### 2021-06-11 Meeting notes

**Date**
11 Jun 2021

**Attendees**
- Kristin Martin
- Jesse Lambertson
- Norma Flores
- Sarah Dennis
- Lucinda Williams
- Dung-Lan Chen
- Nancy Pelis
- Owen Stephens
- Virginia Martin
- Tim Whisenant
- Amelia Sutton
- Abigail Wickes
- Lisa Maybury
- Heather Thoele
- Dennis Bridges
- Julie Brannon
- Peter Sbrzesny
- Nancy Finn
- Martina Tumulla
- Lucinda Williams
- Lisa Maybury
- Kathleen Norton
- Eric Hartnett
- Amelia Sutton
- Michael Aurther
- Janet Ewing

#### Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Minute taker?               | Jesse Lambertson     | **Peter Murray needs volunteers**  
|                             |                      |   - there are still some data integrity issues  
|                             |                      |   - **Question from chat** *(Is there a clear understanding of what data integrity means in this context?)*  
|                             |                      |   - Profiles doing things that they are not clearly documented as updating (MARC, Instance, etc)  
|                             |                      |   - Issues for 'source of truth' is also becoming an issue  
|                             |                      |   - Also, Quickmarc is editing automatically 006 sans notification  
|                             |                      |   - How is this playing out with implementers (who have already implemented)?  
|                             |                      |   - there is a fix, requires a report  
|                             |                      |   - field protection was put into MARC update, but that same field protection is not working when updating Instances  
|                             |                      |   - from chat *(Thanks Kristin. I think it’s important we don’t lose sight of what I think of data integrity between Folio apps - i.e. issues like changes to instances in Inventory doesn’t update information in Orders (or whatever) which I think is probably more relevant to RM)*  
|                             |                      |   - from chat *(I may need to start using more explicit terminology to avoid confusion about the term “data integrity”!)*  
|                             |                      |   - 11:15 EST (Friday, June 11), app interaction meeting info: **Join Zoom Meeting** [https://zoom.us/j/869183544](https://zoom.us/j/869183544) / Meeting ID: 869 183 544  
|                             |                      |   - Skidmore is now live  
| Announcements/Updates       | Kristin Martin       | SIG updates**  
|                             |                      | Bibliographic data flow task force **  
| Product Council minutes 2021-06-10 |                      | **  
|                             |                      |  

---

**11 Jun 2021**, a meeting was held to discuss various topics, including minute takers, announcements, updates, and data integrity issues. The meeting also addressed questions from chat and field protection issues in MARC updates. The meeting included discussions on profiles doing things not clearly documented and the use of explicit terminology to avoid confusion about data integrity. The meeting concluded with information on joining the Zoom meeting for the app interaction session.
## Acquisitions Updates

- Demo/discussion of receiving changes that include the addition of holdingsID (now for R3)
- Import functionality is also R3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dennis Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all these changes pushed to R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref: UXPROD1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all these things are currently in a FORK, in the thunderjet environment, to keep issues from having in the master code branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDERS interactions, here, are connecting things to holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holding links are connected to the POL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order data is being retrieved when loading the holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when a holdings change is required, that change would affect the order record too? or no?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some are using the location, 'on-order,' when ordering, but when the location is actually chosen the final location, this change will NOT be reflected in the order, CURRENTLY, but in this suggested change, then the change would be easier to handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from chat (We have the same workflow at Chicago, Dung-Lan, and we decided we would not change the location in Receiving, but change it in Inventory after it is received)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when it gets to cataloging, that team will make the perm change of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in IRIS, the order will still have on-order, but in this change, that will be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are still issues, much learning is needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementers Questions: Acquisitions/Resource Management implementers

**#16 Ongoing orders: When a piece is received using the receiving app will the "expected date" on a POL be updated to indicate when the next piece is expected?**

- expected receipt date is not protected
- looking at, or wondering about, prediction patterns
- right now, you can't see the history of receiving (there is a future plan for display of piece information, per Dennis / with the comment that one can receive and toggle on to view in discovery (UXprod2373) - but this UXPROD could not be touched until UXPROD1925 is finished (there is a logic an order in the processes)