

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY EDP USERS GROUP
HELD ON TUESDAY THE 17th OF JUNE 2024****SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES****1. Delivery Order Issues**

- 1.1. The issue was originally raised last year and there have not been a lot of tangible outcomes.
- 1.2. A lot of the items covered need to be addressed outside of WIEDPUG, they need to be resolved by industry bodies.
- 1.3. A question has been raised whether to address these issues now or wait until the standards review is complete?
- 1.4. There needs to be some more data collection and analysis completed, robust solutions need to be sought.
- 1.5. It was noted that the standards review is only looking at current business rules.
- 1.6. This does not preclude doing some work now, some of the changes proposed in the DO review may make some changes in the standards review easier.
- 1.7. The working group has not met in 12 months, the group will meet and start working with industry groups.

2. Buyers Purchase Data to AWTA & Hub

- 2.1. This agenda item was raised to try and maximise the accuracy of the data. Need to look at the best way to capture the ownership transfer.
- 2.2. The proposal is to alter the 57 record.
- 2.3. An audit showed that a lot of the data was wrong and the subsequent RPP document was wrong. Adding the regrab into this document will help the issue.
- 2.4. The biggest issue is where the certificate has been re-issued after the initial transmission.
- 2.5. Storage location should be on the RPP.
- 2.6. AWTA does not capture storage organisation. The buyer has an interest in advising AWTA the storage location.
- 2.7. It could be possible to use the invoice as the trigger point to update the data.
- 2.8. There is currently a lack of use from brokers for the RPP document.
- 2.9. The purpose of the RPP is mostly redundant as post sale printing is no longer regularly requested.
- 2.10. If exporters send an RPP, how can the change of ownership be validated?
- 2.11. The transfer is currently done now with an AWTA combo cert, there is no validation for this request. If there is an incentive for a buyer to transmit the RPP there will be a lot more accurate data.

- 2.12. Anyone can build a file from the AC and say I own the wool. Wool base is used as a validation but that is publicly available, there currently is no secure validation of ownership transfer.
- 2.13. It was suggested that it needs to be a different record type to RPP.
- 2.14. Has ACWEP advised NCWSBA the importance of sending the RPP? If brokers were aware they may start sending the document.
- 2.15. This issue has been raised but not addressed. Look at weight and certificate as the highest priority.
- 2.16. There needs to be more work completed to see what can be validated by AWTA. Requires discussions to be held outside of WIEDPUG.
- 2.17. A working group will be formed, members are John Billing (Lead), Brian Vagg, Maxine Blyton, Les Potts, David Mitchell, Evan Vicary.

3. Standards Review Update

- 3.1. Project Update
 - 3.1.1. The project report has been provided. The reason for the red indications for budget and time is because out of scope changes needed to be included. Restrictions to field sizes is not best practice however for ease of transition it was decided it was imperative to include restrictions.
 - 3.1.2. The budget is currently being reviewed, it is most likely a budget extension will be required, this will be presented to WIA.
 - 3.1.3. It was noted that any document can be sent as broadcast or private, it is up to the sender to decide the visibility. There are also inclusion and exclusion lists to give flexibility.
 - 3.1.4. All numeric fields can be negative in the current handbook so this has been included in the rewrite.
 - 3.1.5. The OD is ready for review, the AC is nearly complete, representatives will be advised when it is ready.
- 3.2. Action Items
 - 3.2.1. GI, DS, SR documents have been confirmed to be removed.
 - 3.2.2. Merging the AC & PC documents has been confirmed.
 - 3.2.3. Removing the ACU and using an update method for the AC document has been confirmed.
 - 3.2.4. Merging the 10, 11A & 11B records has been confirmed.
 - 3.2.5. The deliverables for the OD document have not received any negative feedback. Confirmation with developers that documents are appropriate to develop software has been confirmed.
 - 3.2.6. There has been no feedback received regarding the review of the batch processing document.
 - 3.2.7. Sizing of JSON payload. A sale with 1,500 type 20 records was converted, 1.4MB in 80 char went to 7MB in JSON (unformatted).
 - 3.2.8. It was noted that Android and iOS have a 5MB limit. Once the size changes are known there can be changes made to handle the increased size.
 - 3.2.9. Users will need to make allowances for the larger file sizes.

-
- 3.2.10. It was noted that current receiver is being removed, was there any discussion on the original purpose of this field? It was used to determine who else had received the document. It is not used at the moment as AWTA have not implemented this standard in their network, Talman had a different implementation for their network.
 - 3.2.11. There was an assumption made that the information is part of the exchange.
 - 3.2.12. Action: Talman to review if current receiver is still required. Also outline how it was used in the Talman network and how it is used in NZ.
 - 3.3. Discussion points
 - 3.3.1. Is a confirmation endpoint required for requesting data.
 - 3.3.2. It is the clients responsibility to confirm they have received the data from the network. If there is an issue on the client end it is up to the client to advise the network provider.
 - 3.3.3. The proposal is to add an extra confirmation endpoint. The alternative is to use the inbuilt API transmission process.
 - 3.3.4. For an API there are error codes transmitted but how does the network know if the transmission was completed successfully?
 - 3.3.5. The group consensus is to follow Jade's recommendation to not implement a confirmation endpoint.
 - 3.3.6. 21C record masking options.
 - 3.3.7. Options are encryption or only sending for registered receivers (EDI network provider holds the business rule).
 - 3.3.8. It was noted that the less the network changes data the better.
 - 3.3.9. The group agreement is to encrypt data that is private.
 - 3.3.10. Date/Time
 - 3.3.10.1. Recommendations are:
 - 3.3.10.2. Merged into one field
 - 3.3.10.3. Use of literal dates
 - 3.3.10.4. UTC
 - 3.3.11. The group consensus is to accept all of Jade's recommendations regarding date/time fields.
 - 3.3.12. There is a late item for consideration. Excluding records in the RFD process, is this still required? It was historically used to reduce file size which was related to the cost charged by the network, this is no longer an issue.
 - 3.3.13. It was noted the preference is for the EDI network to send all data for integrity.
 - 3.3.14. There was a request to retain the functionality as it helps reduce the file size. It may lead to issues where a buyer request brokers to exclude certain data if it is removed.
 - 3.3.15. A request was made to complete a 10,000 lot sale conversion to JSON including the 84 record bale details to check file size differences.
 - 3.3.16. It was noted that it will be up to network providers to decide on the security implemented.
 - 3.4. WIEDPUG Representatives sign off on Jade deliverables.
-

3.4.1. A document will be distributed asking for a representative from each organisation to sign off on the Jade deliverables when the project is complete. This is to ensure that the governance of the project is completed.

3.5. Demo of GitHub

3.6. All representatives are requested to start becoming familiar with GitHub.

3.7. A link for GitHub will be sent with the minutes.

4. Other Business

4.1. BCC WIEDPUG emails

4.2. Due to security concerns WIEDPUG emails will no longer be sent CC, there were no objections raised to the change.

5. Next Meetings

10:00am AEST Monday the 30th of September 2024

10:00am AEDT Monday the 3rd of February 2025

10:00am AEST Monday the 7th of April 2025

10:00am AEST Monday the 16th of June 2025