

**SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES FOR THE MEETING OF THE WOOL INDUSTRY EDP USERS
GROUP HELD ON TUESDAY THE 17th OF OCTOBER 2017**

SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

1. Delivery Basis Changes

A paper that was circulated to the group was presented at a NASC meeting. A reasonable amount of time was spent explaining the implications of the changes to the committee. A request was made at the NASC meeting to redraft the paper expanding and simplifying where possible the implications of the changes for the committee. The centre field was requested to be focused on for the cataloguing implications.

The group agreed to make the changes to the delivery location and alternative delivery outlined in the paper, these issues were thought to be already addressed. The group consensus was however that all items addressed in the paper to be presented to NASC. An updated paper will be circulated to the group for approval before being presented to a subsequent NASC meeting.

2. AC data updates

The issue that was raised at the last meeting was outlined and an update was provided. Currently OZDE email or call clients whenever there is an update to an auction catalogue. The existing auction catalogue is put on hold and a new catalogue is transmitted if there is a need to update a catalogue. The OZDE network does not overwrite catalogues with new data, it appends. The Talman software will however update existing lots based on a key whilst retaining data in the database such as pricing information.

An enquiry was made as to whether there was a notification system for updated lots. NASC are looking at an alteration notification system that will be distributed about one hour before the sale commences via email.

Currently the electronic distribution of updates to lot data appears to be a sending issue, the receiving of the updates does not appear to cause any problems. Previous experiences are that some systems are unable to re-transmit single lots. It was thought that single lots could cause issues with the catalogue page number.

It was thought that the retransmission of a full catalogue could overwrite buyer valuations. Members were unaware of this issue occurring with the Talman software.

The only issue with this could be a change in certificate number where a buyer could lose the link to previous valuations.

A paper will be drafted to put to brokers for feedback.

3. Mulesing Status

The discussion from a previous meeting was outlined. The group thought that the space needed to be removed from the field. The convention has been in place for approximately eight years with only this issue reported. There is no compelling reason to make a change.

AWEX is the only organisation that collects mulesing data, how do they determine the mulesing status? AWEX relies on the definition in the handbook of the transmitted codes.

An enquiry to the group was made as to whether changing the field from having a space to an M to indicate mulesed was OK, there was not a unanimous group consensus.

The original request was only to make the field conditional. An enquiry was made as to whether changing the field to conditional would be acceptable, the group consensus was that this was the best solution. The group proposed that the condition may be "When mulesed a space must be transmitted". This change will be drafted and presented to the group at the next meeting.

4. Property Identification Code

The paper provided was based on biosecurity work that is being undertaken by the FAWO EAD group that has been in progress for seven to eight years. If PIC was used in data transmissions it would be helpful in identifying the location of wool if there was a biosecurity issue. The data would come from the broker.

Currently the PIC is provided by the grower on the speci however it is believed not to be mandatory. The change would be that the PIC is provided in the TRV document by the brokers and the data would flow to other data systems as the wool progressed through the pipeline.

In the letter there is no reference to transmission or any documents it would be included in, it only asks for a field definition. A full proposal would need to be presented to address the issue correctly.

The EAD working group are looking for a mechanism to make traceability of disease outbreaks as quick and efficient as possible. More clarification is required on the request, the paper was requested to be redrafted and presented at a subsequent meeting.

5. Which details should be mandatory for EDI Code Registration

The agenda item was withdrawn.

6. Make Pack Material field mandatory in Auction Catalogues

There had been an issue in a recent auction sale where there were some old wool packs. Currently two fields cover pack material, 'catalogue symbols' and 'pack material'. Currently the codes for pack material do not appear to be correct and the field is optional, it was not sure why the field should be optional. Currently one software supplier's clients are not transmitting anything in the pack material field.

The group consensus was there was no known reason why the pack material field should be optional and the codes should be cleaned up. A draft will be presented at the next meeting for suggested changes to the field.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Next Meetings

9:00am AEDT Tuesday the 30th of January 2018

9:00am AEST Tuesday the 17th of April 2018

9:00am AEST Tuesday the 12th of June 2018

9:00am AEDT Tuesday the 16th of October 2018