

Minutes

Participants

Flat-Rate ALADIN MoU5 Representatives	Michiel Vanginderachter (Belgium)
	Yelis Cengiz (Türkiye)
	<i>Rahma Ben Romdhane (Tunisia) - Absent</i>
RC-LACE-MoU5 Representatives	Christoph Wittmann (Austria)
	Andre Simon (Slovakia)
	Jure Cedilnik (Slovenia)
HIRLAM-C Representatives	Saji Varghese (Ireland) STAC Chair
	Sami Niemelä (Finland)
	Javier Calvo (Spain)
Météo-France Representatives	François Bouyssel STAC vice-Chair
	<i>Alain Joly - Absent</i>
	Christine Lac
ACCORD PM	Claude Fischer
ACCORD CSS	Anne-Lise Dhomps
ECMWF Observer	Michael Sleigh
System & code AL invited	Daniel Santos Muños

1. Opening

Saji opened the meeting at 11:02 with 13 participants connected (out of 16). He welcomed the participants to the 11th STAC meeting, and particularly Michael Sleigh who replaced Steve English for this meeting as the ECMWF observer.

2. Adoption of the draft agenda

Saji reminded everyone that the purpose of the meeting is the common scripting roadmap and the

management positions and he hoped that everyone had the time to read the preparatory documents.

He opened the floor to comment on the agenda and asked if anyone had any AOB to add.
None.

The agenda is adopted by the STAC.

3. Common scripting roadmap

Saji reminded everyone that during the last STAC meeting, there was an update on progress on the roadmap and STAC members were asked to give feedback.

STAC suggestions had been:

- To evaluate the resources required to implement the roadmap
- How to further exploit the tools available
- To elaborate on the milestones.
- Also that we should include the user stories as part of the report.

These suggestions had been considered in the new version of the report and gave the floor to Claude to present the report.

Claude explained that the Task Force (TF) had met once since the last time and that after the meeting some extra work had been required to finalize the document (Claude & Daniel).

Claude reminded the context:

- The A/A on 9 December approved forming a Task Force (TF) to work out a roadmap for the common scripting system (“CSSy” - this topic has been recognized as very sensitive during the preparation of the scientific strategy)
- A simplified overview of the content of the roadmap was presented to STAC at its meeting of 21 May (the work then still was in progress). The take-away messages from STAC were: to evaluate the resources, how to leverage existing tools, explain milestones. STAC also welcomed access to the User Stories elaborated by the TF.
- The TF has now completed its work, and the roadmap is presented to STAC for discussion and recommendation (to the A/A)

Then Claude gave the main elements of the roadmap:

- Highlighting some management aspects:
 - the manpower estimates remain tentative, and shall be adjusted as the work moves on
 - the trajectory of required dedicated staffing reads like (3+1+1), by progressively forming a “scripting technical team”
 - further analysis tasks are required, for instance in order to leverage on existing tools and when complex configurations will be tackled
- Milestones have been defined (see table)
- the tasks, either development or further analysis, are grouped in a sequential order

Saji opened the floor to comments and questions.

Javier: It seems that it is quite an effort from the DEODE part, for instance a lot of transfer of knowledge.

So my question is whether this is going to be accounted as real ACCORD contributions ? Because my guess is that most of the persons working for DEODE belong also to ACCORD.

So is it going to be accounted for ?

Claude: My opinion is that the DEODE effort on this roadmap should be accounted for in ACCORD as all other DEODE activities under the description of “DEODE funded manpower which fall in the scope of ACCORD”.

Javier: I feel that we are giving the DEODE teams extra work. It is not really a work that could be funded by DEODE itself because it is not in their goals. I would say that it is more a direct ACCORD contribution.

Claude: We hope for a long-term co-development partnership. This will depend on the next goals of DEODE. For now, the roadmap mainly involves DEODE requested expertise to train people in ACCORD on the existing scripts in DEODE. If we manage to build a small team on the scripts within ACCORD, they will work on our specific developments. We will need to organize this work in collaboration with the expertise and coordination structure within the ACCORD MG, especially the System Area Leader.

Regarding observation handling and data assimilation components in the scripts, we will likely need to involve experts from DA. Considering the expertise levels of DEODE and ACCORD, these experts would come from ACCORD.

The small “scripting team” will eventually be responsible for both development and maintenance, with additional expertise from ACCORD. This team should be composed of ACCORD staff to carry out this work.

Saji: the DEODE personnel who are contributing to the transfer of knowledge to ACCORD can not be funded by DEODE. It has to be separately resourced. And whoever is involved in the DEODE team may have to work with the ACCORD team to implement the initial aspects.

Claude: Obviously the DEODE expertise that we will need in the next few months will have to be agreed with the DEODE management team. How they will account for that on the DEODE side will be their responsibility. How we can account for it on the ACCORD side, is what I explained earlier.

Daniel:

1/ Regarding transfer of knowledge. From the beginning, we have known that DEODE does not specifically address knowledge transfer.

Nevertheless, DEODE has conducted some training sessions in Toulouse and has produced materials and presentations (e.g., WW, Spring 2024). A first step in knowledge transfer would be to make these presentations available to the ACCORD community. This is not costly—simply grant access to the material.

2/ In the roadmap, mainly for the next year; the goal is the implementation of the current solution and trying to establish that the DEODE current solutions are working efficiently.

3/ We should try to find as many synergies as possible with the DEODE team. The CSC leaders and teams working for ACCORD can be accounted for in ACCORD, and sometimes they are the same people working on DEODE. Therefore, communication and the transfer of knowledge should not be difficult. If we use the same people, knowledge transfer is ensured.

André: We had a discussion within the RC-LACE and Martina Tudor about this common scripting system. I have 2 comments.

1/ About the introduction. I wonder who will read/use the document. Is it mainly for experts ? or also for people not so much involved in CSSy or NWP like directors ? If for both, the introduction could be more explaining what is the purpose of this CSSy, how it is evolving,

2/ I was wondering whether datasets will be available, benchmark datasets, so that anyone could use them to test the CSSy.

Daniel:

1/ For the introduction I find that it is more for already informed people. I think we need a more general introduction for directors.

2/ Regarding the benchmark / datasets, we are going to implement the 3 CSCs and we want to compare the results with data generated by other scripting systems. So not a benchmark in itself, but at least it would be doable to compare the results obtained by the setup you have at home, to the results reproduced with the CSSy.

This idea is expressed in the roadmap and is described in the task on local implementation.

CHAT.

Daniel Santos - 11:32 AM

Task 1.2. Use of the DEODE scripts to run a forecast of each of the 3 CSCs using an IAL-code version.

- General goal and task description The target IAL code version is CY50T1 or any other recent code version, similar for the 3 CSCs, on the ECMWF and on the MF machines.
- Prepare and run one reference forecast for each CSC in their "usual" environment and using CY50T1, both at ECMWF and at MF.
- Run forecasts for each of the 3 CSCs using DEODE scripts and an IAL-code version (CY50T1) on ECMWF and MF machines.
- Implement and test the global-to-LAM coupling (creation and use of LBC files)
- Outcome: Allow ACCORD teams to understand DEODE scripts and begin adapting them to ACCORD systems and common codes.

This is not a strict benchmark but a comparison : " Prepare and run one reference forecast for each CSC in their "usual" environment and using CY50T1, both at ECMWF and at MF"

André Simon - 11:35 AM

Thank you, Daniel. I see, in this phase it would be satisfactory, if anybody could run later these reference forecasts on his platform and compare the results, it could be considered as a kind of benchmark test.

Claude: I do agree with both of Daniel's answers.

With what is drafted in the roadmap, we are rather looking at developing the scripts and being able to compare with a few existing reference versions

Regarding the introduction, indeed we could add more explanation about what we aim for and the purpose, what will be the benefits for ACCORD of such CSSy. Point taken.

François: The roadmap was discussed with MF experts. Overall, we found the roadmap coherent. Its scope is quite ambitious mostly regarding timelines and resource requirements for its implementation. I remain a bit worried about what is expected from MF outside the DEODE framework.

I would like to remind that MF won't be able to contribute significantly beyond its DEODE involvement as substantial work remains on vortex and olive, and our resources are limited.

Furthermore, in the work plan, there are many tests that are scheduled to be run on MF infrastructures and I guess it will require some support that does not exist much outside DEODE.

So I was wondering if it would be worth reassessing the ambition about porting and testing on MF machines or not.

Porting and testing on ECMWF is a priority, but then which support would be really expected for porting and testing on MF machines ?

Claude: Indeed the possible need for user support on each of the two platforms is not very explicit. Maybe Daniel and myself could complement such manpower estimates if STAC thinks we should add that in the resource requirements.

Currently, we assume that it is not requiring more user support work or effort than in our current situation, where we have partners who are more familiar with the environment of the MF HPC and others with the environment of the HPC at ECMWF.

The core “scripting technical team” who would develop the scripts, also will have to develop the knowledge how to run the scripts on the two platforms with relatively little user support.

Whether this is now a good assumption, or whether we should work a little more on the resource requirements, I’m not totally sure.

Daniel:

1/ Why we mentioned MF and ECMWF is because we want to ensure the portability of the solution on the most common platforms. It is not that we are going to support these tools at the beginning.

The idea is to check the 3 CSCs with the CSSy, and that we will be able to run them on the two platforms.

Later on, the plan is to continue work on the portability to local systems and when we have that, the kind of support we could have would be more transversal.

At the time we will consider the CSSy ready to be delivered, we will think about the support. The user support has not been established yet.

Claude: *After these discussions, I’m wondering if we should not try to express a little bit more the resource requirements for HPC user support for the people who will start work from the ACCORD side. Express the possibility to help them if they need to become more familiar with the one or the other environment (ECMWF and MF). To make it visible. We do not know precisely who will join the scripting team. It may be people who do not have a good knowledge of both HPCs.*

Daniel: *We assume that the people that we are going to recruit will be knowledgeable. But we never know.*

Claude: *Another point of user support that is not visible in the roadmap is that when we will analyse existing tools, we will have to reach out to experts of these tools (ECMWF, MF, elsewhere) .*

Shall we put resources on HPC support and expert support from existing tools we would like to analyse ?

Saji: *I think those aspects of the resources will be revealed once we have completed the design process. It could be added for completion by the end of 2026, early 2027.*

Then the resources required will be more clear. It might be too early to decide about these resources at this stage.

Daniel: *When things are clear, we will have a better understanding of the resources and requirements. If we consider the priorities, this support for HPC and other tools should be taken into account, or at least it should be noted that we will need this support in the design phase.*

François:

I made the comment because MF is very present in the document (more than 10 times) and it gave the impression that we would be able to provide important contributions.

If MF appears because of the infrastructure, the use of the HPC, of course I support the use of MF’s HPC in addition to ECMWF’s HPC. But if behind it means a lot of contributions on developing the new scripting system, or a lot of support to make the scripting system run on MF’s HPC, I’m not sure we are in a position to provide that manpower.

Sami: *For now, I do not see any problem with the roadmap. The steps are very logical.*

Perhaps, to follow François' comment, when I was looking at task 2.1, I was wondering why MF is so much cited. Is this configuration with use cases very relevant for MF, or is it more generally relevant across ACCORD?

Daniel: Some of the user stories were provided by people in MF. There is one feature that vortex uses massively and that's why we considered it necessary to support it in the CSSy, which means that we need to interact with the vortex team in MF. The idea is to mimic the feature.

The DEODE team is confident that it is doable, but we need to take it in a friendly manner.

About the feature itself.

The system defines addresses for all the locations where experiments store their data. This makes it very straightforward to link or couple one experiment with another, because the structure of each experiment is, to some extent, predefined. In contrast, DEODE offers more flexibility in where things are stored. This means that some kind of configuration file is required to link experiments, but it's entirely doable.

We're currently exploring, and aim to further explore, an easy way to configure this coupling, in a way that mimics the behavior of Vortex. To simplify the concept: we want to create a wrapper that enables more user-friendly coupling. That's why Météo-France (MF) is mentioned in this context.

Other references to Météo-France in the document mainly concern support for "belenos" (MF HPC). The goal of targeting multiple platforms is based on the fact that DEODE has already made efforts to run on various systems, such as LUMI. We understand that they also plan to run the scripting system on "belenos". For this reason, we believe it's important to ensure portability of the scripting system from the start.

This is particularly relevant because, in the future, we want to offer partners the possibility to install the scripting system locally. Therefore, we think that the two main computing platforms available to our community should be used to test this portability capability.

Sami: That is more clear. Thank you.

Claude: Once we have this coupling facility mimicking the way Vortex does it, then this function can be of good use to any team. It really should be a function that can serve anyone and any team.

Daniel: Sorry if my message wasn't clear enough. It wasn't for MF's purpose only. Vortex has this extremely good feature. We know that DEODE can mimic this feature. We need to recognize that it is a good feature for the ACCORD community, and that is why it is included as a high priority in the roadmap.

But we need to analyze the feature that MF has implemented in Vortex because it is the starting point of what we want to mimic.

François: I fully agree with what has been said. It is a functionality that will be good for all partners.

Claude, wrap up

- strengthen a little more the explanatory text in the introduction section of the roadmap, and also strengthen the high level management aspects (for Director's level reading),
- add some explanation in the roadmap regarding the need for some HPC support, and the need for the "scripting technical team" to develop its own expertise to be able to run the CSSy on the two main HPCs that we target,
- also add some explanation about the need for expert support on existing tools, at least in the introductory section - also express the need for expertise building in the "scripting technical team" on some specific existing tools or functionalities (such as in Vortex).

Daniel: I think it is good to detail the document, to put more explanation in the introduction for higher level (not too technical). Add that some help will be required for the analysis of existing tools from the owners/developers of these tools.

Claude: Agree with Daniel. So I really now propose that in the introduction we add these needs about HPC support and support from experts on existing tools. And that the people in the scripting technical team will start by running the CSCs with the scripts in their first shaping, but later on these people will be asked to extend their knowledge and progressively specialize a little into specific directions.

Saji: First of all, I would like to thank the task force and particularly the co-chairs Daniel and Claude for taking up this difficult work on preparing a roadmap for the common scripting system. It has not been so easy to make it, and however from the discussions I gathered that overall we agree on the roadmap. We will have to bring in more clarity on the resources and particularly on the expert support required on specific elements, some rather soon, some other later on when we have more clarity on the process.

I propose that STAC now discuss the recommendation for the Assembly.

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

Only for the drafting team:

- **strengthen the introduction regarding the general goal and the benefits expected for the members**
- **explain the likely need for some manpower (1) for HPC support and (2) for expert support to the analysis of existing tool**
- **describe the expected knowledge acquisition by the people who will form the "scripting technical team":**
 - **they will develop knowledge on how to efficiently run experiments on the ECMWF and MF HPC,**
 - **they will develop knowledge on existing tools (probably specializing inside this team),**
 - **both above aspects come in addition to the expertise on the scripting code itself**

4. Management positions

Saji stated that this section in the agenda involves many management positions, including Area Leaders. He reminded that for the AL positions, a WG was formed and that it was co-chaired by Claude and himself.

a. Nomination process of CSC Leaders

Claude reminded that this point was for information purposes only and gave the status of the nomination process for each CSC.

HARMONIE-AROME: The new CSC Leader is expected to be nominated in 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.

b. Area leaders

Claude first reminded the agreed procedure:

The 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 AL-WG.

- 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 at its meeting on 7 July, for approval.

Claude then explained the outcome of the AL-WG:

- 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 somewhat wider scope than the current AL for refactoring and code adaptation (eg wider than GPU)

Claude specified that the code refactoring for GPU adaptation progressed quite well, and activities on the topic will progressively diminish in the next few years (there will be a higher emphasis on assessing the performance of our codes on GPU). Nevertheless, the re-organisation and the code refactoring of the ACCORD common codes in general will have to continue. It is expected that discussions will take place in our community (including ECMWF) on adopting more modern programming paradigms. Among the possible directions: moving more towards object oriented coding, further refactoring data structures in the codes, implementing DSL tools, linking more of the FORTRAN codes with some python codes, interfacing our codes with AI tools etc. This continued activity could be essential for maintaining the quality and the portability of the codes on new machines.

Saji opened the floor to discussions.

***Sami:** The proposal looks very reasonable.*

Thank you Claude for explaining the “coding evolution” AL function. When I read the document I didn't see the purpose of the change, why it was broader.

It is important for the Assembly to explain why this change.

For information, the position for UWC Program Manager is now open. The deadline is 31 August. The expectation is to make the name official on 29 Sept.

***Claude:** For the Assembly we cannot be too technical in the description of the AL functions. Maybe just mention the move to “more modern program paradigms”, and mention the link between physics based codes and AI tools. Not more. We could also specify that to put this activity on the system AL would have been too much workload in addition to his/her other tasks.*

***Javier:** Maybe some small addition could be included for the upper-air physics AL, such as “Leading actions to increase modularity and interoperability across CSCs” which is probably implicit in the current proposal. It could be more explicit .
For the surface AL: maybe add that the AL will have to lead “accurate interaction with the SURFEX community”.*

***Claude:** Regarding the interoperability between the CSCs, it is not specified because it is important for all ALs, therefore the idea of CSC interoperability is in the general terms of references. Regarding SURFEX, the interaction with their community is not only of concern to the surface AL. Other MG members also are concerned like the CSC Leaders and the IL, which is what we see and how we organize ourselves in practice currently. We should not give the impression that the Surface AL is the only responsible for the interaction. Nevertheless I’m fine with stressing this more on this position.*

***Claude to wrap-up:** no need to add anything more about CSC interoperability.
add a bullet for the surface AL: “pay particular attention to (...) the interaction with the SURFEX community”.*

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.

c. Other management positions (CNA, DO, CSS, IL)

Claude explained that MF intends to propose a staff for respectively the position of Integration Leader and for the position of Consortium Scientific Secretary in the continuity of phase 1.

A call for applications will be proposed for the positions of Coordinator for Networking Activities and of Documentation Officer with a timeline aligned with the call for application for AL (deadline to apply: the 7th October 2025.)

Claude emphasized that these procedures follow how these positions have been filled in phase 1

d. New WG proposal for information and communication on AI/ML activities

Claude explained that the WG on AL positions decided to not propose a specific position in the ACCORD management on AI/ML, but rather proposed the creation of a Working Group active for the duration of MoU-2.

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.

Claude detailed the WG composition proposal:

- 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

Saji thanked Claude for the very clear presentation and opened the floor to comments.

***Sami:** I have a few comments on the AI/ML Information & Communication WG.*

First, I think it is a good idea to have it in the form of a WG. So far, AI develops so fast, it is difficult to see whether a dedicated person would be required. The WG fits the purpose at this point.

We had this type of discussion in UWC while creating our own new organization.

Second, I see a good fit with the plan of UWC. The creation of the WG will partly deal with overlapping issues.

Last, I think that it is good that the general assembly has something to say in terms of the length of duration of this group. To have the possibility to see the evolution of the Group and decide on its evolution.

Saji: *The whole area of machine learning and AI is evolving fast and we expect to see rapid changes over the years. I would at least see this WG functional for the next 2-3 years before we review the terms of references of this working group.*

François: *I strongly support this proposal of setting this working group on communication; To share, gather and communicate information about AI/ML. The duration of three, four years looks very good to me as well.*

Michiel: *Just for clarification, in phase 1 there was also a WG on AI/ML. Will this one replace it? Is it a new one?*

Claude: *The old one's purpose was to build a portfolio of suggestions of AI activity in connection with our existing systems. This portfolio work has indeed been completed. In the follow-up, we perhaps never gave this former WG-ML a very official termination, but in practice it doesn't exist anymore.*

*This **WG-InComAI** is new. It covers about half the task of the old WG (relating to information). In this new working group we won't build a portfolio or any specific proposal of a work plan. It is really about information and communication, and that is then a clearly new role.*

Michiel: *OK, I think that this is very valuable but will that be enough?*

For instance, we also have an AI working group at RMI. It's not only focused on gathering information; it also brings together expertise from different groups working on it. In a way, they are almost always using the same architectures, but for different applications. When everyone focuses on their own application, ideas from different fields that are transferable might emerge.

They can be used more generally than just for this one application, for instance in physics or dynamics. I don't know if there are any plans to set up this kind of working group.

When you were discussing the area leaders previously, you said that they would be proactive in AI methods. However, if every area is working on AI independently, there might not be as much synergy as there could be. So I don't know if this is something that the working group could do.

Maybe there should be a different working group for this, or perhaps it should just be done informally by the area leaders.

Claude: *From my understanding, much of the activity and exchange you described around the development of machine learning (ML) and AI tools across different areas is already taking place within existing initiatives—such as the machine learning pilot project (ML-PP), for example.*

A key point raised by the ACCORD directors was that we should avoid duplicating the coordination of work already being handled by these other initiatives, particularly in the areas of AI and numerical weather prediction (NWP). The directors made it clear that they would not support efforts that introduce an additional layer of coordination and planning, especially if it essentially replicates what is already being done elsewhere.

I would tentatively assume that the first meaningful interactions—or "hooks"—between the new working group and the management group could happen at the level of system aspects and MQA, particularly in model evaluation. Whether the models are data-driven or physics-based, we have the expertise how to validate forecast models. This could allow us to collaborate with AI teams, either by contributing directly or by offering guidance and tools to support their model validation efforts.

Beyond that, the boundary between hybrid modeling and fully data-driven modeling is not always clearly defined—it can be considered a gray zone. I expect that the working group will also play a role in gathering information about developments within European programs and among member

institutes, particularly regarding the development of specific ML-based tools that could complement existing systems.

It's clear that fully data-driven forecasting is becoming a major area of development. So at this level, it's crucial to understand the progress being made, the performance of these models, and how they compare to ours.

At the same time, there are teams focusing on specific components, such as data assimilation or ensemble prediction systems (EPS). I hope the working group will help us better understand these efforts and how they might integrate with our current systems.

Hybrid modeling, as a thematic area, is still evolving. The working group should be positioned in order to help ACCORD understand in which directions to explore hybrid modeling, and fuel the MG for instance with information and suggestions.

Lastly, with regard to coordination across teams, many already have AI-focused groups and are actively collaborating with European partners through various programs. In our proposal, we've made a strong effort to avoid duplicating those discussions. This was a clear message from the ACCORD assembly at the end of 2023: we must organize ourselves in a way that is complementary to existing initiatives and mutually beneficial.

***Saji:** The Assembly has made it very clear that we have to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts from ACCORD side compared to the other European initiatives, but at the same time, we need to be well informed of those such European initiatives so that we can actually complement the work that's being carried out outside and also that will benefit ACCORD. So that's one of the basic ideas behind this working group.*

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.

Claude reminded the timeline for the transition (grey what has been done so far):

- **A/A 1-2 December 2025:** Approval of all other management positions; Nomination of LTMs (per institute)
- 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); **Nominate the CSC-Leader (Harmonie-Arome)**
- July 2025: Call for applications to the management positions (DL for receiving answers: **Tuesday 7 October 2025**)
- **A/A 7 July:** **Nominate the CSC-Leaders (Arome, Alaro)**; Approve the nominations of IL and CSS; Approve the list of Area Leaders (their functions); Approve the Calls for application (ALs, CNA, DO)
- **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)
- **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***

5. Review of STAC recommendations

Claude thanked the STAC members for the comments and for the recommendations.

6. STAC composition (reminder)

Claude reminded the STAC members about the current composition of STAC.

Members	Family
Saji Varghese (chair), Sami Niemala, Javier Calvo	HIRLAM
François Bouyssel (vice-chair), Christine Lac, Alain Joly	Météo-France
Yelis Cengiz, Rahma Ben Romdhane, Michiel Vanginderachter	ALADIN-MoU5
Christoph Wittmann, Jure Cedilnik, Andre Simon	LACE

Claude specified that the mandate of the members will be 2,5 years during phase 2 of ACCORD (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. (21 May)
- The PM will inform the relevant key representatives of the families about the start of the renewal process, and keep regular liaison with them. This liaison will take different shapes according to each family:
 - MF: internal discussions
 - Hirlam/UWC: chairs of Hirlam and of UWC
 - LACE: chair of LACE
 - Aladin-MoU5: the PM+CSS will keep in touch with the current STAC members, and organize at least one consultation meeting with the LTMs
- 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 for phase 2, for approval
- Finally, propose the names of chair and vice-chair at the A/A of 1-2 December, for approval

7. Next meeting

27 June 11:00-13:00 CEST (This one !): scripting roadmap; Area Leader functions; online <https://meteo.webex.com/meteo/j.php?MTID=m3015e85d7642b3961bdbaaba5d9c044a>

4-5 November in-person in the premises of Geosphere Austria (Vienna)

noon-to-noon

hybrid will be possible via Teams (Webex as backup):

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_YzMyOWQwZDYtMTk1MS00NTE1LWI2MDMtZGE3ZjVmNDU1M2U1%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%22f7141cf8-3a6a-46a0-96fc-b86b94a58450%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%224f5e53c5-09f7-404c-9351-417b20c6d4d2%22%7d

last STAC meeting under MoU1 => jointly with AMG

8. Closure

Saji thanked the STAC members for their time and the very constructive discussions.

He informed them that he would be very happy to see numerous STAC members in person in Vienna, Austria for the next in-person meeting 4-5 November 2025..