

A-NZ Peppol Stakeholder Working Group - Attachments Focus Group

Meeting Summary - 17 October 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	<p>Introduction Matt Lewis welcomed everyone to the group and acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ and ran through the meeting agenda.</p>
2	<p>Service Provider survey results Matt covered the results and insights from the Service Provider survey. The survey received 9 responses with each role within the Peppol network represented. A copy of the results have been distributed alongside this summary.</p> <p>The groups discussed the results for virus scanning and limits on attachment size. It was noted that the Peppol SLA requires SPs to support messages of 100MB (message and attachments) at minimum, but noting large message / files may have issues with bandwidth with more volume on the network.</p>
3	<p>Reviewing discussions so far Matt reminded participants that the focus group was created out of the Consistent Data Mapping focus group to look at the handling of attachments in more detail - primarily attachments to invoices and credit notes. The group will produce an outcomes document to share intelligence about considerations and practices regarding attachments.</p> <p>The group have covered the following topics and issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is currently supported by Peppol: attachment types are limited by Peppol mime code list. There can be multiple or unlimited attachments, and overall message size (including XML and attachments) of up to 100MN is considered as the minimum service level to be provided by Peppol Service Providers (SPs are free to offer a higher level of service in their services offered to the market) • Reviewed data mapping recommendations for attachments (embedded in UBL invoice) • Use cases and rendering noting that rendering UBL/XML data as a PDF copy of invoice is not intended by Peppol but the group recognises its role in change management • Virus scanning
4	<p>Continue open discussions <i>Virus scanning</i> As previously covered by the group, sections 10.3 and 17.12 of the Service Provider Agreement cover obligations around security. The group agreed that this meant obligations around virus scanning applied to corner 2 (C2) providers but were undecided about the applicability to corner 3 (C3).</p> <p>Following the previous meeting, the group sought clarification from OpenPeppol. The</p>

	<p>Peppol Operating Office replied and confirmed the intent of these clauses means that both C2 and C3 must virus scan. The group agreed that we should approach the Agreements, Policies and Procedures Change Management Board (APP CMB) with a set of questions to further clarify the clauses, as some terms used in the agreement may be interpreted differently. A paper including these questions will be distributed for feedback before it is shared.</p> <p>In summary, the following points were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circumstances where C2s may not be expected to virus scan • Reducing risk with virus scanning • Clarification on what virus scanning attachments involves for Access Points (APs) i.e. needing to unpack and decode element • Exploring non-technical controls that could support the same outcomes as virus scanning • Time, money and effort involved in virus scanning • What happens if a C3 picks up a virus from C2 and how this should be reported. The Peppol Security Working Group is currently looking at incident response management and reporting and is expected to share more information shortly <p><i>Consistent Data Mapping Guidance</i> The group reviewed the Consistent Data Mapping focus group's guidance for attachments. There were no further comments on the guidance.</p>
5	<p>Attachment metadata Matt walked the group through potential opportunities to improve the BIS specifications for increased automation and to future-proof the handling of attachments within Peppol. This was a future forward conversation and changes aren't expected to be dealt with or implemented today.</p> <p>The group reviewed what's currently available in Peppol post-award, pre-award and the greater UBL set to identify fields that could be added to the post-award specification. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum periods - for expiry dates for attachments and knowing how long they can be held for • Document type code - help identify what type of document an attachment is, in a machine-readable way • Removing code 130 restriction from BIS 3 invoice and credit note <p>It was noted that this discussion was intended to consider possible future enhancements. There are no current places for A-NZ to implement any changes in this area. Any proposed changes in the future will be subject to consultation.</p>
6	<p>Next steps and wrap up The slides have been distributed alongside this summary for further consideration and feedback. Email hello@dspanz.org with any feedback.</p> <p>DSPANZ, ATO and MBIE will draft an outcome document for the group to review. In the meantime, we will raise questions and discussions with OpenPeppol. It's expected that the group will meet again once we have an update from OpenPeppol.</p>
7	<p>Meeting close</p>