team in charge of mitraille in GMAP cannot perform version updates on demand (they don't do it for MF operational configurations either). Andrey underlines that the mitraille tests really are for technical validation only, as they focus on tests like A and B-level parallelization, Open-MP and various system options. Neva proposes this could be further discussed within the ALARO team, and maybe Olda can be approached for this task.

Piet will ask Radmila for a procedure and the level of validation ALARO wants or can afford. A contact person for a given cycle would also be beneficial, who would interact with Piet, Claude and Roger (as ACNA).

Neva asks if Meteo-France plans to validate 38T1 as plain as it was done for 37T1 and when. Claude answers that 'yes'. At present, however, GMAP staff still is busy with bug fixing in the data assimilation part (apparently, identical problems in Arpège, Aladin and Arome VAR). Nevertheless, CY38T1 is planned to become the next E-suite cycle, to start early 2013.

Jan asks what version of SURFEX is in 38T1. Claude answers SURFEX is based on a version very close to 7.2 in the SURFEX nomenclatura.

7. First experience with the Harmonie system at OMSZ

Roger and Oldrich intend to deliver a comprehensive report later this year, after Oldrich's visit to OMSZ.

Roger reports that Ulf has installed the HARMONIE system at OMSZ. The HARMONIE verification software runs at OMSZ for ALADIN and AROME experiments. The system has proved its portability : it could be used as a common verification tool with nice facilities. So far, the observations are provided by Xiaohua, but local observations should be created (including national data, MARS data, ...).

Yong asks if this testing was part of the verification plans.

Piet wonders if it would not be double work with the Ljubljana monitoring.

Alex reports having the experience of the HIRLAM tool for verification of GLAMEPS : it is ascii-file-based, thus not so easy to adapt to new or local needs as a database tool.

Roger answers that the tool has a high potential for verification with sophisticated scores and it is complementary to the monitoring done in Ljubljana. He proposes that Christoph comes to Hungary to evaluate the installed tool. Dijana proposes a LACE funding for this visit. Yong thinks that this visit is still too early to be planned and proposes that the LTMs discuss first what sort of verification tool they would like and prepare a plan accordingly.

The meeting concluded that this tool is not overlapping with the common verification (in Ljubljana) neither with the R package that is currently being developed. However, this should be confirmed by the verification group. PM will ask Christoph to coordinate these discussions and testings and there will be a verification side meeting on Thursday afternoon (Xiaohua, Christoph and Alex will attend this meeting and other interested people can join).

8. SURFEX

Piet explains the two options for including calling SURFEX code from full pos (the so-called shallow approach and the deep approach) after the recent SURFEX WW (see the preparatory document : SURFEX.pdf) and asks the LTMs to comment on them.

Either we wait for the prep software to be parallelized or we use full-pos software to do the conversion. In both options, it should be done in agreement with the prep and the SURFEX developers. The chosen option should be proposed to the SURFEX steering committee, together with our proposal for manpower (not everything should be done in Toulouse). A core group with 3 experts in close contact with one expert in Toulouse met during the SURFEX WW but they won't start working before everyone has agreed on the workplan. At the time of this meeting there was still some disagreement between the group of 4. Piet expects this to be clarified rather soon. Piet will contact Eric Martin and Alain Joly to discuss the workplan. The LTMs find the subject too technical to be able to choose one option but agree with the procedure.

Conclusion: LTMs should be aware that this discussion takes place. It is important since a lack of parallelism can make the difference whether SURFEX can be applied or not in the local applications. LTMs can ask their experts to read the technical documents and are invited to contact the PM if they have concerns regarding the two options presented, so that their input may be taken into account within the SURFEX SC.

9. Newsletter

The contributions are still problematic. For the PAC meetings and the General Assemblies, Piet prepares a "Tour of ALADIN", mid-year report of the highlights of the ALADIN activities, as he picks them up during the annual ALADIN/HIRLAM Workshop or the EWGLAM meeting. This could be the basis of our Newsletter, with a limited effort from those who have given a presentation or prepared a poster for these meetings : they would just have to extend Piet's report with their own materials. It is agreed that Piet will send his "Tour of ALADIN" to the concerned people and Patricia will keep asking them **insistently** for their contribution. Yong explains the lack of contributions by the electronic format of the newsletter : a printed

version would be likely to motivate people to contribute.

The LTMs agree to attempt to produce the next Newsletter with the scheme proposed by Piet and, for the future, Patricia will study the feasibility of creating also a printable version.

10. Plans for next meetings

Some 2013 meetings are already planned (when the date and the location are decided, the meetings are announced on the ALADIN “agenda” web page):

- 23rd ALADIN/ 2013 HIRLAM ASM, Reykjavik, 15-18 April 2013 ;
- 14th LTM meeting, Reykjavik, 16 April 2013,
- a CSSI meeting should also be organised to prepare the HMG/CSSI : during the last CSSI meeting, it was agreed to organise it earlier (before the workshop, via web-conference) ;
- HMG/CSSI, Reykjavik, 19 April 2013 ;
- 10th PAC meeting, 11-12 June 2013, Lisbon ;
- LACE DA Working Days, May 2013 : place to be chosen and date to be confirmed ;
- SURFEX WW, Bruxelles, September 2013 : date to be confirmed ;
- 35th EWGLAM & 20th SRNWP meetings, Turkey, 7-10 October 2013 ;
- 15th LTM meeting, Turkey, 8 October 2013 : the LTMs agree on the necessity of this LTM meeting in the autumn, besides EWGLAM meeting, preferably on Tuesday evening ;
- 18th GA : probably in November 2013 : Tunisia offered to host the 18th GA : to be decided by the next GA, Vienna, November 2012;
- Verification meeting : date (March 2013 ?), location (Ljubljana, Brussels, Vienna ?), attendance (verification meeting ? Meeting of the verification team ? ALADIN and HIRLAM ?) and aim (define a common approach with HIRLAM ?) to be defined after the next Thursday side meeting (Alex, Christoph, Xiaohua, Roger ?).

11. AOB

Radmila has submitted the following late question to the LTM meeting : Sami Saarinen has presumably sent a contribution to SURFEX code (as far as understood correctly); why has it been refused for the next cycle ? As agreed between MF (centralising SURFEX contributions), ALADIN and HIRLAM, such proposal should be submitted to the SURFEX Steering Committee that will deal with it. It is thus primarily a matter for the SURFEX governance. Claude mentions that SURFEX code proposed by HIRLAM for CY38T1 was redirected to the SURFEX governance and the SURFEX team, so that it would enter via their official release.

PM will speak to Sami Saarinem later this week to understand the problem better.

LTMs were asked whether this format of having a short but well targeted meeting on Tuesday is OK, since this is the first time we do this? The LTMs agreed to continue like this.

12. Closing

Piet thanks the LTMs for their attendance, both in Helsinki and in Toulouse via video-conference and closes the meeting. He also thanks the FMI for offering this video-conference facility.