

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY EDP USERS GROUP  
HELD ON TUESDAY THE 8<sup>th</sup> OF JUNE 2021**

## SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

### 1. WIEDPUG Standards Update

This item arose as a part of the eSpeci work as well as being a part of a paper on how WIEDPUG could fund projects from a meeting in 2019.

The papers are presented to give the opportunity for others to comment on them. WIA has a meeting at the end of August and it is intended for the paper to be presented at that meeting.

There were some concerns with certain sections of the paper such as the documentation component of the project. Also, the audience receiving the paper may not be able to understand all of the issues presented and may misinterpret some of the content.

It was considered that the documentation was 99% completed as a part of the eSpeci project work, were the formats not agreed upon?

There was a concern that security issues were being listed as a part of the EDI network environment, this is incorrect, it should be a separate project.

The paper confuses policy issues with the technical issues. For example, text file lengths in the brand field, this is a small element of a technical issue that bring in significant costs to the industry.

The paper seems to imply we do not have a network, can we operate without a network?

Version control is missing in the paper, we have spoken about version control in the past, that should have been identified.

Transition times are not addressed in the paper.

It was noted that policy issues for WIA surround the funding, technical issues will not go to WIA. We need to decide what the best way forward is, is it JSON or something else?

No decisions will be made on standards and the implementation of any proposed changes until we receive feedback from the independent review.

It was noted that this is a significant project, there will need to be multiple skill bases.

After the phase 1 review is completed everyone will be able to comment on what it will cost to implement the recommendations, the technical recommendations can be discussed.

There was an opinion that some of the scoped work can be done first, if this is not the case the consultant could incur significant costs. The scope of the project could be narrowed by

this group.

We are looking for an independent review to advise how data exchange should occur and how do we transition. An independent approach is a circuit breaker to get to an agreed upon standard and clarify the strategic direction. There are bigger picture issues along with the technical issues of structures.

It was noted that systems security should not be part of this review as it is different to data exchange security.

It was hoped that we could introduce API keys in the data exchange in the short term. We need to introduce a level of security more urgently.

It was thought that this is a large project, we are after technical recommendations, we need to get the financial cost and benefits. Maybe the second phase is separate, is it a step too far initially.

As far as costing we will not know until after the recommendations are made.

Are the two reports good enough to go to WIA. It is difficult to get agreement, do we need to make further changes? Are there any strong objections to the paper going to WIA?

It was thought that the document has come a long way but it raises a lot of questions that are not answered.

The first step of the project is to get approval from WIA to get quotes.

To present this to WIA a covering letter is required that tries to give some examples of where the limitations are, for example bale description field lengths and security.

It was noted that phase 1 is self-explanatory, if it is presented to WIA they will be able to understand it.

There is nothing in the document about NZ. It was noted that NZ are observers only, they will adapt to whatever the standards are. It was noted that currently NZ transmissions use unsecured FTP, that should be addressed.

The representatives agreed that there is an appetite for change and to push on with the papers. The comments about phasing need to be taken on board to make sure they are covered.

## **2. General Updates**

### **Payment Advice document use**

This item was discussed as a part of the previous minutes review.

There were no updates provided, the item has been marked as actioned and will be

closed.

### **Use of EDI for Mulesing Status Amendments**

This item was discussed as a part of the previous minutes review.

An update was sent to all developers to make sure there were no issues with the proposed standard. Feedback was received from some developers, there were no issues or concerns raised for implementing the format as specified.

AWEX agreed to continue to use existing arrangements in place between AWTA and AWEX, in the future they will look at other options for data transfers.

The consensus is that the document will be accepted and will go into the next handbook in July 2022, AWTA could make it available earlier if required.

### **3. Other Business**

#### **EDI sale roster checking**

EDI sale roster checking against AC transmissions is at a full EDI code level. When they are not on the selling arrangements it can cause issues with late changes. Validation should only be company code which is the first three characters and sale date.

This is not a handbook standards issue as it is not documented in the handbook.

If NASC approves the change it will be actioned, only the first three characters of the selling organisations will be validated rather than the full EDI code.

#### **AWTA Network Security**

A request was made as to whether it is possible for AWTA to look at options to improve EDI FTP security.

### **4. Next Meetings**

9:00am AEDT Tuesday the 12<sup>th</sup> of October 2021

9:00am AEDT Tuesday the 1<sup>st</sup> of February 2022

9:00am AEST Tuesday the 12<sup>th</sup> of April 2022

9:00am AEST Tuesday the 7<sup>th</sup> of June 2022