

Key messages for interim review

As in WP5-6 presentations. Need snappier summary of what our work is achieving, what are the benefits to others (inside and outside CLIP), and add:
Clear rationale for which datasets were selected, why these are important
Benefits of tape data extraction solution (months of effort potentially avoided by users of the data)

Threats to the project time line

None noted (some discussion about D6.1)

Where is the user consultation needed

What do users want from the indicators

If priority indicators are “use cases” for the portal, we need specifics of what the users need, eg thresholds

What material can be provided to WP2 for user evaluation

Luis list of priority indicators – get feedback and more detail about the requirements

Feedback on portal timeline

None noted

WP5 specific actions/questions

Task 5.2 (Metadata standards and services):

Which of the standards developments can we feed into broader activities, and how?
Open issue: Who / how handling the work on “conceptual model for quality control and uncertainty - to include concepts for bias correction and uncertainty of climate model data as required by users and impact modellers”. Is this picked up by uncertainty WG?

Task 5.3 (Component development for CLIPC architecture)

How to connect the CMCC WPS service to the architecture – e.g. as a pilot project.
Need follow-up discussion
ngEO work at DEIMOS superseded by new (opensearch) interface to Copernicus data archive. Point Maris to this when we have the URL

Task 5.4 (Dynamic tape archive extraction and post processing)

Arrange telco to share progress updates LIU/SMHI/Met Office - > arrange follow-up telco
Questions about publication to “CLIPC” project in ESGF rather than source project or type of data (eg regional reanalysis) and impact of publishing same data to multiple projects