

Contents of Report

Introduction	1
Summary Results.....	1
Conclusion	2
Next Steps.....	4
Appendix 1 – Full Survey Results	5
Appendix 2 – Phase 2 Specifications.....	16

Introduction

The Parish Portal and Online Fault Reporting went live in October 2009. The Parish Portal consists of a reporting facility which allows the Parishes to log in, view and print a report of all highway enquiry information relevant to their Parish. The Online Fault Reporting facility allows all our customers better access to reporting and tracking faults rather than ringing or emailing the Contact Centre. The Parish Portal and Online Fault Reporting systems interact with each other in that if a Parish clicks to log a fault they are routed through to the Online Fault Reporting facility.

The strategy was to deliver Parish Portal base functionality and then work with Parish Councils to improve it as part of a phase 2 development. This had business case approval with investment to be identified by KCC's Information Services Group (ISG). A decision over whether a wider roll-out of a similar 'location view' to District Members and the public would then be taken in the context of the wider KCC Strategy for community engagement. Currently, County Council Members have similar functionality to Parishes but with the building blocks for searching on the system being Parish or urban centre boundaries.

As part of the review process, following delivery of base functionality, a formal consultation exercise was undertaken with Parish Councils by the Community Liaison Teams between May and July 2010. The **response rate** for this survey was **52.9%** (145 of 274 Parishes) and of those Parishes that responded, **73.8%** (107) **said they used/have used the Parish Portal.**

Summary Results

Generally the Parishes who responded to the survey found the system slow, time consuming and frustrating due to four main issues, which were:

1. Problems with the boundaries between two Parishes – faults/enquiries in one Parish are appearing in a neighbouring Parish's reports
2. Not being able to enter more than one fault/enquiry at a time – if they attempt to, then the system cannot cope and has a tendency to freeze. Parishes also have to log in again each time they want to report another issue
3. Mapping facility does not work very well – difficult to pinpoint/plot location
4. Terminology within the system – Enquiry status can sometimes be confusing and does not provide Parishes with enough information nor does it appear correct

It was mentioned by some Parishes that it is therefore quicker and easier to report over the phone or via the Contact Centre instead. Some Parishes did report that they find the system easy to use, although in most cases these same Parishes also identified a problem with the system, mostly with the difficulty in using the mapping facility to plot fault locations. These shortcomings are now also in the County Member arena with the Liberal Democrat Leader supporting Parish Council concerns.

Conclusion

It is clear from the consultation that whilst a good proportion of Parishes state they have used the Parish Portal, it is not currently delivering the business benefit of reduced calls. (Statistics show, during the period March – July 2010, that whilst phone calls to report a fault via the Contact Centre have gone down by around 20%, the use of webform has gone down by around 50%). Parishes have used the system but most do not now use it as a reporting tool due to its obvious limitations. There is therefore an issue here as this does not complement the KHS strategy to move towards greater self-service and reduce the reliance on the Contact Centre and Community Liaison Officers handling of calls.

As mentioned above in the introduction, it was always KHS' intention to carry out a second phase of development for the Parish Portal (and, due to their interaction, Online Fault reporting). The phase 2 specifications for Online Fault reporting and the Parish Portal, which are currently under development and discussion with ISG, can be found in their current state at Appendix 2.

The specifications have been prioritised using the MoSCoW methodology:

M – Must have

S – Should have if possible

C – Could have this if it does not affect anything else

W – Won't have this time but would like to in the future

These specifications will potentially provide further functionality which will endeavour to enhance the overall usefulness and usability of the system for the Parishes, such as the introduction of Parish 'home pages'; the ability to view different Parish's home pages; ability to filter reports; the ability to upload and attach photographs to enquiries raised; be able to see if a fault has already been logged by someone else; and generate generic emails to the Community Liaison Officers.

An initial project 'interview' meeting took place with ISG on Friday 17th September 2010 to develop the specifications and further half day sessions are being scheduled in order to develop the project in more detail. However, from this initial meeting it is clear that rather than developing the current Parish Portal, a more substantial Parish Website will be needed to ensure that it meets technological standards for system stability. This website will however retain the current functionality but will deal with the improvements needed to make it more user friendly.

With regard to the main issues raised by the Parishes in the survey, these will be addressed by the current phase 2 specifications as follows (and shown as a 'tick column' in Appendix 2):

1. Problems with the boundaries between two Parishes – faults in one Parish are appearing in a neighbouring Parish's reports

Unfortunately, there is not a simple solution for solving the problem of faults being assigned to the wrong Parish. The issue is that the nationally recognised data repository, 'The Gazetteer', used as the source of information for this aspect of the system, has the 'Town fields' aligned to the postal address of the road. Often these 'fields' are the same as the Parish but unfortunately, if the Postal Town does differ from the Parish it falls within, then this problem raised in the survey will occur.

To overcome this problem for the Parishes, the best solution, which is included in the Phase 2 specifications, is for the system to update the reports based on the 'geographic' area in which they fall.

This will mean that all enquires that actually fall within the boundary of the Parish will appear in that Parish's report, irrespective of the postal town of that road; this will also solve the problem where a road is in two different Parishes.

- 2. Not being able to enter more than one fault at a time – if they attempt to, then the system cannot cope and has a tendency to freeze. Parishes also have to log in again each time they want to report another issue.**

This issue is dependent on the corporate Kent.gov login-in project. ISG have now completed a peer review to ascertain costs and have completed the specification for this project. Again, the solution to this issue is included in the Phase 2 specifications.

- 3. Mapping facility does not work very well – difficult to pinpoint/plot location**

This issue should be resolved by Phase 2. Following Phase 2 development, the mapping functionality will have the ability to zoom into street level and zoom out to the extents of the Parish; a change will be made to allow users to point and click instead of drawing a red box around the location; and an automatic message will appear on the screen if the map is not showing enough detail for the user and will recommend zooming to street level.

To help check the correct location has been plotted, enquiries will be labelled on the map with the enquiry number and when hovered over with the mouse will display the relevant information. In addition to this, when an enquiry on the list within the system is clicked on, the relevant point on the map will be highlighted.

- 4. Terminology – 'Enquiry Resolved' status is sometimes confusing and does not provide Parishes with enough information nor does it appear correct**

This is not an issue with the system that needs resolving in Phase 2 development. '*Enquiry Resolved*' is the status used by KHS staff in cases where they do not feel any work is needed. However, if this status is used, KHS staff have been asked to add information in to a 'notes' field on the system to explain why this is. Unfortunately, the notes field cannot be viewed by Parishes as it is used as a working tool by KHS staff so, if a Parish is concerned that the enquiry has not been resolved and they have not received any communication as to what the resolution was, they should contact their Community Liaison Officer for more detail.

The full survey results can be found at Appendix 1 along with a cross-analysis with the Phase 2 specifications.

Next Steps

No.	Step	Timescale	Accountability
1	Head of Network Management & Performance and the Community Liaison Officers to agree content of this report	By 23 rd September 2010	Gemma Jones
2	Report circulated to Parishes via Community Liaison Officers as feedback on the survey	24 th September (feedback by mid October 2010)	Community Liaison Officers
3	Revised Specifications for Phase 2 (as a result of Parish Survey) shared with ISG for quotes and timescales for completion	End October 2010	Philip Murphy
4	Sign off by Head of Network Management & Performance of quotes and timescales from ISG in line with original Business Case	Beginning Nov 2010	Philip Murphy
5	Project and Communication Plans developed for Phase 2 Implementation and delivery	End of Jan/early Feb 2011 (provisional)	Philip Murphy and ISG
6	Further consultation following Phase 2 development and analysis to ensure Parishes are using the system with greater success	April 2011	Community Liaison Officers
7	Decision by Head of Network Management & Performance about wider rollout to District Council's and the public	May 2011	Philip Murphy

Areas 1&2

Response?		Do Parish use MKHO		Reasons for non use of MKHO	Using but having problems with logging	Using but having problems with reports	Who do parish contact about MKHO	Are parishes sending e-mails to CC	Problem to be addressed by Phase 2?
Yes	No	Yes	No						
Dartford									
6	1	5	1	Spends time touring parish and reports from his mobile.	System freezes when multiple potholes put on. CLO explained new procedure	There are still multiple problems with the reports. Needs fuller explanation and what is actually happening. Enquiry resolved is not helpful as it tells us nothing when the work has still not been completed, dates appear wrong as well.	CLO	Yes for non pressing matters that do not fall into the categories provided on MKHO	FRA17
				Have not had time to utilise this facility, CLO to go out again to clerk					
Gravesham									
5	1	3	2	Not using MKHO prefers to use e-mails as she can get ref straight away.	Have had problems plotting on maps.	More information must be on the reports. There is a problem with the boundaries between two parishes and one clerk's items are coming out on the other.	CLO	Yes. Was informed by CLO to either ring through or use MKHO	PP06, PP07, FRA10, FRA15
				Clerk is still to have training on MKHO.					
Sevenoaks									
21	9	16	5	Mainly using the telephone as it takes to long.	Problems with mapping - Icon jumping when submitting	More information must be on the reports. There is a problem with the boundaries between two parishes and one clerks items are coming out on the other.	CLO	Occasionally - advised to ring Contact Centre	PP06, PP07, PP08, PP09, PP10, PP11, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17
				Not had time because of clerks sickness					
Tonbridge & Malling									
6	18	5	1	Without a parish clerk but tried system and took too long.	Have had problems with the mapping	Reports not giving the information they need	CLO	Have been but now informed by CLO not to if at all possible	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, PP11
Maidstone									
32	10	22	10	Takes too long	Problems with mapping	Problems with reports	CLO's	Yes because system takes too long	FRA10, FRA15
Tunbridge Wells									
13	4	7	6	Not had training yet	Problems with mapping	Problems with reports	CLO	Some do email	FRA10, FRA15

Areas 3&4

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Shepway			
Dymchurch	No	Only had a dial-up system until last week and was unable to access portal	
Lympne	Yes	Does not find the system user friendly. Very time consuming and slow, especially the map. Only uses the system if reporting one fault. More than that e-mails to Ann Norton. Found lists confusing. Idea was good but considers a waste of money.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17
Lydd	Yes	Have to say it was much easier to just email. System is a bit frustrating with its requirements for every detail each time. The location is problematic as residents often do not give as much information as would be ideal which takes time in finding a recognised location. I have given up using the map as taking too long trying to make it work. Also mandatory requirements for descriptions - there is only so much you can say about a street light not working.	PP06, PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Newchurch	Yes	Did find it a problem initially although understood it well at the training. Am awaiting a "lesson" with a parish council Chairman who found it straightforward	
New Romney	No	Regrettably the Town Council has not had cause to use the Portal for reporting faults so are unable to comment. When such time arises if we do encounter problems we will let you know immediately. Ann Norton aware that one of the Councillors does use the system without any problems	
Sellindge		Replied to Jennie Wickenden as covers Ashford parish as well	
Dover			
Alkham			
Aylesham	No	It would not work for me and takes me ages to navigate it - and then it doesn't work. Have essentially given up - perhaps an idiots' guide, with step by step instructions might help	
Capel-le-Ferne			
Deal			
Denton with Wootton			
Dover			

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Dover continued			
Eastry	Yes	"To be honest I don't use it unless i have to. I find the system quite cumbersome. You have to enter all your details every time you report a fault. It is much faster and easier to report over the phone. The maps are slow to respond, a full page option would help as once you get enough details to see the area you need you can only get a small part of it on screen."	PP03, FRA02, FRA10, FRA15,
Eythorne			
Goodnestone			
Great Mongeham	Yes	Same clerk as for Eastry PC	
Guston			
Hougham Without			
Langdon			
Lydden			
Nonington			
Northbourne			
Preston			
Ringwold with Kingsdown	Yes	I find it very useful. My only comment really is that the map facility is a bit cumbersome to use, frequently you do not know the post code so have to use maps and it can take a while to get homed into to exactly the right location	PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Ripple			
River			
Sandwich	No	We have been experiencing lots of problems with logging in and also using the map to locate exactly where faults are. We have therefore not been using the portal to report problems but have been doing so through e mails to eastkent highways. We have just logged into the portal and improvements appear to have been made so will report via this means in the future. Our feedback in therefore not good on past usage but hope that the improvements will change our views in the future.	PP02, PP03, FRA02 FRA03

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Dover continued			
Shepherdswell with Coldred	Yes	I use the Parish Portal every time I need to report a problem. I like the system and the email acknowledgement with job number. I've tried using the in-built map to help to identify the location of problem items a few times but have given up on it because I cannot get it to work - I always seem to end up in the English Channel when I'm trying to zoom in to a location in my village! I am fortunate in that I can usually give a post code for every problem I report.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Sholden			
St Margarets at Cliffe	Yes	Don't find using this difficult - it is easy to input information. The only problem I have encountered so far is when you enter a reference number for an outstanding issue, and the screen shows that item as being "satisfied" - that does not really answer the questions in some cases - that does not say whether that is to KHS' satisfaction or the Parish Council's! In bad weather requested a salt bin for a location in the village; on checking it described item as "satisfied" but no salt bin!	PP13
Staple			
Stourmouth			
Sutton			
Temple Ewell			
Tilmanstone			
Walmer			
Whitfield			
Wingham	Yes	I have used the portal to track faults which have been reported (although on one occasion it gave me the wrong information). For reporting faults I find it much easier and quicker to email the contact centre. When I logged on just now I thought I would look at the reports for Wingham Parish and it asked me to log in. I used the same log in name and password that I used to access the site but it would not accept it. Do I have to have a separate user name and password for the reports page?	PP02, PP03, FRA01, FRA02, FRA03
Woodnesborough	Yes	Same clerk as Eastry	
Worth			
Thanet			
Acol	No		
Birchington	No		

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Thanet continued			
Broadstairs	Yes (No Response therefore picked up from reports)		
Cliffsend	No		
Manston	No		
Minster	Yes (No Response therefore picked up from reports)	At a parish meeting it was reported it is a slow system to use. When reporting faults it is easier to call into Contact Centre	
Monkton	No		
Ramsgate	Yes (No Response therefore picked up from reports)		
St Nicholas & Sarre	No		
Ashford			
Aldington & Bonnington	Yes	Other than having to log in twice, I find it very useful. Also use to compile a list of outstanding issues for the Parish Council each month	

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Ashford continued			
Appledore (Also Clerk to Kenardington)	Yes	used regularly but the map is often not working - also very time consuming to zoom in every time you use it - They have asked whether individual users have some sort of bookmark, or could the postcode be used to automatically select the area of interest. They do feel though that www.fixmystreet.com is much better and you can attach a photo	PP03, PP04, PP07, FRA02, FRA07, FRA08, FRA10, FRA15
Bethersden (Also Clerk to Ruckinge/Stone/Warehorne)			
Biddenden	No		
Bilsington	No		
Boughton Aluph (also Clerk to High Halden)	Yes	Finds it difficult to navigate and you have to put in customer details every time you log a new issue - Finds the map difficult to use	PP03, FRA02, PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Brabourne (Also Clerk to Smeeth and Westwell)	Yes	Easy to use although the maps load slowly - When reporting multiple problems on the same road she is only allowed to mark 1 fault - would prefer to log several faults in close proximity in one go	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17
Brook (Also Clerk to Hastingleigh)			
Challock	Yes	Finds it easy to use and not experienced any problems. However, it is just as easy to log on and report a fault as any member of the public can.	
Charing			
Chilham			
Egerton	Yes	Easy now but found it awkward at the start. No difficulties other than there are too many key strokes to get to the essential sections and it is a long-winded process to make multiple reports in one session.	PP11

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Ashford continued			
Godmersham	Yes	Have used a couple of times but finds it difficult to pinpoint larger areas - i.e. when there is a stretch of pavement that needs clearing	PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Great Chart with Singleton			
Hastingleigh (Also Clerk to Brook)			
High Halden (Also Clerk to Boughton Aluph)	Yes	Finds it difficult to navigate and you have to put in customer details every time you log a new issue - Finds the map difficult to use	PP03, FRA02, FRA10, FRA15,
Hothfield (Also Clerk to Little Chart/Ruckinge/Shadoxhurst/Stone/Woodchurch)			
Kenardington (Also Clerk to Appledore)			
Kingsnorth			
Little Chart (Also Clerk to Hothfield/Ruckinge/Shadoxhurst/Stone/Woodchurch)			
Mersham & Sevington			
Molash			
Newenden			
Orlestone (Also Clerk to Stanhope)	Yes		
Pluckley			
Rolvenden			

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Ashford continued			
Ruckinge			
Shadoxhurst (Also Clerk to Little Chart/Ruckinge/Hothfield Stone/Woodchurch)			
Smarden			
Smeeth (Also Clerk to Brabourne and Westwell)	Yes	Easy to use although the maps load slowly - When reporting multiple problems on the same road she is only allowed to mark 1 fault - would prefer to log several faults in close proximity in one go	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17
Stanhope (Also Clerk to Orlestone)			
Stone (Also Clerk to Warehorne/ruckinge)			
Tenterden	Yes	Only used it 3 times as it takes too long to log issues	
Warehorne (Clerk to Stone and Ruckinge)			
Westwell (Clerk to Brabourne and Smeeth)	Yes	Easy to use although the maps load slowly - When reporting multiple problems on the same road she is only allowed to mark 1 fault - would prefer to log several faults in close proximity in one go	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17
Wittersham			
Woodchurch			
Wye & Hinxhill			
Canterbury			
Adisham	-	-	
Barham	Yes	Tuition given recently (May 2010)	
Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne	Yes		

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Canterbury continued			
Bishopsbourne			
Blean	Yes		
Bridge	Yes	One issue: Enquiries are closed as "Resolved"...but they haven't been	PP13
Chartham and Chartham Hatch	Yes		
Chestfield	Yes		
Chislet	Yes	(Has just been given tuition - May 2010)	
Fordwich Town Council	Yes		
Hackington	Yes		
Harbledown	Yes	No problems.	
Herne	Yes	No, now that improved. Easy to use. Information is easy to access and I am happy with the system	
Hoath			
Ickham and Well			
Kingston	Yes		
Littlebourne			
Lower Hardres	Yes		
Petham	Yes		
Sturry	Yes	No problems - it works well - easy to use	
Thanington Without	Yes		
Upper Hardres			
Waltham	Yes		
Westbere		I still find it a good idea to speak to the helpdesk when it comes to reporting matters.	
Wickhambreaux			
Womenswold			
Swale			
Bapchild			
Bobbing			
Borden			

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Swale continued			
Boughton under Blean			
Bredgar			
Doddington	Yes	Easy to use once you get the hang of it. Determining a location is difficult. Useful to see what general public and others are reporting. Problems when running reports and according to the portal job have been completed and they have not. Do not feel the parish council should be checking each job.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, PP13, PP11, PP12
Dunkirk			
Eastchurch	Yes	Has persevered with the portal for 6 months. However, very slow, time consuming and frustrating. Inputting information, particularly on the map, the tools are unhelpful. When inputting numerous issues the system cannot cope so do them singly. The parish report information is very limited. On a number of occasions have phoned the liaison officer to clarify points. Regular users such as parish councils need a faster and more details system to be able to use it effectively. NO LONGER USE the portal. Report either to the Contact Centre or the Liaison Officer directly.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, FRA17, PP03, PP04, PP05, PP11, PP12
Eastling			
Faversham	No		
Graveney with Goodnestone	Yes	Use it occasionally. The technique for locating things on the map is difficult. The map does not show individual maintained lights for KCC. Would also be useful to show the parish council maintained lights.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15
Hartlip			
Hernhill			
Iwade			
Leysdown			
Lower Halstow			
Luddenham			
Lynsted and Kingsdown			

Parish	Do Parish use MKHO?	Problems	Problem to be addressed by Online Fault Reporting Phase 2?
Swale continued			
Milstead			
Minster on Sea	Yes	Lack of resources they are not able to use as much as they would like. At the same time, unless they report a fault their end, the fault is not picked up by KHS during their checks. Whilst the inspector does an excellent job they wonder if this is due to a lack of resources our end. They would like to remind KHS that the overall responsibility for checking and repairing faults lies with them and they need to improve their system of fault finding.	
Newington	Yes	Sometimes find it difficult getting access to the maps to report a fault and sometimes the warning triangle used to locate on the map. Does not stay where you put it!	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, PP08, PP09
Newnham			
Norton, Buckland & Stone	Yes	Much easier and more productive to pick up the phone and call the Liaison Officer.	
Oare			
Ospringe			
Queenborough			
Rodmersham			
Selling			
Sheldwich, Badlesmere & Leaveland			
Stalisfield			
Teynham	Yes	Have encountered problems with the portal, particularly with the map. I tend to use post codes now where possible which is easier to use. Anything too involved I ring the Contact Centre.	PP07, FRA10, FRA15, PP06
Throwley			
Tonge			
Tunstall			
Upchurch			
Warden			

Appendix 2 – Phase 2 Specifications

Parish Portal Specification

ID Locator	Action	Priority	Satisfy main issues raised by Parishes
PP01	To open an account with MKHO, as a Parish Representative	M	
PP02	To allow users to change their login and contact details.	M	
PP03	To recognise the Parish as they return to the website and display a home page with map of their parish displaying all open, closed enquires that are less than 3 months old, and a list of all these enquires.	M	✓
PP04	To allow Parishes the ability to view a number of different Parishes home pages based on their logon details. (some parish clerks look after more than one parish and will need to view 2 or more parish details)	M	
PP05	To update the map and report on a daily basis using a nightly extract from WAMS.	M	
PP06	To allocate enquires to parishes based on the geographic area in which they fall	M	✓
PP07	Mapping ability to zoom into street level and zoom out to the extents of the parish plus a buffer of 1km.	S	✓
PP08	Label enquiry on map with enquiry number and ability to mouse over enquiry to display relevant information.	M	✓
PP09	Ability to click on the enquiry in the list and this will highlight the relevant point on the map.	C	✓
PP10	The ability to link to the fault reporting site to update existing enquires and raise a new enquiry.	M	
PP11	The ability to filter the report on service, subject, date, parish.	S	
PP12	The ability to save parish report to csv, excel, pdf	M	
PP13	The ability to request more info on a particular enquiry by generating a generic email to the relevant CLO	C	

Online Fault Reporting Specification

ID Locator	Action	Priority	Satisfy main issues raised by Parishes
FRA01	To open an account with Fault reporting site, select a user id and password.	M	
FRA02	To recognise registered users each time they return to the website. Parish, Public, District, Member	S	✓
FRA03	To allow users to change their login and contact details.	M	
FRA04	To allow users to log a fault without the need to set up an account, customer will need to enter details as per existing site with the addition of a postcode as a mandatory field.	M	
FRA05	The system will return a confirmation message online that thanks them for visiting MKHO and logging an enquiry and include in the message text the enquiry number, the date and time the enquiry was submitted, the fault category and the fault type, a description of the enquiry and the location.	S	
FRA06	The user can elect to receive an email or text message confirming the enquiry has been logged as well as an email update every time there is a status change to the enquiry.	Needs investigating	
FRA07	The ability to attach a photograph to the enquiry. (PBMI requirement to pull through the connector tool)	M	
FRA08	The ability to view photographs of before and after jobs as taken by the contractor. (PBMI requirement)	C	
FRA09	To ability to pull through attributes from CSM and present them to the customer as a series of questions (PBMI requirement)	S	
FRA10	A change to the mapping functionality that will allow the user to point and click instead of drawing a red box around the location.	S	✓
FRA11	To report that an enquiry of this type already exists in this location and have the ability to show existing open enquires on the map.	M	
FRA12	When tracking an enquiry you should be able to hit the enter button as well as the submit button to produce the enquiry update page.	M	
FRA13	Where a job has been raised, provide the completion date for the job	M	

ID Locator	Action	Priority	Satisfy main issues raised by Parishes
FRA14	When entering the description of the enquiry present a message to the user not to include location details as they will be asked for location details during step 3	M	
FRA15	The message “The map is not showing enough detail for you to accurately pinpoint the fault location. We recommend you zoom in to the street level” Should appear across the map	M	✓
FRA16	Customer must have ability to update an existing enquiry they have already raised	S	
FRA 17	Once a fault has been reported must be presented with an option to “report another fault”.	M	✓