[1:01:05 PM] Caroline Barnes: Hi everyone!

[1:01:11 PM] Caroline Barnes: Let's go ahead and get started.

[1:01:32 PM] Evan Menkhus: Hey, this is Evan Menkhus, Software Developer at Junior Achievement USA

[1:01:37 PM] Caroline Barnes: If everyone who's here would please share your name, organization, and the version of CRM you're currently using, since we're talking UPGRADES today!

[1:02:00 PM] Evan Menkhus: Currently on 2.94, looking to upgrade to 3.0 later this year.

[1:02:12 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes removed Tracy Parizek from this conversation. \*\*\*

[1:02:13 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Tracy Parizek \*\*\*

[1:02:16 PM] Clare Cooley: Hi, I'm Clare Cooley, developer, University of Georgia, CRM version 2.94

[1:02:29 PM] Samuel Lufi:

Sam Lufi, American Bible Society, 2.9 => 3.0 (in testing)

[1:02:30 PM] jan shorter: Jan Shorter - City of Hope - BBEC v.2.94

[1:02:30 PM] Tanya Crowe: Tanya Crowe, University of Georgia, Developer, version 2.94 & we have started some testing against 3.00.

[1:02:51 PM] Arnetta Gosse: Hi, I'm Arnetta Gosse - University of Iowa on 2.9

[1:03:04 PM] Roger Jacobs: Roger Jacobs, Earthjustice, 3.0

[1:03:05 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Brennan Hadden \*\*\*

[1:03:14 PM] Polly Heninger: Polly Heninger, The Associated: Jewish Community Federation of Baltimore, 3.0

[1:03:16 PM] \*\*\* Brennan Hadden can't be added until they accept your contact request. \*\*\*

[1:03:44 PM] System: skype:?chat&blob=KmhH0rGDbdIkLstrpOws7sDhXCNnT\_J-736w53IgsQ81FqkMWev4s0IfVZLBGwRkHl4

[1:04:29 PM] Caroline Barnes: Ok everyone! We have a number of organizations here today to share their experiences with version 3.0, and we can talk about upgrades in general as well.

[1:04:53 PM] Caroline Barnes: I have some questions from people who couldn't attend, but does anyone have a question they'd like to kick off with?

[1:05:25 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Brennan Hadden \*\*\*

[1:05:32 PM] Yvonne Novick: Yvonne - Pittsburgh Federation. 2.94 currently. upgrading soon

[1:06:06 PM] Samuel Lufi: I am wondering about adjusting procedures. There are things that we didn't implement well when we first started with BBEC. Conversion is getting key decision makers together. Does it make sense to ahve those conversations now, then try to implement immediately after conversion? Should we implement changes before conversion is completed?

[1:06:38 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes removed Susan Arrington from this conversation. \*\*\*

[1:06:40 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Susan Arrington \*\*\*

[1:07:02 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes removed Reane Travis from this conversation. \*\*\*

[1:07:04 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Reane Travis \*\*\*

[1:07:10 PM] Jeff Garmon: Jeff Garmon - University of Georgia - 2.94, preparing for 3.0

[1:07:36 PM] Brennan Hadden: Brennan Hadden - SMU - 3.0

[1:07:37 PM] Caroline Barnes: whew! we've got some people having trouble joining today, so please bear with me everyone!

[1:07:53 PM] Caroline Barnes: and while we're still getting started, ground rule:

[1:08:12 PM] Susan Arrington: @Caroline, now I am here

[1:08:14 PM] Caroline Barnes: if you're responding directly to someone's question/comment, make sure to use the "@" symbol so we know who we're talking to

[1:08:24 PM] Jeff Garmon: Question for anyone on 3.0 already - any big gotchas which didn't surface during testing

[1:08:26 PM] Susan Arrington: @Susan from Junior Achievement USA

[1:08:26 PM] Caroline Barnes: @susan just gave a great example of that!

[1:08:39 PM] Reane Travis: Reane Travis, UNC-Chapel Hill Currently on 2.94, we're working towards upgrading to 3.0 later this year.

[1:09:15 PM] De-Stepp: David Stepp, Legacy Health, 3.0

[1:09:24 PM] Susan Arrington: @everyone we too are planning for 3.0 later in the year, putting together the plan now, we are on 2.94

[1:10:25 PM] Samuel Lufi: @jgarmon - I think that is a great question re: things missed in testing

[1:11:02 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Samuel, when we upgraded to 2.91 we had a major conversion of data. We did it in conjunction with the upgrade working with Blackbaud. I believe a lot of work was done before implementing the upgrade and then there was also post work based on how things had changed. I would say definitely start having conversations now and figure out the best path forward talking with Blackbaud about how things are different for you in the upgraded version.

[1:11:45 PM] Jeff Garmon: @samuel - if possible, I personally prefer to limit large funcitonal changes outside of any upgrade (crm included), but if functional requires it, during upgrade may be the most appropriate time

[1:11:47 PM] Samuel Lufi: @RogerJ thanks

[1:11:51 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Samuel There is no great answer to your question. It really depends on you organization. Somethings to think about: How hard is change at your organization? When is the next time you would be able to make changes? How many stakeholds does it impact?

[1:12:08 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes removed Tracy Parizek from this conversation. \*\*\*

[1:12:41 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Tracy Parizek \*\*\*

[1:12:44 PM] Samuel Lufi: @brennan @jgarmon thanks

[1:12:51 PM] Michelle Manno: @farfromnoise so did you upgrade from 2.91 to 3.0? of did you do the upgrades inbetween?

[1:13:01 PM] De-Stepp: @Samuel if you already have 3.0 in testing and moving to production is coming soon it may be best to implement procedural changes at the same time. Provide up front conversations and training but make the move to 3.0 and new procedures together. Our staff react better to what they see as a single change rather than a series of changes. Gauge your own staff reaction.

[1:14:05 PM] Roger Jacobs: @jgarmon, batch processing and reporting. We have had several reports that time out now. Whether this is due to bad report design or something else, I cannot say, but it is something we should have looked at a lot closer. Some of our batch processing for gift entry is taking way too long. We are still working out the bugs as to why this happens. It appears to be something with new duplicate detection that has been implemented. But I would highly recommend testing out all reports and batch processing paying close attention to how much time it all takes. We didn't pay as close attention to "time outs" because our test environment is not nearly as powerful as our production.

[1:14:11 PM] Samuel Lufi: @de-stepp - that has been part of my thinking. On the other hand, making the changes, testing them, documenting new procedures - these take time from an already strained team

[1:14:13 PM] Jeff Garmon: @De-Stepp, yes - user acceptance to change can dictate some decision/chagne point

[1:14:59 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, I actually don't remember, but I 90% positive we went straight to 3.0.

[1:15:07 PM] Jeff Garmon: @roger jacobs - thanks, were those out of the box reports/batches, custom, or all of the above?

[1:15:32 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes removed Ivana Plesnivy from this conversation. \*\*\*

[1:15:35 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Ivana Plesnivy \*\*\*

[1:15:59 PM] Michelle Manno: @roger jacobs - how long did the upgrade take from the start of planning to the upgrade? what suggestions do you have?

[1:16:07 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Jeff all the above. More so with custom, but all the above.

[1:16:54 PM] Polly Heninger: @roger jacobs - for us some of those time outs on reports were because several revenue-related tables were turned into views and the reports now use those views which are slower. rewrite to use tables and they're ok.

[1:17:51 PM] Caroline Barnes: @roger that's an interesting point about people disregarding timeouts assuming that it's just the test environment. i'm curious if others have had a similar experience

[1:18:47 PM] Arnetta Gosse: @caroline - we at Iowa tried to go to 2.94 but choose not to experienced the testing environment issue as well.

[1:19:27 PM] Samuel Lufi: @caroline @roger - most of the canned revenue reports never ran for us in 2.9. On our custom reports that we know work, we have insisted that they run correctly and in a timely manner in 3.0 (though this continues to be one of our biggest sticking points during the upgrade process)

[1:19:51 PM] Brennan Hadden: @caroline We have our test for the current version and our upgrade on the same sized hardware. It allows us to compare performance of our current environment to upgrade without the expense of production level hardware.

[1:20:11 PM] Caroline Barnes: @arnetta - interesting. particularly when we're trying to jump the FTM hurdle, that must be a challenge.

[1:20:33 PM] Caroline Barnes: @brennan - that sounds like the ideal route - that way you don't have that concern about environment causing slowness

[1:20:55 PM] Caroline Barnes: @brennan - did that result in fewer "surprises" for you guys now that you're actually on 3.0?

[1:21:00 PM] De-Stepp: @caroline - we also experience performance differences between testing and production environments. They are designed with identical architecture but testing is not as powerful.

[1:21:33 PM] Jeff Garmon: @caroline - UGA does experience more timeouts and such from some of our testing environments, I try to adjust the settings per environment and just work to educate folks it will be slower.

[1:21:49 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, I believe it was about 3 months total for us. We were a bit aggressive with it. Other than test as much as possible, I don't think I have much else to recommend. I'm on the IT side of things so my exposure to the users experience is relatively limited. But from what I heard, we only had a couple of user trainings and most people were surprised how easy it was to transition to the new environment.

[1:22:31 PM] Brennan Hadden: @caroline I think it helped, but still having some surprises. You always do.

[1:23:08 PM] Caroline Barnes: @de-stepp @jeff - it sounds like we sort of have to find a balance between what's realistic for a test environment hardware vs. what we need to ensure that performance issues don't translate to production.

[1:23:29 PM] Polly Heninger: If you use joint name formats and one of the constituents is inactive you may end up name formats like "and Mrs. Jones".

[1:23:47 PM] Michelle Manno: @roger jacobs - that surprises me too. that isn't what we have heard from others. does anyone else have a time estimate for upgrading from 2.91 to 3.0?

[1:23:54 PM] Jeff Garmon: is anyone here operating with BBIS on 3.0, if so, curious how the transition from web batches to enhanced revenue/constituent batches went for you?

[1:24:15 PM] Caroline Barnes: @brennan - any in particular that you'd suggest other organizations keep in mind to be aware of?

[1:25:05 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Polly, thanks. Yeah, we're aware of the changes and are still trying to figure out where we need to fix reports. We also have reports that should be run against the datamart since they hit every single record. That and our hardware is over 5 years old now. Doing a hardware refresh next fiscal.

[1:25:19 PM] De-Stepp: Also - one thing to look out for: our web and app servers are two load balanced servers each. The load balancer devices on the web servers went to sleep during the upgrade of the web servers because they could no longer see the servers. Our IS team is segmented into server, app, network teams - took awhile for the group to come together on the issue to determine the actual cause. Just need to wake them up before we could move forward with the final upgrade steps. Silly - but unexpected issues like this can throw an IS team unfamiliar with the software into fits on upgrade night.

[1:25:43 PM] Samuel Lufi: @michelle.manno we started our process february and are projecting a go-live date in august/september

[1:26:25 PM] Tracy Parizek: Still nothing...........sorry I need to work on other things, already spent too much time on this.

[1:26:30 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Caroline If you are not webshell, allow more time than you think for UI model changes for customization. I would at least add 50%. FTM takes a lot of time as well. I would add more time for it.

[1:26:33 PM] Samuel Lufi: @michelle.manno - we are moving from 2.9 to 3.0

[1:26:39 PM] Michelle Manno: @samuel.lufi - thanks. any tips you can offer? Did you have a lot of FTM issues?

[1:27:42 PM] Ivana Plesnivy: @all - those of you who have upgraded, did you run this as a separate project or in addition to your regular work? and then how long did it take?

[1:27:47 PM] Michelle Manno: @everyone - did you all go with the webshell option for 3.0?

[1:27:52 PM] Barbara Laane: Barb Laane, Feeding America, Technology Programs Manager here. Sorry I'm late, but I had an unexpected item that came up today.

[1:28:13 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, yes

[1:28:43 PM] Barbara Laane: @Michelle, yes. We are using webshell for 3.0.

[1:29:01 PM] Samuel Lufi: @michelle.manno - I haven't been working closely with that team. I know that we have done a great deal of work with our finance team because that was the primary failure of the 2.9 implementation

[1:29:26 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Ivana At SMU, the upgrade was in addition to the regular work. It took about 3 months, after we started the project the second time.

[1:29:29 PM] Barbara Laane: @Ivana, we rad this as a completely separate project with a charter, kick off meeting use cases and weekly meetings with the team and Blacbkaud.

[1:29:47 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Michell, yes we are using webshell for 3.0

[1:29:50 PM] Samuel Lufi: @michelle.manno our finance team is the primary driver for our go-live date estimate. They want to close out the fiscal year (June 30 for us) on 2.9 and walk the parallel proces on 3.0

[1:29:57 PM] Michelle Manno: @roger @barbara - why did you choose to go with webshell? we are leaning towards not going with it because there seems to a number of items that need to fix if we go with it

[1:30:10 PM] De-Stepp: @Michelle - yes but the smart client is still available and we've found that acknowledgment letter processes are better edited in the smart client - can't remember exactly what the issue is but this one process is always run from smart client.

[1:30:11 PM] Jeff Garmon: @Ivana - seperate project in conjunction with regular work. Our testing going from 2.94 to 3.0 skips all the FTM stuff and as @brennasmu mentions, we're alreay webshell, so it honestly doesn't seem too bad

[1:30:27 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Ivana, it was a project but everyone involved was still doing their normal work duties. We started in July/August and we went live in October.

[1:30:46 PM] Barbara Laane: @Michelle, our upgrade actualy was was started with the enviornment and preliminary set up in mid December. But we didn't actually do testing until beginning of January and then went live 4/2/2014.

[1:32:05 PM] Barbara Laane: @Jeff, we are using BBIS here for our North Texas Food Bank. You will want to get your ERB template set up first. Blackbaud helped us with that, but now I know exactly what we needed to do and get it prepped for production before we went live.

[1:32:30 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, We needed the webshell version so our remote users could function in our Citrix environment. The smart client doesn't play well with Citrix. And we just wanted to have everyone on the same platform for training and support. We also found it to be a snappier user experience over the smart client.

[1:32:33 PM] Jeff Garmon: @de-stepp, on 2.94 things which still require client are web batches and design mode and others (which I can't recall off top of head). Those seem to be resolved in 3.0

[1:32:49 PM] Barbara Laane: @Michelle, Technlology team here did most of the testing as our Food Bank teams also needed to keep up with regular work, but we did ask them to help in testing key features after we did a once through.

[1:32:54 PM] De-Stepp: @Ivana - 2.94 to 3.0 upgraded test environment early January and production first week of February. In addition to our regular work.

[1:33:14 PM] Jeff Garmon: @barbara.laane1 - extra attention to ERB, thank ya....

[1:34:05 PM] De-Stepp: @Jeff, yeah we are on 3.0 now and those items are resolved. Still this nagging letter process. Only affects a couple users.

[1:34:55 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Jeff is the letter process the issue with output to MS Word?

[1:34:57 PM] Barbara Laane: @Jeff, we spent a lot of time on BBIS in validation as part of our go-live date. Everyone spent time putting in transaction in production to make sure they worked fine while we still told users that they had to be out of the system.

[1:34:58 PM] Caroline Barnes: while we're on the subject of web shell, it's worth mentioning that for version 4.0, Click Once will be going away and we'll be completely web based. of course, that means that all of the gaps that there were in earlier products is a major focus right now and those will all be taken care of by 4.0

[1:35:40 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, I may have missed it, but what is the target date for 4.0 to be released?

[1:36:14 PM] Caroline Barnes: @barb - November :)

[1:36:38 PM] Jeff Garmon: @caroline - ah..already delayed a month since I heard last ;)

[1:36:41 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, thanks. I'm sure we will be looking to upgrade next Spring to 4.0.

[1:36:56 PM] Ivana Plesnivy: @all did anyone have to do significant rework of BBIS from 2.91 to 3.0?

[1:37:08 PM] Caroline Barnes: @jeff - just making sure it's all bright and shiny perfect for y'all! ;)

[1:38:05 PM] Barbara Laane: @Ivana, no rework with BBIS other than template and make sure we upgraded our estore to latest version.

[1:39:24 PM] Tanya Crowe: @Brennan did you mean to addresss @De-Stepp with your last question?

[1:39:39 PM] Jeff Garmon: @all already on 3.0 - have you utilized the new option "Constituent Update Rules" where CRM allows different rules for replacing or creating addresses? If so - any good/bad to report from that?

[1:40:24 PM] Barbara Laane: @Jeff, right now we are just using the checked template for the batches; so nothing to report from this end.

[1:40:37 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Tanya @De-Stepp @Jeff Yes, I did mean to ask @De-Stepp if the issue was output to MS word/

[1:41:25 PM] Roger Jacobs: @all, This might seem slightly off-topic, but having a viable test environment is obviously crucial to doing an upgrade. Does anyone have any tips/tricks on refreshing data in a second SQL environment? Some key factors I've run into that are just annoying are dealing with security and making sure that the correct report server and datamart are being used and not the production environments. As well as refreshing the test report environment. Thanks.

[1:42:56 PM] De-Stepp: @brennan - yes, something to do with output to Word and/or editing the merge document from within CRM.

[1:42:59 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Roger we have it database refresh scripted. The files are copied from production and the restored. We then run a set of script to change the configurations.

[1:43:14 PM] jan shorter: Is anyone out there also using and syncing Luminate Online with BBEC and if yes, what version of BBEC?

[1:43:41 PM] Jeff Garmon: @all, another global question is any type of security enhancements give you issues (or just diggung through to find the new stuff)

[1:43:52 PM] Brennan Hadden: @De-Stepp Take a look at the SP 4 or SP 5. I know BB has done some work to address the issues.

[1:44:18 PM] Roger Jacobs: @bhaddensmu, are these scripts your organization has created? Or are these generic, "duplicate your SQL environment" scripts?

[1:44:31 PM] Jeff Garmon: @Roger - what @brennansmu referenced, custom scripts

[1:45:18 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Roger @Jeff we developed the scripts and use SQL agent to run them

[1:45:31 PM] De-Stepp: @Brennan - Thanks, we're on SP4. I'll have to look at SP5 - or maybe v4.0 by the time we get to another upgrade cycle.

[1:45:50 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Jeff @bhaddensmu, thanks

[1:47:04 PM] Jeff Garmon: @Roger -the biggest gap with my custom db move scripts has to do with BBIS, the users/developers seem to imbed urls everywhere and I'm always missing something in a table somewhere

[1:49:06 PM] Jeff Garmon: generically, sounds like the FTM canges and going to webshell have been the biggest hurdles for folks

[1:49:33 PM] Caroline Barnes: Ok everonye - since things are quieting down, I had a question that Murel from LCMS asked me to put to the group since he's unable to join today:

[1:49:56 PM] Caroline Barnes: How do you come up with a test plan when upgrading? What do your test plans look like? Do you run test scripts?

[1:51:46 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, we do use cases and store them on our HungerNet Sharepoint environment. So the use case tells the user exactly what he/she needs to do and what the expected results are. The user then needs to mark the use case a success/failure. If the use case is a failure, then they need to say why the use case failed and what the problem with. We don't run test scripts here, but are thinking that would be a great evolution to speed up the process.

[1:52:41 PM] Caroline Barnes: @barb - thanks! how do you figure out what your use cases will be?

[1:52:46 PM] Jeff Garmon: @caroline - will be our first upgrade since go live. during implementation we allowed SMEs to define their test plans and use cases, that was a mistake. We're currently developing a guideline per functional area and will expand that based on the SMEs input after we distributed it

[1:52:53 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Caroline, Think of all your business process and write them down. Our test plan looks like a lot of tasks that a particular job function usually does and we ask some individuals that are used to doing those tasks to perform them in the test environment. We didn't have scripts written out but larger headings and we expected people most knowledgeable about an area to report back on what they found in their testing.

[1:53:39 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Caroline, some areas were more detailed than others.

[1:53:44 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, we had a set of use cases that we took from a previous upgrade on 2.94 and then we went through the new features and added additional use cases and modified the old ones to fit with webshell.

[1:54:37 PM] Caroline Barnes: @jeff, @roger @barb - do you all have your end users do the testing of their tasks in your upgrade environment, or do you have designated people do all the testing?

[1:54:39 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, we also covered really important processes that users do day in and day out.

[1:54:48 PM] Michelle Manno: @all - so who is updating/creating the test/use cases? IT? Users?

[1:54:56 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Caroline, end users

[1:55:26 PM] Tanya Crowe: @Caroline, @Murel - as a developer, in our last upgrade before go live, I went through and tested my own customizations - I mean in general our first round of testing might be by the developers - before it gets to the end users.

[1:55:49 PM] Barbara Laane: @michelle, IT created and modified the use cases before the users ever came in. And then both IT and users did testing with IT doing the first pass to flush out obvious issues first.

[1:55:50 PM] Michelle Manno: @all - did your developers maintain two different environments? One for 3.0 and one for the current version that you are on? If so, were there any issues with that?

[1:56:03 PM] \*\*\* Caroline Barnes added Larry Chaffee \*\*\*

[1:56:11 PM] Jeff Garmon: @caroline - plan is for select users (about 80) to use testing environment, but we also lean on key individuals as well, so a mixture

[1:56:47 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, Not IT. We have a DBA in our Development department who managed the process. We also had test cases from a previous upgrade so we did start from that and expanded. But the test cases originally came from a collaboration with end users in different departments and our DBA.

[1:56:48 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Michelle We had two environments

[1:56:54 PM] Barbara Laane: @Michelle, we had two 3.0 environment and then kept TST and DEV for our 2.94 environments, so we could go back and double check things in different environments - how it worked previously and how it worked in the new environment.

[1:58:01 PM] Jeff Garmon: @michelle manno - initally being developed by our advancement services director (based on our go live results) and then the functional areas grow it from there, to be consolidated back at advancement services.

[1:58:34 PM] Michelle Manno: @brennan & barbara - did you developers have to make coding changes for both versions of CRM?

[1:58:43 PM] Jeff Garmon: @michelle - different environments

[1:59:03 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Michelle, we still have 2 test environments. One for our current 3.0 version and one for our old 2.91 version. Until we feel that we have all the bugs worked out of the 3.0 version, we want to keep the old 2.91 for comparison. The only issue is that we can't do a data refresh on the 2.91 and of course the resources it takes to have 3 separate fully functioning environments.

[1:59:56 PM] Jeff Garmon: @roger - 5 seperate environments before we start the upgrade

[2:00:04 PM] Barbara Laane: @Michelle, we have one custom application that only works with Click Once application and I'm asking our developer now to make it compatible with Webshell. And there were some .net applications but I believe those were ok other than needing to re-install them to new environment.

[2:00:10 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Michelle Most of the time yes. We have all of you code in a code safe that has the history and branches so we can go back and look at the code if needed.

[2:00:19 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Jeff, sorry ;)

[2:00:32 PM] Michelle Manno: @all thanks!

[2:00:38 PM] Jeff Garmon: @roger - me too

[2:03:27 PM] Caroline Barnes: thank you all so much for this wonderful conversation - I'm sure some people are signing off now, so as usual i'll follow up with the transcript, summary, and any questions that didn't get answered.

[2:03:42 PM] Barbara Laane: @Caroline, Thanks. Thanks, All!

[2:04:09 PM] Caroline Barnes: We are hoping to do much more sharing around upgrade experiences in the near future, in the hopes that we can all learn from each other and make this process better for everyone. keep an eye out!

[2:04:20 PM] Caroline Barnes: thank you especially to everyone on 3.0 who came to share their experience today!!

[2:04:50 PM] Roger Jacobs: @All, thanks for the information. If anyone has any questions feel free to contact me at rjacobs@earthjustice.org. We are a medium sized org with about 30 users and 2.5 million constituents in the database.

[2:04:54 PM] Michelle Manno: @all - is anyone will to chat offline about their upgrade experience from 2.91 to 3.0?

[2:05:08 PM] Roger Jacobs: @Caroline, thanks for pulling it together.

[2:05:48 PM] Brennan Hadden: @Michelle, Happy to chat about 2.91 to 3.0 upgrage

[2:06:24 PM] Michelle Manno: @brennan - awesome. i'll be in touch! Thanks!

[2:06:46 PM] Caroline Barnes: @michelle @brennan - I was thinking, maybe it would be helpful if those on 3.0 would be willing to do a brief post in our community, something along the lines of "What is the greatest benefit you’ve seen from being on version 3.0?

What is the most significant lesson you’ve learned during this upgrade that you’d want to share with other organizations?"

[2:06:55 PM] Caroline Barnes: just as a way to start those conversations?

[2:07:16 PM] Michelle Manno: sounds good

[2:07:51 PM] Jeff Garmon: yes - thanks to all who have (and will) share their 3.0 stories

[2:08:21 PM] Caroline Barnes: @michelle - cool! I would just love to be able to have everyone benefit from these discussions. There's so much experience out there and my job is to make sure that we have good places to share it :)

[2:11:19 PM] Michelle Manno: @caroline this is great! Thanks for doing this.

[2:13:31 PM] Caroline Barnes: @michelle - you're so welcome. I am just very appreciative of everyone being so willing to share. We have a great community here!

[2:14:05 PM] Michelle Manno: i know it is great that people are willing to share! Have a good one! chat next week!

[2:14:14 PM] Caroline Barnes: :)