# 2022-09-09 Acquisitions Meeting notes

## Date
09 Sep 2022

## Attendees

## Agenda
- **Housekeeping**
  - Next meeting, Tuesday (9/13) at 1 pm
  - If planning a conversation regarding FYRO experience/reflection/info sharing is still of interest within the group

- **PC Updates (Kristin Martin)**

- **Business**
  - Continue to discuss Implementers' Topics - see Acquisitions/Resource Management Implementers - We will start with topic #50 (Björn Muschall)

## Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FYR  | Are people interested in having a session to discuss Fiscal year rollover with Institutions that have completed the process? | Dung-Lan | Björn: This was recently done in the German group and it was a good session. From Julie Brannon (she/her) to Everyone 08:04 AM 
As your faithful documentation working group representative, I'd be interested to know if anyone used the https://lotus.docs.folio.org/docs/acquisitions/finance/#rollover-fiscal-year documentation during rollover and whether it was helpful/feedback/suggestions :) |
| PC Update | Did a retrospective and looked forward | Kristin | A few things of interest to the SIG
- Would like to enhance the PC relationship with the SIGs in ways that aren't there now. How can we better understand where there are gaps to address in the roadmap.
- What exactly are we talking about when we say folio product? What is the product? Different groups and people have different ideas of what that is. How do we work with outside groups.
- Look at the scope criteria group. |
| WOLFcon recordings | From Julie Brannon (she/her) to Everyone 08:13 AM 
This is a handy compilation of Wolfcon 22 recordings | | https://docs.google.com/document/d/1deqIGFxOvMHDtxPRfDMIPdqYMYgY38CJt0Ont_WVo/edit
https://recordings.openlibraryfoundation.org/oif |
| :15 | Invoice approve/pay with pending Order | Björn Muschall | 
- The approval/payment of an Invoice should not be allowed if the linked Order is pending since transactions will not behave as expected. Opening the Order after approval/paying creates new encumbrance transaction for current FY with values for Awaiting payment resp. Expended = $0.00 even though the Invoice is already processed. For this reason, the encumbrance/expended amount is not taken into account during FYRO. Right, it's the wrong workflow. But a warning would definitely help to address this issue. For my liking I would prefer a modal warning when approving and paying an Invoice with pending Order (with options Cancel/Proceed).
- Addendum: After fixing transactions on database level and bringing it to the attention of colleagues, this workflow error occurs again and again. From Sara Colglazier (MHC/5C) to Everyone 08:19 AM
- I guess I did not realize that you could approve/pay an invoice on an Order with Status Pending?!! I am just want to make sure I am understanding correctly. +1 to that!! |
From Scott Perry (UC) to Everyone 08:19 AM
This seems like a bug to me.
Dennis: Is there a use case for paying an invoice against a pending order?
  Several people agreed.
EDI will not link to a pending PO, but you can manually add it.
From Julie Brannon (she/her) to Everyone 08:22 AM
Agreed that this should be treated as a bug - order should be in open status before invoice can be approved.
Dennis: If there is a multi-line invoice, you would expect every order to be open to approve?
  From Kimberly Pamplin to Everyone 08:24 AM
    Yes
  From Scott Perry (UC) to Everyone 08:24 AM
    Yes
  From Dung-Lan Chen to Everyone 08:24 AM
    Yes!
From Julie Brannon (she/her) to Everyone 08:24 AM
Yes - if an invoice relates to multiple orders we’d still want all orders to be in an open status
From Scott Perry (UC) to Everyone 08:24 AM
Yes. Blocked regardless of encumbrance
Owen: I am not sure why this is important to people?

Dennis: Do we want to revisit being able to pay an invoice against a close order? 

attach real invoices to complete the PO or attach $0 invoice to close it. 

Sure, gift/exchange/free stuff can still have a fund attached if fund code is required as part of POL approval but we don't have to 

describing? 

Perhaps we add a tenant-level setting that requires a fund in a POL (unless est cost is 0)? Or a POL-level warning, like Bjorn is 

have a warning that no fund code is applied before opening an order. 

From Owen Stephens to Everyone 08:38 AM 

I consider the ability to approve an invoice with a pending order to be a bug of the first order, especially since it seems to impact encumbrances. Looking to see the impact on the recording of the payment in the transactions (all of them have funds). 

From Scott Perry (UChicago) to Everyone 08:36 AM 

I think that's a good question Dung-Lan - and perhaps the issue is that you may have 'orders' that are not paid? (free stuff, pre- 

payment, ???), I'm guessing a bit here 

From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone 08:37 AM 

If that's a decision we want to change now - I know I'll need to pay for this, but I'll decide the fund at point of invoice, not point of 

payment, ???). I'm guessing a bit here 

From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone 08:38 AM 

We documentation that spells out ripple effects of forking decisions ... 

From Dung-Lan Chen to Everyone 08:34 AM 

If we need to specify fund code when paying/approving invoices since money has to come from somewhere, then why not have the fund code specified in the POL to begin with. 

From Scott Perry (UChicago) to Everyone 08:36 AM 

If one is closed there is a red banner to say one of them is closed? 

The warning for it being Closed would be fine, as long as it is still possible 

Dennis: Is that approach to soft when it's a pending order? Should it just be prevented? It sounds like there are no use 

cases for paying against a pending order. So a soft warning is not enough. 

From Björn Muschall (UB Leipzig) to Everyone 08:42 AM 

Good question - paying against closed orders. Would there be a scenario where you thought you paid for all of it, and then 

an additional fee (or credit) shows up? 

From Björn Muschall (UB Leipzig) to Everyone 08:42 AM 

What happens with the encumbrance if you close an order? 

From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone 08:43 AM 

So in the scenario that Sara describes, would you want to have to reopen the order? Per Scott, sounds like reopening is 

not a great solution, but a warning might be helpful? 

From Dung-Lan Chen to Everyone 08:43 AM 

In FOLIO, reopen a closed PO to attach new invoices is not prohibited. 

From Sara Colglazier (MHC/5C) to Everyone 08:43 AM 

The warning for it being Closed would be fine, as long as it is still possible 

From Sara Colglazier (MHC/5C) to Everyone 08:43 AM 

I don't see any use case for payment on a pending order 

+1 to Scott 

No one else answered Dennis. Silence means no one objects to blocking users paying against a pending order. 

From Julie Brannon (she/her) to Everyone 08:46 AM 

Can we submit this as a bug and get it moved into the development pipeline more quickly than a story? 

From Scott Perry (UChicago) to Everyone 08:46 AM 

+1 Julie 

Dennis: It's probably more like a missing requirement. 

Ann Marie - that is a bug catagory 

Dennis: Today was the deadline for Morning Glory 

Sara: In lotus you can see the status of the order? 

Dennis: Yes. 

If one is closed there is a red banner to say one of them is closed? 

Yes 

In Lotus you can.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:54</td>
<td>Sara Colglazier: Creating and filtering pieces. Would like to have a way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of identifying pieces that represent material that will be sent for bind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ing. Would like a check box to click that this needs to be sent to the b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indery. This was discussed in the Cross application interaction meeting a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s well. We create the item at the time of sending out issues to the bind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ery, and then check out to the bindery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:54</td>
<td>From Kristin Martin to Everyone: We create the item at the time of sendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ng out issues to the bindery, and then check out to the bindery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:56</td>
<td>From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone: Is there any library doing something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to identify these now in FOLIO? location? checked out to a specific bind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ery (or pre-bindery) patron? tag? something else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:56</td>
<td>From Jackie Magagnosc to Everyone: The staff person who does our binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is experimenting with using the Binding note in the Holdings record to p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ut in details. I guess the presence of the note could flag a title as s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omething that gets bound. So at least in our implementation there is a n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ote type defined for binding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:57</td>
<td>From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone: We've definitely talked about prunin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g the extra item records (after binding). I don't remember talking abou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t a binding flag/checkbox though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:57</td>
<td>From Scott Perry (UChicago) to Everyone: I need to leave for another m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:58</td>
<td>From Kristin Martin to Everyone: I also have to go. Let me know when th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is will go on the agenda again, and I can get our expert in this area t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action items**

- [ ]