



A Consortium for CONvection-scale modelling  
Research and Development

**10th ACCORD Assembly**  
**Monday 7 July 2025**  
**online**  
**14h-17h CEST**

[Meeting link \(Webex\)](#)

## Draft Minutes

### 1. Opening and welcome

Daniel (Chair) opened the 10<sup>th</sup> ACCORD Assembly meeting. Daniel welcomed the delegations (see [Appendix I](#)) and the ECMWF observer, Andy Brown.

He also specifically welcomed Matthew ROBERTS, Managing Director for Service and Research at IMO.

*Matthew: Hello I'm Matthew from the Icelandic Meteorological Office. I'll be formally representing Iceland now in future meetings.*

### 2. Adoption of the agenda

Daniel asked if there were any comments on the agenda, or any AOB.

*No comments.*

Daniel declared the agenda adopted.

### 3. Transition phase 1 / phase 2

Claude reminded the usual timeline regarding the transition.

#### a. Nomination of CSC Leaders

Claude reminded that at the last EA<sup>1</sup>, on 13 May 2025, the Assembly agreed on the CSC leaders' nomination steps and on the CSC groups. There are 3 Canonical System Configurations in ACCORD. Each group is composed of the Members who use the CSC.

Table 1 shows the lists of members per CSC agreed during the last Assembly. Spain eventually asked to be added to the ALARO group.

---

<sup>1</sup> Extraordinary Assembly

The last EA agreed that each CSC group should organise the selection process of their CSC leader in a way that best suited their work organization.

<b>AROME</b>	<b>ALARO</b>	<b>HARMONIE-AROME</b>
Algeria	Belgium	Denmark
Austria	Croatia	Estonia
Belgium	Czech Republic	Finland
Bulgaria	Hungary	Iceland
France	Morocco	Ireland
Hungary	Poland	Lithuania
Morocco	Romania	Netherlands
Poland	Slovakia	Norway
Portugal	Slovenia	Spain
Slovenia	Türkiye	Sweden
Tunisia	<i>Spain</i>	
Türkiye		

*Table 1: lists of ACCORD Members according to their operational use of a CSC*

Claude presented the status for each CSC group.

**HARMONIE-AROME:** The new CSC Leader is expected to be nominated at the end of September (next UWC Programme Manager). In the meanwhile, the current CSC Leader will participate in the needed transition steps.

**ALARO:** Consultation meeting on 5 May, where representatives of the institutes discussed the received application. The applicant **Martina Tudor** has received the full support at the level of each institute.

**AROME:** Consultation meeting on 7 May, where representatives of the institutes discussed the received application. The applicant **Eric Bazile** has received the full support at the level of each institute.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

*None.*

**Daniel:** *Is there anyone against the nomination of the CSC leaders for AROME and ALARO ?*

*No one.*

**Daniel:** *Are there any abstention ?*

*No one.*

**The Assembly endorsed the proposals made by the two CSC groups, and nominated from 1st January 2026:**

- **Eric Bazile (MF) as AROME CSC Leader and**
- **Martina Tudor (DHMZ) as ALARO CSC Leader.**

**For information: the HARMONIE-AROME CSC Leader will be the next UWC PM (the name is expected to be known at the end of September).**

## **b. Area Leaders & new WG**

Claude reminded that the EA of 10 March agreed to form a Working Group tasked to propose the list and the definitions (the functions) of the Area Leaders for phase 2 (WG-AL). The Assembly also approved its composition (chair and vice-chair of STAC, CSC leaders, PM, CSS).

The Assembly agreed on the tasks for this WG-AL:

- Define the precise list of Area Leader functions for the start of phase 2. Note: 8 such AL functions in phase 1.
- Define the precise ToRs for each function, which will complement the general ToRs agreed in the draft MoU-2.

The target was to present the full proposal to the A/A<sup>2</sup> at its meeting on 7 July, for approval (preparatory document 3.b.1)

In addition, the WG-AL proposed a new WG about information and communication on AI/ML activities (preparatory document 3.b.2)

### **Area Leaders**

Eight functions have been defined: dynamics, upper-air physics, surface, (upper-air) DA, EPS, MQA, system, coding evolution.

The general ToRs include:

- support to the management of code contributions
- support to documentation
- a proactive attitude toward AI/ML in their Area

The specific ToRs include some focus on transversal (across-Area) tasks.

The AL for coding evolution has a wider scope than the current AL for code refactoring and adaptation (to GPU): address modern programming paradigms, continue refactoring activities in order to maintain the quality and the portability of our codes

### **New WG-InComAI**

Claude explained that the WG-AL also addressed the question of AI/ML inside ACCORD and in connection with the various programmes that have been set up at European level. The WG-AL concluded that the coordination of AI/ML in ACCORD should remain the task of the new MG, however there also was a need for specifically keeping a close eye on the progress of the activities at the European scale (ML-PP, E-AI etc.). Such informed monitoring already has been expressed in the scientific strategy for phase 2. The WG-AL chose to propose the creation of a dedicated WG with a focus on Information and Communication on AI/ML activities. Such WG should be active for the duration of MoU-2 (the suggested name is “WG-InComAI”).

---

<sup>2</sup> Regular ACCORD Assembly

Claude outlined the purposes of this group:

**To collect information and track progress** in the development of AI/ML for NWP from

- the ML Pilot Project,
- the E-AI Program,
- programs at ACCORD Member institutes,
- Destination Earth (DE\_330, DE\_371 etc.)
- This list of target programmes might evolve during phase 2 of ACCORD to reflect any change in the way AI/ML activities are organized in the Euro-Mediterranean geographical area, and as felt relevant for ACCORD.

**To communicate this information within ACCORD.** As specific tasks of such communication, the WG shall:

- provide a yearly report made available to STAC (Governance-level) and to the ACCORD/MG (management-level),
- prepare or help prepare material for the ACCORD All Staff Workshop (talks, invited speakers, posters, topical session etc.) and/or for the Newsletter.

**To discuss and make proposals on standpoints or specific activities** (in ACCORD) by which the consortium can be influential in the above listed programmes for a mutual benefit. The standpoints and/or the activities shall be handed over to STAC and/or to the MG for consideration respectively at governance and management level (as relevant).

**External communication** (from ACCORD to other programmes) shall be preferentially organized by the Chair with the support of the Vice-Chair of the WG-InComAI, in close consultation.

Proposed composition for the WG:

- the ACCORD/PM who chairs the WG-InComAI
- One representative of each ACCORD family, chosen for his/her particular expertise at the crossing of AI/ML and physics-based NWP and/or his/her role in one of the above mentioned programs
- the WG members propose a vice-chair among them
- The WG may invite observers to its meetings: ACCORD MG members, or an external expert on case-by-case
- organisational support by the ACCORD/CSS

### **STAC recommendations**

Claude stated that both proposals, AL functions and WG-InComAI, were discussed in STAC two weeks ago. STAC provided the recommendations below:

#### **Regarding the AL functions:**

- STAC recommends the Assembly to approve the eight Area Leader functions and to encourage Members to look after suitable candidates for applying
- STAC recommends the Assembly to approve the Calls for applications and to issue them with no delay, in order to meet the DL for applications (7 October), enable an appropriate selection process to be organized and allow the A/A to nominate the chosen candidates in the beginning of December

#### **regarding the WG-InComAI:**

- STAC recommends the Assembly to approve the ToRs of the WG for information and communication on AI/ML activities
- STAC recommends the Assembly to approve forming the WG for phase 2 of ACCORD

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

**Marianne:** Thank you Claude for the preparation of the document and the presentation, and to the working group members who have been dealing with the topic.

Basically I'm in favor of this proposal but I have one question. What would be the price, the budgetary need, in order to have this new management group operational. Will it be equal to what was done during the first phase ? The information is missing in the document and it is important.

**Claude:** Apart from the PM position, all other positions at ACCORD level are in-kind, including AL, CSC leaders, CNA, DO, ...

So the budget would be the same.

To clarify on the side of FTEs, the Area Leader positions, like the CSC Leader positions, are for 0.5 FTE in continuity of phase 1.

**Roar:** Thank you Claude for the presentation and the documents.

Later today we will discuss the roadmap on the Common Scripting System (CSSy).

The CCSy, when in place, should change the way we work and potentially change the resources needed to carry out the current tasks.

Have you been thinking about how the new CSSy will influence the resources needed and about any implication on the AL functions ?

**Claude:** In terms of shaping the AL functions, at first, the CSSy activity will be mostly coordinated by the System AL. As progress will be made and more functionalities will be available in the CSSy, several of the other ALs will be involved as well as CSC Leaders, in coordination with the PM.

Regarding the impact of the arrival of the CSSy in terms of activities and resources, the very first aspect to consider are the resources needed to implement the roadmap (refer to the roadmap in item 5 of this EA). After the implementation of the CSSy, and provided the CCSy is well adopted by the teams, it could indeed be a game changer in the work. For now it is difficult to estimate the impact more precisely.

**Daniel:** It is clear that part of the tasks in the roadmap will be introduced in the work plans. We have to see the CSSy as a tool that we are going to use to facilitate R&D and sometimes also strengthen operations. We will have to follow its progress.

**Marianne:** To the question of what would be the benefits of the CSSy, I understood from the answer that it is not so easy to say exactly what benefits we could have from a resources perspective.

But having said that, I remember when we were discussing all those things in the beginning of establishing phase one of ACCORD, we were discussing that when we, one day, we would have a common scripting system, things would be easier. So maybe we should ask someone to look into what the benefits could be, to make sure that we are aware of those. At least I would expect that we are going to be able to deliver more for less in a situation where we wouldn't have to cope with three different scripting systems or more.

**Claude:** To organize the tasks of analyzing the progress and looking into the benefits of the common scripting system for facilitating activities or getting more for less, I propose to use the ACCORD structure that we will have in phase 2. These tasks could be addressed in the course of the work of

*the management group in the next phase, possibly in connection with the reviewing of the work plans with the STAC.*

*The new MG and STAC could monitor or review regularly both the progress of the CSSy and the way the system can be used and its impact on the activity and the efficiency of the activity in ACCORD.*

**Marianne** Thyrring, DMI 2:35 PM<sup>3</sup>

*good solution, Claude!*

**MET Norway - Roar** Skålin 2:36 PM

*Yes, I agree with Marianne. It's important to look into this, as we are all struggling with resources and we want to spend them as wisely as possible. So happy you will follow up, Claude.*

**Volkan:** *We fully support the proposal to establish a dedicated working group for information and communication on AI and ML activities within the ACCORD consortium. This is crucial for effectively integrating and leveraging the significant potential of AI/ML in phase two.*

*By creating a focus group, of course, we can ensure clear communication, foster collaboration, and develop our current strategy for AI/ML adaption. These efforts will increase the consortium's capabilities. Thank you very much.*

**Iceland, Matthew** Roberts (IMO) 2:38 PM

*This is just a comment for the group—no need to take the floor.*

*As a strategy for ACCORD, I believe that forming a new AI-oriented working group is both logical and necessary. Across meteorology and climatology, we are witnessing a revolution in AI/ML-assisted processing, particularly in forecast evolution. AI-assisted decision-making for meteorological impacts is also a rapidly growing field, so it is only fitting that ACCORD formalises this new working group.*

**Matthew:** *Just to echo the previous speaker's remarks, this is just more a comment rather than a question to the management group. I think it's excellent that we can vote on this today and also that the management team will be able to play a part in overseeing the feedback from the WG. I fully support this.*

**Daniel:** *So to conclude on this discussion, we have to agree :*

*1/ to the description, the terms of reference of the area leaders and the way in which we are going to publish the call,*

*2/ to the approval of the working group for the communication related to AI.*

**Daniel:** *Is there anyone against the proposal regarding AL and the WG-InComAI ?*

*No one.*

**Daniel:** *Are there any abstention ?*

*No one.*

**Regarding the Area Leader functions, the Assembly approved:**

- **The eight Area Leader functions with their general and specific ToRs**
- **The full text of the Call for application**
- **To launch the Call for the ALs soon after this A/A meeting. The DL for submitting the applications is proposed to be 7 October 2025**

---

<sup>3</sup> Gray highlights stand for comments made in the chat

## **Regarding the new WG-InComAI, the Assembly approved:**

- **The ToRs (including tasks, duration and composition) of a WG for information and communication on AI/ML activities**
- **To establish this WG in phase 2 of ACCORD**

Daniel thanked Claude and the people who worked in the WG-AL for the good proposals.

Claude thanked the Assembly members for their comments regarding the Area Leaders, the working group on AI and for the comments in relation to the follow up on resources and effectiveness of working with the scripting system.

### **c. Other management positions**

Claude explained that there are a few other management positions that need to be filled for phase 2. They are neither ALs nor CSC Leaders, but nevertheless essential.

The Integration Leader (IL) is responsible for integrating code contributions and for building new code versions. He is also the link with our global modeling partners, ECMWF (IFS) and MF (Arpege).

The ACCORD Consortium Scientific Secretary (CSS) assists the PM with practical matters such as providing support to the elaboration of the work plans, to the elaboration and the implementation of the consortium budget, to other MG members etc.

The Coordinator for Network Activities is for instance in charge of the coordination across the Local Team Managers with the Programme Manager.

The Documentation Officer position was newly created during phase 1, and approved by the Assembly two years ago. It is now part of the overall management structure of ACCORD.

Claude finally explained that

- Meteo-France is proposing the two names for the IL (Alexandre Mary) and for the CSS (Anne-Lise Dhomps).
- Calls for applications are proposed for the positions of Coordinator for Network Activities and of Documentation Officer, with a timeline aligned with the AL positions.

Note that these procedures follow how these positions have been filled in phase 1.

Daniel opened the floor for comments.

*None.*

**Daniel:** *Is there anyone against the proposal by MF for Alexandre Mary as IL and Anne-Lise Dhomps as CSS ?*

*No one.*

**Daniel:** *Are there any abstention ?*

*No one.*

### **The Assembly nominated:**

- **Alexandre Mary (from MF) as Integration Leader from 1 January 2026**

- **Anne-Lise Dhomps (from MF) as Consortium Scientific Secretary from 1 January 2026**

*Daniel: Is there anyone against the proposed call for application for CNA and DO position ?  
No one.*

*Daniel: Are there any abstention ?  
No one.*

**The Assembly approved the texts for the Calls of application for the positions of Coordinator for Network Activities (CNA) and of Documentation Officer (DO)**

**The Assembly agreed to launch the Calls for CNA and for DO soon after this A/A meeting. The DL for submitting the applications is proposed to be 7 October 2025**

*Daniel: Thank you very much for the trust you are giving to these two important persons working for the consortium, Anne-Lise Dhomps and Alexandre Mary. It is important to continue with their experience and to start the procedure for the CNA and the DO as soon as possible.*

## **d. Governance positions (STAC / PAC)**

Claude reminded that the mandate of the STAC and PAC members will be 2,5 years (from the beginning of 2026 until mid-2028).

The formal procedure and the timeline for the nomination of the members reads:

- In order not to delay the procedure, the current members have been invited to start checking for themselves, and with their families, whether they continue in phase 2.
- The PM will inform the relevant key representatives of the families about the start of the renewal process, and keep regular liaison with them (MF, HIRLAM/UWC, RC-LACE, for ALADIN-MoU5 there will be by a dedicated consultation).
- The PM+CSS will collect the **proposals by the families until the end of August**, and share them with the Bureau (in September)
- The target is to submit the A/A at its meeting of 9 October a full composition of the next STAC/PAC for phase 2, for approval
- Finally, propose the names of chairs and vice-chairs at the A/A of 1-2 December, for approval

The A/A is invited to approve this procedure which has already started.

Daniel opened the floor for comments.

*None.*

## **e. Budget**

Claude stated that it is the first time that the Assembly is invited to discuss the budget for phase 2. He reminded that the Assembly is not asked to vote or take any decisions so far. The process will continue until December, and for now the Assembly is just expected to give guidance.

Claude presented different aspects of the budget for phase2.

### **Financial procedure**

Regarding the transfer of funds within the partners, Météo-France is currently studying how to renew the financial procedure in order to allow the maximum of continuity between phase 1 and phase 2.

### **Outlines of scenarios for phase 2**

Taking into account the experience of the past 4 ½ years, the feedback from the staff and the content of the scientific strategy for phase 2, three types of expenses have been analyzed in more detail:

- An increase in the compensation rates (these rates are then valid for the whole MoU2)
- An increase of in-person participation to ACCORD R&D events (visits, WW, meetings)
- Cost scenarios for R&D infrastructure (in relation to the 2026-2030 scientific strategy)

### **main outcomes of the analysis**

The so-called “upper-bound increase scenario” amounts to an increase of the annual contribution by about +36.8%, and is suggested not to be further considered;

The so-called “intermediate increase scenario” amounts to an increase of the annual contribution by about +17.9%;

For both upper-bound and intermediate scenarios, the impact of a zero-net increase of the annual contribution have been studied, showing that:

- absolutely drastic reductions are required in many current expenses to accommodate for a zero-net increase in the upper-bound scenario (almost NO in-person participation and/or NO organization of R&D actions possible anymore),
- Less drastic reductions are required in the intermediate scenario, however some strategic arbitration remains needed.

All the above budget scenarios can potentially be compared with a no-change situation with respect to expenses in phase 1, the latter however meaning that for instance R&D infrastructure costs are dismissed in phase 2.

### **Questions for guidance by the A/A**

- The intermediate increase scenario would allow a certain flexibility for increasing some compensation rates and/or in-person participation and/or R&D infrastructure costs. Would you support an increase of the annual contribution of about +18% in phase 2 of ACCORD (from 11k€ to 13k€) ?
- Would you support a smaller (than +18%) increase ?
- Would you support a progressive increase of the annual contribution, such as by about +4% in 2026 (11.5k€) followed by an additional increase of about +5% in 2027 or 2028 (12k€) ? (for example to account for the potential infrastructure costs)
- Would you support an increase of some of the compensation rates, regardless of whether the annual contribution is increased or not, to take into account the increase of travel costs and facilitating priority expenses for in-person participation ?
- Do you consider it important to increase competencies and accelerate priority R&D tasks in ACCORD, including by increased in-person participation to common R&D activities ?
- Assuming that the phase 1 surplus (of about 140k€, the exact amount will be known at the end of the year) can remain technically available for the ACCORD budget,
  - Would you support keeping the surplus within the phase 2 budget (i.e. not to redistribute it to the Members) ?

- Where would you consider that the surplus should be used with the highest priority: increase compensation rates, in-person participation, infrastructure costs ?

Daniel thanked Claude and emphasised how important the Assembly's feedback on the topic is. He reminded the Assembly that we are a research oriented consortium and that communication between the teams is essential. Then he opened the floor to comments and guidance on the budget scenarios.

**Nuno:** *about the surplus, we would support that we try to keep the surplus for the next MoU. For us the highest priority would be for infrastructure cost. About the budget itself, knowing that we have to update the budget, we will support an increase in the budget. If the majority goes for a one-shot increase, we would like to see the value of it.*

**Ivan:** *I would like to support the comments from Portugal. We are also fine with the solution of keeping the surplus and moving it to the second phase. And also infrastructure costs are something that we are comfortable financing.*

**Gabriella:** *We also support keeping the surplus for phase two. In Hungary we would like to avoid the zero-net scenario. We can accept to increase the contributions. We can cope with a gradual increase also. We feel the importance of the increase for in-person participation and for R&D infrastructure. We can accept that the compensation rates stay the same, but we will support an increase if others support it as well.*

**Taimar:** *Thank you very much for the very well prepared material. It is visible that a great effort was placed into the paper with several options proposed. As many others, I will start by the end, regarding the surplus, we would prefer to keep the surplus in the budget. And before that, talking about the surplus, as it was well noted that the surplus was generated during COVID by staying online (instead of being able to meet physically), I would recommend to stay online and generate more surplus, so to speak. Coming to the options, life gets more expensive and we don't mind at this point to have a slight increase yearly. I'm not going to repeat what the guidelines are concerning any budgetary obligations internally here (at ESTEA), but basically this is zero growth. Nevertheless we don't mind going along with the intermediate option either. We are however really eager to see, while increasing the input, what output is ? Should there be any kind of KPIs<sup>4</sup> or more specific targets in place? As a comment, and probably this is not really tightly related to the budget as such, but the mention of "compensation" really confuses me. Why should we compensate somebody for something ? I believe that everybody should pay their own costs and we have solved half of the equation. Thank you.*

**Claude:** *Regarding Taimar's comment on the compensation, I'd like to clarify that we are all on the same page and indeed the compensations by ACCORD are not to somebody. For instance regarding the in-person participation at a WW, the actual cost of the mission (per-diem and travel) is paid by the institute. If the travel has been agreed by ACCORD and is supported by its budget, there is a certain amount sent back to the institute according to a rating (the compensation rating, voted once at the beginning of a MoU period).*

---

<sup>4</sup> Key Performance Indicator

*ACCORD does neither compensate for the real expenses nor to a person, it just compensates a certain amount based on the ACCORD compensation rates to an institute.*

**Daniel:** *I think it's one of the milestones, one of the building pieces of ACCORD. The way in which we organise the meetings, WW, ASW, is an example of cooperation. It is the way the consortium is working.*

**Claude:** *just to complement, on the compensation rates, you can find in the annex I of the preparatory document the figures that we use currently when we compute the refunding. So the question about the compensation rates is : Would assembly members agree that for a certain subset of these compensation rates, the figures could be a little bit increased but again they would stay as compensation rates (and not real price refund) with agreed figures for everyone.*

**Marianne:** *Thank you for the presentation Claude and the document which are very well prepared and quite detailed.*

*The question I have is, if technically we cannot have the surplus in the next budget, I mean the 140 k€, where does the money go? I think it would be wise to keep it within the budget of ACCORD. It doesn't make much sense to me to distribute it across Europe again.*

*When it comes to the more overall questions you're raising, whether we are in favor of increasing the budget or not increasing the budget, I have to say, like we have said in all other European collaborations the last couple of weeks, that we (not specifically DMI, but all state agencies in Denmark) are under budgetary pressure from next year.*

*So it means that basically we are not very fond of an increase. We are very fond of efficiencies and we are very fond of reorganizing budgets. We are very happy with reorganizing the activities we have and trying to prioritize what is the most important.*

*For us that's my statement for today. And of course the work which is going to take place now until the end of the year will show what kind of increase you are talking about. But seeing from our point of view, the basic idea is to not spend more money but less money.*

**Natacha. Bernier (Météo-France) 3:20 PM**

*(Météo-France) We support a carry over of the surplus and the intermediate increase scenario.*

**Virginie:** *We just commented in the chat to contribute to the discussion. First of all, I wanted to say that I think it's very important that we have this discussion right now, in a context that as Marianne just said, is very difficult for many of us, on the budgetary side.*

*But at the same time, compared to other amounts that we have been discussing, especially last week, the increase of one thousand or two thousand euros for ACCORD is very very small, but does mean a lot for our work in ACCORD.*

*That's why, as much as I can understand and sympathize with the principle of not increasing contributions such as Marianne just stated, considering how small the amount is, from MF we can live with an intermediate increase in the budget. I think ACCORD, in general, is very efficient and organized towards money savings.*

*Last, we definitely support a carryover of the surplus rather than the redistribution of it.*

**Radmila:** *We also support the intermediate increase of 18%.*

*We think that we are very efficient within ACCORD, we are doing a lot for not much money. I just recall what Diana Klaric<sup>5</sup> from Croatia was sometimes saying, when she was Program manager of LACE, that we are too cheap compared to other institutions.*

*So we support this and of course it would be very reasonable if we could transfer the surplus to phase two.*

*It's very important that we keep the activity of cooperation.*

---

<sup>5</sup> Diana Klaric from DHMZ was a former LACE PM

**Josef:** I think that we all support the use of the surplus from the current phase into the next one. Regarding the increase of our payments, the amount is rather low at about two thousand Euros per year.

But of course, some of us have budgetary problems. Maybe a stepwise increase, which was also mentioned, would be acceptable for most members of ACCORD.

**Bulgaria - Ilian Gospodinov - NIMH - 3:26 PM**

NIMH Bulgaria is in favor for a progressive increase of the annual contribution for the next years; Intermediate level of increase of the compensations as in Annex 2; in favor for transfer of the surplus to the budget of the next phase of ACCORD; and distribution of the surplus for all mentioned highest priorities.

**Ilian:** I wrote in the chat but I will say in words that we discussed yesterday with our director and our LTM, the variety of possibilities of budget for the next phase.

We decided that a progressive increase of the annual contribution would be the best for Bulgaria.

Not only because it will be of course easier to accept, but also because the MoU states that an increase of the budget will not be more than ten percent from year to year. For our institute, for the next year, going immediately to 18% is out of this projection.

I don't remember how we take decisions in the Assembly for this, whether it should be by majority, but in any case we will do what is necessary to make the project going and we will accept the decision of the Assembly.

We are in favor of transferring the surplus to the next budget and distributing the surplus for all mentioned highest priorities of expenses.

We are also in favor of increasing the compensations at the intermediate level as proposed in Annex II of the preparatory document.

**Iceland, Matthew Roberts (IMO) - 3:31 PM**

IMO supports the use of the surplus and also supports the 18% increase in phase 2. I agree with previous speakers that the financial cost is small compared to the enormous scientific benefit that ACCORD brings to all national meteorological services.

**Matthew:** Just to echo the national representatives who were in support, I think we're all in agreement with the use of the surplus.

From our perspective, and this is simply IMO perspective, we're very happy with the collaboration, we believe it has enormous scientific and research benefits in many different areas. When we think about where we're heading in terms of the strategy of ACCORD, the cost increase on a scale of a few thousand euros is more than acceptable.

**Volkan:** We also support transfer of surplus for the next phase.

**Daniel:** Thank you all for your comments. It is the right time to make a first synthesis of your feedback. So among the things that have been said:

- The Assembly favours the transfer of the surplus to the next budget. The feasibility to transfer the surplus to the next phase remains to be studied.
- A large number of you, A/A members, supported the intermediate increase scenario.
- A step wise progression was mentioned several times. Explore how to use the surplus to compensate.
- We want to continue activities and continue to encourage the contact between the teams (also in-person contact).

**Claude:** 2 comments still have to be addressed:

1/ from Marianne, what would become the surplus if not transferable. We are working in MF on the technical possibility to keep the surplus in the ACCORD budget for the next phase. If it is not possible, the only way would be to redistribute the surplus to members at the end of the year. But then the question would be whether the members would be able to bring it back to the ACCORD budget which may not be simple for several of the members because of their own financial procedures. So we hope that we can avoid this situation and go for a simpler solution for which we still require some formal clarification inside MF.

2/ from Ilian, what are the voting rules for budget matters in ACCORD. I cannot say now on the spot whether unanimity is mandatory. The Assembly should always try to take decisions by unanimity but whether unanimity strictly is required for the budget has to be checked in the MoU. We will make sure that the voting rules are well explained for the 9th October A/A discussion.

Then regarding the synthesis of all the comments that were made, I think that, Daniel, you gave a very fair and comprehensive overview. Should we nevertheless propose a scenario with zero-net increase or should we keep it out ?

**Daniel:** My feeling is that, except those who have very strong instructions like Marianne to keep the same budget, reasonably you have the support for the 18% increase.

**Claude:** Thank you very much for your comments. There have been a few positive comments on the work you've seen in the preparatory document. I'm very happy that this document was found useful for many A/A participants, and again sorry that we sent it late. It was indeed our biggest task with Anne-Lise over the last week, and I would like to thank our scientific secretary for a huge job analyzing in detail the several scenarios and tables shown in the preparatory document.

**In conclusion of the discussion on guidance, and in order for the PM+CSS to refine the budget scenarios in view of the 3rd extraordinary A/A meeting of 9 October, the Assembly agreed on the following guidelines:**

- **OK to transfer the surplus if possible.**
- **Intermediate increase scenario (+18%).**
- **Consider stepwise increase & how to use the surplus in a stepwise approach.**
- **Rather OK to consider expenses for in-person and R&D infra (when needed); perhaps consider keeping compensation rates.**

**The Assembly took note that the A/A is expected to take the decisions regarding the ACCORD budget at its meeting on 1-2 December 2025.**

*Marianne Thyrring, DMI - 3:35 PM*  
*oh, PLEASE, find a sensible solution!*

*ESTONIA, Taimar Ala - 3:40 PM*  
*Clarification: EE opinion was also conditional. Our guidance is also to keep the same level until additional benefit is clearly demonstrated.*

## 4. Progress on MoU2

Daniel gave the floor to Claude to present the progress on the finalisation of MoU2 and the signing procedure.

Claude reminded that during the last Extraordinary Assembly, on the 13th May 2025, the Assembly approved the technical content of the MoU2 that was prepared by the MoU2-WG. The main request was to check the naming of each institute and make a legal check in each institute to assess that the document could be signed.

## **a. Institutes' namings**

Regarding the Institutes' namings, Claude confirmed that all the feedback from the institutes has been received and that the "preMoU2-4" version has been updated with all requests.

## **b. 1) Legal check**

Regarding the Legal check, 5 comments have been received (FMI, EEA, RMI, KNMI, WG-MoU2).

After discussions with the various institutes to clarify the comments, 3 modifications were implemented:

- "EMI" fully spelled out as European Meteorological Infrastructure
- A clarification on the explanation before the signature pages, at the top of the signatures table
- A modification to make clear that the duration of the mandate of the chair/vice-chair of PAC would be 2.5 years like the mandate of the members of PAC in general.

Comments from FMI and RMI did not lead to suggestions of changes in the memorandum.

Claude explained that the new version "preMoU2-4" also includes the cleaning-up which is a consequence of previously approved changes, such as the correct numbering of Items and the adjusted cross references inside the text.

## **b. 2) Request by SHMU to be listed in Annex III**

Claude informed that during the legal check, a request was received from the Slovak institute (SHMU) to be listed in Annex III of the MoU. This annex lists the institutes who are allowed to provide only half of the usual resources asked by the MoU, i.e. they are allowed to provide only 1 FTE instead of 2, including only 0.5 FTE instead of 1 FTE for CEpQA (code engineering and quality assurance).

Daniel gave the floor to Josef, as the SHMU representative.

*Josef: The reason is very simple. We are losing several members of our NWP team. We will not be able to provide the ordinary 2 FTE. For several months we will have only 3 NWP developers available and we will face a lot of challenges. Of course if our people are able to deliver more than 1 FTE, it would be a pleasant surprise, but we are not sure about it.*

*That is the reason why we decided to ask for this exception like our colleagues that are already in Annex III.*

Daniel acknowledged the difficulty of the situation and wished that SHMU would hopefully, in the future, find the needed resources for the 2 FTE.

Daniel opened the floor to comments.

*None.*

**Daniel:** *Is there anyone against the last proposals of changes in the text of the MoU2 ?*

*No one.*

**Daniel:** *Are there any abstention ?*

*No one.*

### **The Assembly:**

- **Approved the modifications in relation to the legal check (and the cleaning-up)**
- **Approved adding SHMU in the list of Annex III**
- **And consequently approved the full text of the MoU2 (core and annexes)**

Claude thanked the Assembly members for their approval and suggested the Assembly to now address the discussion about the signing process.

## **c. Signing process**

Claude reminded the A/A members what they had decided during the 9th Assembly in December 2024 concerning the signatures.

Some NMHSs require signing a paper version while others prefer an electronic signing.

Therefore the following procedure is proposed:

- Sending a PDF version to every member including individual pages per Institute without signatures (this format is the one of MoU1).
- Each member signs its individual signature page either electronically or on paper.
- The paper versions should be sent back to the ACCORD/CSS as a scan.
- All pages will be grouped in the final PDF and sent back to the NMHSs.

The signing procedure is expected to start soon after the 7 July A/A at the latest.

At the time of editing the preparatory document for this item 4.c, the status at ACCORD institutes regarding MoU2 was the following:

- Assuming the modifications required after the legal check by Members have been approved (Item 4.b), all institutes are ready to sign the MoU2 but AEMET and TSMS (who are still in their legal check procedure).

The goal is to have collected all signatures by 14 November 2025 (i.e. about two weeks ahead of the last A/A meeting of this year).

Claude furthermore presented the possible risk and mitigation measures:

- Deal with any further request for a change after the 1/1/2026 as a request of change in the MoU2 once it has entered into force
- Any Member not having signed the MoU2 by 31/12/2025 remains as an observer until signature

Daniel gave first the floor to AEMET and TSMS.

**Jaime:** *We intend to have this legal check during this month. I want to express that for us getting the legal check is more or less the same as getting the memorandum signed. So for us, if we were to have the OK from the state attorney now, it would mean that we can sign the MoU at any time.*

*So sorry about the delay, but we work a bit differently than others and we don't really have an internal legal check. We have to go into the ministry procedures and e to the state attorney, who in fact says that it's ok to sign it or you have to change it.*

**Volkan:** *We already completed all the legal checks. We sent an email last week. We sincerely thank the teams for their careful work especially for collecting and reviewing the legal feedback from all members. Their efforts may ensure the memorandum of understanding is clear, accurate and ready for final approval. Thanks to this strong teamwork, we are ready for a smooth and successful phase two.*

**Claude** *thanked Volkan for this really good news and for the efforts undertaken by TSMS to be ready to confirm their legal check in time for this A/A meeting.*

Daniel opened the floor to others.

**Ilian** *Gospodinov 4:12 PM*

**NIMH Bulgaria** *supports the initiation of the signing process of the latest version of the MoU2 as soon as possible.*

**Jaime:** *Maybe we have the possibility to approve this version and continue with the procedure because I can come back to this meeting maybe in two or three months if there is some change we would like to do, I could present them there.*

*Probably we can sign the MoU with a remark saying that it may change within the next months or something like that. So we can manage to find an internal solution in Spain because we can sign the memorandum even if it has something not perfectly according to our law.*

**Claude:** *Do we start the process of signing and if AEMET requires some changes, the A/A will have to accept the changes unanimously ? We could keep the signed pages and adjust the content of the document.*

**Daniel:** *It could be acceptable for minor changes. Otherwise, we would have to start the entire legal check process again. Lets hope that AEMET will not come with fundamental changes.*

**Marianne:** *In phase 1 we had the same trouble. There are always members that can sign faster than others, for good and understandable reasons. I would prefer that we start the signing. In case any relevant additional comments are made, we will obviously take them on board. But I would not think that the risk of receiving any major comment is too big. The risk is bigger to wait than to start the process and still have big changes proposed.*

**Daniel:** *I do agree. We can not wait.*

Claude proposes that the Bureau checks the progress of both the signature process and the last feedback on the legal check.

**Daniel:** *Is there anyone against the proposal to start the signing process as soon as possible after this Assembly, the proposed procedure and to mandate the Bureau to monitor the progress of the signing process & of the legal check by AEMET ?*

*No one.*

**Daniel:** *Are there any abstention ?*

*No one.*

**The ACCORD Assembly approved the signing process to start with the date of this A/A meeting (7 July).**

**For the procedure, the finalized version will be sent to members as soon a possible.**

**For paper versions:**

- **Send a scan version to the CSS [css@accord-nwp.org](mailto:css@accord-nwp.org)**
- **Send the original version to the PM by paper mail**

**For PDF versions:**

- **Send the signed pdf version back to the CSS [css@accord-nwp.org](mailto:css@accord-nwp.org)**

**In the Bureau: monitor the progress of the signing process & of the legal check by AEMET**

*Daniel thanked members for their support in starting the procedure and expressed his hope that AEMET would succeed in finalising the procedure before the December Assembly.*

## **5. Scripting roadmap**

Claude reminded that the A/A on 9 December approved forming a Task Force (TF) to work out a roadmap for the common scripting system (this topic has been recognized as very sensitive during the preparation of the scientific strategy)

The TF has been active from December until mid-June.

STAC reviewed the roadmap proposal at its meeting on 27 June 2025.

### **Scripting roadmap: main goals**

- The common scripting will facilitate R&D collaboration across ACCORD teams.
- It will ease local installation of complex configurations such as EPS or DA, and increase the level of meteorological quality assurance by enabling teams to use and/or compare similar workflows.
- It can be considered by the teams for local use although this will not be mandatory, neither for research nor for operations.
- The roadmap includes:
  - Manpower and expertise estimates per tasks;
  - A trajectory about dedicated staffing for the scripts, i/o to build a small team. The scope of competence-building of this team should go beyond the scripting code alone, including HPC environments and existing tools that can accelerate the development;
  - Milestones.

Claude detailed that each milestone includes a list of tasks that span in time from this autumn to the first part of 2027. He explained that both the needed manpower and the needed expertise are important. It would be desirable for ACCORD to be able to build a small team of but a few people who will develop and maintain these scripts.

Claude further explained that, in his view, the people who will compose this small team will become experts of the scripting codes as such (ie the functions and the code for implementing them), but they also will have to build an expertise on the existing tools and on HPC environments.

Claude noted that the profile of this small "scripting experts team" could be seen as fairly similar to the profile of the "DAVAI contributors' team" which has been formed during phase 1 (ie a size of eventually about 4-5 persons, with some variety of competence around a core tool).

Claude expressed his hopes that the drafting of the staffing requirements can motivate a few people from the teams in ACCORD to join this activity. He emphasised that it is important that Assembly members are aware that expertise on the NWP code as such is not specifically required. Anyone with an understanding of the functions of a scripting system and with an appetite for analyzing workflows, for working in HPC environments, and developing tools like scripts would be welcome.

He specified that in order to facilitate the collaboration on various NWP configurations and workflows, and in order to make the connection to the existing scripts, it is very important that many teams are involved.

### **STAC recommendations**

STAC recommends the Assembly to approve the Common scripting roadmap and encourage Members to appropriately staff for the proposed activities.

Daniel thanked Claude for the broad explanation about the roadmap on the scripting system and opened the floor to comments.

***Marianne:** I want to congratulate Claude, STAC, all the scientists who prepared this roadmap. The fact that today, in ACCORD, we are able to look at this document now, reveals that we are an organisation which is maturing quite fast. I'm very pleased about that.*

*When we first created ACCORD, having different scripting systems was really a hiccup. I know that we still have various systems and we will continue to do so for a few more years, but the fact that we are now starting a common journey is something for which we should thank all those people who made it possible for us to make this decision today and follow the roadmap. Thank you very much.*

***Roar:** I would like to echo Marianne and say that I'm also very happy and grateful to see that we have this roadmap in place. However I'm a bit worried by the second bullet point on the slide here, "Encourage members to appropriately staff the proposed activities".*

*Are we confident that this is sufficient to reach the goal of the roadmap? I noticed that each task has a number of FTEs allocated to it but I haven't done the calculations, I don't know how it's spread in time. So, do we need more to make sure that the members will start the activities, and what do we do if they don't do it?*

***Claude:** If you, Assembly, agree to validate the roadmap, what we will do next is to share the content of this roadmap with Local Team Managers. We will explain to them the content of the roadmap and it will be part of the Rolling Work Plan for next year.*

*Regarding the total amount of expected staffing, like I suggested a few minutes ago, we should consider the idea of building a small team to develop and maintain the scripts over time. It is hard to fully estimate the staffing, but my current impression is that we could start the team this autumn with 3 people at 0.1 to 0.2 FTE, then complement the team with 2 more people next year;*

*ACCORD would be doing well if the core team was something like about five persons with 0.1 to 0.2 FTE of dedicated manpower to the scripting work.*

*In addition to that core team, we will need to have a few experts on existing tools and on complex configurations (i.e. DA, EPS) just to help and explain their workflow. Some of the tasks in the roadmap are not drafted as development tasks today, at first they are actually drafted as additional*

analysis tasks. This is why I think that the core team will have to organize work with experts to complement and strengthen the analysis on some of the specific configurations.

Iceland, **Matthew Roberts** (IMO) 4:37 PM

I would like to second the comments regarding the progress on the roadmap - this represents an important achievement for the consortium

**Matthew:** Just a brief comment in connection with those from both Denmark and Norway about the timeline. If we think about Destination Earth, just very briefly, and the very bold goal set by Europe in relation to climate change research and meteorological applications, then I think it's excellent to see that connection with DEODE phase 2. For example, this proposal comes at a very important time, and I think the roadmap fits very well with the implementation timeline for Destination Earth. So, it's a very big step forward.

**Claude:** Yes indeed we want to use the outcome of DEODE and we want to stay in good connection with DEODE developments. However, for this common activity in ACCORD, and when we speak about staffing for the roadmap, we definitely mean ACCORD staffing and planning of its own. Indeed DEODE has its own objectives, timetable and deliverables. It's fair that we in ACCORD develop our own roadmap, as much aligned with DEODE as we can, but our own nevertheless, with our own resources.

**Daniel:** Any further comments raised ? No.

**Daniel:** Is there anyone against the roadmap ?

No one.

**Daniel:** Are there any abstention ?

No one.

**The Assembly approved the roadmap and that ACCORD should start implementing it as soon as possible.**

**The Assembly agreed to encourage Members to appropriately staff the proposed activities.**

Daniel thanked all who worked on this document which is very important as it finalises the scientific strategy for the phase 2 of ACCORD and it is very important before signing the MoU.

## **6. Review of decisions by the A/A**

All decisions made during the meeting are reviewed in session so that the actions related to those decisions can start as soon as the Assembly is closed (Note that the decisions are drafted in these minutes **in bold font** inside each item).

All decisions are validated. Two last remarks were made.

**Marianne:** Regarding the budget, I can subscribe with the 4 bullets. But I would like to mention that as I said in my first intervention concerning the budget, we are basically not very pleased with increased budgets anywhere. But I don't mind that we are looking into what +18% would mean, what we would do for 18% more. I do recognize, like other colleagues, that it is not a lot of money. But I'm not sure today what we can get with +18%, what the benefits would be, and I haven't promised from our side that we will be able to deliver.

Claude answered that this comment will be taken into account when refining the budget scenarios, by detailing more the partition of expenses and the expected benefits.

*Nuno: I was just wondering if the electronic signing should be alphabetically, and how would you join the document? Shouldn't there be some kind of ordering in the Members' signing?*

Daniel and Claude explained that the full MoU will be sent to members as a pdf document, but only one page per member needs to be signed and sent back.

## 7. Dates of 2025 Consortium events, including next Assembly

- **Extraordinary ACCORD Assembly (online)**  
Monday 10 March 9:00-12:00 CET, progress by the MoU2-WG
- **Extraordinary ACCORD Assembly (online)**  
Tuesday 13 May 10:00-13:00 CEST, progress by the MoU2-WG, nomination of PM
- **ACCORD Assembly spring 2025 (online, half-day)**  
Monday 7 July 14:00-17:00 CEST, Management positions, budget, roadmap
- **Extraordinary ACCORD Assembly (online)**  
Thursday 9 October 9:00-12:00 CEST, progress on signing process, pending issues on transition steps (the final agenda will be confirmed later)  
<https://meteo.webex.com/meteo/j.php?MTID=m6cafe0adc7860596ee711fefbb1e8f99>
- **ACCORD Assembly end of 2025** in person in Brussels, on the kind invitation of IRM/KMI;  
two half-days Monday 1 Dec afternoon - Tuesday 2 Dec morning

*ECMWF Andy Brown - 5:02 PM*

*The ECMWF 50th anniversary events in Reading are Tue 2nd - Fri 5th Dec. Have we already checked that there is no worrying clash for Tuesday (there may not be)?*

Checked after the meeting. No clash in the calendar.

## 8. A.O.B

None.

## 9. Closing

Daniel closed the meeting by stating that he was a very happy chair because there were a number of very important results achieved during the meeting and further, the nomination of several important people in the management for phase 2 has also been acted.

Daniel added that the Assembly reached a very important milestone with the agreement to start the process of signing the MoU.

Daniel also stated that the approval of the CSSy roadmap represented the finalization of the

strategy, so it was indeed a very nice A/A meeting before the summer.

Claude thanked the Assembly for their comments and their support, and Daniel for the chairing.

Daniel also thanked the people who have been involved in the preparation of the documents, the WGs and the scripting roadmap TF.

## Appendix I: Participants

Member	Delegation
<b>ALGERIA</b>	Mohamed MOKHTARI
<b>AUSTRIA</b>	Gerhard WOTAWA
<b>BELGIUM</b>	<b>Daniel GELLENS (chair)</b>
<b>BULGARIA</b>	Ilian GOSPODINOV
<b>CROATIA</b>	Ivan GÜTTLER
<b>CZECH REP</b>	Radmila BROZKOVA (LTM)
<b>DENMARK</b>	Marianne THYRRING
<b>ESTONIA</b>	Taimar ALA (PAC) Kai ROSIN
<b>FINLAND</b>	Sami NIEMELA (STAC)
<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>Virginie SCHWARZ (vice-chair)</b> Natacha BERNIER (PAC)
<b>HUNGARY</b>	Gabriella SZÉPSZÓ (LTM)
<b>ICELAND</b>	Matthew ROBERTS
<b>IRELAND</b>	Saji VARGHESE (STAC chair, LTM)
<b>LITHUANIA</b>	Vida RALIENĖ
<b>MOROCCO</b>	Mohamed DKHISSI Siham SBII (LTM)
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	Werenfried SPIT - from 15:00
<b>NORWAY</b>	Roar SKÅLIN
<b>POLAND</b>	Bogdan BOCHENEK (LTM)
<b>PORTUGAL</b>	Nuno LOPES (PAC) Maria MONTEIRO (LTM)
<b>ROMANIA</b>	Florinela GEORGESCU (PAC chair) Alexandra CRACIUN (LTM)
<b>SLOVAKIA</b>	Jozef CSAPLAR - from 14:50
<b>SLOVENIA</b>	Jure JERMAN
<b>SPAIN</b>	Jaime REY
<b>SWEDEN</b>	Hakan WIRTEN
<b>TUNISIA</b>	Wafa KHALFAOUI (LTM)
<b>TÜRKIYE</b>	Alper GUSER Volkan Mutlu COŞKUN Yelis CENGİZ (LTM, STAC)

<b>ACCORD PM</b>	Claude FISCHER
<b>LATVIA Observer</b>	Uldis ZANDOVSKIS
<b>HIRLAM PM (obs.)</b>	-
<b>LACE PM (obs.)</b>	Martina TUDOR
<b>ECMWF Observer</b>	Andy BROWN
<b>ACCORD CSS</b>	Anne-Lise DHOMPS