Summary report

Lists all the questions in the survey and displays a summary with chart for each question. Text input is not included.

Table of contents

Report info	1
Question 1: Name: >	2
Question 2: Organization (please select your primary affiliation):	3
Question 3: Email Address: >	4
Question 4: Have you ever used an NCEP NWP System? If so, which? Please do NOT include those where you have	5
Question 5: How have you used operational NWP systems? For example, research, development, testing, teaching	6
Question 6: If you have ever worked with a NCEP NWP system, tell us what you found easy or difficult in usin	7
Levels	7
Question 7: If you have never worked with a NCEP operational NWP system, do think you may work with one in th	9
Question 8: When in the research process would NITE be most useful?	10
Levels	10
Question 9: For this tool to be useful in facilitating running the NAM operational system, which aspects of	11
Levels	11
Question 10: A list of supporting aspects that would make NITE more useful can be found below. These items may	14
Levels	14
Question 11: The following list of capabilities may be a part of this tool. Please indicate the relative pri	15
Levels	15
Question 12: How closely must NITE follow operational upgrades to be most useful? In other words, how soon a	17
Question 13: H ow many versions of a NWP system should be made available to the users?	18
Question 14: Which versions of a NWP system should be made available to users?	19
Question 15: The initial implementation of this tool will likely be targeted to a single computing platform	20
Levels	20
Question 16: With HPC system (WCOSS & amp; Zeus) specification changes and revisions in data mass-storage poli	21
Levels	21
Question 17: What input datasets would be required?	22
Levels	22
Question 18: What periods for input datasets would be required?	23
Levels	23
Question 19: Do you see a need for non-operational global model data, such as, GFS reforecasts, or parallel ru	24
Question 20: Should NITE include data visualization, or should graphics production be left to each user?	25
Question 21: Should NITE generate some basic forecast verification, or should verification production be left	26
Question 22: What type of information should be retained regarding the experimental configurations?	27
Levels	27
Question 23: How important is it for a NITE user to be able to see the experimental configurations of other us	28
Question 24: On a scale from 1 (mimic operational system, no options) to 5 (fully configurable) please rank w	29
Levels	29
Question 25: What modifications to an NCEP operational forecast system would you be most likely to want to us	30
Levels	30
Question 26: Please add use cases, and/or comment on these.	32
Question 27: Do you have any further comments and suggestions?	33

Report info

Report date: Start date: Stop date: Stored responses: Number of completed responses: Monday, October 20, 2014 3:34:08 PM MDT Monday, September 1, 2014 9:00:00 AM MDT Monday, October 20, 2014 5:59:00 PM MDT 72 40

Name: >

Organization (please select your primary affiliation):



Frequency table

Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
NCEP/EMC	19	38.78%	38.78%
ESRL	9	18.37%	18.37%
NCAR	5	10.2%	10.2%
HRD	1	2.04%	2.04%
University	12	24.49%	24.49%
Other:	3	6.12%	6.12%
Sum:	49	100%	100%

Email Address: >

Have you ever used an NCEP NWP System? If so, which? Please do NOT include those where you have only used output products, do include those you have actually run/executed.



Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
None	8	7.62%	16.33%
HWRF	17	16.19%	34.69%
SREF	5	4.76%	10.2%
GFS	13	12.38%	26.53%
GEFS	2	1.9%	4.08%
НҮСОМ	3	2.86%	6.12%
High Res Window	3	2.86%	6.12%
NAM (NMM-B based)	16	15.24%	32.65%
NAM (WRF-NMM based)	12	11.43%	24.49%
RUC	2	1.9%	4.08%
RAP	4	3.81%	8.16%
RTMA/URMA	2	1.9%	4.08%
Verification System	11	10.48%	22.45%
Other	7	6.67%	14.29%
Sum:	105	100%	100%

Total answered: 49

Frequency table

How have you used operational NWP systems? For example, research, development, testing, teaching, operational implementation,



Frequency table

Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
Research	36	27.91%	75%
Development	34	26.36%	70.83%
Testing	35	27.13%	72.92%
Teaching	8	6.2%	16.67%
Operational implementation	16	12.4%	33.33%
Sum:	129	100%	100%

If you have ever worked with a NCEP NWP system, tell us what you found easy or difficult in using the system.

Levels



	Very Easy	Somewhat Easy	Neutral	Somewhat Difficult	Very Difficult	Sum
Faced limitations related to IT security issues	4 10.26% 0.99%	6 15.38% 1.49%	17 43.59% 4.22%	11 28.21% 2.73%	1 2.56% 0.25%	39 100% 9.68%
Obtaining and keeping track of source code	5 12.2% 1.24%	10 24.39% 2.48%	13 31.71% 3.23%	11 26.83% 2.73%	2 4.88% 0.5%	41 100% 10.17%
Locating computation al resources	4 9.76% 0.99%	15 36.59% 3.72%	9 21.95% 2.23%	8 19.51% 1.99%	5 12.2% 1.24%	41 100% 10.17%
Launching and monitoring jobs	9 21.95% 2.23%	14 34.15% 3.47%	13 31.71% 3.23%	3 7.32% 0.74%	2 4.88% 0.5%	41 100% 10.17%
Setting up runtime options (namelists)	5 12.82% 1.24%	11 28.21% 2.73%	13 33.33% 3.23%	10 25.64% 2.48%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 9.68%

Dealing with parameters that are hardcoded in scripts (namelist values, directory names etc)	1 2.5% 0.25%	9 22.5% 2.23%	9 22.5% 2.23%	14 35% 3.47%	7 17.5% 1.74%	40 100% 9.93%
Making	7	10	8	11	5	41
changes in	17.07%	24.39%	19.51%	26.83%	12.2%	100%
source code	1.74%	2.48%	1.99%	2.73%	1.24%	10.17%
Retrieving	3	10	12	12	4	41
data for	7.32%	24.39%	29.27%	29.27%	9.76%	100%
input	0.74%	2.48%	2.98%	2.98%	0.99%	10.17%
Keeping track of large amounts of output	5 12.2% 1.24%	8 19.51% 1.99%	12 29.27% 2.98%	11 26.83% 2.73%	5 12.2% 1.24%	41 100% 10.17%
Interacting	2	7	23	6	1	39
with other	5.13%	17.95%	58.97%	15.38%	2.56%	100%
researchers	0.5%	1.74%	5.71%	1.49%	0.25%	9.68%
Sum	45 - 11.17%	100 	129 32.01%	97 	32 - 7.94%	403 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

If you have never worked with a NCEP operational NWP system, do think you may work with one in the future?



Frequency table

Levels	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
2	2	2.78%	7.14%
3	5	6.94%	17.86%
4	8	11.11%	28.57%
5 (Certainly!)	13	18.06%	46.43%
Not answered:	44	61%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

When in the research process would NITE be most useful?

Levels



	5: Most Useful	4	3: Somewhat Useful	2	1: Least Useful	Sum
Initial developmen t of an idea	6 15.38% 2.56%	5 12.82% 2.14%	11 28.21% 4.7%	8 20.51% 3.42%	9 23.08% 3.85%	39 100% 16.67%
Early prototyping implementat ion	7 17.95% 2.99%	13 33.33% 5.56%	10 25.64% 4.27%	5 12.82% 2.14%	4 10.26% 1.71%	39 100% 16.67%
Initial case studies to test a hypothesis	16 41.03% 6.84%	12 30.77% 5.13%	7 17.95% 2.99%	1 2.56% 0.43%	3 7.69% 1.28%	39 100% 16.67%
Wide number of test cases to test a mature idea	18 46.15% 7.69%	7 17.95% 2.99%	10 25.64% 4.27%	2 5.13% 0.85%	2 5.13% 0.85%	39 100% 16.67%
End-to-end testing including cycling	17 42.5% 7.26%	9 22.5% 3.85%	9 22.5% 3.85%	2 5% 0.85%	3 7.5% 1.28%	40 100% 17.09%
Finished work ready for operational implementat ion testing	14 36.84% 5.98%	11 28.95% 4.7%	6 15.79% 2.56%	4 10.53% 1.71%	3 7.89% 1.28%	38 100% 16.24%
Sum	78 - 33.33%	57 - 24.36%	53 - 22.65%	22 - 9.4%	24 - 10.26%	234 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

For this tool to be useful in facilitating running the NAM operational system, which aspects of the system should it support?

Levels



5: Nec	Very essary	4	3: Somewhat Necessary	2	1: Not Necessary	Sum
-----------	----------------	---	-----------------------------	---	---------------------	-----

Running components of the NAM system in standalone mode, for example, supporting runs of NMM-B or GSI without running an end-to-end system	14 37.84% 3.7%	7 18.92% 1.85%	9 24.32% 2.38%	6 16.22% 1.59%	1 2.7% 0.26%	37 100% 9.79%
Running NAM end-to- end with all components used in operations, for example, observation al pre- processing, data assimilation , forecast model, partial cycling, etc.	19 48.72% 5.03%	6 15.38% 1.59%	11 28.21% 2.91%	2 5.13% 0.53%	1 2.56% 0.26%	39 100% 10.32%
Retrospecti ve Runs	23 60.53% 6.08%	9 23.68% 2.38%	3 7.89% 0.79%	3 7.89% 0.79%	0 0% 0%	38 100% 10.05%
Real-time Runs	8 21.05% 2.12%	5 13.16% 1.32%	16 42.11% 4.23%	6 15.79% 1.59%	3 7.89% 0.79%	38 100% 10.05%
Previous versions of operational model codes and workflows	5 13.51% 1.32%	9 24.32% 2.38%	9 24.32% 2.38%	8 21.62% 2.12%	6 16.22% 1.59%	37 100% 9.79%
Developmen tal versions of the NWP system with modified code for the components (e.g., different NMM-B or GSI code)	15 39.47% 3.97%	16 42.11% 4.23%	3 7.89% 0.79%	1 2.63% 0.26%	3 7.89% 0.79%	38 100% 10.05%
Developmen tal versions of the NWP system with modified workflows (e.g., different cycling methods)	12 31.58% 3.17%	12 31.58% 3.17%	6 15.79% 1.59%	6 15.79% 1.59%	2 5.26% 0.53%	38 100% 10.05%
Developmen tal versions of the NWP system with modified input datasets (e.g., different observation s or model first guess)	14 37.84% 3.7%	14 37.84% 3.7%	5 13.51% 1.32%	2 5.41% 0.53%	2 5.41% 0.53%	37 100% 9.79%
Forecast graphics	12 31.58% 3.17%	10 26.32% 2.65%	11 28.95% 2.91%	5 13.16% 1.32%	0 0% 0%	38 100% 10.05%
Forecast verification	14 36.84% 3.7%	10 26.32% 2.65%	11 28.95% 2.91%	2 5.26% 0.53%	1 2.63% 0.26%	38 100% 10.05%
Sum	136 - 35.98%	98 - 25.93%	84 - 22.22%	41 - 10.85%	19 - 5.03%	378 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

A list of supporting aspects that would make NITE more useful can be found below. These items may be implemented initially or in later development. Please rank by priority the following items:

Levels



□ 1: Low Priority

	5: High Priority	4	3	2	1: Low Priority	Sum
NWP system scientific documentati on	16 41.03% 6.93%	13 33.33% 5.63%	4 10.26% 1.73%	3 7.69% 1.3%	3 7.69% 1.3%	39 100% 16.88%
NWP	25	10	1	2	1	39
system	64.1%	25.64%	2.56%	5.13%	2.56%	100%
users guide	10.82%	4.33%	0.43%	0.87%	0.43%	16.88%
Online tutorials on NWP system	16 41.03% 6.93%	12 30.77% 5.19%	7 17.95% 3.03%	2 5.13% 0.87%	2 5.13% 0.87%	39 100% 16.88%
Online	23	10	3	1	1	38
tutorial on	60.53%	26.32%	7.89%	2.63%	2.63%	100%
NITE	9.96%	4.33%	1.3%	0.43%	0.43%	16.45%
In-person tutorials on NWP system	3 7.89% 1.3%	12 31.58% 5.19%	12 31.58% 5.19%	7 18.42% 3.03%	4 10.53% 1.73%	38 100% 16.45%
In-person	7	12	9	7	3	38
tutorials on	18.42%	31.58%	23.68%	18.42%	7.89%	100%
NITE	3.03%	5.19%	3.9%	3.03%	1.3%	16.45%
Sum	90	69	36	22	14	231
	38.96%	29.87%	15.58%	9.52%	6.06%	100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

The following list of capabilities may be a part of this tool. Please indicate the relative priority of each of these capabilities.

Levels



	5: High Priority	4	3	2	1: Low Priority	Sum
Source code managemen t: connect with version control to keep track of source code, scripts and changes.	25 65.79% 7.27%	8 21.05% 2.33%	4 10.53% 1.16%	0 0% 0%	1 2.63% 0.29%	38 100% 11.05%
Input data managemen t : select alternative or additional input datasets	16 41.03% 4.65%	10 25.64% 2.91%	9 23.08% 2.62%	4 10.26% 1.16%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 11.34%
Experiment metadata managemen t - a history of what code, scripts, modification s, data were used in the experiment	14 35.9% 4.07%	14 35.9% 4.07%	9 23.08% 2.62%	2 5.13% 0.58%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 11.34%

Input data retrieval: mass- store/HPSS access and automated retrieval	13 34.21% 3.78%	16 42.11% 4.65%	6 15.79% 1.74%	3 7.89% 0.87%	0 0% 0%	38 100% 11.05%
Output data archiving: mass- store/HPSS access and automated storage of results	7 18.42% 2.03%	18 47.37% 5.23%	8 21.05% 2.33%	5 13.16% 1.45%	0 0% 0%	38 100% 11.05%
Launching and monitoring jobs: using batch queues, retries, reporting errors	16 43.24% 4.65%	10 27.03% 2.91%	8 21.62% 2.33%	3 8.11% 0.87%	0 0% 0%	37 100% 10.76%
Supporting the download of data to a local machine	5 13.51% 1.45%	13 35.14% 3.78%	10 27.03% 2.91%	6 16.22% 1.74%	3 8.11% 0.87%	37 100% 10.76%
Output data visualization : basic graphics	9 23.08% 2.62%	17 43.59% 4.94%	9 23.08% 2.62%	3 7.69% 0.87%	1 2.56% 0.29%	39 100% 11.34%
Output data verification: against baseline models and/or observation s	14 35.9% 4.07%	16 41.03% 4.65%	6 15.38% 1.74%	3 7.69% 0.87%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 11.34%
Sum	119 - 34.59%	122 - 35.47%	69 - 20.06%	29 - 8.43%	5 - 1.45%	344 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

How closely must NITE follow operational upgrades to be most useful? In other words, how soon after an operational implementation should NITE be updated to reflect the new operational model?



Fred	luency	table
1154	ucity	labic

Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
Less than 1 week	2	2.78%	5.13%
Less than 1 month	16	22.22%	41.03%
Less than 3 months	15	20.83%	38.46%
Less than 6 months	6	8.33%	15.38%
Not answered:	33	45%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

H ow many versions of a NWP system should be made available to the users?



Frequency table

Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
Only the latest one	9	12.5%	23.08%
The latest one and the previous one	22	30.56%	56.41%
The latest one and the previous two	4	5.56%	10.26%
Comments:	4	5.56%	10.26%
Not answered:	33	45%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

Which versions of a NWP system should be made available to users?



Frequency table

Choices	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
Only the latest one	14	19.44%	35.9%
All versions used operationally within the last 12 months	16	22.22%	41.03%
All versions used operationally within the last 24 months	9	12.5%	23.08%
Not answered:	33	45%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

The initial implementation of this tool will likely be targeted to a single computing platform and environment. Please rank by priority additional flexibility that may be implemented in later development:

Levels



	5: High Priority	4	3	2	1: Low Priority	Sum
zeus (NOAA R&D)	16 43.24% 8.79%	12 32.43% 6.59%	7 18.92% 3.85%	1 2.7% 0.55%	1 2.7% 0.55%	37 100% 20.33%
jet	8	9	13	1	5	36
(NOAA/HFIP	22.22%	25%	36.11%	2.78%	13.89%	100%
)	4.4%	4.95%	7.14%	0.55%	2.75%	19.78%
wcoss	12	2	13	4	4	35
(NOAA	34.29%	5.71%	37.14%	11.43%	11.43%	100%
operations)	6.59%	1.1%	7.14%	2.2%	2.2%	19.23%
yellowstone	9	8	11	4	6	38
(NCAR/univ	23.68%	21.05%	28.95%	10.53%	15.79%	100%
ersities)	4.95%	4.4%	6.04%	2.2%	3.3%	20.88%
any generic OS and batch system a user may have	8 22.22% 4.4%	5 13.89% 2.75%	7 19.44% 3.85%	4 11.11% 2.2%	12 33.33% 6.59%	36 100% 19.78%
Sum	53	36	51	14	28	182
	-	-	-	-	-	-
	29.12%	19.78%	28.02%	7.69%	15.38%	100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

With HPC system (WCOSS & amp; Zeus) specification changes and revisions in data mass-storage policies (HPSS) on the horizon for 2015, output data archiving capabilities may be limited in terms of volume and duration. Which of the following datasets would be critical in preserving? Please indicate on a scale of 1 (low priority) to 5 (high priority) the relative priority of each of these data file types. You can enter details of necessary output frequency or file formatting in the comment box.

Levels



	5: High Priority	4	3	2	1: Low Priority	Sum
Verification output files	16	8	10	2	0	36
	44.44%	22.22%	27.78%	5.56%	0%	100%
	8.79%	4.4%	5.49%	1.1%	0%	19.78%
Graphical output files	5 13.89% 2.75%	7 19.44% 3.85%	16 44.44% 8.79%	3 8.33% 1.65%	5 13.89% 2.75%	36 100% 19.78%
Postprocess	14	9	12	0	1	36
ing files	38.89%	25%	33.33%	0%	2.78%	100%
(POST files)	7.69%	4.95%	6.59%	0%	0.55%	19.78%
Raw model	7	8	11	4	7	37
history/resta	18.92%	21.62%	29.73%	10.81%	18.92%	100%
rt files	3.85%	4.4%	6.04%	2.2%	3.85%	20.33%
Preprocessi ng files (boundary condition & initial condition files)	20 54.05% 10.99%	7 18.92% 3.85%	5 13.51% 2.75%	4 10.81% 2.2%	1 2.7% 0.55%	37 100% 20.33%
Sum	62	39	54	13	14	182
	-	-	-	-	-	-
	34.07%	21.43%	29.67%	7.14%	7.69%	100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

What input datasets would be required?

Levels



	5: Essential	4	3	2	1: Not Necessary	Sum
Global model data to drive the NWP system	33 86.84% 22.3%	4 10.53% 2.7%	1 2.63% 0.68%	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	38 100% 25.68%
Other model initialization data (e.g. NAM initialization s)	15 41.67% 10.14%	12 33.33% 8.11%	7 19.44% 4.73%	1 2.78% 0.68%	1 2.78% 0.68%	36 100% 24.32%
Observation s used operationall y	26 68.42% 17.57%	2 5.26% 1.35%	8 21.05% 5.41%	1 2.63% 0.68%	1 2.63% 0.68%	38 100% 25.68%
Additional observation s (e.g., other satellite, aircraft reconnaissa nce etc.)	6 16.67% 4.05%	9 25% 6.08%	15 41.67% 10.14%	5 13.89% 3.38%	1 2.78% 0.68%	36 100% 24.32%
Sum	80 - 54.05%	27 - 18.24%	31 - 20.95%	7 - 4.73%	3	148 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

What periods for input datasets would be required?

Levels



	5: Essential	4	3	2	1: Not Necessary	Sum
Real-time	14 40% 8.09%	7 20% 4.05%	6 17.14% 3.47%	5 14.29% 2.89%	3 8.57% 1.73%	35 100% 20.23%
Retrospecti ve for a few selected case studies	17 50% 9.83%	5 14.71% 2.89%	10 29.41% 5.78%	1 2.94% 0.58%	1 2.94% 0.58%	34 100% 19.65%
Retrospecti ve for 4 months (one for each season)	12 35.29% 6.94%	14 41.18% 8.09%	8 23.53% 4.62%	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	34 100% 19.65%
Retrospecti ve for 1 year	9 26.47% 5.2%	11 32.35% 6.36%	13 38.24% 7.51%	1 2.94% 0.58%	0 0% 0%	34 100% 19.65%
Retrospecti ve multi- year	10 27.78% 5.78%	5 13.89% 2.89%	6 16.67% 3.47%	13 36.11% 7.51%	2 5.56% 1.16%	36 100% 20.81%
Sum	62 35.84%	42 - 24.28%	43 - 24.86%	20 11.56%	6 3.47%	173 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

Do you see a need for non-operational global model data, such as, GFS reforecasts, or parallel run results?



Frequency table

Levels	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
1 (Not Important)	5	6.94%	13.51%
2	5	6.94%	13.51%
3	12	16.67%	32.43%
4	11	15.28%	29.73%
5 (Essential)	4	5.56%	10.81%
Not answered:	35	48%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

Should NITE include data visualization, or should graphics production be left to each user?



Frequency table

Levels	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
1 (Not Important)	4	5.56%	10.53%
2	5	6.94%	13.16%
3	8	11.11%	21.05%
4	16	22.22%	42.11%
5 (Essential)	5	6.94%	13.16%
Not answered:	34	47%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

Should NITE generate some basic forecast verification, or should verification production be left to each user?



_		
Freq	luency	table

Levels	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
2	3	4.17%	7.89%
3	10	13.89%	26.32%
4	14	19.44%	36.84%
5 (Essential)	11	15.28%	28.95%
Not answered:	34	47%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

What type of information should be retained regarding the experimental configurations?

Levels



	5:Essencial	4	3	2	1:Not necessary	Sum
Name and institution	12	11	7	4	5	39
	30.77%	28.21%	17.95%	10.26%	12.82%	100%
	3.85%	3.53%	2.24%	1.28%	1.6%	12.5%
Provenance	22	11	5	1	0	39
of source	56.41%	28.21%	12.82%	2.56%	0%	100%
code	7.05%	3.53%	1.6%	0.32%	0%	12.5%
Provenance of scripts	18 46.15% 5.77%	11 28.21% 3.53%	8 20.51% 2.56%	1 2.56% 0.32%	1 2.56% 0.32%	39 100% 12.5%
Computatio nal platform	16 41.03% 5.13%	14 35.9% 4.49%	7 17.95% 2.24%	2 5.13% 0.64%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 12.5%
Compilation options	20	11	7	1	0	39
	51.28%	28.21%	17.95%	2.56%	0%	100%
	6.41%	3.53%	2.24%	0.32%	0%	12.5%
Runtime	28	10	1	0	0	39
options	71.79%	25.64%	2.56%	0%	0%	100%
(namelists)	8.97%	3.21%	0.32%	0%	0%	12.5%
Comments	16	8	14	0	1	39
to describe	41.03%	20.51%	35.9%	0%	2.56%	100%
experiment	5.13%	2.56%	4.49%	0%	0.32%	12.5%
Searchable keywords to describe experiment	10 25.64% 3.21%	10 25.64% 3.21%	15 38.46% 4.81%	4 10.26% 1.28%	0 0% 0%	39 100% 12.5%
Sum	142 - 45.51%	86	64 - 20.51%	13 - 4.17%	7	312 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

How important is it for a NITE user to be able to see the experimental configurations of other users?



Frequency table

Levels	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency	Adjusted relative frequency
1 (Not Important)	4	5.56%	10.26%
2	5	6.94%	12.82%
3	8	11.11%	20.51%
4	14	19.44%	35.9%
5 (Essential)	8	11.11%	20.51%
Not answered:	33	45%	-
Sum:	72	100%	100%

On a scale from 1 (mimic operational system, no options) to 5 (fully configurable) please rank what would make this tool most useful

Levels



	1 (no options)	2	3	4	5 (configurabl e)	Sum
Source code build options (debug, optimization , MPI, etc).	1 2.56% 1.3%	4 10.26% 5.19%	7 17.95% 9.09%	10 25.64% 12.99%	17 43.59% 22.08%	39 100% 50.65%
Operational system workflow (DA, cycling, obs, ensemble, etc)	1 2.63% 1.3%	4 10.53% 5.19%	4 10.53% 5.19%	13 34.21% 16.88%	16 42.11% 20.78%	38 100% 49.35%
Sum	2 - 2.6%	8 - 10.39%	11 - 14.29%	23 - 29.87%	33 - 42.86%	77 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

What modifications to an NCEP operational forecast system would you be most likely to want to use in a research experiment? Please check all that apply and add specific comments to clarify

Levels



	Will not use	Will probably not use	May or may not use	Will probably use	Will certainly use	Sum
Run-time configuratio n (i.e. namelist settings)	0 0% 0%	1 2.63% 0.44%	5 13.16% 2.2%	11 28.95% 4.85%	21 55.26% 9.25%	38 100% 16.74%
Source code modification s	0 0% 0%	0 0% 0%	4 10.53% 1.76%	16 42.11% 7.05%	18 47.37% 7.93%	38 100% 16.74%
Adding new components (such as a new hydrological or ocean model)	1 2.63% 0.44%	7 18.42% 3.08%	14 36.84% 6.17%	9 23.68% 3.96%	7 18.42% 3.08%	38 100% 16.74%

Workflow (scripting) modification s (including adding new components , adjusting how/when components are invoked, alternate data assimilation strategies)	0 0% 0%	4 10.53% 1.76%	9 23.68% 3.96%	11 28.95% 4.85%	14 36.84% 6.17%	38 100% 16.74%
Creating ensembles	1 2.63% 0.44%	1 2.63% 0.44%	15 39.47% 6.61%	14 36.84% 6.17%	7 18.42% 3.08%	38 100% 16.74%
Alternative input datasets (models, observation s)	0 0% 0%	3 8.11% 1.32%	17 45.95% 7.49%	11 29.73% 4.85%	6 16.22% 2.64%	37 100% 16.3%
Sum	2 - 0.88%	16 - 7.05%	64 - 28.19%	72 - 31.72%	73 - 32.16%	227 - 100%

*Sequence of numbers in a cell

Absolute frequency

Relative frequency row

Please add use cases, and/or comment on these.

Do you have any further comments and suggestions?