**From:** Rounak Nayak

Hi All,

Thank You Ramesh for Your Comments.

+ Looping in Sanjay and Sudheer

***Key Minutes of the Meeting for Registration Processor Demo***

**Date:** 24th Jan 2018

**Participants**

Ramesh, Anadi, Krishnan, Hemant, Jane, Resham, Shravan, Hareesh, Sudheer, Mono, Sanjay, Gita, Romila, Lingam, Satish, Registration Processor Dev Team, Rounak

**Action Items**

1. *CNIE/EC Integration*

            - Creation of Dummy CNIE/EC Integration Stage using Camel - *Sanjay/Mono*

2. *Camel Bridge Configuration*

            - Add a Stage which takes HTTP End Point instead of Vertex in Camel          - *Sanjay/Mono*

            - Testing Camel Bridge Orchestration           - *Lingam/Satish*

3. *Manual Verification Stage*

            - Make Manual Verification Stage Pluggable for Demo-Dedupe and Bio-Dedupe.       - *Sanjay/Mono*

            - Make Changes to Status Code used for Manual Verification     - *Sanjay/Mono*

                        i.e. Manual Verification Approve/Manual Verification Reject

            - Store Scores of Manual Verification in Status Comment/In Manual Verification Table        - *Sanjay/Mono*

4. *Demographic Deduplication Algorithm*:

* + 1. Current implementation will consider: Name, Gender and DoB only. If other parameters need to be included (EG: CNIE Number), the SI needs to make necessary changes.

5. *Registration Transaction/Registration Table*

            - Store Current Status in Registration Table - *Sanjay/Mono*

            - Store Intermediate Status like On Hold for Manual Verification when Packet is In Manual Verification - *Sanjay/Mono*

6. *Handling System Failure*

            - Strategy for Re-processing of Packets if a Vertical goes Down - *Sanjay/Shravan*

            - Testing Strategy to Test System Failure Scenario - *Gita/Lingam/Satish*

7. *Config Manager*

            - Perform Impact Analysis for Changes in Configuration in Middle of Deployment - *Sanjay/Mono*

8. *Dockerization of Database*

            - Identify ways to Dockerize Database for MOSIP - *Shravan/Nasir*

9. *Printing and Postal Queue*

            - Come with an Architectural design for Printing and Postal Queue - *Shravan/Ramesh/Sanjay*

10. *Email ID for testing*

            - Need an Email ID for testing (receiving email id for a Registration)   - *Krishnan*

11. *Documentation for Template*

            - Documentation in ReadMe File for Adding Attributes in Notification Template - *Mono*

12. *Testing*

            - Manual Testing Needs to be Automated - *Gita/Lingam/Satish*

1. *Document Exception to be included in backlog for v2*:

* Allow Registration Officer to mark an exception, if one/more mandatory documents are not available, which needs SPVR authentication (Like Biometrics Exception)

Kindly add on/update comments as required.

Thanks and Regards,

Rounak Nayak

Business Analyst

**From:** Ramesh Narayanan

Hi All,

It was very good to see the ID issue process happening through the registration processor using a packet received from the registration client.

here are my observations from my side. Hope these can be combined with some minutes from your side.

1. Manual intervention stages for CNIE mismatch and biometric dedupe are typically integration points. We should put placeholder stage in place and have a stubbed out implementation, where integration code can come in later.

2. Dedupe schema was to be separated as per discussion with Sanjay, as it seemed like demo depue could become something that could be an external service or a module of its own. We can take an action item to clarify and close this out.

3. Dummy ABIS - would like to see what has been implemented.

4. We discussed some additional fields for Status table as needed, which could contain structured information. Would like to look at this as well the additional stage related tables per that are being used.

5. The registration status table did not show the current stage where the process is in. This needs to be addressed.

6. What are the signals that Kubernetes can use to scale a stage? Is is limited to Linux load factors or can the pending pipeline size be used to determine the scale too?

7. Throttling was discussed, and a potential mechanism identified. What are the next steps?

8. The resilience of the registration processor was not clearly established. While we know that the current tool-set we are using can help us achieve this, I would like to see some pointed input on how we are ensuring that the system survives failure /restart of individual stages, camel orchestrator and both.

9. Impact of config changes and ensuring that the system can handle bad config gracefully needs to be done. Please look at the configuration entries and classify them based on their impact. Some of then can be hot swapped, while others might need to deal with data consistency, process consistency and version consistency challenges.

10. Whiteboard session to be done on HTTP stage in registration processor.

11. Testing team to identify and own testing artifacts that can be used to automate testing.

12. Test scenarios and coverage was well thought out. These scenarios need to be automated.

13. All stages have to be implemented at least as a stub so that the camel flow can be frozen for morocco and be tested.

I thank everybody for the time spent on this demo. It has given plenty of confidence and comfort. We still have a way to go hope we can gain momentum.

Krishnan / Anadi,

Please enrich this from your notes.

Regards,

Ramesh