



Minutes
10th Joint PAC-HAC meeting
start: 14 May at 13h30
end: 15 May at 11h30
video-conference



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.), Sami NIEMALA (FI rep.), Jeanette ONVLEE (HIRLAM PM), Werenfried SPLIT (NL rep.), 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.), Maria MONTEIRO (non-MF non-LACE rep.), Patricia POTTIER (Secretary), Piet TERMONIA (ALADIN PM), Martina TUDOR (LACE PM)

ECMWF Obs: Andy BROWN (15 May morning)

Excused: Branka IVANVAN-PICEK (LACE rep.), Mohamed MOKHTARI (non-MF non-LACE rep.), Gintautas STANKUNAVICIUS (LT rep.) and Estonia

1 Opening and welcome

Daniel opened the meeting at 13:30 and welcomed all the participants to this unusual fully video-conference meeting.

2 The agenda below was adopted

with harp as additional point in the A.O.B.

Agenda	Introduced by	Documents*
1. Opening and welcome	PAC chair	
2. Adoption of the agenda	PAC chair	2_agenda_PAC-HAC-May20
3. Policy issues: convergence (C)	ALADIN & HIRLAM PMs HAC & PAC chairs	
3.1. Draft MoU & Strategy		
3.1.1. Outcomes of Istanbul GA-C		3.1_Minutes_GA_C_Istanbul
3.1.2. Strategy & composition of the management group		3.1_Strategy_document
3.1.3. CWG & HLWG proposals		3.1_Management_composition
3.1.4. Draft MoU		3.1_Minutes_HLWG
3.1.5. Roadmap		3.1_Draft_MoU
3.2. Rolling Work Plans 2019 and beg. 2020		3.1_Roadmap
3.3. Rolling Work Plan 2021 (inc. timeline)		3.2_RWP2019_realization
3.4. Preparation of GA/C agenda		3.3_RWP2021
4. A.O.B: harp: possibilities for open source	PAC chair	3.4_Joint-GA/C
5. Date of the next meetings	PAC chair	
6. Closing	PAC 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 during the morning. Daniel (PAC chair) and Heiner (HAC chair) reported on these discussions when the points are discussed.

3.1 Draft MoU & Strategy

3.1.1 Outcomes of Istanbul GA-C

Daniel briefly summarized the main decisions of the joint ALADIN General Assembly (GA) and HIRLAM Council (C): the GA-C acknowledged the progress made by the Convergence Working Group (CWG) in the preparation of the draft MoU of the future Consortium and created a High-Level Group (HLG) to further investigate topics that still raised some concerns (Intellectual Property and voting rights).

3.1.2 Strategy & composition of the management group

Daniel recalled the background: a strategy meeting was held in Toulouse early February 2020 to agree on common key objectives and priority goals for the five next years. Based on the conclusions of this meeting, the CWG has worked on a draft Strategy document.

The CWG also proposed the composition and the Term of Reference (ToR) for the management group of the Consortium: this management follows the structure of the R&D areas as discussed in the Strategy document; two types of Area Leaders (AL) have been defined (AL1K -whenever possible - to lead the area and define a long term vision, AL2K – otherwise - to conduct specific actions in order to progress on CSC interoperability).

Heiner summarized the HAC comments: the HAC would like more emphasis on the drivers of the Consortium and an analysis of the points where the Consortium is vulnerable (such as a potential lack of manpower for realising some key objectives) and the identification of the domains with important competition. The HAC underlined the necessity to maintain and develop core expertise. Jeanette added that many strategies encompass human resources. Ben pointed that capacity building is a way to mitigate single points of failure.

Daniel answered that the capacity building is mentioned in the MoU and in the Strategy document. The PAC already pointed the need to reformulate the 5th high-level goal, to better express the actions under the capacity building. Realising a full risk analysis over the Strategy would be a huge work and the CWG would rather propose to add some points of attention for the transversal domains that are understaffed.

Piet proposed to translate in the document the results of the enquiry that had been launched among the ALADIN LTMs and the HIRLAM HoR to identify teams and experts who could contribute to the main goals of the Strategy.

The PAC-HAC asked the CWG to add in the Strategy document the inquiry summary and some points of attention and to better highlight the drivers of the Consortium and where there is an important competition. This point was discussed again the next morning when Saji came with a proposal for a text to better define the goal “Further develop the capacity building activities of the Consortium” and **the PAC-HAC adopted the proposed text and asked the CWG to add it to the Strategy document.**

PAC-HAC gave their formal support to the Strategy document.

Daniel reported on the PAC remarks on the limited mandate for the physics AL2K: the PAC understood the reasons (the AL2K will analyse and make proposals for making the physics packages more interoperable; at a second stage, the Consortium may need an AL1K position for the physics or another AL2K with a new mandate), approved the proposed management but asked for an explanation

to be added in the management document about the physics AL and a careful communication toward the LTMs.

Heiner reported same comments from the HAC about the physics AL2K. The HAC also wished that the CWG makes sure that the division between AL1K and AL2K is not interpreted as a level or value judgement. In the call for applications and the ToRs, all Area Leaders should be referred to as AL.

The PAC-HAC asked the CWG to make the text clearer (AL1K versus AL2K) and explain why the physics AL is an AL2K with a 2 year mandate, including a plan for the time after this period.

The PAC-HAC gave their formal support to the Management document, modulo these explanations.

3.1.3 CWG & HLG proposals

Daniel reported that, after their 3rd meeting, the HLG considered that the draft MoU was mature to be presented to the GA-C; the PAC-HAC was tasked to give some guidance on the new formulation of the *item 41* proposed by Radmila. The HLG was confident that a consensual version of the MoU could be prepared after this PAC-HAC meeting.

Both the PAC and the HAC had reviewed *item 41* in the morning: their comments were discussed and a new version agreed on: the Meteorological Quality Assurance (MQA) is confirmed as an important task of the Consortium but it is agreed to remove from the MoU the details on how it is done; as running tests on representative domains is not possible for all CSCs, part of the MQA work will be done on local configurations.

In order to make sure that all LTMs and HoRs account the manpower for MQA on a same basis, it is agreed that only work beneficial to everyone should be declared. Radmila and Philippe proposed to specify in *item 27* for quality assurance activities “useful to the CSCs in a Consortium-wide sense”.

The PAC-HAC agreed on the new formulation of *item 41* and *item 27*.

In coherence with the modification of *item 41*, Radmila proposed some changes in the ToRs of the CSC Leaders (*Annex VI*). Her proposal was discussed in-session and both Claude and Jeanette commented on the proposal. **The PAC-HAC agreed that these ToR should be changed in the direction proposed by Radmila and taking into account the comments made in PAC-HAC** (i.e. give a wider view of the interaction of the CSC Leaders with the whole MG and retain some specific parts of the original text). **The CWG will work out a new version of the ToR for the draft MoU, along these lines.**

3.1.4 Draft MoU

In addition to the *items* already discussed during point 3.3, Daniel opened the discussion on the draft MoU.

Javier proposed to include two additional clauses in order to make sure that AEMET will be allowed to become a Member: 1) All activities under this Memorandum of Understanding will be subject to the availability of ordinary annual funds to the Signatories; 2) This Memorandum of Understanding cannot be opposed to national laws or regulations of Members.

Philippe answered that the HLG discussed a similar request from CHMI and agreed that the CWG adds such a clause. Still, a lawyer should check the compatibility with *item 171*.

About Javier first recommendation, Philippe proposed to add a footnote to *item 124* indicating that membership fees should be delayed in case of force majeure and on decision on the Assembly.

The PAC-HAC agreed with these modifications of *item 124* and *item 171*.

Claude confirmed that, as decided by the HLG, he was working with Jeanette to add in the *Annex VIII* in which repository the reference version of the each legacy code was at the present time (for ancillary codes, when there is no official repository, the indication will be “other repositories”).

The PAC-HAC agreed with this modification of *Annex VIII*.

About *item 16* (definition of a non-contaminating license) and *item 146* (that requires the use of a non-contaminating license for going to open source), Jure wondered if the text of the draft MoU allows the use of component licenses, that PAC preferred to non-contaminating ones, because they offer more guaranty that the owners of the codes will get free access to the improvements made by the licensees. Philippe confirmed that component licenses are allowed with the current formulation of these articles (component licenses are non-contaminating licences, with additional constraints). Philippe explained that the CWG was reluctant to impose the wording “component license” in the MoU as it may be difficult to agree on an internationally known component license (CeCILL-C is based on the French law, others still need to be explored such as LGPL, EU-PL, WIPO, ...).

The PAC-HAC agreed to keep *item 16* and *item 146* unchanged and adapt them in case a suitable component license is found after exploration by the CWG.

At 17:00, the meeting was suspended until the next day and resumed at 09:00 on Friday 15 May.

In addition to the MoU *items* previously discussed, the only additional remarks on the draft MoU was by Saji and Heiner about the way to measure the success of the Strategy after 5 years and the possibility to identify indicators for each of the main goals, or to organise external review.

Piet and Jeanette explained that the management team will keep their goals in check during the 5 years and the PM will report to the Assembly. Patricia added that the *item 69* of the MoU mentions the possibility for the Assembly to commission a review of the activity of the Consortium by a group of independent experts.

The PAC-HAC agreed that the draft MoU does not need any change to ensure the evaluation of the strategy.

The PAC-HAC recommended the approval of the draft MoU, with the modifications agreed above.

3.1.5 Roadmap

Philippe explained that there was nothing to change with respect to the roadmap for the new Consortium as presented at the GA-C in December, as all actions are exactly on time. The only adaptation of the document relates to the COVID-19 pandemic imposing new working methods for the preparation of the documents.

PAC-HAC agreed.

3.2 Rolling Work Plans 2019 and beg. 2020

Piet explained that, although the ALADIN-HIRLAM agreement considers common Rolling Work Plans (RWP), no indications are given about common reporting. Thus, in the convergence process, a

common reporting tool was decided and Patricia was asked to develop it. It has been used since 2018. The 3 PMs, Claude and Patricia regularly check all the registered actions and Patricia produces relevant statistics to follow the realisation of the RWPs, comparing the manpower committed and reported, by Partners, or groupings, or work packages.

Piet analysed the statistics for 2018, 2019 and the commitments for 2020, and commented improvements decided during HMG-CSSI to homogenise ALADIN and HIRLAM reporting practices. All together, more work is reported than committed.

The PAC-HAC thanked Piet for his very didactic presentation and took note without question.

3.3 Rolling Work Plan 2021 (inc. timeline)

Piet explained that, during the HMG-CSSI meeting, the list and contents of the Work Packages for RWP2021 were discussed and agreed on, based on the outcomes of the Strategy meeting. A list of actions was also defined. The timeline to assess the RWP2020 and to prepare the RWP2021 was also adopted in order to have the RWP2021 ready to be proposed to the next PAC-HAC meeting, then to the GA-C. Thus, the deadline for the commitment of the manpower to the RWP2021 by the LTMs and HoRs was put on the 4th week of September. The HMG-CSSI had asked the PMs to show this timeline to the PAC-HAC to make them aware of these deadlines that are generally ahead of local timetables, specially when the GA-C is in November.

PAC-HAC took note of this timeline and the constraints for the commitments delivery.

3.4 Preparation of GA-C agenda

The PAC-HAC recommended to organize the next GA-C meeting in a video-conference format, on the same dates as originally planned for the face-to-face meeting in Barcelona. The PAC-HAC agreed with the draft agenda proposed for the meeting and tasked the CWG to work out the details with the chairs of the GA-C.

4 A.O.B.

harp open source

Piet explained that the harp developers had advocated to put harp under the MIT license. The PAC agreed to make harp open source but would prefer a diffusion under a component license, such as the CeCILL-C license (the component licenses have the advantages of the non-contaminating licenses, while guaranteeing that the owner will be able to benefit from the modifications and control the diffusion of the initial code).

Jeanette added that the HAC also supported to make harp open source and recommended to use in any case at least a non-contaminating licence, possibly an internationally known component licence.

Andy explained that ECMWF is looking for possible well-known licenses, with a pragmatic approach, considering that OOPS and ATLAS are under APACHE license already.

Philippe added that possibilities for more known component licenses should be explored, i.e. LGPL.

Daniel concluded that, as the decision about harp belongs to the Members who contributed, PAC-HAC recommended that those four Members (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Norway) decide by email consultation which license they will use for harp, as long as it is at least a non-contaminating one.

5 Date and place of the next meeting

The next meeting had originally been planned for 20-21 October 2020 in Madeira (Portugal). Considering the uncertainty about travel possibilities, the lower benefit of having a physical meeting if the social interactions are still limited by then, the additional work and cost to organise simultaneously a face-to-face and a video meeting, the PAC-HAC decided to organise their next meeting as a full video-conference.

Saji pointed that the 21 October is overlapping with EUMETNET STAC/PFAC meeting. PAC-HAC agreed to move to 19-20 October.

Schedule for the next meetings in video-conference:

- **19 October 2020 morning: separate PAC and HAC meetings,**
- **19 October 2020 afternoon and 20 October 2020 morning: joint PAC-HAC meeting,**
- **20 October 2020 afternoon: meeting of the CWG.**

6 Closing

Daniel thanked the participants for the good discussions and the progress and closed the meeting at 11:30.

