

Mapping between Volere and the Ideal Map on CSH

VOLERE		CSH		Observations
1	The Purpose of the Project	2 3 9	Purpose Measurements on improvement Guarantor	
1.1	The User Business or Background of the Project Effort	2	Purpose Beneficiaries	Motivation and considerations can partially be taken from the [2. purpose] section of the ideal map. The description of the system cannot. The [1. Beneficiaries] section can be used to cross check that the Volere 1.1 section covers all the needs of the beneficiaries.
1.2	Goals of the Project	2 3	Purpose Measures of improvement	
	Goal	2	Purpose	Goals can be derived from the [2. purpose].
	Advantage	2	Purpose	Advantage can derived from the [2. Purpose], if included. We suggested the CSH ideal template to have “Aim: Justification”
	Measure	3 9	Measurements of improvement Guarantor	Expected a consistency between Measurements of improvement and Guarantor
2	The Stakeholders	1	Beneficiary	
2.1	The client	1	Beneficiary: Secondary client	Suggested the CSH ideal map template to list the client in Secondary Client, if not a beneficiary.
2.2.	The Customer	1	Beneficiary: Secondary client	Suggested the CSH ideal map template to list the customer in Secondary Client, if not a beneficiary.

2.3	Stakeholders	1 4 7	Beneficiaries Decision maker Experts or source of knowledge	
	Stakeholder Identification	1 4 7	Beneficiaries: Primary client, secondary client, who we cannot realistically serve Decision maker, including “who ideally should be able to stop us?” and “who should change or redefine the measurements of improvement?” , “Who is already in control of the resources?” Experts of source of knowledge	Suggested the CSH ideal map template to divide clients as follows: Primary Clients: beneficiaries (may also be a customer, consumer, user) Secondary Clients: affected (positively and negatively), sponsor, customer, user, consumer
	Knowledge needed by the project	8	Expertise	Expected consistency between [Expertise] and [Expert or source of knowledge] Suggested the CSH ideal map to use the form “Expertise : Expert : Justification of the expert. : Issues”. This field would include expertise, justification of expert, and issues.
	Degree of involvement	7	Experts of source of knowledge	Comes from the type of expert: Indispensable experts; desirable experts; impossible experts; undesirable experts
	Degree of influence	4	Decision maker: , including “who ideally should be able to stop us?” and “who should change or redefine the measurements of improvement?” , “Who	Come from the type: “should be able to stop us”, “should change or redefine measurements of improvement”; “Is already in control of the resources”, “Input on which system to build” , “Input

		7 5	is already in control of the resources?" Experts or source of knowledge: undesirable experts Resources	on whether to deploy the system on a given environment", "should not have influence" (in case of undesirable experts). The list of resources in the "Degree of Influence: Is already in control of resources (list of resources)" can be taken from [5. Resources]
	Agreement on how to resolve conflicts with stakeholders with similar interests		----- // -----	----- // -----
3	Constraints		----- // -----	----- // -----
4	Naming Conventions and Terminology		----- // -----	----- // -----
5	Relevant Facts and Assumptions	12	Partially from worldviews	----- // -----
5.3	Assumptions	12	World Views: privileged views	Some assumptions could be taken from the privileged views of the worldview, but this category encompasses much more than assumptions about the system.