

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY EDP USERS GROUP  
HELD ON TUESDAY THE 16<sup>th</sup> OF JUNE 2025**

## **SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES**

### **1. General Updates**

- 1.1. Forward WDO example document
  - 1.1.1. The document has been forwarded, the task is marked as completed.
- 1.2. ACWEP to write to AWEX with any eBale data transmission concerns
  - 1.2.1. It was advised that there are no concerns with eBale data itself, the fact that it is transmitted with AC data is the main concern. The request is for the data not to be sent with the AC as it makes it much easier to trace data such as pricing for overseas entities.
  - 1.2.2. It was noted that there are not many eBale ID's transmitted in the AC's currently.
  - 1.2.3. AWEX will engage with ACWEP to review the issue.
  - 1.2.4. It was noted that if the eBale ID is removed from the AC exporters will need the ability to identify eBale Lots in the AC, this would most likely require a new field.
- 1.3. Write to NCWSBA regarding the RPP document
  - 1.3.1. The letter has been sent to WIA, to date there has been no response. Individual brokers will be contacted that are not transmitting after a response is received from NCWSBA.
- 1.4. PIC data at the bale level
  - 1.4.1. The updated WoolClip API document is being finalised.

### **2. Standards Review Update**

- 2.1. Project Update
  - 2.1.1. Business Rules Update
    - 2.1.1.1. Updates to the business rules are on hold pending the working group modifications to the standards as the business rules will rely on these changes.
  - 2.1.2. Revision of the GitHub specification
    - 2.1.2.1. Revision of the GitHub specification is also on hold until the working group completes the review.
- 2.2. Full review of API Standards
  - 2.2.1. It was noted that AWTA & AWEX are the only organisations that have raised concerns with the review in their responses. They indicated that some of the concerns raised have not been addressed.
  - 2.2.2. The aim of the modified bale object is to represent what is physically on the bale.
  - 2.2.3. A concern is the header holds the bales together, without it how will the bales be grouped?
  - 2.2.4. Most of the time it is the same brand at the lot and bale level. For example, you are not going to put various at every level.
  - 2.2.5. A question raised was when the bale details are not available how do you get 'header' details. It was noted that in this case it is the attribute of the lot not the bale level.
  - 2.2.6. The AWTA & AWEX concerns would be alleviated by having bale details and lot level details, this was not clear originally.
  - 2.2.7. The bale was the only element reviewed to get agreement initially, lot level will be reviewed if approved.

- 2.2.8. Bale number and bale renumpers need to be addressed if there are alpha characters.
  - 2.2.9. Variable length fields could be an issue, particularly brand and description. AWTA do not want to receive a brand that is greater than thirty characters to make sure it matches the certificate.
  - 2.2.10. This may require a new field 'Brand Printed on Certificate'.
  - 2.2.11. Business rules will need to handle issues with any other fields lengths as well. Also, special characters could be an issue. It was noted that burden is now on the receiver rather than the sender to check field lengths.
  - 2.2.12. It was noted that the standard needs to handle off network transmissions as well.
  - 2.2.13. AWTA & AWEX agreed that the concerns raised in their responses have been addressed and will be handled at the lot level.
  - 2.2.14. It was pointed out that weight unit has been moved from the lower level to a higher level.
  - 2.2.15. It was noted that bale number has been renamed to just number and the same with bale renumber to just renumber and both attributes from string to integer.
  - 2.2.16. It was noted that bale description was renamed to description. The working group is to determine what the name is called if it is added to the lot level.
  - 2.2.17. Area of origin has been renamed to wsa.
  - 2.2.18. It was noted that unit number moved from an integer to a string in the working group proposal. The working group will check this.
  - 2.2.19. Gross and tare are an integer in the working group proposal, the Jade proposal is a decimal. All weights in the Jade proposal have a standard weight field that is two decimals with a weight unit.
  - 2.2.20. The group consensus was to deprecate the three fields listed in the paper as well as the number of bales as it is handled by the listing of all the bales.
  - 2.2.21. Another concern is capitalisation of postCode. If it is two words compared to one there will be a different nomenclature. In Australia it is one word, therefor it should not have a capital C.
  - 2.2.22. In the Jade standard all attributes have a length as well as a data dictionary, it is self-documenting. If field sizes are removed we will need a separate document.
  - 2.2.23. NZWTA & Golden Micro Solutions did not submit a response. In the meeting they agreed to proceed with the review by the working group.
  - 2.2.24. The Talman representative requested time to review with Talman staff and then send an email confirming their response.
  - 2.2.25. There are two options to complete the review by the working group, the first is to let the working group proceed and report back to WIEDPUG regularly. The second option is to include an oversight process similar to what AWTA and AWEX provided with the Jade project.
  - 2.2.26. The working group advised that they would submit each API as it was completed for review by WIEDPUG. They will work through a logical order starting with the TRV.
  - 2.2.27. The timeline for the completion of the review will be worked on and reported back to the group.
  - 2.2.28. It was noted that the working group will update all of the GitHub objects, including class diagrams, examples, OpenAPI Spec in both JSON and YAML as well as the data dictionary. Also need to back up the existing Jade standard. This work needs to be included in the timeline.
- 2.3. Revision of timelines
- 2.3.1. The working group will give a timeline estimate during their planning phase.

## 2.4. Revision of cost estimates

- 2.4.1. In the submissions from WIEDPUG representative organisations there were no significant changes in the cost estimates for the working group proposal compared to the Jade standard.

## 2.5. General Discussion

- 2.5.1. WIA will be briefed on the new timeline.
- 2.5.2. There have been some queries about what the tangible benefits are with the standards review. We need to address the security concerns and access to data.
- 2.5.3. There were documents created by the group listing costs and benefits when the standards review process started, the secretary will forward the documents with the minutes.
- 2.5.4. A request was made to have a web page and network that runs 24-7, there is an expectation the network would have an ability to monitor & manage transmissions. It was noted this is out of scope for the current project and it would be up to the network providers to determine what can be included.

## 3. Other Business

### 3.1. DO Transmission Concerns

- 3.1.1. A concern was raised that DO's transmitted to the network can be accessed by people they are not intended for.
- 3.1.2. AWTA advised that DO's cannot be sent as a broadcast document in the current network.
- 3.1.3. It was clarified that all of the recipients listed to receive the DO can get all of the details. For organisations such as the carrier this may not be appropriate.
- 3.1.4. It was advised that the solution for this would be to have a carrier only version of the DO with only the required data included. The representatives that have concerns with the data in the DO were requested to submit a proposal for the group to review.
- 3.1.5. It was noted in the Jade standard all documents provide the sender with the ability to send to all, send to only a listed set of recipients, or send to all except an exclusion list.

- 3.2. The group was reminded that Version 38 becomes effective on the 4th of August.

## 4. Next Meetings

10:00am AEST Monday the 22<sup>nd</sup> of September 2025

10:00am AEDT Monday the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February 2026

10:00am AEST Monday the 13<sup>th</sup> of April 2026

10:00am AEST Monday the 15<sup>th</sup> of June 2026

Meeting closed: 11:28 am