

# Minutes: VALUE General Assembly Athens

RENATE WILCKE

25.09.2014

## Terms and conditions

### Acknowledge data set

Heike Can we have a DOI for the VALUE data sets as a permanent identifier to cite?

Douglas Why not acknowledge the names of the data providers directly? Like having a table in the terms of conditions.

Sven List would be really long, maybe to complicated

Alrun Automatic, after putting in metadata the “ready” sentence for the user comes out.

Sven Should we force people to cite the framework people?

Douglas Yes

Heike Formulate it a bit softer, more polite.

Martin Do we flag the measures we do not calculate?

Douglas Maybe having a footnote.

## Minimum number of stations

Douglas Suggesting 5 minimum station, if someone can only focus on one specific region (as method might be too costly) of which at least one is a **defined common station**. So we would have 1 fixed station for each region.

José We have 8 different types of climates in Europe. 1 station for each climate type.

Douglas **You have to select one of the 8 focus stations, and at least downscale 5 stations.**

José Why the 5 minimum? One should downscale as many reference stations (of 8) as possible. The point is to be comparable with others.

Douglas Defined and acknowledged: **Requirement: 1 reference station**

## **Reclaimer**

Jens At some stage someone will want to make money out of VALUE. If we want to avoid that we need to have a statement like in ENSEMBLES... minimum, if it is public used we need an acknowledgement. We need the word “commercial” in the terms and conditions, to show that we have thought about it.

Eli If we don't have commercial use allowed, we would cut off a lot of end-users

Alrun There might not be so much interest in selling validation results.

Heike If it is already publically available, then it is like that already. We should not disclosing good results.

Martin We do have data also, not only validation, so there might be some value in our results to be sold.

Douglas Downscaled data and validation results should be able use for commercial use as well.

Douglas Predictant data (only members?), raw downscaled and validation (all free)

Christian We need to check what the license for derived products says.

Douglas We will ask for a statement from each data provider

Christian Acknowledgement of observation data

## **Third category between public and non-public data**

Douglas Tickable box for available only for VALUE

José Separating VALUE and non-VALUE members

Heike There is no point in it as everyone can join VALUE.

José Data provider (VALUE) will be informed if their data is used

Douglas We could do that in a newsletter

Heike Would you state your intention about writing a paper? Why not just write an email to let them know that you will use the data

### **Laying open metadata**

(suggestion of Richard)

Heike You might not want to have your method reproducible, as you sell your method otherwise. So it can be not applied here.

Douglas I don't like it. :) Science should be open, and research should be open. Reproducibility should be provided, as a fundament of science.

Yunichi Isn't the publication good enough

Martin Publication is not enough as they don't write details

Rasmus Even if you have a magical method, it is not science, if nobody can use it. If results are so dependent on a method, and secret, then maybe the method is not robust.

Ole As a developer you should have the advantage to exclusively publish on the method for a couple of years.

Douglas There is a difference between RCMs and statistical downscaling. The code of the RCMs doesn't need to be reproducible for us, but the code of the SD method.

José We shouldn't force people to give away the code, as we would lose a lot of groups.

Alrun People will want to validate their model before publishing, so they won't want to public the method with the validation.

Neyko Algorithm should be available, but one shouldn't have to give the tricks away.

Martin Being practible and stating clearly that we violate the fundamental thoughts of good science.

Douglas We would at least get methods validated

- Vote for being pragmatic
- It is about metadata, which should be clear and detailed. not about published code.

## Portal and data

(José) Status of missing stations. Stations in Norway and Sweden are added. France is coming, Hungary under discussion as data goes so far only till 2000. Poland without stations (only gridded). Now we have about 80 stations, will be about 100. Now we need to decrease number of stations to 50, with considering all 8 climate types, all altitudes, land, island... exclude redundant station types.

## Pseudo reality

### experiment 2.1 (for being more robust)

Pedro, Sven, Martin More GCMs than RCMs would be important to cover the range of large-scale responses,

Douglas More RCMs than GCMs as we want to have a more robust decision

- **decision:** 3 GCMs, 5 RCMs so we get 5 runs in total

### experiment 2.2

Models to be used: (GCM) MPIr1 + RCMs and (GCM) CNRMr1 + RCMs

### experiment 2.3

Models to be used: (RCM) RCA + 5 GCMs

## CORDEX-ESD, NCPP, EURO-CORDEX, beyond VALUE (report and discussion)

### CORDEX-ESD

(Douglas)

- 3 workshops (Trieste Nov 2013, July 2014, May 2015 Capetown) WCRP
- Development of **open** downscaling validation exp for two example regions (La Plata basin and Southern Africa)
- Bruce, Bill Gutowski, Rasmus, Maria Laura Bettolli, Chris Jack, Douglas
- Trying to keep VALUE consistent with CORDEX ESD

## **NCPP**

- Metadata: Sticking close to NCPP and CORDEX-ESD
- (Christian) Methods described with the metadata

## **EURO-CORDEX**

- Creating something like CORDEX-ESD in EURO-CORDEX?
- For now, just sticking with VALUE until we published some papers, then talking with EURO-CORDEX people.

## **Future of portal**

Santander group will maintain the portal until in 2 years. What about in 5 or 10 years? VALUE member will stay members of the portal, but portal will be kind of open to join for everyone.

## **post VALUE activities**

### **Workshop 2015:**

- How can we further exploit the results of VALUE?
- What are the most urgent issues in the current climate change research?
- To continue VALUE work, we need to find funding
- Framework/portal will be open to whole community (after VALUE).

### **brainstorming:**

Andreas Apply all downscaled data to impact models, in a coordinated and systematic way. (Supported by Christoph) climate impact interface

Heike, Rasmus Statisticians might have a different view on “our” problems and bridging gaps. There are three types of data: rational number, categorical, count. Asking the right questions! What users need?

Ole We should not be precise about methods, but also regions/segments ... for the impact modellers, economists. Like using our focus regions, to use the expertise on that.

Martin We should work on facts not only on methods, like all the assumption we are using in regional modelling.

Jens Communication is the most important issue, how to communicate to policymakers. It is a scientific question/problem.

## Workshops this year

- GCM-biases (Hamburg, October 2014) Douglas, Stefan Hagemann
- User-interfaces (Bern, end of November 2014) Ole, Douglas
- maybe: Science-policy interface (Ole, Douglas)
- condition for workshop funding from VALUE: up to 4 external experts being reimbursed, but need to give talk. Or not-reimbursed external people
- Writing workshop (paper for bigger picture (high-impact paper), limiting number of people, CORDEX and impact community and GCM modellers, with Bruce ..., early 2015)

## Specific papers

We (steering group? Douglas?) will identify a couple of papers/topics with lead authors, which cover the most important aspects, experiments, working groups. Those who upload data will be invited to the papers.

There is potential for lots of other papers: one has to write a proposal (to whom?) for a specific paper. Plan is a special issue in the International Journal of Climatology (thanks to Radan).

In about half a year we could start to write the papers.

WG2 papers already in progress:

- (Sven) RCM eval on differen obs gridd data.
- (José) thinning out the station density, effect on the evaluation and the grids

## Next meeting

There will be no MC meeting, it will be for 2 days, most probably in Istanbul.