2019-06-12 Consortia SIG Meeting Notes

Date

12 Jun 2019

Attendees

- Noah Brubaker
- Kelly Drake
- Kristen Wilson
- Peter Sbrzesny
- Steve Walker
- Elena OMalley
- Martina Tumulla
- Brandon Cole
- Mike Waugh
- Noah Brubaker
- Paula Sullenger

Goals

- Begin review of gap analysis prioritizations

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
5min	Housekeeping/updates - F2F next week; no SIG meeting on 6/19 - There is a 2-part consortial implementers session scheduled for the F2F - We are NOT interested in having a Zoom room for this meeting	All	
55min	Gap analysis prioritization review 1. Prepare for session a. Assign someone to update the JIRA features with more details as they are discussed. This way the PO just needs to talk and someone else will record what they say for everyone to see going forward. b. Ask all SIG members to have the spreadsheet at https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1eHmRKUH2mzurOLL7iaaHV65qHpvGnyN8j5YNxocMUJ4/edit?usp=sharing open so they can edit the Rank for their institution as the features are discussed (the spreadsheet has both an Original Rank and New Rank field for each institution) 2. You may want to start by looking at the ranking order of the features—or you can just jump to step #3 below a. Does anything look "off"? In other words, something is ranked very high/low inappropriately--you may want to address obvious issues immediately b. Are any dependencies out of order? Some have already been fixed—you can update the rank in the New PO Rank field, which is to the right of the Original PO Rank field 3. Review features with SIG to clarify what they are (while discussing, assigned person should be updating JIRA issue with clarifying information). SIG members should be discussing these questions: a. Is this really a go-live feature? (if not, update working spreadsheet for institution) b. If it is, is there really just a part of the feature that is needed at go-live? Could we split out that part of it? c. Is there a reasonable workaround for all or part of the feature? 4. After the feature has been discussed, place a "Yes" in the Processed? column--there is also a column for Comments 5. The results will be shared with the Product Council and the institutions so that any discrepancies can be addressed and resolved ASAP Notes from meeting: - The four implementing consortia have been asked to take the lead on the gap analysis prioritization review - The four include FLO, GBV, HBZ, and Five Colleges - GBV and HBZ would like to have individual tenants for each library system, but some library systems are complex will require infrastructure to support division of teams and branches. This means they need a mix of cross-tenant and single tenant-like functionality. - We would like to recommend a new feature to describe a central admin tool that supports many of the existing features such as viewing data, making changes to multiple tenants, consortial reporting, etc. - All new rankings were added to the spreadsheet and comments added to Jira - We reviewed all unassigned issues; the issues with an assigned PO still need to be done.	All	
5min	Wrap-up/planning		

Action items

- ☐