

**HazCollect Follow-On Operational Test & Evaluation (FOTE)
Test Review Group Meeting Minutes
October 1, 2008**

Attendees:

WFO Pittsburgh, PA: Richard Kane, Joseph Palko
Central Region: Gregory Noonan
WFO Paducah, KY: Deanna Lindstrom
SRH: Walt Zaleski, Janice Bunting
WRH: Jeffrey Lorens
WFO Anchorage AK: Sam Albanese
WFO Honolulu HI: Raymond Tanabe

CIO14: Odon Dario
OPS24: Jerald Dinges, Jae Lee, Bert Vioria
OS6: Michael Dion
OS51: Herbert White
OST11: Joel Williams, Steve Pritchett
OST33: Jeremiah Dewey

Mercer County PA EM: John Nicklin
Daviness County, KY EM: Walter Atherton
Contra Costa County EM: Art Botterell
Anchorage AK EM: Vince McCoy
Hawaii EM: Tom Simon

UACS: Sean Payne, Valencia Hicks

On Wednesday October 1, 2008, the National Weather Service Test & Evaluation Branch (OPS24) hosted the HazCollect Follow-on Operational Test & Evaluation (FOTE) Test Review Group Meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to present the status of the FOTE testing at WFO Pittsburgh, PA (PBZ) and WFO Paducah, KY (PAH) from September 25 to October 1, 2008. During the meeting, the following items were discussed:

1. Bert Vioria proceeded to discuss the status of the FOTE testing at WFO PAH and WFO PBZ. There were a total of eight successful daily test ADR messages generated by Walt Atherton (Daviness County, KY EM) and John Nicklin (Mercer County, PA EM). There was one test ADR message, sent by FOTE test team, which was successfully routed and broadcasted for Mercer County, PA. There are also a total of four Test/Test ADR messages that were sent and stopped at the Telecommunications Gateway during failover testing.

TTR Discussion:

2. **TTR #57: Message was not sent to the expected HazCollect Rack during ingest failover.**
On Monday September 29, 2008, the FOTE failover testing was performed by FOTE test team. During failover Test #2, the HazCollect Server Rack 1 Server 1 router ingest line

was pulled and the first of two incoming Test/Test ADR messages was sent. The first test ADR message was expected to be routed to the HazCollect Rack 1 Server 1, but during the test, this message was routed to Rack 2 Server 1. Odon Dario noted that there was an inadvertent and unplanned NOAANET reboot that occurred the same time of the message transmission, so a retest was performed. Before the retest, the Rack 1 Router 1 ingest line was put back on and message was verified to be normally sent to Rack 1 Server 1. On the retest, the test ADR message was still being routed to Rack 2 Server 1. Another failover retest for Failover Test #2 has been planned per OST recommendation. No disposition has been decided.

3. **TTR #58: CAFÉ Formatter handling of expired NWEM messages and generation of new and incorrect creation and expiration times.**

On Tuesday September 30, 2008 at 1:15pm EDT, the state ADR message test was successfully performed by the FOTE test team for the state of Pennsylvania. Monitoring WFOs at Sterling VA, Cleveland OH, State College PA, Buffalo NY, Mt Holly NJ, and Binghamton NY all reported successful broadcast.

Joseph Palko, from WFO Pittsburgh PA (PBZ), reported that they were having AWIPS problems, so the test state ADR message was not initially broadcasted. However, Joe also explained that a CAFÉ NWEM Formatter anomaly was detected when WFO PBZ AWIPS came back on the next day. The previously sent test state ADR message from Sept 30th was inadvertently broadcasted as soon as AWIPS became operational even though it was expected to have already expired.

Initial investigation by WFO PBZ indicated that the test ADR message, via CRS message header, had a new and incorrect creation, effective, and expiration time. The TRG agreed that further investigation is required, including an action for Tim Hopkins to generate an AWIPS deficiency report to track this issue. Subsequently, **TTR #58** was generated for the TRG to track this anomaly. No disposition has been decided.

Gregory Noonan also added that the NWRWAVES formatter, which is currently used as the required formatter for all weather-related messages, would have properly detected that the message has expired by using the whole WMO message MND header which contains the month and date fields.

4. Bert Viloría proceeded to inquire from Tim Hopkins the status of the two TTRs from the previous week. The TTRs currently have the following disposition:
- **TTR #55:** HazCollect Server mode changes are not saved in all servers. (Priority 2, Impact 2).
 - **TTR #56:** HazCollect message queue data are not available for display in all servers. (Priority 2, Impact 2).

Tim Hopkins reported that the analysis on the database issues for both TTR 55 and 56 are still on-going and the disposition remains as is.

5. Bert Viloría proceeded to discuss the current Open Action Items. Action Item #3 (HazCollect database integrity) was assigned to Tim Hopkins and he indicated that via previously performed spot checks, the database seems to be correct. Jae Lee added that

during the planned National Message on November 18, 2008, the HazCollect database integrity can be further tested. This action has been closed.

Bert Vilorio added that Action Item #9 (WFO Operational Procedures) and #10 (Local PNS sample sent to WFO before their start of the FOTE) are both ongoing. The draft operational procedures document has been generated and is going through FOTE site review. The local PNS message samples are being sent to each FOTE site prior to their start of the FOTE.

6. During the state message test for Pennsylvania on September 30th, there was an issue regarding the issuance of SAME tones for ADR messages. All of the monitoring offices reported that the state ADR message was broadcasted successfully but it did not broadcast any SAME tones. WFO PBZ did not broadcast the state message because their AWIPS was down.

Art Kraus provided two documents that states that ADR messages should have the SAME tone enabled specifically stated in:

- a. **NWEMs on CRS – Item #5 of document** says, “Barring regional requirements, it states that all NWEM message types, including ADRs are set up to transmit SAME tones to all appropriate transmitters.
- b. **CRS Note 63** - Page A-12, Appendix 2 Table 1 actually shows the ADR message type to have NWRSAME tones.

However, WFO PBZ sent a link from the Eastern Region Headquarters web site that ADRs should not have SAME tones:

<http://www.werh.noaa.gov/MSD/Resources/Dissemination/AppendixA.htm>

In addition, Joseph Palko mentioned that Appendix G of the National Directive shows that ADR messages should NOT have SAME tones.

<http://www.nws.noaa.gov/directives/010/pd01017010a.pdf>

An action item (Action Item #15) was assigned to OS51 to mitigate this discrepancy between the **NWSI 10-1710, Appendix G** and **CRS Note 63** regarding the sending of SAME tones for ADR messages. Art Kraus has recently found the latest draft version of the **NWSI 10-1710, dated 2006 (attached in minutes email)**; Page G-11 states that ADR messages should have SAME tones.

Richard Kane (WFO PBZ WCM) is currently investigating the Eastern Region policies concerning the Yes/No issue relative to SAME tones for ADR products. For the time being, the WFO PBZ will have no SAME tones for ADR messages during the FOTE. WFO PBZ will follow the existing ER supplement ERS 02-005 at this time during the FOTE and revisit national and regional 10-1710 directives this winter with the goal of synchronizing them.