OEB GDAR EBT Standards Working Group – Transport Protocol Subgroup

Information contained in working group notes represent the views of the individuals participating in the working group only, and in no way reflect official Ontario Energy Board position or opinion.

Minutes for July 6, 2006 – Draft

ATTENDEES:

Darcy Hewgill	Direct Energy
Mark Logan	Direct Energy
Ernest Cheng	Enbridge
Leonard Gallant	Enbridge
Adam Berent	Energy Savings
Latif Nurani	Energy Savings
Loraine Baillergeon	Kitchener Utilities
Victor Bosyy	Kitchener Utilities (City of Kitchener)
Mark Davis	Superior Energy Management
Omar Silva-Fulchi	Superior Energy Management
Mark Van Praet	Union Gas
Dave Robertson	Union Gas
Vu Pham-Tran	Union Gas
Dennis Alexander	Union Gas
Tom Stark	ExtenSys
Donald Shaw	ExtenSys
Scott Atkins	SPi
Barb Robertson	OEB

NEW BUSINESS

Item	Discussion	Action Items
1. Draft May 15, 2006 minutes	• Accepted as written	
2. Connectivity Testing	• DE/Union – Determined cause of previous failures	DE/Union will address any required changes and re-test

3. Draft Protocol	• Comments/revisions added to ver 0.5 were reviewed and accepted • Additional changes identified: o Section 4.5.1.3.1 – add "using Sender's public key" to item 3 and delete items 4 through 6; revise example in Appendix A o Section 4.6.3.3.3 – add note that boundary can be set at the discretion of the sender; 'EBT part' is illustrative only o Section 4.6.4.1.1 – add to Note to refer to Standards Document for format of filename o Section 4.6.5.2.2 – add example of "poorly formed file name" o Section 5.1.2 – discussion re use of DocReject FA for duplicate document reference numbers – add note to refer to Standards Document (ref item 4 below) o Section 5.1.2 – first bullet; add wording to clarify validating is based on the party's own copy of the schemas which should be consistent with those on the OEB website	Tom Stark will make revisions to document
4. Standards Document	• Technical Rules – leave maximum EBT document size prior to encryption and compression at 500Mb (note: will review again in future) • Section 5.6 Functional Acknowledgement o Under "Data" second paragraph – FA will be sent within "4 business hours" (instead of 1 business day currently used as placeholder only) o Re duplicate PIPE document numbers – change wording from "should" to state they "shall" be rejected at FA level o Re duplicate transaction numbers within a PIPE document – change wording from "should" to read "may" be done at the FA level (NB – no changes made to "Note" which reads "Duplicate Transaction Reference numbers across all transactions will be done at the application level (i.e., if duplicated transaction number are found beyond the transactions contained in the PIPE document, then an Application Advice Reject shall be sent	Barb Robertson will make revisions to document

	rejecting the transaction with the duplicate number.) o Re duplicate file name – revise wording to state that the file will be rejected by sending an FA DocReject (i.e., not in an HTTP response)	
5. Test Plan	• Group thanked and complimented Scott on "strawman" test plan • Opening remarks – plan prepared from the perspective of the tester at the workstation only; the server has no obligation other than to be up • Comments/Revisions o Very detailed test plan (good!), but need to delineate whether test is external, or internal only. Group identified category applicable to each test for incorporation in plan o Section 2.1 – clarify tester "at a workstation" o Section 2.2 – add "both parties should exchange certificates" o Section 3.2, PC1 - delete "server forced" from expected pass result o Section 3.5 – include a modified #7 to ensure FA comes back encrypted for the right recipient o Section 3.6, UR1 – systems do not check for encryption, so need to revise test o Section 3.6, UR5 – cannot understand doc ref number; therefore cannot send FA o Section 3.7 – add test for duplicate document reference number, duplicate transaction reference number within a document, and unique file name o Section 3.9, LT4/LT5 – revise these	Scott Atkins will make revisions to test plan Scott will provide a "document generator" on request (ref 3.7 of test plan)
6. Proposed Date for Protocol Test	• Test will take approximately 2 weeks • Proposed that testing start approximately 4 weeks prior to Market Test • Proposed date, based on Market Testing commencing October 16, 2006	

	would be mid-September	
7. Items from Market Test Planning Meetings	• Holds - request that there should be no automatic holds over the weekends (i.e., do not advance one day from Friday to Monday by moving computer back) • Synch dates – no need to synch date in front end with date in back – use time/date stamp from the application • Separate Certificate for "dummy vendor" – do not require separate certificate	
8. Proposed change to Delivery Protocol	• This item arose after the meeting (July 21, 2006), and was addressed through email exchange only – IT WAS NOT DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING, AND IS BEING INCORPORATED IN THESE MINUTES FOR COMPLETENESS ONLY • Re Section 4.7, a proposal was made to add second entity-body common element called "document_type" which would identify, prior to decryption, whether the document was a PIPE or an FA, and would therefore make apparent which schema to validate against • Although all parties accepted the proposal was technically preferred as the most robust way to handle validation due to there being two separate schemas, some parties were averse to making changes to the protocol at the current time.	No action required.
NEXT MEETING		
		Action Items & Prime
1. Time and place	• TBD	
2. Agenda	• TBD	