dspanz. digital service providers
australia new zealand

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

Meeting Summary - 26 May 2022

Item #	Outcomes
1	**Introduction** Maggie Leese welcomed everyone to the group and acknowledged Traditional Owners in Australia and NZ.
2	**Introduction to the Topic** Andrew Stein introduced the access point migration and exit topic to the group and began running through the questions included in the slide pack before opening up to a group discussion.
3	**Understanding the Current State** The current process for switching involves the customer asking their current AP to de-register them and then asking their new AP to re-register them manually. There aren't many examples of switching APs to learn from. The focus group needs to consider the future state where there will be higher volumes and more SME participants. The group discussed the following 'topics': *Participants involved* The group discussed different scenarios where multiple parties may be involved including the current and new AP providers, the current and new SMP providers, and in some cases an end user's accounting/ERP/FMIS solution that integrates with an AP. The 'switch' in the A-NZ context generally refers to switching SMPs as most A-NZ APs are providing their own SMP service, rather than a single/low number of SMPs providing services for many APs. This means the SMP provider is an important player. An SML entry is owned by an SMP, and only the 'owning' SMP can remove the entry to allow the participant ID to be registered elsewhere. In rare situations in A-NZ, and more commonly in some overseas jurisdictions, the 'switch' may involve changing APs that both use the same SMP, in which case the switch will require updating SMP records as opposed to updating the SML record. *Who initiates the switch?* A switch can be initiated by the end user, e.g. by a large entity who has a 1:1 contract with a Peppol Service Provider. A switch may also be initiated by end user (C4) software. The new Peppol agreements define relationship ownership when there is end user software involved - the contractual relationship is between the AP and end user software, where the C1 or C4 software provider is acting as an intermediary.

Where a switch is initiated by end user software, it is responsible for communicating and seeking 'approval' from its end users. **Acknowledging that SMEs will often not know who their AP is, the group agreed that end users should have the ability to request to de-register**.

From a process perspective, currently it is likely that the end user needs to orchestrate a switch by requesting the current AP/SMP to turn off the service, then independently approaching the new AP/SMP to turn on the new service. In this scenario, APs are not 'connected'.

Discussed scenarios where switching AP/SMP can become complicated. For example:
- End user is not aware of what's happening in the background and selects to use a new package (e.g. software add-on). May not be aware they are selecting to switch AP/SMP.
- End user's Participant ID is supplied by the software provider (e.g. a GLN or domain name), which the end user cannot retain when switching to a new provider. Although it is expected that the end user has ownership of its Participant ID, there may be different commercial / contractual arrangements in place that need to be considered.
- An end user is moving from end user software 1 to software 2 and there is an overlapping period where both software can be used - when should the switch happen?

Questions were also raised regarding how would an end user (particularly an SME) know what features may be lost after the switch.

What is the process for switching?
If the end user or end user software initiates the switch, **the AP should verify that it is a valid request and that it has been authorised before the technical switch occurs**. They should complete Know Your Customer checks to be confident. Note that the end user software may not have the information to be able to verify the end user making the request.

Conversation around if an end user is no longer your client, they should be removed from SML (e.g. if AP/SMP is denying access due to lapsed payments and have ceased service to the end user). Rules around end user identification mean that you must deal with active contacts which infers that you should de-register them, but the rules do not explicitly state this.

Note that in Singapore if there's a request to switch AP/SMP and it has been authorised, you must do the switch.

Agreed that outside of providing examples and considerations for end users and end user software, this focus group will consider business processes as out of scope. This means that all guidance will be given, subject to existing contractual obligations between end-users and Service Providers.

Technically, how does the switch happen
The current OpenPeppol pattern does not have SLAs in place but the technical 'design' was aiming for a (near) real time switch and no/little outage. However, it requires both the losing and gaining SMPs to agree and implement this capability. Rick Harvey will look into the existing migration pattern document and provide feedback for the group.

	Acknowledged that the SML is the key switch point. In discussions, the term "de-register" is generally used to talk about switching but in technical terms it means removing the entry from the SML. *What is an acceptable outage?* The Focus Group could develop and recommend SLAs on outages. Further discussion is needed. *What role does the Peppol Authority play?* Peppol Authority does not have authority over the end user software in requiring them to have deregistration functionality.
4	**Potential Outcomes** Discussed potential outcomes for the working group including: ● Recommendations and considerations for end users and end user software switching APs ● SLAs on outages
4	**Next steps and wrap up** There will be at least another meeting of the AP only stream of this Focus Group on 9 June before joining with other participants on 21 June. DSPANZ, ATO and MBIE will develop some statements that could form part of the guidance produced from the focus group to discuss at the next meeting and additional considerations / issues to deep dive into.
5	**Meeting close**