

## IMPACT R3 Branch Trading Issues

| Ref | ISSUE  | STATUS   |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.2 | Taking into account the requirements for a monthly Branch Trading Statement, confirmation is required concerning the impact on the Horizon infrastructure of increasing the retention of transaction data at the branch from the current 35 days to 49 days. In particular, the impact assessment should consider branch and central storage requirements and processing times for branch reports.   | <p>FS provided assessment to Clive Read/ David Parnell on 12/2/04. Following POL review of cost implications, Clive Read requested (24/2) impact assessment of 49 days data retention at branch and 35 days at data centre to try and avoid data centre storage upgrade. GJ issued notes (26/2) reporting investigation results with options for POL consideration.</p> <p>Following consideration of GJ note, DP/CR confirmed working assumption for CD should be based on Option 3:</p> <p>Extend the data retention at the counter to match maximum possible at the Data Centre (say 42 days – to be confirmed). This avoids any unforeseen “mismatch” issues. Could introduce a calendar of 13 four-week months in the year for Branch Trading periods and therefore maintain same level of safety zone at the branch. Assumption to be reviewed with POL Stakeholders on 4/3.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PB to incorporate working assumption in CD. <b>Issue Closed</b></p> |
| 1.3 | <p>Confirmation is needed concerning the POL requirement to use the rem out dockets/vouchers functionality. It is understood that some sub-set of the following may be involved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Losses (various categories) and gains</li> <li>2. Postage costs</li> <li>3. Petty cash expense / purchases</li> <li>4. Robbery &amp; Burglary clearance</li> <li>5. Write offs (various categories)</li> <li>6. Intruder Alarms (Directly managed only)</li> <li>7. Counterfeit Notes (DM only)</li> <li>8. MVLs to car hire companies (DM only)</li> <li>9. Obsolete Stock (Agents only)</li> <li>10. Customer Goodwill (Agents only)</li> </ol> | <p>Proposal circulated by Philip Godden on 10/2/04. Consideration needed regarding POL FS requirement for rems. Suggestion that could assume no rems and drive from cut-offs.</p> <p>Following review with DP, following proposed as working assumption for CD:</p> <p>Existing process for handling dockets/vouchers is retained with the addition that Horizon forwards an event to central system when a related cut-off report is produced. This will enable POL to configure reference data to define which items are to be handled in this way and the availability of the event within POL MI will support back-end control processes.</p>  |

## IMPACT R3 Branch Trading Issues

| Ref | ISSUE  | STATUS  |
|-----|--|---|
|     | <p>11. Spoilt Postage Labels (Agents only)</p> <p>12. Redeemed savings stamps (BBC, DVLA..)</p> <p>This information is required to assess the impact on associated reporting, e.g. opportunities to remove or implied change required to existing product specific reports. (see also FS CD review comment 18/2 Nos. 2 &amp; 4)</p>  | <p><b>Action:</b> John Dutton/Chris Allen to review/confirm acceptance of working assumption for CD (also need to address related issue 1.4 below).</p>   |
| 1.4 | <p>Confirmation is needed concerning how stock/ vouchers/ dockets items are required to be mapped onto accounting and will they be represented on branch reports/accounts.</p> <p>This information is required to help identify/confirm associated migration requirements.</p>   | <p><b>Action:</b> John Dutton/Chris Allen to confirm POL requirements (see related issue 1.3 above).</p>  |
| 1.5 | <p>Confirmation is needed regarding requirements concerned with the reconciliation of transactions to be supported by Horizon automation.</p> <p>This information is required to enable the assessment to progress with the identification of scope for the reconciliation simplifications and associated cost savings anticipated by Schedule 12 of the Fujitsu contract. (see also AW CD review comment 18/2 No. 3)</p>  | <p>Notes produced from POL review (23/2) have not finalised requirement. Following POL/FS review (24/2), GJ circulated a proposed CD working assumption covering proposed APS/TPS merge which DP confirmed should be used for CD</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PB to incorporate working assumption in CD. <b>Issue Closed</b></p>  |
| 1.8 | <p>Confirm re-engineering of DVLA product, to enable it to be controlled by Horizon, is out of scope for IMPACT and will be addressed by a separate CR if required, i.e. DVLA product will remain uncontrolled (non-value) at S80.</p> <p>Investigations have shown that, compounded by S60 changes to DVLA product handling incorporating use of ADC, it cannot be changed to controlled stock simply by changing the associated reference data and would require non-trivial re-engineering to achieve the change.</p> | <p>POL/FS 24/2 review confirmed working assumption for CD should be that MVLs are treated as a single stock type for the purpose of reporting to POL FS.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Dave Parnell/Clive Read to review working assumption with Davyd Nash.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PB to incorporate working assumption in CD. <b>Issue Closed</b></p>  |
| 2.4 | <p>Following discussions between Tony Marsh and Clive Read, a review meeting has been arranged for 18/2/04 to examine a proposal to remove the current method of posting discrepancies into a branch Suspense account.</p>   | <p>Stakeholder review on 26/2 did not appear to address all issues. Review with DP proposed that working assumption for CD should be that POL will withdraw Suspense products that enable cash discrepancies to be posted to Suspense requiring branches to make good or obtain pre-authorisation for discrepancies that special treatment. It is assumed that this requirement will be met by existing Horizon functionality and POL will revise reference data to obtain required effect.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> DP to review/confirm wording of working assumption.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> PB to incorporate working assumption in CD.</p> |

## IMPACT R3 Branch Trading Issues

| Ref  | ISSUE   | STATUS  |
|------|---|---|
| 2.6  | Review meeting in London on 11/2/04 confirmed that TMS/AIS requirements are not expected to be completed on a timescale compatible with scheduled CD production. Decision taken to include sufficient information in CD regarding TMS/AIS to enable solution design work to proceed. (see also 3.5 below) | As agreed at POL/FS 24/2 review, GJ issued note (27/2) detailing working assumptions and details of "missing" information that needs to be in CD to enable DP/CT work to proceed in lieu of finalized TMS/AIS requirements.<br><b>Action:</b> AH/CR to review/confirm working GJ assumptions for CD and provide working assumptions for "missing" information by close of business 2/3. |
| 3.1  | Confirm Horizon events POL require to be forwarded to POL MIS (Data Flow Item 2 from 11/2 S80 design review). (see also JD/BG CD review comments 18/2 No. 40 & 41)  | GJ forwarded (27/2) list of Horizon events to POL to assist with requirement identification. Follow up note sent to JD 1/3.<br><b>Action:</b> JD to confirm POL requirement   |
| 3.4  | Requirements to be confirmed concerning carry forward into TMS of existing feed of Camelot related data to Martins. (Data Flow Item 10 from 11/2 S80 design review)   | <b>Action:</b> To be addressed under issue 2.6 above.   |
| 3.5  | Confirmation of DPI, Parcel Force TMS feed requirement (Data Flow Item 13 from 11/2 S80 design review)  | <b>Action:</b> To be addressed under issue 2.6 above.   |
| 3.7  | Confirm requirements for handling non-accounting data (including centrally identified corrections). ("Other Functionality" note from 11/2 S80 design review)  | Problems identified with proposal to handle in POL FS. GJ provided note (27/2) detailing list of services that require support for non-accounting data. GJ following up with CA to clarify current progress whilst PG is on leave.<br><b>Action:</b> Dave Parnell/Chris Allen to confirm requirement working assumption for CD  |
| 3.12 | Confirm cheque handling requirements (FS CD review comment 18/2 No. 6)  | CR confirmed (24/2) comment "cheques should work like this in future" should be removed from section 10.1.2.5 (under automation entry) of the draft CD.<br><b>Action:</b> DP/CR to review POL cheque handling requirements.<br><b>Action:</b> PB to incorporate agreed working assumption in CD. <b>Issue Closed</b>  |
| 3.13 | Confirm requirement for trigger condition that enables Horizon/OPTip feed to be switched off(FS CD review comment 18/2 No. 8)   | Review with DP confirmed this should be addressed within context of overall migration requirements.<br><b>Issue Closed</b>  |
| 4.1  | Confirm requirement for start/end period of weekly reports now that Branch Trading  | <b>Action:</b> JD to confirm requirements.  |

## IMPACT R3 Branch Trading Issues

| Ref | ISSUE  | STATUS                                     |
|-----|--|--|
|     | Statement is to be produced monthly.   |  |
| 4.2 | Given that the new Cash Variance Report does not cover a fixed period, clarification is required regarding what report the reprint functionality should refer to within a previous period  | <b>Action:</b> JD to confirm requirements. |
| 4.3 | The requirement for an interim Branch Trading Statement has been tabled. However, the production of the BTS assumes completion of SU balances has taken place. Given that there currently the Office Snapshot report is given to obtain an interim branch trading position, confirmation/clarification is required concerning the interim BTS requirement. | <b>Action:</b> JD to confirm requirements. |