

Minutes of 3rd DRD Managers Forum, 18 July 2024,
<https://indico.cern.ch/event/1438288/>

Present: EDP: Didier Contardo, Felix Sefkow, Paris Sphicas, Thomas Bergauer, Silvia Dalla Torre, Jens Dopke, Valerio Re. DRDs: Michael Doser, Roberto Ferrari, Giuliana Fiorillo, Massimiliano Fiorini, Roger Forty, Roxanne Guenette, Gregor Kramberger, Michael Moll, Andreas Mussgiller, Eraldo Oliveri, Roman Pöschl, Burkhard Schmidt, Frank Simon, Maksym Titov, Francois Vasey, Guy Wilkinson. Invited Helge Meinhard.

1. Introduction by D. Contardo:

Main goal of the meeting is to agree on a proposal for the DRD MoU template annex 6, following the initial meeting on overall MoU template of 9, July.

2. Summary of framework and process to update the MoUs (F. Sefkow)

- Discussion can be summarized as follows:
 - MoUs provide a unified framework, where the institutes' agreements on common activities are formalized
 - The MoUs, including the corresponding Annexes, should be sent to Funding Agencies for signing. As defined in the MoU template, "A Funding Agency may be a Collaborating Institution or a body acting on behalf of one or more Collaborating Institutions in the conclusion of the MoU".
 - Updates to the annexes can be agreed upon by FA representatives in the Resources Board and do not require extra signatures.

Annexes are meant to support a formalisation of commitments, and not necessarily resources that are needed for commencing the work, as, eg. in the case of DRD5.

3. Proposal for MoU annex 6 and terminology (D. Contardo)

- Discussion can be summarized as follows:
 - The scheme with only two levels of breakdown was agreed to be adopted uniformly across DRDs, avoiding differences in the definitions of the second levels in the different DRDs as well as the non-tree structure between the second and third levels for some DRDs.
 - The terminology that is already used in all DRD proposals, namely Work Packages and Deliverables was also agreed upon. Reasonable further grouping and details on the deliverables could be included in the text. G. Fiorillo indicates that for DRD2 the current proposal needs some adjustment.
 - A set of tables per Deliverable was also adopted.
 - The question was raised by M. Titov whether the WP commitments should be public to all FAs, even when they do not contribute. H. Meinhard indicated that this is current practice in any MoU.
 - The question was raised by G. Kramberger whether Institutes can appear in a FA (grouping of institutes) and also as their own source of resources. H. Meinhard responded positively, however the way this can be implemented in the pledge tables is to be defined.

4. AoB on MoUs

- The question of the ability of some FAs/Institutes to sign MoUs was raised. H. Meinhard answered that the case of US has a specific solution within the CERN Framework. It appears that other cases could appear that will be dealt with by CERN on a case-by-case basis.

- The question about the ability of FAs/Institutes to commit to MoU IP rules was raised. H. Meinhard indicated that this is now for the FAs to confirm.
5. Action Items from this meeting
- DRDs should start to prepare their list of deliverables to which the participating institutes will commit resources. Throughout this process, the DRD managements should be in communication with the ECFA [DRD National Contacts](#) so that the latter can effectively present the overall DRD needs of each country to the corresponding Funding Agencies.