Australian Government
Australian Taxation Office

SuperStream

Contributions V3 Conformance Testing Guide

A guide to the Contributions v3 conformance testing process for employers, funds and solution providers

Payday Super
18 September 2025

Version control

This document is maintained by SuperStream Data and Payments Improvement Project team as part of the ATO Payday super program

Version	Date	Author	Description of change
V1	8 July 2025	Shane Moore	Initial Draft for feedback
FINAL	18 September 2026	Shane Moore	Final version published

We acknowledge the Traditional Owners and Custodians of Country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, waters and community.
We pay our respects to them, their cultures, and Elders past and present.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for funds, software developers, employers and solution providers when undertaking conformance testing against version 3.0 of the SuperStream Contributions Standard. This version principally adds the Member Verification Request and incorporates updates to existing Member Registration Request and Contribution Transaction Request functionality.

Changes to the Fund Validation Service (FVS) is out of scope for this document, and testing requirements will be captured separately.

1.2. Testing cycles

Improvements to the SuperStream standard and Fund Validation Services (FVS) technical and business guidance documents will be progressively delivered over four phases.

Phase 1 – New Payments Platform (NPP) – is available from 12 August 2025 through an opt-in process. Funds will be required to accept NPP payments from 1 July 2026, enabling faster payments between employer to fund (and back to employer where amounts cannot be allocated).

Phase 2 – Error Code Management – scheduled to be delivered over a two week period in May 2026. This phase will simplify error codes, so the message is more transparent, allowing employers to take corrective action.

Phase 3 – FVS – scheduled to be delivered July 2026, to provide employers early visibility of changes (such as Successor Fund Transfers) and provide traceability of product closures.

Phase 4 – MIG Changes – scheduled delivery date to be confirmed, will introduce new functionality allowing employers to verify fund account details, and other changes supporting contributions to be made to the fund.

Phase 1 (NPP) does not require any coordinated testing; however, funds will need to ensure their financial provider can accept NPP payments. Phase 3 (FVS) testing requirements will be detailed outside of this document and are out of scope for the purposes of Contributions v3.0 Conformance Testing.

Throughout this document we will align references to testing cycles with the functional phases - Phase 2 (Error Code Management) will be referred to as Cycle 2; and Phase 4 (MIG Changes) will be referred to as Cycle 4.

The testing timetable will mirror the functional release schedule for Phase 2 (Error Code Management) and Phase 4 (MIG Changes), as detailed in *Schedule 4a Data and Payment Standards Contributions and Member Registrations Message Implementation Guide (MIG) v3.0*; and *Schedule 6 Data and Payment Standards Error Code Management v3.0*. These will be tested in the cycles as per below.

Cycle 2 – Error Code Management

Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR)

Employer and Fund Transactions

b. Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR)

Contribution Transaction Error Request (CTER)

Employer and Fund Transactions

a. Contribution Transaction Error Request (CTER)

As Cycle 2 – Error Code Management – contains limited technical changes, Cycle 2 will be a streamlined testing process. While the overarching technical framework of error messaging is not changing, Cycle 2 will facilitate testing of the new and updated error messages.

Cycle 2 testing will occur between funds and sending providers and will use existing CTR and MRR functionality to facilitate the CTER and MROR test cases. Full end to end testing will occur in Cycle 4, at which point the new CTR and MRR functionality (as well as the new MVR functionality) will be tested, and Cycle 2 (CTER and MROR) functionality will be regression tested.

A number of regression test cases will also be undertaken to ensure existing functionality has not been affected.

Cycle 4 – MIG Changes

Member Verification Request (MVR) - NEW

Employer and Fund Transactions

a. Member Verification Request (MVR)
b. Member Verification Outcome Response (MVOR)

Member Registration Request (MRR) - updated

Employer and Fund Transactions

c. Member Registration Request (MRR)
d. Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR)

Contribution Transaction Request (CTR) - updated

Employer and Fund Transactions

e. Contributions Transaction Request (CTR)
f. Contributions Transaction Error Response (CTER)

Due to the volume and scope of changes, Cycle 4 will require an increased focus on testing across a range of scenarios. Cohort groups will consist of a representative selection of solutions to gain sufficient confidence that updates are working as expected rather than testing every individual solution.

Regression testing will also occur, including on Government to Business (G2B) transactions, and functionality tested in Cycle 2.

1.3. Audience

The audience for this document is any employer, fund, software developer and solution provider that will be developing or extending their software to make it compliant with the Superannuation Data and Payment Standard 2012 (The 'Standard').

This document has been written for an audience expected to be familiar with the following:

- XBRL – www.xbrl.org
- XML – https://www.w3.org/TR/xml/
- ebMS3.0/AS4 - www.oasis-open.org/standards
- SuperStream program – www.ato.gov.au/datastandards
- SBR Program – www.sbr.gov.au

1.4. Document Content

The document provides sample test cases for execution by testing parties as part of a self-certification process up to and including peer-to-peer testing. This document contains a list of test cases to assist in validating the following:

- AS4 ebMS message conformance and testing supporting SuperStream business to business exchange of data
- The application code complies with the business rules defined in the corresponding Message Implementation Guide (MIG), and Error Code Management schedules, for the transaction.
- The application code generates an XBRL message instance that complies with the XBRL Definitional and Report Taxonomies and associated Schematron rules.
- The application code correctly processes a message received including exception handling.

1.5. Document Structure

The detailed content of this document is divided into the following cycles of testing, and by the core transactions:

Cycle 2 – Error Code Management

- Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR) (*Section 4.2*)
- Contribution Transaction Error Request (CTER) *(Section 4.3)*
- Regression Testing (*Section 4.4*)

Cycle 4 – MIG Changes

- Member Verification Request (MVR) *(Section 5.2)*
- Member Registration Request (MRR) *(Section 5.3)*
- Contribution Transaction Request (CTR) *(Section 5.4)*
- Regression Testing (*Section 5.5*)

The following testing methods will be undertaken where appropriate, to ensure the system changes operate as expected without unintended consequences. These are defined further below.

Conformance testing

This section focuses on the different solution scenarios and the many components involved in the messaging implementation that will be developed by funds, gateways and solution providers to support the Contributions Message Implementation Guide (Contributions MIG) v3.0, and the Error Code Management schedules.

An overview of interoperability testing, integration and peer-to-peer testing is provided for both employer and fund transactions.

Peer-to-peer test cases

Employer to Fund Transactions (B2B)

The tables in this section provide a catalogue of the contributions v3 tests and then specify the detailed messaging steps involved in each of the peer-to-peer test sequences listed for CTR, MVR and MRR messages, the corresponding CTER, MVOR and MROR response messages.

Government to Fund transactions (G2B, regression test cases only)

The tables in this section provide a catalogue of the contributions v3.0 tests and the steps involved in each of the peer-to-peer test sequences listed for a range of Government contribution and rollover transactions.

During Cycle 2 and Cycle 4, negative tests can be used by our testing partners through making their own arrangements and test criteria.

1.6. Testing definitions

Interoperability Testing

- Interoperability testing occurs between gateway operators.
- Interoperability testing relates to message level testing only and not application-level testing of additional services provided by a gateway.
- Interoperability testing will be coordinated by the Gateway Network Governance Board (GNGB).

Integration Testing

- Integration testing occurs between employer solutions, gateway operators and funds.
- Integration testing verifies the interactions and data exchange achieves the intended functionality.

- Interoperability and integration testing is a prerequisite before moving to peer-to-peer testing. There will be a verification process managed by the ATO before testers can transitioning to peer-to-peer testing.

Peer-to-Peer Testing

- Peer-to-peer is a network-level test that validates all solution and connections between employers and funds, and vice versa.
- Peer-to-peer testing will be scheduled and coordinated by the ATO based on fund readiness dates and registry system approach.

Payment reconciliation is out of scope. Payments cannot be tested in a testing environment as no actual payments are created.

1.7. Other Related Documents

This document is to be used in conjunction with the current versions of these related documents:

- Data and Payment Standards Contributions and Member Registrations Message Implementation Guide v3.0 (Draft Schedule 4a)
- Supporting XBRL reporting taxonomy
- Data and Payment Standards Terms and Definitions (Draft Schedule 2)
- Data and Payment Standards Payment Definitions (Draft Schedule 3)
- Data and Payment Standards Message Orchestration and Profiles (Draft Schedule 5)
- Data and Payment Standards Error Code Management (Draft Schedule 6)
- Contributions User Guide Draft v2.0
- Business Response Messaging Framework User Guide Draft v1.2

2. Conformance testing

2.1 General

General principles are as follows:

- The scope of the test conformance suite includes interoperability testing, integration testing and peer-to-peer testing for primarily business transactions.
- There will be regression testing on government contribution and rollover transactions, to ensure the system changes have not affected successful processing.
- The test scope for SuperStream Contributions v3.0 encompasses business-to-business AS4 ebMS message exchange and payload (XBRL) testing.
- The testing also references the ATO enabling service – Fund Validation Service (FVS). SBR within the ATO owns this service which is referenced as part of the data standard.
    - As noted in section 1.1 of this document, FVS changes are tested independently, and their testing requirements will be documented separately. The FVS functionality (whichever version is in production at that time) is required to support some test cases.
- B2B test use cases are initiated from the employer and will capture the required set of data to support member verification, member registration and contribution transactions. The test cases defined in this document will provide a generic set of steps to support these activities. It is the responsibility of all parties involved in testing to capture data in their specific process.
- To streamline testing, if all clients use the same implementation of a registry system, then only one needs to test, however if there is anything unique to a particular client, they would need to test separately. This would be determined by the registry provider.

2.2 Integration test cases

Integration testing will provide assurance that the changes made across the SuperStream system work together as expected. Integration test cases are the responsibility of each solution implementation team.

A checklist of integration test cases is provided within each section and represents the minimum requirement. The full extent of integration testing will need to be agreed between each fund and their solution provider/s, including SMSF providers.

2.3 Fund Validation Service (FVS)

The certification status field values recorded in the FVS will indicate a status for Contributions, and a schedule version number for each. The version number will only be updated after a major change to the Contributions schedule. The field must contain a value, or a combination of one rollover and/or one contribution value. Refer to the FVS User Guide for details of the Certification Detail values.

Changes to FVS is out of scope for this document, and testing requirements will be captured separately.

3. Gateway Interoperability test scenario catalogue

Interoperability test cases will be developed and documented by the Gateway Network Governance Body (GNGB). These tests will validate the ability of gateways to communicate and exchange messages correctly with one another across the Superannuation Transaction Network (STN).

4. Cycle 2 – Error Code Management

4.1 Interoperability test case summary

No interoperability testing will be undertaken in Cycle 2 – Error Code Management.

4.2 Member Registration Outcome Response

This section gives an overview of the testing plan to verify the Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR) functionality, and lists the test cases that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for employer and fund transactions.

4.2.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for employers and funds.

While the Member Registration Request (MRR) is a key dependence for the test to be undertaken, the focus of this test is on the Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR).

Integration testing checklist

1. Employer and Service Provider/s testing sending message (MRR)
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages (MRR)
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending responses (MROR)
    - 3.1. Outcome messages generated
    - 3.2. XML message construction
    - 3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Employer and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses (MROR)
    - 4.1. ebMS message receipt
    - 4.2. XML response message deconstruction
    - 4.3. Outcome message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
    - 5.1. Mandatory fields present
    - 5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
    - 6.1. Values according to taxonomy
    - 6.2. Cross field validations
    - 6.3. Other business rules – fund

7. XBRL
    7.1. Message correctly formed
    7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
8. XML
    8.1. Message correctly formed
    8.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
9. ebMS
    9.1. Header and wrapper correct
    9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
    9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
    9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

4.2.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the member registration request test case scenarios for employer to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

While the Member Registration Request (MRR) is a key dependency for the test to be undertaken, the focus is on the Member Registration Outcome Response (MROR). Existing MRR functionality will be used to facilitate testing the MROR. New MRR functionality will be tested later in Cycle 4 (see section 5.3).

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome. As the purpose is to test MROR functionality, the test focuses on the response message sender (3) and receiver (4):

1. Message sender
2. Message receiver
3. Response message sender:
    a. XML message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XML message deconstruction

Employer to APRA Fund scenarios Employer to Fund (B2B) sending MRR

1. Fund to Employer (B2B) – Fund receiving MRR and MROR generated

4.2.2.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are the minimum test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-Peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Employers and Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Employer A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Employer A.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 4.2.2.2 for further detail.
Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.

MRR	
Test number	**Description**
MRR1.1	Valid single member MRR message
MRR1.2	Valid multiple member MRR message

MROR	
Test number	**Description**
MROR2.1	Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created – business error
MROR2.2	Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created – technical error
MROR2.3	Success - new membership created with account details returned

4.2.2.2 Peer-to-peer test cases
Send and receive MRR and MROR

MRR1.1 Valid single member MRR message **MROR2.1** Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created – business error			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.1.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

MRR1.2 Valid multiple member MRR message **MROR2.2** Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created – technical error			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.2.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.2.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.2.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

MRR1.2 Valid multiple member MRR message **MROR2.3** Success – new membership created with account details returned			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.2.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.3.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.3.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

4.3 Contribution Transaction Error Request

This section gives an overview of the testing plan to verify the Contribution Transaction Error Request (CTER) functionality and lists the test cases that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for employer and fund transactions.

4.3.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for employers and funds.

While the Contribution Transaction Request (CTR) is a key dependency for the test to be undertaken, the focus of this test is on the Contribution Transaction Error Response (CTER).

Integration testing checklist

1. Employer and service provider/s testing sending message (CTR)
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages (CTR)
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending responses (CTER)
   - 3.1. Error messages generated
   - 3.2. XML message construction
   - 3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Employer and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses (CTER)
   - 4.1. ebMS message receipt
   - 4.2. XML response message deconstruction
   - 4.3. Error message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
   - 5.1. Mandatory fields present
   - 5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
   - 6.1. Values according to taxonomy
   - 6.2. Cross field validations
   - 6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
   - 7.1. Message correctly formed
   - 7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
8. XML (responses)
   - 8.1. Message correctly formed
   - 8.2. Message internally consistent – parameters and event items
   - 8.3. Refund parameters match the Business Response Messaging Framework

9. ebMS
   9.1. Header and wrapper correct
   9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
   9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
   9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

4.3.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the contribution peer-to-peer test case scenarios for fund to employer testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

While the Contribution Transaction Request (CTR) is a key dependency for the test to be undertaken, the focus is on the Contribution Transaction Error Response (CTER). Existing CTR functionality will be used to facilitate testing the CTER. New CTR functionality will be tested later in Cycle 4 (see section 5.4).

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome. As the purpose is to test CTER functionality, the test focuses on the response message sender (3) and receiver (4):

1. Message sender (message construction and transmission)
2. Message receiver (message receipt and deconstruction)

3. Response message sender:
   a. XML message construction
   b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
   a. ebMS message receipt
   b. XML message deconstruction

Employer to APRA Fund scenarios Fund to Employer (B2B) sending CTER

1. Fund to Employer (B2B) – Fund receiving CTR and CTER generated

Employer to SMSF scenarios SMSF to Employer (B2B) sending CTER

1. SMSF to Employer (B2B) – SMSF receiving CTR and CTER generated

4.3.2.1 B2B (Employer to APRA Fund) peer-to-peer tests - receive and send the following:

1. Contributions Transaction Request (CTR)
2. Contributions Transaction (CTER)
   2.1. CTER Business error

4.3.2.2 B2B (Employer to SMSF) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

3. Contributions Transaction Request (CTR)

4. Contributions Transaction (CTER)
    4.1. CTER Business error

4.3.2.3 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are the minimum test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-Peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Employers and Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Employer A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Employer A.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 4.3.2.4 for further detail.

Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any of Error, Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.
Note 2: Payment reconciliation cannot be tested in a testing environment as no actual payments are created.

	CTR
Test number	**Description**
CTR1.1	Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund)
CTR1.2	Valid single member CTR message (SMSF)

	CTER
Test number	**Description**
CTER2.1	CTER Business error (APRA fund)
CTER2.2	CTER Business error (SMSF)
CTER2.3	CTER Technical error (APRA fund)
CTER2.4	CTER Technical error (SMSF)
CTER2.5	CTER message with Context ID included (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
CTER2.6	CTER message with Context ID included (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
CTER2.7	CTER message with original PRN and refund PRN included

4.3.2.4 Peer-to-peer test cases

Send and receive CTR and CTER

CTR1.1 Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund) **CTER2.1** CTER Business error (APRA fund)			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR
		CTER2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B Send CTER
CTER2.1.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.2 Valid single member CTR message (SMSF) **CTER2.2** CTER Business error (SMSF)			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.2.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR
		CTER2.2.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send CTER
CTER2.2.EMP_A.02	CTER2.2.EMP_A.02		

CTR1.1 Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund) **CTER2.3** CTER Technical error (APRA fund)			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR
		CTER2.3.FND_B.02	Fund B Send CTER
CTER2.3.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.2 Valid single member CTR message (SMSF) **CTER2.4** CTER Technical error (SMSF)			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.2.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR
		CTER2.4.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send CTER
CTER2.4.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.1 Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund) **CTER2.5** CTER message with Context ID included (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR
		CTER2.5.FND_B.02	Fund B Send CTER
CTER2.5.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.2 Valid single member CTR message (SMSF) **CTER2.6** CTER message with Context ID included (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.2.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR
		CTER2.6.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send CTER
CTER2.6.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">CTR1.1 Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund)
CTER2.7 CTER Business error, with original PRN and refund PRN (APRA fund)</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Employer A</th><th colspan="2">Fund B</th></tr>
<tr><td>CTR1.1.EMP_A.01</td><td>Employer A Send CTR</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>CTR1.1.FND_B.01</td><td>Fund B Receive CTR</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>CTER2.7.FND_B.02</td><td>Fund B Send CTER</td></tr>
<tr><td>CTER2.7.EMP_A.02</td><td>Employer A Receive CTER</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
</table>

4.4 Regression Testing

This section gives an overview of the regression testing plan to verify a selection of rollover and Government contribution and rollover transactions, to ensure the SuperStream changes have not had any adverse impacts on existing, unchanged functionality. This section lists the regression tests that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for fund and Government transactions.

4.4.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for funds and Government.

Integration testing checklist

1. Government and Service Provider/s testing sending:
   1.1. FVS call
   1.2. XBRL message construction
   1.3. ebMS message transmission
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages
   2.1. ebMS message receipt
   2.2. XBRL message deconstruction
   2.3. Process contribution or rollover into registry system and generate response
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending messages
   3.1. Error or outcome messages generated
   3.2. XML message construction
   3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Government and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses
   4.1. ebMS message receipt
   4.2. XML response message deconstruction
   4.3. Error or outcome message process

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
   5.1. Mandatory fields present
   5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
   6.1. Values according to taxonomy
   6.2. Cross field validations
   6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
   7.1. Message correctly formed
   7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data

8. XML (responses)
    8.1. Message correctly formed
    8.2. Message internally consistent – parameters and event items
    8.3. Refund parameters match the Business Response Messaging Framework
9. ebMS
    9.1. Header and wrapper correct
    9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
    9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
    9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

4.4.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the Government contribution and rollover peer-to-peer test case scenarios for ATO to fund testing and fund to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome:

1. Message sender:
    a. XBRL message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
2. Message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XBRL message deconstruction
3. Response message sender:
    a. XML message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XML message deconstruction

Fund to Fund scenarios Fund to Fund (B2B) sending IRR

1. Fund to Fund (B2B) receiving IRR
    a. IRR processed and either RTR, RTOR or IRER generated

B2B (Fund to Fund) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

1. Initiate Rollover Request (IRR)
    1.1. Single member IRR message generated
    1.2. Multiple member RTOR message generated

4.4.2.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are recommended test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-Peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Fund A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Fund A.
Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 4.4.2.3 for further detail.
Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any of Error, Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.
Note 2: Payment reconciliation cannot be tested in a testing environment as no actual payments are created.

	IRR
Test number	**Description**
IRR7.1	Valid single member IRR message
IRR7.2	Valid multiple member IRR message Note: it is optional to send a multiple member IRR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member IRR.

	IRER
Test number	**Description**
IRER8.1	Valid error response sent

	RTR
Test number	**Description**
RTR9.1	Valid multiple member RTR message processed successfully

	RTOR
Test number	**Description**
RTOR10.1	Rollover response processed successfully

4.4.2.3 Peer-to-peer test cases - B2B

Regression test cases

IRR7.1 Valid single member IRR message **IRER8.1** Valid error response sent			
Fund A		**Fund B**	
IRR7.1.FUND_A.01	Fund A send IRR		
		IRR7.1.FUND_B.01	Fund B receive IRR
		IRER8.1.FUND_B.02	Fund B send IRER
IRER8.1.FUND_A.02	Fund A receive IRER		

IRR7.2 Valid single member IRR message **RTR9.1** Valid single member RTR message processed successfully **RTOR10.1** Rollover response processed successfully			
Fund A		**Fund B**	
IRR7.2.FUND_A.01	Fund A send IRR		
		IRR7.2.FUND_B.01	Fund B receive IRR
		RTR9.1.FUND_B.02	Fund B send RTR
RTR9.1.FUND_A.02	Fund A receive RTR		
RTOR10.1.FUND_A.03	Fund A send RTOR		
		RTOR10.1.FUND_B.03	Fund B receive RTOR

5. Cycle 4– MIG Changes

5.1 MIG Changes – Interoperability test case summary

Interoperability testing will occur once for Data and Payment Standards Contributions and Member Registrations Message Implementation Guide (MIG) v3.0 changes. The checklist below provides a summary of the functional requirements for test cases that will test the interoperability with message transaction sequences.

The interoperability test cases documented are the minimum test cases required to meet the interoperability testing phase exit criteria. To assist in testing it is assumed Gateways may require additional test cases agreed upon within their testing cohort.

1. Employer Gateway to Fund Gateway
    1.1 Transport Layer connectivity
    1.2 Message Service Handler (MSH) Layer connectivity
    1.3 Application Layer connectivity – all gateways

5.2 Member Verification Request

This section gives an overview of the testing plan to verify the Member Verification Request (MVR) functionality, and lists the test cases that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for employer and fund transactions.

5.2.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for employers and funds.

Integration testing checklist

1. Employer and service provider/s testing sending message (MVR)
    1.1. XBRL message construction
    1.2. ebMS message transmission
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages (MVR)
    2.1. ebMS message receipt
    2.2. XBRL message deconstruction
    2.3. Process request transaction and generate response
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending responses (MVOR)
    3.1. Outcome messages generated
    3.2. XML message construction
    3.3. ebMS message transmission

4. Employer and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses (MVOR)
    4.1. ebMS message receipt
    4.2. XML response message deconstruction
    4.3. Outcome message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
    5.1. Mandatory fields present
    5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
    6.1. Values according to taxonomy
    6.2. Cross field validations
    6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
    7.1. Message correctly formed
    7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
8. XML
    8.1. Message correctly formed
    8.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
9. ebMS
    9.1. Header and wrapper correct
    9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
    9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
    9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

5.2.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the member verification request test case scenarios for employer to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.
In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome:

1. Message sender:
    a. XBRL message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
2. Message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XBRL message deconstruction
3. Response message sender:
    a. XML message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission

4. Response message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XML message deconstruction

Employer to APRA Fund scenarios Employer to Fund (B2B) sending MVR

1 Employer to Fund (B2B) – Employer sending MVR
  1.1 MVR request sent and received successfully
2 Fund to Employer (B2B) – Fund sending MVOR
  2.1 MVOR response generated and received successfully

Employer to SMSF scenarios Employer to Fund (B2B) sending MVR

3 Employer to SMSF (B2B) – Employer sending MVR
  3.1 MVR request sent and received successfully
4 SMSF to Employer (B2B) – Fund sending MVOR
  4.1 MVOR response generated and received successfully

5.2.2.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are the minimum test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Employers and Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Employer A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Employer A.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 5.2.2.2 for further detail.

Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.

	MVR
Test number	**Description**
MVR1.1	Valid single member MVR message – APRA fund
MVR1.2	Valid single member MVR message - SMSF
MVR1.3	Valid MVR message with Record Count populated

	MVOR
Test number	**Description**
MVOR2.1	Success – member verified successfully (APRA fund)
MVOR2.2	Success – member verified successfully (SMSF)
MVOR2.3	Unsuccessful – member not successfully verified, and/or account unable to accept contributions.
MVOR2.4	MVOR message with Context ID included

5.2.2.2 Peer-to-peer test cases

Send and receive MVR and MVOR

MVR1.1 Valid single member MVR message – APRA fund **MVOR2.1** Success – member verified successfully (APRA fund)			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MVR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MVR		
		MVR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MVR
		MVOR2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MVOR
MVOR2.1.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MVOR		

MVR1.2 Valid single member MVR message – SMSF **MVOR2.2** Success – member verified successfully (SMSF)			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
MVR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MVR		
		MVR1.2.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive MVR
		MVOR2.2.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send MVOR
MVOR2.2.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MVOR		

MVR1.3 Valid MVR message with Record Count populated **MVOR2.3** Unsuccessful – member not successfully verified, and/or account unable to accept contributions			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MVR1.3.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MVR		
		MVR1.3.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MVR
		MVOR2.3.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MVOR
MVOR2.3.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MVOR		

MVR1.3 Valid MVR message with Record Count populated **MVOR2.4** MVOR message with Context ID included			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MVR1.3.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MVR		
		MVR1.3.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MVR
		MVOR2.4.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MVOR
MVOR2.4.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MVOR		

5.3 Member Registration Request

This section gives an overview of the testing plan to verify the Member Registration Request (MRR) functionality, and lists the test cases that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for employer and fund transactions.

5.3.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for employers and funds.

Integration testing checklist

1. Employer and service provider/s testing sending message (MRR)
    1.1. XBRL message construction
    1.2. ebMS message transmission
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages (MRR)
    2.1. ebMS message receipt
    2.2. XBRL message deconstruction
    2.3. Process request transaction and generate response
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending responses (MROR)
    3.1. Outcome messages generated
    3.2. XML message construction
    3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Employer and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses (MROR)
    4.1. ebMS message receipt
    4.2. XML response message deconstruction
    4.3. Outcome message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
    5.1. Mandatory fields present
    5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
    6.1. Values according to taxonomy
    6.2. Cross field validations
    6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
    7.1. Message correctly formed
    7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data

8. XML
    8.1. Message correctly formed
    8.2. Message internally consistent – context and data
9. ebMS
    9.1. Header and wrapper correct
    9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
    9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
    9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

5.3.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the member registration request test case scenarios for employer to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome:

1. Message sender:
    a. XBRL message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
2. Message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XBRL message deconstruction
3. Response message sender:
    a. XML message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XML message deconstruction

Employer to APRA Fund scenarios Employer to Fund (B2B) sending MRR

1. Employer to Fund (B2B) – Employer sending MRR
    a. MROR response generated and received successfully

5.3.2.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are the minimum test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Employers and Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Employer A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Employer A.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 5.3.2.2 for further detail.
Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.

	MRR
Test number	**Description**
MRR1.1	Valid single member MRR message
MRR1.2	Valid multiple member MRR message **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member MRR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member MRR**
MRR1.3	Valid MRR message with Record Count populated

	MROR
Test number	**Description**
MROR2.1	Success – new membership created with account details returned
MROR2.2	Success – member account updated **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
MROR2.3	Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created
MROR2.4	MROR message with Context ID included

5.3.2.2 Peer-to-peer test cases

Send and receive MRR and MROR

MRR1.1 Valid single member MRR message **MROR2.1** Success – new membership created with account details returned			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.1.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

MRR1.2 Valid multiple member MRR message **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member MRR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member MRR** **MROR2.2** Success – member account updated **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.2.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.2.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.2.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

MRR1.3 Valid MRR message with Record Count populated **MROR2.3** Unsuccessful – new membership unable to be created			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.3.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.3.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.3.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.3.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

MRR1.3 Valid MRR message with Record Count populated **MROR2.4** MROR message with Context ID included			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
MRR1.3.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send MRR		
		MRR1.3.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive MRR
		MROR2.4.FND_B.02	Fund B Send MROR
MROR2.4.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive MROR		

5.4 Contribution Transaction Request

This section gives an overview of the testing plan to verify the Contribution Transaction Request (CTR) functionality and lists the test cases that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for employer and fund transactions.

5.4.1 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for employers and funds.

Integration testing checklist

1. Employer and service provider/s testing sending message (CTR)
   - 1.1. XBRL message construction
   - 1.2. ebMS message transmission
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages (CTR)
   - 2.1. ebMS message receipt
   - 2.2. XBRL message deconstruction
   - 2.3. Process request transaction and generate response
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending responses (CTER)
   - 3.1. Error messages generated
   - 3.2. XML message construction
   - 3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Employer and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses (CTER)
   - 4.1. ebMS message receipt
   - 4.2. XML response message deconstruction
   - 4.3. Error message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
   - 5.1. Mandatory fields present
   - 5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
   - 6.1. Values according to taxonomy
   - 6.2. Cross field validations
   - 6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
   - 7.1. Message correctly formed
   - 7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data

8. XML (responses)
   - 8.1. Message correctly formed
   - 8.2. Message internally consistent – parameters and event items
   - 8.3. Refund parameters match the Business Response Messaging Framework
9. ebMS
   - 9.1. Header and wrapper correct
   - 9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
   - 9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
   - 9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

5.4.2 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the contribution peer-to-peer test case scenarios for employer to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome:

1. Message sender:
   a. XBRL message construction
   b. ebMS message transmission
2. Message receiver:
   a. ebMS message receipt
   b. XBRL message deconstruction
3. Response message sender:
   a. XML message construction
   b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
   a. ebMS message receipt
   b. XML message deconstruction

Employer to APRA Fund scenarios Employer to Fund (B2B) sending CTR

1. Employer to Fund (B2B) – Fund receiving CTR
   a. CTR processed successfully or CTER generated

Employer to SMSF scenarios Employer to SMSF (B2B) sending CTR

1. Employer to SMSF (B2B) – Fund receiving CTR
   a. CTR processed successfully or CTER generated

B2B (Employer to APRA Fund) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

1. Contributions Transaction Request (CTR)
    - 1.1. Single member CTR message successfully
    - 1.2. Multiple member CTR message successfully
    - 1.3. Valid message with Other Details tuples populated with agreed value
    - 1.4. Valid message with Record Count populated
2. Contributions Transaction (CTER)
    - 2.1. CTER Business error

B2B (Employer to SMSF Fund) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

3. Contributions Transaction Request (CTR)
    - 1.5. Single member CTR message successfully
    - 1.6. Multiple member CTR message successfully
    - 1.7. Valid message with Other Details tuples populated with agreed value
    - 1.8. Valid message with Record Count populated
4. Contributions Transaction (CTER)
    - 4.1. CTER Business error

5.4.2.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are the minimum test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Employers and Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Employer A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Employer A.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 5.4.2.2 for further detail.

Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any of Error, Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.
Note 2: Payment reconciliation cannot be tested in a testing environment as no actual payments are created.

	CTR
Test number	**Description**
CTR1.1	Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund)
CTR1.2	Valid single member CTR message (SMSF)
CTR1.3	Valid multiple member CTR message (APRA fund) **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member CTR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member CTR**
CTR1.4	Valid multiple member CTR message (SMSF) **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member CTR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member CTR**
CTR1.5	Valid CTR message with Other Details tuple populated with an agreed value between peers (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
CTR1.6	Valid CTR message with Other Details tuple populated with an agreed value between peers (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
CTR1.7	Valid CTR message with Record Count populated (APRA fund)
CTR1.8	Valid CTR message with Record Count populated (SMSF)

	CTER
Test number	**Description**
CTER2.1	CTER Business error (APRA fund)
CTER2.2	CTER Business error (SMSF)
CTER2.3	CTER message with Context ID included (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**
CTER2.4	CTER message with Context ID included (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**

5.4.2.2 Peer-to-peer test cases

Send and receive CTR and CTER

CTR1.1 Valid single member CTR message (APRA fund) **CTER2.1** CTER Business error (APRA fund)			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.1.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR
		CTER2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B Send CTER
CTER2.1.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.2 Valid single member CTR message (SMSF) **CTER2.2** CTER Business error (SMSF)			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.2.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.2.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR
		CTER2.2.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send CTER
CTER2.2.EMP_A.02	CTER2.2.EMP_A.02		

CTR1.3 Valid multiple member CTR message (APRA fund) **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member CTR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member CTR** **CTER2.3** CTER message with Context ID included (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.3.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.3.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR
		CTER2.3.FND_B.02	Fund B Send CTER
CTER2.3.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.4 Valid multiple member CTR message (SMSF) **Note: it is optional to send a multiple member CTR but all funds must test that they can receive a multiple member CTR** **CTER2.4** CTER message with Context ID included (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.4.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.4.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR
		CTER2.4.SMSF_C.02	SMSF C Send CTER
CTER2.4.EMP_A.02	Employer A Receive CTER		

CTR1.5 Valid CTR message with Other Details tuple populated with an agreed value between peers (APRA fund) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.5.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.5.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR

CTR1.6 Valid CTR message with Other Details tuple populated with an agreed value between peers (SMSF) **Note: optional to send, mandatory to receive**			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.6.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.6.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR

CTR1.7 Valid CTR message with Record Count populated (APRA fund)			
Employer A		**Fund B**	
CTR1.7.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.7.FND_B.01	Fund B Receive CTR

CTR1.8 Valid CTR message with Record Count populated (SMSF)			
Employer A		**SMSF C**	
CTR1.8.EMP_A.01	Employer A Send CTR		
		CTR1.8.SMSF_C.01	SMSF C Receive CTR

5.5 Regression Testing

This section gives an overview of the regression testing plan to verify a selection of rollover and Government contribution and rollover transactions, to ensure the SuperStream changes have not had any adverse impacts on existing, unchanged functionality. This section lists the regression tests that form the basic requirement for integration and peer-to-peer testing for fund and Government transactions.

5.5.2 Integration Test cases

This section gives an overview of test cases that should form the basis of application integration testing for funds and Government.

Integration testing checklist

1. Government and Service Provider/s testing sending:
   - 1.1. FVS call
   - 1.2. XBRL message construction
   - 1.3. ebMS message transmission
2. Fund and Service Provider/s testing receiving messages
   - 2.1. ebMS message receipt
   - 2.2. XBRL message deconstruction
   - 2.3. Process contribution or rollover into registry system and generate response
3. Fund and Service Provider/s testing sending messages
   - 3.1. Error or outcome messages generated
   - 3.2. XML message construction
   - 3.3. ebMS message transmission
4. Government and Service Provider/s testing receiving responses
   - 4.1. ebMS message receipt
   - 4.2. XML response message deconstruction
   - 4.3. Error or outcome message processed

Message structure and content tests

5. Presence of fields
   - 5.1. Mandatory fields present
   - 5.2. Conditional and dependent fields present if required
6. Values
   - 6.1. Values according to taxonomy
   - 6.2. Cross field validations
   - 6.3. Other business rules – fund
7. XBRL
   - 7.1. Message correctly formed
   - 7.2. Message internally consistent – context and data

8. XML (responses)
    8.1. Message correctly formed
    8.2. Message internally consistent – parameters and event items
    8.3. Refund parameters match the Business Response Messaging Framework
9. ebMS
    9.1. Header and wrapper correct
    9.2. Transmission and receipt successful
    9.3. Response messages correctly packaged
    9.4. Response message transmission and receipt successful

Test Data

Sample message instances will be available separately to this document.

5.5.3 Peer-to-peer test case summary

This section provides a summary of the Government contribution and rollover peer-to-peer test case scenarios for ATO to fund testing and fund to fund testing. The test cases below form the basic requirement for testing. Specific variables or error messages can be determined with the testing group at the time of testing.

In each case the following basic capabilities are tested along with the business process outcome:

1. Message sender:
    a. XBRL message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
2. Message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XBRL message deconstruction
3. Response message sender:
    a. XML message construction
    b. ebMS message transmission
4. Response message receiver:
    a. ebMS message receipt
    b. XML message deconstruction

Government to Fund scenarios ATO to Fund (G2B) sending GCTR

1. ATO to Fund (G2B) – Fund receiving GCTR
    a. GCTR processed successfully or GCTER generated
2. ATO to Fund (G2B) – Fund receiving GCTAR
    a. GCTAR processed successfully or GCTAOR generated

Government to Fund scenarios ATO to Fund (G2B) sending USM

3. Fund to Government (B2G) – Fund sending USM
    a. Outcome response generated
4. Government to Fund (G2B) – ATO sending USM
    a. USM processed and outcome generated
5. Fund to Government (B2G) – Fund sending USMOR
    a. Outcome response generated

Government to Fund scenarios ATO to Fund (G2B) sending Release Authority

6. ATO to Fund (G2B) – Fund receiving Release Authority
   a. Release Authority successfully processed

Fund to Fund scenarios Fund to Fund (B2B) sending IRR

7. Fund to Fund (B2B) receiving IRR
   a. IRR processed and either RTR or IRER generated
8. Fund to Fund (B2B) sending RTR
   a. RTR processed successfully and RTOR generated

G2B (ATO to Fund) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

1. Government Contributions Transaction Request (GCTR)
   1.1 Single member GCTR message successfully
2. Unclaimed Superannuation Monies
   2.1. Single member USM sent to ATO
   2.2. Single member USM rollover for processing
   2.3. USM rollover processed successfully
3. Release Authority
   3.1. Release Authority processed successfully

B2B (Fund to Fund) peer-to-peer tests - send and receive the following:

4. Initiate Rollover Request (IRR)
   4.1. Single member IRR message successfully
5. Initiate Rollover Error Response (IRER)
   5.1. IRER Business error – member doesn't exist
6. Rollover Transaction Request (RTR)
   6.1. Valid single member rollover for processing
   6.2. Valid single member rollover successfully processed

5.5.3.1 Peer-to-peer test scenario catalogue

The following test case scenarios are recommended test scenarios required for peer-to-peer testing. It is the responsibility of the trustee to ensure these tests are completed successfully for each solution, regardless of whether the fund or their service provider conducts the test.

Peer-to-peer Test Case Scenarios – G2B

Each test case should be performed by Government and Funds sending and receiving data. i.e. ATO sending to Fund B, and then Fund B sending a response to ATO.

Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 5.5.3.2 for further detail.

Note 1: The response pattern used by the responding party may be any of Error, Partial or Progressive. The receiving party for a response must be able to process all response pattern types.
Note 2: Payment reconciliation cannot be tested in a testing environment as no actual payments are created.

	GCTR / GCTAR
Test number	**Description**
GCTR1.1	Valid single member GCTR message
GCTAR1.2	Valid single member GCTAR message

	GCTER / GCTAOR
Test number	**Description**
GCTER2.1	Valid single member GCTER message
GCTAOR2.2	Valid single member GCTAOR success message

	USM – ATO to Fund
Test number	**Description**
USM3.1	Valid single member USM rollover

	USMOR – Fund to ATO
Test number	**Description**
USMOR4.1	USM rollover response processed successfully

	USM – Fund to ATO
Test number	**Description**
USM5.1	Valid single member USM rollover

	USMOR – ATO to Fund
Test number	**Description**
USMOR6.1	USM rollover response processed successfully

	RA – from ATO to Fund
Test number	**Description**
RA7.1	Valid release authority sent (such as Division 293 deferred debt (DivDef)

	RAS – from Fund to ATO
Test number	**Description**
RAS8.1	Release Authority Statement (RAS)

	RASOR – from ATO to Fund
Test number	**Description**
RASOR9.1	RAS successfully processed

Peer-to-peer Test Case Scenarios – B2B

Each test case should be performed by Funds taking on both a sending and a receiving role. i.e. Fund A sending to Fund B, and then repeated with Fund B sending to Fund A.
Each test requires checking of both sending and receiving solution correctness – refer to the test cases in section 5.5.3.3 for further detail.

	RTR
Test number	**Description**
RTR10.1	Valid single member RTR message

	RTOR
Test number	**Description**
RTOR11.1	Rollover response processed successfully

	IRR
Test number	**Description**
IRR12.1	Valid single member IRR message

	IRER
Test number	**Description**
IRER13.1	Valid error message sent

5.5.3.2 Peer-to-peer test cases - G2B

Regression test cases

GCTR1.1 Valid single member GCTR message **GCTER2.1** Valid single member GCTER message			
ATO		**Fund B**	
GCTR1.1.ATO.01	ATO send GCTR		
		GCTR1.1.FND_B.01	Fund B receive GCTR
		GCTER2.1.FND_B.02	Fund B send GCTER
GCTER2.1.ATO.02	ATO receive GCTER		

GCTAR1.2 Valid single member GCTAR message **GCTAOR2.2** Valid single member GCTAOR success message			
ATO		**Fund B**	
GCTAR1.2.ATO.01	ATO send GCTAR		
		GCTAR1.2.FND_B.01	Fund B receive GCTAR
		GCTAOR2.2.FND_B.02	Fund B send GCTAOR
GCTAOR2.2.ATO.02	ATO receive GCTAOR		

USM3.1 Valid single member USM rollover **USM4.1** USM rollover processed successfully			
ATO		**Fund B**	
USM3.1.ATO.01	ATO send USM		
		USM3.1.FND_B.01	Fund B receive USM
		USMOR4.1.FND_B.02	Fund B send USMOR
USMOR4.1.ATO.02	ATO receive USMOR		

USM5.1 Valid single member USM rollover **USM6.1** USM rollover processed successfully			
Fund A		**ATO**	
USM5.1.FND_A.01	Fund A send USM		
		USM5.1.ATO.01	ATO receive USM
		USMOR6.1.ATO.02	ATO send USMOR
USMOR6.1.FND_A.02	Fund A receive USMOR		

RA7.1 Valid release authority sent (such as Division 293 deferred debt (DivDef) **RAS8.1** Release Authority Statement (RAS) partial release **RASOR9.1** RAS successfully processed			
ATO		**Fund B**	
RA7.1.ATO.01	ATO send RA		
		RA7.1.FUND_B.01	Fund B receive RA
		RTR8.1.FUND_B.02	Fund B send RAS
RTR8.1.ATO.A.02	ATO receive RAS		
RASOR9.1. ATO.03	ATO send RASOR		
		RASOR9.1.FUND_B.03	Fund B receive RASOR

5.5.3.3 Peer-to-peer test cases - B2B

Regression test cases

RTR10.1 Valid single member RTR message **RTOR11.1** Rollover response processed successfully			
Fund A		**Fund B**	
RTR10.1.FND_A.01	Fund A send RTR		
		RTR10.1.FUND_B.01	Fund B receive RTR
		RTOR11.1.FUND_B.02	Fund B send RTOR
RTR11.1.FUND_A.02	Fund A receive RTOR		

IRR12.1 Valid single member IRR message **IRER13.1** Valid error message sent			
Fund A		**Fund B**	
IRR12.1.FUND_A.01	Fund A send IRR		
		IRR12.1.FUND_B.01	Fund B receive IRR
		IRER13.1.FUND_B.02	Fund B send IRER
IRER13.1.FUND_A.02	Fund A receive IRER		