An update on activities was provided by the SIP Communications and Outreach WG.

- An updated wiring diagram for the planned UFS portal was shared to the group for comment. A request to provide content and images was made to the group.
- Content for the portal will be obtained by working with the UFS-SC and SIP working groups.
- If schedule goes as planned, Phase 1 of the website should be presented by mid-July.
- "ufscommunity.org" was preferred as the URL name. Since the desire to have a shorter URL was expressed by the team, the possibility of procuring "ufs.org" is being explored.

Adam Clark provided a briefing on FV3 in the 2018 NOAA Hazardous Weather Testbed (HWT) Spring Forecasting Experiment. This is first of two Convection Allowing Model (CAM) briefings planned prior to the upcoming SIP meeting.
- A general description of the Spring Experiment, including facilities, process, and schedule, was provided. FV3-specific activities on the schedule were highlighted.
- Plans for continued use of the Community-Leveraged Unified Ensemble (CLUE) in the Experiment were provided (including the evolution of model contributions). HREFV2 is considered the baseline to beat. Various results of the FV3 applications along with subjective and statistical verifications were shown.
- UFS CAM verification metrics development was noted – development continues between the SIP CAM WG and Verification and Validation WG. The current proposed metrics are fairly expansive – may be able to pare these down once examined further to reduce redundancies, etc.
- Question was asked on the impact of HWT on NCEP suite to date? One area was the impact of the HREFV2 - spent a lot of time comparing this with experimental ensembles. There has also been an impact of HWT efforts on early versions of the HRRR and on severe weather diagnostics (making their way into CAM efforts).
- Question was asked on verification and validation and associated process - Is HRRRV3 initialized in same way as FV3? The answer given was that HRRRV3 is more advanced than FV3 in using radar data in first 6-12 hours, etc (more sophisticated). It was noted that there was currently no capability to run FV3 like HRRRV3. But HRRRV3 could be initialized with GFS.
- Skill of FV3 given the limited investment in resources and tuning to date (when compared with HRRR) has been notable (1-2 years of development at the CAM scale). The work to date suggests that there is a need to accelerate the assimilation aspect and also to think more about configuration of experiments that can be validated (standardized where feasible, rather than having differences in initialization, etc). With funded NGGPS work, controlled initial conditions, boundary conditions, and even physics can be expected in upcoming experiments.
- Assimilation discussed in this briefing was said to be different than assimilation for GFS. Currently, assimilation is done with GSI and will be transitioned to use JEDI as capability evolves/becomes available. (What does using JEDI mean? JEDI is infrastructure.)
- A question was asked of whether the SIP Physics WG can coordinate to ensure testing is done in a carefully planned way with regard to physics testing at the CAM scale? The need for active communication between the CAM and Physics WG groups was recognized and emphasized.
- Soil condition assimilation was discussed and was said to be different between HRRR and FV3 CAM applications. NGGPS funded efforts mentioned earlier will work to standardize this where possible.

Time was not available for Ming Xue to present his slides, and Ming’s discussion will be on next week’s agenda.