UA Measurement WG Meeting
20 May 2020

Attendees

 Dennis Tan Tanaka

 Dessalegn Yehuala

 Mats Dufberg

 Rachad Sanoussi

 Pitinan Kooarmornpatana

 Sarmad Hussain

Agenda

1. Final Review SoW CMS https://docs.google.com/document/d/12L5fgTOD5ITbqJ9y-1vPwZgAwOu5EST4PtotqmShpnE/edit?usp=sharing [docs.google.com]
2. Final Review UAM Prioritization Framework https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uZENuWMzAcbOxxnhm2fYnU8TAh9sbS2j5qEaWI3sSfE/edit?usp=sharing [docs.google.com]

Meeting Notes

The WG members finalized SOW for CMS after it was reviewed by the UA Tech WG. The members was informed that the requirement regarding to the CMS framework was removed as there was no dependency on the CMS.

The extension requirements were discussed. The objective of this SOW was to find the model of a UA ready website built by a CMS. Therefore any UA-ready extension found would be sufficient. However, it was also possible that none UA-ready extension could be found and the members discuss how to handle such case. It was concluded that a fixed number of extensions would be required to test, all finding would be documented. In the case that none of the five extensions was found to pass all UA tests, the best and reasonable effort to find an UA-ready alternative would be required.

The WG members then discussed the deliverables. It was noted that the target audiences for the output of this project were UA Ambassadors and website developers. The objective was to enable CMS administrator to be able to test their website using CMS to ensure UA-readiness, therefore the test plan, UA-readiness report, as well as the training materials were included in the deliverables.

In addition, the website or websites would be established to demonstrate the default CMS configurations versus with UA-ready configurations. The website or websites would be maintained by the vendor for 18 months.

The SOW would be updated as discussed and would be shared on the mailing list.

The prioritization framework was shared. The methodology used the quadrant of high-low level of impact and high-low level of effort. This would help WGs to relatively compare the projects and decide what to focus within the limited resource.

The measure of impact comprised of User Visibility, User Impact, and the Critical Path. User Visibility referred to proximity to the end-user experience (UX). User Impact referred to the measurable number of users who would benefit if the component is UA-ready. Critical Path referred to relative level of importance of a component within a system. The measure of effort comprise of Volunteers time and Funding in the terms of small-medium-large.

The Prioritize Worksheet was shown. Each project will be plotted into the worksheet. It was not aimed to have specific numbers but to see the relative comparison of the projects. Projects prioritization would be discussed in the next meeting.

Next meeting: Wednesday 3 June 2020, at 15:00 UTC

Action items

No.	Action Item	Owner
1.	*Update the SOW for CMS as discussed by the WG*	*Dennis*
1.	*Review the UAM Prioritization Framework document in preparation for discussion*	*ALL*