

POC Systems Work Group No.3 Meeting Notes

MEETING: POC Systems Work Group
DATE: Friday 18 November 2016
TIME: 10:00AM – 16:00PM
LOCATION: AEMO Melbourne Offices; Level 22, 530 Collins St

1. Key Outcomes

Notified Parties (FTP to FTP):

- AEMO walked through a draft version of 'Notified Parties' slide pack that it will present to the B2B working group on Wednesday 23/11. Highlighting the changes made to the solution since the last version and the reasons for those changes. The main discussion points noted here were;
 - **Notification content:** With regards to the content of the 'notification' the B2B WG have recommended giving a full copy of the SORD in the message payload. Andrew Bell made the comment that the notified party would not need a full copy of the transaction as a lot of the data contained in the SORD would be irrelevant. Additional information was suggested to be added to the transaction metadata along with the payload. This will be raised with the B2B working group in the in Wednesday 23/11 meeting.
 - **Notification Header:** The Initiator of a service order will need to populate the multiple 'TO' participants in the header and populate the attribute/role of the notified parties.

It's also noted that there are still SWG members who don't endorse the proposed solution. AEMO will consolidate this feedback and include in the meeting with the B2B working group on the 23rd November.

New Protocols

- AEMO presented the new protocols and interfacing methods presentation to the group.
- Whilst running through the proposed ASync 'Push-Pull' solution it became apart that the group was not on board with AEMO's proposal of a 'Push-Pull' method and challenged the perceived advantages outlined. The question was raised 'What is the (Push-Pull) solution offering in terms of performance & speed?' And 'Why would you implement to different methods of communicating, bearing in mind sync has to be 'Push-Push. Going further a group member also implied that implementing two different patterns for messaging would have potentially higher costs for participants.
- There were also concerns in the group of AEMO taking the responsibility of managing participant's queues in the 'Push-Pull' solution. Instead the groups preference was to manage the message queue, prioritisation /throttling in their own systems.
- In this discussion a point was also made that there is no current use case apparent where a 'near instantaneous' protocol is needed. For the current VIC AMI smart meter implementation the quickest response from a meter they are seeing on 3G is still around 8 minutes. Therefore

the proposed sync solution with a timeout of 15 seconds is not currently needed in the market. A member also stated that for a customer wanting a meter read over the phone multiple ASync calls would be needed within their systems to retrieve information from the meter. So again having a sync call between 2 participants with a 15 second timeout will not be useable with the current systems implementation/

- This discussion led to the group agreeing that a simpler approach would be to implement one method only, and as sync has to be Push-Push ASync should also be 'Push-Push'.
- It was at this stage the group decided to hold off going through the rest of the presentation and instead agreed to form a focus group to white board a solution for an ASync Push-Push solution.
- The group agreed that the solution proposed by the focus group should adhere to the following 7 principles.
 1. The protocol should support a common pattern for data exchange – for ASync & Instant
 2. Benefits on top of Hockey-Pokey
 3. Speed of the message delivery
 4. Use of the protocol shouldn't be restricted by the timing of the requested task/work
 5. Traceability for the undelivered messages
 6. The protocol should support interoperability
 7. Ability to recover from catastrophic event
- The members of this 'sub group' were agreed by the wider group in the session and were as follows; *Note: a number of people stayed for the focus group that were not captured originally as it was run directly after the SWG. Please reply back to the mail if anyone was missed.*

| Focus Group Members |
|---------------------|
| Annett Rietmann |
| Andrew Bell |
| Bibhakar Saran |
| Trent Smith |
| Peter Wijtzes |
| Clinton Gadsden |
| Andrew Hooker |
| Deepesh Goswami |

Focus group:

- In the focus group session the member agreed what the patterns should be for a 'Push-Push' solution for the following scenarios;
 1. Happy scenario.
 2. Recipients Web Service not available.
 3. The Acknowledgment pattern when interoperated (We Service>FTP.)
 4. One too many Web Services.
 5. Web Service>FTP with a stop file on ftp.
- The group drafted a solution and reviewed this solution against the 7 principles to confirm its viability. AEMO took the option to then take this white board solution away and produce a new pack to share firstly to the focus group and then once reviewed to the wider SWG.

2. Action Items

The following actions were identified in the meeting;

| Item | Topic | Action required | Responsible | By |
|------|--|---|-------------|-------|
| 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 |
| 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 |

3. Other Business

3.1.

4. Meeting Critique

5. Next meeting

The next POC SWG meeting is scheduled for 6th December at 09:30AM.

The meeting closed at 13:30PM.

6. Previous action Items

| Item | Topic | Action required | Responsible | By |
|------|--|---|-----------------------|-------|
| 1 | Notified Parties & Ack Patterns | AEMO to produce a paper outlining the 2 identified options. | AEMO | 26/10 |
| 1.1 | Request for member preferences of notification model Option. | Members to respond back to AEMO's paper. | Working Group members | 28/10 |
| 1.2 | Context diagram | Volunteered to frame a context diagram for a variation of Option 1 (EHub generating notifications). | Kristen Clarke | 02/10 |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|------|-------|
| 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 |
|-----|---|---|------|-------|

7. Items raised prior to Meeting

8. ATTENDEES:

| Attendees | Company |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Aakash Sembey | Simply Energy |
| Adrian Honey | TasNetworks |
| Andrew Bell | AusNet Services |
| Andrew Hooker | Powercor Australia |
| Anna Russo | Endeavour Energy |
| Annett Rietmann | AGL Energy |
| Ben Friebel | Hansen Technologies |
| Bibhakar Saran | Jemena Ltd |
| Chami Fernando | Energy Australia |
| Charles Coulson | Metropolis Metering |
| Clint Gadsden | Lumo |
| David Sales | TasNetworks |
| Deepesh Goswami | Secure Meters |
| Doug Miles | Energex |
| Eugene Tverdolov | Powercor Australia |
| George Owiti | Red Energy |
| Helen Vassos | Active Stream |
| Jun Liu | Simply Energy |
| Kristen Clarke | Pacific Hydro |
| Neville Lewis | Select Data & Measurement Solutions |
| P Wijtzes | AGL |
| Paul Greenwood | Vector |
| Richard Wallbrink | Itron |
| Saurabh Sharma | Hydro Tasmania |
| Trent Smith | Brave Energy Systems |
| | |

