

Skill Assessment
for
Coupled Biological/Physical Models
of
Marine Systems

Workshop 1 (11-13 July 2006) Summary
18 July 2006

Overview

The group convened 11 July 2006. The attendance list is posted on the project website¹.

The first 1.5 days were spent in plenary. The .ppts used and the 1-page summaries of each are posted on the website indicated below. They are password protected with the password to be distributed separately to project participants.

In the evening of Day 1 an informal discussion was held concerning prospects for a Model Intercomparison and Evaluation Project [MIEP]. That discussion continued throughout the workshop.

In the second day the group broke into pre-determined discussion groups:

- HAB
- Ecosystems and Fisheries
- Carbon Cycling
- Water Quality

Reports from these 4 groups are posted on the project website.

On the third morning the group assembled to consider 'cross-cutting issues' selected in plenary:

- Skill Metrics
- Data Assimilation
- Error Models
- Intercomparison Exercises

The group chose to continue the discussion on Skill Metrics in plenary. The group then broke into three parallel sessions. Reports from the 4 groups are on the website. The continuing coordinated activities are:

- a) Skill Metrics: There was wide concurrence on the need for a unifying group products, with Matlab and Fortran toolkits, bibliography, etc. Dennis McGillicuddy will focus this continued development.

¹ http://www-nml.dartmouth.edu/Publications/internal_reports/NML-06-Skill

This is the location for all project materials.

b) Data Assimilation: There was consensus on the need for a unifying group exposition of key concepts; yet details on how this would be carried forward remain to be resolved. Recent reviews by Robinson and Lermusiaux and by Hoffman and Friedrichs (The Sea, 2002) may have already achieved what is needed here; others are sought. Watson Gregg volunteered to initiate a draft for early distribution to the entire group with help from Alan Robinson, Marjy Friedrichs, Keith Thompson, Charlie Stock, and others.

c) Error Models: Consensus emerged that this item needed group clarification; that it overlaps with Data Assimilation needs; and that a single composite group (DA + Error Models) should carry this forward to the next workshop in the form of a single workshop document. The charge to Watson's group (above) is expanded accordingly.

d) Intercomparison Exercises: The report from this group is on the website. Additional activities would have to be explored before an exercise can be properly defined. The working group reports on this topic discuss issues and desirable attributes of such exercises; they may be shared in wider, project – oriented circles for implementation. Enrique Curchister will carry circulate some ideas in the USGLOBEC community and keep the present 'Skill' community informed.

Web Site

The existing web site has accumulated the following materials:

1. Plenaries
 - 1 Pagers
 - .ppt presentations
2. WG Reports
 - Carbon
 - HAB
 - Water Quality
 - Ecosystems and Fish
3. Cross-Cut Reports
 - Skill Metrics
 - Data Assimilation
 - Error Models
 - Model Intercomparisons
4. Intended Contributions to the Volume, at the close of the workshop – Titles and authors

These materials are for use of participants only; the intention is to improve the quality of the volume being assembled, by improving and facilitating communication. The .ppt and 1-page presentations will be password-protected to keep them among participants.

Schedule

The general schedule to project completion was discussed. Key target dates were established:

Journal Selection (editors)	1 September '06
Authors' Workshop 2:	1 March '07 (target date only)
External Peer Review of papers Begins	1 April '07
In print:	December '07

There was still discussion about the relative timing of the second workshop – whether it should be before or after the peer-review of manuscripts; and how to handle the synthesis of cross-cut reports/products into the front-matter of the volume, and their relation to the individual contributions. This was taken up later by the editors [see below].

Journal Candidates were identified. Both DSR II and JMS are acceptable to the group, with a general preference for JMS. Editors will act on that advice during the summer and negotiate with publishers.

The **Spring'07 Workshop Venue** was discussed. There was general agreement that the UNC venue had many positive attributes and could work again. Other options were discussed.

Final detailed schedule:

The editors met Friday 14 and considered schedule and expectations for the second workshop. A key concern is the coordination exhibited between individual papers and the front-matter synthesis of terminology. The revised plan below includes the following elements: (1) accelerated progress on cross-cutting topics (including terminology) so draft materials will be available to authors as they compose their individual manuscripts; (2) authors are expected to circulate (subject to editorial discretion) completed drafts of their individual manuscripts prior to the second workshop; (3) the primary goal of the second workshop is to synthesize and coordinate all of these contributions. This is a significant departure from the approach discussed at the meeting. However, the editors felt that this would ultimately yield a more coherent product than the original concept of internal review in distributed mode. The following schedule is recommended:

Cross-cut work products (DA, Skill Metrics) to be reported to editors and circulated to all; editors to begin synthesis of same. **1 Nov '06**

Editors complete 1st draft of front-matter synthesis and distribute same to workshop participants. **1 Feb '07**

Authors complete 1st draft of individual papers; editors to post these to website (password-protected) unless authors request otherwise. **15 Feb '07**

Authors' Workshop 2: (**target date only; logistics being investigated**) **1 March '07**

Final papers complete and submitted to editors for review **1 April '07**

External Peer Review of papers begins **1 April '07**

It is not possible to project a printed outcome in '07 under this schedule. A more reasonable expectation lies in '08. The reasons are twofold: a) we are talking about the whole volume as a single unit, hence the slowest case governs; and b) credible review plans must accommodate the likely iteration through extra or second reviews and the substantive response to same – for at least a few contributions. Editors and ultimate publisher need to be realistic about this and reserve enough discretionary time to achieve the goal. We can and should strive to beat this projection.

End of Friday editors' recap.