

BREAKOUT SESSION 1 GROUP A

BREAKOUT TOPIC 1: What are the risks of turning off the NAM/SREF/RAP too soon?

1. Loss of skill for mesoscale environment predictions (e.g PBL structure)
2. Detrimental downstream impacts on deterministic and ensemble CAMS (e.g HREF)
3. Spread skill deficiency in short-term GEFS compared to the SREF

BREAKOUT TOPIC 2: When the decisions are made to turn off these models, what is a reasonable amount of time for the transition? Explain briefly. Gather a sampling of opinions.

1. Managing and communicating expectations about strengths and weaknesses of parallel model and motivation for the replacement/transition ← (enough time for this)
2. 6-12 months for collection of real-time parallel/retrospectives statistics and case studies
3. Account for enough time to effectively reproduce the same set of products, grids, post-processing, etc and make sure downstream products are unaffected by the change

BREAKOUT SESSION 1 GROUP B

BREAKOUT TOPIC 1: What are the risks of turning off the NAM/SREF/RAP too soon?

1. Reduced quality of guidance
2. Not knowing when replacements with similar quality would be available
3. No longer meeting specific needs of stakeholders and users
4. Risks in turning these systems off too late exists too

BREAKOUT TOPIC 2: When the decisions are made to turn off these models, what is a reasonable amount of time for the transition? Explain briefly. Gather a sampling of opinions.

1. Give a decent amount of time (i.e., 2 years) to allow discussions to occur to prepare people for the upcoming change
2. One year after retrospective forecasts are completed to recalibrate products
3. Rip off the bandaid - 30-90 days after decision is made (present practice)

BREAKOUT SESSION 1 GROUP C

BREAKOUT TOPIC 1: What are the risks of turning off the NAM/SREF/RAP too soon (Issues related to the risks)?

1. It is paramount for the new system to either match or improve the skill of the current systems. If there are degradations, are they acceptable? (SIP?)
2. Turning off the RAP would be risky because you would lose the hourly temporal frequency (0-3 day?) and the DA and physics (e.g., PBL) advancements associated with the RAP/HRRR systems, which have been tuned together. (CCPP?)
3. There are concerns about losing model diversity. The SREF is a multi-core, multi-physics ensemble, and the GEFS is a single-core ensemble. (HREF?)

BREAKOUT TOPIC 2: When the decisions are made to turn off these models, what is a reasonable amount of time for the transition? Explain briefly. Gather a sampling of opinions.

1. Transitioning to the new system is dependent upon progress toward matching or improving skill of these systems (risk of being stuck with the frozen systems).
2. Depends on when the system actually becomes operational at NCEP; there should be a transition period (e.g, 6 months to a year) before sunsetting legacy models. It's a tough call when there is no clear winner. (SIP?)
3. There is a seasonal dependence on when to retire these systems (e.g., prior to severe weather or hurricane season).

BREAKOUT SESSION 1 GROUP D

BREAKOUT TOPIC 1: What are the risks of turning off the NAM/SREF/RAP too soon?

1. ensure continuation of quality and timing of products for the customers
2. mesoscale details not adequately captured by a global-domain model
3. ensure compatibility of new models with AWIPS
 - a. new ensemble model may not be fully developed (i.e. viable alternative)

BREAKOUT TOPIC 2: When the decisions are made to turn off these models, what is a reasonable amount of time for the transition? Explain briefly. Gather a sampling of opinions.

1. which metrics are to be relied upon to decide timing of transition?
2. reasonable transition timetable: no less than one year
3. ensure satisfaction of customers with proper testing and validation