

Minutes

Participants

Flat-Rate ALADIN MoU5 Representatives	Nuno Lopes (Portugal) <i>from 15:20</i>
	Mehmet Fatih Büyükkasabbaşı (Turkey)
	Subs.: Siham Sbi (Morocco)
RC-LACE-MoU5 Representatives	Florinela Georgescu (Romania), chair
	Radmila Brozkova (Czech Republic)
	Subs.: Jure Cedilnik (Slovenia) <i>absent</i>
HIRLAM-C Representatives	Taimar Ala (Estonia) <i>excused</i>
	Jørn Kristiansen (Norway) <i>absent</i>
	Subs.: Ben Wichers Schreur (Netherlands) <i>absent</i>
Météo-France Representatives	Alain Joly <i>from 14:30</i>
	Marc Pontaud
	Subs.: Samuel Morin <i>absent</i>
ACCORD PM	Claude Fischer
ACCORD CSS	Anne-Lise Dhomps

1. Opening

The participants at the start of the meeting noted that the attendance at this meeting was lower than usual and no HIRLAM family representative was present. According to the ACCORD MoU, there is no quorum required for a PAC meeting to be valid. The attendees concluded that the PAC meeting can be held, which also is highly desirable in order to make some timely progress on the issue of international collaboration and the request by BMKG. Information on the list of attendees will be added to the outcome of this meeting and shared with the Bureau in preparation of the next Assembly. The meeting minutes shall be made available as soon as possible to all PAC members.

Florinela (PAC chair) welcomed the presents. 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, and was already agreed for the last meetings.

2. Adoption of the draft agenda

Florinela reminded that the 7th ACCORD Assembly on 4 December 2023 discussed the expansion of international collaboration on the common codes, and decided on the next steps.

Upon request, Claude presented the agenda. With regard to the item on international collaboration, he explained that he was not going to give an exhaustive description of the preparatory document that he had sent out the previous week. The document must have been read and he only intends to give the broad outlines and a few highlights.

He explained that after the discussion on strategy, he would give a brief update on the renewal of the PAC membership.

The agenda was unanimously adopted. Florinela gave the floor to Claude for a brief introduction of item 3.

3. Introduction to the topic by the PM

Claude reminded that “*The Assembly approved forming the task team and approaching ECMWF management to discuss the questions from PAC-4.*”

The task team was formed of the PM, the CSS, the chair and vice-chair of the Assembly, and met with Andy Brown, Head of Research, and Fabio Venuti, Head of Cabinet (Office of the Director-General) in January 2024.

Outcome of the ACCORD/ECMWF meeting

Claude presented a brief of the outcome of the meeting:

- **case-by-case** evaluation of each candidacy regarding the link with ECMWF (IFS codes)
- eligibility criteria for ECMWF MS or CS have been clarified (see preparatory document)
- impact of DE (or other EU-funded) projects on the evaluation of new candidates: **case-by-case** prevails, it's not possible to anticipate any systematic impact on the evaluation
- IFS software policy: during the meeting, ECMWF management has expressed its wish to extend the scope of IFS codes being made available as open source; since then, ECMWF has proposed MS to move to an open source approach for the whole of the forecast model in its updated 2025-2034 strategy (tbd at the next Council)
- implications of Foreign Affairs: a matter of evaluation for each MS

Updated material in preparation of an ACCORD strategic position paper

Claude explained that he has put efforts into keeping the material updated. This part corresponds to the second section of the preparatory document. He won't present all the material in his oral introduction, just some specific updates.

Questions and recommendations to a candidate NMHS

(refer to the text [in violet](#) in the preparatory document)

Procedure to organize the exchange of information and the decision-making steps (shortened and slightly updated version hereafter)

- Letter by the candidate NMHS to the Chair of the Assembly
- [steps A-E] Application evaluation process with the aim to strengthen the information and the knowledge of how the candidate NMHS sees its relation with ACCORD
- [step F] The evaluation process eventually provides the Assembly elements it can use
 - to formally approve an Acceding Member (Article 3, Items 49-53)
 - for an Associate Member candidacy, to invite ACCORD Members to consider entering into negotiations with the candidate NMHS in accordance with Article 12

Claude stressed that step F is not much described in the preparatory document and probably should be a bit more detailed. It is indeed the first step where a concrete decision by the ACCORD Assembly is expected, and the precise decision to be taken depends on the type of membership that is considered. Thus, step F in the slide (*and now in the minutes*) is more precise.

licensing conditions for an Associate Membership

They need to be specified in an Associate Membership Agreement between any ACCORD Support Member and the candidate Associate Member, because the Associate Member is not a member nor an accessing member (thus, the MoU conditions for sharing the codes in the consortium do not apply).

estimated resources for a Supporting ACCORD Member

Claude indicated that these estimates were obtained after consulting with several technical experts last year. They are given for information relevant for any Support Member.

implications of Foreign Affairs

This aspect is a prime responsibility for every member state but the sharing of information is needed across ACCORD.

ASSOCIATE Membership policy aspects

Claude presented an extra slide on the policy aspects related to the Associate Membership status. Indeed, this is still a very new status, not yet implemented on a concrete case (BMKG is applying for this status). Thus, Claude reorganized the elements of the MoU with this focus on policy, and he added two bullets on aspects not explicitly addressed in the provisions of the MoU:

- ASSOCIATE Membership policy aspects overview of Article 12 of the MoU:
 - Item 156. A specific licence of the common codes will be created for the Associate Members, following the rules of Article 10.
 - Item 157. The status of Associate Member will not be limited in time. However, it is expected that some Associate Members will develop their expertise up to a sufficient level to become Member, and will then follow the usual procedure to do so.
 - Item 160. The formal decision to accept an Associate Member will be taken by the Assembly, by a vote at unanimity. The proposal submitted to the vote must be explicit on the breakdown of the assistance work between Members, other actors if any, and on the funding scheme.
 - Item 161. The approval of ECMWF must also be obtained for each particular Associate Member.
 - Item 162. In case several Members or groups of Members would like to enter in competition to assist the same Associate Member via a competitive funding scheme, the Consortium will not attempt to restrict or bias this competition.
- (derived from the intentions underpinning Article 12) an ASSOCIATE Member has no voting rights, nor any other formal rights or obligations w/r to ACCORD
- a more open question could be whether an ASSOCIATE Member is granted an observer position in

the ACCORD Assembly
Claude expressed that he is inviting PAC to make comments on the last bullets.

Outline of a position paper explaining the overall intentions and the context of ACCORD (preparatory document [blue text](#))

- to welcome new Members sharing the same goals and ambitions
 - only WMO Member States NMHSs are eligible for membership
 - the progress of any new acceding membership process shall be carefully monitored
 - the impact in ACCORD of a wider range of geographical collaborations shall be regularly assessed, with the aim of an efficient cooperation in the consortium
 - the close collaboration of ACCORD with other organizations of the EMI or within EU-funded projects sets standards on scientific policy and technical norms, which any new Member should be ready to adopt
- Annexes ?
 - list of questions and recommendations
 - other?: evaluation procedure, Table 1, licensing clauses ?

Claude commented on the above slide (position paper proposal) that the position paper could be formed by the outlined text on intentions and context, complemented by an Annexe with the set of questions and recommendations. The position paper could be fairly publicly available or it could be easily used by any ACCORD Member (once approved by the Assembly). All the other material drafted in the preparatory document and briefly introduced before could be reorganized into a specific companion document mostly to share within ACCORD.

Claude finally recalled the suggested draft recommendations for the ACCORD Assembly (meeting on 3 July), as formulated in the preparatory document (*note: see below the agreed recommendations by PAC*)

- On using the updated material for drafting the position paper
- On using the updated material with BMKG and with any potential Support Member in ACCORD, for starting discussions for an ASSOCIATE Membership Agreement
- On the possibility for an ACCORD Member to submit to the ECMWF PAC (in preparation for the ECMWF Council) the request to allow the IFS-ARPEGE-ACCORD codes to be provided to BMKG after they have become an ASSOCIATE Member

4. Discussion on the updated preparatory document

Florinela opens the discussion.

Florinela: how can we use the result of the discussion with ECMWF when the management persons only presented their point of view, not an official position ?

Claude: we couldn't expect any other kind of statement than an expression of personal management opinions. However these opinions provide guidance for ACCORD. Certainly, the official statements by ECMWF would occur in the Committees and even more notably at Council when all MS will concur to build any such official statement.

Radmila: Then from now on, how do you propose to develop the strategy document ?

Claude: reminded his proposal to organize the strategy material along the lines of two elements, the position paper and the additional analysis material. He suggested organizing the PAC discussion along these two main lines. Perhaps start with the material as presented in the preparatory document. The main new aspect in the proposal is the detailed outline of an evaluation procedure of any new candidate, ahead of any

decision by the Assembly. That part would stay in the ACCORD additional material. What do PAC members think of such a detailed procedure, taking into account that it makes the whole discussion process more complex and that it is mostly about exchange of information between both sides (ACCORD and the candidate) ?

Siham: I have a question about the evaluation task force. What is the spirit of the task force, how does it compare with the ToRs of PAC for instance ?

Claude: Indeed, the evaluation TF would be different from a Committee (STAC or PAC). The spirit would be to gather a group of people with different competencies and expertise from ACCORD. The other intention would be to enable at an early stage in the discussion process different members to participate in the discussion with a new candidate.

Fatih: I think it would be great if the candidate could meet the Assembly. A formal exchange would be great. Give the candidate an opportunity to present himself.

Radmila: I agree. But in person it might be difficult for a far away country.

Florinela: Could be in person or online, and they would have to make an effort.

Claude: In the proposal, there is a step where the candidate NMHS is invited to send a written document based on the questions and recommendations. Could this be the first step of the presentation for the candidate, and replace a first presentation at the Assembly ?

Florinela: No, it should not replace it but we should keep both steps.

Radmila: Agrees, it should not be replaced. Everyone in the Assembly should have the opportunity to interact with the candidate.

Fatih: we could let the choice: in person, online, or send a document.

Claude: Indeed in our current practice we used to invite a new candidate to give a presentation of his goals and ambitions to the Assembly, as one of the first steps in a membership discussion.

However I think that an online presentation is then more relevant than in-person because it implies less organizational and institutional involvement for the candidate (avoid the risk of false expectations that could arise if ACCORD makes an in-person invitation at an early stage).

Florinela suggests to hold the coffee break now (15:25) and continue the discussion afterwards (15:35).

5. (Discussion continued after coffee break)

Florinela: suggests to continue the discussion.

Claude: My impression is that for the next version of the strategy proposal, regarding the procedure that was in the document, there should be an optional step when either the candidate presents his goals and ambitions in front of the Assembly (upon invitation by the Assembly), or the Assembly sets up the evaluation task force.

Radmila: No, we should not consider optional steps. Keep both.

Florinela: Do the members have to agree that the candidate can do a presentation ? Who will put the item in the agenda ?

Claude: It could be discussed in the Bureau.

Radmila: *or the PM proposes it ?*

Claude: *I don't think that it should be only the PM to decide on this. The Bureau is in charge of preparing the agenda for the Assembly meetings.*

Radmila: *First the Assembly sees the Letter of intention from the candidate NMHS, and only after that step an invitation can be formulated.*

Florinela: *Should both steps be planned for the same Assembly ?*

Radmila: *No. There needs to be a separation (6 months), let the Assembly time to discuss.*

Claude: suggests a conclusion from this part of the discussion with the following points:

- in the *exchange of information* procedure, the first step is to invite a candidate to give an online presentation to the Assembly, on his goals and ambitions to join ACCORD (this step is after the Letter of intention, and requires approval by the *Assembly probably*)
- let time to the Assembly to *analyse* the outcome of the presentation, and then to agree to organize the *evaluation* Task Force
- *None* of the above steps is *optional*, both should take place. Keep a very stepwise *procedure*, let the *Assembly* the *possibility* to discuss at each step

Claude: *Can we address specific questions related to Associate Members ? In particular, should an associate member be present at Assembly meetings ? As an observer ?*

Marc: *I'm in favour of opening the Assembly more widely to observers, but we would have to organise the agenda so that some parts stay private, and others public. Plan in-camera sessions.*

Radmila: *Do not fully open the Assembly agenda for them, but have time to discuss the situation of Associate Members.*

Claude: *As an example, Latvia is invited to the whole Assembly. However the Latvian NMHS has signed a cooperation agreement with ACCORD, via the Chair of the Assembly. An Associate Member won't have such a cooperation agreement. It will be engaged with one or several ACCORD Members in a specific Associate Membership Agreement after negotiation with them.*

Radmila: *Advises to be careful to not write too strict rules. Consider having a point from time to time to follow the progress at the Assembly level.*

Claude: *Agree. The progress report at the Assembly could be the responsibility of the Support Member (not the Associate Member).*

Claude: *How then about the case of Indonesia ? Are there steps PAC would like to recommend already now ? For information to PAC, Claude confirmed that informal discussions about BMKG already have taken place with ECMWF and MS representatives. This could pave the ground for official discussions of the request by BMKG in ECMWF Body meetings (PAC, Council). On the side of the ACCORD Assembly however, we have not planned to invite them for a presentation. Also now it is too short a notice.*

Radmila: *Is there an ACCORD country supporting BMKG ?*

Siham: *(The NMHS of) Morocco wishes to support BMKG and is interested to discuss a detailed application with them.*

Radmila: *Do you think they could answer the questions from the preparatory document (the text *in violet*) ?*

Siham: *I think so.*

Florinela: *in December could they be presenting their goals and ambitions ?*

Claude: *Reminded the participants that an ACCORD member has to bring up the request by BMKG already at the upcoming ECMWF Council (19-20 June), if the Center's official position is expected in the autumn meetings.*

Claude: *To Siham: can the support of Morocco be forwarded to the ACCORD Bureau ?*

Siham: *Yes, it is also fine that the intention of the Moroccan NMHS is mentioned in the minutes. Discussions with BMKG are ongoing. No official document so far.*

Marc: *Will the NMHS of Morocco talk about its intentions regarding the cooperation and the application of the Indonesian NMHS at the Assembly on 3 July ?*

Siham: *I expect so.*

Claude: *Then, assuming the NMHS of Morocco makes an official statement of support to BMKG on 3rd July, they could use the documents and all the elements of the strategy for collaboration in their further discussions with them.*

Florinela: *Noted that Nuno had joined the meeting in the meanwhile.*

Nuno: *Sorry I was late, I missed discussions. I read the document and am fine with it. Were there comments on it ?*

Claude: *Noted that there had been no specific comments on the Questions and recommendations as set in the preparatory document. Today we have been mainly discussing the procedure with a few adaptations, and we just discussed the way forward regarding the request by BMKG.*

6. Review of recommendations by all participants

Florinela proposes to make a break in order for her and Claude to work on the draft recommendations and share them with PAC (16:20).

PAC resumed the discussion by checking the draft text shared by Claude on the screen. PAC agreed on the following formulation:

PAC recommends the Assembly:

- to adopt a strategic position paper along the lines outlined during PAC, and including the questions and recommendations for any new candidate
- to adopt an information and evaluation procedure including
 - an invitation to a candidate NMHS to give an online presentation of its goals and ambitions at the ACCORD Assembly,
 - followed by an application evaluation which can include a written report by the candidate addressing the questions and recommendations formulated in the strategy document, and a discussion with an ad-hoc evaluation task force
- that these steps are in preparation of a formal decision by the Assembly to approve either an

Acceding Member or an Associate Member

For the case of BMKG, PAC recommends the Assembly:

- to organize the next steps in order to be able to decide on the Associate Membership status in its meeting on 9 December. These steps would include (1) to identify ACCORD Members interested to discuss this cooperation with BMKG, (2) to identify an ACCORD and ECMWF Member able to propose the BMKG request for discussion at the level of ECMWF's PAC and Council.

Claude: *noted that these recommendations could be used in line with his proposal to reorganize the material of the preparatory document in two parts: the position paper (to be used with a candidate NMHS at any time) and the additional information (more for sharing in ACCORD).*

Alain: *fine with the content of the text; just on the form, the text of the questions and recommendations should be reformulated in a more formal/legal aspect. Avoid the personal style "do they"/"do you" and reformulate instead with "the candidate should" etc.*

Claude: *Pointed out that the only point of discussion where PAC probably did not reach a firm conclusion today was about the position of an Associate Member with respect to the Assembly. This question probably was not mature enough yet to be able to reach a conclusion, and we should get back to it later. Perhaps first see how the proposal materializes for a first candidate. I suggest mentioning this aspect to the Bureau for their information.*

7. Update on renewal of PAC membership

Claude reminded that the PAC membership is for two years, according to the MoU Item 88, renewable if needed.

The ACCORD Bureau has suggested that the current PAC members assess whether they wish to continue for an additional year (2025), and liaise within their families.

Information on continuation and/or new proposals should be provided to the PM and the chair of PAC.

The Bureau will continue to monitor the composition of the PAC for 2025, to ensure that a full composition can be submitted for approval to the Assembly on 9 December.

Marc: *I'll retire by the end of this year, so I won't renew my mandate.*

Claude: *Reminded PAC members that the chair and vice-chair of PAC should be Assembly representatives.*

Nuno: *I'll keep the position if no one else can fill the position (for the Aladin-MoU5 family). Otherwise I'll leave it to a new member.*

Radmila: *I can continue. However we need to discuss and get approval at the level of the LACE Council.*

Florinela: *Agree.*

Fatih: *I can stay for one more year.*

Siham: *I can continue, but let's wait to see whether other Aladin-MoU5 candidates would be known.*

8. AOB

None

9. Closing

Florinela thanked the participants for fruitful discussions and the joint work on recommendations to propose to the Assembly.

Claude: Thanked members for reading all the documents in this very busy period.

Florinela closed the meeting at 17:10.