A Consortium for COnvection-scale modelling Research and Development

2nd ACCORD Extraordinary Assembly
Tuesday 13 May 2025
online
10h-13h CEST

Minutes

1. Opening and welcome

Daniel (Chair) opened the 2nd ACCORD Extraordinary Assembly (EA) meeting. Daniel welcomed the delegations (see Appendix I).

2. Results of the in-camera session

Daniel took the floor after coming back from the in-camera session concerning the PM nomination. He explained that he was glad that the in-camera session was short.
He reminded that, as decided at the 9 A/A, the PM selection panel was composed by the chair of the A/A (Daniel Gellens), the vice-chair (Virginie Schwarz), the chair of HIRLAM Council (Marianne Thyrring) and the chair of RC LACE Council (Libor Černikovský).
Daniel explained that during the interview, Claude had the opportunity to share his views on what he has learnt from the last 5 years as ACCORD PM and to present his vision and motivation for the next phase of ACCORD.
During phase 1, he performed well in his role as PM and the consortium developed more rapidly than expected and also with a new sense of belonging and contributing to the same community.
The candidate responded openly and in depth to the various topics. The jury was convinced of the quality of his application and noted his interest and attention to the implementation of ACCORD's strategy for phase 2.
In addition, the panel recognised that he has a good understanding of the AI/ML challenge for NWP, a subject that is becoming increasingly important.
The panel wanted to emphasize that the managerial tasks will become more important in the future and to encourage Claude to prepare himself accordingly.
Daniel then presented the conclusion of the in-camera session:

The Assembly officially nominated Claude FISCHER from Météo-France as Programme Manager of the ACCORD Consortium from 1st January 2026.

Claude thanked everyone for their trust and their satisfaction for the work done and emphasised that it was a common effort.
He said that he could only agree that ACCORD will face an interesting period and that indeed, we will have to use ACCORD and the structure we all put in place together to get the best for the ACCORD members with the challenges like HPC, AI/ML or the development of our science.
He thanked the Assembly Members for their trust in him.

3. Adoption of the agenda

Daniel asked if there is any comment on the agenda, or any AOB.

No comments.

Daniel declared the agenda adopted.

4. Transition phase 1 / phase 2

a. Nomination of the PM

Result from the In-camera session presented by the chair of the Assembly before the Assembly.

b. Nomination process of CSC Leaders

Claude reminded that this point is for information purposes only.
At the last EA (10 March), 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 asked to be added to the ALARO group.
The last Assembly agreed that each CSC group should organise the nomination of their CSC leader in a way that best suited their selection process.

AROME	ALARO	HARMONIE-AROME
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	*Spain*	
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 in September (next UWC Programme Manager). In the meantime, the current CSC Leader (Jeanette Onvlee, KNMI) will participate in the needed transition steps.

Regarding ALARO and AROME CSC, the bureau discussed how to organise the consultation and selection process for both groups. A first consultation meeting was proposed for each group.

ALARO: Consultation meeting on 5 May, where representatives of the institutes discussed the received application. The representatives are checking to confirm the support at the level of each institute (DL: 16 May). 11 (out of 11) positive answers received.

AROME: Consultation meeting on 7 May, where representatives of the institutes discussed the received application. The representatives are checking to confirm the support at the level of each institute (DL: 16 May). So far, 11 (out of 12) positive answers received.

The outcome of the process will be explained in the Bureau and the two names will be proposed as well as the status for HARMONIE-AROME at the next Assembly, the 7 July, for a formal approval of the nominations.

Claude said that the first two names will be in continuation of the current phase and acknowledged that the process was rather smooth and quicker than expected.

The target is to present the proposals to the A/A at its meeting on 7 July, to approve the names.

c. Procedure for defining the MG structure (Area Leaders)

Claude reminded that this point is for information purposes only as well and that the last A/A on 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. It also approved the composition of this WG and to:

- 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.

Claude explained that the organization of the WG really started at the very end of April with 3 online meetings scheduled (1h30 each) in May and June. A draft (incomplete) online working document has been prepared and a specific STAC meeting is planned for the very end of June, in order to analyze the proposal and make a recommendation for the 10th A/A.

The target is to present the full proposal to the A/A at its meeting on 7 July, for approval.

d. Transition: headlines of timeline regarding the management positions

Claude reminded the timeline for the transition:

- **A/A 1-2 December 2025**: Approval of all other management positions

- in the end of October or in the first half of November: Interview the AL candidates
- **A/A 9 October**: Budget aspects; Discuss any pending issue (management, status of signing)
- July 2025: Call for applications to the other management positions (DL for receiving answers: Friday 10 October 2025)
- **A/A 7 July**: Approve nomination of CSC-Leaders; Approve the structure of the MG (ie the list of Area Leaders); Discuss the management positions which require a Call for application; Discuss other management positions and approve the first nominations
- May-June: preparation of the definitions of the Area Leader functions (Working Group)
- May 2025: Procedure for nominating the CSC-Leaders is organized within each list of "CSC institutes"
- **A/A 13 May**: Nominate the PM for phase 2
- 2nd half of April or in the beginning of May: interviews of the PM candidates
- March-April 2025: Consultation for the CSC Leaders (facilitated by the PM+CSS if needed)
- **A/A 10 March 2025**: Approve the procedure for listing the "CSC institutes" & Approve each list of "CSC institutes" (*each list then agrees on how it organizes the selection of the corresponding CSC-Leader*);
- December 2024: Call for application for the PM position (DL of receiving answers: Friday 4 April 2025); **DONE ON 20 JANUARY 2025**
- **A/A 9 December 2024**: Discuss the procedure and the timeline, as well as the Selection Panel and the Call of application for the PM position; ***provided the A/A approved the scientific strategy with no reserve (item 10) => APPROVED***

Daniel thanked Claude for the follow-up of these processes and emphasised that the timeline is very important to follow the different steps to be ready for phase 2 in January 2026, then he opened the floor.

Gabriella*: What is going to be the process for PAC and STAC members for the next phase? Will we have to confirm whether they want to finish with this phase or whether they intend to continue ? Will we have to nominate new members ?*

Claude*: Yes, we will indeed have to decide on the composition of STAC and PAC for the next phase. Regarding the formal aspects, it was already agreed at the last meeting that the mandate will become 2.5 years (MoU2).*
My current proposal is to start asking the existing members if they wish to continue, and then that they would have to check within their family. If they do not wish to continue, they will have to trigger a discussion within their family for their replacement.
This is how we proceeded with the renewal during phase 1 and personally I would suggest keeping this two-step process.

Daniel*: When will this process occur ?*

Claude*: This year, to be ready for next year. I would say finish the whole designation process for the December Assembly.*
Regarding PAC I will have to liaise with our current chair of PAC to organize the discussion about PAC membership, as we do not have any PAC meetings planned.
For STAC, meetings are already planned and this will be on the agenda.

5. Progress of WG-MoU2

a. Approval of manpower figures for Q3-Q4/2024

Claude explained that the approval of the 2024 manpower figures is needed to update one of the Annexes of the MoU.
Claude reminded that the manpower in ACCORD is regularly registered in the Common Manpower Register which is maintained by the CSS. The manpower is quarterly registered by LTMs then checked by the PM and the AL (for their Area) with the help of CSC Leaders.
Twice a year, the Assembly is asked to approve the manpower figures officially by semester. Usually it is done at the July Assembly, but this year they are presented during this 2nd EA so the figures can be added to the total cumulated manpower from 1/1/2018 to 31/12/2024 (i.e. 7 full years, in Annex VII of the MoU2).

Claude specified that Table 1 in the preparatory document “5.a.Manpower” contains the cumulated manpower for the full year 2024 for approval.

Daniel opened the floor to comments.

Nuno*: Going back to an Assembly discussion in 2022, the point was made that we wanted in ACCORD to make use of the DEODE-funded manpower to accelerate our work; however there were issues on how to account for that manpower due to IPR considerations. Now I have the impression that we are going to count on some DEODE manpower to facilitate the development of the ACCORD scripts. I would thus like to get confirmed how this DEODE manpower would be counted in ACCORD.*

Claude*: There are two aspects in your remark.*

<u>Regarding the manpower</u>, we ask all the members, if they wish, to register DEODE funded manpower entering into the scope of ACCORD activities. The way it is done at the moment, is by identifying, inside the DEODE WPs, which ones enter the scope of our ACCORD RWP.
For DEODE phase 2 we have an agreed list of DEODE WPs that was discussed in STAC last year, then approved at the Assembly level and shared with LTMs.
LTMs can account DEODE-funded manpower for those WPs within the ACCORD manpower registration with a specific flag in the CMR tool. This way the manpower is visible.

<u>Regarding the voting rights</u>, in 2022, the Assembly decided that this DEODE funded manpower would not count, and it hasn't changed ever since 2022.

<u>For the scripting work</u>, we know that we have a few teams that are developing the scripting in DEODE. In parallel, we are working to define the roadmap for scripting for ACCORD.
The staffing for this activity cannot only be DEODE funded, there will have to be some ACCORD contributions. We are assuming that we’ll be able to split the DEODE and the ACCORD contributions though I acknowledge that considering a certain level of co-developpements, the splitting could be tricky. I nevertheless think that it is feasible by re-checking the WPs and/or the Deliverables on the DEODE side, and give some fair clear instruction to the LTMs.

Daniel*: I assume that the STAC will analyse and check what is usable.*

***Claude**: Yes indeed, it can be open to discussion in STAC, maybe first with our chair of STAC. We could have the item at a STAC meeting.*

***Daniel**: It is time to validate the manpower and the figures. Is there anyone against the update of the figures of the manpower ?*
No one.
***Daniel**: Are there any abstention ?*
No one.

The Assembly unanimously:

- **Approved the 2024 realised manpower figures (Appendix II).**
- **Agreed to introduce the figures in the Annex VII of the MoU.**

***Daniel:** Thank you for preparing the figures, and also to LTMs for all the work for the registration.*

***Claude**: Thank you for your trust and thank you to Anne-Lise and to the Area leaders for checking the figures in a shorter time this year, it was much of an effort with a short notice indeed.*

b. Proposals of changes for MoU2

Claude presented the progress of WG-MoU2 and the third set of proposals for updating the MoU.

The activity of WG since it started in November 2024:

- 11 online meetings of about 2h each
- Reminder of previously approved changes:
  - A/A of 9/12/24: vocabulary, definitions, introducing a few hooks about AI/ML
  - A/A of 10/3/25: organisation (governance, management, resources), technical texts (Annex II and simplified core text of the MoU)
- On 10/3/25, the A/A advised the WG, for the last set of suggested changes, to focus on aspects that did not work well in phase 1.
- The WG analyzed the following aspects: IPR & licensing, membership, other legal kind of aspects, remaining Annexes (III, VII)

Proposals by the WG-MoU2 for this E-A/A:

- "IP"/"IPR" redrafting and text clarified where it was felt necessary (in most places, the MoU refers to "intellectual property rights")
- harmonization of the MoU with respect to recent WMO Regulation
- some other clarification of the text (manpower accounting period, majority decision versus voting)
- updated figures in Annex VII 2018-2024 (note: including the Q3-Q4 2024 manpower figures, upon approval in Item 5.a. of this A/A)
- date of entry into force: 1/1/2026
- names of institutes on the individual signature pages

The A/A members were invited to check the document "5.b.preMoU2-2":

- The document is a full Memorandum;
- Proposals approved by the A/A on 9/12/24 and 10/3/25 are included and coloured in pale green;

- Proposals submitted to the E-A/A on 13 May are made visible in tracking mode:
- new or modified text considered as a major change is coloured in pale red, new or modified text considered as a minor change is coloured in pale blue, removed text is furthermore noted with strikethrough (the colouring is done as well);
- For the sake of clarity when referencing Articles, Items and Annexes with respect to the current MoU, the numbering of Articles, Items and Annexes is kept identical to MoU1. New Items are identified by a Letter (A, B) and removed Items are kept in tracking mode (so that the numbering isn't affected);
- The specific naming(s) of institutes on their individual signature pages are coloured in light orange.

Daniel opened the floor to comments.

***Florinela**: Thank you chair and Claude for your presentation. As co-chair of this WG with Claude, I'd like to remind you that the group has met every 2 weeks since November last year. All meetings have had a clear agenda to share progress on discussions.*

If you require some changes, we will have to meet again to analyse them. Claude mentioned some of the most important changes, but I want to remind that during meetings, and even between meetings, we did work a lot to check all articles very carefully. Among those articles, I believe that one in particular should have your attention, the item 151 concerning the WMO resolution.

Finally I'd like to thank all my colleagues in the group for the work and discussions. Thanks Claude, thanks Anne-lise, thanks to all of you.

***Abderrazak**: I want to state difficulties encountered at various meteorological institutes, especially logistics and human resources. I suggest to periodically review these difficulties.*

***Daniel**: Do you see in practice what you want to organise ?*

***Abderrazak:** In some institutes there are few human resources. For example in Tunisia, we currently have a very small team of 2-3 and we want to increase its size to 4-5 engineers. We then face the issue of training the newcomers and it would be good that training can be organized.*

***Daniel**: It's a good point, all the members of ACCORD are walking in the same direction. We want to improve our work however to strengthen our teams is not always easy. I really thank you for mentioning it. I do not think that your comment requires changing the document. I think it is already mentioned in our Strategy common objective to strengthen our working collaboration.*

***Claude**: We have indeed been explicitly mentioning in the scientific strategy that ACCORD should organise training, tutorials and some support for the benefit of the various teams. If you are increasing your team, you may need to train your newcomers and that is a part of the strategy. In practice it is done by several means. Part of the training is via WWs. We also tend to do online tutorials and from time to time, we propose a visit to a country where a person from ACCORD can provide technical tutorials. These actions are proposed each year when we prepare the ACCORD Rolling Work Plan (RWP) and when we prepare the actions that will be supported by the ACCORD budget (DAP.)*

So I can confirm that these activities are not mentioned in the MoU, but in the strategy for the new phase. I propose to keep in touch with you and with Wafa (Tunisian LTM) to see what can be organized for your team.

***Matthew** (in the chat): This is a comment from the Icelandic Meteorological Office (IMO).*

We found the memorandum to be clear, well-organised, and covering all the key points related to the ACCORD Consortium's goals, governance, and ways of working.
Thanks to the working group and the management team for putting together such a comprehensive document.

Daniel gave the floor to Matthew.

Matthew*: It was just a comment. We read the MoU; it is an exceptionally comprehensive document. I wanted to congratulate everyone for the hard work, I realize how much work has taken place in the WG over many months and I think the document addresses everything needed. We tried to find holes in it and it seams to fit for every contingency. I would say that it is a very good document and it is definitely valid for a 5-years period.*

Daniel*: I suggest that we approve the changes including annex VII of course and open up the next steps, which include the consultation from the legal point of view.*

Daniel*: Is there anyone voting against the proposals of the various changes ? no*
Are there any abstentions ? no

The Assembly approved the changes proposed for the MoU including the updated Annex VII.

The Assembly thanked the WG for the work carried out during weeks and weeks.

Claude*: Thank you for your trust in the WG. I can just join Florinela. The MoU-WG really worked in a good spirit. Every meeting was very positive and constructive.*

Thank you for your useful comments so far.

Regarding the next steps, Claude proposed, based on discussions in the Bureau: (1) a legal check by each Member, then (2) the signing process.

The timeline would be:

- To confirm the naming references on the signature page. Provide feedback to PM+CSS by Friday 23 May.
- To make a legal check of the content focusing only on blocking issues in formulations which would require a change in order for your institute to be able to sign the MoU. Provide feedback to PM+CSS by Friday 13 June.
- To agree on the start of the signing process at the next A/A meeting on 7 July.

Claude: *the PM and the CSS will make available online shared working documents where Members will be able provide feedback on their naming choices and report on their legal check.*

For the names, for some institutes there is a single name. For other institutes there are several names that are being used in other official documents and on the institute's website.

For the legal check, all members will receive a new version of the MoU containing all the changes highlighted in green. The idea of this legal check is to verify that the text as it stands is a version *that you will be able to sign. The process of signing is different from one country to another, the level at which the decision (or the permission) to sign is taken spans from the institute to ministries.*

If there is any change needed so you can sign the MoU, please communicate it to us and the sooner the better. Any such specific legal aspects will be discussed at Bureau level and we will do our best to address any such proposals.

For the signing process, we will again have the MoU at the agenda of the 7 July A/A with hopefully a full feedback on the legal check and the names of institutes. The final version of the MoU will be available for the Assembly to decide to start the signing process.

***Daniel**: Are there any remarks about what Claude proposed as the next steps ? No.*

***Daniel**: So no need for voting, just agreeing on the next steps.*

The Assembly agreed on the next steps and their timeline:

- **To confirm the naming references on the signature page**
- **To make a legal check of the content focusing only on blocking issues in formulations which would require a change in order for your institute to be able to sign the MoU**
- **To agree on the start of the signing process at the next A/A meeting on 7 July.**

6. Feedback from the scripting roadmap task force

Claude explained that there isn't any decision to take on the scripting roadmap, but as it is an important topic it is only fair to give the Assembly an update.

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 met five times online (1h30) and once in-person (ASW2025).

At first, the high-level requirements were discussed based on a User Stories approach. The availability of these high-level requirements within the DEODE scripts has been evaluated. Mainly, one missing requirement has been identified, which will require an analysis and development work on ACCORD resources.

Claude detailed the current status and next steps:

- a simplified draft list of tasks has been made
- two additional online meetings are planned in order to draft a more detailed list of tasks, including an evaluation of resources whenever possible
- the aim is to have this draft detailed list ready for mid-June, to be presented at a dedicated STAC meeting in the end of June
- presentation at the A/A on 7 July, including STAC recommendations

Daniel opened the floor for comments.

No comments.

Daniel thanked the TF who is working very hard on this item.

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

Extraordinary ACCORD Assembly (online)

Tuesday 13 May 10:00-13:00 CEST, progress by the MoU2-WG, scripting roadmap if not in March, update on nomination process and/or any other actions in relation to the phase 1/phase 2 transition
=> today

ACCORD Assembly spring 2025 (online, half-day)

Monday 7 July 14:00-17:00 CEST.
Business as Usual. Then updates on the transition steps; An important goal is to have an approval of the modified (full) memorandum and start the signing process.
https://meteo.webex.com/meteo/j.php?MTID=m324db01a6353e5b49b9bbd4e4e841ae6

Extraordinary ACCORD Assembly (online)

Thursday 9 October 09:00-12:00 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 - confirmed.

Claude explained that the preparatory document for the A/A is more detailed, with STAC and Bureau meetings added.

He took the opportunity to thank the Bureau who is indeed very helpful in preparing the questions and tasks in connection with the A/A matters.

He invited all members to consider the 9 October EA meeting and keep it on their agenda. The meeting will be useful for the following of the numerous steps for the transition.

Daniel opened the floor for comments or questions on the next meetings.
No comments or questions.

8. A.O.B.

Daniel asked the Assembly if anyone had any suggestion or question to rise before the end of the meeting.

None.

Daniel thanked everyone for the very good meeting. He thanked all the persons involved in the scripting TF, in the MoU-WG and the members in the STAC and the PAC for the swift and efficient preparation of the next phase.

Daniel finally congratulated Claude for the good work and for the renewal in the PM position.

9. Closing

Daniel closed the meeting at about 11:40 (CEST).

Appendix I: Participants

Member	Delegation
ALGERIA	Adbenour AMBAR
AUSTRIA	Gerhard WOTAWA
BELGIUM	Daniel GELLENS (chair)
BULGARIA	Ilian GOSPODINOV Boryana TSENOVA (LTM)
CROATIA	Ivan GÜTTLER
CZECH REP	Ján MAŠEK
DENMARK	Marianne THYRRING
ESTONIA	Taimar ALA (PAC) Kai ROSIN
FINLAND	Sami NIEMELA (STAC)
FRANCE	Virginie SCHWARZ (vice-chair) Natacha BERNIER (PAC) Pauline JOYEUX
HUNGARY	Gabriella SZÉPSZÓ (LTM)
ICELAND	Hidda THORSTEINSSON Matthew ROBERTS
IRELAND	Saji VARGHESE (STAC chair, LTM)
LITHUANIA	Ričardas VALANČIAUSKAS Vida RALIENĖ
MOROCCO	Siham SBII (LTM)
NETHERLANDS	Maarten VAN AALST Werenfried SPIT
NORWAY	Roar SKÅLIN
POLAND	Bogdan BOCHENEK (LTM)
PORTUGAL	Nuno LOPES (PAC) Maria MONTEIRO (LTM)
ROMANIA	Florinela GEORGESCU (PAC chair)
SLOVAKIA	Jozef CSAPLAR Maria DERKOVA (CNA, LTM)
SLOVENIA	-
SPAIN	Jaime REY
SWEDEN	Bodil AARHUS ANDRÆ

TUNISIA	Abderazzak RAHAL Wafa KHALFAOUI (LTM)
TÜRKIYE	Murat ALTINYOLLAR Volkan Mutlu COŞKUN Yelis CENGIZ (LTM, STAC)
ACCORD PM	Claude FISCHER
LATVIA Observer	Andris VIKSNA
HIRLAM PM (obs.)	Jeanette ONVLEE
LACE PM (obs.)	Martina TUDOR
ACCORD CSS	Anne-Lise DHOMPS

Appendix II: Manpower figures

2024 accumulated manpower figures

Partner	Accumulated manpower: 01/01/2024-31/12/2024		
	person.months	**F.T.E.**	**Breakdown**
ALGERIA	33.92	3.08	1.98%
AUSTRIA	56.17	5.11	3.27%
BELGIUM	29.67	2.70	1.73%
BULGARIA	27.17	2.47	1.58%
CROATIA	33.42	3.04	1.95%
CZECH REPUBLIC	79.17	7.20	4.61%
DENMARK	27.32	2.48	1.59%
ESTONIA	11.74	1.07	0.68%
FINLAND	32.32	2.94	1.88%
FRANCE	719.85	65.44	41.92%
HUNGARY	51.67	4.70	3.01%
ICELAND	11.74	1.07	0.68%
IRELAND	37.07	3.37	2.16%
LITHUANIA	4.99	0.45	0.29%
MOROCCO	31.42	2.86	1.83%
NETHERLANDS	67.82	6.17	3.95%
NORWAY	104.32	9.48	6.08%
POLAND	41.67	3.79	2.43%
PORTUGAL	11.42	1.04	0.67%
ROMANIA	23.17	2.11	1.35%
SLOVAKIA	56.92	5.17	3.31%
SLOVENIA	40.17	3.65	2.34%
SPAIN	61.82	5.62	3.60%
SWEDEN	72.07	6.55	4.20%
TUNISIA	22.67	2.06	1.32%
TÜRKIYE	27.42	2.49	1.60%
TOTAL	**1717.18**	**156.11**	**100.00%**

Accumulated manpower figures used for voting

Partner	Breakdown of the accumulated manpower	
	Since 2021	**Since 2018**
ALGERIA	1.65%	1.61%
AUSTRIA	3.23%	3.42%
BELGIUM	1.79%	2.23%
BULGARIA	1.88%	1.63%
CROATIA	2.06%	2.22%
CZECH REPUBLIC	4.12%	4.55%
DENMARK	2.01%	2.23%
ESTONIA	0.68%	0.47%
FINLAND	2.63%	2.74%
FRANCE	41.35%	40.81%
HUNGARY	2.50%	2.60%
ICELAND	0.59%	0.53%
IRELAND	2.49%	2.49%
LITHUANIA	0.54%	0.35%
MOROCCO	2.05%	1.83%
NETHERLANDS	3.55%	3.46%
NORWAY	7.19%	6.22%
POLAND	1.88%	1.59%
PORTUGAL	0.81%	0.96%
ROMANIA	1.38%	1.47%
SLOVAKIA	3.03%	3.59%
SLOVENIA	2.31%	2.41%
SPAIN	3.89%	4.06%
SWEDEN	3.49%	3.65%
TUNISIA	1.41%	1.38%
TÜRKIYE	1.53%	1.50%
TOTAL	**100.00%**	**100.00%**