**Speaker 1**  
So OK, so now we I am recording it. So the first question that I have to ask you is what's your current official position in your job?

**Speaker 2**  
I'm a solution architect in in <omitted>.

**Speaker 1**  
Solution architects in <omitted>. Nice, nice.

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, that means resales. So doing architecting, sizing, designing.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. So it's more, it's more in the architectural side of the the development. I think I've got a problem with the connection. Ohh hello. Sorry, can you hear me now?

**Speaker 2**  
Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**Speaker 1**  
OK.

**Speaker 2**  
You know what happened, and I think it's my connection that went down and then again so.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, sorry.

**Speaker 2**  
I would I'm a solution architect in <omitted>. That means pre sales role and my daily or weekly job it's around presenting our solution, the <omitted> solution and doing some POV, POC, etcetera.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, great, great. And for how long have you been doing that?

**Speaker 2**  
This role solution architect, I think last six years.

**Speaker 1**  
Six years, OK.

**Speaker 2**  
But in <omitted> since three years.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK. So you had the same position solution architect in in other company before?

**Speaker 2**  
Yeah.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, great. Great. So as I asked before, you had the chance to use the bot right for a bit to check the documentations for one and overall how was the experience using the bot, what are your thoughts about using it?

**Speaker 2**  
It was good. It was good. I just follow the instruction, installed it. I used my, let me see, no repo but the organization where to install the bots. So it was.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. And did you use our deployment of it or did you try to run your own instance of the bot?

**Speaker 2**  
No, I try first with mine.

**Speaker 1**  
OK.

**Speaker 2**  
And with my instance.

**Speaker 1**  
OK.

**Speaker 2**  
And then I'm flying with yours. But I have to stop for working reasons, for business reasons.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. OK, that's great. And did you end up with any questions about the bot, something you didn't quite understand and you were curious about or how was that?

**Speaker 2**  
Well, I think that this is the first thing that I thought is ohh that would be very useful on on-premises installations.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK.

**Speaker 2**  
Yeah. Limit the bots only on GitHub. I know that there is an ecosystem in GitHub, but on-premises I imagine organizations that I met that don't like GitHub, Enterprise, GitLab and all those kinds of solution.

**Speaker 2**  
Yes.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. I'm sorry, <omitted>, but I missed the first phrase you said. You said it's really useful if you have your private instance of it, is that what you said or did I misunderstand?

**Speaker 2**  
No, no, no. It's on on-premises environments.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK. And this on-premises, what do you mean by that? Sorry if I'm not completely aware about it.

**Speaker 2**  
Yeah, on-premises means I have my servers in my organization, like in my data center. It's not on the cloud. It's not a SaaS solution like GitHub or any other.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK.

**Speaker 2**  
Solutions like GitHub as well, but to be run on-premises.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK.

**Speaker 2**  
Let me, I might have problem with the connection.

**Speaker 1**  
Yes, I will also close mine here and then. OK. And I'm sorry if you told that, but I couldn't understand everything. Is there any reason you consider that the bot would be ideal in this context, deployed this way?

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, because most of the time you don't want to give access to any third-party solution to your private repository. And most of the companies that do not have, they don't push their codes to the cloud, they want to keep it in their environments.

**Speaker 1**  
OK.

**Speaker 2**  
That's why I was saying that like on-premises with GitHub Enterprise which can be installed on-premises environments. This is just for banking, insurance, all the finance, they will not push any code to GitHub SaaS on github.com.

**Speaker 1**  
Yes.

**Speaker 2**  
They will use their own repo on-prem.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. Amazing. That's great feedback and I'm not sure you saw that the solution we have to configure the bot is adding a configuration file to the repository. Is this type of solution something that companies would be willing to do, even in a privacy environment? Or is there any other solution that they tend to use as configuration options for these type of?

**Speaker 2**  
No, no, no. I think the JSON file is fine. They are used to have those long configuration files, either YAML files or JSON file. They're used to it, and having a JSON or YAML file will allow the companies to also batch the installation, batch the configuration so they can use a template and then eventually work the template, process the templates and do all those kind of things.

**Speaker 1**  
That's great. And then about using the bot when you try to open some issues, try to check how the bot operates after you check how the operation happens. Do you think the bot would be useful for identifying technical debt items to help you manage them?

**Speaker 2**  
I don't know if I really meant it correctly, but the auto label I think it's a great feature. And I think it's the one that would be eventually mostly used.

**Speaker 1**  
Yeah. And do you think this type of label helps during the development process? What would be a potential use that you see for this type of auto labeling?

**Speaker 2**  
OK, first of all, classification, categorization, but that's general for any kind of labels or tags. But the thing is you can easily group them and see what is the status of your project, the status of your code.

**Speaker 1**  
Front. Yes.

**Speaker 2**  
And then eventually you can assign based on the label to different people. And based on that, you can prioritize and organize your work. I don't know if you are familiar with this. Yes, yes. At least at high level it will allow you to organize better your priorities and your work.

**Speaker 1**  
And do you also think it would make easier to monitor these issues over time?

**Speaker 2**  
Absolutely, absolutely.

**Speaker 1**  
And usually this type of monitoring, does it happen in terms of time, like how long the issue is open, or does it happen in terms of functionality or module? How does that happen, this type of monitoring using the labels?

**Speaker 2**  
As you may have guessed, the real answer is it depends.

**Speaker 1**  
It.

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, I mean there is no easy way to just identify and give a number or a score which is standard for each PR issue or whatever. It needs to be analyzed and assigned to the right people at the right time.

**Speaker 2**  
Issue, every PR might have hidden effort and hidden cost. That could be like, you think it will take a week or two weeks or one sprint or two sprints. And then at the end maybe it goes in the core of your system and you need to refactor, so it will take much more. Then you probably decide OK, just leave it, we will do it next sprint or whatever. We have other priorities, we cannot break everything. So it really depends. I would say time is something that you should measure and that it's generic enough for any kind of monitoring, the status of an issue or a PR.

**Speaker 1**  
Yes.

**Speaker 2**  
But also you need to, if you really do analysis of what needs to be implemented or fixed, then you need to also quantify how much time you will need. So can you hold on a second?

**Speaker 1**  
That's great.

**Speaker 2**  
TD means technical debt.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, I think I didn’t get the last phrase, sorry.

**Speaker 2**  
No, sorry, <omitted>. I had to answer the phone.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. Sorry, sorry.

**Speaker 2**  
It was Italian, so.

**Speaker 1**  
So in the same direction of managing issues over time, do you think the bot could help you manage more items, more issues?

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, absolutely, I think so.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. And do you think this would be due to the reason that the bot is labeling something automatically or just because the bot is standardizing labels?

**Speaker 2**  
Because of the auto labeling. If you standardize or name the label, it will give you quicker insights of what's going on.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, OK then it's easier for someone to look in.

**Speaker 2**  
Yes.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. Yeah, it makes sense. And then moving to the next perspective on the evaluation, when you read the documentation. Did you find it easy to understand? Did you have any problems to understand how to install, what are the functionalities, how to operate them? How was your experience reading the documentation of the bot?

**Speaker 2**  
I think it was quite simple. The only thing is that you have to have a programmer background. That means developers will understand very easily the documentation, what to do, how to do it, etc. Non-technical PM would probably not.

**Speaker 1**  
Oh, I see. And do you see why this happens? Is it because of the phrasing of the explanation or because how the bot is built?

**Speaker 2**  
No, that's because of the people. My experience is: for programmers, developers it's easy. The documentation is clear, to the point, essential. Also the configuration files. For me it's easy reading, it's itself documentation. But for non-technical people or at least high level technical people, they will find it hard to understand and they will not understand why they should use it.

**Speaker 1**  
OK. That's interesting feedback. And do you see any action to mitigate this problem?

**Speaker 2**  
It's used by technical people and by programmers, yes. I think it's fine like this. It's only for programmers or technical people.

**Speaker 1**  
Yeah. But do you think if someone had to adopt this bot, does this decision also go through non-technical people, or do you think developers could use it without consulting non-technical people?

**Speaker 2**  
Well, you need to split in two categories. There is demand coming from dev people, which is bottom up. They will raise at some point: I saw this bot, it's very useful, this is how it works, and they will tell this to their PM, team leads, product manager, whoever. Developers need to clarify the intention of the bot and sell the bot to the product managers. Otherwise the product manager will not easily understand the bot. They will say ohh it's a classification bot, it's easy, we already have in place everything.

**Speaker 1**  
Yes. Ohh I see. That makes completely sense. Our target in this case.

**Speaker 2**  
My demand is bottom up instead of top down. The birth of the bot will come from devs, only from them.

**Speaker 1**  
Perfect. So that's a good thing to check or to bear in mind that our target is devs in this case, because this kind of demand will come from them. That's great.

**Speaker 1**  
And then another thing about documentation, do you think it would be easy to remember how to use the bot? I know that sometimes people tend to keep the documentation at hand when they need it, but sometimes just remembering how to use may speed up the usage. Do you think the documentation and functionalities of the bot are easy to remember without documentation?

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, absolutely. All the parameters and commands are quite easy to remember.

**Speaker 1**  
OK, that's good. And just another question about usefulness. Do you think there is any context in which the bot is not useful?

**Speaker 2**  
Yeah, I would say probably on a very small dev teams. Like two people, two colleagues working on the same repo. I think there must be a team of at least more than five people. The bigger the team, the more useful the bot. But also with some limitation: if you have a team of 25 people committing and pushing code, I would not rely only on auto label because I would probably spend most of the time changing labels. The bot meant something else.

**Speaker 1**  
OK so.

**Speaker 2**  
I think the crucial factor is the size of the team using the bot.

**Speaker 1**  
Perfect. That makes sense, because then we have a sweet spot where the bot helps to manage, but you can still keep the labels coherent and concise among all the people in the team. I think that's the takeaway, right?

**Speaker 2**  
Yes.

**Speaker 1**  
Perfect. And then the final question would be, do you need any feature on the bot?

**Speaker 2**  
Yes, I think something is missing. As you already have the auto label that can understand which label to use, I would probably integrate with some compiler thing to suggest what could be the right thing to do. As you have read and write permission to the repo, I'm not saying that you should write the code and fix it, but you should probably suggest something within the code itself. My background is in Java, so I would say like you could probably comment on the code and say hey you should do this and fix this.

**Speaker 1**  
I see.

**Speaker 2**  
That's what the compiler will generate for you.

**Speaker 1**  
That's a very nice suggestion, and usually people do not put code snippet on issues to be revised, but things we have in mind for example is having issue template where you can specify the code or at least the files you are mentioning on that issue. How is your perception about using this type of template?

**Speaker 2**  
If you are a software house, you are a vendor, you need to have a standardized template. You cannot permit your developers to open an issue with just text. There must be steps, how to replicate, what kind of test you did, what was the expectation and so on. So if you see many times on GitHub, when you open an issue on some open source project that is supported by a vendor, all the issues have a specific template which is very strict and very long. That will help you identify properly and save you time, otherwise you will have plenty of issues with just “it doesn't work” without additional information.

**Speaker 1**  
That makes completely sense. So using this type of strict template is something that contributors to bigger projects are used to.

**Speaker 2**  
Great.

**Speaker 1**  
Yeah, that's great. OK, <omitted>, I think that was it. The idea with copilot was quite interesting, something that to be fairly honest, we didn’t think about. And we will definitely take this to the table to discuss how to proceed. Thanks again for your support. I will transcribe the interviews, analyze the data, and write a paper. I should have the paper by the end of the year, hopefully, and then I can definitely share the results with you. You can also get insights from other people, what they said, what they discussed about the bot, and this might help. I will share with you when I have it.

**Speaker 2**  
Yes. Please.

**Speaker 1**  
Yes, and the same thing about the other survey you answered. We just finished the manuscript, I think I will submit it this week and then I can also share with you and you can have a look of what we found from that one, which the results are quite interesting.