EFiling Check-In - Nov 10, 2021

# Attendees:

* Paul Clark
* Ken Lally
* Laura Beaufort
* Jonella Culmer
* Robert Fultz
* Ryan Lanz
* Marlene Colucci
* Alex Lin

# Discussion Notes:

* These notes capture discussion points and action items not covered in materials provided.
  + Slide Deck: “2021-11-10 FEC - FECFile Online - Weekly Check-in.pptx” for slide deck content
* Schedule (p3):
  + Alex elaborated on the discussion item regarding the QASP: Given the reuse approach that the team is taking, it is challenging to set QASP targets as scoping what is measured and when it is measured will be hard to predict. We would propose working together as part of sprint/increment planning to define QASP goals.
    - Laura and Paul both agreed that setting a target date to meet the QASP measures would be fair.
    - Laura and Paul both agreed that an iterative definition of QASP measures against product increments is worth considering.
* Staffing and Resources (p4):
  + Alex noted that our proof-of-concept using Cloud Foundry to deploy the fecfile-online app was only partially successful, and that we may want to curtail that effort, assuming we can get access to cloud.gov shortly.
  + Laura recommended that a longer discussion be planned for system architecture and environment setup.
  + Laura shared a system architecture diagram for discussion and feedback.
* Budget, Scope, and Contract (p5):
  + Paul confirmed that the approvals from the IT office have been completed.
* Discussion:
  + Robert asked if we planned on meeting next week, given Veteran’s Day is 11/4.
    - Paul will help coordinate FEC schedules; Alex will send TCG schedules.
* Assessment Feedback:
  + Paul confirmed that the FEC planned to consolidate feedback on Tues, 11/23.
  + Initial feedback from FEC was positive overall.
  + Jonella asked if feedback should be sent as it was identified or held until Tuesday.
    - Alex confirmed that as it was identified would be fine.
  + Laura noted that, when she had reviewed the code using Django’s deployment checklist, she found a secret\_key that was hardcoded, which is identified as a “critical setting.” She was surprised that Bandit did not identify this, but recommended it be called out in the final assessment.
    - Al clarified after the meeting that it was identified by Bandit as a “possible hard-coded password” but flagged as a low severity item.