**BCDevExchange**

# *Pay for Pull Process* | Developer's Experience Map

## IMPETUS for PARTICIPATING

Interest in public service volunteer developer opportunities. Came across Code for America, led to Code for Canada, led to BCDevX

| | AWARENESS of DevX | ASSESSMENT OF OPPORTUNITY | DOING THE WORK | ASKING QUESTIONS | SUBMITTING PULL REQUEST | GETTING PAID |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **JOURNEY** | Saw the issue when it was first posted as an unpaid opportunity. Wasn't motivated to work on the issue, but subscribed to the Repo anyway. Received immediate notification when it was posted as P4P. | Had a solution in mind<br>Use case and Acceptance Criteria were clear | | | | |
| **TIME** | | | | | | Evaluation of Pull Request and payment was prompt |
| **CHANNELS** | BCDevExchange.org 🟨<br>GitHub repo 🟨<br>Email notification 🟨 | GitHub 🟨 | | GitHub 🟨 | GitHub 🟨 ⚠ *don't hit the 'MERGE' button prematurely!*<br>Test environment 🟨 | GitHub 🟨<br>PayPal 🟨 |
| **THINKING / FEELING** | | Do I care about this issue?<br>It doesn't seem like anybody else is looking at this. I could probably do this quickly and get paid. (No risk to me)<br>*"I imagined that Pay for Pull might work as a kind of honorarium for contributing.... but really it's just spec work."* | | | Unsure whether the PayPal ID was submitted correctly. Envisioned payment being sent "into the ether" | Why is email required? Don't understand the legal reason for requring this?<br>3.9& surcharge from PayPal is discouraging; would prefer cheque and longer time to receive payment |
| **INSIGHTS** | | This model will encourage "stealth development", competition--not collaboration.<br>Developers who want to get paid won't even fork the repo--they'll work on it in secret and try to sneak it in. | | Capacity: sometimes challenging to respond to questions in a timely manner | | For Devs, PayPal is a hassle ($30 fee) and a security concern (having to publicly post their PayPal account name)<br>Ethical tension as the business between reviewing pull requests in the order in which they're received, yet also reserving the right to "pay for the BEST code." |
| **OPPORTUNITIES** | Ensure strong links/references with other jurisdictions' similar models | If the Partner accepts work from different developers for individual, connected issues, will they get a patchwork instead of a clean, coherent solution? On the other hand, if you direct award Issues 2 and 3 to the successful developer on Issue 1, it's "winner take all" model. | | | | |

**LEGEND**

🟨 Citizen Engagement Toolkit - Issue #1 -

🟩 Citizen Engagement Toolkit - Issue #2