

Attendees:

ABRFC/Billy Olsen  
CNRFC/Rob Hartman, Eric Strem, Pete Fickenscher  
NCRFC/John Halquist  
NWRFC/Harold Opitz, Joe Intermill  
OCWWS/Mary Mullusky  
OHD/Pedro Restrepo, Jon Roe, Chris Dietz, Joe Gofus

## 1. CAT Charter

- There is a good deal of frustration with the entire process, which seems to be rather messed up. Pedro recommends we view the CAT as a technical team, as in the case of the Distributed Hydro Modeling requirements team; NWSEO representative to that team is Paula Cognitore, whose contributions have been very valuable. Although this group could suggest an NWSEO rep for the CAT, it has no say. Pedro continues to take the lead on getting the Charter coordinated; he also recommends we don't let the question of Chris's CAT membership hold up a review of the Charter by NWSEO.

## 2. List of Operations

- "Tier 1, Tier 2" approach is being taken. NW and NC have both submitted lists of their Tier 1 operations. AB suggests adding Lag/K. There was an apparent agreement in the past that we aim to get NWRFC to IOC first, then NCRFC would follow. Billy agreed to get his list of operations out to the group today.

## 3. Review of Rob's slides "Migration and Roll-out Strategy".

- Slide 1: Goals Add: coordination with other programs (e.g., AWIPS II). Add: Have to work within Delft's resource limitations On the subject of local applications, we need to consider training on writing adapters for local developers. OHD might develop the adapters for all operations and give them to the RFCs. The local applications most likely to break will be those accessing fs5files. Agreed that MPE and HPN and Radar Ingest are "outside the box for now".

- Slide 2: Roll-Out Discussion on "Basic" Operating Capability, which differs from Initial Operating Capability - BOC covers a preliminary minimal set of operations/capabilities for a subset of functionality; IOC matches current operations/capabilities. Discussion on DOH workshop - floated a suggestion that we use the workshop as a training opportunity and put a demo client-server system together, with a server at OHD. Data feeds would need to be set up. Participants at the DOH workshop could then practice adding and changing basin configurations in a truly meaningful way. Issue: this is a significant effort that would detract from the main work. Additional issue: may backfire if the performance is poor, or anything doesn't work properly - we don't want other RFCs to be left with a bad taste. We could accomplish more if we push off the DOH conference until October (currently expected in June-August time frame) using the

standalone demo from April 2007 Pilot workshop. Discussion around practical issues of introducing other RFCs simultaneously resulted in recognition that a 2-phased approach (rather than a full-inclusive approach) might be the best way to go after all.

- Slide 3: Pathfinder RFCs Refers to CAT sites. We can't get to IOC without including hydraulics and reservoirs. Question about use of SOBEK versus license - Pedro said it should not be a problem to get a license for testing purposes. But it is expensive.

- Slide 4: Trail Blazer RFCs There won't be any trail blazer RFCs; ignore slide.

- Slide 5: Development Teams Will need to focus on the basics before we can make any progress towards future activities like ensembles.

- Slide 6: Other Stuff OHD/HL/HSMB (science modeling) should read OHD/HL/HSEB (software engineering). Resources will be an issue, as it isn't clear yet what Delft's costs are. Key discussions will take place next Thurs 2/21; cost and technical proposal will follow. Delft costs have been high to date; however some of that is a result of the \$ value, some is the result of primary contractor overhead (e.g., RTi). Budget is reasonably stable - looks like we have enough for Delft under CHPS, plus some extra (TBD) under XEFS. Also noted that we need to build expertise within NWS HQ (e.g. OCWWS and/or OHD) so we don't have to forever rely on Delft; this has always been Delft's approach anyway.

#### 4. Other

- migration tools. Reminder that the RFCs will need some automated mechanisms to translate existing files into FEWS format. Possible that RFCs might be able to assist with this effort. Delft or OHD may also participate. Key is to identify what needs to be done.

- training. Not just for RFC developers, but also required for HSMB scientists who need guidance and help asap.

- XML editor. Outstanding action item from conference call on Jan 3 - two RFCs don't yet have oXygen, but will acquire it. Ref: <http://www.oxygenxml.com/>. John said everyone should buy the Professional (not Enterprise) edition, because it supports Postgres. Cost is around \$300. This is a short-term solution. OHD has a future action to investigate a national solution for all RFCs.

- communication. Could we capture the "mental progress" we make, and share it with other RFCs somehow? That might help with the transition process. Suggestion that we publish news-worthy information (e.g., decisions made) via mechanisms such as the email list (chps\_fews\_pilot) and the CHPS web page. Another suggestion was to periodically open up these calls to a wider audience.

#### 5. Next meeting

- Will finalize the list of Tier 1 operations to get OHD developers jump-started

- Karel will be in Silver Spring on Thurs 2/21, discussing with OHD a proposal for CHPS IOC implementation. We have at least one good contractual vehicle we can use; others are still in the works. Karel will join the meeting next week to provide further information, and answer questions.