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**Repository Content Review - report**

**SG-OBPS-VI, Nov 2025**

The decision on a document inclusion in the repository is not on the maturity of a practice, but whether the practice falls into the topical areas (i.e., subject scope) of the repository and whether the practice document is a method description.

The objective of the issue of the repository  [revised content and method criteria](https://drive.google.com/file/d/16xpZo3HGnyMwPU9g1vWMgvmsnA6KYqd7/view?usp=drive_link),was to have a consistent process for decisions on which documents to include in the OBPS and to reduce subjective evaluation of candidate practices. The decision criteria identified in the criteria document does not relate to the quality of the practices or its maturity level. The decision criteria is solely about the fitness for inclusion in the repository against the published criteria. Thus the review is not a technical or scientific peer review as may be done in a journal or by an expert panel.

Following the issue of the repository  [revised content and method criteria](https://drive.google.com/file/d/16xpZo3HGnyMwPU9g1vWMgvmsnA6KYqd7/view?usp=drive_link), it was agreed to review some of the repository content with the [CAPARDUS collection](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Af7Mo2OWw-A_2duCFH9RDSBISR5Rnu3d/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=115984934548572908651&rtpof=true&sd=true) as the first to be reviewed,because CAPARDUS is known to have extended their collection beyond the OBPS Content Criteria. The next Collection to be reviewed will be the Miscellaneous Practices Collection

The logistics of the review survey were trialled during the month of October 2024 with 9 members of SG, who had collaborated on agreeing the revised content and method criteria. The full exercise started 01 Nov 2024 with a call for volunteers initially from the whole SG to contribute to the review. Additional reviewers could be invited from the Ambassadors and Task Teams and depending on progress, possibly beyond.

There are some 200 records to be reviewed in this first collection exercise; each record is looking for 3 reviews - ie 2 reviewers must agree a decision. If the first two reviewers agree a decision a third review would not be required which will reduce the number of records to be reviewed by each reviewer.

A suggested workflow is provided:

* Have the [review spreadsheet](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Af7Mo2OWw-A_2duCFH9RDSBISR5Rnu3d/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=115984934548572908651&rtpof=true&sd=true) open
	+ Click the full text publisher URL to open the document for review
	+ Copy the citation of the document record you are reviewing from the spreadsheet
	+ Click the Link to Review in the spreadsheet for the record you are reviewing to open the survey
* Copy and paste the record citation you are reviewing into Q1
* Complete the survey
* Click in the spreadsheet the dropdown 'Completed' in one of the Reviewer boxes for the record you have reviewed.

From the trial it was reported that the majority of the 10 records in the trial took between 10-20 mins to complete.
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