



Key outcomes

UNCLASSIFIED External

Title:	Focus group – BIG review		
Issue date:	13 March 2019		
Venue:	WEBEX		
Event date:	12 March 2019	Start: 2:00pm	Finish: 3:00pm

Chair:	Sonia Lark	Facilitator:	Sonia Lark
Contact	Sonya Summers	Contact phone:	02 47257383

Attendees: names/section	Jason Stewart – Intermediaries and Individuals Dino Di Lorenzo – Intermediaries and Individuals Dimce Ritevski – Public Groups and Internationals Karen Greaves - Intermediaries and Individuals Sonia Lark – Digital Partnership Office Kevin Johnson (Reckon) David Delaney (ANZ) Kous Bandyopadhyay (CBA) Andrew Smith (MYOB) Darin Carter (Sage) Rohan Walder (Xero)
Apologies: name/section	Ross Stuart (SuperChoice)

Next meeting	TBA
---------------------	-----

Agenda item: 1 – Welcome and introduction

Sonia Lark welcomed the members, and provided some background on the expectations of the group, including that it will report back to the Digital Service Provider

Agenda item: 1 – Welcome and introduction

Architecture Reference Group (DARG) at the next meeting scheduled for 3 April in Melbourne.

Agenda item: 2 – General discussion

There was general discussion on a number of topics raised around the relevance and value of the BIGs.

Usage

There was mixed opinions from the group as to the value of the BIG.

Some DSPs advised they never use the BIG, or only as a last resort, they did find value as a resource from a business rather than a technical perspective.

There was general agreement that the BIG described how to *use* a service rather than how to *build* it – and even then it often falls short of providing sufficient detail and context, so is of limited value for technical implementation.

Lead time

The group agreed there is currently insufficient lead time between a BIG release and a service being implemented. A more appropriate lead time would be six months, but this may be unrealistic due to other constraints faced by the ATO, some of which are outside of our control. (for example: late government changes)

Duplication

The question was posed around the benefit of duplicating technical specifications in the BIG which may be available elsewhere.

Kevin Johnson commented that all the documents can be used together, so duplication is unnecessary.

David Delaney commented that information may be duplicated, but at times there is less jargon and more of a business focus rather than technical. He agrees there was no need to duplicate technical detail.

Andrew Smith suggested user-friendly commentary for some of the business detail.

Location

The group agreed it would be beneficial to have all documentation located in one place.

Format

Dino Di Lorenzo took the group through an example of the BIG and described the intent of each section.

Overall the group agreed there was value in moving content which is common to ALL BIGs to an 'overview' document or common BIG, leaving BIGs specific to a service for tailored detail, including detail and context.

Improvement opportunities

A number of suggestions were given for how to improve the BIGs:

- 'What's new' – a summary of changes to a service
- Links to the technical documentation
- A list of the 'exceptions' – limitations to taxpayer circumstances eaning they are unable to use this service, validation errors where particular taxpayers cannot lodge electronically.
- FAQ's – questions can be documented for future reference as they arise and are addressed.

Next steps:

A mock-up of a new BIG template will be developed and presented at the DARG meeting on 3 April for review and feedback.