

**Collaborative Assembly of
Software Developers and HMRC (CASH) Meeting
Room 1.22, Euston Tower,
286 Euston Road, London, NW1 3UH
13th March 2013, 11.00 – 14.30**

Attendees

Mike Walker (MW) - Chair	HMRC – P&P Head of SDST
Dennis Dawkins (DD)	HMRC – P&P SDST
Roger Hancock (RH)	Legal Software Suppliers Association (LSSA)
Louise Bennett (LB)	BCS
Norman Green (NG)	BCS
Ken Gower (KG)	AFSS
Kevin Hart (KH)	BASDA
Alex Rowson (AR)	BASDA
Denise Walsh (DW)	HMRC Business Customer Unit
Paul Harrison (PH)	HMRC Business Customer Unit
Umer Ehsan (UE)	HMRC Digital Solutions Programme
Chris Tongue (CT)	HMRC Compliance & external software
Martin Lines (ML)	HMRC – P&P SDST
Martin Gleave (MG)	Aspire
Judith Daley (JD)	Aspire

Apologies

Simon Parsons (SP)	IREEN/BCS
Simon Sabel (SS)	e-Conveyancing Liaison Group
Philip Webb (PW)	BCS Government Relationships Group

1. Welcome and minutes from previous meeting

MW welcomed and introduced all the attendees. He reviewed all the action points from the last meeting and confirmed that these are all now closed.

MW expressed thanks to developers for taking the time to complete the SDST customer satisfaction surveys and provided a brief summary of the successful results achieved this year. For the first time ever the July 2012 satisfaction levels reached a 100% positive rating which is a pleasing result for the team and year to date levels are running at over 97%.

NG endorsed this by praising the incredible amount of help that had been provided by SDST with RTI and said how appreciated it was by the developer community.

MW gave some headline figures for the SA filing peak in January '13.

2. Identity Assurance & GDS / HMRC Digital Strategy – Umar Ehsan

UE introduced himself as the Digital Solutions Manager for IDA and talked through the developer engagement plan. He highlighted the first important date HMRC is aiming towards is Oct 2014 with a pilot scheme for a designated service or services.

The following question arose following the initial talk through:

Q. KH – Has a pilot service been decided yet?

A. UE – Not yet, we're looking for CASH etc to help select best option.

UE flagged up other sections of the plan relating to the Working Groups with the following summaries and Q&As:

Working Groups

3.1 Customer Journey Experience

Q. KH – What are the most relevant data points expected in a ‘Good Customer Experience’?

A. UE – We’re looking for this detail to come out of the working groups as an early indicator.

Q. KH – Are we looking at this from a technical viewpoint or holistically across customers?

A. UE – Holistically to identify what is a good customer journey from End to End. It’s important to define the scope early on in Working Groups.

3.2 Token design

This will probably focus more on technical aspects so it’s important to get appropriate developer representatives. GDS will also feed into this working group.

3.3 Interface with Replacement Transaction Service (including APIs)

Q. Will it be a cross government solution or HMRC specific?

A. UE – This is still to be decided but HMRC are leading the design.

3.4 Pilot Group and Early Adopters

No issues or questions raised on this point

3.5 Third Party Software Identity Provision

This group is expected to go forward initially with a feasibility study. It’ll need to determine if there is any appetite for developers to become ID providers and if their solutions would meet or fit into the technical or commercial policy/guidance.

Following the discussions on the proposed working groups the meeting moved on to cover their Governance. The following Q&As cover this section:

4 Governance

4.1 Communications

A technical ‘Blog’ is being explored to feed info to the wider developer community. In addition there may be other ‘closed’ forums to allow Q&As etc.

4.5 Nominating Representatives

UE confirmed he’s looking for the Rep Bodies to help with their selection.

UE concluded his run through of the Engagement Plan and opened up discussions for a general Q&A session. Below is a list of the main points to come from this session:

- The group agreed the Engagement Plan approach was welcoming and expressed how please they were to see HMRC involving the software developer community early in the design stage.
- Developers need to know what level of commitment was expected from them on the Working Groups. UE - Confirmed this would be approx 3Hrs per month for formal meetings as detailed on the Plan (Page 9). There may be a need for additional resource for preparation work, research etc outside formal WG meetings.

- Is there any chance that HMRC will provide access to online tools to support collaboration e.g. E-Rooms etc? UE - HMRC are looking at this but we may also need developers to assist with facilities. It was felt that it was incumbent on HMRC to set up online facilities rather than relying on developers and that the IDA project should be used as the trigger to get online collaboration facilities in place between HMRC & Developers. It was agreed that this would be taken on board and attempts made to explore what could be done but there may be departmental constraints.
- The location of meetings may determine who can practically participate. HMRC will aim to assist with practical issues and will try to travel to developers rather than vice-versa, particularly for any one to one sessions.
- Attendees at working group meetings must be consistent to ensure continuity but this resource commitment could be a challenge for some developers. This could provide further backing to push for virtual meeting facilities.
- UE -Downstream HMRC Compliance issues need to be considered. – This will probably fall under the remit of the Customer Journey Group.
- DD/UE - The decision to implement this Engagement Plan was partly driven out following workshop on the original thinking that hadn't fully considered the requirements of the Software Community. All the information gathered at those previous meetings was captured and will feed into this engagement work. KH expressed his view that the earlier workshop had already covered a lot of this ground and that it is important to re-use the assets produced in earlier workshops to avoid duplication of effort.
- The view was expressed by several people that an initial HMRC decision on the timings and which exemplar services will go into the pilots would help developers decide who is best placed to participate. Although there should be value for developers who decide to enter the pilots they need a clear understanding of all the plans before they can make an informed decision on their participation. UE agreed to take an action to discuss pilot options with regards to work stream participation.
- UE - It's hoped the pilot services will be decided quite early with the possibility that these may naturally fall into line under certain customer segmentations/groups.
- KG - AFSS members are likely have greater interest in Token Workgroup rather than the other more generic groups as this is the one of most direct relevance to them.
- There was a suggestion that HMRC should be narrowing the choice of solutions, possibly under customer groups such as Direct & Indirect Customers or Heads of Duty. This is expected to be an early decision for the Pilot Working Group to make, although there was a suggestion that this could happen without the need for a face to face workshop. Options could be collated and distributed for opinions and a decision to be made.
- A suggestion was made that the PAYE service may be a good option for the pilot as this covers a good cross section of customer organisations and use-cases.
- Government Digital Services (GDS) are still defining what Self Assertion is for Businesses etc.
- LB - Consideration needs to be given to all EU and Non EU plans around IDA to ensure they align with these plans. UE - confirmed that this is being actively tracked.
- Working groups are expected to have no more than 8 software developer members with the wider groups feeding into these.
- A question was asked around whether the outcomes from the Token Working Group would include the sourcing of tokens as this could be quite pivotal to the software community. UE - confirmed that this would be a requirement for that group to consider.

UE concluded this session by thanking everyone for their input and confirmed he was happy to receive any additional questions or comments after the meeting and that these should be sent via the SDS Team.

3. Agent Strategy

Paul Harrison gave an overview of early plans for a new approach to how HMRC will identify and interact with Agents. This generated some follow up discussion with the main points and comments from developer reps as follows:

- Any changes need to take account of customers who work with multiple agents for different aspects of the tax affairs and interactions with HMRC.
- New processes need to ensure copies of statutory notices can go to Agents as this could help with client compliance. This could be via a HMRC portal view facility or through an API for agents allowing sight of HMRC/Taxpayer interactions.
- Suggestion made to avoid any migration of existing Agent data onto a new system. Only new validated data should be used and this should be facilitated by allowing for a very flexible lead time for data cleansing with an initial suggestion of 1-2 years.

PH thanked everyone for their input and asked for any other questions or comments to be sent to him via SDS Team.

4. Computers & Compliance

Chris Tongue provided a quick update on the subject following his attendance at the previous CASH meeting.

CT explained how his remit in this area had changed slightly with the formation of a new national team looking at things like Business accounting and Electronic Point of Sale (EPOS) software systems etc. HMRC need to improve our knowledge of these to help our compliance staff and IT based auditors. We need to assess what risks may be associated with particular systems to gain a greater understanding of how they work in particular where evasion can be exploited, for example via the electronic suppression of sales transactions through EPOS systems. Gaining knowledge of the range of systems on the market and having the opportunity to evaluate them in a technical lab would be a huge help in identifying whether a system is being operated as intended.

These initial thoughts are just early ideas but will be formalised in time and engagement with the developers of the type of systems mentioned would be really helpful. It was flagged up that early engagement with developers, as happened in RTI, is crucial if there is any likelihood that specific data output or functionality is required to aid this work. Expecting taxpayers to extract information from existing systems is much more difficult to comply with.

CT closed by thanking everyone for their input.

5. SDST Update

This was covered by MW in the introduction.

6. AOB

There was no AOB

The meeting closed at 1:55pm

Next Meeting – Initially planned to go ahead in approx 3 months. Specific details will follow.