



# Test environment key messages

UNCLASSIFIED External

<b>Title:</b>	Test environment working group		
<b>Issue date:</b>	21 December 2018		
<b>Venue:</b>	Webinar		
<b>Event date:</b>	19 December 2018	<b>Start:</b> 12:30pm	<b>Finish:</b> 1:00pm

<b>Chair:</b>	Sonia Lark	<b>Facilitator:</b>	N/A
---------------	------------	---------------------	-----

<b>Attendees: names/section</b>	ATO – Mick Ferris, Sonia Lark, Kate French  Industry – Jack Wee (Catsoft), Brett Reed (e-PayDay), Mike Behling (MYOB), Kevin Johnson (Reckon), Michael Wright (Sage), Paul Siriwardana, Shane Paxton (Thomson Reuters), Anthony Migliardi (Xero).
<b>Apologies: name/section</b>	[Who won't be attending the event, including name and section]

<b>Next meeting</b>	TBA
---------------------	-----

## Key discussion points:

### Options and costings for EVTE testing models

- a. Current state – EVTE uses stubs and mocks to provide a consistent end model
- b. Managed data sets – separate data for each DSP or containers.

The ITR granular data conformance suite will be released on 20 December, we will take a look at the data to see what could be changed and improved. Optional versus mandatory data.

Option 1:

- Advantages
  - fast to set up individual services once the framework has been created
  - easy to maintain updates to services
  - availability is higher than managed environments
  - minimises unexpected errors due to environment issues
- Disadvantages
  - does not persist data
  - limits testing to prepared scenarios in most cases

Option 2:

- Advantages
  - end to end interaction can be tested
  - DSPs can tailor their testing through the creation / removal of data for particular clients
- Disadvantages
  - higher operational cost for setup and maintenance of the environment
  - service changes will take longer to make available to consumers
  - additional costs to reset test cases (higher costs again to determine what data should be reset and what should stay)

Looking at the activity statement, there are 26 sub environments, if one of these were down, you would not be getting an end to end environment.

An RFI went out recently for the new e-commerce environment, in this we are looking for improvements to our test capability through technology upgrades in that space. The option 2 detail probably jumps the gun on some of this in looking at our ability to go to containers, or worst case scenario is setting up a separate data set for each person if that's where we want to get to.

Sage - would the containers be a scenario where the ATO sets up an image for a particular service, build a service for IITR and a whole range of scenarios and that image could be deployed for each DSP as they onboard and want to test.

Mick - yes, the goal behind this is that we could create individual container for each DSP with all the same information in the conformance suite, it's then up to the DSP as to how it's used. Still need to resolve how we reset data, do we reset at midnight or have other instructions, e.g., send a message or have a UI where you can rerun on demand.

MYOB – one of the disadvantages – when you do a deployment and there are changes to the conformance suite test do you see that as a long delay in getting each of those containers.

Mick – potentially, the process for our delivery at the moment is we create the information and set up function tests, once these are passed the product is moved into EVTE. We are doing our system test cycle in parallel with the DSP's, so we need to have the delivery environments aligned.

MYOB - it takes a day at the moment to deploy EVTE, if during that deployment you are putting a new service up will this increase the outage or would the ATO pre prepare.

Mick – most of that information would be preset, the ATO is pushing for automated deploys. The ATO could take up a hybrid position, some services you want to do full end to end testing and others you won't, submitting a TFN declaration is one you wouldn't. The CU is one service where you want to be able to take a client through each step, add, update and remove, in the stubbed environment at the moment you go through all that and get a

message back to say yes action has been undertaken, though values haven't changed your end.

Sage – how would the hybrid work, given that you may have someone needing option 1 or option 2, would you reroute to a different end point, pick up the product ID in the payload or give a separate EVTE endpoint to hit, so we know what we are hitting on the way in.

Mick – it would be the later, as much as possible seamless on the DSP end.

Option 2 is the consensus

Next steps – consider what services we need for that kind of work, position as a working group is to go back to the ATO and say we would like this data for these advantages and it must apply to service X, Y, X . We can then start to work through a plan to meet that need.

**Review CU conformance suite flow (note: specific client data has not been included).**

For the first lot of services for the container may need more input from the group, the expected plan for the CU, need to work through what the workflows ought to be, create a journey map. The CU document contained the services, not the scenarios we would be trying to test, and that needs to be spelt out.

We need feedback from the DSPs as to what scenarios would be within the service.

There needs to be a meeting with interested DSPs to do a review of the data and then talk about the specific gaps we want filled. We can also have a conversation about mandatory conformance test cases or creating a set of test data that can operate in addition to the mandatory tests.

Next meeting will be in the week of the 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019.