

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Doc.No. : EUM/TSS/REP/15/830806
Issue : v1
Date : 3 November 2015
WBS/DBS :

EUMETSAT
Eumetsat-Allee 1, D-64295 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel: +49 6151 807-7
Fax: +49 6151 807 555
<http://www.eumetsat.int>

Document Signature Table

	Name	Function	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Cleber Gomes Balan	SAF Support Engineer		
Reviewed by:	Lothar Schueller	SAF Network Manager		
Approved by:	Dominique Faucher	Process Assurance Engineer On behalf of the OSI SAF OR-11 Review Board		

Distribution List

Name	Organisation
EUMETSAT SAF Network Secretariat (Lorenzo Sarlo, Frédéric Gasiglia, Lothar Schueller, Dominique Faucher, Cleber Balan)	EUMETSAT
External Participants as listed under Section 2.2 via Cécile Hernandez (cecile.hernandez@meteo.fr)	OSI SAF

Document Change Record

<i>Issue / Revision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>DCN. No</i>	<i>Changed Pages / Paragraphs</i>
V1	03 November 2015	-	First version after OR-11 Review Board assessment.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Purpose and Scope.....	5
1.2	Document Structure	5
2	REVIEW PROCESS.....	6
2.1	Objectives.....	6
2.2	Participants.....	6
2.3	Updated Documentation	7
2.4	Data Package.....	7
2.5	Schedule	8
2.5.1	Status of actions and recommendation from previous ORs	10
2.5.2	Assessment of RIDs and project team answers	24
3	CONCLUSION	25
APPENDIX A	OSI SAF OR-11 REVIEWER'S DIRECTORY	27
APPENDIX B	RID TRACKING LIST FOR REVIEW BOARD PROCESS	28

Table of Tables

Table 1: Documents Under Review	7
Table 1: Reference Documentation	7
Table 2: Product Manuals	8
Table 3: Review Schedule	9

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and Scope

This document presents the outcome of the Operations Review 11 (OR) of the OSI SAF which has been held on 03-04 November 2015 at KNMI, De Bilt, The Netherlands.

1.2 Document Structure

Section 1 presents the purpose and scope of the document.

Section 2 presents the status of previous OR actions, the review process steps and the comments' outcome related to the RIDs raised by the reviewers.

Section 3 presents the corresponding conclusions concerning the proposed objectives.

The Appendix A presents the review board membership. Appendix B presents the RID tracking list including the board comments regarding each RID.

2 REVIEW PROCESS

The review was implemented according the organisation note provided by the OSI SAF, dated 02nd October 2015 with reference SAF/OSI/CDOP2/MF/MGT/ON/031 in which the objectives are recalled below:

2.1 Objectives

Objective 1: To assess the provided quality of the distributed products against the Service Specification.

- By assessing the Half Yearly operations Reports (HYR) against the service specification in relation to the quality of the distributed product, for the covered operational period.

Objective 2: Committed Services to Users : confirm that the committed Services were provided according to the Service Specifications (including requests for archived products).

- By assessing the Half Yearly Reports in relation to the Service Management aspects (user requests, tools, training, workshops, etc.) against the Service Specification.
- By assessing the requests / questions raised by the users in the User Service tools and the proposed answer.

Objective 3: Interfaces with EUMETSAT : confirm that Operations Interfaces have been performed in line with approved JOP/OICD, Operations Procedures and Operation Interface Specifications

- By assessing the Half Yearly Reports related to the operations activities and interfaces with other entities, or other inputs (mail exchanges between EUMETSAT and OSI SAF User service).

Objective 4: readiness for MSG-4 assessment : assess the readiness of the MSG-4 chain (in development) to start the initial reception and processing of the MSG-4 data at the engineering level.

2.2 Participants

- Review Board Membership (See Appendix A for details)
 - Giovanna De Chiara (ECMWF)
- EUMETSAT Secretariat Support
 - Cleber Balan
 - Carlos Vicente
 - Lothar Schüller
 - Julia Figa
 - Anne O'Carroll
- The OSI SAF Project Team will be represented throughout the review process by:
 - Cécile Hernandez, Météo-France, OSI SAF Project Manager,
 - Philippe Labrot, Météo-France, Météo-France local manager,
 - Steinar Eastwood, MET Norway, MET Norway local manager,
 - Anton Verhoef, KNMI, KNMI local manager,

- Eva Howe, DMI, DMI local manager.

2.3 Updated Documentation

The documentation was made accessible to the participants through the Web Rid Tool located in the URL (<http://saf.eumetsat.int/>) and the EUMETSAT ftp address accessible on: ftp://safrev:safrev@ftp.eumetsat.int/SAFOSI/CDOP2/OR11/OR11_Docs_Under_Review/.

2.4 Data Package

The input documents for this review are this Organisation Note and the Review Data Package which includes:

Document	Version	Acronym
Status of last Operation Reviews actions		
Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014	1.0	HYR14-2
Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015	1.0	HYR15-1

Table 1: Documents Under Review

Exchanges (problems / questions / issues) between users and User Service if any are included in the Half Yearly Reports.

The reviewers are also invited to access the OSI SAF web site: <http://www.osi-saf.org/index.php>.

The following documentation will be provided for information on:

ftp://safrev:safrev@ftp.eumetsat.int/SAFOSI/CDOP2/OR11/OR11_Ref_Docs/

Document	Version	Acronym
CDOP2 OSI SAF Service Specification	2.5	SeSp
OR 10 meeting minutes	1A	OR10 minutes
CDOP2 Configuration Management Plan	1.1	CMP
Joint Operation Procedures and Interface Control Document	8B	JOP/OICD
Definition of Product Status Categories	1A	
RID Tool User Manual		

Table 2: Reference Documentation

Products Manuals (listed below) of products currently in the OSI SAF portfolio are available on <http://www.osi-saf.org/biblio/bibliotheque.php>.

Document	Version	Date
Ascat Product Manual (OSI-102, OSI-102-b, OSI-103, OSI-104, OSI-	1.13	May 2013

Document	Version	Date
104-b)		
Oceansat-2 Wind Product User Manual (OSI-105)	1.3	May 2013
RapidScat Wind Product User Manual (OSI-109)	1.1	March 2015
Low Earth Orbiter Sea Surface Temperature Product User Manual (OSI-201, OSI-202, OSI-204, OSI-208)	2.7	November 2014
Atlantic High Latitude L3 Sea Surface Temperature Product User Manual (OSI-203)	2.1	November 2011
Geostationary Sea Surface Temperature Product User Manual (OSI-206, OSI-207)	1.3	October 2013
Atlantic High Latitude Radiative Fluxes Product User Manual (OSI-301, OSI-302)	1.2	September 2014
Geostationary Radiative Flux Product User Manual (OSI-303, OSI-304, OSI-305, OSI-306)	1.3	April 2013
Global Sea Ice Concentration Product User Manual (OSI-401-b)	1.0	April 2015
Global Sea Ice Edge and Type Product User Manual (OSI-402-b, OSI-403-b)	1.1	April 2015
50GHz Sea Ice Emissivity Product User Manual (OSI-404)	1.3	September 2013
Low Resolution Sea Ice Drift Product User Manual (OSI-405-b)	1.7	March 2015
Medium Resolution Sea Ice Drift Product User Manual (OSI-407)	1.3	December 2013
Global Sea Ice Concentration Reprocessing Product User Manual (OSI-409, OSI-409-a, OSI-430)	2.1	July 2015
Sea Ice Product Manual (OSI-401-a, OSI-402-a, OSI-403-a)	3.11	September 2014

Table 3: Product Manuals

2.5 Schedule

Event/phase	Date/period
Review Data Package procurement	
Documentation available	6 October 2015
Review preparation	
Reviewers' analysis and RID submission	up to the 16 October 2015 (included)
Project team answers	up to the 27 October 2015 (included)
Review	
Operations review at KNMI, Utrechtseweg 297 3731 GA De Bilt, the Netherlands	3 November 2015 (start at 9:00 am)

Finalisation of Meeting Minutes	4 November 2015 morning (start at 9:00 am)
Review process conclusion	
Presentation to Steering Group	4 November 2015 afternoon (TBC)

Table 4: Review Schedule

2.5.1 Status of actions and recommendation from previous ORs

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-7-Action-04	IFREMER to clarify if the use of NAIAD is reported from the FTP statistics provided in the Operation Reports.	Ifremer	Not done yet.	Management issue : raise to Sg that the interface with PT and IFREMER are not providing any monitoring. There is only one IFREMER point of contact which does not have delegate when away.	Done in HYR 2015-1	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-7-Action-07	Using day time drifting buoys measurement at high latitude for global SST. The action OR 6 Action 11 was to investigate the possibility to use day time drifting buoys measurement at high latitude for global SST and document it in quarterly reports. Project Team recognized that this should be useful but cannot be done as a priority. The Board reiterates that this activity be performed, either via a Visiting Scientists activity or during CDOP 2. It is however also recalled that it has been done for HL (see validation rep p 7 to 11 of OSI 203 of April 2011, doc MET-Norway /TEC/RT/117), but this action OR 6 action 11, renamed OR 7 action 7 concerns the validation of the Global Metop SST product at high latitudes (standard procedure is to use night time data in validation but at high latitude during summer there is no night due to midnight sun conditions).	MF	Will be done from next HYR (2014-2)	open	Done in HYR 2014-2	Action Closed.
OR-8-Action-03	Information from NAIAD users. To assess the possibility to provide information on OSI SAF products provided to users via NAIAD.	Ifremer	Not done yet	see action 4 OR 7 Remains open since different issue as action 4 OR 7	If users download a product, it is reported in the Ifremer FTP server statistics.	Action Closed.
OR-8-Action-05	Units in table 1. PT to add units in the table (for example table 11 and 12 in QR 113) when there are only percentage and to add the bias and std deviation	MET Norway + DMI		done for SSI, open for sea ice	Done	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-8-Action-08	Buoy comparisons for ASCAT coastal product in 2010. Investigate / clarify the different v component standard deviation in fig. 52 occurring in December 2010 (if not requiring too much effort).	KNMI	Not done yet. Will do so in HYR 2014-2	add the disclaimer in next report, e.g. Indicate that the statistics depends on the number of buoys used.	Done. 'Note also that the statistics as shown for the different ASCAT products are not from a common set of buoy measurements. So the number of scat/buoy collocations differs per product, in some cases we do have an ASCAT coastal wind but no 12.5 km or 25 km wind due to (small) differences in quality control. This sampling issue gives rise to different bias and standard deviation scores in the plots below.'	Clarified, Action Closed.
OR-8-Action-32	Valid users. PM to check the users list, and to remove from the list all users with a non valid mail address.	PM	Not done yet.	Send an e mail to all users to find out which e mail address are not valid. That would at least detect the non-valid users.	E-mail sent on the 01 December 2014 -> 144 e-mails in error	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-9-Action-05	Sea Ice Concentration data set (product OSI-409): MET Norway to contact EUMETSAT to verify the proper recognition of this reprocessed dataset in the Product Navigator.	MET Norway	11/09/2014 Steinar Eastwood : can the data set be recognized in the Product Navigator without being in the Data Center? 11/09/2014 Frederic Gasiglia : I believe that we could do that. We could try also to ingest these 20 years Data Set directly in the Data Denter, Cleber will be in touch with you to confirm this.	Mail 27-10-2014: Hello Dominique, This approach has been analysed by OPS and it could be implemented via the PN without the Data Center Ingestion as a first step as suggested in the OR 9 action 05. So it will be done for November this year, as input we need the hyperlink of the MET No in which the Data could be ordered via their site. Cleber OR 10 action 1: PT to contact EUM (Cleber / Frédéric for addressing the issue.	See action OR-10-Action-1.	Closed (see discussion below)

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-9-Action-20	To present the new service messages (service desk) at next OR.	MET Norway + DMI	Plans being discussed internally at MET Norway	on going. MET Norway indicated that the service message organisation is being modified. The announcement on incident will be coming from the service desk. It should be in place early 2015. See presentation in annex 5 a	Closed with the presentation provided in OR10. The implementation has been delayed due to other tasks have taken all the available persons. The plan is now to have this in place at MET Norway early 2016.	On-going

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
<p>OR-9-Action-26</p>	<p>To set up a VSA to compare OSI SAF ice concentration products with the products from other organizations (e.g. NSIDC).</p>	<p>MET Norway</p>	<p>Proposal for AS/VS for Ice GMPE currently being drafted together with David Poulter</p>	<p>open</p>	<p>OSI_AVS15_01 (Comparison of OSI SAF and other available Sea Ice Concentration and Edge Products) is ongoing. Associated VS activity by David Poulter (Pelamis Scientific Software Ltd), coordinated by MET Norway. The kick-off meeting took place at MET Norway on 25-26 March 2015. Some delays are expected due to other commitments of David Poulter in the ESA Felyx project. (Action Closed)</p>	<p>Action Closed.</p>

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-1	Origine: OR-9-Action-05: Sea Ice Concentration data set (product OSI-409): MET Norway to contact EUMETSAT to verify the proper recognition of this reprocessed dataset in the Product Navigator. PT to contact EUMETSAT to ensure that the link to the met Norway web site is identified in the Product navigator to enable user to access it, and to ensure that the dataset is then also available in UMARF	MET Norway			Currently communicating with EUMETSAT on how to best handle this.	On-going
OR-10-Action-2	(OBJ_AOC_02_MF) provide further explanations on regional bias in next HYR (improve the legend related to figures such as fig 45)	MF			Done in HYR 2015-1	Action Closed
OR-10-Action-3	OBJ_DF_03_MF ; Obj1_ackermann_12_KNMI, OBJ1_LC_02_MET.no; OBJ_LSc_29_PM - provide updated SeSp an PRD to SG for endorsement, and check what is in the SeSp and update if necessary, by removing product which are not in operations)	KNMI			Done. Corrected in SeSp 2.3 and PRD 3.0	Action Closed
OR-10-Action-4	OBJ_DF_08_MF - PT to investigate why the NOAA-19 NAR SST validation in JUNE 2013 positive bias is different of other months. Nota: if this is a one off, do not spend too much time on it.	MF			NPP sees that positive bias too. Action can be closed.	Action Closed
OR-10-Action-5	Obj1_ackermann_09_MET.no - Independent document/report listing the available stations to be provided for next OR	MET Norway			Ongoing, the report is expected to be ready before OR-11.	Report delivered to reviewer. Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-6	Obj1_ackermann_11_MET.no - The comments to the validation results for the ice concentration product should have been referencing to figure 54 (NH) and figure 58 (Southern Hemisphere). since the comment is erroneous, update the Ops Report and provide it to SG	MET Norway			Done. HYR14-1 provided to SG by e-mail on the 04/12/2014. Action can be closed.	Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-7	OBJ2_LC_03_PM - Add in the central web site menu a line regarding training, which could identify the material which has been made, a link to other framework where such training information is available, etc.: report on progress of work at next OR.	PM			Ongoing. An evolution of the website in preparation. This new version will contain a training section.	On-going
OR-10-Action-8	OBJ2_LC_04_PM - To be re-assessed at next OR the FTP sites statistics homogeneity	PT and PM			Done	FTP sites statistics homogeneity has been verified in the report. Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-9	OBJ_LSc_01_PM - add the data record on the first page , for the time being. (another solution should be found when there will be several data records). Discontinued products associated with the phase should be also identified. See also rid <filename>:=OBJ_LSc_07_PM	PM			Done for Sea ice Concentration, OSI-151 to be added when released	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-10	OBJ_LSc_05_PM - PT to assess what could be feasible to ensure that the last 6 months (for example) service messages are visible on the web site. To implement a solution if feasible within present resources availability. Nota: PT can also propose / implement other solution.	PM			Done. Implemented . Services messages from 2 last years are presented in the web site.	Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-11	OBJ_LSc_08_PM - PT can have a consistent approach for PUM, ATBD and Validation report for products availability in the web site. (due date: next OR) For other documents (such as VS report) it is left to the PT consideration whether the document should be available or not on the web site (there could be report that the SAF PM may not agree to see available to external people)	PM			Ongoing. It has been decided to have the product documentation on thematic web sites only and top-level documentation on central web site. Central web site may gather links to thematic web pages.	On-going
OR-10-Action-12	OBJ_LSc_09_PM - the issue concerned discontinued product, for example, where the associated documentation should also be made available. To draw user attention on the issue, in the web page documents section, add a sentence indicating that former versions of the documentation is available.	PM			Done.	Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-13	OBJ_LSc_10_PM - ensure that there is only one link to one repository for the web site access to documents (consistency between web sites). (due date: next OR)	PM			Ongoing (Invariable links for WIND and LML web sites are set)	On going

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-14	OBJ_LSc_11_PM – PT to try to get PO DAAC to implement: · Harmonisation of the presentation and naming of all OSI SAF products in PO.DAAC would be appreciated,	PM KNMI MF			Ongoing	On-going
OR-10-Action-15	OBJ_LSc_13_MF - add some text / clarification on the next HYR if there is a problem on the map	MF			Done in HYR 2015-1	Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-16	OBJ_LSc_16_MET.no - (HR14-1): Section 5.2.1.2: In the "Comments" the PT announced further validation results documented in a separate report, addressing the non-compliance with the service specification in some months and for the Hopen station report to be provided at next Operation Review, and include a link in the OPS report (it will be also announced via the messages / news system): due date: next OR	MET Norway			the report is expected to be ready before OR-11.	Closed with provided report.
OR-10-Action-17	OBJ_LSc_19_MET.no - clarify in the ops report what is meant with this “yearly averaged Standard deviation” in table in ops report section 5.3.1.	DMI			Done	Action Closed
OR-10-Action-18	OBJ_LSc_20_MET.no - update the OPS report template to add a clear statement on the results and the applicable SeSp requirement	MET Norway			Done	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-19	OBJ_LSc_22_MET.no - SH product type only contains the class "Ambiguous find out if there are any users (workshop, other). Clarify the approach for this Sea Ice type over Antarctic.	MET Norway			Discussed at last sea ice review with Eero Rinne (FMI) stating the usefulness of providing the product over southern hemisphere. We have proposed an activity on this in CDOP-3. At present the SH ice type product file is delivered only for consistency.	Action Closed.
OR-10-Action-20	OBJ_LSc_23_MET.no - in table table 25 , for next ops report, update the table with respect to relation with SeSp-	MET Norway			Done	Action closed.
OR-10-Action-21	OBJ_LSc_25_MET.no - Product 405 is not monitored and PT does not provide the quality for the last period. PT indicates that they are reconstructing the all set up. Monitoring should be re-started early 2015. To be reviewed at next OR (a priori only a 6 month monitoring would be provided).	DMI			Product to consider is OSI-407 (medium resolution sea ice drift) not OSI-405 (low resolution). The product is included in HYR 2015-1st half and are monitored.	Action Closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-22	Obj1_ackermann_04_MF - b) Assess the possibility of adding a map indicating the number of buoys available in each box	MF			Adding a map will make the document heavy, we prefer to add the minimum of buoys in each box.	Action closed.
OR-10-Action-23	Obj1_ackermann_07_MF - add a few sentences on why classical seasonal effects have an impact on the quality assessment.	MF			Done	Action closed.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-10-Action-24	Action OR-8-Action-22 has been replaced by this action: status of wind dataset in Naiad to be clarified by PT (the product temporal coverage should be clearly in line with the SeSp). The Report should only identify the users / usage of these data. See also action 4 OR 7	Ifremer			The availability of wind dataset in Naiad is not mandatory, and in any event cannot meet the timeliness. Proposal : remove Naiad from the table in SeSp and indicate outside the table that the products can be visualised in a friendly interface with a different timeliness.	A sentence shall be added into the SeSp indicating that the timeliness requirement is only applicable with EUMETCast and FTP dissemination means. Action On-going.

OSI SAF Board Report for the OR-11

Reference	Description	Responsibility	01/10/2014 Status	28/10/2014 Board decision/ Status at OR10	Current Status	11/2015 Board decision/ Status at OR11
OR-11-Action-01	After an FTP outage, how to send products to the archive but not to EumetCast ? OSI SAF to strive an update on the JOP/OICD with EUMETSAT describing the procedure on what to be done in case of EUMETCast / FTP outage.	EUMETSAT Secretariat	Asked to Harlad Rothfuss, Michael Schick on 17/12/2014 22/01/2015 : Frédéric Gasiglia told OSISAF this could be resolved by adding a filter on the file date to avoid dissemination by EUMETCast of an old product (Planned in April/May with MMS migration)		Wait for EUMETSAT operations team to configure the forwarding to EUMETCast in such a way, that data older than a cut off date (based on the timestamp in the filename) will be ignored. Then the backlog data can be sent to the same operational directory. This will be available in approximately at the end of 2015	On-going.

2.5.2 Assessment of RIDs and project team answers

The Board have identified several issues (Review Item Discrepancy - RID) prior to the review, which the Project Team answered (see Appendix B).

The Review Board also addressed two other major points not related to any RIDs but that deserved some attention:

- 1-Systematic false ice in lakes identified in the Sea Ice Concentration product (OSI-401-b)

Information to the SG 01: The Sea Ice Concentration (OSI-401-b) product was supposed to be released within the next weeks but an issue related to the systematic false ice in lakes was identified having its release being postponed. It has been confirmed that although this product is disseminated operationally it is **not considered as a qualified “operational” product**. It has been noted that the treatment for lakes is working for (OSI-401-a) and the PT expects to implement it for (OSI-401-b) as well.

The board agrees that a new ATBD shall be delivered and an inspection over lakes performed. The result of this inspection shall be included in the Validation Report (to be provided on a dedicated delta ORR before mid January 2016).

It is expected that the switch from OSI-401-a to OSI-401-b will take place on the 26 January 2016 and the PT plans to have a delta ORR for OSI-401-b before mid January 2016.

- 2-Medium Resolution Sea Ice drift archiving interface problem.

Recommendation 01 to SG: The Medium Resolution Sea ice drift product is being distributed since 2013 but unfortunately a problem due to a mismatch of the acronym information on the EUMETSAT Data Centre internal document (UMARF OICD) prevented this product to be archived after EUMETCast dissemination. It has been noted that the processes for dissemination and archiving of new products are not described at an adequate level in the JOP/OICD.

The Review Board recommends to the SG to task the PT to initiate a discussion with EUMETSAT Data Centre responsible and document these missing processes.

Metadata Validation

It has been agreed that a “quality check” over the OSI SAF products metadata sent to EUMETSAT Data centre shall be performed avoiding products to be discarded due to invalid XML metadata files (see action 15 below).

3 CONCLUSION

The Board thanks the Project Team for its steady support during the review process.

Regarding “*Objective 1: To assess the provided quality of the distributed products against the Service Specification*”; the RB did find the OSI SAF products and specification largely complies with the Service Specification.

This objective has been considered successfully achieved with the provision of the documentation implementing the RIDs comments (see dispositions in Appendix B).

Regarding “*Objective 2: Committed Services to Users: confirm that the committed Services were provided according to the Service Specifications (including requests for archived products)*.”; the board did not detect any major deviations of the OSI SAF services provided in the reporting period against the Service Specification and thus confirms OSI SAF operations largely compliant with its operational commitments.

Regarding “*Objective 3: Interfaces with EUMETSAT : confirm that Operations Interfaces have been performed in line with approved JOP/OICD, Operations Procedures and Operation Interface Specifications.*”; the board identified a recommendation concerning the JOP/OICD update.

Recommendation 01 to SG: The Medium Resolution Sea ice drift product is being distributed since 2013 but unfortunately a problem related to a mismatch acronym information on the EUMETSAT Data Centre internal document (UMARF OICD) prevented this product to be archived after EUMETCast dissemination. It has been noted that the processes for dissemination and archiving of new products are not described at an adequate level in the JOP/OICD.

The Review Board recommends to the SG to task the PT to initiate a discussion with EUMETSAT Data Centre responsible and document these missing processes.

Regarding “*Objective 4: readiness for MSG-4 assessment: assess the readiness of the MSG-4 chain (in development) to start the initial reception and processing of the MSG-4 data at the engineering level*”; The PT confirms that the tests are being performed until 26 November 2015. It has been noted that the engineering test report will be provided in the beginning of December 2015 to demonstrate the readiness of the chain to receive and process MSG-4 data.

Actions identified during this Operations Review 9 Process

<u>Action</u>	<u>Actionnee</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	<u>Related RID</u>
002	PT	See also OR-10-Action-12. PT to ensure that the user documentation applicable to older product versions is made accessible without the need of the helpdesk. The suggestion is to use a ftp directory with the relevant historical versions of the user documentation (PUM, VR, ATBD) or to provide	OR 2016	=

		links to them e.g in the winds product "modification/anomalies list" or service messages.		
003	PT	For future reports, PT to add wind comparison with number of buoys used in the statistic (half yearly report).	OR 2016	<u>002</u>
004	PT	PT to provide in the next OR (2016) statistics about the central web site usage. PT has chosen to use PIWIK.	OR 2016	<u>010</u>
005	PT	PT to include maps of the number of contributing pixels (Number of bouys in box). To be checked in the next OR.	OR 2016	<u>007</u>
006	PT	PT to ensure consistence terminology on validation input frequency and resolving the ambiguous "bi-weekly" in the next report.	OR 2016	<u>023</u>
007	PT	PT to include in the next Report a sentence explaining the difference between 2h and 3h rapidscat availability.	OR 2016	<u>017</u>
008	PT	a) PT to revise the information contained in the FAQ section cleaning up the outdated information and adding new relevant information.	OR 2016	<u>014</u>
		b) PT to assess the implication of implementing a forum in the future.		
009	PT	PT to strive for a self explaining text on each page with the explanation of each acronym.	OR 2016	<u>015</u>
010	PT	PT to harmonize the approach on sending news and service messages to the users and report to the next OR.	OR 2016	<u>016</u>
011	PT	PT to negotiate with EUM operations the possibility to send after outage situations (e.g. SSMIS) input data to the OSI for further production yet in the OSI SAF timeliness. The outcome of this negotiation should be reflected in the JOP/OICD.	OR 2016	<u>024</u>
		PT to:		
		a) clearly distinguish the categories for product status (operational, pre-operational, in development, discontinued, released) and categories for service availability statuses.		
012	PT	b) strive to have a same approach for all osi saf subsystems and	OR 2016	<u>020</u>
		c) consider the implemented EUMETSAT web site "OSSI" system indicators.		
		d) consider forwarding the NASA planned outages and manouvers to EUMETSAT (with a link) as a service message.		
013	PT	PT to add some more info about the products already in the acronyms list under 'Current near real time production at a glance'.	OR 2016	<u>003</u>
014	PT	PT to ensure that the outcome of future user workshops are summarized in workshop reports and made available to the users.	PP CDOP-3	<u>013</u>
015	PT	PT to create and implement a mechanism for validating the metadata (XML) sent to the EUMETSAT Data Centre	OR 2016	-

APPENDIX A OSI SAF OR-11 REVIEWER'S DIRECTORY**Dr. Giovanna De Chiara**

Marine Prediction Section

European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Shinfield Park, Reading RG2 9AX, UK

Tel: +44-118-9499707

Fax: +44-118-9869450

e-mail: Giovanna.DeChiara@ecmwf.int

APPENDIX B RID TRACKING LIST FOR REVIEW BOARD PROCESS

**OSI SAF
Operations Review 11**

**Review Items Discrepancies (RIDs)
Tracking List
for Review Board Process****RB Decisions (codes)**


- **W** Withdrawn The RID is withdrawn by the Author, on the basis of additional information/clarifications provided.
- **C** Closed by answer RID Closed by Discussion, having the Project Team provided sufficient evidence on the adequacy of the provided information.
- **CR** Closed by Reference The RID disposition is provided in the referred other RID.
- **DU** Document Update The affected Document must be updated/modified as agreed or as a result of a recommendation approved by SG.
- **CA** Closed with Action An action is agreed to address the detected problem. Actions can be Urgent (U) or Normal Work (N).
- **SG** To the SG for decision No Agreement is reached on the implementation of RID recommendation. A Steering Group decision is required. Or the RID is passed to the SG for Information/Evaluation.


RIDS Categories

- Major
- Minor
- Editorial

Note: for the Close-out Date for dispositioned RIDs
see General Comments/Recommendations of the RB Report

RIDs Tracking List (sorted by document)

Date & Time Size	RID Title	Problem Description
Filename	Category Identification	Recommended Solution
	Reviewer	
	Document Title	
	Problem Identification	
	Page (Only if local problem)	
	Section (Only if local problem) 	

	Paragraph (Only if local problem) 		
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:20</p> <p>File Size: 3358</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2014_S2_Ocarroll_005.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Include IASI SST in summary</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Anne Ocarroll</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 13</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem): 5.1</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem): 2</p>	<p>Problem Description: IASI SST missing from list of polar SSTs.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please include IASI SST.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R since HYF template s released to</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:24</p> <p>File Size: 5005</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2014_S2_Ocarroll_007.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Undetected cloud affecting SST biases</p> <p>Category</p>	<p>Problem Description: The text explains that undetected cloud and fewer drifters in a box causes a larger cool bias for day-time AVHRR in the East Equatorial Pacific.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Has further stringent cloud quality control been applied to identify anomalous pixels such as the use of robust or 3-sigma statistics to remove</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R observatio methodolo</p>

	<p>Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Anne Ocarroll</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 38</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):5.1.4</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):Comments</p>	<p>outliers? Availability of the maps with the number of contributing pixels would also contribute to the explanation. There are other instances through both reports where undetected cloud is an explanation for cool biases in the SST products (e.g. page 44 of the 2015 report). It would be useful to include methodology to assess this further, to further understand the biases known to not be affected by undetected cloud.</p>	<p>the global to identify number of of the HY methodology products. In HYR20 number of we do not future, we standard d</p> <p>Reviewer maps will</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 12: 35</p> <p>File Size: 4556</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2014_S2_Ocarroll_008.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Explanation of cool biases in AHL</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Anne Ocarroll</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p>	<p>Problem Description: The cool biases of the AHL products against in situ are explained in this section.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please expand the text to explain why the standard deviations are not meeting the requirements during the summer months. The cool biases are consistently quite large, even for those months that are likely to have slightly better cloud screening (day-time, not winter). Please comment if this is expected to continue, or if there are plans to improve these biases through correction or retrieval updates. What are the accompanying SSES biases for these data, do these correct for the biases?</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R are outside masking. To improve w cloud and the AHL S</p> <p>The split b 12-hourly nighttime</p>

	<p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 44</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):5.1.5</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):Comments</p>		available o observatio Reviewer text in the
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:36</p> <p>File Size: 3563</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2014_S2_Ocarroll_009.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Reference source not found</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Anne Ocarroll</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 58</p> <p>Section (Only if local</p>	<p>Problem Description: Reference source not found.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please update.</p>	 Institute o Author R Use of mu the input f After som better tool HYR temp A new ver Reviewer

	<p>problem):5.3.1</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem): Last paragraph</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:13</p> <p>File Size: 3429</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2014_S2_Secretariat_021.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Negative Standard Deviation Margin</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: I'm assuming that the products with negative Standard Deviation margin still distributed to the users. Does the product provide enough information enabling the user to assess the quality of the data provided.</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>HYR and products.</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 11:52</p> <p>File Size: 3873</p>	<p>RID Title:Wind comparison with buoys</p> <p>Category</p>	<p>Problem Description: Can you please specify if the number of buoys used for the validation is changing in time quite a lot? I am thinking to the reduced number of TAO buoys in 2013 and 2014.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>number of</p>

OBJ1_OR2015_S1_deChiara_002.txt	<p>Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>[This is a comment valid also for Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014]</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>each year:</p> <p>2008 138</p> <p>2009 130</p> <p>2010 133</p> <p>2011 131</p> <p>2012 118</p> <p>2013 109</p> <p>2014 104</p> <p>2015 127</p> <p>The reduc extra plot componen</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 11:53</p> <p>File Size: 3110</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_deChiara_004.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: font size paragraphs</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p>	<p>Problem Description: Paragraphs 5.2 numbering have quite big font size</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 11:54</p> <p>File Size: 3314</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_deChiara_006.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:typos</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if</p>	<p>Problem Description: Paragraphs 5.2.2.2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) assessment of the AHL SSI and DLI product --> products 2) this station will be unavailable for som period --> some periods 3) There is some difference --> there are some differences <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>HYR14-2</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

<p>Date: Nov 3 11:56</p> <p>File Size: 3569</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_deChiara_012.txt</p>	<p>local problem):</p> <p>RID Title:Statistics</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: For scatterometer products, any plan to add maps with the bias and standard deviation statistics?</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>standard d</p> <p>model) are</p> <p>http://nwp</p> <p>could add</p> <p>Reviewer</p> <p>page could</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:38</p> <p>File Size: 3739</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_Ocarroll_011.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: SST biases on North and West edges of NAR</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Anne Ocarroll</p>	<p>Problem Description: Figures 13 and 14 show some large biases on the North and West edges (also for figures 21 and 22).</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Although the monthly statistics are in requirements for these cases, please add an explanation to the text for the large biases in the maps for both day and night.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>22 (also vi</p> <p>processing</p> <p>(especially</p> <p>A few box</p> <p>clouds. Al</p>

	<p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 26</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):5.1.3.1</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		<p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:43</p> <p>File Size: 4825</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_023.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:twice a week / biweekly / bi-weekly?</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] I know I am being picky, but in British English the use of biweekly means twice a week, while everywhere else it means every 2 weeks, so it is a rather ambiguous term used in an international context such as the OSI SAF :-) I am getting a bit confused with your validation approach, particularly in paragraph 2 in section 5.3.1, where it gives the impression that the NH validation is twice a week and the SH validation is every two weeks, but then down in the first paragraph after table 16 you say 'bi-weekly' and mean (after checking the link you provide) twice a week.</p> <p>This issue comes up again several times through section 5 and it is not improved by the fact that in figure 46 caption you then mention a certain 'weekly DMI analysis'. I am sorry, I am sure it is all perfectly clear to you, but I can't say the same...</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify the validation approach and avoid for future reports the words biweekly or bi-weekly and use e.g. fortnightly (for every two weeks - I know it sounds posh, but at least it is unambiguous) or twice-weekly (for twice a week) - it will make the reading and understanding of your approach so much easier.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>to update t</p> <p>The valida</p> <p>available a</p> <p>where only</p> <p>The menti</p> <p>English. It</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>problem): 55</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem): 5</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:16</p> <p>File Size: 3446</p> <p>OBJ1_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_026.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Impact on Cloud Mask</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 13</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):Section 3.1</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: In case that a similar problem occurs with the reception of the data from the NWP nominal model, is there a way to avoid this problem to happen again?</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>responsibi</p> <p>However,</p> <p>processing</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:18</p> <p>File Size: 3891</p>	<p>RID Title:Identified unknown anomalies</p>	<p>Problem Description: I only see the description of the problems in this section. What were the corrective actions implemented? Was there an attempt to identify the root cause of the problems?</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p>

OBJ1_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_027.txt	<p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 13</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem): 3.2</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify.</p>	<p>In January due to bug These bug so the sam corrected i</p> <p>In March a Emissivity sometimes</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:33</p> <p>File Size: 4021</p> <p>OBJ2_OR2014_S2_Secretariat_024.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: Off line products generation</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014</p> <p>Problem</p>	<p>Problem Description: In the Comments section it is justified the EDC ingestion outage of products based on SSMIS data. Since the data to be ingested into the EDC is to be accessed as a off-line product by the user, couldn't the it be processed once the network problem was resolved?</p> <p>Recommended Solution: To be discussed, since as it is, this would imply disseminating an out of timeliness product through EUMETCast.</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R EUMETC an best-eff basis. This</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 93</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):6.3.2</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem): 1</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:00</p> <p>File Size: 4297</p> <p>OBJ2_OR2015_S1_deChiara_010.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: Web site statistics</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local</p>	<p>Problem Description: Are the statistics for the OSI SAF central website and KNMI scatterometer web page based on unique visitors as for OSI SAF Sea Ice Web? I think this is the best way to assess the evolution of the number of users accessing the different web pages.</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>are based o</p> <p>The statist</p> <p>group of v</p> <p>We are aw</p> <p>our point o</p> <p>For exampl</p> <p>As the the</p> <p>the choice</p> <p>For the ne</p> <p>analytics s</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 23:19</p> <p>File Size: 3738</p> <p>OBJ2_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_017.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:RapidScat product availability June 2015</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem): 9</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):Table 2</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] I was surprised to see the availability of the 3-h timeliness RapidScat products lower than the 2-h one for June 2015. How is this explained?</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>3-hours pr</p> <p>available v</p> <p>So the num</p> <p>number of</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:07</p>	<p>RID Title:Availability figures on ftp and</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JSF] It's good to see that all the products have excellent availability figures. However I noticed that for the SST products, availability is better</p>	<p>Institute of</p>

<p>File Size: 4439</p> <p>OBJ2_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_018.txt</p>	<p>EUMETCast</p> <p>Category</p> <p>Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):pages 9 and 11</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):Tables 2 and 3</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>on EUMETCast, while for the Sea Ice products availability is better on ftp, quite systematically from month to month. What is the reason? If understood, perhaps this would uncover issues in the data dissemination that could be addressed (priority configuration, bandwidth, server availability, 24x7 support, etc ...)- although the differences are indeed very small, just the 'systematic' aspect called my eye...</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify</p>	<p>Author R</p> <p>For sea ice accessibility are hosted data are fin by EUME processing For SST p accessibility This is reg</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 12:01</p> <p>File Size: 4069</p> <p>OBJ2_WEB_deChiara_001.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: NRT RapidSCAT Quicklooks</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p>	<p>Problem Description: I noticed that on the Scatterometer web page http://projects.knmi.nl/scatterometer/ascats_osi_25_prod/ascats_app.cgi?day=0&flag=yes only RapidScat 25km - 3hour products are available for Quicklook. I was expecting to find also RapidScat 25km - 2 hour products.</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>http://proj http://proj http://proj http://proj</p> <p>They are a</p>

	<p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		<p>not clear to and we wi</p> <p>Reviewer http://proj every time saw 3 of th</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 23:17</p> <p>File Size: 3721</p> <p>OBJ2 WEB deChiara 003.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Products name on the web page</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Giovanna deChiara</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification:Local</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: It would be more clear to have some more info about the products already in the acronyms list under 'Current near real time production at a glance'. For people like me, not familiar with SST and Radiative Fluxes products, names like NHL, NAR, AHL DLI, are not clear without going into the single web page including the description. It would be much easier to know already in the main page what those products contain.</p> <p>Recommended Solution:</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R implemen</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	Section (Only if local problem): Paragraph (Only if local problem):		
<p>Date: Nov 3 23:19</p> <p>File Size: 4566</p> <p>OBJ2_WEB_Secretariat_013.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: Outcome of user workshops</p> <p>Category Identification: Minor</p> <p>Reviewer: Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification: General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] This is more a suggestion than a RID: In the outcomes of the workshops, accessible through the main web site, I see the agenda, a link to all presentations (both very useful if you have attended the workshop) but I am missing a bit on the actual outcome, especially for the wider user community that might not have been there for many reasons. Yes, I see that the presentations used to trigger the discussion within the wrap-up sessions are there (at least for the 2014 mtg, which I had the pleasure to attend) but I remember there were a few additional interesting topics that came up during those final discussions that are not reflected, so I was wondering whether there are workshop reports and if so whether they could also be made available.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Consider sharing workshop reports with users through the web page, or workshop outcome highlights, as this gives good visibility to the user community as a whole on the project developments and is likely to trigger more user involvement in that development and in future workshops.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>the outcome</p> <p>To make t</p> <p>have uploa</p> <p>includes o</p> <p>I understa</p> <p>the web si</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 14:39</p> <p>File Size: 4833</p> <p>OBJ2_WEB_Secretariat_014.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: FAQ section</p> <p>Category Identification: Minor</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] I go through the FAQ section and I find very specific questions/answers. Some of them may have made sense to the specific user that raised them, and so I expect would the answer (hopefully :-). But I think that in a typical FAQ section, the usefulness of the information is precisely in generalisation of the answers to help the wider community of users, rather than a specific one. This is well achieved in some of the Q/A, e.g., nr. 1, but not so much in others, e.g. 6 or 2, where the Q is</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>answers ar</p> <p>A mechan</p> <p>item was c</p>

	<p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>referring to specific validation information (which other readers may not have or know of) and the A to other information that equally the reader may not have access too.</p> <p>Of course some other SAFs don't even have a FAQ page, so I think it is very good that you have one in the first place!</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Consider putting some limited but meaningful amount of effort in moderating the FAQ section to improve the usefulness of the entries for the wider user community.</p>	<p>An outcom forum cou The setup We are aw configure user name</p> <p>Reviewer</p>
<p>Date: Nov 3 14:44</p> <p>File Size: 3832</p> <p>OBJ2_WEB_Secretariat_015.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Acronyms</p> <p>Category Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] I could not find a table with acronyms - this could be really useful. For example, the CDOP acronym is user is several of the FAQ entries, but one has to dig into the project documentation to find what it means.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Consider adding to the main web site entry an acronym list with the most common terms used in the OSI SAF context, e.g., CDOP, SSI, DLI, SST, SSIST (you should find a better acronym for this... it sounds terrible in English, by the way), EUMETcast, EUMETSAT, METOP, AHL, etc</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>It is already</p> <p>It is not th evolve to S</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:04</p> <p>File Size: 5913</p> <p>OBJ2 WEB Secretariat 016.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Events vs. service messages</p> <p>Category Identification:Minor</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: [JFS] I saw among the service messages an announcement and a reminder of the scatterometer conference coming up in 2016 (by the way, thanks for spreading the news!). But I was wondering why this was not sent as an event. I think that messages like this should go to events, which do not need to be necessarily only OSI SAF events, but e.g. announcements of relevant meetings: GHRSSST, IOVWST, conferences and workshops of relevance to the users, etc...</p> <p>Another examples are several announcements of release new or updated sea ice data sets ice data sets, under service messages and under events too.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Explain what the criteria are to distinguish service and event messages and try to use consistently. If there is no difference, it might be best to just have one list only ...</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R Steering C</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Action OS News mes</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The answer</p> <p>-----</p> <p>A service messages A service problems EUMETS.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>A news is A event in in a servic Few of the are also re Outreach i announced</p>

			Service m the OSI S. ----- The answe used that v The distin about proc is for anyt Should we planned fo What is su web site (n now for se Reviewer
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:35</p> <p>File Size: 3928</p> <p>OBJ3 MAIL Secretariat_019.txt</p>	<p>RID Title: "Planned Events for week #" service messages</p> <p>Category</p> <p>Identification: Minor</p> <p>Reviewer: Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Exchanges (problems / questions / issues) between users and User Service</p>	<p>Problem Description: Some OSI service messages related to "Planned Events for week #", do not contain enough information.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: It would be helpful if the planned event could be specified on the Service Message or the direct link for the OSI SAF planned events webpage.</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>However, prepared w When som Some mes past and a regular n Addition registered</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	<p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 15:39</p> <p>File Size: 4124</p> <p>OBJ3 MAIL Secretariat 028.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:Anomaly #1112 (stamp error for OSISAF medium resolution ice drift product (OSI-407))</p> <p>Category Identification:Major</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title:Exchanges (problems / questions / issues) between users and User Service</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p>	<p>Problem Description: Despite this problem not being covered by this OR, it is important to understand what is the current status of the related fix? Has the data been fixed in the archive?</p> <p>Could this problem have happened to other products? was there an attempt to verify the other products?</p> <p>Is there a preventive action identified in order to avoid similar problem in the future?</p> <p>Recommended Solution: Please clarify.</p>	<p>Institute of</p> <p>Author R since Sept before the</p> <p>The bug w circumstan did not wo</p> <p>The other reports. St operationa</p> <p>Reviewer</p>

	Section (Only if local problem): Paragraph (Only if local problem):		
Date: Nov 3 15:40 File Size: 3583 OBJ3_OR2014_S2_Secretariat_022.txt	RID Title: Broken link Category Identification: Editorial Reviewer: Secretariat Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 2nd half 2014 Problem Identification: Local Page (Only if local problem): 58 Section (Only if local problem): 5.3.1 Paragraph (Only if local problem): 2	Problem Description: Broken link Recommended Solution:	Institute of Author R Use of mu the input f After some better tool HYR temp A new ver Reviewer
Date: Nov 3 15:40 File Size: 3218 OBJ3_OR2015_S1_Secretariat_025.txt	RID Title: Document ID incomplete in header Category	Problem Description: "SAF/OSI/CDOP2/M-F/TEC/RP/XXX" Starting on page 5-8. Recommended Solution:	Institute of Author R Reviewer

	<p>Identification:Editorial</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: Half Yearly Report for 1st half 2015</p> <p>Problem Identification:General</p> <p>Page (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Section (Only if local problem):</p> <p>Paragraph (Only if local problem):</p>		
<p>Date: Nov 3 16:06</p> <p>File Size: 4724</p> <p>OBJ3 WEB Secretariat 020.txt</p>	<p>RID Title:RAPIDSCAT products planned outages</p> <p>Category Identification:Major</p> <p>Reviewer:Secretariat</p> <p>Document Title: OSI SAF Web Site</p> <p>Problem</p>	<p>Problem Description: It has happened several times in the past where no RAPIDSCAT Winds products are received due to a planned outage, and the OSI SAF Web-page show the product as available.</p> <p>Recommended Solution: For the RAPIDSCAT products planned outages it would be helpful if a Service Message could be provided announcing the planned outage in advance.</p>	<p>Institute o</p> <p>Author R</p> <p>planning o</p> <p>JPL receiv</p> <p>outages in</p> <p>(http://pro</p> <p>However,</p> <p>correct. No</p> <p>'true' situa</p> <p>We curren</p> <p>notify the</p> <p>informatio</p> <p>We are op</p>

	Identification:General Page (Only if local problem): Section (Only if local problem): Paragraph (Only if local problem):		Reviewer

