B2B Procedures

- Technical Delivery Specification Discussion paper

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: CitiPower / Powercor / SA Power Network*

***Completion Date**: 1st December 2016*

Item	ID	Discussion point	Priority (H,M,L)	Participant comment
1		1. FTP Delivery methods & 2. FTP Acknowledgement Patterns	H	The hokey pokey protocol should not change however the introduction of the use of SFTP is preferred instead of FTP
2		3. New delivery protocols	H	The preference for the use of secure webservices and exclusively using asynchronous patterns. All B2B & MSATS should be able to use the new protocol however it should not be mandated to move away from FTP. The B2B & MSATS browser is sufficient for us to update our settings
3		5. New e-hub acknowledgement patterns	H	Webservices should not require the use of ac1 as the request/response mechanism implicitly implies delivery. In the event of 1 request needing to be sent to multiple participants the MACK should contain the response of all recipients in order to identify who did not receive the request. Ehub should not retry for more than 3 times or longer than 1 minute In the event of a recipient using WS being down however the initiator using FTP, a stop file should be used to stop more transactions rather than rejecting all the submitted messages.
4		6. New e-hub many to one messaging	H	Information only recipients need to send both MACK and TACK. Recipients need the ability to notify sender that they are not responsible for the site. Initiator should capture a negative TACK, resolve the issue and resend to relevant parties. E.g wrong MP is notified, retailer gets reject TACK and resends the message to the correct MP. The Notifed party needs to know all state changes after they receive the initial notification message. We do not believe that there is a scenario where synchronous webservices are appropriate. Most transaction require comms to the meter or other systems which would take longer than the ws timeout. The header can specify who needs the message and what role that party play in this transaction.
5		7. New e-hub validations	H	The new eHub should perform Security validation (authentication, SSL), schema validation and flow control (DDOS prevention)
6		8. Contingency	H	The current contingency (email) is appropriate
7		9. Other changes to the procedures	H	We support the proposed changes however believe that the Obligations should remain in an enforceable document. Contact details can be moved elsewhere.

1. Technical Delivery Specification – Feedback template