EFiling Check-In - Oct 14, 2021

# Attendees:

* Wei Luo
* Paul Clark
* Ken Lally
* Ryan Lanz
* Jonella Culmer
* Robert Fultz
* Alex Lin
* Matt Travers

# Discussion Notes:

* These notes capture discussion points and action items not covered in materials provided.
  + Slide Deck: “FEC - FECFile Online - Weekly Check-in - 2021-10-14.pptx” for slide deck content
* Schedule (p3):
  + Paul confirmed that the proposed findings/analysis would be an acceptable interim deliverable for review.
    - Alex noted that, by focusing the interim deliverable on the automated scanning results, we achieved a 2-for-1, as reviewing those results with the identified PoCs (Laura, Jonella, Robert) was something we needed to do anyway.
  + Robert recommended that, given the plan is to refactor and re-architect the application, the team be mindful about what’s worthwhile in terms of the automated scans.
    - Alex agreed and proposed that we calibrate on what that should look like when reviewing the initial analysis.
* Staffing and Resources (p4):
  + Alex noted that, since creating the slide deck, Slack has been stood-up, and Paul has provided access to Github and JIRA for the TCG team.
  + Ken stated that database access should already have been provided to Matt and Al.
    - Matt confirmed that he had received database access.
  + Alex asked who needed to be involved in the policy discussion of what goes in a public vs. private repository.
    - Paul responded that, for now, Paul, Ken, and Alex should be in that discussion.
    - **Action Item:**  Alex to setup a follow-up discussion on this topic.
  + Ryan asked to move the demo to 1 or 1:30 pm on Monday. (Agreed and updated.)
    - Ryan also noted that he’ll be able to provide access to the QA and UAT environments, but the DEV environment has 2FA enabled and won’t be accessible without some intervention by the developers.
* Budget, Scope, and Contract (p5):
  + Per prior discussion with Ken, Mobile Accessibility was identified as not applicable to the current assessment.
    - Robert recommended that, if possible and low effort, it might be worth reviewing just to identify the baseline for comparison, even if that baseline is 0%.
    - Ryan commented that mobile accessibility was not a major focus of the prior development effort, and that just some of the forms (e.g. Form 99) might have mobile accessibility built in.
      * Identifying and agreeing on what was important for mobile accessibility is a critical part of the next round of development. This is due to the fact that some forms are just not well suited to being used on a mobile device (e.g. heavy data entry forms), while others might be.
      * Jonella added that, based on her review, she had not seen any user research supporting what should or should not be included in mobile accessibility--and that such user research was really needed to have a clear understanding of what needs to be mobile accessible.
      * Alex agreed and responded that, on *Integrity.gov,* TCG’s UX team worked with users to identify certain parts of the system that would be appropriate for mobile devices (e.g. user profile updates, reviewing a submitted report) and put in warnings for areas that were not well-suited to mobile usage (e.g. data entry for transactions).