

Minutes

Participants

Flat-Rate ALADIN MoU5 Representatives	Daniel Gellens (Belgium), chair
	Mehmet Fatih Büyükkasabbaşı (Turkey)
	Subs.: Mohamed Mokhtari (Algeria)
RC-LACE-MoU5 Representatives	Florinela Georgescu (Romania), vice-chair
	Radmila Brozkova (Czech Republic)
HIRLAM-C Representatives	Jussi Kaurola (Finland)
	Jørn Kristiansen (Norway)
Météo-France Representatives	Alain Joly
	Marc Pontaud
ACCORD PM	Claude Fischer
ACCORD CSS	Patricia Pottier

1. Opening

Daniel (PAC chair) welcomed everybody. The meeting is recorded and the recording will be deleted after the minutes are accepted.. The solution for video-meeting is a good practice for PAC meetings, that are usually short ones.

2. Adoption of the draft agenda

Daniel reminded that the last Assembly (on 7 July) decided to convene PAC in order to discuss how to account for DEODE-funded manpower in ACCORD. The ACCORD Bureau met on 5 October and suggested that PAC members also could discuss how they see the continuation (or not) of their membership to the ACCORD PAC. These are the two main items on the agenda.

Claude proposed an A.O.B for information to the PAC in relation with the management of the spectral transforms codes.

The agenda was unanimously adopted.

3. DEODE-funded manpower in ACCORD

Claude gave the context:

- the DEODE main contract was signed on 1 September (ECMWF/MF)
- kick-off meeting took place on 16 September

The DEODE-funded manpower is already visible in the ACCORD documents and for ACCORD management:

- by a specific reference to the DEODE project in the list of participants within the RWP (Claude presented an example regarding draft commitments in the RWP2023)
- by a specific flagging when LTMs register their local manpower in the Common Manpower Register (Claude presented examples on the interface used by the LTMs)

For information, Claude gave a few figures on overall manpower: the DEODE funded manpower which could be relevant for ACCORD amounts to about 33 person.year on average for a one year period of 12 months. This figure can be broadly compared with the ACCORD RWP Q3/2021-Q2/2022 summed total staffing, over all members, which amounts to about 162 person.year on an average over 12 months.

Regarding manpower reporting rules in general, any manpower reported by an ACCORD team is accounted for in the CMR for IPR, regardless of its funding, provided that his/her tasks fall within the scope of the RWP. This rule is in-line with Article 2, items 27-28 of the MoU (RWP and CMR). It is valid for permanent NHMS staff as well as for staff hired on external funding.

Claude informed about DEODE IPR provisions:

- background IPRs are kept by ACCORD members
- improvements to bg-IPRs are owned by the E.U. Commission (via ECMWF), but DEODE can ask for being assigned back these subsisting IPRs (the decision lies with ECMWF)
- the use of DestinE results by all ACCORD members will be asked to ECMWF, the decision lies with the E.U. Commission

According to ACCORD rules, manpower figures provide the key for sharing the IPRs across all Members (and voting rights are linked with the share of the IPRs).

The Assembly decided to convene a PAC to discuss how the manpower figures reported on DEODE/DestinE funding should be accounted for in relation to the share of the IPR on the common codes.

In the preparatory document, three possible scenarios were proposed, with the scenario A being the preferred one:

- A. all DestinE-funded manpower is accounted for in the share of IPR provided that his/her tasks fall within the scope of the ACCORD RWP (of course, no double accounting of work is allowed and any such mistake should be pruned from the CMR);
- B. DestinE-funded work (in the scope of the RWP) is only partially accounted for, for instance only permanent staff but not staff hired on the contract;
- C. no DestinE-funded manpower is accounted for at all.

Draft recommendations were proposed in the preparatory document.

Claude concluded with suggesting PAC to comment: any Questions or Comments on how we propose to make DEODE-funded manpower visible in the RWP and CMR ? any comments on the scenarios or other possible scenarios ?

Daniel thanked Claude and gave the floor to comments or questions:

- Radmila thanked Claude and Patricia for the proposals on how to make the DEODE-funded manpower visible in the ACCORD management tools. She asked what “avoid double accounting” means; Claude explained that with the proposal for the RWP and the CMR, LTMs have the means to clearly separate ACCORD and DEODE-funded work time, and the CMR even provides some means for automatic checking of consistency in the reporting

- Radmila noted that there is currently no guarantee that the DEODE subsisting IPRs in ACCORD codes would indeed be assigned back to ACCORD. Claude confirmed that this will first have to be requested by MF (the prime contractor) once several code changes are available. So the DEODE core management team will work on this towards the end of phase 1. Radmila suggested that then it would be good to decide on the share of subsisting IPRs in ACCORD only after the assigning back was accepted by ECMWF and the EU (conditional acceptance of scenario A).
- Radmila further suggested that the accounted manpower should focus on efforts that lead to actual code contributions in the T-cycles. In the recent past, ACCORD codes had been studied and modified in external projects, however the new codes had been found impossible to port back to the common code repository of ACCORD (aka as “T-cycles”). Claude answered that the decision to integrate a code change from an external project (DEODE or other) should remain a matter of decision at scientific and technical level, and sometimes ACCORD staff is working on exploratory studies whose outcome might actually not lead to a concrete code contribution (because it would be recoded, or because the results would be disappointing). Nevertheless, we would still account for the associated manpower when we consider that we have learned something from this work.
- Patricia confirmed that we have the appropriate tools in the CMR for making a continued registration and survey of the DEODE-funded manpower, even if the decision with respect to share of IPRs is to be delayed to after a positive answer from ECMWF on the back-assignment of IPRs.
- Jørn explained that he agrees with the existing principles for manpower in ACCORD, which work well: any manpower reported by an ACCORD team is accounted for in the CMR for IPR, regardless of its funding, provided that his/her tasks fall within the scope of the RWP. Then what makes DEODE different ? it is the size of the contribution and the fact that DEODE is not a research project per se. There indeed also are Service-oriented tasks and such work won’t be accounted for in ACCORD. He suggests agreeing on a simple, common rule for both DEODE and other external-funded projects, and scenario A is fine as it fits with the current rules.
- Radmila added that another difference between DEODE and any other externally funded project was that DEODE has very specific rules on IPR (to the EU) while usually there is no such provision in research contracts (or they are not very specific).
- Jørn further pointed out that ECMWF seemed rather strict on keeping a high level of confidentiality on DestinE figures and resources (which are based on real costs), even among contractors and sub-contractors. Is then the wide share of DEODE-funded manpower figures in ACCORD not in contradiction with this requirement of confidentiality ? Claude confirmed that ECMWF was insisting on confidentiality, however in ACCORD we are not aiming at sharing DEODE real costs or actual registration figures (on manpower, on financial provisions etc.). We only work with estimated manpower figures in relation to the ACCORD RWP. Jørn suggested that a disclaimer could be formulated in the ACCORD documents to make clear that in ACCORD, we are not dealing with DEODE management figures, only with figures relevant for the ACCORD internal management. Make clear that in ACCORD we do not create a breach of confidentiality with respect to DestinE provisions.
- Daniel: do we then still see reasons to keep the DEODE project well identified in ACCORD, or should we generalise DEODE practice to all external projects ?
- Radmila asked when the request for being assigned back IPRs would be formulated to ECMWF? Claude: the assignment back of IPR should be requested by Meteo-France to ECMWF in 2023. Concretely the request will be prepared with Elisabeth, Roger, Kristian and himself: formulate the request, list examples of improved codes. Radmila also asked what precisely “improvements” means ? Claude answered that “improvements” means “code changes” in the way they would be described by using a code tracking tool (i.e. list of changed routines, list of modified lines of codes, technical documentation associated with a code commit). This was agreed at negotiation time.

Daniel suggested other PAC members to express their views:

- Jussi: supportive to scenario A including the proposal by Radmila
- Florinella: thanked Claude, Patricia, supports scenario A with Radmila’s suggestion to avoid double accounting
- Alain: asked what was the experience with accounting of manpower on European projects in the former ALADIN times. Patricia said the manpower was accounted for just like ALADIN manpower

(no difference made). Alain also asked whether for instance the work on the gridpoint-based dynamical kernel had been accounted for in the consortium effort ? Claude answered “yes”, even though the associated development never entered an official T-cycle (however the work did lead to a gain of knowledge and expertise in our teams)

- Daniel: confirmed that work should be accounted for as soon as it is in the RWP
- Marc: supports scenario A and is quite confident that we will get the subsisting IPRs back.
- Fatih: supports scenario A
- Mohamed: supports scenario A

PAC supported scenario A, conditional to subsisting IPRs being assigned back to ACCORD (confirmation next year).

PAC agreed in the meeting on the recommendations for the Assembly (See Annex I).

4. Membership in PAC

Claude reminded that the PAC membership is for two years, according to the MoU item 88, renewable if needed. In its meeting on 5 October, the ACCORD Bureau suggested that PAC members could use their meeting on 11 October to discuss who is considering to continue, and who would like to step down. PAC members also could discuss whether they'd like to encourage some level of rotation, which could depend on the family they represent. Eventually, some suggestions might imply changes in the positions of chair or vice-chair, which PAC also could discuss. After the meeting, PAC members should liaise with their relevant governance body (per family).

The proposals will be discussed in the Bureau in November (composition per family, chair/vice-chair proposals), relation with the Membership and chairmanship of the Assembly and the PAC.

Daniel considered that it a good thing to bring new persons to the advisory committees, thus Daniel decided to step down as chair of PAC and, if possible, to stop completely his role in PAC. If necessary, he offered to continue in 2023.

Florinella would like to continue her participation in the PAC but not at the level of the vice-chair, as the topics are sometimes too technical for her expertise.

Alain and Fatih confirmed that they can continue as PAC representatives.

Jussi explained that he will discuss within HIRLAM.

Mohamed appreciated participating in PAC but has other obligations for the next two years. Mohamed should confirm his decision asap.

Jørn agreed to continue, and will speak to Marianne and with Jussi.

Radmila was happy to continue but needed to check with LACE.

(Note: Marc was absent at that part of the meeting due to IT and connexion issues)

Continuation or changing membership should be communicated to the ACCORD Bureau, via the PM and the CSS, by 4 November.

5. AOB

Claude explained that the LAM spectral transform codes are currently being significantly refactored, following partially what is being done in the global transforms for IFS/Arpege (in the context of preparing the codes for new HPC architectures like GPUs).

On the technical side, there are several reasons to go for a common, single packaging of the global and the LAM spectral transform codes: the current refactoring could be continued more efficiently; the synchronization of future code versions would be simpler; the spectral transform code maintenance would be easier.

On the more managerial, political and governance side, the global spectral transforms are maintained and distributed by ECMWF under an open source licence (APACHE-2).

Therefore, the issue of approving an open source distribution of the LAM spectral transform codes is likely to be addressed by the ACCORD Committees and the Assembly in forthcoming meetings.

Radmila: if there is no strict difference between the IFS/ARPEGE spectral transform codes and the LAM spectral transform codes (at least for the Fourier part), aren't the LAM spectral transform codes already open source *de facto* ?

Claude: not technically speaking so far since the spectral transform codes currently used in the IFS/Arpege and ACCORD releases still are not taken from the open source packaging. However, in the "spirit" advocated by ECMWF, the intention is to build all our systems using only one reference code, which then eventually would be the one from the open source version.

Radmila: will ECMWF put more codes under APACHE-2 ?

Claude: this is already the case, since a few other IFS components have been declared open source (upon decision by the ECMWF Council): the radiation scheme (ECRAD), a simple cloud scheme (CLOUDSC) etc..

Daniel: What should the calendar be for discussing the LAM issue in ACCORD ?

Claude: at a next ARPEGE/IFS coordination meeting where the ACCORD PM is invited, Claude will ask ECMWF and MF about the coordination of the global spectral transforms, and then try to organise the discussions with the ACCORD bodies in the first half of 2023.

Daniel: should we ask STAC ?

Claude: agrees that this question also could be presented to STAC next year, who could make recommendations on the shaping of the coordination of the spectral transform codes across all partners. The item probably is a transversal topic for both STAC (scientific and technical recommendations) and PAC (policy question regarding open source, just like at ECMWF where this issue is regularly presented to the PAC and to Council).

6. Closing

Daniel thanked the participants for fruitful discussions and the good recommendations to propose to the Assembly. Daniel closed the meeting at 16:30.

Annex I: PAC recommendations formulated to the Assembly

- I. PAC welcomes and agrees with the practical implementation of the DestinE-funded manpower within the Common Manpower Register (CMR) and the Rolling Work Plan (RWP), as proposed by the PM and the CSS. PAC recommends adding a disclaimer in the CMR and in the RWP explaining that the manpower figures are not representative of decisions or actual figures from the DE_330 contracts, and that these figures only are meant for ACCORD-internal management purposes.
- II. PAC agrees with the IPR analysis and the principle of redistributing the DestinE-subsisting IPRs (within ACCORD background IPRs) across all Members.
- III. PAC recommends redistributing the subsisting IPRs following option A, i.e. redistribution according to the DestinE-registered manpower falling within the scope of the ACCORD RWP, and following the provisions of Article 9 item 136 of the ACCORD MoU.
- IV. PAC recommends that the proposals in items II and III are conditional to a positive decision by ECMWF (and EU) regarding the assignment back to ACCORD of subsisting IPRs.