PAC Participants*: 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*: Philippe BOUGEAULT (MF rep. at the HAC meeting), Branka IVANVAN-PICEK (LACE rep.), Jeanette ONVLEE (HIRLAM observer, attending the HAC meeting)*

1. Opening and welcome

Daniel opened the meeting at 14:00 and welcomed all the participants.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda below was proposed and adopted, with addition of one point on the preparation of the GA agenda.

Agenda	Introduced by	Documents
1. Opening and welcome	PAC chair	
2. Adoption of the agenda	PAC chair	2_agenda_PAC_2019
3. Policy issues: convergence	ALADIN PM & PAC chair	
1. from scope document to MoU		
1. short and long term goals and organization of the future single consortium		3.1_Goals_and_Organisation
2. strategy meeting content		3.1_Strategy_meeting
3. budget principles and scenarios for financial organisation		3.1_Financial_scenarios
4. quality assurance		3.1_QA_document
5. legal aspects (IPR, disputes)		3.1_Letter-to-directors
6. draft MoU		3.1_Draft_MoU
7. Procedure for PM and leaders selection		3.1_PM&L_selection_procedure
8. roadmap and back-up solution		3.1_Roadmap
4. Policy issues: ALADIN only		
1. PM report and realisation of RWP2019		4.1_Report
2. ALADIN Budget (2019 & 2020)		4.2_Budget
3. Changes in position (if any)		
5. A.O.B	PAC chair	
1. Proposal for the agenda of the GA		
6. Date of the next meetings	PAC chair	to be agreed with HAC
7. Closing	PAC chair	

3. Policy issues

1.   From scope document to MoU

Following the distribution of the draft MoU for the future ALADIN-LACE-HIRLAM Consortium last spring, the Convergence Working Group (CWG) had received several important comments and requests for clarification. The CWG had investigated them in detail and many documents had been

produced, including a new version of the draft A-L-H MoU. They had been distributed to the PAC-HAC members for discussion during the Toulouse PAC, HAC and joint PAC-HAC meetings.

1. *short and long term goals and organization of the future single consortium*

Piet introduced the first two documents "goals and organisation" and "strategy meeting" as prepared by ALADIN and HIRLAM PMs, and explained how their proposal for creating a common scripting system, together with a common working environment, was aimed at strengthening the collaboration within the future joint consortium members.

The PAC discussed at length this proposal and the content of these documents. Not everybody had understood the same the common working environment and concerns about what this really encompasses, its importance as a first goal, its usefulness, its costs in terms of manpower, … were raised. The PAC asked for clarification and the documents to be modified accordingly. The PAC agreed on the text below, to be proposed to the PAC-HAC the following day:

- *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.*

2. *strategy meeting content*

Besides the above points, the PAC had no comment on the general organisation of the strategy meeting, but proposed to refine the draft list of areas and topics proposed by the ALADIN and HIRLAM PMs. The PAC underlined the importance of giving all groupings and partners the opportunity to contribute to the strategy.

3. *budget principles and scenarios for financial organisation*

Piet presented the 3 proposed financial scenarios proposed by the CWG: they differed by the number of compensated positions.

Radmila commented that LACE practice was not accurately described: the first sentence of the third paragraph should not refer explicitly to LACE.

PAC recommended to remove the GNI graphic and its reference in the text.

Radmila and Martina explained that, among the three scenarios, LACE would choose the scenario A, as the compensations would enter in conflict with LACE budget.

4. *quality assurance*

Piet explained that following 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.

The PAC reviewed this document and proposed the following modifications:

- *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.*

1. PAC proposed to modify the QA document accordingly and to keep its new version in annex II of the MoU.

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. ZAMG had already given their agreement and Meteo Romania had proposed slight complements.

Radmila gave the Czech position (an official full answer will follow): CHMI considers that there are currently 16 co-owners of the ALADIN code; according to the CHMI understanding of the ALADIN MoU5, whatever changes on the way the common property of the code is handled have to be decided unanimously; the ALADIN-HIRLAM merge implying a change in the ownership, the merge must first be unanimously approved by the 16 ALADIN Directors before it is discussed in a joint ALADIN-GA and HIRLAM Council (GA/C). The PAC recommended to check this understanding by CHMI with other lawyers and in particular the French one who already explored the topic.

6. *draft MoU*

Piet explained that the CWG had taken into account the comments received on the first draft MoU, besides the comments from Slovenia and the later comments from Czech Rep, that will be incorporated in the updated version the CWG will prepare for the GA/C.
Due to lack of time, the PAC could not go point by point through the draft MoU: this was done the day after during the joint PAC-HAC meeting (see 9th PAC-HAC minutes).

7. *procedure for PM and leaders selection*

The CWG had proposed a procedure for PM and area leaders selections. Radmila pointed that this document was pending on the approval by the GA/C of the convergence process and draft MoU. The PAC had no comment on the content of the document.

8. *roadmap and back-up solution*

Due to lack of time, the discussion was postponed to the PAC-HAC.

4. Policy issues: ALADIN only

1. PM report and realisation of RWP2019

Due to lack of time, Piet proposed that any comments on his report document were sent by email in order for him to prepare an updated version for the ALADIN GA.

About the manpower numbers, Radmila commented that the philosophy of reporting is not the same within ALADIN and HIRLAM. Martina answered that the 3 PMs, Claude and Patricia had checked the reported manpower: some similar actions might be reported in different Work Packages depending on the LTMs or the HoRs who report, but this doesn't change the total (over the whole RWP) manpower numbers.

2. ALADIN Budget (2019 & 2020)

PAC made no comment on the report of the ongoing execution of the 2019 budget.

PAC recommanded the flat-rate contribution for 2020 to be at the ceiling (2019 contribution augmented by the inflation), thus 12215 € per Member.

3. Changes in position (if any)

None.

The PAC was suspended at 19:00.

5. A.O.B.

The PAC resumed at 8:15 on Tuesday 6. The PAC discussed the preparation of the ALADIN GA and its draft agenda (the PAC agreed on a draft agenda that will be proposed to the Bureau for validation).

A half-day was originally planed for the GA meeting in Istanbul. Considering the number and the importance of the topics to be discussed during the GA meeting and in preparation for the joint GA/C the day after, the GA chair considered that half a day was not enough. After in session phone discussion, the PAC and the GA chair agreed that there was a need for a longer meeting or for having an additional preparatory meeting (this is the solution chosen by the HIRLAM Council, to meet the previous week besides the ECMWF Council). In order to avoid an additional travel to the Members of the GA not attending the ECMWF Council, it was preferred to rather extend the meeting on 16 of December to the morning. Patricia contacted the Turkish hosts who confirmed that an earlier start (10:30) of the ALADIN GA was possible.

6. Date and place of the next meetings

This point was discussed during the PAC-HAC meeting (see 9th PAC-HAC minutes for more details).
Next PAC ad 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.

7. Closing

Daniel thanked the participants for the good discussions and closed the meeting at 8:50.