**MEETING OVERVIEW**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting Title** | **Cooler Communities Check In Call** | |
| **Meeting Type** | To Inform  To Perform | To Gather Input  To Make Decisions |
| **Meeting Agenda** | **Agenda**   * Review Project Objectives * Discuss MAPC Initial Architectural Review * Berkeley API Discussion * Next Steps & Action Items | |
| **Meeting Date** | 3/19/2019 | |
| **Meeting Time Duration** | 2:00pm - 3:00pm | |
| **Location** | WebEx Conference Line (Not Recorded) | |

## Participants:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Attended** |
| Bradley Hubbard-Nelson | Phone |
| Gilda Gussin | Phone |
| Jill Appel | Phone |
| Brad Smith | Phone |
| Ryan Kelly | Phone |

## Notes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MAPC Development Process** | |
| **Jill** | What is MAPC development process? |
| **Ryan** | The Digital Services team work in an agile process using GitHub Projects to coordinate issues and tasks then out in development sprints. |
| Goals, timeline, and budget will dictate limited changes to scope |
| Working of the Google Sheet’s as user example |
| **Review Project Objectives** | |
| **Ryan** | Goal to augment community fairs with an improved digital tool |
| Working to replicate the Google Sheet as MVP with some modifications |
| Alignment with other towns while desired may not be possible. Concerns we don’t other communities at the table when designing a tool for them. May not be able to test our decisions with towns. |
| Will look for alignment, but don’t have requirement gathering or planning in their needs within this scope. Aiming for a replicable process if others interested. |
| **Ownership and Sustainability** | |
| **Jill** | What is the plan for ownership? How does MAPC manage projects over time? |
| **Ryan** | MAPC for most projects owns, maintains, and administers projects built by Digital Team. This is done through maintenance funding if available, those without funding or users are sunset. |
| Examples of MassBuilds was built in house and is maintained in house. |
| MAPC has also built and handed off projects to other parties. Example would be Boston youth Jobs platform. Built in house with Boston, eventually handed of are now run and maintained by City. |
| **Brad HN** | Mass Energize may be interested in maintaining application going forward. |
| **Ryan** | **Decision Point** Will need to define ownership as it will impact technology choices. |
| **Review of Prototype & Architectural Technology Path** | |
| **Ryan** | After the last call we have been reviewing technology options |
| Viewing the project as three components that work together. Intake, Logic Layer, Visualizations |
| **Ryan** | **Intake Layer:** |
| Will show a demo of the interface we are proposing to use for an intake layer. |
| We have investigated using a survey / form tool to provide this layer |
| **Decision Point** using a survey technology will take less development time to complete and provide more robustintake features, animations and flow etc. If we developed custom (JavaScript) forms we would not be able to build to the UI level of an online form builder in the scope and time. At this time we have only identified, not being able to include full real-time calculations with this technology choice. |
| **Decision Point** choosing to build off of a survey tool then begs the question which survey tool. If maintained by MAPC, we have an account to Qualtrics in which a survey can be added at no licensing cost. Qualtrics maybe prohibitory expensive for other to replicate. MAPC would not be able to add in users/admin from towns to the tool. Other tools could be used by those that may want to replicate the application while still using logic and visualization layers. The intake data can be segregated by community. |
| The ability to customize forms by town would be limited. Any requests would need funding to support the work. Would not require developer to make survey changes. |
| **Jill** | The ability for community customization is not a top priority. |
| Mentioned Gloucester MA example of recent fair / model |
| **Brad HN** | This survey tool would not allow for a full open source replication by another locality. |
| **Ryan** | Yes, this would create a dependency on a third party tool. The output from this tool is a .csv that is then consumed by the other two layer logic and visualization both of which will be developed with an open source license. The tool could be swapped if another location desired to recreate that .csv by other means. |
| Demo: Have migrated the Google Sheet questions to Qualtrics to see if form logic would be able to handle the requirements of “multi select” and “skip logic” need for user to not be presented with full large survey. |
| Video of intake draft: <https://youtu.be/TIyHdvfeiHQ> |
| DRAFT Survey: [https://mapc.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/](https://mapc.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV_0wiHeWbuN9GJ81f?Q_SurveyVersionID=current&Q_CHL=preview) |
| **Jill** | Note to add State as field on the first screen |
| **Ryan** | Will need to carve out time with the group at a later stage to review and prioritize fields and UI form flow. |
| **Logic Layer:** |
| This is the recreation of the sum and weighting done by the cells in the Google Sheet. |
| The MAPC suggestion is to use Ruby on Rails developed simple backend application to automatically pull the .csv intake export and run calculations. Further discussion and understanding of requirements is need to determine level of control desired by administrators. |
| The Berkeley API looks to be a full carbon calculator that provides only access by API into data that is input into their application. |
| **Brad HN** | Believe the Berkeley API would be able to serve as logic layer if we passed it mapped fields from our application / intake and receive back scores for each entry. |
| **Jill** | Not interested in using the Berkley tool as an intake application |
| **Brad HN** | Would not have to use the Berkley tool, but would be relying on API |
| **Ryan** | this would create a dependency on Berkley’s API for calculations. Would not be able to build or change weights / formulas. This may conflict with the needs of a tool at MA fairs. Suggestion to build logic layer in own application. |
| **Brad HN** | Will already be working with Mass energize to develop in Python API calls to Berkley. |
| **Ryan** | Need to identify where work is complimentary and if goals are divergent |
| Using a custom Ruby development to calculate metrics/totals would be easier for MAPC to supported as updates are already part of MAPC practices. |
| **Decision Point** Python or Ruby would both be able to be used to meet the requirements of this application. Need to identify user priorities to inform decisions to move forward. |
|  | **Visualization Layer:** |
|  | Will be open source tools to build charts similar to those found in Google Slides |
|  | Limited time to discuss this layer during the call. |
| **Next Steps** | Will begin to fill out “User Stories” *As a < type of user >, I want < some goal > so that < some reason >.* This allow us to address the **decision points** raised in the call. The tradeoffs will be clearer if aligned through user story review. |
| Ryan and Brad Smith will be sending along a virtual sticky note board with user stories for review, voting and welcome additional user stories. |
| Will revisit decision points and after user story work in coming weeks. Will not leave open during development. |