XOserve

Communication Ref   : MP/1029/DJ
Subject   : Re: cor0962 - Consolidated Representation Response Matrix

Colleague,
Please find attached a copy of the consolidated Representation Response Matrix in respect of the Query and Workflow Management Project as discussed in yesterday's UK Link Committee.

Regards,
Debi Jones
Project Officer
xoserve Projects & Change Management
31, Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT.
0121 623 2332
debi.jones@xoserve.com

If you have any comments, concerns or issues with this email, please contact uklink@xoserve.com

P Save Paper – Do you really need to print this email?

UKLC_Conso...pdf (53.0 KB)

Query and Workflow Management Project UK Link Committee Consolidated Representation Responses

CB/943/DA – Actions and Discussions within the ConQuest External User Group

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
British Gas	David Watson	19/1/2010	n/a	-	• We are on IEv6.0. Cookies are not allowed	Thank you for your comments. xoserve provided an initial response via the CEUG forum on the 12 April advising that responses received indicating that comments from Users indicated that IE6 and above versions are used. It is mandated that Cookies is enabled to ensure that Users can use the system features.
EDF Energy	Sue Naden	26/1/2010	n/a	-	• Internet Explorer version 6 with no plans to change to version 7at this time. • Cookies are allowed but have to be pre-arranged. • The home workers log into the systems via VPN therefore will use the company IP address. • The suggestion that password resets are submitted via an email address is favourable.	Thank you for your comments. xoserve provided an initial response via the CEUG forum on the 12 April advising that comments from Users received indicate that IE6 and above versions are used. We will benchmark at IE6, and equivalent i.e. Fire Fox v3.x; Safari v4.x. It is mandated that Cookies is enabled to ensure that Users can use the system features. Users will be able to log into the system from any location. From the representations received, we did not see any benefits to restrict access via a secured link. Users will be prompted to make password changes via the system.

Query and Workflow Management Project UK Link Committee Consolidated Representation Responses

CB/947/DA – Amendment of Existing EFT Formats from Excel to XML or CSV

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
EDF Energy	Ashley Collins	08/03/10			Our preference would be to explore the ability to use the conquest system itself to raise bulk queries in the same way we can when raising single queries. At present our organisation carries out a mix of both single and bulk queries so having a standard process for all types makes sense going forward. This would also address your concerns regarding security more so than sending files electronically, and will also mean there is no need to process files into conquest when they reach you saving long term costs your end. If the above possibility isn't available then we would want to stay with CSV for the time being. We will need to create some new batching & validation processes in our file handler to pick these files up so there will be a cost for us to implement this type of change. This is on the assumption that the sheet continues to be used and creates a CSV file which will be picked up and sent via IX rather than attached to email	Thank you for your comments. As part of the Q system it is anticipated that there will be the capability to uploaded 'small' files (estimated at circa 100-200 records) via a bulk upload facility. xoserve provided an initial response via the CEUG forum on the 12 April advising that Interface files will be in csv format and the Q System will convert csv files to XML.
Scottish Southern	Martin Brandt	05/03/10			From the options you present SSE would want to retain CSV. However I don't know whether you have explored the option for the response to the query coming back 'within' Conquest. I have an internet bank account and if you have a query, you send it in when you are logged in and see the response when you log in next time.	Thank you for your comments. Per the response provided at the April CEUG we will retain the CSV file format and the Q system will make the conversion into XML. It is intended that when a user raises a contact upon closure of the contact they will be notified via email. Users will also be able to view responses within the UI.

CB/978/DA – COR962.1 – Q Project Implementation – M Number Creation (MNC) Process Format Change

Query and Workflow Management Project UK Link Committee Consolidated Representation Responses

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
EDF Energy	Ashley Collins	26/5/10	Reject	Yes	EDFE will support the QMP file as a generic record for all relevant contact types if issued via IX albeit with redundant fields identified and removed and new fields added subject to review. If the contact is raised via the web however for ease of use only the relevant fields should be visible for the user to populate. This could be introduced by means of a drop down for the contact code. The EFT will need to look at to see which category it fits in with, i.e. if multiple different contacts are added to the EFT form it may not be viable to reduce the fields dependant on contact type so all fields would need to be visible as per the IX QMP. We believe the EFT form should be updated by xoserve in line with any changes to file formats to ensure that any uploaded file will not fail validation. For ease of distribution that latest version could be published on the xoserve website for users to locate and download themselves meaning xoserve just notify the UK Link members of a new version. This could also be indicated within you online training guides. We noted your concerns regarding UK Link members supporting file changes with less than 6 months due to prior notices going through CEUG to develop the files, however we agree with Centrica in that without visibility of a final file type and its records you should record it as a risk to your implementation plan as some UK Link members may not be able to book in IT changes without knowing what they are actually changing up front regardless of a work in progress at CEUG. Moving forward we believe it would be beneficial to bottom out the changes to the QMP and other conquest files asap in order to meet with a 2010 rollout of phase 1.	Thank you for your comments. The proposed file format issued in the above communication will be amended following feedback from UK Link Members. We will revise the implementation summary to provide a generic record. Where the Q screens are used to raise the query only the relevant fields will be visible. The EFT template to which you refer is intended only to be a temporary measure to assist user transition to the new system – but your comments are noted regarding the functionality, and the longevity of this being available. We will consider these points as we progress through development. I note your comments regarding the timescales. I propose a wider discussion at the UKLink Committee.

CB/983/DA – COR962.3 – FLE –Process to Challenge UK Link File Outcomes

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
EDF Energy	Ashley Collins	17/06/10	Accept.	Y	EDFE support this proposal.	Thank you for your comments.

CB/992/DA – COR962.4 – ADD / UNC – Address Update Request

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
E.ON	Danielle King	21/07/10	Accept	Yes	E.ON accepts this change but we would also prefer to see the file formats showing the agreed 'proposed address' rather than 'alternative address'.	Thank you for your comments. We have had a number of suggestions for amending this field name. We plan to review the field names as part of review of the final file format, and will consider inclusion of your proposed names at this time.

CB/994/DA - COR962.6 - Proposed Removal of QEX file

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
British Gas	Graham Wood	23/07/10	Reject		Further to your communication re: the removal of the QEX file. I can confirm that teams within British Gas currently utilise the QEX report therefore we would not like to see the report withdrawn from the scope of the replacement system without suitable alternative arrangements being in place.	Thank you for your comments. We will develop a solution that maintains the QEX functionality.
Gazprom	Steve Mulinganie	21/07/10	Reject		Further to the issue highlighted at the recent operational meeting regarding the use of the .QEX file. Gazprom would like to confirm that we do utilise this report and would not wish to see its withdrawal. If an equivalent report were to be made available which could be run from the system on an adhoc basis we would of course be open to this solution.	Thank you for your comments. We will develop a solution that maintains the QEX functionality. We are not planning to provide a reporting interface with the initial delivery of the Q system, so we will retain the QEX in the existing format. Any records (whether raised by the web, web file or I'X) will be included within this report should they change status in the

						preceding week. This file will continue to be delivered by I'X.

CB/1007/DA – COR0962.7 - Q Communication for UK Link Committee

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
npower	Steph Shephard	23/09/10			If an email response is sent to a Shipper, and the email is not delivered, what action will be taken to deliver the response? Will Users will be able to search via the MPRN for the site, (or other site data, e.g. postcode) so if the email is not delivered, the response to the query will still be updated and available to view? Is the use of an email box account permissible, as this would generate a large number of queries/responses to one specific email address? We welcome the flexibility to be able to raise and receive queries via email; however this would potentially increase the time it takes us to complete our process and resolve queries. As such we favour the continued use of IX as a preference to email.	Thank you for your comments. It depends where the failure is. I assume that you refer to this being after us issuing the email – in such circumstances we would be unable to track successful delivery. Yes, Users will be able to use the Search facility provided in the Q system to view details for any contact that they have raised. We intend to register individual's email addresses against each user id. This will be used for provision of passwords and account administration. Where the information is raised by file, then an email address could be specified – this could be a box account. I would expect that we would put some validation to ensure that we have a valid email account provided (this would be valid by virtue of relating to a valid email for an account within xoserve's security layer). It is proposed that we remove the ability to raise queries by email – you would use the web interface to load an individual contact, or

						use the web interface to load a file of 100-200 records. Otherwise this would need to be raised via I'X. Noted.

MP/1018/DJ – COR962.8 - DUP - Duplicate Contact UKL Committee Representation

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments
						No comments were received during the representation window.

LJ/1021/DJ - COR0962.9 – Proposed process change to Theft of Gas (TOG) Representation

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments

LJ/1020/DJ - COR0962.10 – Proposed changes to Prime and Sub Deduct (PSA) Contacts Representation

Shipper	Name	Date	Accept/ Reject	Publish	Shipper Comments	xoserve Comments