

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY EDP USERS  
GROUP HELD ON MONDAY THE 17<sup>th</sup> OF NOVEMBER 2014**

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES**

**1. Handbook Review**

A review of the handbook has been conducted with the element cross reference merging into the data dictionary and a list of documents to be removed made.

It was now up to the users to decide if the new format is better and the proposal is to publish both the new data dictionary with the element cross reference merged along with the current element cross reference chapter for the next handbook release, for subsequent releases the element cross reference chapter would be removed. There are a total of six documents and about ten records listed for removal.

It was requested that the GI document be kept as it has been used in the past and could be used in the future.

**2. Invoices**

There was a concern about efficiencies with EDI documents which are designed to eliminate hard copy invoices however recently there has been an increase in hard copy invoices being requested.

For any action from this group to be made it would be necessary to identify what the deficiencies are.

It was enquired if there was any difference between the printed invoice and the electronic invoice in terms of information provided, it was noted by the group that there were some differences.

It was noted that there were no changes required to the electronic invoice to meet current legislation. When GST was introduced the legislation was changed so electronic invoices did not have to be printed.

**3. Non EDI Network Data**

Systems will begin bypassing the EDI network if we don't accommodate other transmission methods.

Currently all test certificate data goes out electronically via EDI. Other methods are used from time to time due to ease of transmission such as PDF, the type of information distributed via these methods is not needed to be sent via EDI.

If a radical change was being proposed similar to XML in 2008 a cost benefit analysis would need to be undertaken.

#### 4. Sale Outcome – Lots Sold prior to auction

There has been an approach from an exporter to include lots sold prior to auction in LPB transmissions, it is a proposal only at this stage.

There would be no issue with capturing the sale outcome of '7', the question would be whether systems are able to receive a sale outcome of '7'.

There would be software changes needed but they would be minor for the receivers of LPB data.

Some concern was expressed over possible privacy issues and this would need to be considered.

As long as the request was from the buyer there should be no issues with transmitting the data. The information would only be included in the LPB transmission after the buyer and broker decide to provide the information.

#### 5. Bale Details

A request from FAWO was for the following items to be considered:

- Changes required to the handbook;
- Software changes required by providers/users;
- Operational changes for the users (so they can optionally request the data);
- Impact the extra data will have on the transmission system;
- Lead time required for software changes to be made and implemented;
- Cost implications to software providers and users;
- Any other factors that may be relevant.

It would be relatively easy to set up in the standards. Previously WIEDPUG had made some changes to the handbook to allow for identification of underweight and overweight bales. The main concern to adding all bale details would be the load placed on the network.

There would need to be an 81 record loop and a change in the RFD document with a possibility of an extra two exclusion type records. Brokers as well as receivers of bale detail data would need to change their software. There may also need to be an 80 record loop depending on interlot requirements.

It would take about two to three days for software changes and about a week for two staff to make the necessary script changes.

There would need to be a six month lead time to implement the changes and that any changes to the handbook need to be published in February 2015 in order to be implemented during the July 2015 recess.

The group did not foresee a major difference for the EDI network in terms of load except in the case of clients requesting an entire catalogue.

It was estimated from AWTA data supplied for season 2013/14 that there would be a 34% increase in data volume for brokers and slightly less of an increase for the buyers.

Some users are unable to transmit bale detail data and there was a concern that they may be discriminated against in the auction room.

A change was proposed to the existing identification of underweight bales in the handbook. The change would be to have the lightest bale identified on all lots. The change was accepted by the group and the field name will be changed to 'Lightest Individual Bale Weight', the associated notes in the handbook will also be updated. This change will be included in the next handbook release.

It was noted that the issue wasn't the volume of data but the inherent knowledge that the broker would like to retain.

#### **6. Next Handbook Release Date**

It was agreed by the group that the next handbook release date will be in the July 2015 recess (20<sup>th</sup> of July 2015).