



## **BIC Task & Finish Working Groups** Project Briefing Document

**Document Status:Draft**

**Project Name: BIC Web Services Task & Finish Working Group**

**Version Number: 1.1**

**Created by: Simon Edwards**

**Created date: 19/11/2014**

## BIC Committee Review and Approval

This project has been signed off by the Physical Supply Chain Committee and Karina Luke.

### Document History

Version	Summary of Changes	Document Status	Date published
0.4	Added new CDF requests from Bertrams	Draft	21.05.2013
0.5	Delays caused by Francis Cave's availability (LCF T&FWG)	Draft	21.11.2013
0.9	Version completed for sign off by BPSCC 03062014	Draft	28.05.2014
1	Version for revised project with new timescales	Draft	4.11.2014
1.1	Final Version with suggested budget for BIC costs	FINAL	19.11.2014

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1. PURPOSE**
- 2. BACKGROUND**
- 3. PROJECT DEFINITION**
- 4. OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**
- 5. CUSTOMERS QUALITY EXPECTATIONS**
- 6. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA**
- 7. ANY KNOWN RISKS**
- 8. OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN**
- 9. BUDGET/COSTS**
- 10. AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE**
- 11. PROPOSED TASK & FINISH GROUP LEADER/PROJECT MANAGER**
- 12. CUSTOMERS AND USERS**
- 13. REPORTING**

## **1. PURPOSE**

*This document should provide a full and firm foundation for initiating the project or work with the BIC Task & Finish Working Group. Although forming the basis of the Project Initiation Document, it is a key document in its own right and gives the direction and scope of the project or work. Purpose of the work should be clearly stated.*

BIC developed a suite of Trade XML Web Services between 2006 and 2009. These web services have not been reviewed since and some users notably Bertrams have requested additional functionality and new message pairs to cope with new requirements. An updated suite of web services would give users additional functionality within an industry standard. It would also give BIC an improved product to promote to members and an opportunity to encourage members to adopt BIC web services as an efficient means of business communication.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

*Context of the project or work should be explained, and what it was that suggested the need for it. State whether the project or work will be a stand-alone activity to fulfill one particular book industry requirement or whether it is part of a larger on-going programme.*

The BIC suite of Trade Web Services consists of XML messages for use between trading partners. Each business requirement is solved by a pair of messages. For example if one business has books available, a customer of that business can send a web service message saying Do you have this book? The supplier's computer can then reply automatically with details of the book's availability. These web services usually work in near real-time so a request is almost immediately answered. This enables trading partners to connect their businesses via these web services and improve the flow of information in the industry in terms of speed and accuracy. Pairs of messages can be developed to do almost any task which one system can ask of another. For example, "Send me an ONIX record for this ISBN" and the reply would contain the ONIX record for that ISBN.

The project originally identified a number of possible messages, arranged them in order of priority and then developed them. The process involved regular conference calls hosted by BIC and was attended by a wide variety of UK and overseas businesses. All these messages are now live except for the messages involving CDF (Customer Direct Fulfillment) on wholesalers which is still to be completed. The problem with web services is that they are relatively easy to create and implement so trading partners often decide to implement bilateral messages and don't bother with standards. However, where the requirement is the same across many trading partners, there is an opportunity for standards to provide benefit. When first developing a standard it is impossible to predict all the different ways in which businesses work so standards inevitably change over time as new functionality is requested and added. The methodology of the T & F Working Group would be to consider these change requests and if they are suitable, make the necessary changes to the web services and accompanying documentation. Web services is extremely flexible so it lends itself to continuous improvement.

Bertrams has requested to develop additional CDF messages including the request authority to despatch message (REQ)/authorise despatch (AUT) and an address update web service (both for

consumer direct fulfilment). These should be considered by the working group along with any other new message requests from members.

One additional requirement has appeared recently which is the need to keep the ISO codes used in web services up to date. These codes are used to indicate entities such as country, currency etc. and although they don't change very often, there needs to be a mechanism to cope with any changes. If these codes are not recognised by a receiver of a web service message then the message is likely to fail. This requirement may be part of a larger piece of work to look at automating the updating of ISO codes as well as code lists used in EDI and metadata messages.

The Task & Finish group will accept requests for changes or additions to existing web services and consider new message pairs. It is hoped that BIC members will participate in this process and that the output will be both useful and beneficial to members.

### **3. PROJECT DEFINITION**

#### **3.1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

*Explain what the project or work is trying to achieve by stating its objectives, which should be measurable and defined in terms of the project's major deliverables, effort, cost, tolerances and business benefits expected.*

The project deliverable is an updated suite of web services and accompanying guidance documentation accommodating changes requested by BIC members and now better fit for purpose. The effort involved is envisaged to be:

- 1) Establishing who the interested parties are so that they form the Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) Any BIC members may register an interest in the work of this T&F WG and may attend the first meeting and subsequent conference calls. Note that some users of the BIC Web Services standard are based outside the UK so it is not practicable for them to attend the first meeting. However, it is envisaged that they may want to attend subsequent conference call meetings if interested.
- 2) A single face to face meeting of the T&FWG. This will be held at BIC and will involve hiring a room etc.
- 3) Analysis work by members of the group chaired by John Garrould (Bertrams). Any changes requested to date will be reviewed and the group will decide how best to deliver their requirements where appropriate.
- 4) It is envisaged that there will be some input by BIC consultant, Francis Cave (author of the EDItX messages which form the basis of BIC's suite of web services.) In order to establish a budget for this work it will be necessary to commit to a cost for Francis' time. This will be detailed later in this document.
- 5) A revised and updated suite of web service standards would be produced by the BIC Web Services T & F Working Group and these would be uploaded to the BIC website by the BIC Business Manager and promoted to the BIC community by BIC's Training, Events and Communications Committee. Note that one of the problems with BIC's web services has been that it is not known how widely these standards have actually been implemented. The new web services will be available on the new BIC website and users

will have to register to download the standard. Hopefully this will give BIC useful usage feedback and the opportunity to follow up with advice and training etc.

- 6) Business benefits include an improved set of web services standards. A publishable deliverable and a promotable standard. The benefit for members and their trading partners is that they can use a proven suite of messages which already exist rather than having to write their own and that these are the industry standard so that they can be implemented more easily in future with other trading partners and at lower cost.
- 7) Negative aspects of not doing this work could be that those who wanted it done might do it themselves as a non-standard work outside BIC. A non-BIC alternative actively promoted updated version could be used by BIC members whilst BIC's web services standards would fall into dis-use. Clearly this would be damaging to BIC's reputation and role in the industry. BIC would have failed to respond to members' needs.
- 8) A later promotional phase for this project may be considered in future and this could cover writing case studies which would show how BIC members have implemented BIC Web services and how this has been beneficial to their business.

### **3.2. PROJECT SCOPE**

*Describe the major deliverables of the project or work along with specific products, which are not part of the project. Describe the major dependencies (which impact on the project during its life) and interdependencies, which will exist after implementation. List what is, and what is not included (including anything that may be added at a later date)*

The formal deliverables are an updated suite of BIC web services, including a number of new message pairs, with accompanying guidelines documentation/Implementation Checklist and FAQs. They will be published on the new BIC website.

The group will also update where necessary the background documentation such as the WSDL Definition for the SOAP Protocol and the XML Schema for Request and Response payloads in XML format. This is an opportunity to revisit work done to a high standard in 2006 to 2009 and some of which was revised in 2011, and ensure it is all still fit for purpose.

BIC Members may need help and encouragement to invest in web services so one deliverable from this project should be a “beginner's guide to Web Services”. This would cover both major types of web services, SOAP and REST.

It is envisaged that the T&F Working Group will identify, prioritise and develop new web service message pairs as requested by BIC members or members of the T&FWG, Note that the range of web services is not restricted to the physical supply chain but also includes some message pairs with application in the library supply chain and for the exchange of metadata such as requesting an ONIX record. Progress reports will be presented to the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee, the BIC Library Committee and the BIC Metadata Sub-Committee, reporting on progress made on message pairs which are of interest to these committees. As the majority of the web services involve the physical supply chain this will be the authorising committee.

The work will go through possibly several phases e.g. analysis – development – testing – publishing, for each message pair or for similar sets of messages such as all CDF (Customer Direct Fulfillment) messages. Messages will be published in draft when they

are ready for use rather than at the end of the whole project. Live versions will be made available once the draft versions have been tested.

### **3.3. OUTLINE PROJECT DELIVERABLES AND/OR DESIRED OUTCOMES**

*Describe in outline the main project deliverables and outcomes. Do not attempt to explain how the project will produce the deliverables or achieve the desired outcomes.*

The project will deliver a suite of new web services as requested or identified by interested parties or members of the BIC Web services T & F Group or the relevant BIC committees e.g. BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee, BIC Library Committee, BIC Metadata Sub-Committee or BIC's technical clinics.. All new messages will have to be analysed by The BIC Web services T & F Group reporting to BIC's Physical Supply Chain Committee.

In addition to the message pairs there will be background documentation about SOAP and REST implementations, how web services work, implementation guidelines and an implementation checklist. Feedback from users during the project may indicate the benefit of providing more support such as a beginner's guide.

Note that all web services will first be published as a draft and will then be available for testing. Once they have been tested they can be published as a live version available for all. This status of draft or live will be made clear on the new website. All BIC members should be informed when web services are published on the website in both draft and live versions.

The Project will identify milestones and report to the relevant BIC committees at each milestone.

These messages have been developed but may not have been implemented yet. The T&FWG may need to review these briefly to ensure that they are fit for purpose and then these should be promoted along with the other existing messages. It is envisaged that the T&FWG should identify use cases and produce a briefing document for BIC's TEC committee to enable it to promote the benefits of BIC's web services. Some of the existing messages are not widely used but they would fill a gap where there is no established EDI message e.g. for Order Cancellation. A general promotion of the full web services suite would be helpful once this project has delivered.

It is not known if the following messages have been implemented. They need to be checked to ensure they are fit for purpose and then promoted to BIC members:

1. Get ONIX record
2. Get MARC record
3. Send/Put Financial Document
4. Get backorder summary (Get backorder detail)
5. Request backorder release

The following are all new messages requested by members so far:

6. Order delivery address change web service

7. Request authority to despatch – XML message payload to be delivered by FTP or Web service

8. Authority to despatch – XML message payload to be delivered by FTP or Web service. This should incorporate the ability to only provide the delivery address at this late stage in the workflow.

We expect members of the T&FWG to request some additional message pairs. These would be added to this list.

Some of the existing web services have been identified as needing improvement. For example the “Get Order Status” message returns the status of a single specified order. This could usefully be enhanced so a customer can request a list of orders and retrieve the results either via a web service or by receiving a file via FTP. This type of request will be considered by the T&FWG and prioritised according to the amount of work required as other message pairs are similar e.g. Get Back-Orders it may be that it is possible and economical to address this requirement at the same time. The T&FWG will report this activity to the BIC Executive Director and the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee as required.

### **3.4. CONSTRAINTS**

*Describe the constraints within which the project or work must operate, for example there may be constraints on the amount of resources available to the project or the location of the project team.*

It will be vital to recruit a competent chair and a committed Task & Finish Working Group to work on this project and these individuals must all buy into the Task & finish Working Group Terms of Reference from the outset. They will need to be informed in advance of the following:

- Time needed from them in total and how this breaks down over the course of the duration of the project.
- What actions are likely to be expected of them and when

The workload of key individuals will be a potential constraint. John Garrould would be an ideal chair of this group but he is potentially very busy and may find it difficult to commit sufficient time to this project. Ideally a deputy chair who is up to speed on the issues could assist John. In the absence of a BIC member willing to do this Simon Edwards could undertake this role.

Budget is a potential constraint. BIC’s Executive Director needs clarity on exactly what the overall costs incurred will be. The main costs for BIC are likely to be the involvement of consultants, Francis Cave and Simon Edwards.

Time could be a constraint particularly for members of the T&F Working Group who all have “day” jobs. Therefore, in order to manage expectations and respect everyone’s

time, a firm timeline needs to be agreed with the T & F Working Group and communicated to BIC's Executive Director before any work is begun.

The constraints on the project are as follows:

1. Time available for the Chair of the group (John Garrould) to chair meetings and provide feedback, usage data and suggestions for improvement
2. Consultant's availability. Francis Cave is the BIC consultant needed for this project to advise on technical changes to the messages and their payload. NB Francis has indicated that he would rather a total cost was stated in this report instead of his daily consultancy rate which is confidential.
3. It is envisaged that the T & F Group will start with a face to face project meeting at CILIP necessitating a room hire. Then every two months a conference call will be held to discuss progress made and any issues raised.
4. It is assumed that the T & F WG will undertake a brief scoping exercise to establish and prioritise the list of message pairs to be developed. The project is expected to run for about 9 months with regular meetings by conference call at two monthly intervals.

### **3.5. INTERFACES**

*Describe any interfaces with the project or work: both internal and external to BIC, including any links to other industry or members' projects or programme(s) of projects.*

Many BIC members may be interested in this web services work. The Metadata sub-committee, Physical Supply Chain Committee and the BIC Trade Technical Implementation Clinic are also likely to be interested and involved in this work. The output will be published on the website.

Additional interest may come from overseas organisations who may already use the current web services to exchange information with UK based organisations. For example Bertrams have many overseas booksellers using these web services. As the work proceeds the group may receive input from these organisations. These may not be BIC members.

There may be an interest from Editeur who have been involved in the development of the EDItX messages, which form the basis of the BIC Web Services message payloads. They may want to be involved with this T & F Group. The BIC Executive Director will handle this interface.

## **4. OUTLINE BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CASE**

*Show a summary of the project's business or industry case. Why is BIC instructing the work to be carried out?*

As stated above:

Business benefits include an improved set of web services standards with up to date accompanying documentation including implementation guidelines and a beginners guide to

SOAP and REST XML. This will make up a significant publishable deliverable and a highly promotable standard.

Negative aspects of not doing this work could be that those who wanted it done might do it themselves as a non-standard work outside BIC. A non-BIC alternative, actively promoted and updated version could then be used by BIC members whilst BIC's web services standards would fall into dis-use. This would damage BIC's role and reputation.

It is BIC's role to respond to its members and develop standards to enable them to trade more efficiently. Web services offer a relatively low cost means of communicating information between businesses in near real-time and this immediacy of information on for example stock availability could be what wins a sale. Customer expectations of immediate information have grown since BIC's web services were first developed and businesses need to look to real-time processes where these can add value. A full suite of industry standard web services managed and promoted by BIC will be a useful addition to the industry.

## **5. QUALITY EXPECTATIONS**

*State the Quality Expectations and key success factors for the project or piece of work. Detail the relative importance of time, cost and quality of the deliverable so that future decisions may be based on what factor is paramount to the project's success.*

These web services can be judged a success by the fact of their successful implementation although this is often invisible to BIC and hard to quantify. First, each message pair will be rigorously tested by the project team and won't be published as live until fully tested in draft. Previously messages have been published as a draft so that early adopters could test them, implement them and feedback to BIC. This approach will be adopted for all messages which are changed.

Ongoing efforts to monitor usage of these messages would be very helpful in establishing their success. Trading partners offering these services could feed usage statistics to BIC on a quarterly basis. This would help with forecasting and planning in the future. It would also enable more empirical success criteria to be set and monitored. T & FWG participants who plan to implement new or existing messages will be encouraged to provide statistics on usage.

Note that quality will be established whilst the message pair is in draft. Once established the message pair will move to a live state.

Once the T&F Group has finished its work it will be closed down and the BIC Trade Technical Implementation Clinic (reporting to the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee) will act as custodian to any further requests for updates or revisions to these BIC standards. These will be collected together and monitored for their importance. If sufficient changes are needed again in the future then a fresh T & F Group will be considered.

A timeline will be established by the T & F WG. The group will review the list of message pairs and decide on a priority sequence. This will form the timeline over 9 months with milestones as

each message pair or family of similar message pairs will be published in draft for testing and then finally published in live. The objective is to work through these message pairs over a 9 month period. The timing is not crucial for BIC as long as the costs (consultancy fees) is within budget.

The importance of this work will be in the following order of priority: 1. Quality. 2. Cost, 3, Timeline.

Quality is most important because BIC's work has to be to the highest standards. Cost is the second priority because BIC's budget is important and BIC's resources must be managed. Timeline is the least important because if overrunning slightly was still within budget and delivered optimum quality then this would be acceptable. The timeline is only estimated. The crucial point is that delay should not lead to increased costs .

## **6. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA**

*Insert a prioritised list of criteria which the final deliverable(s) must meet before they will be accepted. It is essential therefore to seek agreement with the Committee as to content and priority.*

BIC has little or no data on actual usage of these standards although individual organisations involved will have their own data. The suggestion is therefore that members of the T&F Working Group should provide data on current levels of usage and that this can then be used as a measure for success. One of the benefits of the new BIC website should be the ability to monitor interest in BIC standards and the ability to log downloads of the standards and guidelines. BIC can then follow up with users to ensure that the standards are working successfully. The T & F Group could be tasked with setting the success criteria of the project based on member data at the start of the project and by website data once the new website is live.

The following is a draft of possible acceptance criteria for this project:

1. Each message pair is in use or is likely to be used in the near future by the industry
2. Each message pair fulfills a business need for the industry
3. Each message pair has been examined by the T & F WG and found to be fit for purpose
4. The messages have been fully described together with implementation instructions and user guidelines

It is assumed that the T & F WG will review these acceptance criteria and possibly amend them at the first meeting.

## **7. RISKS**

*Document any risks to the project's Business/Industry Case known at this time, including the risk of doing nothing.*

Not doing this work could mean that those who wanted it done might do it themselves as a non-standard piece of work outside BIC. A non-BIC alternative and actively promoted updated version could be used by BIC members whilst BIC's web services standards would fall into dis-use.

The business risk for BIC is that BIC will become irrelevant to the industry if BIC's standards are not kept up to date and if they are not promoted widely and used by members for business benefit.

There is a risk that any single web service might not suit a BIC member's, or an industry organisation's, business practice but this project is designed to make the messages as suitable as possible. It should be noted that often web services and other BIC standards work is an opportunity for businesses to change and improve their working practices and this may be necessary to obtain maximum benefit from one or more of BIC's web services.

## **8. OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN**

*Show an outline of the overall project plan including major deliverables, their key delivery dates plus overall costs and resource usage. To include any/all consultant fees and how calculated, travel expenses etc.*

This project has been delayed and revised for several reasons but the hope is that it can now go ahead. The BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee will be asked to sign off on this project before the next meeting. This briefing document will be reviewed by the BIC Executive Director and then circulated to the committee via email. It is hoped that a sign off will be possible before the end of November and that the project could hold its first meeting in January 2015 with a proposed end date of 30<sup>th</sup> September.

### Project Costs

BIC's costs are limited to room hire and consultants fees

The only room cost will be for the preliminary face to face meeting. All further meetings will be by conference call using a free service such as powwownow.

If the project over runs then it will be necessary to obtain permission from the Executive Director and the Board before any additional cost is incurred. Reasons for the over run will need to be given. **Please note there is no guarantee extra funding will be found, if the budget set below is over reached.**

## **9. BUDGET/COSTS**

*Detail all anticipated costs to BIC as a result of this work, including, but not limited to: room bookings, consultant fees, travel expenses, advertising, training (if applicable) etc.*

*Any/all budget considerations must be calculated and agreed in advance so that BIC does not over spend. Work will not begin until budget/costs have been approved by BIC's Executive Director and the relevant committee. Any/all consultants must be aware of and strictly adhere to all budget constraints as laid out in the briefing document. Any extra work needed will need*

*to be reviewed closely and the relevant committee will need to be informed as to why extra work was not included in the original budget. Consultants must not carry out any additional work, or incur any additional costs not included in the briefing doc without prior authorisation and sign off by BIC's Executive Director. Failure to do so may result in invoices being declined by BIC.*

BIC Consultant's fees will be incurred by Francis Cave and Simon Edwards during this project.

The fees are estimated as follows:

**Francis:**

- T&FWG Meetings and Conference calls

Preliminary face-to-face meeting in Jan 2015: 0.4 days

4 conference call meetings in Mar, May, Jul and Sep 2015: 0.8 days

- Review and revision of existing BIC web service standards

It is likely that some existing BIC web services will require some attention and the message pairs which are still in draft may need to be reviewed to make them more acceptable. Assuming 4 message pairs will require this attention at 0.5 days for each message pair revision and update of the documentation and associated XML Schema and WSDL resources, a budget of 2.0 days would cover this.

- Development of new BIC web service standards

Three new web service request-response message pairs are identified above (Nos 6, 7 and 8). The T&FWG is ready to receive other requests for additional message pairs from any BIC members. These will be reviewed and prioritised and permission will be requested to undertake extra work if necessary. If we assume that we need to develop 5 new web services and we allow 1.5 days for development of each, this would necessitate a budget of 7.5 days.

Prepare a "beginner's guide to SOAP and REST" web services and general BIC web service implementation guidelines

To improve take up of the existing BIC web services as well as the newly developed web services **it may be necessary for Francis to contribute to a beginner's guide to SOAP and REST web services** and BIC web service implementation guidelines. **If the** committee and Executive Director agree that this work is necessary, then this work would necessitate a budget of 3.0 days work.

Francis's total work is estimated as follows:

Meeting and calls: 1.2 days

Review and Revision of Existing BIC Web Services: 2 days

Development of new BIC web service standards 7.5 days

Beginners Guide to SOAP and REST and Implementation Guidelines: 3 days

Contingency: 1.5 days

Total: 15.2 days

Simon:

Preliminary face-to-face meeting in Jan 2015: 2 hours plus 1 hour prep time.

4 Conference call meetings in Mar, May, Jul and Sep 2015: 1.5 hours plus 0.5 hours prep time = 2 hours x 4 calls = 8 hours.

Project lead role, progress reporting to BPSC Committee and contribution to the various deliverables including user guide, website description etc. = approx 10 hours.

Total = 3 days

If the project overruns or identifies any additional work or deliverables then it will be necessary to obtain permission from the Executive Director and the Board before any additional cost is incurred. **It should not be assumed extra funding will be possible if the project/costs over run.**

## **10. AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE**

*State the Authority responsible for authorising cost and resource usage. This will be Executive Director of BIC.*

Executive Director, BIC.

## **11. PROPOSED TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP LEADER/PROJECT MANAGER**

*Insert the name of the Proposed Task & Finish Working Group Leader/Project Manager.*

The Proposed Chair of the group is John Garrould, Bertrams Group IT Director.  
Temporary Deputy Chair will be Simon Edwards, BIC Consultant.

## **12. CUSTOMERS AND USERS**

*Insert the names of all known stakeholders and any other interested parties: including those outside the BIC community.*

The following is a list of the members of the BIC Web services working group in 2009:

Tom Knight <[tknight@tbs-ltd.co.uk](mailto:tknight@tbs-ltd.co.uk)>;  
Terry Willan <[T.Willan@talis.com](mailto:T.Willan@talis.com)>;  
Simon Parker <[simon.parker@batch.co.uk](mailto:simon.parker@batch.co.uk)>;  
Simon Pallant <[simon.pallant@gardners.com](mailto:simon.pallant@gardners.com)>;  
Simon Edwards <[simon.edwards@dial.pipex.com](mailto:simon.edwards@dial.pipex.com)>;  
Sarah Crossley <[scrossley@wiley.co.uk](mailto:scrossley@wiley.co.uk)>;  
Roger Sidwell <[rsidwell@randomhouse.co.uk](mailto:rsidwell@randomhouse.co.uk)>;  
Richard Hurrell <[richard.hurrell@bertrams.com](mailto:richard.hurrell@bertrams.com)>;  
Nik Louch <[nlouch@cambridge.org](mailto:nlouch@cambridge.org)>;

Mike Trill <[mike@gardners.com](mailto:mike@gardners.com)>;  
Mark Allen <[mallen@wiley.co.uk](mailto:mallen@wiley.co.uk)>;  
Liz McNaughton <[liz.mcnaughton@pubeasy.com](mailto:liz.mcnaughton@pubeasy.com)>;  
Ken Burch <[ken.burch@vistacomp.com](mailto:ken.burch@vistacomp.com)>;  
Jon Windus <[jon.windus@nielsen.com](mailto:jon.windus@nielsen.com)>;  
John Garrould <[jgarrould@bertrams.com](mailto:jgarrould@bertrams.com)>;  
Francis Cave <[francis@franciscave.com](mailto:francis@franciscave.com)>;  
Barry Richardson <[barry.richardson@nielsen.com](mailto:barry.richardson@nielsen.com)>;  
Achilles, Sabine <[saac@amazon.com](mailto:saac@amazon.com)>;  
Chris Morphew <[chris.morphew@bowker.co.uk](mailto:chris.morphew@bowker.co.uk)>

*Note that many members may have moved job, changed email or may no longer be involved in web services. These members need to be emailed to update their interest in this project. They can nominate alternate members from their organisations if required. A call for volunteers will be needed to attract new members to this T&FWG and this should be followed by one or more reminders and a clear deadline.*

### **13. REPORTING**

State the preferred frequency, expected format and type of information needed from the Task & Finish Group. Consult with Executive Director of BIC on this.

This should include but may not be limited to the following:

- i) Costs to date v budget
- ii) Projected costs v budget
- iii) Progress of deliverables against agreed timeline
- iv) Engagement of Working Group
- v) Any issues needing resolution by BIC Committees
- vi) Each draft web services message and accompanying documentation.

It is assumed that the T&FWG will report to the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee which meets quarterly. The Project lead will use the monthly reporting template to keep the Executive Director updated on a monthly basis of all progress against deliverables and budget.

Ultimately the costs to budget are the responsibility of the BIC Executive Director but with the help of the Project Lead who will keep her updated monthly in this area.

**It is important to note that should the project costs overrun, from what has been agreed in this Project Brief, there may not be any additional funding available.**