



**Minutes**  
**9<sup>th</sup> Joint PAC-HAC meeting**  
**Tuesday Nov. 5, 2019**  
**Toulouse, France**



**Minutes**

**HAC Participants:** Halldór BJÖRNSSON (IC rep.), Javier CALVO (SP rep.), Ben WICHERS.SCHREUR (NL rep.), Heiner KORNICH (HAC Chair and SE rep.), Jørn KRISTIANSEN (NO rep.), Xiaohua YANG (DK rep.), Carl FORTELIUS (FI rep.), Jeanette ONVLEE (HIRLAM PM), Saji VARGHESE (IE rep.)

**PAC Participants:** Philippe BOUGEAULT (MF rep.), Radmila BROZKOVA (PAC Vice-Chair), Jure CEDILNIK (LACE rep.), Claude FISCHER (CSSI Chair), Daniel GELLENS (PAC Chair), Alain JOLY (MF rep.), Mohamed MOKHTARI (non-MF non-LACE rep.), Maria MONTEIRO (non-MF non-LACE rep.), Patricia POTTIER (Secretary), Piet TERMONIA (ALADIN PM), Martina TUDOR (LACE PM)

**Excused:** Branka IVANVAN-PICEK (LACE rep.), Estonia, Gintautas STANKUNAVICIUS (LT rep.), Michael SLEIGH (ECMWF obs.)

**1. Opening and welcome**

Marc Pontaud, HoR of Météo-France, welcomed the PAC-HAC members. He underlined the importance of a strong partnership within our 26 NMSs to face the upcoming challenges (new architecture, new dynamics core, external competition, ...) and to maintain and further develop a state-of-the art limited-area NWP model, that would not be easy to achieve among 26 countries with different administrative contexts and in an evolving legal framework. Marc thanked the PAC-HAC and the Convergence Working Group (CWG) for their huge efforts aimed at establishing a single consortium by the beginning of 2021.

Heiner (HAC chair) thanked Météo-France for their warm welcome and the nice dinner that had been the opportunity for friendly conversation between the PAC and the HAC members.

**2. The agenda below was adopted**

Agenda	Introduced by	Documents*
1. Opening and welcome	HAC chair	
2. Adoption of the agenda	HAC chair	2_agenda_HAC_PAC_2019
3. Policy issues: convergence	ALADIN & HIRLAM PMs HAC & PAC chairs	3.1_Goals_and_Organisation  3.1_Strategy_meeting 3.1_Financial_scenarios  3.1_QA_document 3.1_Letter-to-directors 3.1_Draft_MoU 3.1_PM&L_selection_procedure 3.1_Roadmap 3.2_RWP2019_realisation 3.3_RWP2020 3.4_GA_Draft_agenda
3.1. from scope document to MoU		
3.1.1. short and long term goals and organization of the future single consortium		
3.1.2. strategy meeting content		
3.1.3. budget principles and scenarios for financial organisation		
3.1.4. quality assurance		
3.1.5. legal aspects (IPR, disputes)		
3.1.6. draft MoU		
3.1.7. Procedure for PM and leaders selection		
3.1.8. roadmap and back-up solution		
3.2. Realisation of Rolling Work Plan 2019 (first semester)		
3.3. Rolling Work Plan 2020		
3.4. Preparation of GA/C agenda		
4. A.O.B	HAC chair	
5. Date of the next meetings	HAC chair	
6. Closing	HAC chair	

### 3. Policy issues: convergence

The points on this Section 3 were also on the agenda of the separate HAC and PAC meetings held in parallel, the previous day. Daniel (PAC chair) and Heiner (HAC chair) proposed to report on these discussions when these points are discussed.

#### 1. From scope document to MoU

1. short and long term goals and organization of the future single consortium
2. strategy meeting content

Daniel presented the proposals from the PAC meeting:

- *to modify the goals document to stress that the common working environment is not a mandatory step for the start of the consortium;*
- *to make a first draft of the common working environment as input to the strategy meeting:*
  - *common understanding of what the common working environment should be;*
  - *analysis of the objectives, possibilities and expectations, including development and operational suites;*
- *to make, during the Strategy meeting:*
  - *an analysis of feasibility, content of the system (comprehensive vs. bricks, users interface or not, ...);*
  - *an evaluation of the needed manpower will be determined during the Strategy meeting and cross checked with the man power for science.*

Heiner summarised the HAC discussions: the common system was judged very ambitious; the Strategy meeting was to be prepared early and should involve many researchers, as this would become their common strategy; the tasks groups should provide reports that would be the basis of a strategy for the whole consortium.

Philippe pointed the similarity of the reports of the HAC and PAC meetings, that both converged to the Strategy meeting and the way to develop the key objectives for the five next years, making sure that the scientific staff takes ownership of these objectives.

The PAC-HAC focused then on the preparation of the Strategy meeting and on the Task Groups composition and their mandate. The PAC-HAC recommended to pay special attention to have a well balanced representation of the 4 groupings (HIRLAM, LACE, Météo-France, ALADIN flat-rate Partners) and to get all interested people to join the Task Groups (not only the current ALADIN, LACE and HIRLAM management).

Following Jørn suggestion, **the PAC-HAC recommended an executive summary of the MoU to be prepared after the conclusion of the strategy meeting, to be distributed to the whole staff, together with an updated matrix of the single consortium.**

The PAC-HAC tasked **the CWG to summarise the PAC-HAC recommendations for the Strategy meeting** in an updated version of the document prepared by the PMs for item 3.1.2 of this meeting:

- *to finalize the list of the preliminary area description for the strategy meeting (by PMs and PAC&HAC chairs);*
- *to provide some guidance for the task groups: task groups should prepare an open strategy document for each area.*
- *to explicit the formation of the Task Teams for each area:*
  - *CSSI, LACE Areal leaders, HMG;*
  - *further scientists (all contributors to the RWP can be members);*

- Strategy meeting will scrutinize and discuss strategies (invited task groups and additional scientists. Invitation to all LTMs).
- Task groups create report from strategy meeting and write a limited number (<10) of goals for 2021-2026.

### 3. budget principles and scenarios for financial organisation

The CWG has proposed 3 financial scenarios, differing only by the number of compensated positions. Heiner reported that the HAC doesn't recommend scenario B; in the long run, the HAC recommends scenario C but acknowledges that it may create problems at the beginning; thus favours scenario A as a possible solution for the beginning of the single consortium.

Daniel explained that scenarios B and C are not acceptable for some PAC members; the preferred option is scenario A. Martina pointed that even scenario A would impact the way in which the LACE budget will be managed.

**Out of the 3 scenarios, the PAC-HAC supported scenario A.**

### 4. quality assurance

After the remarks sent by Radmila at the PAC-HAC in May (QA procedure judged not described precisely enough in Annex II of the draft MoU), the CWG had been tasked to work on a QA document that would better describe the QA. This document was sent to PAC-HAC for this meeting.

Daniel reported that the PAC judges the document too detailed and proposes ;

- *page 2, bullet 2: "ascending compatibility": erase after "it creates fall-back solutions ...."*
- *page 2, bullet 3: keep only "RTTOV" and remove "or SURFEX"*
- *page 3, 2; bullet 2: the sentence "The management group checks the quality .... by the integration leader" should be replaced by "The Management Group checks the quality of the documentation and agrees on the content of the next development cycle, after due scrutiny by the Integration leader. The Integration Leader scrutinizes the quality of the documentation and agrees on the content of the next development cycle in consultation with the Management Group."*
- *page 5, remove all paragraphs (except the last sentence) under 3. Assuring the quality of operational configurations between local cycles.*

Heiner commented that, although the HAC had found the document very useful, the HAC considered it too technical for a MoU and would have prefer to keep the annex II as it is in the current draft MoU. The HAC also proposed to incorporate the benchmarks for EPS and DA.

**The PAC-HAC tasked the CWG to have a look to both precise HAC and PAC comments and propose a solution for Annex II and the QA document.**

### 5. legal aspects (IPR, disputes)

Among the questions raised after the distribution of the first draft MoU to the Directors, some (Intellectual Property Rights and Settlement of disputes) require advice from legal experts in national and international legislation, before Members can agree to their final formulation in the MoU articles. A letter had been sent to the Directors with the proposed articles.

Heiner summarized the first legal input from HAC members (Finland, Norway, Sweden): in case of disputes, a friendly discussion should be the first step, followed by a mediation if needed (according to ICCS rules or our own rules), preferably to the arbitration.

Daniel reported on the Romanian proposal adding at the end of the sentence "This process does not restrict the right of the Members to adopt Court Proceedings": ***according to their national law***. Philippe pointed that this addition could be accepted, provided the lawyers confirmed that it is coherent with the sentence "*The Members hereby agree that this MoU will be executed under the law of Belgium*".

Daniel also reported on CHMI remarks that, according to the understanding of the ALADIN MoU5 by the CHMI lawyer, the ALADIN-HIRLAM merge implying a change in the ownership, this merge must first be unanimously approved by the 16 ALADIN Directors before it is discussed in a joint GA/C. The PAC had advised to check this understanding with additional lawyers.

#### 6. draft MoU

Daniel, for the CWG, apologized that the comments received from Slovenia before the autumn hadn't been incorporated in the draft MoU and promised that the CWG will do it during their meeting just after the end of this PAC-HAC meeting.

The PAC-HAC reviewed point by point the text of the draft MoU and discussed some changes. When modifications were agreed during the meeting, the CWG was tasked to modify the MoU text accordingly, or the exact phrasing was left to the CWG. The result is the version of the draft MoU proposed to the Directors as preparatory document to the Istanbul GA/C meeting.

#### 7. procedure for PM and leaders selection

The PAC-HAC agreed with the HAC proposals for adding in the announcement the level of seniority expected from the candidates and for removing any dates in the document (they are in the roadmap, see below). The suggestion to use a recruitment agency was dismissed.

#### 8. roadmap and back-up solution

Following the HAC discussions, the PAC-HAC agreed on the necessity of postponing the PM recruitment after the outcomes of the Strategy meeting are approved by the GA/C (strategy, list of Areas). Thus, the call for PM and CSCs leaders should be issued in July, for a recruitment in autumn. The recruitment of the other management positions (Areal Leaders, Integration Leader, Consortium Scientific Secretary, these last 2 positions should also be considered in the recruitment procedure document) should be postponed after the MoU signing, when the new PM is in charge.

Each Member should staff a Local Team Manager: the LTMs should be in place for the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021.

Claude commented that each April, the HMG & CSSI members meet and work on the Rolling Work Plans. In April 2021, as the AL and the Integration leader won't be recruited yet, the 2020 HMG and CSSI members should take care of it.

The PAC-HAC approved and **tasked the CWG to propose an accordingly updated roadmap document** to the GA/C.

#### 2. Realisation of the Rolling Work Plan 2019 (first semester)

The PAC-HAC expressed no concern, the manpower figures showing that the actions are on track. The 3 (ALADIN, HIRLAM, LACE) PMs will report during the GA/C.

### 3. Rolling Work Plan 2020

No further comment.

### 4. Preparation of GA-C agenda

The PAC-HAC reviewed the draft agenda proposed for the joint GA/C and proposed to move the report items after the convergence discussions.

Philippe announced that the ECMWF PAC had approved and considered as uncontroversial the proposal for a status of “associated member” as discussed by GA/C in Zagreb for the future single consortium. This point will be on the agenda of the GA/C in Istanbul.

### 4. **A.O.B.**

None.

### 5. **Date and place of the next meeting**

In 2020, in order to prepare for the signature of the MoU at the end of the year, two one-day joint meetings will take place: Jørn proposed to host in Norway the spring PAC-HAC, mid-May, Maria proposed Portugal (possibly Madeira) for the meeting in autumn (20-21 October 2020).

Next PAC and HAC meetings in Norway:

- 14 May 2020 morning: separate PAC and HAC meetings,
- 14 May 2020 afternoon and 15 May 2020 morning: joint PAC-HAC meeting,
- 15 May 2020 afternoon: meeting of the CWG.

### 6. **Closing**

Heiner thanked the participants for the good discussions and the progress in the convergence actions, and closed the meeting at 12:50.