B2B Procedures

- Technical Delivery Specification Discussion paper

CONSULTATION

CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant**: AusNet Services*

***Completion Date**: 2 December 2016*

1. Technical Delivery Specification – Feedback template

Item	ID	Discussion point	Priority (H,M,L)	Participant comment
N/A	N/A	Background / Discussion	H	As the drafting for the B2B Procedures Technical Delivery Specification will first become available on 23 December 2016 at the second stage of Consultation, AusNet Services is concerned that there is a very limited timeframe for participants to assess any impacts introduced by the Shared Market Protocol (SMP) and any other changes incorporated into the procedure. We believe that this introduces significant risk to the delivery of Power of Choice program. To mitigate this risk, we strongly recommend that urgent work by industry and AEMO is conducted to develop a fully backwards compatible and robust protocol. The Systems Working Group will need to develop interim proposals that are published to representatives across the industry.
	6	New e-hub many to one messaging (to accommodate Notified parties for Service Orders)	H	The 'Option 1' approach to *Notified Parties* proposes a bespoke e-Hub based on process management capability. This is a complex solution which in our view is unlikely to provide adequate support for future industry development, given the explicit trigger and transactional mechanisms the e-Hub will perform. To resolve technical challenges, this 'Option 1' model violates the existing protocol as *initiators* of transactions will only see rejections from *Notified parties*. This would not facilitate a backwards compatibility gateway. In addition, this specific solution will require consideration in the drafting to clarify the roles and liability associated with functions performed on behalf of *initiators* by the e-Hub. We note that 'Option 2' avoids this complexity.
	3 4	New delivery protocols New e-hub interoperability	H	The assessment by industry at the SWG and its focus group has clarified that to maintain interoperability there is limited scope to vary from the essential pattern of business signals established in the existing

				procedure and protocol. Essentially this means that without a mandate for all participants to move to a new protocol there is a natural constraint on the enhancements that can be delivered by the SMP. Within the bounds of these constraints we believe it prudent to demonstrate that introducing a new (but somewhat restricted) protocol would provide a benefit over and above the existing gateway solution. AusNet Services also recommends that in order to meet the interoperability objective it is imperative that the aseXML signal patterns, transactional and message header structures are not changed for participants remaining on the FTP protocol.
	3	New delivery protocols	H	The proposal for synchronous SMP connections requires further justification to support the quantum of change required; it requires changes to the signalling pattern that is embedded in all market procedures, will impose transaction timing constraints on the performance of work and as yet has no data to identify the timing improvement this function would offer over the asynchronous process.
	3	New delivery protocols	H	The proposal for synchronous SMP connections requires further justification to support the quantum of change required; it requires changes to the signalling pattern that is embedded in all market procedures, will impose transaction timing constraints on the performance of work and as yet has no data to identify the timing improvement this function would offer over the asynchronous process.
	4	New e-hub interoperability	H	In AusNet Services opinion, there has not been a proposal put forward to identify how a full multi-party protocol could be established which would retain interoperability. Given there is currently no rule based or procedural based requirement identified for this function and given the late timing to now introduce such a function, we consider that further investment in investigation and assessing options does not appear prudent.