**Segment 1: Rules, Models, Documentation & Scope (Approx. 00:00 - 03:10)**

**1. Topic / Feature Discussed:** Rules Engine, Data Models, Documentation (SRS/SDS/User Manual), Project Scope (1.0 vs 2.0)

**2. Client Requirements:**\* System needs to define packages, data elements, and configure schemas [00:01-00:07].  
\* System requires configuration of simple rules (e.g., age groups, yellow fever country list) [00:07-00:14].  
\* Rules should be applicable based on categories: Foreigner, Local, Organization [00:14-00:31].  
\* Rule sets will combine individual rule schemas [00:31-00:40].  
\* Complex business rules need definition (to be detailed in SPD) [00:40-00:47].  
\* The number of models required depends on the scope and use case analysis; reuse of models across use cases is possible [00:53-01:15].  
\* Version 1.0 scope was mentioned as potentially having 6 models; the current scope (2.0) is aiming for 3-4, but the full requirement might be 6 [00:53-01:08].  
\* Models must meet the business requirements [01:15-01:16].  
\* SRS document structure is confirmed (not Microsoft Word format) [01:48-01:51].  
\* SRS covers initial requirements; SDS will expand on these [01:57-02:04].  
\* User Manual will be the final document defining models and their variables [02:14-02:24].  
\* The final number of models will be confirmed in the User Manual [02:24-02:27].  
\* Need to study all use cases to determine final model requirements and potential reuse [03:08-03:10].

**3. To-Do List / Action Items:**\* Speaker A: Define complex business rules in the SPD [00:44-00:47].  
\* Team: Review specific scenarios (e.g., foreigner as employer) one by one [01:27-01:35].  
\* Team: Update models as requirements become clearer [01:38-01:42].  
\* Team: Confirm structure for SRS document [01:48-01:50].  
\* Team: Expand requirements in SDS based on SRS [02:04-02:14].  
\* Team: Develop User Manual to finalize model details [02:14-02:24].  
\* Speaker A: Provide metrics for module touchpoints, requirements, and risks [02:48-02:54].  
\* Team: Study all use cases to define rulesets and model reuse [03:08-03:10].

**4. Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**\* **Assumption:** Due to lack of data and developed models at the SDS stage, the SDS will contain assumptions based on current understanding [02:04-02:18].  
\* **Clarification:** The User Manual is the definitive source for finalized model specifications [02:14-02:27].  
\* **Clarification:** The exact number of models is currently an estimate and subject to change based on use case analysis [02:36-02:46].  
\* **Clarification:** Scope document does not explicitly state the number of models required [03:10-03:17].

**Segment 2: Model Maintenance, Use Case Merging, Scoring & Weightage (Approx. 03:10 - 12:19)**

**1. Topic / Feature Discussed:** Model Maintenance, Use Case Combination, Scoring Logic (Hard vs. Probability), Weightage Configuration

**2. Client Requirements:**\* Scoring for RE (Risk Engine?) has three parts: Business Rule, Model (reusing old use case), Model [03:51-03:59].  
\* Model maintenance process: If changes occur, study impact -> outcome is either update existing model or build a new one [03:59-04:16].  
\* Requirement to potentially combine processes/use cases (e.g., 5.1, 5.2, 5.3) if underlying steps are similar (like receiving reports, creating/maintaining folders) [04:16-04:38].  
\* The combined process involves: receive report -> analysis -> report generation -> approval -> maintain/create folder [04:43-05:01].  
\* Scoring needs to handle both real-time and batch requests [05:39-05:42, 09:31-09:40].  
\* Business rules are used to differentiate scoring application even if models/processes are combined [10:23-10:35].  
\* Business rules apply across 6 categories: foreigner, local, organization, sea, land, air [10:40-11:01].  
\* Need a mechanism to apply weightage between business rule scores and model scores [11:46-11:57].  
\* Scoring system must distinguish between:  
\* Hard/Fast rules (definite outcome, e.g., 'pen' action, may not need a score) [12:19-13:39, 14:26-15:03].  
\* Probability-based scoring (likelihood of an event, requires score calculation, may lead to investigation) [12:19-13:39, 14:26-15:03].  
\* Probabilistic scoring component requires configuration (human-defined initially) and potentially a machine learning component [15:07-15:27].

**3. To-Do List / Action Items:**\* Speaker A: Combine related processes/use cases (e.g., 5.1, 5.2, 5.3) and document the flow [04:16-04:27, 04:52-05:01].  
\* Speaker B: Add a 'notes' column to track combined use cases/items [05:12-05:17].  
\* Speaker A: Add the combination note requested by Speaker B [05:17-05:19].  
\* Team: Define differentiation for scoring methods (likely in SDS based on business rules) [10:19-10:35].  
\* Team: Finalize the grouping/application of the 6 business rule categories in SDS [11:08-11:16].  
\* Speaker A (or Wilson): Explain the proposed weightage configuration mechanism [12:00-12:18].  
\* Team: Plan the implementation details for weightage configuration [16:07-16:24].

**4. Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**\* **Clarification:** Combining use cases (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) is intended for version 2.0, based on process similarity [04:21-04:41].  
\* **Clarification:** Use cases were previously split (in 1.0?) due to differences in scoring methods and data information/configuration [05:52-06:00, 10:02-10:08].  
\* **Clarification:** The 6 rule categories (foreigner, local, etc.) are combined logic-wise, but real-time vs. batch processing remains distinct [11:31-11:39].  
\* **Clarification:** Weightage between business rules and models is a new requirement not present in 1.0 [11:39-11:46, 12:07-12:09].  
\* **Clarification:** Hard/fast rules (e.g., based on origin like Israel) result in direct action, while probabilistic scores (e.g., based on age, country like Myanmar, gender) indicate likelihood and may trigger investigation [12:19-15:03].  
\* **Clarification:** Two distinct scoring parts for probabilistic scoring: Human Configured and Machine Learning [15:07-15:27].

**Segment 3: Scoring Configuration, Release Scope, Investigation Tool & Case Management (Approx. 15:37 - 24:41)**

**1. Topic / Feature Discussed:** Scoring Config (Human vs. ML), Release Planning, Investigation Functionality, Case Creation/Management, Eagle Eye Module, Reporting Integration, Access Control (IDM/RE)

**2. Client Requirements:**\* "Absolute" scores (likely hard/fast rules) must be human-configured [15:49-15:54].  
\* Weightage configuration applies between business rules and models [15:57-16:01].  
\* Probabilistic scoring involves both human configuration and a machine learning component [16:07-16:25].  
\* Weightage between human config and ML components may evolve, with ML gaining importance over time [16:25-16:45].  
\* Human configuration part requires maintenance/reconfiguration over time [16:56-17:03].  
\* Machine Learning aspect is part of the combined scoring system, not necessarily a separate use case [17:03-17:14].  
\* Investigation functionality is NOT required for the current release (Release 1?) but analysis IS [18:16-18:23].  
\* Release 3 scope currently shows no functional changes from the new solution, only potential tool differences [18:34-18:43].  
\* Investigation tool should be accessible, but access needs control (only relevant personnel) [19:32-19:55].  
\* Investigation tool needs to handle non-PNR data (with ID) and PNR data (without ID) [19:55-20:01].  
\* Investigation tool needs comparison between 1.0 and 2.0 to identify additions/removals [20:18-20:28].  
\* Investigation Tool (UC) is applicable for version 2.0 [20:31-20:36].  
\* Investigation tool functions: Create case based on existing data (from Case Mgmt/Enforcement) OR create a new case from scratch [20:39-21:05].  
\* Eagle Eye module supports standalone case management and cases sourced from other modules [21:13-21:20].  
\* Need to send investigation reports (potentially from Eagle Eye) back to the originating module/case management system [21:57-22:15].  
\* Requirement to send reports directly (e.g., on click as PDF) instead of download/upload process used previously [22:33-22:55].  
\* Reports sent should not change information in the target system (e.g., NIES) [22:47-22:51].  
\* Eagle Eye takes data from Enforcement module (case management) [23:05-23:14].  
\* Need to associate Eagle Eye analysis/visualizations with a Case ID in the source module (e.g., Enforcement) [23:21-23:30].  
\* Access to linked Eagle Eye reports from Case Management should consider user permissions for both systems [23:33-23:44].  
\* Need direct sending of Eagle Eye reports to the associated case (currently unsure if possible) [24:06-24:11].  
\* Worst-case scenario: Manual generation and upload of reports is acceptable if direct sending fails [24:37-24:41].

**3. To-Do List / Action Items:**\* Team: Plan the evolution of weightage between human config and ML scoring [16:25-16:45].  
\* Speaker B: Provide details for the proposed Scoring Configuration Use Case (ID, function, breakdown) [17:23-17:44].  
\* Speaker A: Prepare the Scoring Configuration UC details [17:52-17:58].  
\* Team: Detail out access control for the investigation tool [19:32-19:55].  
\* Team: Compare Investigation Tool functionality between 1.0 and 2.0/new solution to identify changes [20:18-20:31].  
\* Team: Resolve the issue of report integration (API vs. download/upload) [21:51-22:15].  
\* Team: Confirm if direct report sending (PDF) from Eagle Eye to Case Management is feasible [24:06-24:11].

**4. Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**\* **Clarification:** Machine learning is primarily for *creating* the model; weightage discussion is about *using* the model vs. business rules [17:14-17:23].  
\* **Clarification:** Investigation function is out of scope for the immediate release, but Analysis is in scope [18:16-18:22].  
\* **Clarification:** PNR data lacks an ID, differentiating it from other data sources used in investigation [19:55-20:01].  
\* **Assumption:** The previous method of report transfer involved download and upload [22:33-22:42, 23:56-24:01].  
\* **Clarification:** Accessing linked content (e.g., Eagle Eye report from Case Mgmt) depends on the user having permissions in *both* systems [23:33-23:44].  
\* **Clarification:** Eagle Eye needs to be accessible within NIES, requiring a Case ID link [24:27-24:34].

**Segment 4: Access Control, Enforcement, Free Text, AI, Feature Comparison, Dashboards & Reporting (Approx. 24:45 - 44:45)**

**1. Topic / Feature Discussed:** Access Control (IDM vs RE), Eagle Eye Scope & Restrictions, Enforcement Soft Tool, Free Text Handling, AI Assistant, VI Module Scope, Documentation Status, Dashboards, Reporting Details.

**2. Client Requirements:**\* Access rights (permissions) are determined via ID Management for supervisors/bosses [25:08-25:18].  
\* ID Management defines user roles and access levels for functionalities like review/assign [25:18-25:41].  
\* Access depends on context and who the administrator is (potentially different admins for Eagle Eye vs. core modules) [25:41-25:50].  
\* System relies on a central warehouse requiring access control, starting from first login via ID [25:52-26:01].  
\* Access rules are applied per user/role (e.g., IO Investigator role) [26:17-26:30].  
\* User permissions control which tasks can be performed and which folders/data are accessible [26:42-26:48].  
\* Eagle Eye is a separate application/module [26:49-26:50].  
\* Administrator functions for RE (Risk Engine?) are handled within RE, distinct from IDM (which is mainly for SSO) [26:54-27:15].  
\* Access rights (view, configure rules, etc.) are controlled within RE based on user roles defined there [27:15-27:29].  
\* Eagle Eye is expected to have many users, potentially more than core RE business modeling users [27:29-27:39].  
\* Current system (SAS?) restricts visibility; users cannot see others' work/visualizations, query only returns own cases [27:42-27:54, 28:48-29:05].  
\* Supervisor level access requires specific handling (e.g., IO sending IP to supervisor); IO cannot see other IPs [29:07-29:21].  
\* Linking between different cases is currently not allowed [30:04-30:06].  
\* Need to handle connections/integrations based on parameters like phone number, plate number (Enforcement Soft context) [30:14-30:29].  
\* System must handle data captured in free text format; requires a method to extract structured parameters (e.g., plate number from text for JPJ integration) [30:29-31:26].  
\* Access levels are functional (defining what users can do) [32:23-32:26].  
\* Templates for different areas (e.g., Integrity) need to be configurable, with pre-set templates provided and ability for government users to add more [32:44-33:08].  
\* Requirement for an AI Assistant feature (mentioned as 3.1?) allowing users to ask questions [33:55-34:02].  
\* VI module (Visual Investigator?) is not part of version 2.0 scope; previously included mobile apps and maybe on-site query [34:08-34:19].  
\* Core functions like Network Analysis and Case Management Query (including wildcard search for persons/attributes) are required [34:23-34:43].  
\* Eagle Eye is considered a new feature compared to 1.0 [34:43-34:46].  
\* Business Rule functionality needs to be explicitly included/documented for 2.0 (was missing in 1.0 docs) [35:06-35:15].  
\* VI module is planned for Release 3 [35:17-35:24].  
\* Current documentation is for URS 2.0 submission and may be incomplete regarding future releases (e.g., Release 3 IC model) [35:27-35:44, 38:01-38:35].  
\* Need to retain relevant use cases from 1.0 and identify/add new requirements for 2.0 [39:21-39:38].  
\* Dashboard functionality is required, using Install BI tools [40:08-40:16].  
\* Dashboard content needs definition; it should combine statistics and reports [40:27-41:10].  
\* Reports sent to Case Management require a defined template [41:43-41:54].  
\* Report format is likely PDF (similar to VI); need definition of components (data, charts) [42:05-42:34].  
\* Standard reports need clarification: single vs multiple templates, ability to filter components (e.g., visual only vs. full summary) when generating PDF [42:47-43:33].  
\* General reports need structure (defined sections like analysis, description, title) [42:36-42:43, 43:33-43:37].  
\* PIU (Passenger Information Unit?) users need to utilize Eagle Eye [44:20-44:28].

**3. To-Do List / Action Items:**\* Team: Define access control mechanisms clearly, distinguishing between IDM and RE roles/admins [26:54-27:29].  
\* Team: Clarify restrictions on case linking and supervisor access views [29:07-29:31, 30:04-30:06].  
\* Team: Define strategy for handling free text data extraction for integration (e.g., with JPJ) [30:56-31:26].  
\* Team: Confirm specific requirements for configurable templates (e.g., for Integrity) [32:44-33:08].  
\* Team: Detail the functionality of the AI Assistant [33:55-34:02].  
\* Speaker A/Team: Explicitly add Business Rule requirement to 2.0 documentation [35:13-35:15].  
\* Speaker B: Compile full requirements matrix across all releases (currently draft/incomplete) [35:31-35:44, 38:13-38:35].  
\* Team: Review 1.0 use cases for relevance to 2.0, identify and add new requirements [39:21-39:38].  
\* Team: Define specific dashboard content and value representation [40:47-41:10].  
\* Team: Define standard report templates for Eagle Eye, including components and filtering options [41:43-41:54, 42:43-43:33].  
\* Speaker B: Update requirements based on discussion and prepare for dashboard build [44:04-44:17].  
\* Team: Determine where PIU usage of Eagle Eye fits in the requirements/scope [44:20-44:37].

**4. Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**\* **Clarification:** Access control is multi-layered, involving IDM for identity/SSO and RE for application-specific roles and permissions [26:58-27:29].  
\* **Clarification:** Current system visibility is restricted per user; supervisors have broader access via specific procedures [27:42-29:21].  
\* **Clarification:** Linking between cases is explicitly disallowed currently [30:04-30:06].  
\* **Clarification:** Free text processing is a significant challenge requiring specific solutions (dictionary, parameter extraction) [30:29-31:12].  
\* **Assumption:** Requirements are generally the same across different sections/teams (e.g., Integrity), but templates may differ [32:41-32:57].  
\* **Clarification:** VI module is out of scope for 2.0, planned for Release 3 [34:08-34:10, 35:17-35:24].  
\* **Clarification:** Documentation provided (URS 2.0) is the current baseline, but acknowledged as potentially incomplete for future releases [35:24-35:44].  
\* **Clarification:** Dashboards are built new in 2.0; previous reports existed but weren't integrated into a dashboard view [40:36-41:10].

**Segment 5: PIU Needs, Data Access, Warehousing & Final Wrap-up (Approx. 44:45 - End)**

**1. Topic / Feature Discussed:** PIU Analysis Requirements & Tools, Data Access Scope & Control, Data Warehousing, Case Linking (Revisited), Meeting Logistics

**2. Client Requirements:**\* PIU needs to perform analysis (pattern, trend) on data they receive [44:45-44:52].  
\* PIU requires visualization tools for their analysis [44:54-45:11].  
\* PIU use case involves reporting on specific individuals based on their interactions (e.g., contact at OC) [45:31-45:37].  
\* PIU primarily deals with PNR data, limiting their analysis scope compared to Enforcement/Intel who have broader data access and network views [45:37-46:19].  
\* PIU needs the ability to create a new case (Case Management ID) based on findings from PNR data analysis (e.g., identifying unusual patterns) [46:22-46:38].  
\* Once a case ID is created by PIU, it might be referred to Enforcement/Intel, or PIU might conduct further investigation using available tools (like Eagle Eye, if provided) [46:38-46:50].  
\* PIU requires access to the appropriate tool (e.g., Eagle Eye in APS) if it's deemed necessary for their workflow [46:56-47:01].  
\* PIU workflow/use case is distinct from Enforcement/Intel [47:16-47:25].  
\* PIU operates outside the Enforcement/Perisikan environment, limiting their data access primarily to PNR-related information [48:26-48:49].  
\* Data access for users like PIU needs clear definition regarding scope (e.g., daily data vs. historical, core data access) and approval mechanisms [48:56-49:31].  
\* System potentially involves users (like PIU) having their own data warehouse instance [49:41-49:44].  
\* Data elements available in the warehouse are pre-defined; additions require a request process [49:44-49:52].  
\* Need controls to define who can access which data within the warehouse [49:52-50:10].  
\* Access to detailed data might require specific permissions checks [51:24-51:30].  
\* Need the ability to link related cases (e.g., between 'I' and 'BI' systems/modules), but direct viewing across classified boundaries is restricted; requires a request mechanism via Case ID [53:10-53:53].

**3. To-Do List / Action Items:**\* Team: Confirm provision and location (APS vs NICE) of visualization tools needed by PIU [44:54-45:24].  
\* Speaker A/Team: Resolve confusion regarding Eagle Eye provision in APS (stated as add-on, but not in docs); stick to documentation unless confirmed otherwise [46:56-47:45].  
\* Team: Define PIU's access rights clearly, considering their limited environment and reliance on PNR data [48:26-48:53].  
\* Team (Speaker C): Reconfirm/verify PIU's specific data access needs (scope, history, approval) [49:17-49:25].  
\* Team (Speaker C): Consult and confirm access control details for the data warehouse (who can access what data) [49:54-50:13].  
\* Team (Speaker C): Define the process for accessing detailed data and checking permissions [51:22-51:39].  
\* Team: Finalize the mechanism for requesting access to linked case details via Case ID due to restrictions [53:43-53:53].  
\* Team: Schedule follow-up meeting (5:30 next day) [54:20-54:31].

**4. Clarifications & Key Assumptions:**\* **Assumption:** PIU front-end function is similar to a call center focused on immediate decisions, while back-end (Enforcement/Intel) does in-depth analysis [45:37-45:58].  
\* **Clarification:** PIU's primary data source (PNR) makes their analysis potentially less complete than Enforcement/Intel [45:58-46:06].  
\* **Discrepancy:** Speaker A was told Eagle Eye/visualization is included in APS package today, but it contradicts earlier info and documentation. Needs verification [45:04-45:24, 46:56-47:13].  
\* **Clarification:** PIU's access is limited because they operate outside the main Enforcement/Intel data environment [48:26-48:49]. Access to data beyond PNR is questionable/requires approval [48:49-49:14].  
\* **Clarification:** The system likely uses separate modules/data access controls for different user groups [50:34-50:44].  
\* **Clarification:** Linking cases is desired (e.g., Plate Number expansion), but restricted. Request via Case ID is the proposed workaround [53:32-54:01].