

# 14th ACCORD LTM meeting

Monday 31 March 2025, 16h30 - 17h30 CEST hybrid

### **Minutes**

In Zalakaros - Remotely
Excused and not represented

Country	NMS	LTM	representative
ALGERIA	ONM	Mohamed Mokhtari	
AUSTRIA	GeoSphere Austria	Christoph Wittmann	
BELGIUM	RMI	Alex Deckmyn	
BULGARIA	NIMH	Boryana Tsenova	
CROATIA	DHMZ	Antonio Stanesic	
CZECH REP	СНМІ	Radmila Brožková	
DENMARK	DMI	Tommaso Benacchio	
ESTONIA	ESTEA	Ivar Ansper	
FINLAND	FMI	Reima Eresmaa	
FRANCE	MF	Cécile Loo	
HUNGARY	HMS	Gabriella Szépszó	
ICELAND	IMO	Guðrún Nína Petersen	
IRELAND	Met Eireann	Saji Varghese	
LITHUANIA	LHMS	Rimvydas Jasinskas	
MOROCCO	DGM	Siham Sbii	Fatima Hdidou
NETHERLANDS	KNMI	Wim de Rooij	
NORWAY	MET Norway	Jørn Kristiansen	
POLAND	IMGW-PIB	Bogdan Bochenek	
PORTUGAL	IPMA	Maria Monteiro	
ROMANIA	NMA	Alexandra Craciun	
SLOVAKIA	SHMU	Maria Derkova	
SLOVENIA	ARSO	Jure Cedilnik	
SPAIN	AEMET	Javier Calvo	
SWEDEN	SMHI	Jelena Bojarova	
TUNISIA	INM	Wafa Khalfaoui	
TÜRKIYE	TSMS	Yelis Cengiz	Celaleddin Kızılkaya
			-

Claude Fischer (PM), Anne-Lise Dhomps (CSS)

### Opening and adoption of agenda (CNA)

Mariska opened the meeting and presented the agenda.

0	Opening and adoption of agenda	CNA
1	Introduction of new LTMs	CNA
2	Info from CSS/ST	CSS
	Status of DAP2025 actions (list1)	CSS
	Opening and closing of DAP2025 list 2 actions	CSS
3	Review of open actions from the previous meeting	PM/CNA
	Connexions to MF platforms	French LTM
	Topical session on the code evolution	PM
4	Source Code Management and cycles	IL/PM
5	A.O.B.	CNA
6	Next meeting(s) & closure	CNA

The agenda is unanimously adopted.

1. Introduction of new LTMs (CNA)

There were no new LTMs.

## 2. Info by CSS

Mariska gave the floor to Anne-Lise for reminders on the DAP2025, and Claude completed the information.

Anne-Lise reminded everyone that the official DAP2025 ("list1") was sent to all partners on 27 January. The ACCORD\_DAP2025\_follow-up file is available for the LTMs for the follow-up, with the link in the Information4LTM file.

Anne-Lise explained that the call for proposals for "list2" is still open. Proposals should be provided via the online form until 15 April, and thus it is possible to take the opportunity of the ASW to discuss proposals.

- The form is open for scientific visits only
- FYI, some Working Weeks are in preparation for "list2" where some participation with ACCORD support will be discussed in MG:
  - Physics Parameterizations. Claude pointed out that the MG currently was discussing whether this Physics WW should be organized separately, or in common with the MQA-I WW. Anyway, if interested, contact Meto.
  - Technical code and system development: Davaï WW. This WW is for a specific group of DAVAI developers that has formed in the last 3 years. However if you have someone in your team who has interest in it, please contact Alexandre.

- Workflow analysis and discussion towards a more CI/CD approach. Daniel, Alexandre and Daan are working on the topic. Contact Daniel if you are interested.
- Surface Analysis and Modelling (ALARO/SURFEX). Contact Patrick.
- Dynamics (Evolution and coordination of work done in ACCORD with ECMWF). Claude more generally commented that the dynamics team is a small but active team. If an LTM has a person (a newcomer?) in his/her local team with an appetite for applied math, please put him/her in contact with Ludovic.
- MQA-infrastructure. Please attend the topical session on the topic. Part of the discussion will enable defining the content of the WW.
- group scientific visits on "CY51 validation". Alexandre will talk about it in a few minutes.

Cécile asked how many proposals are expected to be accepted for the list2?

Claude and Anne-Lise estimated that about 10-15 weeks could be available.

3. Review of open actions from the previous meeting

Connexion to MF platforms (French LTM)

In relation with issues raised at the last LTM meeting in last February, Cécile made the follow-up on the points listed hereafter:

- Declaring multiple IP addresses for ftp-pro access to prevent the no-connection effect when a single IP address is blacklisted → already done
- Check with the IT service how to be notified when IP address is blacklisted to save time → scheduled in April
- ullet Connection problem mentioned by Radmila ullet in contact with Jan Masez but not yet resolved

Cécile stated that, as another next step regarding the availability of the LBC data, MF is considering to resume the elaboration of formal agreements for the LBC production, as started by Ghislain and presented in an LTM meeting in 2022.

**Radmila**: Thank you Cécile. About the connection problem that we have, we are trying to find out what does not work for us. But so far it is a bit difficult to find.

Regarding a formal agreement, we had originally agreed on the LBC production in 1991. However, I'm not sure I would be able to find any written agreement. It would be great to put that again on paper.

**Mariska**: As Cécile said, we already talked about it with Ghislain 2-3 years ago. Maybe let's have a specific meeting to resume the action?

Claude: Agree. To start, let's just have a meeting - CNA (Mariska), French LTM (Cécile), CSS (Anne-Lise), and PM (Claude) - to evaluate where we are and redefine a methodology for making the agreements.

Cécile: I agree. Moreover, material already exists, so a first step would be to look at it.

Action on Mariska, Cécile, Anne-Lise, Claude, to resume the preparation of LBC provision agreements with the partners using Arpege LBCs.

Topical session on the code evolution (PM)

Claude explained that, as a answer to comments made at our last LTM meeting concerning the code evolution, there will be a dedicated topical session on code refactoring and code evolution, including coding norms and their documentation => Thursday 3 April 14:20-16:00 CEST

He encouraged the LTMs to come to the session and to recommend people in their teams to attend, even online.

### 4. Source Code Management and cycles (IL)

Alexandre introduced a few slides on:

- Formalising more code management: organize the user access to the forge, propose a Contributors License Agreement (CLA) at first pull request, organize Teams within the IAL project
- Timing of CY50T1, CY50T2, CY51
- Continuous Integration (CI)

Alexandre presented different ways of moving towards some more Continuous Integration (CI) within the context of the ACCORD forge and the shared GITHUB history with ECMWF. A solution that seems the simplest to implement in GITHUB is by using a single branch and designing a unique CI process. Such an approach might however not necessarily be the best way. Another idea is to have one CI process in ACCORD and another CI process with ECMWF for bit-identical or technical (neutral) changes.

It is planned that ACCORD will organize WDs to evaluate the implications of each solution in order to help with the decision.

**Radmila**: Can you tell us what is the content of PHYEX? **Alexandre**: PHYEX is the AROME physics package.

**Radmila**: Question on the CI - what shall be the code basis for the scientific developments/contributions? A reference version will be needed for the developers also in the CI framework, and the difficulties of phasing some contributions will remain.

Alexandre: The work and the potential code issues wouldn't change much for contributors. Contributions will always be on the last release. If a new cycle is released in between, people will have to rebase their contributions and resolve potential issues with their authors.

Claude: Thank you Alexandre for explaining the different ways CI could be transposed to our NWP code work. I'lm also glad to see that you could take up this topic with ECMWF and that we aim for a coordinated process.

**Claude**: regarding how to organise the user access to the forge, and the preparation of CLAs, how do you as Integration Leader see the possible future role of the LTMs? How can they help to set up these new practices?

**Alexandre**: Within the forge, given the large number of users per country, we will organize them per GITHUB-team.

We wish to ask the LTMs to then help us in the followed-up management of the users from their team. The follow-up could be the responsibility of the LTM or a delegate. He/she checks when people have left (leave) the institute.

To make this survey, he/she must have access to the forge. Since not all LTMs have the same management profile, and not all have a user access to the forge, they also can delegate the monitoring tasks to another person from their team.

Claude thanked Alexandre for the presentation today and all his work as Integration Leader. Claude also pointed out the importance of Alexandre's role in modernizing the working practices on the ACCORD codes.

#### 5. AOB

There is only one AOB presented by Claude about the hosting of the next ASW. The suggested dates are:

- 13-17 April (as option 1?)
- 23-27 March (as option 2?)

Reima: Personal calendar conflict for me in April. But Nikko could represent me.

**Alexandra**: It seems that the 12th of April is the Orthodox Easter, so the first week would be more difficult to attend.

Claude: Noted. No firm decision now. Let's see hosting proposals before deciding.

### 6. Next meetings and closure

Spring meeting online / 1h.

Claude suggested a spring online meeting to confirm LTMs the final steps for MoU2. LTMs will then have to carefully check that their institute takes all necessary steps for a prompt signing. An update on any other matter regarding the transition to phase 2 could be done as well at this occasion. The possible dates are:

- Monday 16 June
- Mon-Tue-Wed 23-24-25 June

Please answer this framadate poll LTM15 meeting before 18th of April.

Besides EWGLAM in week 22-26 Sept (SMHI and hybrid)

Mariska thanked all LTMs and closed the meeting at 17:30.