dspanz. digital service providers
australia new zealand

Topics discussed at the A-NZ Peppol Stakeholders Working Group

As per the Terms of Reference, the A-NZ Peppol Stakeholders Working Group (referred to as 'the group') has been established to enable stakeholders to discuss issues and possible enhancements of their Peppol implementation.

A number of topics were discussed and prioritised at the initial meeting on 17 November 2021.

Contexts and the priority for each topic are below, including the summary of breakout room discussions as Attachment A.

High priority topics are marked below and an Expression of Interest (EOI) process will commence soon to form focus working groups.

For general consultation

This group may be used for formal and informal consultation about future changes to the network, and topics 1-3 below are some examples.

1. When a significant change is proposed to A-NZ Peppol specifications, which may bring business impact.
   For example: Peppol has developed an international invoicing model and this group will help determine how and when A-NZ can adopt this model - what are the benefits and costs and what is a reasonable timeframe.

2. Entity identification, verification and reporting - which is currently being managed by OpenPeppol but may need to consult with the A-NZ community regarding country-specific requirements and implementations.
   This group will help build a strong and effective mechanism for verification and reporting.

3. Extended use of Peppol invoicing.
   Peppol being a standard framework, can be used for invoicing and other procurement transactions (e.g. purchase order, invoice response). Some stakeholders would like to utilise other transactions (beyond invoicing), which requires a critical mass to realise benefits. There is also feedback / suggestions that Peppol can support other transactions, for example: credit card statements,

dspanz. digital service providers
australia new zealand

payment claims and government grants.

It is currently at an early stage for most A-NZ businesses and the focus is to start with eInvoicing. This group will be a mechanism to raise, explore and discuss these opportunities and assess market readiness.

> **Priority rating is not applicable as consultation will commence as required.**

Specific topics 4 and 5

4. **Consistent data mapping**
   To ensure the consistent interpretation of Peppol specification and business practices. Invoice data is mapped to appropriate data fields. E.g. which Peppol field should be used for a client's account number?

   Some issues were raised by various stakeholders regarding inconsistency / misinterpretation of some data fields, e.g. purchase order number and buyer reference numbers are sometimes not distinguished, which have caused interoperability issues.

> **High priority. Needs to be addressed immediately.**
> Significant impact on DSPs and end user businesses and needs to be proactively managed.
>
> Stakeholders are prompted to share known issues, experience and mapping decisions. Requires clear guidance with examples to avoid misinterpretation and inconsistency.

5. **Industry specific requirements**
   To understand industry specific requirements and the best approach to manage them.

   E.g. whether it should be managed by the current A-NZ specification or should a separate specification be created.
   Some industries have specific requirements too, e.g. construction, energy or telecommunications. Some industry-specific data may not fit nicely to a generic data field therefore we need to have a consensus on how this can be addressed.

Medium priority

This will be an ongoing piece of work as adoption increases in various industries. Different industries may have different standards and there is no one-size-fits-all solution. It is important and we should monitor this closely, however, it is not an urgent issue to solve.

A-NZ should focus on ensuring that basic invoicing works well first.

Specific topics 6-8

6. **Invoice routing**

   Some businesses need to categorise and process invoices in different systems or by different business units / teams.

   What are the architecture and business considerations for managing this in Peppol?

   This is about how invoices can be routed through the buyer's systems when there are multiple destinations for invoices.

   Some buyers have multiple business units or systems that process different types of inbound invoices. For example: if various business units in the organisation each have their own accounts payable teams that use different systems; or a buyer uses different systems or add-ons to match or process different types of purchases and the corresponding invoices.

   This should not affect businesses that have multiple accounts payable teams that all use common systems.

   There is no one-size-fits-all solution. It will depend on the unique circumstances of each receiving business.

   Entities that have these requirements need to weigh up various factors such as communicating with suppliers through onboarding processes and the complexity of their system architecture.

> **High priority**
> The impact of invoice routing varies for different entities. For those who are / might be affected, this needs to be addressed as soon as possible.

7. **Invoice Response and Procure-to-Pay (P2P) / eProcurement**
   To discuss market appetite for other Peppol document types (transactions) and adoption strategy for the A-NZ market.

   To determine the approach to move forward and timeframes.

   This topic is about assessing opportunities and market appetite to implement other existing Peppol document types (e.g. Order, Order Response, Invoice Response).

   We have heard from several stakeholders about the advantages that can be gained if the broader network supports the Invoice Response document (which supports buyers to communicate invoice processing status to sellers, which can reduce costs to manage exceptions, improve payment processes and, as a result, improve relationships between trading partners).

   Also, some entities have expressed interest in implementing other transactions such as Purchase Order.

   However, there needs to be a critical mass of take up to fully realise the benefits. Therefore, input is required from this group to determine the business drivers, benefits, barriers and priorities for adopting additional Peppol documents and how those vary across market segments and industries.

> **High priority (Invoice Response only)**
> There is common acknowledgement that adopting Invoice Response will be beneficial.
>
> Some entities are keen to use digital Purchase Orders.

8. **Invoicing and Payment**
   To ensure consistent implementation and business practice, e.g. data mapping for different payment channels. Closing the gap between Peppol eInvoicing and A-NZ payment capabilities.

   The Peppol invoice allows a seller to include detailed information on acceptable payment channels. There is an A-NZ guidance note to describe how to support popular payment channels in a Peppol invoice to ensure consistent data mapping -

which in turn will enable the receiver to process and pay invoices quickly with greater accuracy.

This could offer opportunities such as helping buyers to verify the supplier's identity or businesses could take advantage of emerging payment automation services.

Low priority (for now)
This is not a high priority but will become important / relevant as eInvoicing becomes more mature. Currently considered a "nice to have" and should be monitored.

Specific topics 9 and 10

9. **Switching Access Points**
   Develop guidance for end users and service providers:
   a. For end users: business considerations when considering switching their access point.
   b. For service providers: best practice to support a smooth transition for clients.

10. **Exit arrangements** *(a service provider no longer provides Peppol services and would like to be de-registered)*
    a. Peppol processes
    b. Best practice for Service Providers (to minimise disturbance to its business clients)
    c. Business considerations: implications for end users

There are processes developed by OpenPeppol but they do not address some potential business implications.

They may not cause immediate issues, however, it needs to be considered / addressed proactively to ensure minimum business interruptions and ensure that the network is stable and efficient.

High priority for both topics
There should be seamless processes to ensure no / little outage in the service and minimal interruption to business operations.

---

dspanz. digital service providers australia new zealand

Attachment A - Summary of Room Discussions

High Priority

Consistent data mapping (topic 4)

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
4-5	2-3	Immediate	- Biggest barrier to entry - Consistency important (even between access points) - Needs to be addressed before there is more volume - Issues should be reported to community - Need active examples from access points across the board - Initial gathering of known issues, decisions about mapping and publishing guidance. Then ongoing meetings for additional issues prompted by new use cases / industries - Examples: - Serial number, client account number, contractor name etc. where to map them - C4 specific data requirements vs. C1 business and/or solutions capability to store and provide the data - Addresses are missing 3 fields for POs - need to map according to hierarchy - Identify what's required to be a valid invoice (including recipient address) - Language and examples of exactly what is meant by critical - no room for misinterpretation - Issues when parts of P2P process are not electronic - Focus on mandatory and best practice fields (Invoice Content) first

Switching Access Points / exit arrangements (topics 10 and 11)

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
4-5	3	Immediate	● This topic is important for Access Points, Peppol Authorities and some end user businesses ● PA's have responsibility with this issue - process needs to be facilitated ● Needs to minimis outage in the service ● Everybody needs guidance for setting up contracts, processes and need to understand business implications

Invoice routing (topic 6)

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
4-5	4	Immediate	● About internal decision on receiver requirements - not a system change ● Important but must be managed locally ● Problem for some large entities (receivers) who have complex / multiple systems ● Awareness of who might be impacted, use of endpoint identifiers ○ Cross border traders need to know each other's business numbers ● Invoice approval process is the most difficult ● Impacting implementations right now

Invoice response (topic 7)
This was split by many groups with P2P not as high priority.

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
4-5	3-4	Immediate	● Higher priority than other P2P document types ● Need to make sure software products are set up to deal with these messages ● Dependency on OpenPeppol's work which is in progress ("advance invoicing") ● Variation and interpretation will be challenging (but there is an industry practice statement guidance document)

Medium Priority

eProcurement except for Invoice Response (topic 7)

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
3	2-3	12 months+	● Some entities would like to implement additional document types such as purchase order ● Invoice on the system is one thing but to get the real benefit you need other documents ● P2P interaction with EDI

Industry specific requirements (topic 5)

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
2-3	4	12 months+	● Get the invoice right first and make sure the basics are working well ● Not enough adoption / implementation in specific industries yet to fully understand ● Identifying and developing working solutions for all might be tricky ● Problem with interpretation by different communities - defining meaning at SP level will be difficult ● Should be at industry specific level - already happens where industries use specific UBL subsets ● Need for general invoice then specific (XML) attachments for each industry based on their needs ● Focus on high priority industries first ● Groups of users who use existing mechanisms to agree on standards - CIUS specifications with tailored schematrons ● More about what industries are using now with their own interpretations - accommodate both current and future users ● Need consistent practice e.g. how to deal with invoices with many pages / lines ● One DSP stated on construction already ● Ongoing piece of work

Low Priority

dspanz. digital service providers
australia new zealand

Invoicing and payment

Impact / relevance	Difficulty	Timeline / urgency	Comments (Summary)
2	2	12 months+	- Low now but will become high / nice to have - Most receivers have a different way of collecting payment info - Different payment options in Australia vs. NZ - no equivalent of BPAY in NZ - Invoice response / P2P, payment and switching access points connected to architecture from the recipient end. High-level architecture that separates responsibilities needs to be done to delegate components - need well-defined responsibilities

New Topic Raised

Identifying businesses / suppliers that are enabled to send eInvoices:

Peppol doesn't list all those enabled to send eInvoices e.g. some businesses are enabled via their SME accounting packages.

- Issue for government agencies trying to identify their SME supplier base to help onboard them to eInvoicing / grown invoice volume
- Room didn't discuss the issue - raise via chat
- Invoice routing resonated with this issue (how to address) even though Invoice Routing was intended to focus on businesses who may want to have multiple end points