## 2020-09-16 Meeting notes

### Date
16 Sep 2020

### Attendees
- Mike Gorrell
- Anton Emelianov
- Marko Knepper
- Stephen Pampell
- Mark Veksler
- Zak_Burke
- Marc Johnson
- Craig McNally
- Jakub Skoczen
- Vince Bareau
- Tod Olson

### Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | UI Testing Revised Recommendations | Anton Emelianov | Reviewing this presentation: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1z3lxCA7rzeCrBGvijyalsrk5qsTHgdUXQV_gZaDU_-NB/edit#slide=id.g5db34332d5_0_0  
Key points:  
**UI Modules:**  
- BigTest v1 (current tool) is unsupported  
- Move from BigTest to Jest or RTL going forward  
- Re-implement all current BigTest tests in Jest or RTL  
- Deadline to re-implementation by Q3-2021 (giving teams 12 months)  
**Stripes:**  
- Impacts only teams/persons that are working with Stripes (i.e. Stripes Force)  
- BigTest v1 (current tool) is unsupported  
- Move from BigTest to BigTest v2  
- Re-implement all current BigTest tests in new BigTest v2  
- Deadline to re-implementation by Q3-2021 (giving teams 12 months)  
**End-to-End Tests:**  
- Current tool - Nightmare JS is unsupported  
- Replace Nightmare JS with BigTest V2  
- Not a job for 1 person - we'll need to identify more people that can contribute (other than Zak_Burke)  
- Expect donated resources from Frontside (makers of BigTest)  
- Re-implement all current Nightmare JS tests in new BigTest v2 over time  
- Note that BigTest V2 will be able to drive end to end tests in any FOLIO environment - new capabilities for each Dev Team (scratch environment) and hosting providers as well as others  
**Action:** Try and identify another individual that can contribute to these tests. Possibly recruit from Stripes Force. Anton Emelianov and Zak_Burke to explore possibilities to be recommended to Capacity Planning team.  
**Code Coverage:**  
- UI Modules should meet 80% code coverage goal. This should include "critical path" functionality  
- If a defect is found that wouldn't have been covered in that 80% then when fixed a new test case is to be created. This new test should be part of teams' definition of done |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Blueprint Update</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Review progress/status of Folio Architectural Blueprint Strategic Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABI-001: (AES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Done, pending inclusion into releases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-002: (Cross-Tenancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions paused, to be restarted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-003: (System/Tenant Users)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-004: (Database Connectivity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-005: (AuthN/Z Refactoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-011: (Search Engine)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blueprint is finalized. SPL is creating their implementation guided by blueprint. TC needs to discuss how and when to move forward with formal Folio implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-016: (SAML SSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting cases from community, options for long-term strategy (continue with custom FOLIO SP or rely on common external options), started discussion on Discuss. Unclear if this can go further as a community discussion. - Tod Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI-019 (Distributed Transactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No progress since last update. I'm aware of it being actively worked on (though a team did recently ask about it and said they might gather their own examples). I'm not actively working on it. I suggest it be considered inactive at present - Marc Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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