

## Agenda:

- Welcome and presence
- Approval of the agenda
- NeIC announcements
- Report by Project Manager
- Deliverable 4.3
- Extension spring 2021
- DP checklist
- Next meeting
- AOB

## Welcome and Presence

Invited:

[Anette Lauen Borg](#), NO, Project leader, Observer

[Dan Still](#), FI, CSC

[Jørn Kristiansen](#), NO, MET Norway

[Michaela Barth](#), SE, Chair

[Sami Niemelä](#), FI, FMI

[Heiner Körnich](#), SE, SMHI

Presence: Anette, Sami, Heiner, Michaela, Dan, Jørn

Quorum: see § 3.6 in Collaboration Agreement

**Decision: We have quorum.**

## Approval of the agenda

Agenda and material was sent out in time on 11th of September.

**Decision: The agenda is approved.**

## NeIC announcements

- SG course in autumn
- New PaRI project
- Open call
- Virtualized meetings (AHM, Nordic RSE, FAIR workshops..)
- Lessons learned NeIC Director leave of absence
- Update long-term funding
- Promotional video

- Zenodo API usage

## Report by project manager

Report:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1rIO7mHVSEgBYj6XYPTsRE6mZo5MASJR7RITluEViLp0>

Discussion:

WP5: Comparison of Apache AirFlow and ecFlow? (WP5 is doing tests of software that may not all be used in the final results.) Decoding GTS messages from the bufr format and installing the actual machine learning quality control software are the next steps to develop a test observations data pipeline.

What is the issue with the SAPP output? WP4 is getting mixed results when comparing the model output using data processed by SAPP with the current MetCoOp model output. WP4 compared model runs with both types of input for August last year: traditional MetCOOp model output was better this time, maybe because SAPP output doesn't yet contain all the observations MetCoOp is using.

SAPP is also treating some observation types differently from how the MetCoOp system is processing them. The treatment of GTS data also differs from country to country, introducing errors and duplicates (no. of stations, height of station..)

**Decision: The report was approved.**

## Deliverable 4.3 (Decision)

DFS software is working for Netatmo observation data now, but the deliverable (due in October) is not finished yet.

What can be done with the tools, do the result respond to what we expect?

This is a working prototype, and the results derived using this tool go into the next deliverable (D4.4).

Is there a github link with code changes?

**Decision: The SG expects a slide presentation including links, explanatory text and histograms on October 30th. The SG will come back with a decision via email by November 6th.**

## Extension spring 2021

Last SG's decision: The Steering Group approves the updated list of deliverables, milestones and Gantt chart. The exact final distribution between the partners depends on staff availability and will be decided in autumn. Also: The two PMs should be handled as part of the extension during 2021.

List of deliverables with the Gantt chart (two tabs) is found here:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YedbWXcOuZk5gip8hftDa0oIYbMII CZv6e-qulydJL8>

Discussion:

The project manager has been in separate contact with all partners to confirm the presented plan for the distribution. CSC might still be able to spend more time already this year. This could be taken as part of the normal accounting.

**Decision: The SG approves the presented PM distribution for the extension period.**

## DP checklist

Last SG's action point: Michaela and Anette to prepare suggestions for DP6-DP8 until next meeting.

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uXT15ai2-0PBS-Duhs-Clv\\_Hwh6m86OJBGpfnURosk/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uXT15ai2-0PBS-Duhs-Clv_Hwh6m86OJBGpfnURosk/edit)

Discussion:

Is there more documentation needed for the long term impact of the transferral of results? Publication(s) would be required for the community to be able to cite the outcome of the project. At least a popular science article for the general scientific community. It is important to make it referable. For the internal modelling community: documentation is needed. Already now WP4 is committing their code directly into a branch of the HIRLAM repository (cycle 43) where forecast codes are stored.

The SG proposed an idea to transform the final report into a public paper: There should be peer reviewed publications for all of iOBS specific topics first, after that the popular science article. Seeing current and projected results the SG expects no problem to get them published. Even in the unlikely case that this is not suitable for all parts, zenodo could still be used to get referable long-term DOIs to ensure documentation for the rest.

AP: PM discuss the final report paper with the team, start with the specific topics first.

Also the ECMWF newsletter can be used to document and share information related to the ECMWF software and user interests (e.g. experiences with SAPP specifics, introduction of Netatmo data into the modelling software).

**Decision: The SG encourages the usage of peer review papers to document as much of the project as possible.**

## Next meeting

**Decision: January 15th 11:00 CET**

## AOB

Self assessment: Strong indication that we are happy with the results in the project when discussing peer reviewed papers.

A continuation of the project would make sense: We can clear up which points are of interest to investigate further after we expand our MetCoOp wish list in the first joint MetCoOp working group meeting.