

Minutes

1. Opening and welcome

Daniel (Chair) opened the 3rd ACCORD Extraordinary Assembly (EA) meeting at 9.00 with 30 connected participants. Daniel welcomed the delegations (see [Appendix I](#)).

2. Adoption of agenda

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

No comments.

Daniel declared the agenda adopted.

3. Transition phase 1 / phase 2

a. Nomination of CSC Leaders

Claude reminded that at the EA of 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.

Claude further reminded that on 7 July, the ACCORD Assembly endorsed the nominations of Eric Bazile (from MF) as AROME CSC Leader and of Martina Tudor (from DHMZ) as ALARO CSC Leader (both from 1/1/2026 on).

HIRLAM-UWC had announced that the HARMONIE-AROME CSC leader would be the next UWC Programme Manager, to be nominated in September 2025. The position is now filled by Daniel Santos Muñoz from DMI.

Claude emphasized that Daniel Santos Muñoz is the System AL during phase 1 of ACCORD so he is well aware of the way we work in the ACCORD management.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

*Daniel: Is there anyone against the nomination of the CSC leader for HARMONIE-AROME ?
No one.*

The Assembly endorsed the proposal made by the Harmonie-Arome CSC group, and to nominate from 1st January 2026:

- **Daniel Santos Muñoz (from DMI) as HARMONIE-AROME CSC Leader.**

b. Area Leaders & WG-InComAI

Area Leaders.

Claude reminded that the A/A on 7 July approved the list and the definitions of the Area Leaders for phase 2 (8 functions).

He emphasized that the Area Leaders play a central role in the planning of the consortium R&D activity, and in the implementation of the ACCORD Scientific Strategy for their Area and beyond.

The A/A approved the full text of the Call for Applications for the 8 functions, and to launch the call with a DL for receiving candidacies set to 7 October 2025.

The number of received applications is 6 concerning 5 functions: (upper-air) physics, data assimilation, dynamics, surface, system.

The following 3 functions have not received an application: coding evolution, EPS, meteorological quality assurance.

Claude specified that for the sake of clarity, the organization of the interviews does not necessarily mean that a candidate will be selected for a function. There might still be empty functions after this round.

According to the timeline and the procedure agreed for the AL positions, and given the status of applications, the next steps could be :

- To organize the interviews of the existing candidates as they go along, and make their proposal for the A/A of 1-2 December (upper-air physics, data assimilation, dynamics, surface, system)
- To prolongate until 10 Nov 2025 the DL for applications only for those Area Leader positions with no suitable application so far (coding evolution, EPS, meteorological quality assurance)
- To mandate the Bureau to monitor the progress and analyze any difficulty in connexion with the AL positions

Daniel thanked Claude for the clear description of the process and opened the floor for questions and remarks.

Daniel: We request your help, to find ALs.

We all need the Management Group to support the activity of the consortium and it's in your hand to support those people to hold such positions.

***Marianne:** I support the process just explained. I hope that we'll find qualified candidates in the pool of applicants we had so far. It's good to know that we did have applicants for 5 positions. Do we have any idea why we didn't receive applications for the last 3 positions ? Does it make a difference to re-open the same positions again ? Is it the content of the position ? The way they are constructed ? The responsibilities ? I don't know myself.*

***Claude:** At this stage it is difficult to answer in particular for coding evolution, EPS, meteorological quality assurance, whether there is a specific reason why we didn't get any applicants. At a more general level, I've done quite some advertisement during the last week (EWGLAM conference) and what I can share are a few reactions that came to me:*

- *In some cases the need to free a half-time position was difficult. So I take the opportunity to remind the A/A that it is possible to have a joint proposal of 2 people with complementary profiles for one single position.*
- *Some people did not feel confident in their own ability to make coordination, steering activity in the spirit of ACCORD; having two persons for one position could mitigate this difficulty for a candidate as well.*
- *Yet another reason invoked is that currently there is reorganisation going-on in some institutes, and this makes it complicated to commit.*

After discussion with the Bureau, we really believe that the content of the positions corresponds to what is needed to implement the strategy.

Therefore the proposal for now is to leave institutes and candidates more time to prepare applications.

Conversely, we certainly also should acknowledge and appreciate positively that we have proposals for 5 positions with support from their institute.

***Daniel:** Is there anyone against the proposal to organize the interviews of the existing candidates, prolong until 10 Nov 2025 the DL for positions with no suitable application and mandate the Bureau to monitor the progress ?*

No one.

***Daniel:** Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly confirmed that the selection panel can organize the interviews of the existing candidates as they go along, and make their proposal for the A/A of 1-2 December.

(upper-air) physics, data assimilation, dynamics, surface, system.

The Assembly agreed to prolongate until 10 Nov 2025 the DL for applications only for those Area Leader positions with no suitable application so far.

coding evolution, EPS, meteorological quality assurance

The Assembly mandates the Bureau to monitor the progress and analyze any difficulty in connection with the AL positions.

***Claude:** Thank you for your trust for the next steps.*

WG-InComAI.

Regarding the WG-InComAI Claude listed briefly the Tasks and Composition adopted by the A/A on 7/7/2025.

Tasks (in short):

- To collect information and track progress in the development of AI/ML for NWP
- To communicate this information within ACCORD (STAC, AMG)
- To discuss and make proposals on standpoints or on specific activities (in ACCORD)
- Can be consulted regarding external communication

Composition:

- 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

Then Claude proposed a procedure to nominate the representatives per family:

The PM will approach key representatives of each family in order to collect a proposal:

- Météo-France management
- The UWC PM in liaison with the UWC Council Chair
- The RC-LACE PM in liaison with the RC-LACE Chair and the chair of LSC
- The LTMs of the ALADIN-MoU5 institutes will be contacted to suggest names (one per institute), including an explanation of the candidate's background and his/her link with AI/ML activities. The ACCORD/PM will organize a dedicated meeting with the LTMs if relevant and discuss the progress with the Bureau

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed composition of the WG ?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved the procedure for completing the composition of the WG-InComAI.

The Assembly took note that the full composition of the WG-InComAI will be proposed for approval during the next A/A on 1-2/12/2025.

c. Other management positions

Documentation Officer and Coordinator for Networking Activities.

Claude reminded that the A/A on 7 July approved the ToRs and the full text of the Calls for the positions of the Documentation Officer (DO) and of the Coordinator for Networking Activities (CNA), and to launch the calls with a DL for receiving candidacies set to 7 October 2025.

One application for the DO position has been received while there was no application for CNA.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

Daniel: *Do we have some feedback explaining why we do not have any application for the CNA position ?*

Claude: *Definitely re-organisation of some institute was a reason. It is a 20% FTE position and the list of tasks is more specific (very good skills in Communication and motivation to help coordinate very technical tasks). We have such people within ACCORD but it would need further discussion on how we could trigger applications.*

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposal to organize the interview of the existing candidate for DO and prolong the call for application for CNA?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

Regarding the DO position

The Assembly confirmed that the selection panel can organize the interview of the existing candidate, and make their proposal for the A/A of 1-2 December.

Regarding the CNA position

The Assembly agreed to prolong the call for applications until 10 Nov 2025.

The Assembly mandated the Bureau to monitor the progress and analyze any difficulty in connection with the DO and/or the CNA positions.

Claude thanked the Assembly for the decisions and emphasized that it is very good to have an application with institute support for the DO position.

Local Team Managers.

Claude emphasized that the LTMs are an essential link between the institutes and their local teams on the one hand, and the ACCORD management (Management Group and Support Team) on the other hand.

The proposal is that the A/A members check and confirm their nominated Local Team Managers for phase 2. The PM+CSS will make available an overview [table listing the existing LTMs](#) and additional columns (1) to confirm the check and (2) to fill the name(s) of the new LTM(s) if a renewal is proposed. (Deadline 6 Nov.)

Note: a few ACCORD institutes have nominated a couple of persons on the function, therefore the conditional plural on "LTM(s)".

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed procedure to validate the name of LTM and present the final list to the A/A on 1-2 December for approval?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved the procedure for confirming the names of the LTMs per institute:

- **Each institute, via one of its A/A delegation members, shall confirm the name(s) of its LTM(s) by 6 November 2025,**
- **The completed list shall be presented to the A/A on 1-2 December for approval.**

d. Governance positions (STAC / PAC)

Claude presented the STAC composition for phase 2; *the mandate is for 2.5 years from 1/1/2026*

Proposed names by component grouping:

ALADIN-MoU5: Michiel Vanginderachter (Belgium),
Yelis Cengiz (Türkiye),
Rahma Ben Romdhane (Tunisia)

HIRLAM/UWC: Ulrik Smith Korsholm (Denmark),
Guðrun Nina Petersen (Iceland),
Javier Calvo (Spain)

MF: François Bouyssel (STAC Vice-Chair 2025),
Christine Lac,
Cécile Loo

RC-LACE: Christoph Wittmann (Austria),
Jure Cedilnik (Slovenia),
Gabriella Szépszó (Hungary)

In addition, the PM, the CSS and the ECMWF observer attend the STAC meetings.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

Claude presented the PAC composition for phase 2; *the mandate is for 2.5 years from 1/1/2026*

Claude pointed out that since the preparatory document, more names have been communicated.

He reminded that the PAC meets only on Assembly request. It is possible to meet without the substitutes, so the PAC is functional as it is, but it is nevertheless important to have nominated substitutes to be sure to work efficiently in case of absence of one member.

Proposed names by component grouping:

- ALADIN-MoU5: Fatih Büyükkasabbaşı (Türkiye),
Siham Sbii (Morocco),
Sub.: to be defined (one name is open for consultation)
- HIRLAM/UWC: Taimar Ala (Estonia - PAC Vice-Chair 2025),
Jørn Kristiansen (Norway),
Sub.: Ben Wichers Schreur (Netherlands)
- MF: Natacha Bernier,
Samuel Morin,
Sub.: François Bouyssel
- RC-LACE: Radmila Brožková (Czech Rep.),
Jurij Jerman (Slovenia),
Sub.: to be defined

In addition, the PM and the CSS attend the PAC meetings.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

None.

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed names for the STAC?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved the list of STAC members.

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed names for the PAC so far?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved the list of PAC members already confirmed.

The Assembly took note that the A/A is expected to approve the names of the chairs and vice-chairs of PAC and STAC at its meeting on 1-2 December 2025.

Claude took the opportunity to thank the leaving members:

Andre Simon (Slovakia),
Saji Varghese (Ireland) STAC Chair 2021-2025,
Sami Niemelä (Finland),
Alain Joly (MF),
Nuno Lopes (Portugal),
Florinela Georgescu (Romania) PAC Chair 2023-2025.

Claude specifically thanked the chairs of PAC, Florinela, and of STAC, Saji, for the excellent collaboration and for the very good interaction for preparing the STAC and PAC meetings in the past few years.

e. Budget

Claude specified that the budget contains two parts:

- Financial procedure organized by MF: the A/A is invited to approve the financial mechanism, which is much in continuation of phase 1, and includes the transfer of the reserve from phase 1 to phase 2. The formal decisions are needed in order to enable MF to implement the procedure.
- Budget scenario for phase 2

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

Marianne: I do confirm that DMI is willing to act as the financial referee on behalf of UWC.

Christoph: I just had confirmation from our financial management that Geosphere Austria will be able to handle transferts between ACCORD and RC-LACE.

Daniel thanked MF for organising all the financial transfers.

Daniel: Is there anyone against the financial proposal ?

No one.

Daniel: Is there any abstention ?

None

The Assembly approved the following procedure:

Météo-France offers to continue to manage the ACCORD budget via a dedicated specific account (ACCORD 3rd party account) according to the following procedure:

- At the beginning of each year, Météo-France issues bills to collect the membership fees (amount decided by the Assembly);
- the PM and the Consortium Scientific Secretary (CSS) finalize the costed Detailed Action Plan (DAP) based on the Rolling Work Plan and the partitioned budget (partitioning among the possible expenses, MoU2 items 116-122) adopted by the Assembly;
- As soon as the ACCORD 3rd party account has been provisioned, Météo-France starts payments to Members according to the DAP (reimbursements of the DAP actions, on a compensatory basis);
- Should a Member not be able to complete a given task for which it has received a payment, this is resolved by a budget adjustment in the following year (to avoid too many financial transfers).

The procedure outlined above is the one agreed by the ACCORD Members for phase 1 (2021-2025, refer to the joint Assembly decision of 27 November 2020).

To ensure continuity of the budget management between 2025 (last year of phase 1 of ACCORD) and 2026 (first year of phase 2), Météo-France proposes to perform in 2026 the budget adjustments

resulting from 2025 non-realized actions. Météo-France furthermore proposes to transfer to 2026 the budget reserve recorded at the end of 2025.

The Directors of HIRLAM/UWC Members confirmed **DMI** to realize all financial actions on behalf of the HIRLAM/UWC countries, i.e. **DMI** will pay to ACCORD 3rd party account the Membership fees of HIRLAM/UWC Members and will receive from ACCORD 3rd party account the redistributed money for the HIRLAM/UWC Members (this decision is valid for the HIRLAM/UWC Members also Members of ACCORD, thus on 9 October 2025 for the NMHSs of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden).

The Directors of RC-LACE Members confirmed **Geosphere Austria** to realize all financial actions on behalf of the RC-LACE countries, i.e. **Geosphere Austria** will pay to ACCORD 3rd party account the Membership fees of RC-LACE Members and will receive from ACCORD 3rd party account the redistributed money for the RC-LACE Members (this decision is valid for all RC-LACE Members: Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia).

Bilateral agreements will be signed with **DMI**, **Geosphere Austria** and **the NMHSs** of Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia and Türkiye.

Claude specified that in order to implement the decision regarding the financial procedure Assembly members will be contacted to give the name of their financial correspondent so the bilateral agreements can be prepared in MF.

(Here is the [link to the table](#) deadline 6th Nov.)

Regarding the budget scenario for phase 2, Claude reminded that the A/A on 7/7/2025 provided guidance on the budget scenarios:

- To transfer the surplus from phase 1 to phase 2 if possible.
[note: it is confirmed that this is possible]
- To develop the intermediate increase scenario (+18%).
- To consider stepwise increase & how to use the surplus in a stepwise approach.
- To consider expenses for in-person and R&D infra (when needed); perhaps consider keeping compensation rates as they are.

The preparatory document presents a preferred scenario which is outlined hereafter and includes:

- 10% rise on **chosen** compensation fees **only**
- More visits where it is believed to be the most appropriate (efficient)
- Documentation collaborative tool + source code Forge if needed
- 2 steps of increase for the contributions: +9,1% and +8,3%
- Use of part of the reserve for year 1
- Remains of the reserve for Data storage and exchange platform if needed or for extra visits.

This scenario is translated into a **suggested budget trajectory detailed in the preparatory document**

(compensation rates, travels, use of surplus, stepwise increase of annual contribution).

Daniel stated that it is a very important topic and opened the floor for questions and remarks.

Nuno: Thank you for the documents. For us the collaborative tools should be active from the first year of the MoU2. It seems very important to have them from the start.

Claude: In ACCORD we do not want to downplay the importance of collaborative tools. We try to use freeplan solution when we can, but if we need to go to a paid solution, we will consider it.

During his answer, Claude displayed the proposed trajectory on (shared) screen. He explained that each year, we will refer to that trajectory when we will discuss the actual requested annual budget figures.

Year 1: +9,1% of the contribution (+ 1000 €) + use of 25 k€ from the reserve

For: compensation rates + more visits

Remaining reserve: 115 k€

Year 2: + 8,3% of the contribution (1000 €)

For: compensation rates + more visits

Use up to 15 k€ per year of the reserve for the documentation collaborative tool, the source code Forge OR more visits, to be decided on a yearly basis.

Years 3-4-5: no more rise of contribution if no changes in the Consortium needs.

For: compensation rates + more visits

Use up to 15 k€ per year of the reserve for the documentation collaborative tool, the source code Forge OR more visits, to be decided on a yearly basis.

Daniel: Regarding the collaborative tools for communications, will it be possible to have them for next year ?

Claude: Indeed, we already have a prototype for communication collaborative tools. The idea is to continue to develop it and share it more widely next year. Check if a free plan solution is enough for our needs, in the end.

Daniel: Is there anyone against the proposed budget scenario?

No one.

Daniel: Is there any abstention ?

None

The Assembly agreed on the specific budget scenario in view of the 11th A/A of 1-2 December.

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

Daniel thanked everyone for the decision and Claude for the preparation of the topic. He also thanked MF, DMI and Geosphere for their role in the financial exchanges.

4. Progress of WG-MoU2

Claude reminded that, at its meeting of 7/7/2025, the A/A approved to start the signing process.

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).

As of the day of the presentation, **23 out of 26 Members have signed the MoU2**. The missing NMHSs have been contacted recently by the CSS in order to evaluate the status.

Risk and mitigation:

Any Member not having signed the MoU2 by 31/12/2025 remains as an observer until signature.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

Marianne: I would just like to remind you that we were in the same situation with the first MoU, and we coped with it. I don't think it would be too complicated to again find appropriate arrangements.

Daniel: At RMI, we just received the agreement from our ministry, so we will be able to proceed with the signing.

5. Licensing the codes in the context of scientific publications

Claude presented an overview of the context on this specific topic.

Some scientific Journals and Editorial Boards are now demanding that authors provide access to the codes used to produce the results shown in their submitted papers. It can be expected that such demands will continue to increase.

The ACCORD Bureau has been discussing the issue and noted that a way forward is to provide access to the codes via a dedicated license. ECMWF already has taken such a measure for the IFS codes. The goal of the license is to enable authors providing access to the codes to scientific editors and reviewers of the Journals who demand it.

The A/A agreed to convene the PAC asap (agreement by email consultation). The meeting took place on 29 September online. The preparatory document for the A/A contains the outcome of the discussion and the detailed recommendations by PAC (repeated in [blue text](#) below).

[PAC recommends the Assembly to approve the following content of the license.](#)

[The elements that should be present in the license include:](#)

- [the licensor is a representative of an ACCORD Member NMHS, hosting at least one co-author and hosting the corresponding author,](#)
- [the licensee is a representative of the institution editing the scientific Journal targeted for the publication of the article under consideration in a peer-review process,](#)

- the license shall be only for the purpose of providing access to the ACCORD common codes during the peer-review process for a scientific publication,
- the parts of the codes that will be provided should be those that are considered necessary and relevant for any editor and/or reviewer,
- the license shall contain explicit references to the title of the paper and to the authors, including the corresponding author, as well as to the name of the Journal and the institution editing this Journal,
- the license shall stipulate that the access is provided for a limited duration of time,
- access to the codes is provided to the scientific editor (the person who supervises the peer-review of the paper) and to a limited number of reviewers, with the understanding that the names of the reviewers remain unknown to the licensor.

The draft license template can be used as a start of a negotiation with an Editor (see Annex in the preparatory document).

PAC furthermore recommends that ACCORD takes further steps with ECMWF in order to discuss the way forward regarding licensing the joint IFS/Arpege/LAM codes in an open source format.

Daniel thanked the PAC for the very quick response to the request made by the Assembly and gave the floor to Florinela as chair of the PAC.

***Florinela:** I do not have anything to add to Claude's presentation. It was a very interesting task for PAC to fulfill.*

Daniel gave the floor to Andy to comment as ECMWF is already progressing in the direction of open source.

***Andy:** In terms of the issue with journals, indeed, at ECMWF, we already do effectively what is in the proposal here. It is definitely not the panacea. Every journal is different, every editor is different, so it doesn't solve all the problems, but it helps. What Claude is proposing is consistent with what we are doing.*

Regarding open source for IFS, we have a proposal to submit to PAC this Autumn, and depending on their view, the proposal will go to the council in December; that is, we make the whole forecast model open source.

The primary drive isn't the issue with journals, but it is a side benefit if we can go for open source. Specific provisions will need to be kept anyway for the data assimilation code which is not proposed for open source.

We are hoping the PAC and the council will agree on the principle, namely to allow the forecast model to be released as open source.

If agreed, the implementation then has a strong link with MF for the IFS/ARPEGE collaboration. Discussions already started with MF.

The same sort of issues hold for the limited area codes and the link with ACCORD. We absolutely don't need to release all the LAM model code at the same time, but considering how much code we do share, if ACCORD is willing to release their code under some open source as well, then we are open to that.

Regarding the IFS, the way we want to structure this is to have the agreement on the principle from our governance on the things we must have in. Based on this decision, we would continue to discuss the implementation with MF for the global side (MF global codes) and with ACCORD if ACCORD wishes.

In this process, we try to separate the policy from the implementation.

Daniel opened the floor for questions and remarks.

Sami: *We had been struggling about the journal situation. So I agree with the licensing, a good answer to the situation.*

I'd like to reflect what Andy said about what is now proposed at the ECMWF PAC about open source and forecast models. Open source is an opportunity for ACCORD as well. We would be in favor of following that proposal from ECMWF.

*About bullet one in the PAC recommendations, "...hosting at least one co-author **and** hosting the corresponding author", why **and** here ? Do we need to have both ?*

Claude: *Thank you for your remarks Sami. About the first bullet, it would make sense that at least one of the co-authors of the paper is in the institute who will discuss the licensing with the journal. Otherwise indeed, in the first bullet, the last part of the sentence might not be needed.*

Roar: *I do support the actions proposed, the Licensing of the codes for publication and also to find a way toward open source license for our codes preferably the same way as ECMWF does.*

Regarding the sentence "The draft license template can be used as a start of a negotiation with an Editor", what's the implication of that ? Is it up to the co-authors in charge or the corresponding authors to decide on a different license based on the negotiations ? What are the implications of that sentence?

Claude: *The implication is, as explained by Andy, each journal is different and might ask different specifications for making the codes available. The idea is to leave a certain degree of freedom to each institute to have the possibility to discuss the details of what part of the code will be made available.*

Some journals would be satisfied with the relevant routine to see how the scientific idea is implemented, others could request a larger part of the code so a reviewer can potentially access a whole workflow of the code.

The parts of the codes that are considered necessary and relevant will have to be discussed between editors and the team who proposes the paper.

Daniel: *To be clear, the degree of freedom is really needed to answer different requests from editors, is it ?*

Claude: *I do believe that yes. If we constrain too much the scope of the codes that are made available, it might still be blocking for some teams to publish in the relevant journals for them, and it is not what we want.*

Martina Tudor - 11:18 AM - chat

ALARO CSC - similarly to the question of Sami, in the first bullet, the first/corresponding/any author may be from a university, not from an NMHS.

ECMWF Andy Brown - 11:19 AM - chat

As Claude says, we have found different journals and different editors. Different editors take very different approaches. So getting through this can be very case by case (which is time consuming and messy)

Roar: *The fact that different journals have different requirements is just another argument to speed up the process toward open source.*

Marianne: Regarding licensing for scientific publication, I fully agree with Andy and Roar. We are hopefully going forward with more and more open data, open source and it should make some of our tasks easier to fulfill although it could also add difficulties.

I support the licensing that is proposed here.

I asked the lawyer at DMI and she agreed with the text. One thing however, we do not have in the text anything about the responsibility of those who will sign the license and receive the access (the Licensee). DMI therefore proposes to add a clause that makes visible a responsibility for the licensee.

Julia Sommer, DMI - 11:25 AM - chat

DMI's proposed wording for point 13 is as follows:

The Licensee shall be fully responsible for damage or loss caused or suffered by the Licensor (whether a member of the ACCORD consortium, ECMWF, Météo-France or third-parties allowed by the IFS-Arpege agreement between ECMWF and Météo-France) for any misuse or breach of the above obligations of the Licensee.

Marianne: I'd like to mention that a document like this one is very useful also in the context of training new scientists, new leaders, and to train them in a world with open source and open code.

Daniel: Maybe the additional proposal by DMI should be submitted to PAC. It is difficult to make a decision quickly, and we are certainly not allowed to make a decision on it now.

Claude: I'm not sure we should convene a PAC about this text but we could share the proposal with the PAC members for information.

As it comes from the lawyers at DMI, maybe it would be relevant to check this text a little bit further at a legal level, if that is possible Marianne, cross check the legal advice and fine tune the text. We could then use the Bureau to evaluate whether the cross-checked fine-tuned text is ready to be shared with the Assembly. If so, ask the Assembly to approve it by email consultation.

Marianne: I'm very flexible on the procedure. I'm also OK if the Assembly decides that we don't need it. We just flow this idea in the interest of ACCORD, it is not a national interest in particular. Any procedure to test whether it is a good idea or not is good for me.

Daniel: Thank you Marianne and Julia. It is really useful to already have a specialist on board.

Radmila: I'm a member of PAC so I followed the discussions about licensing during the PAC meeting. I'm happy to see the suggestion from DMI. I have the feeling that at some point it is important to mention the responsibility of the licensee. I think in general this is a good idea.

Also, as I have said at PAC, our codes are so complex that it seems to me a bit strange for a journal to ask for the whole code, no-one will be able to run the code anyway.

We have to negotiate with editors what is really needed for the reviewer.

Considering the fact that after the refactorization the code is less and less readable even for us, I'm wondering what the reviewers could do.

Regarding the open source code license, I'm not thinking it as accurate for anything,

For people who write papers on DA, we won't give an open license on the assimilation part anyway. Even if it is done for the NWP, I'm wondering what it would mean for us in terms of support. It requires manpower.

I'm warning you a bit that open source is nice, but there are also some consequences such as dealing with multiple repositories and increasing demand on the maintenance.

I don't know how it is done at ECMWF, but you have dedicated people for this in the context of the Open-IFS license.

Andy: At ECMWF we do have 2 staff members on Open-IFS.

One thing the (ECMWF) PAC paper talks about is that we're going to have to be very very careful on the expectations management.

We are not trying to make a community model in the sense of some of the US models where you need an army of 30 people for support.

Our true target here is to make it easier to do targeted collaborations, while today we waste all sorts of time on specific licensing issues.

Pending the PAC and Council decisions, the code would be available to the whole world, but we'll have to be very very careful on the expectation management. We can't support the global community, we will only support at best as much as 2 people can support. That is mainly the reason why we are not proposing the DA codes. It would be even more complicated with DA included.

So it won't completely solve the publication problem, but we would make a very big dent in it.

Daniel: Claude, do you want to comment more on these remarks ?

Claude: At this stage I would not like to continue to comment on what has been said by the speakers. My impression is that for ACCORD, it could be good to now seriously take up the discussion about open source format for part of the common code, in a step wise manner, and try to follow the decisions to be taken for IFS at the level of the ECMWF council.

A few items for discussion probably have merged from the remarks above:

- What is our intention to make the code available under open source ?
- Scope of the code which will become open source ?
- Expectation level ? Related to the level of support.

We should start to address those questions in 2026, after the decisions on IFS by the ECMWF council.

I suggest having an item about open source on the agenda of the next A/A in December.

The A/A also could agree on a task for me to liaise with ECMWF to have a point of information during the next Assembly ?

Not all ACCORD members are sitting in the ECMWF council. Several ACCORD member NMHSs are from cooperating states or states not member at all, so it could be worth having some information at the next assembly.

Daniel: I think it is really needed to give you, Claude, the task to organise the contact with ECMWF and MF, to see how it is going to be implemented, and what we could do to open our codes.

Because it has been shown that it was very positive in interactions with universities and other organisations. It's a win-win. The LAM community could learn from the academics.

Virginie: I just want to inform members that we support what is being proposed for the licensing of codes in the short term including what Marianne proposes or something similar. Regarding the specific MF aspects of the Arpege/IFS codes, we have already indicated to ECMWF that, should PAC and ECMWF council want to go forward on the open source additional step, we would be happy to have MF elements included. Obviously we would have further discussion with ECMWF about the scope and exact modalities. But for the reasons that have been already mentioned, it is positive for MF to be part of that step and obviously, for further discussion we will also be in favor of ACCORD going in that direction.

Upon proposal by Daniel and Claude, the A/A scrutinized the final decisions regarding the licensing ([blue text](#) below).

The elements that should be present in the license include:

- the licensor is a representative of an ACCORD Member NMHS, hosting at least one co-author ~~and hosting the corresponding author,~~

- the licensee is a representative of the institution editing the scientific Journal targeted for the publication of the article under consideration in a peer-review process,
 - the license shall be only for the purpose of providing access to the ACCORD common codes during the peer-review process for a scientific publication,
 - the parts of the codes that will be provided should be those that are considered necessary and relevant for any editor and/or reviewer,
 - the licence shall contain explicit references to the title of the paper and to the authors, including the corresponding author, as well as to the name of the Journal and the institution editing this Journal,
 - the license shall stipulate that the access is provided for a limited duration of time,
 - access to the codes is provided to the scientific editor (the person who supervises the peer-review of the paper) and to a limited number of reviewers, with the understanding that the names of the reviewers remain unknown to the licensor.
- + Proposal by DMI with additional check (repeated hereafter “point 13”)
- + *[chat] DMI's proposed wording for point 13 is as follows: The Licensee shall be fully responsible for damage or loss caused or suffered by the Licensor (whether a member of the ACCORD consortium, ECMWF, Météo-France or third-parties allowed by the IFS-Arpege agreement between ECMWF and Météo-France) for any misuse or breach of the above obligations of the Licensee.*

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed licensing of the codes for the purpose of scientific publications?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved the licensing of the codes for the purpose of scientific publications.

The Assembly approved the following procedure:

- **The Bureau will overview the list of specific elements that should be included in the license taking into account the DMI remark**
- **Email consultation with the Assembly for approval of the text**
- **Distribution of the template license that any ACCORD member can use.**

Daniel: *Is there anyone against the proposed steps to further discuss open source policy and take contact with ECMWF and MF ?*

No one.

Daniel: *Is there any abstention ?*

None

The Assembly approved that ACCORD takes further steps with ECMWF and MF in order to discuss the way forward regarding licensing the joint IFS/Arpege/LAM codes in an open source format.

The A/A tasks the PM to contact ECMWF and MF to follow-up on the open source policy implementation.

6. Review of decisions by the A/A today

Shared on the screen. No further comments.

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

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
an online questionnaire to help with the practical preparation will be made available soon
(Here is the [link to the questionnaire](#) deadline 31st Oct.)

Assembly meetings in 2026:

- Dates to be fine tuned on 1-2 December
- Regular A/A (online) end of June / beginning of July 2026
- Regular A/A (online or in-person) end of Nov or Dec 2026

8. AOB

none

9. Closing

Claude and Daniel thanked all participants.

Daniel closed the meeting at 12.05.

Appendix I: Participants

Member	Delegation
ALGERIA	Mohamed MOKHTARI (LTM)
AUSTRIA	Christophe Wittmann
BELGIUM	Daniel GELLENS (chair)
BULGARIA	Ilian GOSPODINOV
CROATIA	<i>Ivan GÜTTLER - excused</i>
CZECH REP	Radmila BROZKOVA (LTM,PAC)
DENMARK	Marianne THYRRING Julia SOMMER (LTM)
ESTONIA	Taimar ALA (PAC) 10:00-12:00 Kai ROSIN
FINLAND	Sami NIEMELA (STAC)
FRANCE	Virginie SCHWARZ (vice-chair) Natacha BERNIER (PAC)
HUNGARY	Gabriella SZÉPSZÓ (LTM)
ICELAND	<i>Not represented</i>
IRELAND	Saji VARGHESE (STAC chair, LTM)
LITHUANIA	<i>Not represented</i>
MOROCCO	Mohammed DKHISSI Siham SBII (LTM)
NETHERLANDS	Werenfried SPIT
NORWAY	Roar SKÅLIN
POLAND	Bogdan BOCHENEK (LTM)
PORTUGAL	Nuno LOPES (PAC) Maria MONTEIRO (LTM) Margarida BELO
ROMANIA	Florinela GEORGESCU (PAC chair) Alexandra CRACIUN (LTM)
SLOVAKIA	Jozef CSAPLAR
SLOVENIA	Jure CEDILNIK
SPAIN	Jaime REY
SWEDEN	Hakan Wirtén
TUNISIA	Abderazzak RAHAL
TÜRKIYE	Murat ALTINYOLLAR

	Volkan Mutlu COŞKUN 9:00-9:30 Yelis CENGİZ (LTM, STAC)
ACCORD PM	Claude FISCHER
LATVIA Observer	Uldis ZANDOVSKIS
HIRLAM PM (obs.)	Jeanette ONVLEE
LACE PM (obs.)	Martina TUDOR
ACCORD CSS	Anne-Lise DHOMPS
ECMWF observer	Andy BROWN