

MINUTES – POC -SWG

MEETING: Systems Working Group Meeting
DATE: Monday, 1 May 2017
TIME: 09:45 – 14:30pm AEDT
LOCATION: AEMO Melbourne Offices; Level 22, 530 Collins St
MEETING #: Meeting 8

1. Meeting Agenda

The meeting purpose was to walk through the provided SMP Technical Guide, discussing comments and feedback from the SWG Members.

2. Key Discussion and Outcomes

The sections references below refer to the discussed SMP Technical Guide document sections. These sections were reviewed out of order – and are reflected in the order reviewed in these notes.

2.1. Section 10 - Validations

- There was a general principle to minimise any changes to the existing FTP interfaces.
- FTP event codes were reviewed and confirmed as existing event codes are not changing.
- AEMO noted that there was one additional event code for FTP – when the opted in protocol doesn't match the sending protocol. If a transaction group file is sent by FTP, but the selected protocol for this transaction group is API.
- It was noted there will be new transaction groups as part of the B2B procedure changes.
- A query was raised on the timing on creating and clearing stop files, and this is currently not documented anywhere. AEMO noted this process occurs around every 30 seconds.

Key Points:

- The B2B procedures introduce additional transaction groups and transactions as well as modify existing transactions – which will impact the FTP interfaces.

Actions:

- None noted

2.2. Interoperability – Section 9.3

- It was noted that the MessageContextID won't be able to be used to relate all related Notify Party messages. The service order number would need to be used to relate messages.

Actions:

- None noted

2.3. Changing Protocol

- Changing between the API and FTP protocol will be done following the same mechanism as changing the B2B schema version – using the B2B Transform screen in MSATS.
- Once accredited to use the API's - participants will be able to switch (at a transaction group level) from FTP to API.
- Participants asked for a timeline on the MSATS user guides. AEMO noted that the content based on screenshots is expected to be in July.

Actions:

- AEMO will review providing a draft document detailing the MSATS screen changes – which may not have final screenshots, and provide a date for this.

2.4. Section 9.4 and 9.5 – Synchronous and Push-Pull Messaging

- AEMO noted throttling details were still to be added to the SMP Technical Guide.
- Participants requested for samples for the responses they would receive for the standard negative scenarios. HTTP response codes, 404, 405, 500.
- In relation to sync responses it was noted there could be a break of connection during the reply, and would this be captured. AEMO noted this would be captured and would present as a read timeout – waiting on the “To” party to respond.

Key Points:

- For participants planning to implement an API Gateway for a retail transaction group – at a minimum this must implement the B2B async and Hub Message Management API's.
- The B2B sync, and Peer-2-Peer sync API's are value add services, and participants can choose whether or not to implement these.

Actions:

- AEMO to update the SMP Technical Guide with negative scenario response samples.
- AEMO to review on allowing TACK status of Accept as a valid response in sync services. The documentation requires updates to amend this rule.

AEMO response: *AEMO will allow a positive TACK as a valid sync response.*

2.5. Section 9.5 – Push/Pull messaging (async only)

- Push/pull was kept at the request of smaller participants.
- The functionality mirrors FTP, implementing the hokey/pokey process.
- Participants queried if there was a description on the pros and cons of using push/pull versus push/push. AEMO noted there isn't, but will consider this request.
- Participants noted there may be an issue in adhering to the required SLA's – as defined in the TDS – when using the push/pull API. AEMO will review this.

Key Points:

- Hub alerts are only available over push/push. Participants will have to use the MSATS browser, or may have to look at FTP folders for alerts. Such as current stop files. Alternatively, the Participants can retrieve the list of stop files using the AEMO's HubMessageManagement API.

Actions:

- AEMO to review provided additional information on the push/push vs push/pull pros/cons.

AEMO response: AEMO will add detail to the SMP Technical Guide outlining the key differences between the interfaces.

- AEMO to raise SLA question on push/pull response times to the AEMO B2B workstream.

AEMO response: AEMO will update the SMP Technical Guide to state that this will align with the current FTP SLA's.

2.6. Section 9.6 - Peer-2-Peer

- Peer-2-Peer messages use a new PTPE transaction group.
- Peer-2-Peer messages are part of the aseXML r36 schema.
- Peer-2-Peer will be available over the following interfaces:
 - FTP – for free-form messages
 - API - B2B async (push/push or push/pull) – for free-form messages
 - API - B2B sync (push/push) – for free-form messages
 - API - P2P sync (push/push) – for free-form and/or attachments
- There is a 2 MB limit on the P2P attachment messages total size. Including all attachments.
- There is a 1 MB limit on the P2P free-form messages.
- A concern was noted there is an obligation to respond to P2P messages. This would require rejecting these if not supported – requiring participants to change their systems. Some members noted their systems would do this rejection. AEMO will review this.

Key Points:

- P2P is a value added service. Use of this service is expected to be a bilateral agreement between both parties.
- For attachments only the P2P sync API can be used.

Actions:

- AEMO to review allowing participants to indicate the P2P transaction group as not supported – and have the hub reject it.

AEMO response: Support for P2P must be agreed between two parties before it is used. Receiving a P2P message in error would be an unlikely event. AEMO believes implementing blocking logic just for this scenario is of low value. This also aligns with the decision not to block transaction groups as below.

- AEMO to reply if the opt-in at the transaction group level can be extended to other new transaction groups such as MRSR, NPNX.

AEMO response: This was raised in previous B2B Working Groups and the decision was made to not have the e-Hub block transactions groups. It will be up to participants systems to reject these as required. Participants can raise further queries through the B2B Working Group.

2.7. Section 11 – API specific aseXml (r37)

- Samples of the aseXML messages for r37 have been provided.
- r37 will proceed through the standard ASWG process.

Key Points:

- r37 is only used for messages generated by the Hub, in response to API requests. It will not be delivered over FTP.

Actions:

- None

2.8. Registration and Accreditation:

- As per the rules and procedures participants will be required to complete B2B e-Hub accreditation, in line with the published AEMO accreditation process.
- Accreditation is required when using either the FTP or API interfaces.
- Participants queried the timelines for informing AEMO on which interfaces they are planning to use.
- AEMO noted that this will be managed under the Market Readiness.

2.9. Other Questions

- There was a query if the NMI discovery webservice interfaces would change.
AEMO confirmed there is no change to this interface planned as part of the PoC project for 1 December.
- There was a query on the timeline for AEMO providing the Validation Module for participants.
Noting that the detail of what the validation would cover would drive participants own validation logic development.

Actions:

- AEMO will provide more information on the EVM timeline.
***AEMO response:** AEMO will provide the details on the validation logic that the EVM will implement by 31-May. AEMO is still reviewing the EVM software release date.*
- Table 3 (API Format) – The allowed values for the API names is to be updated.
- Section 6.2 – Typo – ‘/messages’ needs to be updated to ‘/alerts’
- Pull API – Normal Scenario #2 – The diagram is a cut paste of Normal Scenario #1. The diagram for Scenario #2 has to be corrected.

2.10. SMP Technical Guide – next versions

- AEMO will provide the next draft by the end of business on Friday 19th May.
- AEMO is still progressing the details for API Key and certificates, and throttling logic, this content is expected to be provided in a final version by 16th June.

Actions:

- AEMO to provide the updated versions of the documents that were discussed in the SWG meeting.
- AEMO will review the API parameters and resources, which are case sensitive, and ensure that this is consistent.

3. Action Items

The following actions were identified in the meeting;

| Item | Topic | Action required | Responsible | By | Status |
|------|--------------------|---|-------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| 2.3 | Changing Protocol | AEMO will review providing a draft document detailing the MSATS screen changes – which may not have final screenshots, and provide a date for this. | AEMO | 31-May | |
| 2.4 | Sync and Push/Pull | AEMO to update the SMP Technical Guide with negative scenario response samples. | AEMO | 19-May | |
| 2.5 | Sync and Push/Pull | AEMO to review on allowing TACK status of Accept as a valid response in sync services. The documentation requires updates to amend this rule. | AEMO | 19-May | |
| 2.6 | Push/Pull - async | AEMO to review provided additional information on the push/push vs push/pull pros/cons. | AEMO | 19-May | |
| 2.7 | Push/Pull - async | AEMO to raise SLA question on push/pull response times to the AEMO B2B workstream. | AEMO | 19-May | Completed <i>See response</i> |
| 2.8 | Push/Pull - async | AEMO to review the restriction on not allowing a positive TACK as a sync response. | AEMO | 19-May | Completed <i>See response</i> |
| 2.9 | Peer-2-Peer | AEMO to review allowing participants to indicate the P2P transaction group as not supported – and have the hub reject it. | AEMO | 19-May | Completed <i>See response</i> |
| 3.0 | Peer-2-Peer | AEMO to reply if the opt-in at the transaction group level can be extended to other new transaction groups such as MRSR, NPNX. | AEMO | 19-May | Completed <i>See response</i> |
| 3.1 | Other Queries | AEMO will provide more information on the EVM timeline. | AEMO | 19-May | <i>See response</i> |
| 3.2 | Other Queries | Table 3 (API Format) – The allowed values for the API names is to be updated. | AEMO | 19-May | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|------|--------|---|
| 3.3 | Other Queries | Section 6.2 – Typo – ‘/messages’ needs to be updated to ‘/alerts’ | AEMO | 19-May | |
| 3.4 | Other Queries | Pull API – Normal Scenario #2 – The diagram is a cut paste of Normal Scenario #1. The diagram for Scenario #2 has to be corrected. | AEMO | 19-May | |
| 3.5 | SMP Technical Guide | AEMO to provide the updated versions of the documents that were discussed in the SWG meeting. | AEMO | 9-May | Completed <i>The latest versions have been provided.</i> |
| 3.6 | SMP Technical Guide | AEMO will review the API parameters and resources, which are case sensitive, and ensure that this is consistent. | AEMO | 19-May | |

4. Other Business

5. Meeting Critique

6. Next meeting

- A final planned full SWG Meeting is proposed for Monday 5th June. AEMO expects that moving forward focus will shift to the Industry Testing in the ITWG, with the SWG only being convened if there is a compelling reason to do so.

7. Previous action Items

| Item | Topic | Action required | Responsible | By | Status |
|------|---|--|-----------------------|-------|--|
| 1 | Notified Parties & Ack Patterns | AEMO to produce a paper outlining the 2 identified options. | AEMO | 26/10 | Completed |
| 1.1 | Request for member preferences of notification model Option. | Members to respond back to AEMO's paper. | Working Group members | 28/10 | Completed |
| 1.2 | Context diagram | Volunteered to frame a context diagram for a variation of Option 1 (EHub generating notifications). | Kristen Clarke | 02/10 | Completed |
| 1.3 | Establish focus group to further investigate Option 1 | AEMO to facilitate session with focus group to Work through the acknowledgment patterns for package 1 & provide a final recommendation for the B2B WG | AEMO | 04/11 | Completed |
| 1.4 | Focus Group to white board 'Push-Push' solution. | Focus group to white board a Web Services 'Push-Push' solution and validate it against the 7 principles outlined in the SWG | Focus Group | 18/11 | Completed |
| 1.5 | AEMO to document solution | AEMO was tasked to document the white boarded solution and then share with the focus group post session prior for review prior to sharing with wider SWG. | AEMO | 24/11 | Completed |
| 1.6 | Manage inflight transactions when changing the interfacing method | AEMO to document the process of managing the inflight transactions when the interfacing method is changed from web services to FTP and vice-versa | AEMO | 13/12 | Completed <i>Added to SMP Technical Guide</i> |
| 1.7 | Notified Parties TACK Optionality | AEMO will include optionality for participants to choose whether to receive all TACK's or just negative TACK's in the notified party's solution. This has been updated in the TDS | AEMO | 13/12 | Completed |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|--|---------|----------|---|
| 1.8 | Multiparty Paper | AEMO to update the paper to include technical limitations of 1 to many on the existing FTP protocol. | AEMO | 14/12 | Completed |
| 1.9 | 1st December 17' Schema validation | AEMO will analyse the impact of adding a technical validation to reject previous schema versions | AEMO | 13/12 | Completed The e-Hub will not reject schema versions. |
| 2.0 | B2B Schema Changes | AEMO to publish early analysis of the B2B schema changes to the group including confidence weighting of each change. | AEMO | 06/01/17 | Completed |
| 2.1 | Multiparty Paper | AEMO to set up a meeting with Kristen to review the multiparty paper and publish back to the group | AEMO | 23/12/16 | Completed |
| 2.2 | B2M Schema Feedback | Provide feedback to their ASWG reps with regards to concerns around the removal of enumeration of MeterStatusCode Vacant – 2nd Tier Retailer Annette Reitmann, AGL – Host Retailer Bevan Cole, Western Power – aseXML Subscriber (WA Elec) Carlos Navarro, Powercor – MDA Rob Wilson, Jemena - Distributors | Members | 21/12/16 | Completed |

8. ATTENDEES:

Not recorded