**CHy Task Team on Interoperable Models and Platforms (TT E2)**

**2nd Teleconference, Wednesday 11 April 2018, 7 am CEST**

**Tentative Agenda**

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Status of advancement on actions identified during the first teleconference
3. Review of the available templates
4. Discussion on the content of the Reference Guide (not discussed during first teleconference)
5. Planned way forward for the dissemination of the platform templates to  Regional Hydrology Advisors, NMHSs, OPACHE, AWG of CHy (not discussed during first teleconference)
6. Other Business
7. Next Call

**Meeting Minutes**

**Participants**

The following experts attended the teleconference: Hwirin Kim (late), William Scharffenberg, Yeshewatesfa Hundecha Hirpa

Sends apologies: Jeff Perkins

From WMO Secretariat: Paul Pilon, Roberto Silva Vara, Tania Gascon, Giacomo Teruggi.

Paul Pilon moderated the teleconference while waiting for Kim to join.

1. **Adoption of the Agenda** (**Annex I**)

The agenda was adopted without any changes.

1. **Status of advancement/new proposed deadlines**

**General remarks:**

* Please copy the Secretariat on all email exchanges pertaining to the work of the Task Team.
* It was suggested that in future Action Items should have members names associated with them and due dates.

**Discussion 1: cost and complexity**

The first topics of discussion were the categories of “cost” and “complexity” (for installation/implementation/application). The idea is to indicate, notwithstanding the “free-of-cost” rationale, any costs related to the installation and/or training related to the model/platform (and any “hidden” costs). Possibly indicate the cost in terms of person-days needed to become operational, even though this is not an easy and objective task. This category (person-days needed) might need to be moved next to the training material line. Possibly involve other experts (with previous experience in the model operation, but not development) to evaluate the first estimate (in terms of person-days needed) received from the developer.

**ACTION 1a**: Bill to write a short description for the next videoconference, as an example, of time requirements and complexity to install, configure and implement a model for a forecast application. Everyone to add in their model template the categories “cost” and “complexity” (of application).

**ACTION 1b**: Discuss via email about a possible name to label the category “complexity”, considering 1) installation and configuration 2) capacity building. Indicate the level of expertise needed at each step (e.g. IT expert, GIS expert, Hydrologist-BSc or MSc or PhD).

**Discussion 2**:  **Review of the available templates**

* Hydrological model template: Yeshewa revised Bill’s template and sent feedback back to him. The feedback included grouping some of the items under “Model Components” and adding data formats and visualization under “Model Outputs”. Bill to add additional headings to reflect Yeshewa’s comments, such as “statistics” or “graphics”.
* Hydraulic model template: Bill didn’t have the chance to provide feedback to Jeff.
* Reservoir model template: Hwirin to receive feedback from Jeff.
* Platforms template: Jeff to receive feedback from Hwirin.

Same categories mentioned by Yeshewa can be considered for inclusion in other templates. All authors to include them in their respective tables (Refer to table below for leads and reviewers).

**ACTION 2a:** Bill to provide the rest of the group his revised template by April 20 at the latest.

**ACTION 2b**: Once received from Bill, everyone to consider his revised inputs in the redrafting of their templates. Once revised all to send their templates to the assigned reviewers. Iterate the process of including Bill’s input via email to the rest of the group. If agreement not met, then call for a teleconference. Anticipate completion of revised template distribution and completion of reviews prior to the next videoconference.

**Discussion 3: Guidance material**

Consistency between Bill’s terminology and definitions and the short summary in each template (i.e. Guidance column) need still to be ensured. Main point is: we want to have the right information for each question, as the better the explanation in the guidance column, the better the reply. Providing examples would be a good starting point to provide guidance to the users.

Once the technical aspects are ready, the Secretariat will explore the “beautification process” (i.e. converting the templates into excel files or provide hyperlinks to the Terminology file).

**ACTION 3a**: New separated rows to be included for the language of the model/platform interface and for the language of relevant documentation and guidance materials. Bill to do for the hydrological template and will share with other TT members by 20 April.

**ACTION 3b**: Each template’s main author is to ensure consistency with Bill’s example. This item is embedded into Actions 2b and 3a. This is to be completed prior to the next videoconference.

1. **Review of the available templates (if any)**

Ongoing, as reported above. The below table summarizes responsibilities for each template:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Template** | **Main author** | **Reviewer** |
| **Hydrologic Model** | Bill  | Yeshewa  |
| **Hydraulic Model** | Jeff  | Bill  |
| **Reservoir model**  | Hwirin  | Jeff  |
| **Platforms** | Jeff  | Hwirin  |

1. **Review of the draft Reference Guide**

Guidance material will be needed to introduce the topic of the Task Team and for distribution of templates to be completed along with the examples that are being developed.

1. **Planned way forward for the dissemination of the platform templates to  Regional Hydrology Advisors, NMHSs, OPACHE, AWG of CHy**

RHAs can also tap on the Regional working Groups on Hydrology (WGsH). We should not expect a huge return in terms of replies. It has to be addressed to model and platform implementers and developers. Secretariat to coordinate the survey and identify the most effective way to target audience for collection of information. Circulation to be done only after guidance material is complete. Consider a “beta-testing group” (e.g. France SCHAPI, Czech Republic, Argentina, PROHIMET, etc.), but first develop an introductory text to lure them into contributing to this activity (See item 4 above). Timing might be an issue (not more than a month needed for feedback): a strategy is needed for this effort.

It is noted that the next teleconference should include an agenda topic for how much more guidance is need for each item in the templates.

1. **Other Business**
* UNU survey on FEWS: WMO has been contacted by UNU to provide information of FEWS operating in different parts of the world. Specifically UNU would like to have WMO’s national contacts. In order not to overtax NMHSs with additional questionnaires or surveys (the UNU one consists of 94 questions), the Secretariat requested TT E2 members to assess their willingness to consider replying to the questionnaire. As well, once members have had an opportunity to review the questionnaire, there may be ways of seeking synergies with its outcomes or with areas covered by the survey.

**ACTION 6a:** share the request to the Task Team to assess their feedback, either in filling in the survey, or in looking for potential synergies and sharing ideas with TT E2 members.

* SCHAPI participant: contacts established, now formalizing his official involvement

**ACTION 6b:** Secretariat to finalize this aspect as soon as possible.

1. **Next Call**

Proposed Wednesday 16 or Thursday 17 May, 7 am CEST.

**ACTION:** Roberto to circulate a Doodle for those days, or the week of 22-25 May.