B2B Procedures

- Technical Delivery Specification Discussion paper

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: Pacific Hydro*

***Completion Date**: 30 November 2016*

Technical Delivery Specification – Feedback template

Item	ID	Discussion Point	Priority	Participant Comment
1	1.1	FTP Delivery methods - The current method and protocols used to communicate with the B2B e-Hub will continue to operate as they do today. There are no changes proposed to how participants communicate using this method other than the scenario where 'notified parties' are present. This however will not change how participants interact with the E-hub using FTP. No changes?	H	In order to ensure a smooth transition on 1 December 2017 it is essential the current protocols used for communication across the B2B e-Hub should not change. Even where the communication is now a one to many for some transactions the protocol of Business Receipt and Business Acceptance/Rejection should apply so as participants can manage exceptions.
2	2.1	FTP Acknowledgement Patterns - The acknowledgement patterns will change to support the new multiple recipient interactions between participants. However if it is an FTP to FTP with a single recipient there will be no change. No Changes to FTP Acknowledgement patterns for one to one communications?	H	The Business Receipt and Business Acceptance/Rejection should also apply to transaction sent to notified parties to minimise change and allow exception management.
3	3.1	New delivery protocols - The new SMP platform will provide additional communication protocols to enable instantaneous messaging for participants. As well as the other functionality supported by the new B2B e-Hub. What is the new delivery protocol (s) proposed by AEMO?	H	Pacific Hydro requests AEMO explain this question further or define the new delivery protocol/s for comment.
	3.2	Are there any other protocols that need to be considered?	H	Pacific Hydro suggest that the following protocols need to be considered as the minimum set of protocols:

Item	ID	Discussion Point	Priority	Participant Comment
				• FTP • Webservices • Manual Portal (User Interface)
	3.3	What transaction types are these protocols they applicable for?	H	All protocols should be available for all B2B transactions. The protocols should consider both current transactions as well as provide flexibility for innovation and future transactions.
	3.4	If more than one protocol' was offered by the B2B hub, how will participants specify their preference?	H	The SMP/B2B Hub should provide the ability for Participants to nominate the protocol method at a transaction type level; both for sending and receiving transactions.
4	4.1	New e-hub interoperability - The new e-Hub will allow participants using different communication protocols to continue to interact. The B2B e-Hub will have the functionality to transform messages from one protocol to another. What interchangeable protocols are available to participants? How will the e-Hub support multiple delivery protocols?	H	To ensure true interoperability, all protocols should be interchangeable for all participants. This ensures each participant can determine the most suitable protocol for their market segment/role.
5	5.1	New e-hub acknowledgement patterns – The new communication protocols are under review to determine how the acknowledgement patterns will work. The objective is to have them interact in a similar way to FTP. Will there be any difference in acknowledgement patterns for the different protocols?	H	The acknowledgement patterns for the different protocols that may be used through the e-Hub should ensure they are both positive and negative to indicate acceptance or not of the transaction. Where a negative response is received, this should clearly indicate the reason why for the purpose of exception management.
	5.2	What are the new acknowledgement patterns for the new protocol(s)?	H	Refer to 5.1
	5.3	New e-hub multiple messaging acknowledgement patterns?		Refer to 5.1
6	6.1	New e-hub many to one messaging (to accommodate	H	Yes, it is expected that notified parties will be able to

Item	ID	Discussion Point	Priority	Participant Comment
		Notified parties for Service Orders) Will the recipient of an information only message MACK it or MACK and TACK it?		indicate they have received the transaction and it is accepted. As the transaction is provided 'for information only' it is expected the message acknowledgement will indicate if they have received the transaction. The transaction Acknowledgement will indicate if they are the correct party to receive the transaction.
	6.2	If a participant TACKs an information only message should this go back to the initiator of this message? Is so what happens to the message if it's a Negative TACK?	H	Both positive and negative transaction Acknowledgement should go back to the initiator. The Initiator will decide how to manage the acknowledgements. If the transaction has been negatively acknowledged, the Initiator will need to take corrective action to ensure the appropriate party is notified.
	6.3	What will the process be if a message notification (i.e. a Service Order Notification) is sent to the wrong participant by the initiator?	H	The Party receiving the notification will send a negative acknowledgement to the Initiator with an Error Code indicating Incorrect Party.
	6.4	How will the information only recipient (the Notified party) know if a transaction has been rejected, should they receive a copy of the negative MACK?	H	Where a transaction is rejected by the Recipient, either by a Business Receipt or Business Acceptance/Rejection, the response should be sent to the Notified party (and the Initiator). It was expected that on the initial notification the notified party may need to undertake an internal process. This will no longer be required as the Recipient has rejected the request.
	6.5	How might these work for a 'synchronous' delivery method? Any changes?		No comment
	6.6	Message bundling for multiple TO parties, how will this work?		No comment
7	7.1	New e-hub validations What are the current validations?		No comment
	7.2	What additional validations are required to support the new functionality?		No comment
8	8.1	Contingency Is the current contingency	M	In section 5.2 Need for Contingency Arrangements, it states that:

Item	ID	Discussion Point	Priority	Participant Comment
		component in the technical delivery specifications sufficient to continue into the new document?		a. The use of a National B2B Infrastructure, couples with the use of aseXML B2B Transactions, has been assumed as the basis for the realisation of National B2B Procedures If new/different protocols are introduced as part of the B2B e-Hub then it is expected the current contingency processes may not apply. Therefore the current contingency arrangements would need to be reviewed.
9	9.1	Other changes to the procedures aseXML transactions and acknowledgements will move from the Technical Guidelines into this new procedure.		This is a reasonable move.
	9.2	The Participant-managed details i.e. ROCL description and obligations - will be removed and will be published separately AEMO on the AEMO website.	H	Where then does the obligation for participants to update the RoCL reside?
	9.3	AEMO will remove defined terms into the Retail Glossary and Framework	M	This is a reasonable move.
	9.4	Event codes are being moved from B2B Procedure: Technical Guidelines into each relevant B2B Procedures.	M	This is a reasonable move.

Currently the PoC Systems Working Group is developing the technical solution for the management of B2B transactions among participants. As indicated previously, Pacific Hydro does not support the two options currently put forward. The technical solution should comprise simple communications to affect Business outcomes associated with the PoC changes. It should be efficient, reliable and easy to implement and promote innovation in advanced meter services. The solution should not impose barriers to entry or discriminate between parties. It protects confidential information and ensures a uniform approach in all states. Finally, it is a single solution that applies to all B2B Procedures.

Pacific Hydro supports a true one to many transaction, where recipients and notified parties are identified on the outbound transaction and the e-Hub directs the transaction to the parties as identified in the transaction. The content of the transaction is not altered. Business Receipts and Business Acceptance/Rejection from both the Recipient and the Notified Party would be managed as for current processes to allow for exception management where transactions have been rejected.