



Australian Government
Australian Taxation Office

SuperStream Contributions V3 Conformance

Better Error Code Management Testing

Lessons learnt

as of 24 April 2026

Based on peer-to-peer Better Error Messaging testing completed to date, the following lessons have been identified and are presented in order of priority based on impact observed during testing.

Priority	Lesson	What we learnt
1	Integration testing must be thoroughly completed before cohort testing	<p>Peer-to-peer testing plays an important role in confirming agreed scenarios and error handling between participants. However, its scope is intentionally limited, and comprehensive integration testing is still essential to reduce unnecessary impact to cohort testing and production risk.</p> <p>Integration testing requires more than connectivity testing. The testing that needs to have been passed before participating in peer-to-peer testing needs to have covered message specification validity. This should test both long and short text of the error messages. Any deviation from the specification is may cause message failure during peer-to-peer testing and production.</p> <p>For example, a missing full stop or incorrect short/long message structure can cause errors in peer-to-peer testing.</p>
2	Validation must fully align to Schedule 6	<p>Under SuperStream V3, message validation is strictly enforced in line with the Message Implementation Guides (MIGs) and associated business rules. Mandatory and conditional fields, including error short and long descriptions, must be populated exactly as specified.</p> <p>During cohort testing, some participants had not fully enabled or implemented these validation rules, which increased the risk of messages passing testing but failing in production.</p>
3	Test registry systems, not individual USIs	<p>Where multiple USIs share the same registry system, a single round of testing provides adequate assurance. The registry's behaviour does not vary by USI, making repeated testing unnecessary.</p>
4	Error message testing must reflect real business practices	<p>Not all funds receive or process all message types (e.g. MRRs) Testing scenarios should align to how participants operate, not theoretical cases.</p>
5	Testing requirements must be agreed and coordinated upfront	<p>Variations in fund testing requirements meant a single set of test data was not always usable by all participants. For example, some funds could only process test member identifiers with specific character lengths (e.g. 9 digits rather than 11). Agreeing these fund-specific constraints upfront enabled compatible testing and reduced time lost to failed or repeated tests.</p>