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## Description

A Glossary of common IT Terms related to contracts and agreements, to establish a common understanding, while reducing duplication of effort in downstream documents.

## Synopsis

Included are the meanings of acronyms and industry terms used to describe agreements.
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## Introduction

## Objective

To develop a common understanding of terms used to deliver services with an IT component.

# Terms & Acronyms

## Contractual Terms & Acronyms

* Services are procured for business providers to optimise their delivery of service to business service consumers:

#### Contract

: a contract between parties outlines expected outcomes, constraints, governance, methods of working, governance, and penalties for missed expectations. They must be accompanied by or include Requirements. Forms of Contracts include but are not limited to *Master Agreements* and *SOW*s.

#### Master Agreement

: a base contract defining common agreements that can be reused as the base of several SoWs.

#### Memorandum of Understanding

: a legally non-binding agreement to achieve a mutual understanding as to vision, expectations and responsibilities before parties undertake actions, transactions or partnerships. Compare and contrast to SOW.

#### Minimum Viable Product

: the first publicly useable iterative delivery of a new service, that has Qualities and Functionality to be usable by a small subset of Users.

#### MOU

: see *Memorandum of Understanding*.

#### MVP

: see *Minimum Viable Product*.

*Note that MVP is also an apt description for projects that immediately begin delivering the business desired functionality without prior planning what else is to be delivered, and how to do so, and therefore the result is one that is missing key service Qualities (see ISO-25010). Hence the acronym can also mean “Missing Valuable Planning”.*

#### POC

: acronym for *Proof of Concept*.

#### Proof of Concept

: a small piece of technical effort to validate a design assumption’s feasibility and cost prior to engaging additional effort to develop the desired outcome as deliverables.

#### RASCI

: *Responsible, Accountable, Supporting, Consulted or Informed:* An acronym for defining the relationship of Stakeholder groups to project delivery.

#### Requirements

: statement of expectation, given as a Permission, Recommendation, Obligation, or Prohibition, attached to Contracts.

#### SOW

* : see *Statement of Work*.

#### Statement of Work (SOW):

* a narrative description of a project’s constraints, requirements, activities, timelines, deliverables expected from a vendor or other service provider. A SoW should be an extension of a base *Master Agreement*.

#### Terms & Conditions

: Also known as Terms of Service, are constraints and Expectations on users and their behaviour for access to a Service.
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