

Subject: Minutes of GOES-R AWG Leads meeting

Date: 31 May 2007

Preparer: Leanne Avila

- Maria has the posters back from the Annual Meeting. If you'd like to see your poster displayed on a wall, please see her.
- Regarding budgets, Risk Reduction and AWG proposals are in review at STAR (have not yet been forwarded to Grants Management).
- Tom Achtor has new project numbers for the new starts.
- Discussion turned to the Annual Meeting, beginning with the impressions of the AIT team. Maciek felt that things went surprisingly good. The tight schedule is still a bit of a mystery to Maciek, but Walt Wolf is confident in the team he has assembled. Given that Walt's team hasn't really started yet, there will be plenty of opportunities for CIMSS to provide input and influence the process. The critical piece of info for Walt seems to be the data structures.
- Walt wasn't particularly warm to GEOCAT, but felt that it could be a useful internal tool for CIMSS AWG algorithms. It could perhaps serve as a prototype for Walt's group to flesh out data structures and connections between algorithms.
- Would Walt adopt GEOCAT in the long run? Probably not in its entirety since the setup is different here (single machine), then it would likely be out in DC. He'll probably adopt the naming variable conventions.
- Tim Schmit suggested that the system might have the look and feel of GEOCAT but have a different name.
- Can simulated data be put into GEOCAT? No reason it can't be put in, but Andy wasn't planning on it.
- Maciek recommended that those with a fall delivery deadline for an algorithm should be sure of two things at delivery: 1) that the code runs and 2) that a test data set is also provided. It does not need to be a perfect case nor does the code have to be perfect.
- Chris also commented that we've also been given guidance to distance ourselves as much as possible from McIDAS-X.
- What about a visualization tool? Wayne relayed a conversation he had with Walt and Mitch. When Mitch asked Walt what he would use, Walt didn't know. Then Mitch asked Wayne what was happening with McIDAS-V.
- Perhaps the GOES-R program needs a separate visualization team.
- Mitch shies from commercial visualization software – wants open source software. In contrast, Walt's an "IDL guy."
- What's the timetable for McV? The Beta release is set for October 1.
- What does the V in McV stand for? Tom Achtor suggested it should be explained as referring to the fifth build of McIDAS.

- Was there anything bad that came out of the meeting for AIT? Maciek alluded to “horror stories.” He noted that Walt’s group is not as far along as we thought. Their PowerPoints don’t show much in the way of unifying thought. But Walt is also very aware of the situation and is open to asking for and receiving help.
- Allen commented that our job is to convince the program office that we have the vision and technical insight to do this work and that we should have a major role. He felt quite strongly that visualization work should be kept separate from AIT work. He also felt it would be useful to conduct a survey to discover what people want the visualization tool to do.
- Did the TAC stress visualization? Yes, the TAC felt it should be a separate team.
- Allen was concerned that SSEC’s visualization efforts don’t seem to be tied to GOES-R. He didn’t feel he could campaign for McV.
- Ray Garcia asked: Do the AWG teams have use cases (with proxy data and existing data) for the McV team to look at satisfying AWG needs? And are the AWG teams allowed to do that? It’s important to convey not only the data structures, but also the required capabilities and how important they are. What is needed above and beyond what McV can provide?
- Tim Schmit commented that it’s hard to know what you need above and beyond McV is you don’t know what McV is.
- Maciek wondered if there would be an alpha release of McV that could be made available to interested players.
- Allen offered his impressions of the annual meeting. He felt the response from the program office was very positive. He felt that our funding and personnel may continue to grow. It would be very important to meet our algorithm deadlines.
- Regarding the tight schedule, Tim Schmit noted that the launch had slipped from 2012 to 2014, but that nothing else had changed in the schedule so it seems tight.
- Overall, schedule dates seemed to be in conflict – Jim Gurka’s dates were not the same as Mitch’s dates.
- Maciek was asked to monitor AIT schedules.
- Allen stated that it was important for people to speak up about any concerns so that we can fix the problems.
- Maciek noted that we want our sounder back.
- There will likely be a hyperspectral sounder on GOES-T (though not due to launch until 2019). The spectrum would be like GIFTS, not IASI.
- No new work for GRAFIIR at the moment.
- The high level flowcharting has been well done and now it’s time to move into the subroutines.
- Is Walt’s team using the flowcharts or just asking for them? The I/O labels are definitely being used, but as for the flowcharts themselves, the team is asking for them. Walt is taking a “design as you go” approach rather than a top down approach.

- Bryan Baum asked Chris Velden if he is working with Mark DeMaria on the winds? Yes. Anything into GEOCAT? No AMV type winds at all.
- Ingrid Guch is looking to survey the funding situation of Risk Reduction and AWG. According to Ingrid there is \$80K in new funding for Risk Reduction.
- Jason Otkin gave a brief presentation on the NCSA simulation. The first simulation of ABI radiances over 3 domains is now finished. The domains were: full disk at 6km resolution (with 5 min data over 6 hours), CONUS at 2km resolution (with 5 min data over 6 hours and 15 min data), and the mesoscale at roughly 670 meter resolution (1 minute data over 6 hours, 5 minute data over 4 hours, and 15 minute data over the remaining time period).
- We have used 40% of the hours allotted to us by NCSA. The next simulation will be a full disk at 3km resolution. Jason will hold a meeting next week to determine the time period.
- COPS data will not be archived in the Data Center – Wayne will talk with colleagues at EUMETSAT to see how we can get access to the data.
- One TB of RAM was used to create the first NCSA simulation. Going to 3km resolution will require 2TB.
- Bryan Baum asked if it would be easy to get more hours. Jason didn't know – he would have to submit a proposal again. After learning that the last proposal was submitted mid-September and awarded soon after in December, Bryan suggested that we shouldn't have to worry about getting hours.
- One issue we do have to worry about is disk space (and university purchasing rules). The first simulation produced 10 TB in output (the second will produce 15 TB).
- Several suggested that we provide Mitch with some of simulation animations now (as animated gifs, not AniS), noting that more animations would follow.
- Erik noted that bands 8-16 take 1% as long to process as bands 1-7.
- The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 27 at 1:30pm.