

Action Item	Description	Action by	Status	Update
19/01 - 02	Business to investigate the need to have different TPAR versions to account for private and government reporting.	DPO/Danny Figueiredo	Closed	<p><b>16 Feb:</b> Ticket update was accepted by the DSP and awaiting the specifications to be release to close the ticket. This item will be removed from the PLSWG.</p> <p><b>2 Feb:</b> The specification for TPAR.0003 (2021) is correct and it's the business guidance that needs updating to reflect that it will be used to reporting "<i>Payments made by government entities for services or payments made by businesses for services</i>". DSPs looking to develop this service, should wait until the FEB EVTE release as it will include this update plus recent legislative changes. Production release is still expected for July 2021.</p>
19/01 - 01	Business to investigate and confirm if updates will be made to company tax rates for future year returns and the possibility of lodgment of future year returns, in prior year CTR versions, via SBR for base rate entities.	DPO/Danny Figueiredo	In progress	<p><b>16 Feb:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>For CTR 2021 EVTE:</u> The Tax Rate for Company ITR is being updated as reported earlier.</li> <li>• <u>For Early Lodgers:</u> This is officially logged as a change request due to the complexity of the matter (INC003071120). It is being actively discussed between the business and technical teams for a final review on the matter as it does impact multiple systems (not just SBR) and they need to ensure all systems can accommodate and are in sync for this change where a Company is to access a future year tax rate. Currently the only alternative for Early Lodgers in this situation (interim) is via paper.</li> <li>• <u>For Early Balancers:</u> <i>details to follow</i></li> </ul> <p><b>2 Feb:</b> An incident has been logged and the ATO is currently investigating. It has been identified that the tax time 2021 rates is on target to be changed, however business together with DWIS are exploring the requirements and implications of making the change to 2020 rate understanding that it only effects the early lodgers or SAP. The ATO is also looking to inform tax agents of this matter via the <a href="#">PLS trouble shooting page</a> (still to be updated).</p>

Action Item	Description	Action by	Status	Update
08/12 - 02	DPO to work with business to determine a way to consult with DSPs on the LCB measure and its implementation.	DPO/Laura Bagnato	<b>Closed</b>	<p><b>2 Feb:</b> The business team attended the PLSWG to provide a feedback opportunity for the recent Change Advice issued 19 January.</p> <p><b>19 Jan:</b> Due to the tight timeframes in which the LCB measure needs to be developed and delivered, the business team will not be in a position to co-design or consult on this one. They have advised that if they do get any feedback they will see if it is already incorporated in our validation checks and design.</p>
08/12 - 01	Business to provide instructions on the SAP process for the LCB measure which DSPs can provide to their clients.	Laura Bagnato	<b>Closed</b>	<p><b>19 Jan:</b> The updated Change Advice has been received and published to the collaboration hub and SWD.</p>

29/10 - 01	Sangitha Sivayogaraj will follow up to confirm the naming issues raised in relation to lodging NLA and Dividend and Interest schedules for trusts or entities with # in the name have been resolved.	Sangitha Sivayogaraj	<b>In progress</b>	<p><b>16 Feb:</b> We are still awaiting for the feedback from relevant areas regarding the scope (i.e. impacts on certain services, or all instances of non-individual names). We have followed this up and will provide further update as soon as it is available.</p> <p><b>2 Feb:</b> The issue was assessed with a bigger scope than original incident. The job sizing and the number of services being rolled out are being examined, aiming to develop a holistic approach for the matter rather than a fix to one single issue raised. The Solution is being developed with no specific timeframe provided as of yet.</p> <p><b>19 Jan:</b> The feature is written and with DWIS for assessment to be progressed to the Product Management Group (PMG).</p> <p><b>8 Dec:</b> The feature is being assessed by impacted function areas and yet to be finalised.</p> <p><b>24 Nov:</b> Business is assisting with the finalisation of the feature. It will progress to the PMG for approval shortly.</p> <p><b>27 Oct:</b> No further update, internal documentations are still being prepared and reviewed</p> <p><b>13 Oct:</b> an initial draft of a feature (system change document) has been completed and will be progressed to internal review and approval.</p> <p><b>29 Sept:</b> Business change request is being planned - submission for internal approval is scheduled in early October. Pending the outcome, further business requirement document will be prepared and progressed to system changes.</p> <p><b>15 Sept:</b> Work is continuing on aligning the use of special characters across services. There may be a staged approach for delivery of updates.</p> <p><b>01 Sept:</b> No further update at this time.</p> <p><b>18 August:</b> No further update at this time.</p> <p><b>4 August:</b> Business is progressing with a request to allow special characters in non-individual entity names – as these validation rules impact multiple business lines and systems, they are working together to reach an outcome.</p> <p><b>21 July:</b> Business are continuing to progress this discussion on the broader implications of allowing certain characters – no further update.</p> <p><b>07 July:</b> no further update at this time.</p> <p><b>23 June:</b> no further update at this time. There’s a broader conversation taking place about acceptable characters in general across services which is being led by business.</p> <p><b>09 June:</b> no further update at this time.</p> <p><b>26 May:</b> Still under review by business.</p>
------------	--	----------------------	--------------------	---

Action Item	Description	Action by	Status	Update
				<p><b>12 May:</b> currently under review by business. The exclusion of # in the DIS was intentional in late 2019 to prevent system errors that were occurring at the time. Due to this, the requirement is being investigated by our business areas to determine whether there is value in allowing this change based on the number of users experience this issue. This is still in progress.</p> <p><b>28 April:</b> DWIS are working with Business and PGI teams to implement a minor change aimed at addressing the issue</p> <p><b>14 April:</b> no further update at this time.</p> <p><b>31 Mar:</b> no further update at this time.</p> <p><b>17 Mar:</b> no further update at this time.</p> <p><b>03 Mar:</b> No further update</p> <p><b>18 Feb:</b> No movement, still waiting for business to confirm and drive the change</p> <p><b>4 Feb:</b> Pending business guidance</p> <p><b>21 Jan:</b> No progress over the shutdown period. Still waiting for business direction on how to proceed.</p> <p><b>10 Dec:</b> We are still waiting for business direction on how best to resolve this issue.</p> <p><b>26 Nov:</b> The last update on the 20/11 is that this is still with the business areas to progress.</p> <p><b>12 Nov:</b> This issue is still being investigated, with the possibility of a fix being required. It has been referred back to business for quality checking.</p>