# Meeting Summary

Okay, here is the structured summary of the technical meeting based on the provided transcript, broken down into logical discussion blocks.

**Block 1: Data Field Naming & Consistency (Approx. 00:00 - 01:30)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Data Field Naming (“Data SK” / “Set activity”) from MyProject Source
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Client (Speaker A) questioned the meaning and origin of the field “Data SK”. ([00:02])
   * Client noted inconsistency in field naming conventions (e.g., “kod S-A” with lowercase ‘a’ vs. a separate column “nama penuh, set activity”). ([00:40-00:46])
   * Client suggested a more consistent naming like “Kod set activity” using proper capitalization. ([00:46-00:56])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Vendor (Speaker A/B team) to investigate and correct the field name “Set activity” which reverted to a default name after data migration (MySQL to Vertica). ([01:04-01:17])
   * Vendor/Team to standardize the naming of related code/description fields for consistency. ([01:17-01:20])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Clarification: “SK” / “Set activity” originates from the MyProject data source provided by the vendor/MyProject team. ([00:13-00:18])
   * Clarification: Only data columns present in the source data (MyProject) are available in the dashboard unless transformation occurs. ([00:36-00:40])
   * Clarification: The specific naming inconsistency mentioned was caused by a data migration process that reset the field name. ([01:04-01:13])

**Block 2: Dashboard - Project Information & Cost Ceiling Analysis (Approx. 01:30 - 05:10)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Dashboard - Project Information Module & Analysis of Cost Ceiling Changes
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * The dashboard should significantly aid in the initial review process for audit topic selection (~50% workload reduction). ([01:43-01:58])
   * The dashboard needs to display projects that have undergone changes in their cost ceiling. ([03:22-03:32], [04:06-04:10])
   * Require the calculation and display of the *percentage* change in the cost ceiling for these projects. ([04:04-04:06], [04:16-04:20])
   * Need the ability to sort or filter projects based on this percentage change (e.g., ascending/descending) to easily identify high-risk/significant changes. ([04:26-04:35], [04:49-04:57])
   * The display should clearly show original vs. revised cost ceiling values. ([03:55-04:04])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Vendor to add a calculation for the percentage of cost ceiling change. ([04:23-04:28])
   * Vendor to implement sorting functionality based on the percentage change. ([04:28-04:33], [04:54-04:57])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Clarification: The count ‘157’ refers to the number of projects showing *any* difference in cost ceiling based on the current filter (Kementerian Belia dan Sukan). ([03:32-03:36], [04:10-04:12])
   * Assumption: High percentage changes in cost ceiling are potential audit red flags (“trigger situ”). ([04:12-04:22], [04:57-05:00])
   * Data Source: Cost ceiling data is sourced from MyProject. ([03:45-03:50])
   * Presentation: Current view showing only the count is insufficient for presentation; percentage and sorting are needed. ([03:38-03:40])

**Block 3: Dashboard - Project Status / Account Closure (Approx. 05:15 - 06:45)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Dashboard - Displaying Projects with Open Accounts After Completion
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Need to identify projects that are completed (“siap”) but their financial accounts are not yet finalized (“belum dimuktamadkan”). ([05:20-05:23], [05:44-05:46])
   * Refine the terminology for this indicator for clarity. Suggested: “Akaun muktamad belum disediakan” (Final account not yet prepared). ([05:23-06:18], [06:21-06:23], [06:32-06:39])
   * The display should link the project status (completed) with its account finalization status. ([05:55-06:00])
   * Need visibility of the project’s RMK (Malaysia Plan) period. ([06:00-06:03], [06:21-06:23])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Vendor to update the title/label for this dashboard element to the agreed, clearer terminology (“Akaun muktamad belum disediakan”). ([06:18-06:23], [06:36-06:40])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Clarification: The focus is specifically on projects physically completed but awaiting financial finalization/closure. ([06:07-06:11], [06:15-06:18])
   * Terminology Agreement: Consensus reached on using phrasing related to “final account not yet prepared”. ([06:21-06:23], [06:32-06:39])

**Block 4: Data Comparison - MyProject vs. GS Mas (Approx. 08:00 - 11:20)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Dashboard - Comparing Expenditure Data: MyProject vs. GS Mas (Accrual & Cash)
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Dashboard should display side-by-side comparison of project expenditure: MyProject data vs. GS Mas Accrual data vs. GS Mas Cash data. ([08:14-08:39])
   * Users require the ability to filter this comparison view by specific project. ([09:08-09:14])
   * The intent is to identify differences between these data sources. ([09:23-09:27])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * (Implied) Re-evaluate the utility and presentation of this specific comparison for performance audit purposes.
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Clarification: Difference between GS Mas Accrual and Cash indicates payments still outstanding (tanggungan). ([09:41-10:00])
   * Clarification: Differences between MyProject and GS Mas are mainly attributed to accounting system variations and delays in MyProject updates, not necessarily performance failure. ([10:16-10:22], [10:44-10:48])
   * Concern/Disagreement: The value of this comparison for *performance audit* objectives (beyond checking payment status) is questioned. It may be more relevant for financial reconciliation. ([10:22-10:28], [10:40-10:44], [11:06-11:11])

**Block 5: Dashboard Philosophy & Navigation - LOI Focus (Approx. 11:20 - 18:05)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Overall Dashboard Design Philosophy, Navigation, and Focus on LOI (Lines of Inquiry)
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * The primary navigation/entry point for the dashboard should be based on “LOI” (Lines of Inquiry / Key Issues / Audit Risks), rather than starting with Ministry selection. ([11:49-12:05], [13:40-14:10], [17:21-17:47], [27:45-27:50], [28:04-28:15])
   * Users want to select an LOI (e.g., “Projek Sakit” / Sick Projects, Cost Overruns) and then see the relevant projects, ministries, funding details etc., filtered by that issue. ([12:02-12:05], [14:02-14:10], [17:41-17:47], [18:16-18:27])
   * The main dashboard page should prominently display key LOIs, possibly prioritized by significance or risk level. ([11:49-12:02], [12:49-12:51], [18:02-18:04])
   * Dashboard should directly support a risk-based audit approach. ([13:40-13:51], [17:36-17:39], [18:55-19:06])
   * Information presentation should be clear, simple, and provide essential information upfront. ([12:45-12:49])
   * Key indicators like spending vs. allocation must remain visible/accessible. ([13:02-13:06])
   * Need to refine the wording/phrasing of LOIs for clarity and accuracy. ([18:43-18:48])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Vendor/Development Team: Restructure the main dashboard layout and navigation to be LOI-centric. ([12:40-12:45], [30:02-30:03], [30:09-30:16])
   * Client (Management/SMEs): Define, finalize, and prioritize the list of critical LOIs to be featured on the main dashboard. ([11:28-11:33], [16:43-16:53], [28:33-28:38], [29:26-29:30], [30:03-30:09])
   * Client/Vendor: Review and refine the specific wording for each LOI displayed. ([18:43-18:48], [29:57-29:59])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Potential Misalignment: A gap identified between the current dashboard design (developed with SME input over months) and the management’s requirement for an LOI-first approach. ([14:15-14:38], [16:02-16:21]) Need to synchronize expectations.
   * Scope: Dashboard should not just replicate MyProject; it must be an analytical tool focused on audit risks/issues. ([17:50-17:53])
   * Existing LOIs: Around 17 LOIs are currently implemented across modules, forming a basis for the prioritized list. ([16:25-16:43]) Need review for significance. ([18:35-18:43])
   * Risk-Based Approach: The LOI-centric design aligns with the client’s move towards risk-based auditing. ([18:55-19:06])

**Block 6: Data Source Reliability & Validation (Approx. 20:45 - 26:15)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Data Reliability, Synchronization Issues (MyProject vs. IF Mass/GS Mas), and Validation Needs
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Requires reliable and up-to-date financial data for audit execution. ([21:33-21:37], [24:43-24:57])
   * Ability to compare MyProject data against the authoritative financial source (IF Mass/GS Mas) within the dashboard is desired. ([23:03-23:13], [24:18-24:29], [26:04-26:09])
   * Auditors must be able to validate dashboard data against source documents/systems. ([25:42-25:45], [25:54-26:02])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Client (Management/PICs): Take action to improve the timeliness and accuracy of MyProject data updates by ministry PICs. ([22:42-22:51], [24:29-24:36])
   * Vendor: Investigate displaying MyProject and IF Mass financial data side-by-side, potentially highlighting differences, ensuring data periods align. ([23:03-23:16], [24:00-24:18], [26:04-26:09])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Critical Issue: MyProject data (used for performance dashboard) is NOT synchronized with the official financial system (IF Mass/GS Mas) and relies on potentially outdated manual updates by ministry PICs. ([21:05-21:33], [22:01-22:12], [22:29-22:36])
   * Authoritative Source: IF Mass/GS Mas is the definitive source for financial/payment data. ([21:33-21:37], [21:47-21:55])
   * MyProject Role Clarified: Primarily for high-level overview and initial topic selection, not reliable for detailed financial verification during audit execution. ([21:37-21:47], [22:12-22:27])
   * Validation Imperative: Auditors cannot solely rely on dashboard figures; independent validation against primary sources is mandatory, even if IF Mass data is pulled into the dashboard. ([25:42-25:45], [25:54-26:02])
   * Data Lag: Need to ensure comparable time periods when displaying data from different sources (MyProject vs. IF Mass). ([23:16-23:30])

**Block 7: ICT Project Module & Sentiment Analysis Module (Approx. 32:00 - 43:50)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:**
   * Dashboard Module: ICT Project Information
   * Dashboard Module: Sentiment Analysis
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * **ICT Module:** Display ICT project details (approval, allocation, components, cost, quantity), allow drill-down, filter by ministry. ([32:32-33:47])
   * **Sentiment Analysis Module:**
     + Analyze news articles for sentiment (Pos/Neg/Neu) related to keywords. ([35:00-35:12], [35:53-35:57])
     + Track keyword frequency/trends in media over time. ([37:47-38:14], [41:12-41:23])
     + Purpose: Support audit topic selection by assessing “Impact” and “Visibility”. ([36:15-36:44], [38:14-38:17])
     + Enhancement: Incorporate more reliable sources: Hansard (Parliament/DUN proceedings) and official directives/circulars. ([40:01-40:32], [41:06-41:12], [41:48-42:07])
     + Enhancement: Rename module to reflect purpose (e.g., “Impact/Visibility Analysis”). ([37:02-37:09], [43:34-43:42])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * **Sentiment Analysis:**
     + Vendor to rename the module appropriately. ([37:02-37:09], [43:34-43:42])
     + Vendor/Team to investigate adding Hansard/official documents as data sources (consider technical limits). ([40:18-40:26], [42:14-42:26])
     + Client/SMEs prioritize data sources (Hansard > Directives > Media). ([41:48-42:14])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * **ICT Module:**
     + Data Source: Comes from “Profit” system (Ministry of Digital), a third distinct source. ([34:34-34:48])
     + Scope: Covers both development and operational ICT spending (e.g., rentals). ([33:50-34:33])
   * **Sentiment Analysis Module:**
     + Purpose Clarified: For *topic selection* based on visibility/impact, NOT operational monitoring. ([36:41-36:53], [41:28-41:34])
     + Data Reliability: News articles are less reliable than Hansard/official documents. ([40:26-40:38])
     + Technical Limitation: Potential issues processing Hansard due to language/format. ([42:14-42:26])
     + Sentiment Value (Pos/Neg/Neu): Kept for now, as it helps identify high-impact (often negative) issues for targeting. ([42:52-43:14])

**Block 8: Ad Hoc Dashboard - Fisheries Case Study & Platform Capabilities (Approx. 43:50 - 61:30)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Fisheries Food Security Dashboard (Ad Hoc Analysis Example) & Platform Use for Presentation/Monitoring
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Platform should support ad-hoc analyses for specific audits using uploaded data. ([44:20-44:33], [51:18-51:30])
   * Platform should be usable for presenting audit findings interactively (linking slides to live dashboard views). ([56:35-57:24], [58:02-58:36])
   * Need a policy decision on whether to continuously update data for completed audits for monitoring purposes. ([59:37-60:05], [60:20-60:26])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Audit Team (Speaker A/Client): Provide accurate, finalized audit finding data for the Fisheries dashboard to enhance its value as a demo/presentation tool. ([57:42-58:02])
   * Client (Management): Decide on and establish a policy for continuous data updates and monitoring of findings post-audit reporting (e.g., until issues resolved). ([60:42-61:26])
   * Vendor/Team: Consider structuring ad-hoc dashboards around the identified LOIs of that specific audit. ([54:43-54:52])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Fisheries Dashboard: An example of an ad-hoc analysis built by the team/vendor using specific data uploads (DOF, LKIM), demonstrating platform flexibility beyond pre-defined modules. ([44:20-44:33], [49:14-49:25])
   * Data Lifecycle: Ad-hoc data is typically static (point-in-time snapshot) unless continuous monitoring is explicitly required and resourced. ([59:37-59:52], [60:05-60:10])
   * Continuous Monitoring: Requires ongoing effort from audit teams to collect and feed data; needs clear policy and justification. ([60:20-60:28], [60:51-60:58])
   * Presentation Value: Confirmed as a key benefit – using interactive dashboards for briefings. ([57:11-57:24], [58:27-58:36])

**Block 9: Scoring Matrix for Topic Selection & Wrap-up (Approx. 61:30 - End)**

1. **Topic / Feature Discussed:** Scoring Matrix for Audit Topic Selection & Final Meeting Wrap-up
2. **Client Requirements:**
   * Implement a scoring matrix feature to rank potential audit topics based on 7 criteria (partially quantitative, partially qualitative). ([64:25-64:51], [65:08-65:16])
   * Integrate the quantitative scoring (from this platform) with qualitative inputs/professional judgment (handled via e-Audit). ([65:55-66:20])
   * Requires technical integration between this platform (JIA?) and e-Audit. ([66:20-66:43])
   * Need standardized terminology across all dashboards. ([67:57-68:01])
   * Need updated/confirmed list of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for consultation. ([68:06-68:35])
   * Overall dashboard improvements based on discussions (LOI focus, layout, terminology). ([61:26-61:41], [67:48-67:56])
3. **To-Do List / Action Items:**
   * Vendor/Team: Continue developing the Scoring Matrix, focusing on integration with qualitative inputs and e-Audit. ([65:25-65:37], [66:40-66:43])
   * Client (Management): Officially appoint/confirm SMEs (Puan Jamiah confirmed as key contact). ([68:18-68:35], [68:59-69:16])
   * Vendor/Team & Client SMEs: Review and standardize terminology used throughout the dashboards. ([67:57-68:01])
   * Vendor/Team: Implement the agreed dashboard structural and content refinements (LOI-centric navigation, etc.). ([61:28-61:41], [67:48-67:56])
   * SMEs (Puan Jamiah et al.): Follow up on action items and monitor progress. ([61:47-62:00], [68:59-69:16])
4. **Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**
   * Scoring Basis: Uses criteria from “GP Prestasi”. ([65:55-66:00])
   * Integration Plan: Quantitative score here, qualitative judgment & final score in e-Audit. ([66:00-66:20])
   * Status: Scoring Matrix is currently incomplete (5/7 criteria shown); e-Audit integration is pending. ([65:16-65:25], [65:41-65:42])
   * Overall Feedback: Client acknowledges the core value and functionality but emphasizes the need for restructuring (LOI focus) and refinement (terminology, presentation) for optimal usability. ([61:26-61:41], [67:41-67:42], [68:54-68:59])