

Working group on S2S and TIGGE databases: technical aspects



WG2, S2S and TIGGE databases: technical aspects

Participants

- Michael Denhard (DWD)
- Kenta Ochi (JMA)
- Daniele Mastrangelo (CNR-ISAC)
- Xing Hu (CMA)
- Feifei Yang (CMA)
- Manuel Fuentes (ECMWF)
- Frederic Vitart (ECMWF)
- Richard Mladek (ECMWF)

- Harry Hendon (BoM) – inputs provided in advance
- S2S & TIGGE user surveys (~400 users)

Q1 What were the biggest technical challenges to be able to participate in S2S/TIGGE projects at the beginning? What could improve next time?

Challenges:

- conversion to required GRIB2 format is a challenge (especially from NetCDF)
- fixed reforecast production
- numerous S2S parameters

Ideas for future improvement:

- conversion tools could be shared among the centres (e.g. using NetCDF)
 - even within one organisation links to other projects and sharing of tools are important (KMA, BoM, CMA..)
 - production checking tools from ECMWF should be shared
 - new tools always welcomed (e.g. to convert to required accumulated sums since the forecast start)

Q2 What are the biggest challenges in the current production phase to ensure long-term minimal effort operations? How could the data archive centres support you more in that role?

Challenges:

- keeping contribution to TIGGE/S2S database after model's upgrade
 - can even prevent to continuation (human/computing resources..)
 - ❖ **official project support** would help
- any operational issue can impact products for archives (which has not highest priorities)
- fixed forecast computation is big job after each model upgrade (CPU, storage..)
- TIGGE high resolution is really needed?
 - who is using it? (limited domain with high res?)
 - ❖ some stats could help to understand if it is used

Q3 How could we improve cooperation between data providers and archiving centres (how to communicate/automate tasks/implement checking tools/test/implement model upgrades etc)?

- share available tools and checking procedures from the archive centres
 - WMO GRIB2 compliance encoding check
 - value limits checks
 - input file checks (number of fields, reference field list creation..))
- notify each time a cycle has been ingested
 - automatic email alerts / some status files

Q4 What are good/bad features in the design of S2S/TIGGE databases (data format/structure/encoding/compression etc)?

- Advanced GRIB packing (second order/complex/JPEG 2000) might cause problems (higher CPU needed for data processing)
 - smaller file sizes for data dispatch can be still achieved using standard unix compression like gzip

Q5 What are good/bad features in the interfaces for getting S2S/TIGGE data (web portals/Web API/direct MARS access etc)?

Problematic features:

- GRIB to NetCDF conversion
 - Not available in ECMWF data portal interface (data discovery only!)
 - ❖ => via WebAPI works (should be better documented?)
 - CMA provides on-the-flight conversion (using GRIB-API)
- pre-computed data (e.g. eps means) before download (like IRI for S2S)
 - not planned at the moment (e.g. in Copernicus CDS (Climate Data Store))
 - can be partially done by MARS compute (for experienced users with full access ECMWF account)
- **slow access and problems with downloading the data from ECMWF archives**
 - mainly related to TIGGE
 - ❖ big archive with data gaps affecting efficient data retrieval
 - S2S data access should have already improved a lot thanks to staging most data on disc (form tapes)
 - ❖ additional "tuning" still might help

Q5 What are good/bad features in the interfaces for getting S2S/TIGGE data (web portals/Web API/direct MARS access etc)?

Problematic features:

- interpolation is different in CMA & ECMWF archives
 - In extreme cases can impact user results based on the identical data from 2 archives

Good features:

- Interpolation is available!
- See full surveys results!

Q6 What would be the most welcomed technical update of S2S/TIGGE databases from user point of view (data formats/data access/new products like time-series etc)?

- addition of pre-computed values (like eps means, weekly means, climatology computed from reforecasts..)
- faster download

Q8 Are you generally satisfied with the way the S2S/TIGGE databases have been created and supported until now? What would you like to change or improve the most?

- from surveys, number of related research articles etc the archives seem to be very useful for scientific community
 - Harry Hendon (BoM): *“Support seems to be outstanding.”*
- ECMWF & CMA are keen on archives continuation
 - But to keep them running in long term the official high level support is needed
 - TIGGE has been agreed until the end of 2019 only
 - ❖ Risk of losing project stakeholders (regular data providers) support

It would be great if one of main outcomes from this Workshop would be to highlight the importance usefulness of the TIGGE and S2S databases, and recommend their continuation.

(particularly relevant for a TIGGE Phase III)