

RATINGS Team

Minutes of Conference Call May 24, 2005

Attendees

ABRFC – Lee Crowley and Janet McCormack
CBRFC – Brenda Alcorn
LMRFC – Ethan Jolly, Amanda Roberts, and Dave Reed
MARFC – Joe Ostrowski
MBRFC – Gene Derner
NCRFC – Dan Prokorny
NERFC – Rob Shedd
SERFC – Mark Fuchs
WGRFC – Pat Sneeringer
ERH – George McKillop

1. Review of Action Items -

Action 4/19/05-1 - Incorporate comments of group into next draft of functional requirements (Reed – due date 4/22/05)

The next version of the functional requirements was distributed on 4/22. Item closed.

Action 4/19/05-2 – Coordinate needed change in Archive Database with Archive Database Team

Julie Meyer, leader of the Archive Database Team has been notified and will implement changes in the archive data needed. We will continue to keep Julie informed of any additional capabilities.

Action 4/19/05-3 – Notify HSDs and OCWWS about the need to utilize the same procedures to interpolate/extrapolate ratings in WHFS/IHFS as used in NWSRFS (Reed)

Email to SR HSB. This will have to be sent through the HOSIP process. Dave Reed will work with SRHSB, OCWWS, and Donna Page to get this process started.

Action 5/24/05-1 Complete HOSIP process to have ratings stored and accessed the same way in IHFS as is done in NWSRFS (Reed).

Action 4/19/05-4 – Provide more detail on RUHT implementation for the project plan (McKillop)

RATINGS Team

Minutes of May 24, 2005 Conference call

Page 1 of 3

George McKillop reported that OHRFC is providing ratings to the WFOs in CR ratings using RUHT and plan to expand this to the other WFOs they serve. LMRFC just implemented RUHT for its WFOs. Item closed.

Action 4/19/05-5 – Summarize capabilities of GUI program (NCRFC - due mid-May)

NCRFC provided a write-up on additional functional requirements and some issues relating to the architecture of the project. See the discussion in item 2 below.

Action 4/19/05-6 – Prototype GUI program to process ratings (NCRFC – due mid-May)

See Item 2 below.

Action 4/19/05-7 – Review RUHT for the need for additional capabilities (Ostrowski)

Joe has completed a limited review but wants to complete a more thorough review of RUHT capabilities. LMRFC brought up one design consideration in the current RUHT program that should be addressed. When ratings are sent to the WFOs, they are placed in a directory that is purged frequently. There is no capability to store/archive the file received daily by the WFO for processing the next day if AWIPS is down when RUHT should be run.

2. Discussion of Dan Pokorny Design Document – This document listed some architecture issues and more specifics on the functional requirements. One suggestion on the architecture was to possibly have a server outside AWIPS which would retrieve the ratings from the USGS, process them into a common format, and then send them to AWIPS. The other was to request the information in AWIPS. Currently, offices use http transfer through the AWIPS firewall and http access will be removed from the system in OB6. LDAD is designed to do this and should continue to be supported as a method for access of external data at an office. CBRFC and MARFC both now have scripts that will download the ratings. With this information, the consensus of the team was to utilize AWIPS and LDAD to retrieve and archive the ratings.

One other design consideration was to either rework existing applications or do a total rewrite. The group agreed it best to tell the developers what needed to be done and then have them make that decision.

With NCRFC, CBRFC, and MARFC having accomplished significant parts of the development, it was decided to have them work together to begin the development process.

There was also some discussion about the functional requirements and if they were sufficiently detailed for the developers. (As an aside, several of the team members had been on HOSIP training the previous day and the need for functional requirements that were detailed and unambiguous was stressed.)

Action 5/24/05-2 - Review the functional requirements and provide more detail (team)

The group also discussed the need for the gage datum to be included in the archive. There may be other metadata that should be retained with the rating that hydrologists can ensure data are consistent.

Action 5/24/05-3 - Review archival requirements and provide any additional metadata requirements (team)

3. Review Tasks – See 2 above.

4. Schedule of next call – The second week in July (week of July 11).