**2021.06.18 PP4 – PINT PoC Coordination**

**Net-meeting, 10:00 – 12:00 CEST**

**Meeting Attendees**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Lefteris Leontaridis (LL) 2. Mikael Aksamit (MA) 3. Paul Simons (PS) 4. Georg Birgisson (GB) 5. Philip Helger (PH) | 1. Erwin Wulterkens (EW) 2. Alexander Apostolovski (AA) 3. Roel Crooijmans (RC) 4. Jerry Dimitriou (JD) 5. Oriol Bausa Peris (OBP) |

**Agenda Items**

* Overdue: Status PP1-A1-A4
* Due: Status PP3-A6

**Decision Log**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Decision** | **Type** | **Note** |
| PP1-D1 | Priority to world regions | Executive | Priority will be to test across world regions first (e.g. EU-ANZ), differences in CIUS inside Europe to be left for a later stage |
| PP1-D2 | Mandatory BIS discussion not in scope for the moment | Executive | Will be addressed when the right time comes |
| PP3-D1 | Priority to global PINT model and the JPN regional variant | Executive | We need to move from the WG deliverable to a global PINT model and the best way to do this is through the modelling of the JPN variant where no prior work exists. The global model and the JPN variant will be developed together and then the global model will be used to create the other regional variants |

**Action Log Notes**Existing Action items with updates (in Red and/or marked with **PP3:**)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Action** | **Owner** | **Target date** | **Status** | **Note** |
|  | **1. Kick off meeting** | | | | |
| PP1-A1 | Payload ANZ: artefacts  Check with ATO | GB | 11/6/21 | Open | **PP1:** A/NZ already available. Publication was planned of specification eo May.  **PP2**: ANZ contacted, no response – we should try with Martin and Chi  **PP3**: ATO sent their artefacts can’t use as is but they are easily restructured |
| PP1-A2 | Payload SG: check with IMDA] – Alignment part of PINT? | GB | 11/6/21 | Open | **PP1:** SG: has different rules that are not supported by the UBL (eg taxable amount in local currency)  **PP2**: We need to produce the PINT-compliant profile  **PP3**: Not the first priority |
| PP1-A3 | Payload JPN: who to involve | GB | 11/6/21 | Open | **PP1:** JPN: Separate project in parallel  **PP2**: GB/JD using the new tools for it, OB looking at the rules for the core invoice (this is what we need for the PINT PoC)  JPN – we are in WIP mode with the common understanding and the confirmation of the business requirement. We will incorporate JPN into the PINT PoC when the cre invoice is agreed. There is some more freedom where there are no priors and they are the first example of a new country modelled directly using PINT  **PP3**: GB Continuing the development of the model and using asciidoc. OB rules sent to JPN for comment and approval. Target date for core invoice (relevant for PINT PoC) 30 June. |
| PP1-A4 | Payload EU: GB update what has been produced – w. Oriol | GB | 11/6/21 | Open | **PP1:** EU: Assumption US BIS 3.0 is fully compliant with PINT and can be used as a start with right document identifier – but we create PINT compliant validation artefacts. Some complexities may come up  **PP2**: We need to provide validation tools and use the reference implementation created from Japan  **PP3**: Go through the data model and restructure. Focus on Japan before proceeding with others. |
| PP3-A1 | Core PINT model should be produced |  | 30/6/21 | Open | **PP3**: First version: 30 June including JPN. |
| PP3-A2 | Effort estimates for the regional variants | All | !! | Open |  |
| PP3-A3 | Document the approach and choices in building the core and regional models. | All | !! | Open | **PP3**: See also: PP3-A4 |
| PP3-A4 | Clarify what deliverables we have – and we need a write-up of this methodology and choices made in the approach | AA | !! | Open |  |
| PP1-A5 | Describe end to end usage/use case scenarios | PH, RC+GB > PS | !! | Open | **PP1:** What are the variances that need to be in the test.  **PP2**: PS made a first proposal, to review by all by next meeting  We need to define wht options we have in the combination of receive capability registered in the SMP, real processing capability in combinations of C3/C4 (RC/JD)  **PP3**: Need more effort to flesh out the scenarios in more detail |
| PP1-A6 | Which CTC playground architecture components are (re)usable for PINT? | PH/JD/MA | !! | Open | **PP2**: We could reuse the SMP and the AP software installed but with either different instances or the same one – we should decide what is more efficient  **PP3**: We use the AP software in the playground but the simpler case is to create separate instances (with different configurations) for the APs. Security and logging issues also are leading us to that direction. |
| PP3-A5 | Deploy the basic infrastructure by 30 June | MA+ JD | 30/6/21 | Open | **PP3**: Action based on PP1-A6. |
| PP3-A6 | Provide a first version of a playground implementation plan | JD | 18/6/21 | Open |  |
| PP3-A7 | Decide whether it is feasible to update the editing and publishing tools during the PoC or later | !! | !! | Open | **PP3:** (see if we can bring in Erlend) |
| PP1-A7 | Reference group invitation email | LL | !! | Open | **PP2**: Draft available (by AA), LL will send out a slightly revised version – maybe 2 weeks max for getting subscribers |
| PP2-A1 | Confirm whether to use the new tools for the PINT PoC | JD/GB | !! | Open | **PP2:** Would be good to use them because there are advantages but we need to be sure this will not slow us down too much |
| PP2-A2 |  |  |  | Closed | **PP2:** Target dates for payload next meeting – *Date added in separate column* |