



www.peppol.eu

**PEPPOL**   
PAN-EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT ONLINE

*making  
procurement  
better.eu*



# Reporting Work Group

**Carmen Ciciriello**

UK Department of Health and Social Care

Date: 26 March 2019



## Background

---

- On April 3rd, 2018, the OpenPEPPOL Managing Committee approved the mandate to establish a Work Group to identify the mandatory reporting requirements for the PEPPOL eDelivery network.
  - A survey has been conducted in May 2018 to assess the current reporting practices, requirements and expectations among PEPPOL Authorities. The Leader of the OpenPEPPOL TICC also provided feedback.
  - Survey results show that the majority of PEPPOL Authorities manually gather monthly reports by collating the data received by AP providers in the form of excel spread sheets. Some PEPPOL Authorities do not gather any statistics.
  - Reporting requirements have been gathered and discussed during the Work Group net-meetings and documented in a Report available on Confluence.
  - Technical specifications for the “DigitalTrafficReport” have been drafted and are available on Confluence.
-



# Mandatory requirements

<b>R1</b>	<b>Number of transactions sent and received per document type</b>
Rationale	To track the number of different PEPPOL messages exchanged over the network.
Implications	This data can be extracted from the SBDH envelope, using the DocumentID.

<b>R2</b>	<b>Number of senders</b>
Rationale	To track the number of senders in order to provide a more complete overview of the number of PEPPOL participants.
Implications	This data can be extracted from the SBDH envelope, using the Sender Identifier. However, some entities may use multiple identifiers.

<b>R3</b>	<b>Number of receivers registered in the SMP</b>
Rationale	To track the number of Participants capable of receiving PEPPOL messages.
Implication / issue	This data can be gathered by monitoring the registrations on the SMPs. Organisations can register more than one ParticipantID.



# Mandatory requirements

---

<b>R4</b>	<b>AS2 vs. AS4 transactions</b>
Rationale	To track the transaction exchanged via each transmission protocol (AS2 vs. AS4)
Implications	This data can be extracted from the Access Point service.

  

<b>R5</b>	<b>Domestics vs. cross-border transactions</b>
Rationale	To track how many transactions are exchanged at a cross-border and domestic level
Implications / issues	It should be possible to extract the country code for the majority of the identifiers used in PEPPOL. Alternatively, the SBDH envelop must be extended to include the country code. TICC to assess the best option.



## Optional requirements

---

<b>R6</b>	<b>Number of transactions exchanged per document type for each sender and receiver</b>
Rationale	To track the transaction volume per document type, for each Sender and Receiver.
Implications	This data can be extracted from the SBDH envelope, using the Sender and Receiver Identifiers. However, some entities may use multiple identifiers.



# Considerations

1	Data to be extracted from the envelope by APs
Requirement	Only data in the SBDH envelope should be gathered. Data included in the message should not be accessed and may be encrypted.
2	Data accuracy
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Some statistics may not be very accurate, such as cross-border vs. domestic transactions.</li><li>- Some entities may use multiple identifiers.</li></ul>
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The PEPPOL Directory could identify the multiple identifiers and country ID, if its use is mandatory.</li><li>- The SBDH envelope could be updated to include a new field, 'Country'.</li></ul>
3	Implementing requirements
Challenge	Service providers may be reluctant to gather detailed information.
Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Update the PEPPOL TIA to include common reporting requirements.</li><li>- Share aggregated statistics with service providers.</li><li>- AP providers should send reporting data to a single system (OpenPEPPOL).</li></ul>



# IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

---



*making  
procurement  
better.eu*

Discuss reporting options and implementation phases.



# Implementation Options

---

- 1. Develop a REST based API for reporting only.** Re-use the existing excel spreadsheet, that could be converted into XML. Access Point providers to send the XML file using REST API.

Pros: Simpler and quicker to start implementing.

Cons: It does not re-use the existing eDelivery network and may delay the implementation of a fully automated solution.

- 2. Develop a UBL based XML reporting message** to include the mandatory reporting requirements. Access Point providers to send the UBL message to OpenPEPPOL, using the PEPPOL network.

Pros: Use of a tried and tested method for creating messages. Fully automated solution. Potential for real time collection of data.

Cons: It may take longer to implement.

---





# PEPPOL Reporting Format

---

PEPPOL  
PAN-EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT ONLINE



*making  
procurement  
better.eu*

## Decisions made by PEPPOL Authorities



# PEPPOL Reporting Format

---

- **Belgium:** Option 2
- **Denmark:** Option 2
- **Poland:** Option 2
- **Germany:** Option 2
- **Ireland:** Option 2
- **Italy:** Option 1
- **Netherlands:** Option 1
- **Norway:** Option 2 is the solution for Phase 3 – long term; for short term Option 1 could be used.
- **Poland:** Option 2



# PEPPOL Reporting Format

---

- **Singapore:** Option 1
- **Sweden:** Option 2; possibility to manually enter the reporting data in a simple user interface for APs without automated reporting.
- **UK:** Option 2

## VOTING RESULTS:

The majority of the PEPPOL Authorities selected Option 2.



## Implementation requirements

---

- XML files to be centrally collected by OpenPEPPOL to create reports which can be accessed by PEPPOL Authorities for analysis.
- Only count messages in one direction (e.g. messages sent). These transactions would be equal to the number of received transactions by the respective receiver APs, so there is no reason to count these transactions twice, on both sides. (However, both transactions sent and received will be reported by APs in order to check for discrepancies and data accuracy).



# Implementation Roadmap

---

- **Phase 0:** From January to March 2019
    - Distribute draft specifications and gather feedback from APs (TICC) and OO.
  - **Phase 1:** from April to September 2019
    - Technical specifications available
    - Use of updated excel spreadsheets
    - All AP providers to send spreadsheets to their PEPPOL Authorities (which will send it to OpenPEPPOL)
  - **Phase 2:** from October 2019 to March 2020
    - Service available from OpenPEPPOL to receive and process XML automatically
    - Use of both XML and spreadsheet (preferably XML)
  - **Phase 3:** from April 2020
    - Mandatory use of automated reporting solution
-



## Next steps

---

As of April 1<sup>st</sup> , 2019, the OpenPEPPOL TICC Leader takes over the activities, in cooperation with the Operating Office:

- Review the reporting specifications for AP providers
- Define requirements for SMP providers
- Implement the actions as outlined in the Implementation Roadmap
- Liaise with TIA Revision Lead to include the reporting requirements
- Define frequency of the reports
- Liaise with PEPPOL Authorities to ensure their requirements are met
- Define how PEPPOL Authorities will access the full set of data from OpenPEPPOL

Net-meeting minutes, reports and technical specifications are available on Confluence:

- <https://openpeppol.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ORDWG/overview>
-