

## A-NZ Peppol Stakeholder Working Group - Consistent Data Mapping Focus Group Meeting

### Meeting Summary - 3 March 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	<p><b>Introduction</b> Matt Lewis welcomed everyone to the group and Simon Foster acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ.</p>
2	<p><b>Introduction of Attendees</b></p>
3	<p><b>Review of the sample invoices</b></p> <p><i>Base Quantity (for price) is greater than invoices quantity</i> This example was for the information of the group. Mentioned that it may be beneficial for the group to cover units of measure (UOM).</p> <p>Relevant calculations are described in the PEPPOL BIS Billing specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Price information</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Invoice line amount</a></li> </ul> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base quantity can be shown by a supplier as part of pricing information, e.g., \$10 for 1 carton of drinks (24 cans). A buyer may order a 'partial carton' of drinks, e.g., 12 cans.</li> <li>• A phone bill charges a partial month, based on a monthly rate</li> </ul> <p>Potential issues could be that the ordered/invoiced quantity is less than base quantity, or UOM is inconsistent. This could cause issues with inventory management. Some software cannot display base quantity and they need a workaround to show unit price (e.g., showing the price of each can).</p> <p><i>GST rate</i> The legislated tax rate should be used as tax rate percent for invoiced item and document level allowance/charges and not a percent that is calculated from item price. It was noted that user configuration may impact the configuration of GST, in which case the user needs to confirm the correct legislated rate is configured. A question was raised about rounding, this will be covered at a future meeting.</p> <p>Mixed GST was also discussed. This is covered in the BIS through <a href="#">a mixed rate VAT example</a>.</p> <p><i>Attachments</i> When an attachment is sent, there are three pieces of information that are mandatory: Attachment ID, File name and mime code (i.e. the type/format of attachment, based on a code list).</p>

	<p>There are common issues across both C1s and C4s. One participant raised a particular issue with users putting full path names rather than just the supporting document name. The expectation of senders is that they should use the file name, and not the full path name. Using the path name does have security implications.</p> <p>An issue was raised about how to distinguish between a copy of the invoice and a different attachment. Some participants believed that code 130 would be an appropriate work around however it is actually used as an asset identifier and shouldn't be used for attachments. This will be covered in more detail at a future meeting.</p> <p>The above examples were covered in the meeting with further examples around organisational specific customer identifiers, non-financial delivery information, freight/delivery charges, calculated quantities, asset equipment identifiers, additional data supporting payment of this invoice and additional data influencing customer purchasing decisions to be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p>Slides presented by Matt Lewis have been emailed to participants and can be <a href="#">accessed here</a>.</p>
4	<p><b>Meeting close</b> Closing remarks from Matt Lewis, Simon Foster, ATO and MBIE.</p> <p>For the next meeting, participants are encouraged to share snippets of UBL as examples of mapping issues. Examples of further issues are also welcome and can be emailed to DSPANZ or your Peppol Authority.</p> <p>The next will be held 17 March at 11.30am AEDT / 1.30pm NZDT.</p>