

A-NZ Peppol Stakeholder Working Group - Access Point Migration & Exit Focus Group

Meeting Summary - 23 June 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	<p>Introduction Maggie Leese welcomed everyone to the group and acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ.</p>
2	<p>Review of Purpose & Expected Outcomes Andrew Stein covered the purpose of the focus group, to make recommendations and guidance, and recapped the last meeting.</p> <p>Continued the discussion from the last meeting on Business Management Software (BMS) deregistering (removing their listing in the SML) end users when they cease using their software. It was noted that if an end-user's software licence lapses, there should be a part of their service agreement that states they will lose access to services including eInvoicing capabilities. Agreed that the wording around how this is explained in any guidance should be clear. An exception to this understanding would be via court order.</p>
3	<p>Action Item - Update on what is covered in Peppol Agreements Joshua Eckersley provided an update on what the Peppol Agreements include around SLAs for releasing SML listings. The Service Provider agreements do not explicitly specify a timeframe for releasing the SML but they do have an obligation to ensure that SML details are up to date and accurate. More detailed information can be found below.</p> <p>--</p> <p>The <u>New Peppol Agreements and accompanying documents</u> had some related information, but the Service Provider agreement does not contain specific timeframes to remove/deregister clients from the SML.</p> <p>The Peppol Service Provider Agreement stipulates that metadata regarding an End User's capabilities must be kept up to date. The agreement indicates that a Service Provider is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit correct and updated metadata regarding its technical capabilities and the services provided to End Users to the relevant provider of Peppol Addressing and Capability look-up services (i.e. the SML) • Peppol Service Providers offering Peppol Addressing and Capability look-up Services shall use all reasonable endeavours to ensure that the metadata provided by its services are correct and update and gives a correct description of the services accessible <p>Internal Regulations states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A provider of Peppol Addressing and Lookup Services who relays data about the End Users listed in the SMP of the Peppol Directory shall be responsible for

	<p>ensuring that the information is accurately relayed. The Peppol Addressing and Lookup Services shall be likewise responsible for following up with the Service Provider who has the primary relationship with the End User, should the provider of Peppol Addressing and Lookup Services at any point become aware of discrepancies or possible errors in the data provided to the Peppol Director.</p> <p>In summary: The agreements only stipulate that the Service Provider must ensure that SML information is accurate and up to date. There is no specific mention of timeframes regarding the removal/deregistration of clients. The above highlighted points support the need for better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of service providers. In a lot of scenarios, the SP is responsible for ensuring accuracy of SML details, so for example, where a BMS licence finishes/lapses, and remove from SML is required, Service Providers are responsible for that, but understandably, they may need to refresh their familiarity of requirements, or have processes in place to ensure that happens in a timely manner.</p> <p>--</p> <p>It was noted that as the OpenPeppol or Peppol Authorities cannot regulate BMS, Access Points (APs) will likely need to communicate this and include it in their service agreements. This group could look to produce sample clauses for service agreement contracts to assist APs.</p> <p>There were discussions about the language used to communicate to the end users noting that SMEs will likely not understand the Peppol framework and technical terminology. It was agreed that guidance will use business terminology to avoid confusion for end users.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Continue reviewing the AP switching scenarios / processes</p> <p>The group started to review scenario 3 where an SME initiates a switch from their BMS's default AP to a third-party add-on to use their eInvoicing capabilities.</p> <p>Discussions continued around how the switch should be initiated, and whether the gaining BMS/add-on can make the request on behalf of the end user. Key discussion points / points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not to expect SMEs to understand Peppol or know who their Peppol providers are • Not to expect SMEs to understand what Peppol features may be affected (therefore the losing provider should use simple terms when reminding the end users about features to be lost) • Complications when add-ons are used for inbound or outbound invoices; noting in some cases an end user may use multiple add-ons • More (if not all) BMS accredit add-ons and should 'sort this out' via their agreement / accreditation process • It is not desirable for the gaining provider (AP, BMS or add-on) to request the losing provider for deregistration on behalf of the client because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Firstly, the gaining provider may not fully understand the services offered by the losing provider ○ Secondly, for commercial reasons, the gaining provider may not have the incentive to educate the client <p>Detailed discussion notes can be found below.</p>

	<p>Action: collate what the group has agreed upon already (recommendations, best practice statements etc.), document them and include in the slide pack for easy reference.</p> <p>In this scenario it was suggested that a conversation should happen between the BMS and add-on. However, it's generally acknowledged that the existing BMS/AP will not know about the new BMS/AP. It's also acknowledged that SMEs may not realise that they can only be listed on the SML once.</p> <p>The basic workflow of this switch is that the end user requests their BMS to deregister, they receive information about the switch, confirm the switch, the deregistration happens and then the add-on can then register the end user. This relies on the agreed upon statement that BMS should provide end users with the capability to deregister. This can be more challenging when an SME uses two add-ons that offer eInvoicing and it is unclear which service the SME is using.</p> <p>The focus group may provide guidance on how the overall process is expected to happen but in this scenario, each BMS may have a different approach to solve this within their marketplaces. Noting that Peppol cannot enforce requirements on C1s and C4s.</p> <p>While the deregister and re-register two step process may work now, as the network grows it's acknowledged this may become difficult. The group expects that in the future it will become a more seamless process much like switching domains. It was noted that the Peppol migration specification outlines a similar process to switching domains. However, in the interim we want to avoid scenarios where APs will not release SML entries (which may be due to a variety of reasons).</p>
5	<p>Next steps The focus group will meet again in two weeks time on 7 July at 11.30am AEST / 1.30pm NZST.</p>
6	<p>Meeting close</p>