2021-12-02 Product Council Meeting notes

Date
02 Dec 2021

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://zoom.us/j/867230970

Or mobile phone one-tap (US Toll): +14086380968,867230970# or +16465588656,867230970#

Or Telephone:
Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location)
US Toll: +1 408 638 0968 or +1 646 558 8656
Meeting ID: 867 230 970
International numbers available: https://zoom.us/zoomconference?m=HFOYojqG6P0eOobNily-kmpgCrJ9eJQ_

Attendees
• Jesse Koennecke, Aaron Trehub, Alexis Manheim, Anya Arnold, Bjørn Muschall, Brooks Travis, Charlotte Whitt, Christopher Spalding, Gang Zhou, Harry Kaplanian, Ian Walls, Ingolf Kuss, James Fuller, Jana Freytag, John Ballestro, Karen Newbery, Kirstin Kemner-Heek, Kristin Martin, Magda Zacharska, Martina Schildt, Martina Tumulla, Mike Gorrell, Owen Stephens, Paul Moeller, Sharon Wiles-Young, Tiewei Liu, Tod Olson

Goals

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 min | Announcements | Jesse | Prioritization Working Group - first meeting December 10: Wiki space
Univ of Chicago's migration plans has been delayed to Jan 15-17 to work through a few more migration issues: remote storage integration, mid-year fiscal migration. |
| 15 min | PC Module Review and Approval Process | | Sub-group formed to develop formal process - meeting on Friday
Follow-up: Can we approve or endorse three modules that are currently ready for deployment in Lotus and send them to TC for review? Questions about proposed modules:
* Do we need this functionality in FOLIO?
* Why now? Technical Council would like Product Council to submit a request for review for items marked in the FOLIO Module/JIRA project-Team-PO-Dev Lead responsibility matrix for inclusion in Lotus. (PC saying, effectively, “we would like this module included in FOLIO...please review this code.”) SIGs and developers are working on functionality that they expect to be included in FOLIO. Starting with PC is the process that we have now.
Modules are bundles of code, and there is a difference between that and the features in UXPROD which have been voted on by libraries. Is this distinction important to the process of getting new things added to the FOLIO distribution? Does something need to be included in a release? If not, how do we leave the impression that they are good and worthy modules (strongly recommend) that libraries will want to use? There is not a place to show/promote apps that are not included in releases. The PC needs a process for highlighting the availability of these sorts of inclusions. Can we hold up getting things available to libraries while this alternative process is worked out? |
| 15 min | OA Modules | | The Open Access modules enable libraries to record, verify and report on open access publications by authors based at their institution. Where appropriate such requests can be linked to any appropriate agreements in the Agreements app (e.g. read and publish agreements) and payment details through invoices in the Invoice app.
OA plans were presented to PC on May 20, 2021 - Slide deck from that meeting
New slide deck overview from today. Expect to have a version for release in Q1 2022.
Action: The PC endorses the OA modules to be included into a flower release and submits it to the Technical Council for review. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 min</th>
<th>Bulk Edit Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scope of these modules is to provide bulk edit functionality in FOLIO. Members from different SIGs came together to list use cases and spec out requirements (some of the work had been previously discussed in the Metadata Management SIG), with PO Magda Zacharska, and developed by the Firebird Team. Initial work has focused on a pilot around bulk editing user records. Slide deck: Bulk Edit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bulk Edit use cases**
- UXPROD-3225 Bulk Edit - User data - Pilot
- BulkEdit proposed road map
- Bulk Edit presentation for SIGs

**Mockups:**
- Local edits (in scope for Pilot project)
- In app edits
- Bulk Edit User Experience research results
- Technical design for Pilot
- Bulk Edit Working Group meeting notes

The deadline to complete active development is February 4—is it too early for Bulk Edit to be reviewed by TC since code is being added daily? How does this relate to the December 3rd deadline for TC review (from Lotus (R1 2022) release timeline) when the code isn’t completed? From the TC’s perspective, there isn’t a deadline for inclusion, but TC notes that it is expected to take 3 weeks to conduct a review while the DevOps team believes it needs 2-3 weeks to add new modules to the reference environments. The December 17th deadline for the inclusion of new modules in a release is the foundation of the deadline and the TC is working backwards from that to have time for its own processes. The release management team is using approval by the TC as a signal to do the work to include a new module in an upcoming release.

Bugfest is the place the community has to do large-scale testing on a module, and to be included in bugfest a module has to be in a release. Do we need to untangle those two?

We probably need to define what it means to get into a release (bugfest versus in announced code)? (This is a question that is in scope for the “PC Module Review and Approval Process” working group.)

**Action:** Bulk edit is recommended for review by the Technical Council. The PC is endorsing the functionality for inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 min</th>
<th>Translation Modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation module discussion at PC: <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1puq9ySnP1RG583TOLDCh9hPZTxBsPscJzJu_y-7W5HU/edit">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1puq9ySnP1RG583TOLDCh9hPZTxBsPscJzJu_y-7W5HU/edit</a>. A preliminary version was also presented during the Sprint Review 120-121 (<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpHoWJKTzY&amp;tl=2820s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lpHoWJKTzY&amp;tl=2820s</a>). It includes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- UXPROD-3148 - Translated library-defined controlled vocabularies
- UXPROD-3149 - UI language switcher widget
- UXPROD-3150 - Allow for customizable date UI display

The TC has put in place a process for module inclusions; TC does not have a process for architectural decisions (such as the required changes to Stripes) or changes to the platform itself. These will be challenges for the review process as envisioned now. FOLIO has two processes for transactions: labels included in the front end bundles and back-end messages. This might be an item that needs to appear on the roadmap (as tech debt?).

There are two questions: is this code of sufficient quality? is this the correct technical approach to take?

**Action:** Kristen to pose the question on the Slack channel to ask Technical Council for the review of the code and to consider the technical approach as well.

— Meeting ended before there was time to take up the remaining topics —
Update from the OLF + OLF Board: OLF Board seeks new OLF community board member - election on Dec. 16, 2021 at Round Table Meetings

Report from treasurer: FOLIO is in good shape, but has not enough funding to hire people - One developer will be extended for another 6 month - AWS grant of $ 62 k was received again for FOLIO

CC Meetings: will be held now bi-weekly (2./4. Monday of the month) and will have an agenda planning meeting in every other week.

Council Liaisons: Agreement, that all Councils shall have liaisons between each other and attend the meetings
  - CC to PC: Kirstin - CC to TC: Mike, Ian - PC to CC: ? – PC to TC: Owen, TC to PC: Tod – TC to CC: ?

Regular meeting of all Committee Chairs shall take place

CC yearly working calendar: Draft version was introduced – ensure, we prepare in time (like elections, MoU’s, etc.)

FOLIO community holidays: CC agrees on, that each group meetings will decide on its own by reaching a critical mass of attendees. Meeting times are based on ET

Review of new capacity planning group organizational sheet: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vWofwZcoN6L7UJupbty-JehYxGyymnTFx1Yd_Qkdstgtd=174205684

Meetings are open to everyone; organizational overview and roles shall become a Wiki page: tbd

WOLFCON 2022 information and brainstorming

Guidelines for private Slack channels have been approved

"FOLIO is an open project and transparent discourse and decision making is the foundation of a trusting and collaborative community. Many conversations and project decisions are made using the group-chat tool Slack. This is why the default for Slack channels is to be public. However, the community council recognizes that there are situations in which a private channel is appropriate - a channel that's intended for "internal" conversations of a team, or a topic that needs more development before being exposed to the rest of the community, or other financial or sensitive topics. This is why Private channels are allowed. The recommendation of the FOLIO Community Council is that the default in creating a Slack channel is to have it be Public, but allow for the creator of the channel to use their discretion to make it private if that is appropriate."

Discussion of App Inclusion in FOLIO:
  - Reflections on ongoing discussions in TC and PC
  - Task force from CC/PC/ TC to volunteer in building processes "folio-scope-criteria": Ian, Kirstin, Harry for CC: will start on December 3, 2021
  - Idea of offering a FOLIO Community training or mentoring sessions

Communication Strategies Group
  - Work on the FOLIO website, building a "Journey Map" for Librarians, Developers, Vendors
  - Start a charter "The Communications Strategies Subgroup aims to identify communication strategies and lead the coordination of communications across the various channels that serve the FOLIO Community"
  - Provide information in other community channels: please see Slack announcement from today! Join the group!

The TC continues to work through how we conduct our business:

- Technical Evaluation of new modules: The TC has published a process for New Module Technical Evaluations, new requests for evaluations are submitted by the PC and the process is managed through JIRA, see TCR Board. This is now a working process, we can review and adjust as we get experience with it.
- Technical Decision making: TC is still working out how technical decisions are made within the project, which decisions must be made by TC, which can be made elsewhere, and what process to follow. This has been hard to move forward, will spin up a sub-group for more focused effort.
- TC participation: starting discussions about expectations for participation in meetings and in committee work outside of the regular meeting time.

Other topics:

- Working through CC's suggestions for committee responsibilities for items on the FOLIO Vision, Strategic Objectives and Initiatives document. Plan to review next week and respond to CC.
- Accepted proposal to adopt Google developer documentation style guide for Writing inclusive documentation for all technical documentation. This sets a goal for developer-provided documentation.

POs meetings

- Discussion - Minimize hotfixes brainstorm discussion. PO thoughts
  - Test early. Test often
  - Conduct analysis to identify trends/themes
  - Testing environments - better data and quality control
  - Testing environments should load data in the way that libraries are loading data
  - Exploratory testing for testing real-life scenarios
  - Rough notes
- Updated PO documentation.
  - Getting Started for Product Owners (Many thanks to Julie Bickle for feedback and updates)
  - JIRA status
  - Key JIRA fields
- JIRA - Root Cause Analysis field: Discussed with Anton updating the Root Cause Analysis (aka RCA field) field to better track reasons for defects and requirement changes.

Cap Planning has been focused on go/no-go decisions based on the readiness and testing of Juniper HotFix 4 and Kiwi.
Action items

☐