Orange group – BIP-M discussion

* what is the relationship between BIP-M and competency frameworks

For some NMHs staffing is structured around the former four class structure (or the two class structure now) – structures are not mandatory important to remember.

The competency frameworks and BIP-M are confused in aviation (one is a body of knowledge/qualification and one is a set of skills to do a job). In aviation, to be a forecaster one must be a WMO meteorologists (ICAO). The workaround for ICAO is saying you must follow the parts of the BIP-M which are required for their job. This is important for the compliance for ICAO. This is the only area in which there is an overlap at present, but Marine and PWS is moving in this direction.

We need a very clear statement about what BIP-M is for. We like the triangle diagram. We think this should sit at the start of the document that describes what a meteorologist (revising the current definition) is and what the BIP-M is for.

A danger is trying to build too many things inside the BIP-M and diluting the core knowledge.

One possibility would be in addition to include some example specialisations (e.g. Marine Meteorology) which are different to the competencies.

* do you accept the approach and level of detail in WMO-No.1083 for the BIP-M?

In general we agree very much with the existing philosophy that is included.

We also though think that the generic skills, which are important for any professional role, the base of the triangle, should be given more weight and expanded in the triangle.

* are there any important topics that are missing, e.g. service areas (aviation, marine, public weather), impact-based forecasting, DRR, use of new technologies? Is the BIP-M the proper place for these additions?

Impact-based forecasting is important to be included and should be an evolution of the current section on service delivery. This could involve emphasising practical examples of service delivery and should incorporate forecasts on all timescales.

We think perhaps to give more prominence to this there should be a section on service delivery on all timescales. This should include sections on data.

We don’t believe that we should emphasise any particular new technology, it is the generic skill of assessing and critically reviewing technologies which are important.

This should be a fifth topic under 3. Topics in Atmospheric Science

* are there topics that should be reduced or omitted?

Some of the more theoretical topics could be reduced e.g. K-theory, qg-theory

Review of the taxonomic words to be clear this matches

Review the maths and physics requirement to emphasise how these are applied to the meteorological context and if there is too much material

* how can we meet the needs of least developed countries that struggle to train and retain qualified staff?

We think we should discuss this in the Global Campus meeting.

* are the two categories of personnel still valid? (see WMO-No.1083 part 3.2)

We think that Meteorological Technician is a problematic title because it doesn’t cover all of the jobs that are needed in a NMS and neither should it.

The MT is really a definition of level of study rather than job title and so we shouldn’t confuse the job with level of study.

* should we add an assessment tool to WMO-No.1083 to help assess when learning outcomes have been achieved?

We have concerns about this, it is so dependent on the context and requires a lot of work to update and keep relevant and adapt to your own students.

* what is required for the future?

In addition to the BIP-M one way of addressing the specific roles is to include some details (learning outcomes, topics) which allow people to specialise in for example aeronautical meteorologist, marine meteorologist. This is not the same as a competency it’s background knowledge rather than job specific knowledge. It is not part of the BIP-M, not a core requirement but an advisory document.