Bureau Open discussion notes
Saturday, 1 April 2017, Geneva (14:00-17:00 CET)

Participants:

Bureau present: Harm Jan van Burg, Anders Grangård, Tahseen A. Khan, Estelle Igwe, Sue Probert, Lance Thompson (Chair)
Bureau apologies: Raffaele Fantetti
Secretariat: Maria Rosaria Ceccarelli, Maria Teresa Pisani, Maike Carstensen
Invited: Colin Laughlan, Ian Watt, Virginia Cram-Martos, Urachada Dao Ketprom, Mitsuru Ishigaki, Hisano Sugamata, Koji Tsubaki, Mary Kay Blantz (by conf call)

Dedicated session on the ODP and project development within UN/CEFACT

Two parts to this discussion: first identifying challenges with the current processes and then secondly brainstorming on the best way forward **(some suggested solutions in blue below)**. Some of the discussion points included:

Patterns in projects
- Projects respect milestones
- Projects do not respect milestones
- Projects doing activities not in proposal
- Projects with deliverables that derail
- Projects with deliverables that don't satisfy expectations

Issues
Different use of ToR / ODP depending on type of deliverable
- There seems to be more data in the CCL than justified by existing BRS/RSM
- Submissions to the library require in their technical assessment checklist require a BRS or the equivalent of a BRS. Could be made clearer.
- We need to continue to ensure that we can handle submissions from other organizations (in the spirit of 'semantic hub')... However, in this case, we still need to understand their submission in order to properly harmonize. There are sometimes project overlaps that are not seen until they reach Library Maintenance.
- All of the libraries should also follow the same rules – **Idea that there should not be different rules for different libraries – these should be aligned (UN/EDIFACT and CCL)**
- We have all of the tools necessary, but they are not necessarily being applied. **Idea: we should encourage a better usage of the UMM.**
- The experts do not always have a clear understanding of the possible deliverables and the processes (notably ODP). Might need something to explain these better.
- **Idea for a training for Domain Coordinators (perhaps as a parallel event to welcome session** – could possibly be open to all experts – perhaps called a "Briefing Session")
- The Bureau should be informed of developments – not just at the end of the process. **Idea to insert something on obligatory reporting and to render obligatory the sharing all documents on CUE.** The Vice Chairs should follow developments of the projects for which they are responsible – however, there is no obligations on reporting in the ODP. Might want to have an obligatory review every 6 months.
- **Idea to systematically consult the Domain Coordinators when a project is being considered within the Bureau.**
- **Idea to communicate more and better internally with experts (perhaps with a newsletter).**

Prolongation of projects
- Projects being kept open for a very long time, even after they have seemingly delivered on their declared deliverables
- How to keep experts engaged after the projects have finished; attracting and keeping experts. Perhaps suggesting that the project teams work on different types of deliverables once they have finished their projects (making Executive Guides, support materials, etc.)
- **Idea to have projects planned to run for longer periods...**
- **Idea to make project proposals with less deliverables and shorter delivery time (rather than one big project with multiple deliverables)**
- **Idea to add some optional steps to the ODP for the development of high-level documents on deliverables and implementation guidelines (presentations, posters, promotional materials)**. It was suggested that this should actually be one of the deliverables planned within the project; or a new project altogether.

HoD support
- Problem of who requests HoD support. This is causing some problems. Need to coordinate the requests for HoD support so that they are not overly-solicited in an unhelpful manner (unhelpful meaning that one project requesting support from a dozen countries and getting much more than 3 HoD support whereas another project has difficulty getting the required 3 HoD support).
- **Idea to require each HoD to contribute experts to the projects they support.** (This would be difficult since this is not required in the HoD ToR and might discourage them from supporting projects.) We could plan to have a standard thank you letter to HoD when they support a project in order to request their assistance in reaching out to experts.
- **Idea to consider more communication to HoDs in order to request support**. Current quarterly report might become monthly… (or bi-monthly to start).
- **Idea to consider having a list of participants in the project proposals**… This might be counterproductive as sometimes it is more effective to progress as a smaller team and open the results up to the wider community afterwards.

Inception
- The 'Inception Stage' of ODP does not seem to be well understood / used.
- Projects often need a pre-ODP step that will allow them to brainstorm on a subject and eventually try to attract other experts.
- **Idea to create pages on CUE for sharing information within our community, allowing exchanges of documents and ideas before the formal creation of a project.**

Ownership of deliverables
- This especially important in the maintenance of projects and the harmonization with other projects.