

**Minutes of the Sixth ALADIN PAC Meeting
Bucharest, June the 3rd and 4th 2010**

Participants:

PAC members

Cornel Soci (chairperson)
Gwenaelle Hello
Philippe Bougeault
Maria Monteiro
Radmila Brozkova (replacing Radim Tolasz)
Gabor Radnoti

Observers

Mikko Alestalo (HIRLAM Advisory Committee chairperson)
Jean-François Geleyn (ALADIN Programme Manager)
Piet Termonia (CSSI chairperson)
Dijana Klaric (LACE Programme Manager)

Secretarie

Daan Degrauwe
Doina Banciu (helping from the hosts)

Excused:

Adérito Serrão
Radim Tolasz
Abdalah Mokksit

1. Welcome and opening of the meeting.

Welcome and practical information by PAC chairperson Cornel Soci.

2. Adoption of the draft agenda.

The agenda is approved.

3. Final approval of the Minutes from the fifth PAC meeting.

No comments are given. The minutes are approved.

4. ALADIN planning:

a. Present status of the 2011 work plan elaboration

Piet Termonia (PT) announces that this topic will be a bit mixed with agenda point 5a, and gives a presentation. The key element of the presentation is that the timetable for the writing

of the 2010 workplan (WP2010) was too compressed. At 14th GA in Istanbul, a proposal was made to relax timetable by starting already at the spring workshop. The procedure calendar was approved by GA. The PAC should then make recommendations for priorities.

Mikko Alestalo (MA) confirms the HIRLAM wish to progress in full merging with ALADIN and considers that a common workplan is the first step towards merging the consortia. It was agreed to do it from bottom-up.

Jean-François Geleyn (JFG) notes that due to some exceptional circumstances (volcanic ashes and national funerals) no wrap-up session was held in the Cracow workshop.

PT makes a proposition for the priorities list for the 2011 workplan (WP2011). If this list is approved by PAC, it will be passed to CSSI.

Philippe Bougeault (PB) confirms that SURFEX parallelization is indeed important. A contract has been placed with CERFACS, Toulouse, to ensure there will be progress on this issue.

JFG makes a distinction between two aspects: pure parallelization is planned for this year, but the work on SURFEX I/O is not yet planned and should enter the 2011 plan. At this moment, it is more a matter of agreement between experts, than a matter of manpower that delays things. This is mostly independent of the parallelization issue.

PB: The proposal that “PAC input is needed on dynamical core” is surprising since the Brac-HR workshop was intended to be a long-term brainstorming, whereas PAC discusses WP2011.

PT: We could start working on it already. Whether we have to include it in the WP2011 depends on agenda item 6.a.iii.

JFG: WP2010 doesn't contain dynamics actions.

MA: The Brac-HR workshop indeed should affect WP2011 from a scientific point of view.

JFG: This discussion should be moved to 6.a.iii

JFG asks why the GLAMEPS-LAEF convergence is not mentioned in the list of priorities?

PT: There has not been any communication (yet) with Wang Yong and Alex Deckmyn.

JFG: This topic might need pushing in 2011, either from scientific point of view, or from administrative.

Cornel Soci (CS) asks if there will be input for all items from CSSI members.

PT: Not yet, but this can be done later thanks to the flexible timetable.

Dijana Klaric (DK) notes that SRNWP-I does not appear in the list of priorities and asks if this will be treated as an extra action, outside the workplan. This may affect the workpower distribution of the workplan.

PT: No answer yet.

MA: Since ALADIN receives money for SRNWP-I, it should be high priority.

DK agrees.

PT agrees that a common plan should contain such “external actions”.

On a question of PB asking what had been the last ‘official’ word on the dynamical core issue JFG cites the 4-year plan on dynamics (see below).

“For all these reasons, the relevance of developing a local-type version of the dynamical kernel should be prospectively considered, and a consensus on the question should be reached.

Then if this development is recognized as a prioritised task, it should receive the status of a well-identified project with the corresponding manpower devoted to it. This is far to be the case for time being due to a severe lack of manpower (vocations?) in the field of dynamics. This project would represent a big work, and therefore HIRLAM should be associated to ALADIN in order to be able to fulfil the corresponding tasks. Due to the many associated uncertainties, it should also be accomplished in ascending compatibility with the well-known and stably-used spectral code, a fact that might plead in favour of finite elements rather than finite differences for the horizontal discretisation.”

MA: Different governance of ALADIN and HIRLAM is not a problem as long as a common workplan is followed, including common workplan tasks. HIRLAM does not want a separate external scientific advisory body. The merging of the workplans lies in the hands of the Program Managers.

JFG proposes to parallelize the workplans in 2011, and merge them in 2012.

PT notes that merging can be done incrementally, topic per topic.

PB asks if PAC will see WP2011 again before it goes to GA?

JFG answers that this is the case. There is even an opportunity to discuss it in an autumn meeting. Last year, the timing was too short for that, but the new timetable should allow for PAC to act on future WP instead of on current one.

Radmila Brozkova (RB) notes that harmonizing with LACE timetable is also needed.

DK explains that LACE uses 3-years workplans, and that one finishes now. The new workplan will be decided on in February 2011, and 2 internal meetings will be organized before this date. She proposes that feedback to ALADIN be given already in September.

PT notes that EWGLAM is already at the beginning of October, so a few weeks earlier would be better.

PB remarks that a second PAC meeting may help solving some issues.

JFG agrees and points out that this is later agenda point. This year, a second meeting may be more necessary than in other years.

DK comments that the scientific content of the workplan is more the business of the Programme Manager and CSSI, rather than PAC's.

PB asks if CSSI isn't more an internal than a reviewing body?

JFG agrees that the CSSI task is indeed ambiguous.

PB states that CSSI cannot produce and review WP at the same time.

JFG notes that this is linked to agenda point 8. Claude Fischer is aware of this problem for the work of the redaction committee of the future MoU4. Actions are taken to redefine role of LTMs and CSSI at this occasion.

b. Present status of the 4-year plan mid-term auto-evaluation procedure.

JFG explains that a mid-term auto-evaluation procedure was asked for by the GA in Istanbul. At this moment, only the skeleton has been developed yet. From here, it will pass to LTMs and CSSI.

JFG gives a presentation with the current status of

- data assimilation and use of observations
- diagnostics, validation and verification
- dynamics
- applications
- upper-air physics
- surface scheme
- system aspects

DK comments that SRNWP-I also has a maintenance aspect besides a technical and scientific aspect.

Gabor Radnoti (GR) asks to explain the plan to use the logistic of WRF for 'CHAPEAU'.

PT answers that it comes down to using the WRF GUI. User friendliness is a very work-consuming task so it would be nice if CHAPEAU could capitalize on the work of WRF.

RB points out that coding rules are still a weak point of system. Especially since these rules are not respected, e.g. the SURFEX code in Cy36, which couldn't even be compiled. RB asks what we will do about that, also in view of the relation with ECMWF.

CS agrees that PAC should express its concern on this topic.

JFG comments that there exists a trade-off between flexibility and complexity, but obeying coding rules is not part of this trade-off.

PB makes the general remark that the current representation (as given in the presentation) of the mid-term auto-evaluation is not very useful for the GA. The review of the workplan should contain the original workplan and a topic-on-topic evaluation. For the sake of brevity, it could be cast in a table representation comparing what was promised with what has been

achieved. For managers, a textual representation is less easy to use than a table to appreciate progress.

RB notes that directors have indicated that it is not sufficient to give the information in a table-format only, but that it is neither desirable to go into scientific details.

DK agrees and gives examples that it is difficult to find a good way of presenting work to managers. Especially if also scientific teams have to be pleased with how their work is presented.

Gwenaëlle Hello (GH) proposes to include also a risk analysis in the table, besides target and status.

JFG agrees as this is something in between text and a yes/no table.

CS considers such a risk analysis useful for the GA too, and not only for midterm review.

JFG notes that a yearly reporting in this form is perhaps too much. Biannual reporting should be okay. Anyway, it's a decision of PAC if the plan should be modified selectively.

PAC takes note that the topics are roughly inline with the work plan.

PAC express its concern regarding the non-standard coding rules applied for SURFEX.

PAC recommends a risk analysis for mid-term review to be presented also to GA.

5. PAC matters:

CS says these already have been touched in point 4; the discussion is transferred to after agenda point 6.

- a. *Preparation of the work by correspondence on the 2011 work plan, calendar and procedure (PM and CSSI Chair)*
- b. *Idem if needed for the auto-evaluation of the 4-year plan (PM and CSSI Chair)*

JFG promises to provide a document on this point later on.

DK asks if this will be discussed by correspondence.

JFG says this will be decided on at the end of the meeting.

6. ALADIN programme definition:

- a. *Update on important recent events (and 'open discussions' in the case 'i' and 'ii'):*
 - i. Various meetings at the occasion of the Workshop/ASM (Krakow, 12-16/4/10):

PT shows a slide on the CSSI-HMG meeting during the Cracow workshop.

PB remarks that the paper of Piotrowski et al. is on dry convection, while we are more interested in deep moist convection. JFG answers that shallow convection tests are on the way and apparently will not bring in a very different picture. Precipitating convection might be another story, but since its onset is heavily controlled by shallow convection, the issues raised by this paper are difficult to ignore.

PT shows a slide on the CSSI-LTM-ST meeting.

DK comments on the status of other common issues, and she notes that LACE was not completely represented in CSSI meeting. During the LACE council meeting, a discussion was held on the workplans and on how to use radar observations in data assimilation. HIRLAM already has some plans on how to do this, and a collaboration between the Croatian and Norwegian teams has been setup. In one year time, more reporting on this will follow.

ii.C-SRNWP related decisions at the occasion of the recent EUMETNET Assembly:

DK shows SRNWP presentation at EUMETNET GA from András Horányi (C-SRNWP PM), and unofficially summarized the outcome of EUMETNET GA: standpoints related to SRNWP actions..

DK remarks that she has a double feeling on the current status of SRNWP (SRNWP roadmap was rejected, but one of SRNWP program on common NWP verification has been prolonged), and wonders where the problem is.

JFG was quite surprised as well. 4 years ago there was a demand for an increased collaboration, and 2 years later a document was produced. These two encouragements now end in disappointment since we receive a completely contradicting message.

MA, who attended the EUMETNET meeting, prefers PB to clarify the French position rather than trying to carry the message from the meeting himself. Germany was opposing further collaboration as well.

PB asks how many of the Directors have changed in this period?

Answer: only the French.

PB asks how can this change the whole opinion of EUMETNET w.r.t. SRNWP? Some of the other Directors probably had also their doubts. In any case, the French Director has doubts on the objective of SRNWP. Why is this extra body necessary, if the consortia are doing the job already?

MA notes that András Horányi finds himself in a difficult position. He has to listen to the consortia. Interoperability is a clear example where an umbrella over consortia is useful. Verification is another one.

PB clarifies the French point of view: the HIRLAM/ALADIN merging is a success, and it goes much further than what SRNWP could deliver.

JFG remarks that the balance between cooperation and competition is now quite missing as a guideline for the work between the consortia. This was the origin of SRNWP. Later, it was

moved to EUMETNET to gain visibility. Still later, cooperation stimulation signals were given. The current evolution will require redesigning the role of the yearly EWGLAM meeting as the sole occasion for interconsortia discussions. The balance is endangered.

JFG agrees that some changes may be necessary, but the current evolution throws us back more than four years.

MA notes that the reorganization of EUMETNET EIG into two committees (STAC and PFAC) which synthesize problems to yes/no questions is positive development.

DK comments that the independent, external reviews of both HIRLAM and LACE claim that cooperation should increase. Moreover, reality (e.g. Brac) is different from policy, members of different Consortia are participating at the planning processes of other Consortia, as the external advisers. Finally, LACE members have expected more transparency at Consortia actions via GIE/ EIG EUMETNET mechanisms..

RB remarks that it is ironical that MetOffice is the leading partner in Interoperability and Verification.

JFG expected that SRNWP would evolve into one sub entity of one of the 3 or 4 new EUMETNET bodies. Why is the marginal saving so necessary to get rid of something that works and does not duplicate other actions or structures?

PB explains that the aim is not to go back 4 years, but rather to go towards a new body.

DK notes that there is no mention of this in the documents. These only talk about the cooperation.

MA suggests that we should wait for the new EUMETNET structure to come into operation.

PAC took note of the recent decisions of the EUMETNET Assembly and discussed them, and hopes that the outcome is not a disapproval of what CSRNWP PM András Horányi has been doing the last 4 years.

iii. Brac-HR workshop (Brač, Croatia), 17-20/5/10.

JFG sets the scene of how the Brac-HR workshop was conceived and organized. Reporting would be done in two parts: (i) punchline synthesis for PAC (and HAC); (ii) website with full presentations etc. It was anticipated that dynamic issues would form a core topic. The discussions lead to the decision to report to PAC with a more extended text, which was only reviewed by 6 people. This report separates consensual topics from three issues that were identified as non-consensual, plus ideas on how to progress on these issues. JFG emphasizes that the discussions were civilised, but no agreement was found. This is not yet the final version of the report. JFG proposes that PAC should not only scrutinise this report, but also take action before the follow up meeting to Brac-HR; i.e. agenda point 6.b.

PB already confirms that French delegation will have comments since they don't feel the situation as a deadlock.

MA thinks that PAC shouldn't take position in this confrontation, but simply propose how to introduce it in the programme definition.

PT gives some slides on the logic of problem, trying to superse all the discussions.

JFG clarifies that the physics-dynamics interaction (PDI) that should be developed is more general than what was discussed in Convergence Days. It should contain all of the no-man's-land in between reversible dynamics and 'process-type' physical parameterizations.

PB comments that this PDI is very complex to develop and asks how many years of work this will require, if the (simple) PDI of the Convergence Days already took more than 2 years? PB also notes that scalability is an issue on the short term.

PB remarks that "Cosmo dynamics" used by PT in his presentation is a misleading term. The French delegation was speaking of a generic, local and accurate new dynamics, as compatible as possible with the ALADIN heritage.

PT fully agrees and proposes to correct this, but this reflects the fact that during Brac-HR there was no clarity on which dynamical core would serve as the basis.

PB agrees that it would be preferable to take an approach that is fair to all physics, but seriously questions the feasibility and timetable of such an approach

JFG thinks that there is no reason why PDI, dynmical core and progress in description of processes could not be developed in parallel.

PB proposes to separate dynamics problems (mainly scalability) from PDI problems. MeteoFrance NWP 'dynamicists' apparently broadly agree with JFG's and Jeanette Onvlee's proposal in their late position paper.

MA points out that HIRLAM doesn't want to take a bet on one approach, but would prefer parallel developments.

RB notes that scalability is mainly a problem for AROME (not only SURFEX), and only to a lesser degree, it is a problem for ALARO. The scalability of the dynamical core may saturate somewhere in the future, but this is still some time away. There is also a semantic problem: "communication scalability" is not the same as "dynamics scalability", but these two are often confused.

PB explains that MF is under pressure to demonstrate that they are preparing themselves for a massively parallel future.

RB and JFG note that the problem is in the methodology, not in the components of the work to be performed.

PB agrees that new dynamics cannot be the only work to be done.

MA notes that we can't be so sure that it's the dynamics that are guilty.

PB answers that we're not sure either that they are not.

JFG says that the problem in Brac was exclusivity in the conditions of the discussion. One could not treat several problems in conditions where opening the discussion about them would have amounted to accept some a-priori postulates about other issues.

DK says that even Terry Davies (MetOffice) commented that a new dynamic core would probably not solve all recognized shortcomings, and that an effort is needed on the methodology.

DK remarks that we should start working on new dynamics in the short term, but that we don't have the people for it.

JFG disagrees: new dynamics are more challenging and attractive than current dynamics topics. Anyway, workpower was not a topic in Brac-HR.

PB says that bargaining in Brac was unhappy: if you start too far from what you want to reach, you'll reach nothing.

MA proposes that HIRLAM organizes the follow-up meeting for Brac-HR, early 2011.

PAC supports this proposal.

DK asks if this will require new meetings in 2011 (comment: unclear have we spoke about working plans for 2011 or about 4Y working plans, it could be erased together with JFG answer).

JFG points out that this doesn't need to be the case.

b. PAC advices/recommendations on matters linked with the preparation, and/or outcome of the brainstorming Brac-HR event. Which steps should now be taken in preparation of the second part of the strategy update process recommended by the GA at its Istanbul Session?

PT shows a few slides summarizing the outcome of the discussions under 6.a.iii.

1. PAC agrees with the strategy of scientific dealing with the issue of the deep convection, i.e. develop a variety of tools to address the unresolved processes?

PB even wants to put it more explicitly: we want to use code at a variety of resolutions; hence we need different solutions to the issue of deep convection.

2. JFG points out that it is less obvious whether we should take a huge leap, reorganize the code, or rather progressively build on what we have today, or any combination of these.

PB asks how we should organize ourselves now, regarding the fact that some things cannot be explored in the current framework.

JFG proposes to keep options open until we progress our study.

PB remarks that the point 1. doesn't only apply on the physics. We need a number of exploratory studies for the dynamics, sometimes on toy models outside the current framework.

PAC recognizes the value of progressive development.

3. PAC agrees on the proposal that we should make an effort to strive for replacement tests as much as possible (this does not exclude that production tests, and academic tests are needed!).

JFG remarks that the late position paper originated as an attempt to find a way in-between the Benard/Lac paper and the others: see if there exist intermediate steps, rather than taking one big step.

4. If we have an agreement on the first three points, how do we substitute for the unfortunately lack of bargaining between the 2 extreme positions during the Brac meeting?

PT suggests transferring the answer to this point to after the WP2011 discussion.

PB proposes to work this out in the coming months.

PT shows a slide containing proposals on how these conclusions will be translated in WP2011.

1. A hint of the late position paper was already in the 4-y plan, shall we promote it to a higher level in the WP2011?
2. At the same time I believe we should also include the Runge Kutta (RK) tests (lower right box) to advance our scientific expertise.

PB points out that "production tests" need a complete system, and cannot be performed on toy models.

PT agrees that this will not be possible in 2011 yet.

RB puts forward the importance of fair tests to compare different setups.

PT proposes to build-up expertise on (e.g.) RK, and not aim at production tests immediately.

PAC agrees on this.

3. We have scattered initiatives for the physics-dynamics interaction (this is not the same as physics-dynamics interfaces). Shall we put them into something more constructive?

PT clarifies that this point will be the task of the CSSI.

JFG remarks that this is indeed important. Until now the efforts have been disperse. Should this be maintained or should some streamlining action be taken? In 5 years time, the PDI (interaction) will most likely be a recognized part of the model.

PT proposes to address the PDI topic specifically in the next year's workplan.

JFG sees it more as an informal transversal topic that needs recognition before itemisation.

JFG gives an overview of the scattered initiatives: Daan Degrauwe's work on equations and their code equivalent, HIRLAM work on Cellular Automaton, use SLHD in a more physical way, reorganization of the 'physical' time-step, QNSE might be an in-depth evolution of the turbulent system, projection of heat sources/sinks on temperature and pressure in the compressible dynamical case.

JFG emphasizes that the work on PDI is more than a reproduction of Piotrowski's results. The issue is whether some streamlining actions are required for finding bridges between all above-mentioned components.

4. Of course we also need input for the issue of diagnostic validation, verification.

PB would like a reference to the need to work on scalability, especially in view of its urgency.

JFG answers that scalability is a constant reference for all actions.

PB would like to see it as an individual action, not as something en route.

JFG points out that there are three constraints for future development: scalability, upward compatibility, and separating reversibility and irreversibility.

PAC agrees that scalability should be a separate recommendation for the WP.

PT made a proposal on the second slide to proceed with the planning process to include the recommendations from PAC, and asks feedback from PAC.

PT proposes that PAC be involved in this, and that it's a matter of writing a clear workplan, and scrutinizing by PAC, before it goes to GA.

JFG indicates that there exists also a need to provide input to the follow-up workshop of Brac-HR in order to harmonize short-term and longterm strategies. This should be done jointly by HMG and CSSI. JFG proposes to take two members (on basic dynamics and on physics, given the issues at stake) on each side (Benard, Vana, Tijm and Hortal). Additionally it is important that this work is followed closely by PAC and proposes two watchdogs (RB and PB).

PB agrees but says that he may delegate this task to Alain Joly.

PB also points out the need to make the distinction between long and short term before the follow-up meeting to Brac-HR.

MA would like some clarification on the Terms of Reference of these 4 people.

JFG explains that they will try to verify if the WP2011 elements of the toymodel tests, production tests and replacement tests are inline with longterm issues. They provide guidelines for these topics and check their feasibility. The aim is to avoid the same blocking in the second workshop as in Brac. Sustainability of core proposals is the key objective.

To summarize, PAC agrees on the following points:

- Scalability is a crucial future goal. All scientific proposals should be tested with respect to scalability.
- Do you agree with the strategy of scientific dealing with the issue of the deep convection, i.e. develop a variety of tools to address the unresolved processes? -YES
- Strategy is a bet: should we take a huge leap, reorganize the code, or rather progressively build on what we have today, or any combination?
- Should we make an effort to strive for replacement tests as much as possible (this does not exclude that production tests, and academic tests are needed!)? - YES
- We should substitute for the unfortunately lack of bargaining between the 2 extreme positions during the Brac meeting.

PAC makes the following proposals for WP2011:

- A hint of the late position paper was already in the 4-y plan. It should be promoted to a higher level in the WP2011.
- At the same time we should also include the RK tests (lower right box) to advance our scientific expertise.
- We have scattered initiatives for the physics-dynamics interaction (this is not the same as physics-dynamics interfaces). We should put them into something more constructive.
- Of course we also need input for the issue of diagnostic validation, verification.

Topic that was not on agenda: manpower discussion.

JFG announces that these numbers will be checked thoroughly for the MoU.

7. Resource matters:

a. Budget matters

i. Report about the ongoing execution of the 2010 budget:

JFG explains that this has already been decided on because of MeteoFrance timetable constrains. GA would like a zero sum, but this will not be reached. MeteoFrance is the central organizing partner. Any budget problems are for the next GA. It is important that all actions that are in the plan are financed and vice versa.

JFG asks PAC how to ensure that MeteoFrance has no deficit/surplus. At 2010 midterm there are already 5 actions that are not fulfilled.

CS asks how this is done in LACE.

DK answers that there is no problem there since money can be transferred to the next year easily.

CS points out that it is very difficult to reach pure zero.

JFG specifies that this year it looks particularly bad, i.e. worse than other years.

JFG sees three solutions:

- ask Meteo-France to transfer money between years, even across different MoUs.
- countries that do not fulfil missions finance other missions.
- finance missions with “sleeping money”

DK proposes to spend the money on useful actions such as the maintenance workshop.

JFG generalizes this to the EWGLAM LTM meeting.

PAC supports these proposals:

- to ask Meteo-France to find a solution to transfer money even across different MoUs as a possible back-up;
- to spend money during maintenance workshop and EWGLAM or maybe a second PAC session if the latter happens..

ii. PAC’s guidance for the elaboration of the 2011 budget, under the constraint that the GA has yet to decide on many dimensioning aspects.

JFG explains Patricia Pottier’s slides.

JFG summarizes that the flat-rate system has not stimulated exchanges between flat-rate countries: exchanges are still with either LACE or Meteo-France. The question to PAC is whether to keep this system, or to reorganize, since one objective has not been reached. The money is not misused, but not used in the originally intended way.

DK asks how the HIRLAM exchanges are organized.

MA answers that they work more locally and with working weeks.

JFG indicates that Patricia Pottier excluded 1-week stays and/or trainings from the statistics.

DK says that it is not only number of stays and budget, but also the quality that counts.

JFG feels that the rate of failure/success is the same for these stays as for the others.

DK suggests that it may take some time for people to realize that they can host visitors.

JFG stresses that the machinery is quite heavy for a limited number of stays, but doesn’t oppose to maintaining this system.

DK sees the fact that more people are attending the ALADIN workshop and HIRLAM ASM as a success of the system.

JFG introduces the final issue, i.e. the yearly ceilings. He proposes something like 9400 if one accounts for inflation and the fact that the first ‘ceiling’ proved to be an ‘average’ rather than an upper bound.

DK answers that for her, anything below 12000 is okay.

Maria Monteiro (MM) warns that the directors will not easily agree with an increased ceiling.

DK indicates that there should be a balance between the ambition of the plans and the available budget; these two should be in relation.

JFG finds this a very dangerous kind of reasoning. It is difficult for year-to-year planning to account for long-term ambitious strategies.

RB also points out the danger of making promises to government.

JFG points out another risk: if not all countries contribute immediately to these ambitious plans, then they may believe that their money shouldn’t go there.

DK agrees that the links shouldn’t be too strong, but that they nevertheless should exist up to some level.

PAC agrees to propose a ceiling of 8200 euro in the MoU4 and yearly updates to follow inflation.

8. PAC’s study of the work of the redaction committee for the new ALADIN MoU (as well as its HARMONIE and ECMWF links). Discussions, recommendations and calendar of next steps.

CS introduces this topic and lists the redaction committee.

A list of issues to be discussed was distributed beforehand.

CS proposes to rely on what the redaction committee has prepared, but that other comments are welcome.

JFG agrees that it is not a final version.

- *take notice and possibly comment on the role and the composition of Bureau (Article 4, paragraphs 24 and 39)*

JFG explains that the Bureau system was not in the first MoU, that its task is to prepare the GA, and that it consists of the GA chairperson, the CSSI chairperson, the PM and the PAC chairperson.

CS agrees that the composition of the Bureau should be specified in the MoU, instead of being discussed in the GA.

PAC agrees.

PB proposes to add members to the Bureau, if necessary, such that all components of the consortium are represented.

- *review and possibly amend the ToRs of... PAC itself (Article 4.3 and Annex IV)*

CS found some mixture between different articles and proposes to revise these and remove redundancies between 4.3 and Annex 4.

PB notes an issue of consistency between the definitions of the bodies in the text.

GH summarizes that the governance aspects should go in main text, and practicalities in the Annex.

PB notes that there is no description of the decision-making of PAC. In fact PAC “recommends” not “decides”

JFG says that this is by agreement.

JFG proposes to also include the composition of PAC (2 MeteoFrance, 2 LACE and 2 others)

- *one aspect raised by Cornel by email: "According to the PAC ToR, the members are designated by the GA. However, it is not clearly stated what action should be taken if from one reason or another a member cannot attend the meeting. In this respect, to make things clear, I would suggest to add some lines in the next MoU. "*

JFG proposes that the GA appoints replacement persons for each PAC member (someone from the same group).

MM notes that on page 33 it is specified that “Deputies of ... can represent members of PAC in the PAC meetings.”

JFG says this should be moved to the main body of the text.

JFG proposes that at least three observers be already mentioned: CSSI chair, HMG chair and LACE PM.

PAC agrees on the proposal.

JFG summarizes as follows: “GA chooses on proposals for the three components, including substitutes for each of the members. If neither the person, nor the replacement can come, this leads to a void.”

PB feels this to may sometimes be a serious problem for MeteoFrance, since it’s only one country.

- *have a careful review of the text and ToRs for LTMs and CSSI members (Article 5, paragraph 42 and Annexes V and VI resp.). In MoU4, the LTMs receive more rights and duties in terms of Programme activity and liaison with PM (beyond being simply local contact persons). CSSI members have a more explicit transversal role, including both advices (to PM) and tasks in terms of technical/operational implementation.*

PB proposes to shorten the ToR texts, esp. LTM. JFG explains that it was far too short in the previous MoU.

PB has two specific comments on CSSI selection procedure:

- “on behalf” should be replaced by “based on”
- Only proposal by PM for CSSI members is too restrictive. Other bodies could also make proposals for members.

JFG proposes that the PAC chairperson, after consultation of PAC members could also make proposals.

PB asks if there is no limitation on the size of CSSI.

PB wants the issue of “transversal issues” to be rewritten because it’s unclear in CSSI ToR Annex.

JFG agrees that it should be explained, but fears that this may oppose some directors. The committee will look for a formulation that pleases the directors.

PB makes a remark on bullet just underneath the previous one: transversality is not clear again, so it should be explained.

JFG agrees and points out that both “transversalities” are not identical.

PB proposes to write it in a more understandable language.

DK proposes that the part on responsibilities in the LTM ToR should go to the main text? This depends on the definition of “membership”. A distinction should be made between the LTM responsibility w.r.t. the consortium and the LTM responsibility w.r.t. the local management.

JFG recognizes that there is an ambiguity in the role of LTMs: defending the consortium internally, and defending his institute externally. He proposes to review this part, and send it to PAC again.

JFG proposes that MM and RB send comments, from practical experience as LTMs, to the MoU redaction committee before June 11th.

- *Evaluate the texts concerning a new structure: the “Task Force” (Article 5, paragraph 42 and Annex VII). The Task Force is proposed as a tool for evaluating, preparing or fostering actions on well identified topics. It is transversal to Aladin & Hirlam (thus the many cross-references) and temporary in time. It is thought as an extra tool for the PM.*

CS notes that such a Task Force (TF) already existed once.

MA comments on the draft HIRLAM MoU. Their feeling is that the TF organization is too heavy: the link to GA and HIRLAM Council is unnecessary. It could be organized at a lower level. Coordination of its ToR with the HIRLAM MoU is necessary.

PT agrees with this proposal since TF flexibility is important.

JFG explains that TF originated from two purposes: stimulate HIRLAM/ALADIN cooperation, as well as take quick action.

PB requests a clarification of the purpose of TF: if it is intended for urgent matters, it shouldn't link to GA. He asks who is going to work in TF, and who makes this decision? He also suggests not to refer to "governance" but to "common practice", and that the phrase "Decided by PAC" should be replaced by "Recommended by PAC".

Following a comment of RB, the proposal is made that the TF does not oppose the workplan.

PT proposes to include something like "the task will enter the workplan automatically". This will strengthen the common workplan development with HIRLAM as well. It could even act as a trial for a common structure with HIRLAM.

PAC agrees on this proposal.

PAC agrees that it is best not to specify interconsortium cooperation explicitly.

PB notes that the maximum of 4 person-month may be much for small services.

PB proposes to add "recommended by PAC...after the consideration of the impact on the workplan".

MA comments that the "The person having been in this position ..." point could be removed.

PT agrees that this sentence becomes unnecessary if the task enters the workplan automatically.

DK points out the inconsistency that PAC becomes a decision-making body on this topic. This decision must be made on consensus within PAC, and this specification should come only in TF ToR. She proposes to include something like "If there is consensus by the PAC, ..."

MA points out that the numbering and organization is not very readable.

JFG answers that it will be revised thoroughly.

- *Article 5, paragraph 44: should "nowcasting" and "regional climate" remain explicitly listed in this paragraph (besides the other items)?*

MA notes that the items in paragraph 44 are all very close to NWP, whereas regional climate and nowcasting are further away. He asks whether other fields (e.g. marine dispersion applications) should be put there too?

JFG proposes to say something like “ADDING help to these and those applications” in the preamble.

- *Article 6, paragraph 56: should we keep an explicit reference to Eumetnet cooperation, or simply remove this paragraph ?*

DK proposes to keep this paragraph, because it doesn't hurt.

MA appreciates the weakness of this paragraph.

- *Article 7, paragraph 64: this paragraph needs to be updated with the input of the LACE PM (observer at PAC)*

DK will make a proposal for this.

- *PAC's advice is searched for how to write in the draft MoU those items where a “lastminute decision by GA, before signature” is mandatory. These items are:*
 - *decision on the members ès Quality of the Bureau (Article 4.4, paragraph 39)*
 - *precise amount of the ceiling (Article 7, paragraph 61)*
 - *rule for returning royalties to the Consortium members (Article 11, paragraph 87)*

For all 3 items, the question to PAC is whether the draft MoU should contain (a) a conditional preliminary proposal (anticipating the decisions that GA might take), (b) have two alternative texts (the alternative to (a) being a neutral text stating “GA will decide of ...”) or (c) only the alternative text

JFG points out that the two first items have been discussed before, and that there is no need to make changes regarding the third item.

- *should the preamble be modified in its structure or content ?*

MA feels that the European collaboration is missing from the preamble. He proposes to include the sentence “RECOGNIZING the possibilities of a wider European collaboration between NWP consortia.”

PB notes that “Brand ALADIN” is not appropriate; just “ALADIN”

PAC agrees on this point.

MA explains that the same issue applies to HIRLAM, which is both a consortium and a brand.

PAC concludes that the word “brand” shouldn't appear in the MoU.

CS notes that “members” should be used everywhere, i.e. replacing “parties” at some instances, e.g. in the last bullet in preamble.

CS notes that paragraphs 3.i. and 4.i. are redundant and considers it is better to change Art. 1 with Art. 2 in order to simplify the text.

CS asks if in Article 1, paragraph 2, the meshsize for mesobeta resolutions should also be specified explicitly.

PAC concludes that it would be better to omit the meshsize specification for mesogamma resolutions as well.

CS suggests that preamble of Governance article should list the bodies of ALADIN.

Aspects in link with the collaboration with Hirlam:

- *check whether the present structure of the common annex III is OK (containing two parts => (1) software collaboration and policy and (2) commercial activity, both parts kept empty for the time being but the version of MoU3 can serve as example); check with Hirlam the referencing inside the core text of MoU (Article 6, paragraph 54ii)*

MA says HAC didn't have a close look yet, and that the HIRLAM PM is the contact person for this issue.

MA notes that "Common research/workplan" could be specified into 4y and annual workplan. He asks if the main text have a reference to the workplan as a tool? This should be homogenized between HIRLAM and ALADIN, anticipating the future.

MA points out the difference between cooperation and collaboration: collaboration is between consortia; cooperation is between persons.

PB remarks that in paragraph 42, the terms "program team" and "project team" are confusing. "program team" should be suppressed.

- *liaison about taskforce*

9. 'Open discussion' concerning the procedure of signing the new MoU.

JFG proposes that the signing should require the physical presence of every member, and that this task cannot be delegated to other countries.

PAC agrees that this should be required.

10. Recommendations by PAC concerning the choice of the next ALADIN PM.

CS recalled that there is one candidate who applied for the ALADIN Programme Manager position, namely Dr. Piet Termonia, from RMI.

PAC evaluated the eligibility of the candidate and considered that all the conditions approved during 14th ALADIN GA in Istanbul were fulfilled by the candidate.

PAC supports unanimously the candidacy of Dr. Piet Termonia.

MA would like to thank PAC on behalf of HIRLAM for its good choice.

11. A.O.B.

DK asks if the discussion of HIRLAM MoU shouldn't be a topic for PAC?

It is answered that the GA chairperson (Klemen Bergant) is observer.

MA notes that the duration of the "Agreement of cooperation" is not limited; so we are legally safe.

12. Date and place of the next PAC meeting (two scenarii must be envisaged for 2010: an autumn PAC session or a 'bureau-type' meeting [in preparation for the General Assembly in Prague, 14-15/12/10]).

JFG notes that some issues will need further coordination: the workplan, the strategic workshop and the MoU. Together these may require an extra PAC meeting.

JFG proposes to plan a PAC meeting, and strip it down to a Bureau meeting if possible.

PAC agrees to plan this meeting on November 9th, 9h — 15h in Budapest.

The decision whether this will be a Bureau meeting or a PAC meeting should be taken by September 9th.

DK asks about the timetable of the MoU redaction?

This depends on the comments from the members. By June 29th, a version should go to the directors. By mid-August, a synthesis of the contributions should be made.

MA notes that the part on the HIRLAM/ALADIN collaboration should be ready earlier.

13. Closing of the meeting.

CS closes the meeting and thanks JFG for his efforts as ALADIN PM, in case there will not be a second PAC meeting in 2010..