

WITS-USDA-OFFICE OF COMMUNICAT

**Coordinator: RJ Cabrera
May 2, 2016
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Good morning thank you all for standing by. I'd like to inform all participants that your lines have been placed on a listen-only mode for the duration of today's presentation. Today's call is also being recorded. If anyone does have any objections you may disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the call over to Ms. RJ Cabrera. Thank you, you may begin.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you (Sue). Good morning all. This is again RJ Cabrera. I'm the DFO for the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Animal Health. Welcome everyone first to the members and then to everyone else joining in today.

This is the first of two teleconferences scheduled. The next one is on June 16. As noted by our operator this call is being recorded. And before I take the toll just a gentle reminder to please mute your phones unless you're speaking.

And a second point of housekeeping is to because it's a telecom and for record-keeping purposes I'd ask that whenever practical that you preface your comments or questions with your name just so we have a nice full and accurate transcript. There will be a written transcript from this call.

It is an exchange. Of course, you know, if you're going back and forth that's not necessary but at some point we would like to, you know, capture everybody's comments accurately.

I believe I know that in addition to other APHIS persons who are on the call I see Dr. Joseph Anelli has joined us. He'll be available throughout the call because the subjects are One Health.

We had approximately 18 persons who informally registered for the call in listen-only. That means there may be more. Not everybody registers. There were no request for public comment so Liz we won't have to take too long for that. In the interest of time I only have one administrative detail I'd like to bring up. And that is for now the September 7 and 8 meeting in Washington DC is taking shape.

We've finalized some things including we will be in the Secretary's conference room again. I don't know if some of you might remember some years ago we were there and we had planned to receive the Secretary. Of course that was preempted by another kind of an unexpected meeting that came up with the delegation.

But as always since we are in the building, it will be the Jamie L. Whitten building we'll request another audience with the secretary if perchance he's available. We'll see. So with that let's do roll call and then I will hand it over to Dr. (Westrum).

And I propose that we just power through this 2-1/2 half hours without a break. I don't think we'll need a break but if somebody feels like they need a break just chime in. For members of the APHIS staff feel free to click onto the URL for real-time access to the document. If you're not able to refer or join in

on the URL just refer to your copy as you might print it out. So let's with that let's begin. Michael Blackwell? Michael Blackwell on the line? Steven I heard you earlier Steven Crawford?

Steven Crawford: I'm here yes.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. (Peter Cunio)? (Peter Cunio)? Glenda Davis?

Glenda Davis: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. David Fernandez?

David Fernandez: I'm here.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. Max Fernandez? Max Fernandez?

Coordinator: I do - this is the operator. I do show his line connected.

RJ Cabrera: Okay. Thank you. John Fisher?

John Fisher: Right here, thank you.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. Wayne Freese, I heard you earlier.

Wayne Freese: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Dan Grooms?

Dan Grooms: Present.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. Annette Jones?

Annette Jones: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you Annette. Mary Anne (Nivel) - Kniebel?

Mary Ann Kniebel: Yes I am here. Thank you.

RJ Cabrera: All right thank you. Randy McMillan?

Randy McMillan: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. John Mahoney?

John Mahoney: I'm on the line.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. Judith I heard you earlier, Judith McGeary.

Judith McGeary: Yes.

RJ Cabrera: Willie Reed I heard you earlier, Willie Reed, Don Ritter?

Don Ritter: Here.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you Don. Charlie Rogers I heard you earlier.

Charlie Rogers: Yes here.

RJ Cabrera: David Smith?

David Smith: Hi RJ. I'm here.

RJ Cabrera: Thank you. Belinda Thompson?

Belinda Thompson: Here.

RJ Cabrera: And of course Ms. Wagstrom. And now I will turn it over to your chairperson Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Thank you RJ. And RJ and I have been talking prior to the meeting. We do have the presentations available to you that we sent out links for as well as the documents that we sent out via email. The documents are also being shared on the Adobe Meetings Web the Web meeting. So I see that there's nine participants that are hooked up for the Web meeting.

If you haven't hooked up and can that would perhaps facilitate the discussion. We all did a lot of work in Dallas and I appreciate everybody's efforts for that. And we came out of Dallas with pretty firm recommendations on foot and mouth disease as well as CWD as well as - I'm sorry I'm scrolling through these, the CWD, scrapie and then outreach for One Health outreach.

And so we sent the document out in the emails that included the recommendations for those that we feel are very close to being able to forward up to the Secretary as recommendations from the meeting that we held in February in Dallas.

And so before we ask for a motion or we perhaps don't even have to ask for a motion if we can have a brief discussion of whether we can reach consensus on this document here on the call. So I guess I'd ask first of all if everybody's had a chance to look at the final recommendations and if there are any

questions or concerns that would present us from reaching consensus on this document. So with that I'll go ahead and open it up to any discussion about the recommendations or questions or concerns?

Glenda Davis: Morning Liz. This is Glenda Davis, Tribal Rep and members of the SACAH Committee. I did have a comment. I think it's on Page 2...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Glenda Davis: ...under D. I guess we do assume that a majority of the states have public safety MOUs and MOAs in place. And I'm just wondering do we just assume that or do we just ensure that some of those MOUs are in place because there will be a need for public safety? Thank you.

Judith McGeary: I'd also ask that you clarify that comment - this is Judith. Are you saying you think there should be additional language? And if - so I wouldn't worry about the specific wording but I'm just trying to wrap my mind around what you're thinking should be added if I understand.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Am I unmuted? Yes I was wanting to see if there's anything under D as far as the agent (unintelligible) that responded to the stakeholders?

Glenda Davis: I'm sorry you're coming in a little low. Could you speak a little louder please?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay I'm sorry.

Glenda Davis: That's much better. Thank you. So as far as a lot of state plans have public safety added as far as MOUs and MOAs in their multi-agency agreements and emergency response. And I don't know if we should mention that here the three will be a need to keep order and keep people safe?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So yes Glenda this is Liz. If you look at Point 2 under D does that -
I mean I think that covers public safety. It just doesn't say how to cover it
with...

Glenda Davis: Traffic control.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...the MOU, right.

Glenda Davis: I think of that'll work it's just that those MOUs should already be in place
before any type of response. And that was just a comment. Thank you.

RJ Cabrera: Okay so what it - I mean we could also just add explicitly the phrase public
safety to our list (unintelligible) personnel, public safety, traffic control and
just make that explicit.

Glenda Davis: That sounds great.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: RJ is that something you can add to the document? I think you've
got control of it?

RJ Cabrera: Actually that particular version is an Adobe. So...

Woman: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...Let me...

RJ Cabrera: ...I need the Word document to be able to...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Well why don't we just make a note and we'll note that under Part D and Point 2 under Part D we need to add public safety into that list of issues that they need to address. And we...

Glenda Davis: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...could then add that to any document that would go forward to the Secretary.

RJ Cabrera: Okay. And we could still move forward on acceptance of the document...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Correct.

RJ Cabrera: ...(unintelligible) okay.

Steve Crawford: This is Steve Crawford. I – thanks for the work putting this together. I think I'm on board with everything that's there. I do have a couple of comments and I'll start at the front end. Page 1 SMD recommendations 1C, is there any value there to supporting the - that recommendation with what I think we heard in that it was said it would take two to three years to get up to speed and production capacity so time is of the essence there.

And I think Steve Parker from Merial who said that. The recommendation I think is okay as is but maybe a little more oomph if it's stated clearly, this process from ramp up to reduction capacity at adequacy would take two to three years new facilities, permitting -- all that other stuff that we heard about. Again I'm fine without just for the group's consideration.

Belinda Thompson: Steve this is Belinda Thompson. I thought 1C was actually just referring to the vaccine bank that already was prepared which right now...

Steve Crawford: Yes.

Belinda Thompson: ...and as we all agreed was not sufficient. But there was some - there's wording in the current FAD prep plan that indicates that even activating that would be delayed until the definition of the scope of the outbreak and the typing was done.

Steve Crawford: Okay.

Belinda Thompson: And so I think this was to address activating even that immediately so that the instant the vaccine could be deployed it could be deployed without any further delay.

Steve Crawford: Okay. I'm and, you know, I'm fine with that either way I guess but that's I appreciate that I guess I hadn't thought of it that way.

RJ Cabrera: Great. Thanks Belinda and Steven. Your next comment Steve?

Steve Crawford: 1F...

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Steve Crawford: ...about USC working with veterinary associations and other stakeholders. Is that about logistics or is that about a strategy to determine which animals, which sectors, which parts of the country get vaccine first? I assume it's just the logistics how we're we going to deliver stuff because USDA and through

its other planning will have determined the strategy part. But I just I guess I was unclear. I didn't have it in my notes and I may have missed that...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Sure.

Steve Crawford: ...part of the conversation.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. And the person put the notes together with Judith I believe we were thinking it was about logistics.

Steve Crawford: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: I know when we got to asking the or answering the specific questions later on that they talked about which animals should be vaccinated first would be at the end where we answered those questions one through five.

Steve Crawford: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And I believe the answer to that was that we felt it needed to be up to incident command to determine which animals would be vaccinated and vaccinated first.

Steve Crawford: Okay. And I - that was my recollection. I wanted to make sure I guess that it was clear to the secretary and the others in USDA who will be reading this that that's our recommendation. It's about logistics of delivery as opposed to strategizing.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Steve Crawford: Two C the last word in the recommendation about delivering essentially the message from the lab contemporaneously to state and federal agencies and to the submitter. I guess I may have agreed to that there and I may have rethought my opinion.

I – concerns about information management when, you know, a diagnosis of a foreign animal disease is delivered at the same time to a private practitioner or producer as it is to regulatory agencies may be problematic if information gets out before a response plan and public messaging plan have been developed.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Steve Crawford: What - so I guess I would - I think it's appropriate to involve the submitter as early as possible because they're clearly going to need to know. But I - contemporaneous would concern me there.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay. So if we - and I can understand where you're coming from. So if we do the following federal agencies put in a - it'd stop the sentence there and then say information to the submitter at the earliest time appropriate?

Steve Crawford: That's perfect. That captures what I'm thinking.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Steve Crawford: And I...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Does anybody else - I should ask at this time...

Steve Crawford: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...does anybody else have concerns about that modification?

Belinda Thompson: Certainly our laboratory would. We don't, you know, the current rules for how you report these...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Who's speaking please?

Belinda Thompson: This is - I'm sorry Belinda Thompson. The current rules about reporting many of these do not - do not even allow the laboratory to report to the submitter. That's left to one of the agency parties, in most cases the state animal health official.

Judith McGeary: And I think that might have been one of the issues because actually the language I - I didn't read this language and maybe it's a slight different modification that I - this is Judith McGeary sorry, that suggest as saying that literally had to go to the submitter at this exact same time as much as making sure that the laboratories had the capacity to send it to the submitter.

And I think that - that part is captured in the agency trying to identify and implement the measures necessary to allow the labs to message these results back.

If the timing is the issue perhaps we instead of changing the current language we add a phrase at the end something like, you know, negative results all appropriate state and federal agencies and the submitter, based, you know, according to appropriate timeframes or something like that. But for me if I remember I mean I think the issue was exactly actually what Belinda just identified which is sometimes the submitters aren't getting this at all.

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda Thompson again. The issue of messaging though requires electronic linkages and software and the transfer of electronic data back and forth between parties.

And it requires the parties on both sides to have some kind of system to link together. And realistically that's a long - it's not even complete for the agencies. It's not realistic to expect that system to encompass the wide range of submitters. I really think submitters should be left off of this entirely.

Judith McGeary: So well so I mean but actually so again I think we may be - that may be just purely a language issue. When I was saying to me the issue of getting the information to the submitters, if message carries the technical connotations you did then we can just say provide both positive and negative results to all appropriate state and federal agencies.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: I think the intent of this part was to actually address the electronic messaging and the need for appropriate attention to IT support on the federal side.

Steve Crawford: I - this is Steve again. I guess the - my antenna were raised by that word because it was included in recommendations about foot and mouth disease and foreign animal disease response. If it wasn't included in information about other disease stuff I would - it would not have - I think to get to Judith's point it would not have raised the flag for me at all. It would be appropriate I think to send...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes.

Steve Crawford: ...depending on the local regulations obviously appropriate to send information directly to the submitter in many cases but in the case of a foreign animal disease investigation I - that's why I was concerned.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So Steve this is Liz. And I - I'm trying to go back to my notes and my discussion and the - and going back and forth between screens. And I'm fine with messaging taking out the words submitter.

But we also had a discussion as we have dealt with Seneca Valley virus that there are herds that are go through an FADD, they come back FMD negative, foot and mouth disease negative. They may or may not be Seneca Valley virus positive and they're stuck in limbo because the submitter which is - or the producer veterinarian that's been involved in submitting with the FADD never gets the results back. The FADD is not providing the results.

You've got animals that need to move and they're not sure - they don't their FMD negative results have been, you know, not communicated to them. And so I think that was part of the discussion. Now that may not fit under Point C if that's about messaging but I do think that that is an important - it's important for that producer and veterinarian that's got oversight of those animals to know the results at an appropriate time.

Judith McGeary: How about - this is Judith. How about we (unintelligible). Two pieces, sorry I think I just developed an echo.

Woman: I think it's okay...

Judith McGeary: Is technical then we aren't also being clear. If the issue's IT then I wouldn't read that into this. So we could create the two points. The agency should identify and implement the measures necessary to allow, you know,

laboratories to electronically message or whatever that appropriate phrase would be both positive and negative results to all appropriate state and federal agencies period.

The agency should identify and implement measures necessary to allow laboratories to communicate, you know, in, you know, communicate both positive and negative results to the submitters at the, you know, in the appropriate timeframe and split that up and deal with the electronic technology for the immediate messaging and the at some point, at some point producers should know.

Willie Reed: You know, everyone this is Willie Reed, you know, I'm having some problem understanding this because if samples are coming from veterinary diagnostic laboratory laboratories going to the foreign animal disease diagnostic lab for testing and confirmation and that results come back to the diagnostic lab we will - we always report back to the client. So I'm not sure why this is a big issue. I mean we always give the results back to the client eventually.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: See eventually - Willie this is Liz maybe it's the eventually that's the concern.

Willie Reed: Yes but the moment it comes back from in DSL or from the foreign animal disease lab we have results it goes out in a report.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Thank you.

Willie Reed: And we don't and we don't electronically message to individual submitters. That's just not possible not the way laboratories work.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Sure. And I understand the fact that we've got the message language means that you can't electronically message although we do have and maybe it's part of the whole FADD investigation the results come back to the FAD, the foreign animal disease diagnostician.

And in many cases we've been hearing that we've had FADD investigations done on Seneca Valley virus cases where the veterinarian producer are having to call multiple times for weeks to get their FMD negative - or not weeks but many days when they find out that the FMD PCR was negative days and days and days before they can ever get their results.

Willie Reed: So who were they calling? They calling the state diagnostic labs and OM labs or are they calling the federal labs?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Well they've been trying to call their FADD...

Willie Reed: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...who has or has not return the calls. And eventually they can get to since most of them have been in Iowa they're calling Iowa State who's giving them their results but then they're finding that the results have been sent to the FADD days and days and days ahead of time - previously and...

Annette Jones: Yes...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...the results have not been...

Willie Reed: Okay.

Annette Jones: This is Annette. That sounds like a very unique concern in a certain part of the country that's really a management issue and supervision issue because I would imagine, you know, most states would or and the federal government would consider that completely inappropriate that an FADD is not available and not returning calls.

So maybe it's a staffing issue or I'm not sure that staffs can (unintelligible) a universal problem. I mean to me it sounds like a management supervision issue. Someone needs to, you know, that should be an easy fix.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay. So your FADD is the minute that they would get a result would be calling their - or not the minute but...

Annette Jones: Yes, yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...fairly quickly after getting results would be calling - okay because we've got it from Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois and Indiana have - Indiana has cleared it up but Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois and I believe Missouri have all had concerns so...

Annette Jones: Yes we could - there could be concerns in California also but the protocol is for them to immediately let the producer who they should be continuing to work very closely with know the results.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Annette Jones: And if they're not which could be happening we need to fix it. But I think it's okay as written anyway because you say appropriate. So I think it's fine to leave submitter on there personally but...

Willie Reed: No, no, this is Willie Reed again. It just seems like this messaging or at least for diagnosticians people who work in diagnostic laboratories we think of electronically messaging between state and federal labs not laboratories and submitters, individual veterinarians or animal owners.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Thank you. So would everyone feel - this is Liz with feel most comfortable saying adding the word electronically to electronically message and removing the and the submitter?

Willie Reed: I would.

Steven Crawford: That would be fine with me Liz, Steve.

Woman: That's fine by me.

Wayne Freese: Liz this is Wayne Freese. That's fine with me but I do concur with Liz that being a veterinarian in practice you sat on this thing for Seneca Valley for weeks at a time. And it's - there isn't any directive at least there should be a directive that says they need to do it.

Whether they do or not I don't know if we can solve the management problem but at least practitioners and the submitter can have the authority to go in and get the results it really affects the packing client and the end user. So I'm on Liz's team on this second point.

Annette Jones: But that if you - this is Annette. What if I believe I think it was Liz or somebody had recommended breaking it into two. Whoever if you could repeat what you recommended that might resolve the issue.

Wayne Freese: Well Wayne Freese. I would recommend breaking into it too. But I think what Liz might be getting it is that people may have - feel that they don't have to report it to the submitter. And I think there should be a second sentence saying the submitter needs to be reported to at least when they have the authority to go in and get the information.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: I think Judith is - this is Liz I think Judith you had a potential second sentence if we break it into two. Do you - did you happen to write that down or recall that?

Judith McGeary: I didn't write it down but I'd simply yes if we take off - if we add electronic and take off admin submitter on that first sentence period, you know, the agency start - echoes the language initially. The agency should identify and implement the measures necessary to allow laboratories to communicate both positive and negative results to the submitter...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes.

Judith McGeary: ...in an appropriate time frame which can go both ways. It means not necessarily immediately if it's something that the agency feel needs to be held on for a little a short while the messaging issues but it also means appropriate you don't get to sit on it forever.

Diane Sutton: This is Diane Sutton. Just one quickie, you may want to consider that oftentimes the FADD is the submitter. You may not achieve your objective by using the word submitter maybe to the animal, to the animal owner that or animal, you know, producer, good point.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And maybe we should say producer and/or veterinarian. How does the committee feel about that as a compromise?

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda Thompson. I agree with Annette Jones that it is already in the protocol to report so you're telling the USDA to do something they already has in their protocol if you want to emphasize that it hasn't been adequately addressed and that they may need to have additional training or support of field staff to get it done.

You know, once again some state animal health officials ask for laboratories not to report it and for them to report it themselves. That's the situation here in New York State. Our state animal health officials want to be the ones to report to the producer. And if you include the word veterinarian I would include something like attending veterinarian.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Sure.

Judith McGeary: So maybe the language could be the agency should identify and implement the measures necessary instead of to allow labs but to ensure that labs also message or not message, also communicate positive and negative results or - and actually...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Well...

Judith McGeary: ...let me try to go back since Belinda just pointed out it's not with the lab. So the agency should identify and implement the measures to ensure that positive and negative results are communicated to the producer and/or attending veterinarian in the appropriate timeframe.

Woman: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: This is Liz. How does - to me that sounds like a very reasonable compromise. Is the committee on board with that?

Woman: Yes.

Willie Reed: I'm fine. This is Willie Reed. I'm fine with it but I'm just not aware that veterinary diagnostic laboratories sitting on results and not reporting it to clients, owners, submitters.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And Willie what I think is happened -- this is Liz again in Seneca Valley -- some of those results have gone back to either the FADD or the states and they have not been from there have not been reported back to the producer and attending veterinarian.

Willie Reed: Yes....

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And so...

Willie Reed: ...I don't doubt that. I just knowing how veterinary diagnostic labs work we report results in a timely fashion to clients. And I just don't see that it's a problem unless others have different experiences.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: I was going to say we didn't either until the last, you know, 60 or 80 cases of Seneca Valley and many of them...

Willie Reed: But the laboratory just sitting on the results and not reporting it to clients?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: The laboratory reporting it to the FADD or the state...

Willie Reed: Well that's what I mean. But the laboratory is reporting appropriately. It's just it's others that...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Right.

Willie Reed: ...are...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Right, right that's why...

Willie Reed: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...we changed the language and took laboratory out of there.

Steven Crawford: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: X and Steve any other points you wanted to discuss?

Steven Crawford: No more burning issues. No I have a couple little comments but I can live with all of them. I think we're good. Thank you.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Great. Great any other members that have input into the recommendations?

Don Ritter: Yes, high Liz. This is Don Ritter. On one section D as in dog to me the - that few sentences seem to be contradictory or at least at best give a mixed message. And I would suggest that we just use the first sentence and forget the rest of it.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Sorry which one was that again? I just missed?

Don Ritter: This is Section 1 and D on (FMD) Page 1 Section 1D as in dog about the user fees. It says we're going to - that we should explore the option of charging user fees and then the next sentence says that they should not be expected to pay for the initial vaccine but, you know, who to ha to whatever but I'm just saying it gets confusing. And I think the message is that we wanted to explore user fees as an option and leave it at that.

Judith McGeary: I we may need to (unintelligible) that language up. But there was a very strong reason for the second one because it, you know, we keep coming back and looking back over, you know, the responses to our previous one. USDA keeps looking at user fees to fund the initial vaccine bank and that seems to be one of the holdups in getting the vaccine established.

And it seemed at least that there was that at least some of us felt that it was get the vaccine bank established using public funds because none of us want to pay for it when you're telling us you don't even know if you let us have it. On the other hand we'd be up for user fees if you're letting us use it.

You know, if it comes down to it and it's charging it so that you can pay for the vaccine, you know, you pay for the vaccine so you can use it sure. So that if you're confused by the language it clearly needs to be edited.

But I don't think the first sentence captures what I think we were trying to tell the agency which was pay for the darn vaccine bank upfront and you can explore the idea of charging user fees when you let producers have it.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. This is Liz. Actually Judith and I are on the same page definitely on this one in that -- and maybe it is a wording thing that -- you know, paying for vaccines that you've use is an appropriate thing to explore but charging user fees puts vaccine in the bank was not what we desired.

So I - if we need to change that wording especially in that first sentence where it says USDA should explore the option of charging user fees if and when the vaccine is used maybe we could change it to just say USDA should explore charging for vaccine when it is used or something to that effect that it doesn't say - doesn't call it a user fee but it would - basically in many ways it would be USDA selling the vaccine that's in the bank to the exploring whether they could sell the vaccine in the bank to those people who are going to be vaccinating their animals.

Don Ritter: Well I mean I see that this is a little more complicated language because, you know, you're going to have some ordered vaccination so to speak where, you know, somebody may not want to pay for right but they're ordered to do it because they're in a certain zone or they're in a certain connection to another premise.

So but it just seems unclear. So we're basically saying that the producers should not be expected to pay for the production of the initial vaccine bank. But you're saying that in the event of an outbreak and vaccine is used that...

Judith McGeary: May be appropriate.

Don Ritter: Right, something like that.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Don how about this? How about starting with the second sentence the producers should not be expected to pay for the initial - the production of the initial vaccine bank. However USDA should explore the option of charging user fees if and when the vaccine is used period?

Don Ritter: Good. I think that sounds clear and succinct. I like that.

Woman: I like it too.

Woman: And that's how I like it too.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: RJ did you happen to capture that?

RJ Cabrera: I did not. I don't have the you guys have the Word version of that?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: I don't have it up so...

Mary Ann Kniebel: This is Mary Ann. You said the producers should not be expected to pay for the production of the initial vaccine bank then you went into the first sentence which was USDA should explore the option.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Mary Ann Kniebel: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Got it. Yes.

Mary Ann Kniebel: (Unintelligible) of the initial vaccine bank.

Steven Crawford: This is Steve...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes?

Steven Crawford: ...can I ask a question?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes.

Steven Crawford: I think that language is better. I guess that leaves me - I from my perspective the single most important piece was get an adequate amount of vaccine to deal with the response. That language and I don't really see any of it - funding an adequate vaccine bank I think is going to be the challenge.

I still like the idea of more broad language. Let USDA explore all options for funding that bank. I agree that there are some that I don't like, others that I'd prefer but the plan my understanding at least is the history of funding an adequately stocked vaccine bank has always been let USDA do it and it's not happened.

So giving them other options I'm - I would support the current language or the language that was just proposed but I would advocate I think for giving USDA more freedom to explore different options to fund the - to fund an adequate bank.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes.

Annette Jones: This is Annette and I actually disagree. And the reason is I don't think we let them off the hook. I mean think of how much money this government has invested in different areas and the cost of the federal government.

I think we need to absolutely not take the pressure off USDA to fund this but if we - I like that language because there might be more creative ways to obtain the money if you could actually make it like a loan of general fund on the, you know, and I don't know about the, you know, from the state perspective.

If this was the state sometimes if we know there's going to be a fee-based income coming in we can take a loan against that future fee-based in our budgeting. You know, it's kind of a bookkeeping thing you know what I mean? So it's easier. It doesn't really show up as a budget item. It's just a loan so it's a liability against that future fee.

So actually they may be able to that - may and I don't know. I'm not a federal budget expert by far but I'm wondering if telling them to fund it up front and use a fee when you use it I mean have they even explored that? That could really be a viable option. Maybe they haven't explored it. I don't know. I just don't want to take the pressure off them.

Steven Crawford: I wouldn't - I this is Steve again. I don't I guess I don't see it is taking the pressure off of them. I see it as looking at what reality is.

Annette Jones: Well if you say explore their offices are going to okay yes we want total private partnership. I mean that's...

Steven Crawford: Explore all...

Annette Jones: ...(unintelligible) at the time. It doesn't matter what you say...

Steven Crawford: I guess I meant to say explore all options. And I realize that gives them more freedom...

Annette Jones: And they'll come back and say if you said explore all options they'll come back and say okay this is the option we want. We want industry to pay for it.

Steven Crawford: They've - and they already said that. The last recommendation of this group was to fund it yourself and their option was the response was I think that

they're not going to do that. I again, I'm in supportive of the language as proposed. I'm just thinking that the reality is they're not going to whether it's an inability or a lack of a push. I just don't think it's going to happen if the only source is USDA funding it up front. But I do support the language as proposed.

RJ Cabrera: Okay Liz?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Do you live with it as it is?

Steven Crawford: Yes I can live with the proposed language.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

RJ Cabrera: Liz do we want to just go ahead and make the edits? I have the document up now.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

RJ Cabrera: I didn't have it up because I had not anticipated that there would be this much...

((Crosstalk))

RJ Cabrera: Let's just go ahead. So we made...

((Crosstalk))

RJ Cabrera: ...changes to D, 1D.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Right. It should start out producers should not be expected to pay for the production of the initial vaccine bank...

RJ Cabrera: Period?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...however and then you delete everything up to USDA after the however.

RJ Cabrera: (Unintelligible) okay. And...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And then on Number 2C.

RJ Cabrera: Communicate.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: No, no, no no, no, no...

RJ Cabrera: No?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...no that's...

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...should allowed to electronically message...

RJ Cabrera: Should allow...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Laboratories to electronically message that electronic...

RJ Cabrera: Oh, okay. Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...to appropriate state and federal agencies period. No, no, keep that there.

RJ Cabrera: You...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So at the end behind state and federal agencies it would be period.

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And then Judith did you write down your language about communicating to the submitter?

Judith McGeary: No I did not. I put a change to...

Woman: So I think...

Judith McGeary: ...producers and veterinarians or...

RJ Cabrera: Yes it was agency should identify...

Judith McGeary: ...thank you.

RJ Cabrera: ...and implement the measures necessary to ensure that both positive and negative results are communicated - no, no, no not changing the first sentence sorry, sorry, undo that.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay so...

RJ Cabrera: It's creating a second sentence sorry. The agency...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: USDA.

RJ Cabrera: ...should identify and implement the measures necessary to ensure that both positive and negative results are communicated but the producer and or attending veterinarian. I think I used in an inappropriate timeframe?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes.

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay. And then under D2 there such as where it says such as personnel D2, yes after personnel no, no go back up D, point two...

RJ Cabrera: Two okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: No, no D go up to...

RJ Cabrera: Oh D.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: One D.

RJ Cabrera: One D.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay I'm sorry. Can I scroll down or not? You had it - so this D here at the bottom of the - yes. And then see where your arrow is, go to D2 the agent - where it says the agency should work with stakeholders.

RJ Cabrera: Yes got it.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: It should say such as personnel comma where you've got - no, no, no we already have it. Just go down the next...

RJ Cabrera: Oh I see it right, right, right okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So after personnel put public safety comma and traffic control and the leave at the same.

RJ Cabrera: Okay. I think that captured everything so far.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. Great, thank you RJ.

RJ Cabrera: Okay. So I'm going to suggest the way move on this. We spent a little bit more time than I had anticipated. And if we could come to, you know, consensus or have a motion?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Excellent is there anybody who has objections to us moving this forward to the secretary's office as our recommendation?

Steven Crawford: I do not. This is Steve.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Great. Hearing no objections...

Man: No objections.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...I think we have - okay if we have no objections we have reached a consensus and then we can move on to the stuff that's going to get really a lot of discussion which will be our recommendations on the Zoonotic disease and antibiotic resistance.

RJ Cabrera: Okay let's bring that back up. Let's start with AMR Liz.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: How does the committee feel? I'll leave it open. Anybody have any preference as to whether we go AMR or Zoonotic...

RJ Cabrera: Actually - yes, actually that's how it is on the agenda. Let's just - I'll pull up an AMR and I will give you back - whoops that's the wrong one sorry. I will give you - here we go. You are now host again.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay. So we had as you can recall questions from secretaries or from actually Dr. Anelli and the agency's asking input on the following questions and that included what are the committee's priorities for involvement, USDA's involvement into the global health security agenda and AMR.

Secondly what are the committee's suggestions for obtaining resources to implement the USDA AMR action plan and the global GHSA action packages and what regulatory or non-regulatory approaches to animal health monitoring for AMR should USDA consider? And that included for monitoring both responsible use of the VFD as part of the veterinary accreditation.

And so we have about eight recommendations that we discussed in Dallas the first being that the committee urged USDA to advocate with FDA to address the problems posed for minor use species including sheep, goats, llamas, alpacas, et cetera, by the new restrictions on VFD and feed through antibiotics.

And so Belinda Thompson I know you had sent some information today about the that - you had received from FDA. Would that - I think this would be an appropriate time for you to share that if you would?

Belinda Thompson: Sure. So there were several questions that came up during our Dallas meeting relative to minor use species, minor species use is - I guess better to say and whether or not the veterinarian feed directive actually applied to prescription medications that were being applied to water and whether they applied to over the counter medications that were being applied to water?

And so I posed a question to the FDA contact site and got back the response that I forwarded to all of you. And they have a list of over-the-counter medications that have moved to prescription status and they provide that list. They have the over-the-counter list of drugs that have moved to veterinarian fee directive status.

And they very clearly say that the application of compounds in water if they are prescription compounds in water that the guidelines that are under the (M-duca) would apply and the minor use exemptions pertinent to that would apply. So they are not covered under the veterinary fee directive if they're given in water.

And if they remain over-the-counter they can be applied to water by the producer. So the veteran feed directive has not removed all of the compounds that are used for the big concern were coccidiosis stats in small ruminants and the camelids, at least the big concern raised at our Dallas meeting were the coccidiosis stats. In addition they have indicated in their response that they have a committee that's working on the compliance policy for the extra label use of medicated fees for minor species. And that working group has already been established.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So this is Liz. Given Belinda's report in that do we want to keep the first suggestion? Do we want to modify it or do we want to delete it?

Dan Grooms: Liz this is Dan, Dan Grooms sorry. I think it actually needs to stay because it's still - we still want to make sure that USDA is working with FDA to address the issue through feed.

And that's what this point alludes to is how can we make available antibiotics to be fed through feed either in an off label manner or, you know, I guess the better – or better idea would be that pharmaceutical companies put it on the label or make it available on label to use in minor species although that's a harder sell.

But I do think that we need to have USDA putting pressure on FDA or working with FDA to get this resolved in the feed. Belinda is exactly right, this has nothing to do with water. This all has to do with the veterinarian fee directive and antibiotics delivered through feed.

Belinda Thompson: Maybe what we could do is leave it. I agree like you said like something in here that points out the minor species needs to be remembered and its USDA's responsibility to be involved in that. One option would be to take off just the second sentence and leave it more open so it's not a question of saying, "Here, you know, we know that is to be off label or whatever but just that USDA needs to be involved with FDA on this process."

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: This is Liz. About the suggestion, you know, removing that second sentence that's saying - ending in the first sentence by saying, "By the new restrictions on feed through antibiotics published in the revised VFD rule," so

we understand that it's the veterinary fee directive role that is causing the concerns? Does that fit the needs Dan and others?

Dan Grooms: I think that's fine on my - yes that's fine on my end.

Willie Reed: Yes. This is Willie Reed. I could live with that too.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: RJ are you also editing this document? RJ?

RJ Cabrera: I'm sorry. I had you on mute. I'm sorry. Let me take down the PDF and put up - and share my Word again so we can capture stuff real-time.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Randy McMillan: Liz this is Randy McMillan.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes?

Randy McMillan: And all the animals listed are terrestrial animals in number one. Could we just have a general statement for - or include aquatic animals as well?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Absolutely. I think that would be appropriate. At least from my point of view if the rest of the committee doesn't object...

Man: I think that's a reasonable suggestion.

Dan Grooms: Yes it's - sorry. This is Dan Grooms. Yes I mean I think this issue is broader than even just aquatic. I mean we're dealing with the issue here in Michigan. I'm sure other states have honeybees which are considered food animals and how do you feed honeybees antibiotics because of some of the bacterial

diseases? So it's really broader than just even aquatic species in the terrestrial ones. So if we can capture all food species that would be good.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay so RJ in that Point 1 there we have including sheep, goats. Do we need all of the llamas, alpacas but sheep goats - we'll leave llamas alpacas. Aquatic species behind alpacas add aquatic species? Honeybees and others by the new - and then continue the sentence by the new restrictions and feed through antibiotics and then were the sentence ends we are going to extend that sentence and say outlined in the revised veterinary fee directive rule.

RJ Cabrera: Is that the DFD is that...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. But it's the revised VFD rule.

RJ Cabrera: (Unintelligible) rule.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And then we're going to delete the second sentence.

RJ Cabrera: Great.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay then the second recommendation that we recommend that the agency identify existing information and conduct additional scientific valid - scientifically valid research on alternative preventive and animal health measures.

And we outline that what the measures could be including outreach to nontraditional segments and identify any potential AMR implications with these alternatives and also education on to producers on these alternatives. How does the committee feel about Point 2 there? Hearing no concerns let's

move on to Point 3 and this is where we got into the global AMR initiatives asking the USDA to serve as the voice of American agricultural interest in the discussions and but realizing that we also need to address the threat of AMR globally because of the threat of the spread of genes that have evolved in other countries. Any questions, concerns, revisions to the Point 3?

Glenda Davis: This is Glenda. I do have a comment on the area where it says the spread of genes. Do we want to state the threat of genetically inferior genes or the threat of antimicrobial resistance in genes? So I just wanted to do a little correction there.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. Right I think that's a great point Glenda. Maybe we should say of AMR genes or anti-microbially resistant genes? And maybe we should spell it out even further anti-microbially resistant bacteria and/or genes. I think I've got a couple microbiologists on the committee. Does that - is that more holistically global or inclusive of what might be spreading globally?

Dan Grooms: Liz this is Dan Grooms. I - it certainly AMR can be spread through either the whole bacteria or just the genetic material so I think that captures it well.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So yes, so RJ it'd be resistant bacteria and/or genes? Yes right where you were right before genes bacteria and/or genes. It should just be antimicrobial resistance yes. Excellent. Any other comments on Point 3?

Belinda Thompson: Yes. I - we're not just talking about ones that have already evolved. We're also talking about the whole issue of preventing and so that have or can evolve around the world.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So that you're thinking that have - that was Belinda right?

Belinda Thompson: Yes I'm sorry that was Belinda that have or can evolve. You know, part of the global effort is that prevention.

RJ Cabrera: It could just be because how about because of the threat of the spread of AMR genes from other countries or globally?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. Does that work for you Belinda...

Belinda Thompson: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. And then just replace that with from. Yes you were right RJ
no, no...

RJ Cabrera: So the global spread is that...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Oh okay yes from other countries. Or do we even need the from other countries or just have it as the global spread there?

Belinda Thompson: Right.

RJ Cabrera: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes because you want to take that out right?

RJ Cabrera: Correct.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Thank you RJ.

RJ Cabrera: Sure. We might get better time out if we just kind of go through - I'm - I have expected that most of us would have reviewed much of this and I'm just - I'm concerned about time making sure we have enough for both topics.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Sure. And I think that, you know, my expectation would be that AMR would take more time. I could be wrong...

Randy McMillan: Yes.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: ...and zoonotic disease.

Randy McMillan: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: But I guess the question is does any Point 4 where we're urging the USDA to seek funding from human health rather than divert funds from other USDA priorities is that any questions or comments on that?

Woman 1: Sorry RJ I do have a comment on that one.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: That's okay.

Woman 1: This is Dan.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Okay.

Woman 1: So I'm - teasing. But I wanted to clarify because one of my stakeholders raised the question on this and I gave what I thought was where we'd headed. But it's not clear in the language and I can't be completely confident to where we were headed. The concern that was raised with me was this image from this - from the funding thing that this was a human health issue, not a USDA

issue. My response was that we were talking about the current funding cycle where USDA had not received any funding for AMR and that rather than sort of pull funding from other programs in this funding cycle we wanted USDA to look to FDA and CDC who'd gotten funding.

And if that's accurate if that reflects what the committee was talking about we might want to clarify, you know, from other (unintelligible) in this funding cycle, you know, the committee encourages USDA to seek funding for AMR, you know, work in future funding cycles. And I do think I think USDA needs to be part of this, should be getting funding for this work.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Well do you want to add in future or in...

Woman 1: So urges USDA to seek so at the end of that first sentence rather than diverting funds from other USDA priorities in the current funding cycle and then the next - sorry the next sentence the committee encourages USDA to seek funding for this work in future funding - in future cycles funding cycles.

RJ Cabrera: Wait a minute that was the first sentence?

Woman 1: No. What I'm saying is to seek funding maybe to seek appropriations for this work. I mean the idea is we didn't get appropriations in this funding cycle for this work and we don't want to split up from our current ones but next funding cycle it should be included in USDA's budget proposal might be the way to phrase it. I'm not sure.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Yes. So that yes that would be a second sentence RJ.

RJ Cabrera: Okay.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: And then the committee urges USDA to seek funding or seek appropriations for this work in future funding cycles. Sorry this is Liz.

Woman 1: Thanks Liz. Thanks for...

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Does that work for you?

((Crosstalk))

RJ Cabrera: Funding cycles.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Any other questions or concerns for the committee on that? Point 5 we're just asking USDA to share our recommendations with other stakeholders.

Point 6 we talk about veterinarians that we urge USDA to implement measures to promote loan forgiveness and recruitment of veterinarians in underserved areas and for minor use species any comments or questions?

Point 7 is research and epidemiology of antimicrobial resistance including the transfer of resistance between animals and humans and vice versa including assessment of risk of each transfer - of such transfer, excuse me.

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda Thompson. Point 7 and 8 are both in the national plan for antimicrobial resistance. And I think all of us agreed that the USDA should be involved in both of them. The issue is that they don't nobody gave them the money once again. And so I think by including them we're saying, you know, the obvious that we think they're important.

I don't know if there's another way we should state that but that, you know, those points are already included in the national plan, just can't do them because there's no money appropriated for it.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Anybody on the committee have a suggestion for how to bring that point out as far as you know, there are a lot of priorities within the plan but these are two of the priorities that we find most or think that are one of the highest priorities? Do we want to put that up front that we understand that some of our recommendations are included in the - in their plan but these priorities are ones we want to call out to be especially important?

RJ Cabrera: Particularly given their responses to our previous recommendations I think it's worth being explicit on that because I mean one of the things I'll bring up at the (event) when we get into those regs I certainly saw a pattern in the last set of recommendations and responses where, you know, see it's like we're talking about doing this. So yes I mean if the message is we know we're talking - you're talking about doing this but really this is what we think you need to focus on out of your entire list let's yes, let's be flippant.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Should we do that right up to the front in the top where we have a paragraph to begin with that says we, you know, like an introduction point that says we understand that many of our recommendations are included in the plan in the AMR USDA AMR action plan however below are the - higher what the committee feels are the highest priorities?

RJ Cabrera: Or perhaps and maybe the one edit I suggest to that is maybe rather than the highest priorities because I have to like a little (unintelligible) of that because I haven't done my due diligence and really sat down with the plan and said here's, you know, would my stakeholders agree that these are absolutely the

highest but below are the priorities that the committee believes deserves special attention?

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Perfect.

Belinda Thompson: And it might be appropriate to also - you know, one of the reasons why the USDA wants comments from a committee like ours is because they have to turn around and ask for funding from somebody else and it's helped them have stakeholder involvement.

It's in their plan that they want to do this but it's also in the overall national plan, the President's plan the - and yet once again they weren't given the funding for it so it might be to - it might be appropriate to say the committee recognizes that some of its recommendations are currently in the USDA AMR plan as well as the national plan and that failure to fund these specific initiatives leaves the USDA with limited resources for adopting its plan or something.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: Can you repeat that again Belinda? Failure to fund the plan...

Belinda Thompson: Failure to fund yes the plan leaves the USDA with limited resources for participating in the national plan. I mean is just a statement of the obvious.

Dr. Elizabeth Wagstrom: So we've got maybe it's failure to fund the USDA or the USDA AMR plan because we're talking about two plans so failure to fund the USDA plan.

Woman: Right. I don't know about that second slide, Failure to fund the USDA.

Woman: Yes. We've lost a verb in there or something in there. That leaves limited resources or provides limited resources to fully –

Woman: Limited resources. There are limits to resources, okay.

Woman: I should've asked if everybody on the committee I believe is looking at the screen. We can say what RGS typed here on the introduction that we recognize that some of the recommendations are currently included in the USDA AMR action plan – in the national action plan but the recommendations below are priorities that we feel merit particular attention.

The failure to fund the USDA AMR action plan severely limits resources for USDA to fully purchase the national plan. Are people comfortable with that language?

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Yes. On that I like that addition.

Man: Yes. It sounds good.

Man: Agreed.

Man: Yes.

Woman: Excellent. We've gone through what we did in Dallas on AMR. Is there anything anybody wants to add at this point to recommendations on AMR?
Great.

What we'll do is RJ and I will go back to language with (Judith) to make sure that we've got periods and commas and things like that and have it ready to send back out to you for a final approval. Let's move on to the zoonotic disease discussion.

I think that was one that in Dallas left us a little bit flat footed in that. We were asked to provide a list of zoonotic diseases for inclusion into the national list to report on animal diseases, surveillance and also for surveillance, preparedness and response planning and also justification for including each.

We wanted to – they wanted us to recommend a process for receiving input from various stakeholders both traditional such as animal industry groups and non-traditional to revise an NLRAD. We didn't – we found two diseases that I think the first thing that we did is the committee urged USDA to clarify that the – the agency response to report the zoonotic disease a concern would be and RJ can you move your arrow up? I can't read below your arrow. Thank you.

And in talking with my stakeholders just recently before this call we also very much hesitated to provide a list of diseases because before any diseases are listed we need to know the impact of such a listing. I would – I know coming from the pork industry we're definitely – that's where my stakeholders are. I guess I'd open that up to whether others in the committee have the same concern of if you feel comfortable leaving that point there.

Belinda Thompson: This Belinda Thompson again. Sorry is somebody else talking?

Woman: No. I think it's just an echo Belinda go ahead.

Belinda Thompson: Okay. The diseases that are there are diseases that I mentioned. I agree. I felt kind of flat footed. I didn't feel fully prepared for this part of the discussion. I have subsequently read the proposal for a U.S. national list of reportable animal diseases that's on the USDA website that wasn't part of our materials for the meeting. They go over what listing the diseases under the various implications emergency regulated diseases, emerging diseases and monitored diseases means and there are already currently regulations in place that they don't actually intend to change.

They can be reviewed. I would scratch item 3 entirely because there are already in the list. This list that they have is actually pretty comprehensive. I did look through the list and there's just a couple things I think that could be added to it. This is a pretty complete proposal already.

Liz Wagstrom: Okay. Does anybody – so you're saying Belinda -- this is Liz again -- that you feel rabies and rift valley fever could be scratched because they're already on the list?

Belinda Thompson: Correct.

Liz Wagstrom: Do we need to in any way reaffirm that we're happy on the list? I don't know that anybody has anything they want to take off of the list.

Woman: Can I just ask Dr. Anelli to maybe jump in here and let us know we're on the right track?

Joseph Anelli: Sure. Hello, thanks. I guess there might be a few diseases that may be of concern that are on the list. For example trichina is – I don't know whether the swine industry has concern if there is any surveillance for trichina in feral swine or actually one proposal that we've already received is to look at the

occurrence on trichina on the island of Puerto Rico. That'd be something that'd certainly be a one help effort that could be funded with some of the zoonotic money that we already do receive.

Whether or not that's something that the industries would be in favor of or opposed to would be one of the things we're looking for here. I guess the other thing that comes up with this is within the global health security agenda there's a section under zoonotic diseases that suggest that each country do a prioritization of zoonotic diseases for the purposes of surveillance and so on. That's really talking about some third world nations to do that. It also applies to us domestically.

On a state by state basis would you folks see us working between boards of animal health and state public health veterinarians to see if there is a list of zoonotic diseases (unintelligible) and others potentially that we might want to make a priority in some states so as to assist industries in one recognizing the incidents and prevalence of that disease?

And two, using it to help educate producers and if it's somehow exposure to the public in petting zoos or something, education of the public of why you would want to wash your hands after being in a petting zoo for example. Those are the kinds of things I'm thinking about.

Woman: Thank you Dr. Anelli.

(Judith): This is (Judith). I have to say that I feel fairly unprepared to respond to that. I think those are great questions from the agency. I don't have the information from my stakeholders particularly like I couldn't say we approve of the current list. We might but I haven't gotten back to the specific questions because I wasn't clear on them.

(Joe): This is (Joe). By the way (Joe) is fine. The question really is we're not talking about a regulatory program. We're not talking about eradication of a particular zoonotic disease. We're simply talking about education and potentially surveillance. That'd be the sorts of things that we'd like to get input from.

Like you said your stakeholders, are there things that producers have to deal with where additional information on the zoonotic disease end would be particularly useful where it may not be collected or ready or in fact it's only collected on the human side and not the animal side?

(PM Grooms): This is (PM Grooms). I'm going to say that this section is the least well defined as to – as far as what we're being asked to comment on. I hate to get down into the weeds and be giving recommendations on individual diseases whether they should be on the list or not. I think – this is my personal opinion.

I think that at this point I'd be very uncomfortable making any recommendations without further discussion, maybe that this is discussion that needs to occur at our next get together after getting further clarification as to what we're being asked to make recommendations on. I'm just saying I'm pretty unclear as to what we're being asked to do at this point. I came out of Dallas the same exact way.

Don Ritter: Don Ritter here. I agree with the last speaker, that I don't think we're the subject matter experts to pick all the diseases that need to belong on the list if that's the intent of the questions that were put to us. I do agree that there should be a national list and we've got to start somewhere. Maybe we could recommend informing some subject matter experts in the various commodity groups to start coming up with a list for their respective sectors.

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda Thompson. Once again that has already happened. There's a plan and it wasn't provided in our materials for discussion on a meeting. It's the proposal for a U.S. national list of reportable animal diseases. It was published in July 2014 and it was – I believe it was edited or it was last posted and updated in 2015. It includes stakeholders in the pork industry, beef industry, dairy industry and it has a long list of stakeholders on subject matter experts. They've already put together a list which is 1, 2, 3, 4 pages long. If people haven't seen this plan –

Liz Wagstrom: I want to say – Belinda let me jump in. We actually did have a presentation on the national list of reportable animal diseases back in June I think. Then it looks like – is there a section on zoonotic diseases? This question looks like zoonotic. It's strictly on zoonotic, currently (Joe) ((crossover)).

(Joe): Yes go ahead.

Liz Wagstrom: Go ahead (Joe).

(Joe): And that's really the question here, is that list of reportable diseases is already complete and had lots of different commodities represented. My question is specifically about zoonotic diseases and is there anything about zoonotic diseases that should be on a reportable list that might not – that same scrutiny that these other diseases were given in terms of impact on the commodity is different than this question.

This question could be is there a zoonotic disease which doesn't necessarily affect the animal itself but has some implication for human health and should those diseases be on this list.

Woman: I can think of two that aren't on the list that should be on the list because they're zoonotic. The list is really comprehensive but leptospirosis isn't on the list anywhere that I can see and there should be a concern from a one health perspective as well as affecting various industries.

It's one of the most common diseases that I get calls for in a lab because people want more information about it and because it's not reportable we have little information to give them.

The second one is a wildlife disease. It's a roundworm in raccoons that's commutable to people and other domestic animals and it's called Baylisascaris. There's a lot of interest in figuring out where that appears.

Woman: Given that we've reframed what we thought the questions centers on I'm thinking there's – that we table this particular topic and maybe have the members revisit with their stakeholders on what they want to recommend to you.

Woman: That seems like an appropriate idea. I know from the pork industry we've been working to get trichina on the list only for trade purposes so that we have – we can talk about prevalence or lack of such in our domestic herd. With that how does the committee feel about coming back and revisiting this in September?

Man: Seems like a good idea.

Man: Fine with me.

Liz Wagstrom: Okay. Why don't we – in our notes RJ can you note that we'll revisit in September but let's not lose Belinda's recommendations or thoughts around leptospirosis and Baylisascaris.

John Fischer Liz this is John Fischer and I can think of other disease agents that occur in wild animals. Maybe they're on this list that I'm looking at right now but I don't see – west Nile virus, Lyme disease, there's going to be a bunch of them.

Also if you look at the draft recommendations we were sent to prepare for this that last bullet item in italics references some of the cold-blooded animals and also some of the aquatic animals. It looks like I'm down there to put together a list of zoonotic at the (unintelligible). That'd be helpful and like the rest of you I'm a little unsure of exactly of what's being asked, the list of exactly what in which species.

Liz Wagstrom: I've got to say (John) that we also – I for some reason attributed Randy McMillan's comments to you.

(John Fisher): Okay.

Liz Wagstrom: That's where the names got mixed up here. It was an error on my point so Randy actually sent in that email. I think that we – if you can come – if the list asks Dr. Anelli let's ask you to give us a little more clarity on the assignment of what we should come ready to discuss in September and then especially (John) and Randy if you can think through once we receive that assignment a little bit about the wildlife and aquatic pathogens that may fit – may be answers to the questions that Dr. Anelli is putting together for us.

Randy McMillan: This is Randy. One other question is whether food borne pathogens should be an issue for some illnesses because people do eat wild mollusks for example and mollusk is seafood in general and they're considered to be a vector for more virus and (unintelligible) and Listeria and things like that. The questions is whether food borne pathogens should be on a national list as zoonotic pathogens.

Liz Wagstrom: (Joe) maybe that's something you can also clarify as you clarify the questions.

(Joe): I will (unintelligible). That'd be a big way to address this is try to make these much more specific for you.

Liz Wagstrom: (Joe) when you're working on the questions in addition to the materials if you're going to very clear what the implications are, what the effect of listing things on this list as opposed to other lists and that way when we're reaching out to our stakeholders they understand really what's the meaning behind putting or not putting things on this list.

(Joe): Very good, I'll do that.

Liz Wagstrom: Thank you.

Mary Ann Knievel: This is Mary Ann Knievel. Also at this point do you know what happens when they're listed as emerging? Do you have some of those explanations in that if you have those?

(Joe): No. You mean what would happen from a trade perspective or an industry perspective if –

Mary Ann Knievel: No. I kind of talked about a response tree of what has to happen for something to be listed as – where does it ((crossover)) what is it emerging? Where does it – what do you see as the – that response tree?

(Joe): Okay. There's actually a document that we put together that was a field bide for zoonotic disease investigations that we were giving to our field employees. We should probably get a copy of that to you folks to see because in there we do have – it's not exactly a decision tree but it's a way of arriving at whether or not an issue rises to the point where we should look at it all, we should commit some resources to do a further investigation or whether it's been required significant commitments and then whether or not we should do that.

Woman: That might be helpful to have that. Okay.

RJ Cabrera: (Joe) I'll follow up with you. This is RJ. I'll follow up with you in a week or so and we'll figure out a way forward and (unintelligible) the members with what they need to consider this in September.

(Joe): Great.

Woman: Thank you. What RJ and I will do is – and (Judith) will go back and we'll make sure that our sentence structure and things like that on the animal curve with resistance recommendations are correct. We'll get that back up to the committee for approval to send forward to the Secretary if it needs approval in our June conference call and we'll revisit in September these zoonotic diseases.

With that I think (Judith) has – we've got time on the agenda to go over the agency's response to this committee's recommendations from 2015. I'll turn it over to (Judith).

(Judith): Thank you. My plan assuming -- and please speak up if you object -- was not to go through these one at a time. I'm going to assume that all those who are interested enough to really think -- want to know that the substance of the responses will be through them.

What I discussed with RJ doing was going through, picking out just a few of them as examples of the type of response we're getting and ask both those who helped develop these initial or original recommendations and the new committee members to spend some time and think about what this means for how we write recommendations and how we interact with the agency moving forward.

Are there things that we want to ask from the agency that we want to change about how we structure our discussions that we simply want to keep in mind as we edit our recommendations and how we word them to maximize the exact of our work and the time we're all spending on this? I will say the one that I'm going to bring up just for substantive which I think is relevant to what we were talking about earlier so I'll just touch on it substantively is on funding.

I think that it reiterates the need to be very clear. We had a recommendation in our previous -- actually let me pause. Is everyone good with that approach, wouldn't like that or would anyone like to take a different approach?

RJ Cabrera: (Judith) can I just press the very thing which the fact that the agency is pleased with the quality (unintelligible) to your recommendation and we're posing this question because we want to learn more and we want to make sure everyone else is okay with the process. It's one of these things where we're going to constantly keep twisting and proving the way we do these things.

What you've done thus far has been very good relative to other committees that work with you. You really are a high (unintelligible) committee and so we're just looking for insight and ideas about perhaps how do it to improve. Everything can be improved and that's all I had to say. Go ahead (Judith).

(Judith): Thank you RJ. I'm going to pull the document up too. Is everyone okay with this sort of pick and choose approach (unintelligible)?

Man: Sure.

(Judith): Okay we'll go with it then. Substantively I'll start with the mouth disease ones since that's probably something we're spending so much time on. The recommendation from 2015, one of the explanations with the committee support the procurement of a fully functional FMD antigen vaccine bank but doesn't support the use of private or matching funds for procuring FMD vaccine bank.

Uncontrolled FMD outbreak would be devastating to producers. The impacts would be felt across the entire U.S. economy. The vaccine bank is a public good. It should be paid for by public funds. The agency's response was that the AFIS administrator has given clear direction that VS needs to continue exploring public/private partnerships for expanding the FMD vaccine bank and VS is working to follow this direction.

We then also had a second recommendation that plays into this, that the committee favored the approach of procuring fully functional FMD vaccine bank or it should contract for the procurement of a fully functional FMD vaccine bank. VS respectfully asked the committee for further discussion and definition regarding its recommendation to implement further reliance on contracting out the FMD vaccine bank. Contracting out the role of

government would lead back to a public/private partnership and cost sharing with the industry depending on the scope of the committee intends.

Essentially it took the agency peers to taking our approval of having a contracted out provision for the vaccine bank and bring back in the idea of cost sharing with the industry.

Woman: It makes no sense to me. I want to know who the hell wrote these responses and are we the secretary advisory committee. It doesn't really matter if the administrator doesn't agree with what the – a committee says in my mind.

Mary Ann Knievel: Well whether it matters or not – this is Mary Ann. We have to address what they said and I go back to what (Annette) said earlier, that again it gets into budgetary issues that I'm not the best at. Borrowing against a future use, I think that really possibly has some merit of looking – something we should bring up to them to look at. You go ahead and fund it and it'll get paid for as it gets used. I just think that's something we ought to – figure out how to put in words.

Woman: Given the timeline it may be worth bringing it up. I would express caution about being too optimistic on that front just in terms of a timeline. It's one –

Woman: Very optimistic (unintelligible).

Woman: I meant just because it's a lot – think about it from an economic perspective. If there's a certain level of certainty that's something would get used within the next five to ten years it's one thing to advance money based on that. We certainly don't have that certainty. I think we're very glad we don't have that certainty and so I just –

- Woman: It folds in with the next one that you brought up and it's about trying to contract with someone like Mary L where your vaccine does get rolled forward and used. It's not all just sitting there being wasted. You've got someone actually managing the bank a little better.
- Woman: I think that was our intention. I think that's actually a good specific. That's what we were talking about when we said public/private partnership.
- Woman: Right. I think they know it too. We're not telling them what they want to hear.
- Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda. I would agree that we can respond back and say in response to your request for what do we mean by contracting we can say just what you said, that we're suggesting using a private corporation or multiple private corporations or vaccine manufacturers specifically to hold and manage the vaccine bank and appropriately manage the reagents so that they can be rolled forward and don't expire. I don't have the wording of that but I – and that we weren't implying that that was going to be a privately funded initiative.
- Woman: Exactly. I think they're asking for that kind of language and we should give it to them.
- Woman: Are there additional comments or thoughts or reactions? I agree with Belinda and the other questions of whether we want to do that, maybe even – we can work up language and then have it at the June meeting for approval and discussion.
- (Steve): This is (Steve). I guess I'd be in favor of looking at some language with the June meeting. I agree with everybody's – with the idea that USDA ideally would pay for an adequate stock and managed vaccine bank upfront with the

intent that they'd be reimbursed for that on the back end if it was used. I'm still less – I'm not confident or optimistic that that's realistic. Jim Ross estimates are that'd cost \$150 million new a year. I don't think that's going to happen period.

It probably wouldn't happen with new funding sources either but I think asking USDA to – and I don't see their budget increasing substantially by asking them to reallocate from what they currently get to pay for this. It's going to be a challenging thing to muster support for as well.

I support the concept that we want to reiterate to them this is a really big deal. You need to figure out to do it. I just think that's going to fall on deaf ears. I don't think it's realistic to say, to come up with the money. I don't think it's going to happen.

Woman: Right. I agree that it's unrealistic so I didn't want to leave with the impression that I didn't agree that I'm not a realist. I'm also a long term thinker and it might not have initial or next year as a year but I think if we keep repeating that this is important, it's (unintelligible) which is public/private but just give (unintelligible) the pressure for them to problem solve and use every opportunity to push for a way to resolve it. That's my thinking and I don't need a – I don't expect a solution tomorrow. Again I'm in ad for the long haul.

Man: I guess I – sorry about that. I agree. I guess I thought earlier that we're not asking them to look at every opportunity but only to fund it themselves. I may be parsing words more than I need to.

I would – I like the idea of USDA looking at taking every – turn over every rock and see how you can fund this but I thought what we were telling them is that this is yours to fund. We didn't mean with this prior recommendation that

you should be looking at private funding. You should be doing it yourselves.
Did I misunderstand that?

(Annette): This is (Annette). I'm going to phrase that as soon as you open the door to look at everything they already have the apps for that. They've written it in this response and then just about other meeting I've had with them. Their response is as soon as you open the door for any solution they already have the solution.

The solution is a district paid for it. That's why I don't want to open the door to every option. I think the nice – that there's middle ground and maybe we need to be a bit more clear as (unintelligible) recommendation which is (unintelligible) this fund how I can insurance like USDA and a set of government backs, all kinds of insurance programs even banks and everything else funded upfront and then if it's used we'll use fees to replace that funding, something like that.

This is how we get a response back on that I guess. I'm afraid if we leave it too broad – and again I feel totally wrong and I very much can speak to the group's thought on whatever the majority wants.

I'm just as afraid that if we leave it too broad there's no throwback (unintelligible) they always throw back and then they're going to stop trying to think of ways to find it themselves. When I say themselves I mean by the federal government with our tax dollars.

Man: Fair enough.

(Peter Feenia): This is (Peter Feenia). Sorry I'm getting here late but I think we have to sort of realize that the establishment of this vaccine bank is vitally important to all

these livestock industries. I don't – I'm not quite clear as to why we can't approach the commodity groups about developing some sort of self-insurance program that'd help get the vaccine bank established.

Once it's there we can have a partnership to keep it on a rolling basis. From what I understand what we've been told, to get this thing established and get the amount that we need if we're going to do a vaccination approach strategy of control it's going to take a lot and we should – I think we should talk to the commodity groups about developing some kind of self-insurance maybe through a (unintelligible) of something like that.

Liz Wagstrom: This is Liz Wagstrom. I think one of the recommendations out of this – that we just put forward to the Secretary is to actually do a full call for information so we know how much it's cost. We have I think (Steve) just mentioned (Jim Ross's) estimate of \$150 million a year.

When you talk to (Mary L) and others they think it'd be much less. It took (unintelligible) including a congressional hearing to get USDA to issue a partial request for information. I think we can all talk about maybe we can do this, maybe we can do that. Unless they finally get the information on how much it cost, a lot of this is just talking about do we need \$1?

Do we need \$100? Do we need \$1 million or do we need \$100 million? Without that information which we've – it's very clearly in this asset of recommendation ask them to get I don't think we have the information to make a whole lot of recommendations either.

Mary Ann Knievel: Liz this is Mary Ann Knievel. I'm not sure if you'd know the answer to this but you're the one that comes to mind. They never actually asked Congress – uh oh. Are you there?

Woman: I'm there.

Man: Hello?

Woman: I heard a phone –

Woman: (Max)?

(Max): Yes that's me. I got disconnect. I'm sorry.

Woman: I think several of us but we're all back here.

(Max): Okay, thank you ma'am. Thank you.

Woman: Mary Ann go ahead. Yes I wasn't sure. Have they – they've never actually asked specifically asked Congress to fund an FMD bank. Is that not correct?

Mary Ann Knievel: There is \$1.9 million on the budget for the North American vaccine bank that we share with Canada and Mexico. This year they increased that by about \$3 million in their (unintelligible). They're up to somewhere and I don't remember if they increased the \$3 million or just increased it \$2, \$3 million. Needless to say we're under \$5 million for what might be \$150 million or even \$75 million discussion or need. No they haven't asked for much of an increase and this is the first year they've asked for any increase.

There's discussion about potential ways to look at a farm bill as a way to identify a funding mechanism. They're taking tires and looking under rocks for potential fixes but I think that perhaps by the time we come to our September meeting they will have gotten information back on their initial

request for information. Maybe that's something we keep on tab for our September meeting, is to ask them for what they learned from this request for information on cost.

Then we can ask perhaps come up with some recommendations based on what we hear there and see if this is – from my point of view I don't think we've told them not to look for other options but if they're going to go straight to a user fee option I think the commodity groups and other stakeholders like – such as (Judith Small) stakeholders felt pretty strongly that the user fee was best applied at a point in time when vaccine may be used rather than to put together a bank.

(Judith): Let me insert a couple of thoughts here. This is (Judith). One is to explain where my producers are coming from which is simply if there were even a guarantee that assuming a vaccines available that they would have access to it. I think there'll be a lot more willingness to go ahead and fund it upfront as basically an insurance policy concept.

The problem is getting cold, pay upfront and even if vaccines available we might make a logistical decision that you guys don't get it. That's problematic and it just decreases any willingness to go ahead and fund something when for all we know the vaccine can sit there and they wouldn't be allowed to use it.

The other thing is I guess one question may be – what popped into my head listening, I think it was (Steve) talking earlier about trying to be creative as we do seem to be stuck in this dynamic of user fees or USDA go find the money somehow. I may come up completely dry on this.

I haven't said I'm going to come up with (unintelligible) ideas but I'd be up for trying to brainstorm on are there other options really? Let's try to move

beyond the USDA saying it should be user fees and that's telling them go find the money. It's your problem. Is there anything else?

I think it was to come up with some specific suggestions that are creative. It'd be great to include those in our next set of recommendations. I do think telling them to look at all possible sources, they keep just swinging right back over to industry. That just – I'm seeing that pattern too clearly.

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda Thompson. I have to agree with the point about access to the vaccine that (Judith) brings up. Right now up until now there hasn't been a commitment in our government to have a sufficient vaccine bank. The vaccine bank we're talking about would disappear very early in an outbreak if it was ever used. Swine would be fighting. Beef would be fighting. Dairy would be fighting, other commodity groups for who gets it.

As soon as you start having industry funded, industry is going to have a say in who gets it. Until there's sufficient vaccine bank that everybody gets it I don't think you can have that discussion about industry funding it when the federal government is going to say you either get it or you don't get it or we're not going to use it today.

As long as the federal government is in control in the distribution and the use of the vaccine and when and if I think a private funding of that is really off the table whereas if the vaccine if it's a federal bank and vaccine is available and if you want to use it it's going to cost you whatever, a buck ahead of whatever it is, I think it's an easier sell.

I think the other thing we need to be very careful of is whenever we talk about public/private partnerships the assumption is that that's public/private funding. Public/private partnership can be how a government contracting

somebody else to do something because they know how to do it better than our government does. Our government doesn't manage vaccine banks routinely and may not be the best people to do that. Likewise they may not be the best people to distribute vaccine. Maybe the standard animal health pharmaceutical companies should be the distributors.

That'd be an example of public/private partnership that we're not talking about a partnership and who pays for it. We're talking about a partnership in who carries out logistics. I would be very careful when we talk about public/private partnerships that we may acknowledge that they'd be useful logistically but that we be careful and who we think needs to pay for things.

Liz Wagstrom: (Judith) and RJ this is Liz. Do we – we're not expected to reply back to USDA on the reply to us, are we?

(Judith): I'm letting RJ take that.

RJ Cabrera: I was muted. You're not expected but you may. This is a very direct request for clarification and – but normally – and I just want to say this again. The agency isn't expected to reply to your recommendations. When you do your recommendations and submit them they're done.

This is an opportunity for us to say hey committee, listen. Thank you for your recommendations. We just want you to know that you're taken under advice and we wanted to assure some folks that got more questions than in other years. Last year about hey, what happened with these recommendations when we submit them.

We took it upon ourselves to respond. Again you don't have to reply but to the limited discussions going I think this particular one, you guys should probably

explore. I like especially the idea of coming up with specific creative suggestions rather than a broad basis on – I think there's (unintelligible) where to go with this and we can certainly revisit this again on June's call if you'd like or bring it up in September.

(Steve): This is (Steve). I like the idea of revisiting. In my notes I've written down a couple of brainstorming through it against the wall concepts that might be alternatives. Give me a couple of months to flush them out and may make them more useful for other folks to look at and may not make them any more feasible but at least more for you to read I guess. I like the idea of talking about this more either in June or better yet in person in September.

Woman: I'm speaking specifically to this question. The agency (unintelligible) asked for the discussion definition.

(Steve): I understood.

(Judith): Basically what did we mean by public/private partnership and what do we think about the funding issues. I think those are two pieces to that, the first being easy to explain to them. I think we have an action plan for this section or for this piece.

Hearing no contradiction there were a couple of pieces. First of all I do want to reiterate RJ. She and I talked quite a bit about this and I've been on this committee for a long time and I kept going where on earth does all of this go. I'm really pleased that the agency took the time to respond to us and give us this information. There are – I'm almost skipping and if we have time I'll come back.

There were several pieces that I want to point out where they just gave us a really nice clear response. We were just like okay, you said ask and here's what we're going to look at or here's what we're doing and where we are. Those were really nice. I'm starting by picking out the pieces that I think are problematic, not to pick on the agency but because they could use some discussion I think from this committee. I wanted to clarify what I'm picking on isn't because I felt the whole response were problematic but just the pieces I think need the discussion.

On page 8 RJ where we're looking at the agency's response to the recommendations on the national list of reportable diseases and now RAD there was actually a similar response on two things, one here and one at the very end where you'll see it. We had a recommendation. The committee recommends USDA specify a process through which diseases and/or conditions are to be added to the list and also to which they can be removed from the list.

USDA should also specify the response strategy for each disease listed if they're actionable and what those actions may be. In the agency's response that shows up on page 8 they said the process for addition to removal from an approval of the U.S. NLRAD has been addressed in previous related documents. The U.S. is reviewing feedback on the NLRAD recommendation proposal and we use these comments to develop well defined guidelines for maintaining and editing it.

Response strategies for many of the diseases are already outlined. I'm not going to read (unintelligible) that whole past. What I (unintelligible) from this and there was like I said a very similar one at the end actually much shorter on the very last page where basically in response to recommendation where we

said there doesn't appear to be any clear definition of end points the response was the plan has stated goals and objectives.

If we seem to be having a disconnect with the agency and I honestly wasn't sure and particularly those who were involved or who know with our recommendations on NLRAD, I don't remember where we were given those documents and we didn't do our homework were we not given those documents?

Were we given those documents and we simply disagreed that they were clear and we thought that their specifications weren't as clear as apparently USDA thinks they are? I want to sort that out because I think it becomes a question. First of all if anybody remembers any of that and can contribute to what they think happened and –

Woman: Order of the foundation thereof.

(Judith): Yes and what can we do to avoid this kind of disconnect with the agency and what do we need from them and what can we do.

Mary Ann Knievel: (Judith) this is Mary Ann. We didn't get any of those documents and I remember when we were discussing it. Nobody knew that so I don't – common knowledge to us.

(Judith): Anybody else? I think we have people. It's just suddenly gone quiet.

Liz Wagstrom: (Judith) this is Liz. I'd also say in response to when we're asking about response plans if you look at some of the response plans I know it's hard to make response plans for every disease. Even if you go back and look at their emerging diseases response plan there's a lot of (unintelligible) decide when

we get there sort of language. I think that does raise some concerns for people because even though we're told that there may not be a regulatory response I think as the producers we're – our first assumption is that it's USDA. It's government. It may become a regulatory response.

(Judith): Other comments from folks? Are they about the specifics of the concerns about the – in all that list or the general issue of the committee agency dynamic?

(Annette): This is (Annette). I agree. I noted that a little bit of a disconnect too and I think we addressed it in some of the earlier discussion about the preamble for our responses. I have the impression in some of the – obviously different people must've drafted different responses but there's almost a defensiveness that I'm surprised by like it was an argument with the committee.

I think we're on the same team. I feel like I'm on USDA's team even though I made those harsh comments. I think it's couching the introduction to our responses in that manner that I've attempted to with this group might help with that or maybe just some personal dialogue. We're not to attack you. We're trying to help you at your request actually. Maybe they shouldn't even respond. You might be better off it's not responding the same. Thank you.

RJ Cabrera: That's probably why (Annette). Again this was direct action to multiple requests for what happened when we vendor our recommendations. It's not something that's done generally because they're recommendations. We get recommendations from many different sources but we wanted to do that. It could be something with the tone. I recognize the tone but these were really short responses. We just wanted to get together. There were multiple authors because we went to the subject matter experts when we're responding to each of these.

What's helpful is if – I heard some comments earlier about they might respond – might've responded differently with regard to this and the fact that maybe you guys didn't have access to some documents that were necessary for you to properly and fully get the questions that will (unintelligible).

That's good feedback to us. I think I give you – we give you lots of material and I try to manage that. One of the questions I wanted to put out here for you guys is what are you thinking about, the types of material to give you before these meetings?

Sometimes I think it's over the top, just about right. This is more for the folks in general for a while. Even for those of you who – this is your first term we give you the summary sheets and more reading material. Is less better or how that's gauged that for you?

Woman: RJ I wondered – this popped into my head. We've had discussions about how early you can get materials and there's limitations in terms of the agency's ability to get all the pieces in order too far ahead of the meeting. I wonder about some of the really basic background.

We're covering such a wide range of topics with such a diverse committee that – I know you Liz. Some topics are like yes, I know a lot about this already and others where I'm like I'm clueless. Can someone give me the one on one? I wonder if it'd be possible, at least get maybe those 101 documents like what is this, the procedure for being added, removed from or approved for the NLRAD list.

Maybe even – let's say the summary sheet, the specific questions aren't prepared, aren't ready to be distributed until two weeks before the committee

meeting. Maybe once we set the broad topics some of the 101 documents could go out then and those of us who need to – whichever topics each of us needs to come up to speed on one – those basics. We could be reviewing it back and then closer to the meeting we get the specific questions that highlight the focus points.

Woman: When you say one on one I'm not really sure –

Woman: Sorry 101.

Woman: One 01, okay. The NLRAD 101.

Woman: Yes.

Woman: Okay. That was – we were hoping that the summary sheets would provide that. Maybe the feedback to us is that you'd like to include more foundational info principles in each of these sheets. I'm not really sure – help me out (Judith) what –

(Judith): I guess the only reason I didn't make that my idea was just to share volume of reading in the two weeks before at the meeting.

Woman: That's something we can certainly (unintelligible) on. Two weeks was a little – it was earlier this year past and that was the best we could hope for this year. I'm thinking a month out that was the goal to do and not to give them all to you at the same time, try and maybe send out over a period of time. We can certainly work on that and I think you're right (Judith).

You made the assessment that everybody's at different places in terms of their grounding and understanding of these topics. We get lots of information out

there on the sites. We do have – you guys have your own website. You have many documents from years past that'd be helpful to review.

Sometimes we don't know what's going beyond the agenda until maybe a month or so before. Building the agenda, we engage with you in some years and the past few years we've engaged in more in terms of asking you what types of topics would make the agenda.

In terms of building the agenda and the time from that point forward to the meeting we might do better to try and get further meet time in there. I'm thinking that's the way to go but in terms of 101 I'm at a loss.

We'd try and incorporate that in some of these sheets but there's (unintelligible) go through summary sheets and we want to drill down to the issue at hand. Another idea would have – be have you guys to submit inquiries so that we'd be better prepared during the meeting. When you get the documents you have a look see and you bounce back on a question or two for further understanding. It'd be a way to address that as well. Any other comments?

Belinda Thompson: This is Belinda. When we got to the meeting and – I'm just talking about the CWD summary document in questions that we received. I found that one to be a little bit different from the rest. I thought the rest actually were questions that somebody designed specifically for our committee. It turned out that that document was really designed for a meeting that they were holding with captive deer farmers.

Woman: Yes. That was a myth.

Belinda Thompson: That one was really problematic for me.

Woman: I know. We missed it on that one and we realized that at the meeting. I should say I realized it but you were right in engaging that. That was a document used for specific individual stakeholders and probably not appropriate for this committee because you guys are rendering collective advice.

(Lane Cruise): I have a question. This is (Lane Cruise). One the things that comes up so often is what are the odds of the foreign animal disease for swine, cattle? In other words are we focusing right on foot mouth disease alone? Is there odd ratios that the government has that tells us we're on the right track or is there three tracks we should be on? In other words we go to our stakeholders in swine and say we want to prevent FMD. Is that the most prevalent one? Whoever can answer that I'd appreciate it.

Peter Cunion: This is Peter Cunion and I can speak for the American Association of Bovine Practitioners. One of the committees I'm on, we're working on developing a list of other potential high risk trans-boundary diseases. I think that that list is going to be available or presented at our fall meeting this year.

(Lane Cruise): That'd be great.

Peter Cunion: I'm not sure it's going to necessarily have the swine producers but it is within our group an attempt to prioritize other areas that we need to not only have awareness but potentially some sort of prevalence mechanism in place as well.

Liz Wagstrom: This is Liz. I'd say that's one of the reasons that we've actually spent – check our funding to fund the Swine Health Information Center just (unintelligible) get that look outside the U.S. and try to make sure we're prepared. Everybody's list is going to be different. As Peter mentioned what might be a bovine priority might not be our priority.

(Lane Cruise): Well one of the – I’ve been going back and forth with some people in China to ask questions now and then. This really is surprising. The more I delve into it in China from my office not the biggest problem people generally feel. The problem they feel that’s present (unintelligible) is classical swine fever. The damagers are right off the boat if anything else. I just want to make sure that we’re all going down the right track. I’m just talking about swine, same thing for the cattle or whatever.

Woman: Bring this back to the agency. Maybe one of the questions for the agency and particular may be a good topic for September would be almost what I – State of the Union address. Let’s – before we dive or as part of diving into specific topics can there be some sort of discussion on how these fit into the bigger picture of what the agency’s seeing and is on its radar.

That may also be something that’d be helpful to get from them to the extent they have anything like that pre-existing, what’s on the radar for us to think about what we’d like to take up at our September meeting.

(Lane Cruise): That’d be great. How does CWB fit into (unintelligible)? I just want to be on the right track and I know that everybody knows there’s got to be some (unintelligible) calculations for you.

Woman: (Lane) can I just ask are you going after whether or not the topics that make the agenda are on with what’s happening (unintelligible)? I’m not sure – I want to get the question right because I think that.

(Lane Cruise): What my concern is that we really delve into corners that are generally regarded this first in mind. All I’m asking for is a periodical review of what people are prioritizing in each species so we all can feel we remain on a track.

When I'm into producer meetings – to veterinary meetings I sometimes feel that they need to be reminded of what USDA thinks is important. I'm not sure what USDA totally prioritize as 1 through 5 as the most prevalent dangers. That's all I'm saying, just to review periodically.

Woman: I've got you. I got it. Thank you.

Woman: Okay. With that we're at by my clock 12:22 and eight minutes left in the call. I think that's – we've hit – that I found I think that need the most discussion. Like I said I'll reiterate there are several that I thought were good responses in terms of clarity. There were a couple where they basically said disagree with you. There were a couple where they said thanks for the point and here's what we're doing to follow up on it.

I encourage everyone to go through these and perhaps email RJ, Liz and myself with any ideas you have, any reactions you have both in terms of are there any pieces you think we should be replying to. I think the other one we already identified on this call.

Are there additional pieces that you'd like to see us actually take up and do a reply to at our June or September meeting? Are there responses that cause you concern in terms of the self – we didn't have information or that USDA didn't get our point and what you suggest we need at our future meetings and what you'd like to see happen? I think with that RJ I'll hand it back to you for (unintelligible).

RJ Cabrera: Okay thank you. I think someone is un-muted. We're getting a little background. So thank you all again. I think today was a good meeting. We have one more final set of recommendations and another set that will be re-asked in a couple weeks, maybe a month. That will go on to our September

agenda. We appreciate the feedback that you guys come up with. What I (unintelligible) is perhaps maybe a one page of very general feedback.

One of the things I look for in the recommendations is to incorporate like we did last year, a background. It's something to press this year, individual recommendations because many people see these recommendations and they may not have the context there in the discussion. (Unintelligible) and (Judith) maybe you and I, we can all revisit how it might incorporate that intro paragraph much like you did with the – I think it was the – no it was out AMR today, just a (unintelligible).

It's something to give context for people who are reading these things who aren't familiar with the topics. That being said I don't have any other comments. I'm going to turn it over to Liz for any final comments and we'll adjourn.

Liz Wagstrom: Great, thank you RJ. Thank you everybody for joining. I guess I really don't have any other comments other than we will plan on that June conference call. We'll be going over at that time the emerging animal diseases and I believe there may be NLRAD may be on that as well. We'll definitely make sure that we'll go send you any documents that may – we'll look back and find any documents that may be relevant to that and make sure you've got them in plenty of time for the call.

Then I will leave it up to – be hearing obviously from RJ on plans on how to get into or how to – when we're scheduling and travel, et cetera, into our September meeting. With that I'd say happy Monday and thank you everybody for having joined.

One more thing. (Unintelligible) Just before the June meeting and like I did with this one I'll resend the documents and links to the presentation just to refresh the (unintelligible) you guys searching for past documents. We'll do that and then we'll also send you the recommendations that we'll be reviewing (unintelligible). I'll do that a week in advance.

Much of the documents that we'll be reviewing are on the website under meetings and presentations. That's a plan and if you need something (unintelligible) than that send me an email. With that I think now we're ready to adjourn. Thanks.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

Woman: Good bye, thank you.

Man: Good bye.

Man: Good bye.

END