

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

Meeting Summary - 12 May 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	<p>Introduction Simon Foster welcomed everyone to the group and acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ.</p>
2	<p>Discussion on mapping examples</p> <p><u>Organisational specific customer identifiers</u> Currently, there are no clearly determined fields for a seller-defined customer/account number and there is a mixed use of location details, site number, account number or contact name to assist buyers to route an invoice to the right system/branch for matching and approval.</p> <p>The general principle is that, where possible, the data should be mapped where it matches the semantic meaning, e.g. location should be in cac:DeliveryLocation or cac:PostalAddress accordingly.</p> <p>For customer/account number, mapping options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AccountingCustomerParty/Party/PartyIdentification</i> (see below) • <i>BuyerReference</i> • <i>Note</i>, the free text field <p>DSPANZ and the Peppol Authorities agreed to verify the semantic meaning of <i>cac:PartyIdentification</i>. The group agreed that using <i>BuyerReference</i> is acceptable, as it can assist a receiver to process the invoice. Note that if the seller does not know what information a buyer requires, the seller may include this in other fields, such as <i>Note</i>.</p> <p>The EN 16931 Semantic Data model has the following for this field (BT-46): “An identifier of the Buyer. [Usage Note:] If no scheme is specified, it should be known by both buyer and seller, e.g. a previously exchanged seller-assigned identifier of the buyer.”</p> <p>In the scenario where the account number is known to both parties and expected by the buyer, <i>cac:PartyIdentification</i> should be used.</p> <p><u>Party ID</u> Party ID was partially covered in the above discussion but for general clarification, the group ran through the fields that are for Party Identification purposes and their semantic meaning. There was discussion on whether an “entity’s legal name” can be their legal name or their trading name. The group agreed that this should include an entity name that is registered in the business register (e.g. in AU, this could be the legal entity or a registered business name).</p>

	<p>One participant raised a query as to whether an Organisation Parts Number (OBN) can be used in the Endpoint ID field, or Party Legal Entity field, to identify the legal entity, or should the “parent” GLN (i.e. the NZBN) of the overall entity be used to identify the legal entity? Clarification was sought from MBIE and the advice is; OBNs are GLNs, so they are treated the same as an NZBN. EndPointID is used for routing so it is recommended to use this for the Buyers OBN. As a guide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EndPointID is the GLN for the Buyers OBN • PartyIdentification:ID is the GLN for the Buyers OBN • PartyLegalEntity:CompanyID is the GLN for the Suppliers NZBN or OBN • PartyTaxScheme:CompanyID is the Suppliers GST number. <p>There have also been issues where an NZBN number has been included instead of the GST number. Work is underway to fix this issue.</p> <p>The Party Tax Scheme field is not mandatory, but in Australia the seller must include the GST branch number when the GST branch is making a taxable sale. In New Zealand, the GST number must be provided when a GST registered organisation makes a taxable sale. Some organisations will reject an invoice if the GST number/GST branch number is not included.</p> <p>The group agreed that it would be valuable to include the table on the Party Identification fields in the guidance document.</p> <p><u>Unit of Measure</u></p> <p>The group acknowledged that it is difficult to support the full list of options in the Peppol code list for units of measure. It was agreed that receiving DSPs should recognise that there will be varying C1 capability to support the full Peppol code list, and they should be flexible. Invoices should not be rejected based on non-matching UoM. The group does not recommend hard coding units of measures which would result in rejecting anything outside of a coded set.</p> <p>It was noted that the Swedish Peppol Authority went through a process to document the 40 most common units of measure and have preferenced these options. A similar approach could be taken for A-NZ.</p> <p><u>Usage details</u></p> <p>From discussions in the focus group, many participants are looking to create highly summarised invoices as the Peppol invoice and then include the usage details through existing systems (e.g. customer portals) or attachments. This is mostly consistent with the current customer experience where they prefer this additional information in a PDF attachment.</p>
3	<p>Review draft outcomes for closed mapping topics</p> <p>Joshua Eckersely presented the draft outcome document and ran through the detail currently included for each of the mapping issues. It was noted that a separate document for sample invoices will be produced.</p> <p>Once an updated draft of the document is ready, it will be shared with the focus group for their feedback. There will be approximately two weeks for feedback and a deadline will be communicated when the document is shared.</p> <p>Feedback can be provided by emailing:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DSPANZ - hello@dspanz.org• ATO - eInvoicing@ato.gov.au• MBIE - support@nzpeppol.govt.nz
4	<p>Next steps and wrap up</p> <p>There will be a placeholder sent out for a further meeting of the focus group in the event there are significant changes to the document. If the meeting is no longer required, it will be cancelled.</p> <p>The document will be presented back to the All Stakeholders Working Group for their approval at the next meeting in July.</p>
5	<p>Meeting close</p> <p>Closing remarks from DSPANZ, ATO and MBIE to thank everyone for their input during this meeting and the focus group overall.</p>