B2B Procedures

- Technical Delivery Specification Discussion paper

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: VectorAMS*

***Completion Date**: 02 December 2016*

1. Technical Delivery Specification – Feedback template

Item	ID	Discussion point	Priority (H,M,L)	Participant comment
1.1		No Changes ?		Vector AMS beleieves AEMO should consider removing the VPN and instead implement SFTP using public/private key authentication. This will remove current bandwidth limitations that will only get worse with additional message exchange use cases, and allow large
2.1		No Changes to FTP acknowledgement patterns for one to one communications ?		Vector AMS Australia's preference is to maintain the existing acknowledgement patterns for FTP.
3.1		What is the new delivery protocol(s) proposed by AEMO?		Vector AMS Australia are unclear on the nature of the question. This appears to be a question of AEMO.
3.3		What transaction types are these protocols they applicable for?		Vector AMS Australia believe all current transaction types should be supported.
3.4		If more than one protocol ws offered by the B2B hub, how will participants specify their preference?		Vector AMS Australia believe participants should be able to configure the protocol they wish to use for each transaction type.
4.1		What interchangeable protocols are available to participants?		Vector AMS Australia believe SOAP/XML, REST/JSON is appropriate.

4.2		How will the e-Hub support multiple delivery protocols?		Refer to 5.1
5.1		Will there be any difference in acknowledgement patterns for the different protocols?		Vector AMS Australia believes that the same constructs should be applied, although could be simplified for a web service implementation. If the e-hub is providing messaging services and implements a guaranteed delivery pattern, then technical validation (ie MACK) can occur synchronously as messages pass to/from the e-hub. The formal business acknowledgement (i.e. current TACK) is the only message that needs to flow back from recipient to originator. This can be subject to the same technical validation (ie MACK) as it passes synchronously to/from the e-hub. This pattern could make it easier for the e-hub to support multiple protocols, and allow dynamic translation/routing through different transports (including ftp) based on individual participant preferences.
5.2		What are the new acknowledgement patterns for the new protocols?		As above
5.3		New e-hub multiple messaging acknowledement patterns?		As above

6		New e-hub many to one messaging		Vector AMS Australia believes AEMO should consider implementing a publish-subscribe model which requires a participant to opt-in to receiving notified party messages. A participant should be able to subscribe to the senders and topics they are interested in. For companies that implement multiple roles they could end up receiving the same message as both recipient and notified party, which will create unnecessary noise and consuming resources and bandwidth.
6.1		Will the recipient of an information only message MACK it or MACK and TACK it?		The only mechanism required is to ensure the message was successfully transferred from the e-hub to the notified party. (Refer to 5.1)
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?		The e-hub should have the flexibility to provide both positive and negative TACKS back to the initiator of the message, and this should be configurable.
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?		Exception processing can be managed by sending a point to point transaction to inform the correct participant. It would be expected that this will occur very rarely as it requires a initiator to get it wrong and for a Notified party to produce the negative TACK when receiving a message incorrectly.

6.4		How will the information only recipient (the Notified party) know if a transaction has been rejected, should they receivea copy of the negative MACK?		This question is unclear. Vector AMS Australia assume this relates to transactions rejected by other parties. Notifies Parties should only receive the message once the hub has successfully delivered the message to the recipient.
6.5		How might these work for a 'synchronous' delivery method? Any changes?		For synchronous delivery, a simpler request-response pattern should be used.
6.6		Message bundling for multiple TO parties, how will this work?		The e-hub will maintain a message queue for each participant, and publish messages to the appropriate queues once the recipient sends a TACK. Messages expire if the recipient sends -ve MACK, -ve TACK or TACK timeout occurs, and originator is notified of this event.
8.1		Is the current contingency component in the technical delivery specifications sufficient to continue into the new document?		AEMO should consider specifying the designed level of availability for the e-hub, and expected availability for participant systems (eg three 9's). A statement of 24x7 availability is too vague. AEMO needs to consider how information only messages to notified parties fits in.
9.1		aseXML transactions and acknowledgements will move from the Technical Guidelines into this new procedure.		We support this proposal

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.		We support this proposal
9.3		AEMO will remove defined terms into the Retail Glossary and Framework		We support this proposal
9.4		Event codes are being moved from B2B Procedure: Technical Guidelines into each relevant B2B Procedures		We support this proposal
0		General Comments		Vector AMS Australia believe that the e-hub needs to expose appropriate administration API's so that management of B2B transaction can be easily integrated into participant systems. These API's need to allow for querying the hub on message volumes, individual transactions and allow for the assignment of participant setting i.e. which transaction types are to be forward through to participant gateways.