

STP Design Working Group (DWG) Issues Register as at 15 Dec 2016

DWG Issue Number	Issue	Description	Source	Date Raised	Actions/Mitigations Comments	Status for DWG
1	Hire/termination scenarios	Detailed scenarios required for Hire/termination including where employee has multiple periods of employment	Design Working Group	21-Sep	Outcome: design enables the employer to report employment dates and the ATO can use this information to establish the employer/employee link in ATO systems. Action: Detail scenarios to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
3	Intermediaries	Define who completes the intermediary section of the taxonomy and link to various payroll models	Design Working Group	21-Sep	17-11-2016 A Meeting will be scheduled by SIPO to discuss with SWD for SBR services * Atuthorisation Model walkthrough for STP to be scheduled at DWG in 2017.	Walkthrough for DWG in 2017
4	Lump sum E breakdown	Should Lump sum E be included in the initial implementation of STP. What value does it add. How will employers provide the letter when the ATO is providing the payment summary information	Design Working Group	6-Oct	Outcome: Agreement in DWG that this should be in a later iteration of STP. Action: Detail scenarios to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
6	Declarations	Better definition on declarations, who is providing the declaration according to the various payroll models	Design Working Group	6-Sep	Outcome: The ATO will provide better definitions. Action: Detail scenarios to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update

7	Trading name	Should trading name be collected in payroll event	Design Working Group	6-Sep	<p>17/11/16 DWG - will not be required as part of the payroll event. (ATO will test displaying trading name on the EOFY summary and via ATO Online).</p> <p>17/11/16 Advice from ATO Operational Policy Assurance and Law Branch to use the Legal Entity Name of employers in STP</p>	Closed
8	OTE	Employees don't understand, should not be displayed to employee's. Should only be collected if SG amount cannot be provided	Design Working Group	6-Sep	<p>Outcome: Updated the rule to indicate SG amount should be provided and where it cannot then a OTE amount can be provided instead. End user testing required to determine display.</p> <p>Action: Explanation to be provided in SWDGL and data definition of pay event taxonomy</p>	Software Developer Guideline update
9	Full File Replacement vs. updating YTD values in subsequent report	When should a FFR be used rather than updating YTD in next report or adjustment service	Design Working Group	6-Sep	<p>Outcome: It was agreed that the the FFR would provide a replacement of the complete file and not an individual employee record or subset of the file.</p> <p>Action: Detail scenarios to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines</p>	Software Developer Guideline update

10	Final Event (EOFY) Indicator	Guidance and scenarios around data item	Design Working Group	6-Sep	Outcome: It was agreed that the Final Event Indicator would be available through the payroll event and any adjustment events. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
11	TFN Declaration via Payroll Event	Guidance and scenarios around data item	Design Working Group	6-Sep	Outcome: Included in payroll event. Optional, existing services still available. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
12	Business Management System Identifier (BMS ID)	Guidance and scenarios around data item	Design Working Group	6-Sep	Outcome: BMS ID will provide flexibility to meet various payroll industry models. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
13	Employee Payroll ID	Guidance and scenarios around data item	Design Working Group	6-Sep	Outcome: Employee Payroll ID will provide flexibility to meet various payroll industry models. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update

14	Employer gross payments and withholding	Reporting these amounts is not a part of natural payroll event process	Design Working Group	6-Sep	17/11/16 DWG Employer gross payments and withholding: Agreed and closed. 17/11/16 Options to be presented to DWG. 31/0/16 Outcome: further consultation required with large withholders. Action: Deep dive meeting set up for Fri 4 Nov.	Closed
15	EOFY processing period	When should the EOFY summaries be generated? Should it be only after 14 July	Design Working Group	6-Oct	Outcome: EOFY summaries will be generated after 30 June on receipt of final indicator. Employer business process will determine when Final indicator is provided. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
16	Transitional scenarios	Transitional scenarios between BMS or joining STP need to be documented including zeroing out the previous reports when values are migrated	Design Working Group	6-Oct	Outcome: STP reporting will allow employers to zero out previously reported values. Action: Detail scenarios and guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
17	Allowance Type	Allowance type should align to published table on ATO.gov.au	Design Working Group	6-Oct	Outcome: Allowance types reported in STP will align to the published table on ATO.gov.au. Action: Guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update




18	Employee TFN Declaration	clarify the definition of this data item. Is it for only a new TFND being received or when any of the TFND fields are updated without a declaration being received	Design Working Group	6-Oct	Outcome: A declaration is only required when an employee submits a new TFN Declaration. Changes to employment circumstances can be reported via STP but will not be considered a new TFN Declaration. Action: Guidance to be provided in Release 2 of the Software Developer Guidelines	Software Developer Guideline update
19	Link between payroll event, adjustments and end of year processing	Event Linkages From an overall perspective, the Pay Event is not a stand-alone file. It has dependency on the Adjustment Event and the EOFY Event. These are the trio of events that are fundamental payroll events. Without visibility of all of these event fields, how can build commence on the Pay Event? These complimentary events are prerequisites for the Pay Event build	Design Working Group	6-Oct	17/11/16 DWG Was discussed as part of agenda item 8. Scenarios and further discussion to take place at DWG on 15 December 7/11/16 Discussion to commence at DWG.	To be discussed at the 15/12 DWG
20	Death Benefits	different TFND capture arrangements/timing for Trustee, Dependant, Non-dependant salary and wages and death benefit payments.	Email	6-Oct	17/11/16 DWG Further clarification is required from DWG on scenarios and ATO to confirm if death benefits are in scope as the employees status change after they have passed away. 17/11/2016 Seeking further clarification on issue at DWG	Open

21	Employment Termination Payments scope	<p>Some employers satisfy and make their employee termination payment obligations via a trust i.e. Redundancy Trusts. Accordingly, does the ATO consider these payments made by the Redundancy Trust to be outside the scope of the STP reporting requirements i.e. the termination payment is made by the Trust (interposed entity) and not the 'Employer.'</p> <p>Questions/reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly, we understand that the obligation to withhold from the payments under s12-85(b) of TAA 1953 essentially lies with the Trust making the payment. Therefore is it the ATO's view that the Employer does not have a reporting obligation under s389-5(1). Please advise? • Similarly, as the Trust is not a 'substantial employer' (s389-5(6)), is it the ATO's view that the Trust also does not have a reporting obligation under s389-5(1). Please advise? 	Email	6-Oct	<p>17/11/16 DWG ETP is in scope but clarification required for redundancy trust meet the definition of a substantial employer.</p> <p>17/11/2016 Issue is in progress - consulting with ATO Operational Policy Assurance and Law Branch</p>	Open
22	Display of super information	<p>Employees knowledge of Superannuation - what level of information should be displayed Need for currency and accuracy of information displayed Making super information transparent has a high value - it may cause confusion and the effort to address this needs to be considered it would need to be made clear to employees that SuperStream information captured during an event was not confirmation of payment, but rather notification of an action to attempt to pay. There is a requirement to work collaboratively on the design for what super information is displayed to the indiv via myGov</p>	Design Working Group	Oct-16	<p>Issues will be considered as part of the design for displaying Super Data in MyGov . These are planned for discussion on 15 December.</p>	Open

23	Super reporting	Defining who is the service provider and understanding cost impact of Super reporting obligation	Design Working Group	Oct-16	Deep Dive feedback on 3/11 - Service provider responsible would be that which includes all SuperStream data and corrections made by intermediary and is authorised by the employer to send the data.	Closed
24	Super reporting	Members suggested that SG data be collected from trustees as that would allow access to more accurate information.	Design Working Group	Oct-16	Deep Dive feedback on 3/11 - This is possible for Channel B solutions, but as the STP obligation is on the employer this is unlikely to occur in the short term. It may become part of the MIX service in the future where all contributions are reported by funds to the ATO.	Open
25	Super reporting	The employer can collect employee information, but what constraints did employers have in disclosing information? I.e. Privacy issues from the perspective of the sender.	Design Working Group	Oct-16	ATO has advice to say it can collect, but we will seek advice on Privacy issue from the position of the sender	Open
26	Super reporting	challenges in collecting SG liability data; especially in regards to Channel B. Unresolved questions include whether to capture the data from payroll, service provider or Trustee? Also, what activities are required before the data is sent from the employer or their service provider?	Design Working Group	Oct-16	Similar to issue 23 - Deep Dive Feedback on 3/11 - capture data where it is about to be processed to includes all SuperStream data and corrections made by intermediary. Must be authorised by the employer to send the data.	Closed
27	Super reporting	Should we require a different extract be created through software to filter SG information during a payroll event, from an software perspective it would be easier to send the entire payload to the ATO rather than 'bits and bobs'.	Design Working Group	Oct-16	design is creating option to send all superstream CTR information, or only mandatory SG related information.	Closed

28	Super reporting	Application of STP arrangements to Defined benefits funds	Design Working Group	Oct-16	consider as part of Channel B design, considering whether contributions to a defined benefit fund should be excluded from the reporting requirement	Open
29	Sending of data	Does there need to be a declaration in the message to support sending by the intermediary? I.e. employer stating all data is true and correct.		Oct-16	there is a requirement for a declaration, but this will be managed through the terms and conditions of use for the service	Closed
30	Sending of data	Intermediaries will need a legal/commercial agreement with the employer to support sending of information, this will be a change to existing agreements.		Oct-16	Correct there will need to be an agreement to support the sending of information to the ATO. This will need to be updated prior to an intermediary or service provider sending data.	Closed
31	Sending of data	Do we need a Flag to fund by employer asking them to notify ATO of positive processing of contribution?		3-Nov	Due to the requirement to obtain a declaration and authorisation from an employer, we do not consider a flag is required.	Closed
32	Aggregation of data	Opt out or opt in (legal privacy issue) – can aggregators have an opt out model for sending STP SPR data?		3-Nov	Due to the requirement to obtain a declaration and authorisation from an employer, we do not consider an opt out model is supported.	Closed
33	Aggregation of data	Authorisation model for ATO receipt of data (legal privacy issue).		3-Nov	to be confirmed at a future DWG	Open
34	Aggregation of data	Quality of data – is there a response to the data provided to the ATO -what validation occurs in the channel? -What does ATO reject?		3-Nov	Validation will align to existing superstream validation, with the exception that the ATO cannot require the employer provide data that is not mandatory for the purposes of confirming payment of the SG obligation for a member	Open

35	Aggregation of data	What data is in XML file – what does Channel B file look like -Is this the same as CTR, how do we understand mandatory versus optional data requirements.		3-Nov	starting analysis provided for 1/12	Open
36	Aggregation of data	How do we differentiate duplicates vs Resends in the design?		3-Nov	will be discussed at a future DWG	Open
37	Aggregation of data	What does implementation look like?		3-Nov	will be discussed at a future DWG	Open
38	Aggregation of data	Is an intermediary able to send all CTR data for both STP and non STP employers on the basis that the ATO then deletes the data for non STP employers, or conversely we retain it but do not treat the employer as being a voluntary adopter of STP.		3-Nov	an intermediary may only send data to the ATO where the employer has authorised the sending of information.	Closed
39	Authorisation	ATO to provide sample wording of declaration to the DWG in relation to the sending of CTR to the ATO		1-Dec	in progress	Open
40	Channel B	DWG wants a more detailed presentation of how all channels (not just B) will work for Super reporting. It was agreed that this would be developed by the ATO. ASP (Affiliation of Superannuation Practitioners) members will assist in this process		1-Dec	small industry group preparing content for future DWG on 14/12	Open

LEGEND	Status	Description
	OPEN	work in progress
	Closed	closed or pending closure at next meeting
	Pending	Referred to another forum or update of documentation.