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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Missouri is ranked in the top ten nationally in swine, poultry, and cattle inventories. Most of these animals move interstate to be fed or processed due to the lack of feeding and processing facilities within Missouri. This presents a challenge to ensure the cattle over 18 months of age are identified prior to movement out of state for processing. Since Missouri has been Brucellosis and Tuberculosis free for over ten years, we rely on slaughter surveillance to monitor for disease incidents. The ability to trace the slaughter suspects is crucial to maintain our disease-free status and contain any possible disease incidents. The swine and poultry movement are predominately vertically integrated systems, utilizing herd health plans and the GIN identification system, moving in large lots. The mandated identification system by the swine industry ensures traceability for independent producers who move their livestock with individual identification. The Scrapie Program has ultimately provided the same structure for the goat and sheep industry.

Missouri utilizes a data management program (USAHerds) to house its traceability information. This software allows for quick and reliable searches for information as the need arises. The data and information from official calf hood vaccination forms, Certificates of Veterinary Inspections, disease test charts and other is entered into this program.

The ability to query official identification in a data base greatly enhances the efficiency, thus decreasing the time required to trace animals in a disease incident. Time is crucial in the event of a disease outbreak, especially if the disease is a highly contagious and infectious. The time required to identify and trace an infected animal is directly related to the magnitude and ability to contain and control the outbreak.

The ability to transfer the identification information electronically from paper forms to the data base reduces the labor required and increases the accuracy of the data. The workforce to provide the required data entry is expensive compared to the utilization of electronic identification methods. The equipment to read and record the official identification enhances the accuracy of the data and provides traceability in real time. We continue to work with a less than an adequate work force to provide data entry essential for complete compliance to the Animal Disease Traceability Plan.

Missouri will continue to assess the current identification systems utilized by the disease programs to determine their compliance with the traceability goals. Missouri has promoted the use of electronic certificate of veterinary inspections, vaccination, and test charts to increase the efficiency and accuracy of data entry. Missouri will also monitor any necessary changes to movement requirements to ensure animals are officially identified when they enter interstate commerce.

- What is the fundamental problem(s) this plan addresses? Missouri will continue to address the large volume of data entry required and accuracy issues incurred with manual entry.
• What are the key elements in summary form? The market streamlining program that was developed and implemented to capture the official identification of test-eligible cattle moving through the livestock markets throughout the state has provided Missouri with a large query able database to initiate our disease investigations. The traceability plan will continue to build on this basic plan and expand the type of official identification in the database.
• What are the primary benefits? The traceability plan utilizing the Market Streamlining and USAHerds to collect and manage the data will fit well within USDA’s framework for animal disease traceability.
• The implementation of USAHerds has tied the entire disease programs together. This provides a common database for all forms of official identification among the species.
• Missouri will utilize the AIMS system to allocate official identification ear tags. In addition, we will work with other states with USAHerds to enhance the traceability components of the software.
• Missouri has promoted heavily the utilization of electronic certificates of veterinary inspections and various test/vaccination charts to enable the identification to be queried in the same manner as the market streamlining data. This will continue to be a priority of the program.
• How does this plan build upon previous efforts to advance ADT? The plan builds on all the previous advancements that have been made, including but not limited to more electronic records and data capture, installation of readers in markets, new electronic CVI options etc.
• How does this plan fit within USDA’s new framework for ADT? The plan should align with the new framework.
• How does this plan support animal health information systems within the State, Tribe, or Territory? Advances in the plan and goals will interact with current information systems.
• How does this plan support animal health information need with other States, Tribes, Territories and USDA nationally? Missouri will utilize the AIMS system to allocate official identification ear tags. In addition, we will work with other states with USAHerds to enhance the traceability components of the software.
• What alternatives were explored? None
• What are the projected costs and benefits for the first, second and third years of the plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>Fringe</th>
<th>E &amp; E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. CURRENT TRACEABILITY SITUATION
2.1 Who are we?
Although various State/Tribe/Territory governmental agencies are tasked with ADT efforts, identifying the specific agencies/units involved in implementing this road map is essential to planning success. This also includes identifying constituents that will be impacted by and/or require collaboration with, to advance the proposed plan.

- Who are the primary constituents? The primary constituents are the livestock and poultry producers, livestock market owners, accredited veterinarians and Missouri Department of Agriculture Animal Health Division employees.
- Who are the external constituents? States of origin and destination.
- What does statewide, tribal-wide, territory-wide mean? Statewide means the information must be collected from a variety of sources and locations throughout Missouri.
- How are traceability data used internally, externally? The traceability data will primarily be utilized internally to enable Missouri to verify the absence or presence of disease within our state. The data will enable Missouri to effectively identify, contain and control the affected animals in the event of a disease incident.
- What values guide the ADT system? Accuracy and efficiency in data entry.
- What is the make-up of the ADT advisory group? How and how often are they engaged? The animal disease traceability advisory group was formed under the previous program guidelines. The group was comprised of individuals representing livestock commodities, producers, veterinarians, and agribusiness. The group initially met on a regular basis, however, will meet on an as needed basis or as written into the cooperative agreement.

### 2.2 Where are we now?

In assessing the existing situation, this section is intended to link inventory of existing infrastructure with a broader range of considerations.

- How is ADT currently defined? Is it viewed as a cross-cutting component to animal health information systems? Is it viewed as a stand-alone initiative? The current animal disease traceability is viewed as a vital component of our disease control program. We utilize the market streamlining program to provide necessary information to enable us to trace animals related to a disease outbreaks or incidents. The program is identified as a separate animal health program but is integrated into the disease investigations involving cattle. The USAHerds data allows us to trace efficiently and in a fast manner. There are well over 7 million individual movement records available for traces as needed. In addition, those records are now being shared through AHER and available to assist other states with their traceability needs.
- What measures of traceability capability are currently being used? What are the specific values and associated interpretation? The
percentage of successful traces is also utilized as a measurement of the capability of our current system. The specific values vary with the species; however, in regard to the cattle industry (test-eligible over 18 months) we can currently trace 95% of the traces within 1 day.

- How is coordination being currently achieved within the unit? The market streamlining system concentrates on the beef industry and lacks coordination with all species identified. However, the USAHerds software provides coordination between all species and allows access to all staff.

- How is coordination currently being achieved statewide, tribal-wide, territory-wide? The market streamlining data is obtained from all livestock markets located throughout Missouri. The market streamlining data is managed by USAHerds, which is accessible to staff located throughout the state.

- How does the present unit coordinate activities with other existing agencies/units? MDA has a very strong relationship with the Area Veterinarian in Charge, therefore, we coordinate the necessary information to ensure the investigation is accomplished in a timely manner.

- What standards for traceability are currently being used? Are they appropriate? Missouri currently strives to provide traceability to the farm of origin within 2 working days for all species. This is appropriate for most of the traces, however, if the livestock or poultry is marketed through a dealer this standard is not appropriate.

- What is the state of technology infrastructure? Missouri Office of Administration maintains computer/servers and backups data on a daily basis. Capability in terms of size? Compatibility within and outside the agency/unit/depot. etc. for sharing data when needed. Missouri has implemented a computer software program to electronically collect and submit the same information as was collected on the VS 4-54 Form to a central database to enable traceability in a short period of time. We have also acquired data management software to provide additional traceability capabilities. The data management software is accessible 24/7 to our staff. The sharing of information must be approved by the department director; the capability to share is adequate.

- Are requests for information available 24/7, or only available M-F, 40 hours per week, if authorized personnel are present? The accessibility to the data would be 24/7 through authorized personnel. Additionally, identification information is submitted to AHER on a daily basis or as changes occur and is accessible to other states and USDA personnel.

- What is the impact of state, tribe, or territory funding on capability? How does Federal funding fit into the plan? It is necessary to complete the overall mission while the market streamlining program
was paid for with state funds, federal funding will be utilized to provide data entry, outreach programs, USAHerds software maintenance, personnel funding, some travel, and upgrade computers.

2.3 Strengths and Weaknesses

[Strengths are intended to describe circumstances or positions that allow an organization to take advantage of opportunities. Weaknesses, in contrast, are issues or threats that make an organization less able to exploit opportunities.]

- What are the strengths of the organization in terms of technology, human resources, personnel capabilities, etc.? The data management software (USAHerds) has greatly enhanced the accuracy of the identification entered in the Missouri database system. The software enables the department to query “official identification” to trace animals in the event of a disease incident. The ability to merge the market streamlining data with USAHerds greatly enhances the amount of data and allows MDA to manage the data more efficiently. Missouri will analyze the current identification requirements for movement into the state and determine the changes necessary to comply with the Animal Disease Traceability program.

- What are the weaknesses in terms of “lack of” technology, human resources, personnel capabilities, etc.? The biggest challenge is maintaining adequate staff to provide data entry into the system. The continued development and implementation of electronic certificates of veterinary inspections is essential to accurately capture the data necessary for traceability.

2.4 Opportunities and Threats

[The basis for this component is the assumption that improving ADT capability will create opportunities for those involved that would not be available should traceability not be optimized. At the administrative level, implementation of standards for improving efficiencies of information collection, storage, sharing, and security would be an opportunity. Every State/Tribe/Territory is subject to catastrophic events, such as tornados, wildfires, drought, winter storms, animal/zoonotic disease, flooding, possibly hurricanes.]

- Does this plan create an opportunity in ability to respond? Yes
- Does this plan enable or avoid consequences of potential threats? The plan enables Missouri to respond more efficiently in the event of a potential threat, however, the consequences would be dependent upon the threat.
- Does this plan provide for better use of available resources than current approaches? The plan enhances the utilization of the resources.
• Does this plan enhance networking opportunities? The ability to access the information 24/7 by authorized individuals will greatly enhance the networking opportunities. District Veterinarians will be able to locate and identify animals of interest in a timely manner.

• If this plan is not implemented, what are the threats? Missouri will not be able to fully utilize the capabilities of the database to protect the livestock and poultry industries from disease or catastrophic events.

• If this plan is not implemented, will others be tasked with doing so? Missouri would continue to strive to provide traceability to enable us to respond to a disease outbreak or natural disaster.

• Have previous efforts to coordinate with other entities within the applicant’s boundaries, and outside the applicant’s boundaries, been complicated or unavailable for not having this plan in place? The market streamlining software allows Missouri to query a database of test eligible cattle in an efficient manner. However, the system was not capable of communicating with the field staff and coordinating with other sources of official identification.

2.5 Inventory of existing infrastructure and suitability assessment

[This section is intended to provide a more detailed and technical assessment of existing infrastructure than the “Who we are” section. An outcome of this section is to support the requirements analysis for funding prioritization and justification.]

• Human resources MDA currently utilizes several employees for data entry in USAHerds for a variety of animal health programs which affects traceability. These employees enter data from health certificates, test records, tag allocations, livestock market information, premises and other forms of data relating to disease traceability.

• Space availability Missouri will purchase from Missouri Office of Administration as needed.

• Connectivity resources, both in office and in the field. The office and field staff has access to the information through smart phones and “hotspot” devices.

• Access to USDA ADT and animal health information resources Missouri is uploading information into USAHerds.

• Organization of all existing paper record systems used to access ADT or animal health information Missouri is uploading information into USAHerds.

• Computerized data management capability, including present storage size, speed, security, etc. Missouri will utilize Office of Administration to purchase storage space as needed and standards/requirements.

• Automated data capture capability. The market streamlining system is semi-automatic. Missouri will continue to promote the use of
III. VISION AND MISSION CONTEXT FOR ADVANCING TRACEABILITY

3.1 Vision Statement: Missouri is committed to the continued implementation of a traceability program to ensure the ability to identify and contain in the event of a disease incident or natural disaster.

3.2 Mission Statement: Missouri will strive to continue to advance the accuracy and efficiency of the traceability program through implementation and utilization of technology.

IV. TRACEABILITY REQUIREMENTS

The following categories must be described in the Road Map:

4.1 Strategic goal(s): To develop and implement a State-wide infrastructure for advancing animal disease traceability compatible with State, Tribe, Territory and USDA standards.

1. Enhance electronic sharing of data among Federal and State animal health officials, veterinarians, and industry; including sharing basic ADT data with the Federal Animal Health Events Repository (AHER);
2. Increase use of electronic ID tags for animals requiring individual identification in order to make the transmission of data more efficient.
3. Enhance the ability to track animals from birth to slaughter through a system that allows tracking data points to be connected; and
4. Elevate the discussion with States and industry to work toward a system where animal health certificates are electronically transmitted from private veterinarians to State animal health officials.

4.2 Programmatic goals (objectives)
- Continued input data into appropriate systems
- Improve retrieval of available traceability information
- Continually monitor ICVI data quality
- Continued development and implement the utilization of electronic interstate certificates of veterinary inspections
- Continue outreach programs to accredited veterinarians to increase the quality and processing of electronic forms and health certificates.
- Working with veterinarians to adapt more electronic means and the use of electronic data capture software and apps, such as mobile apps.

4.3 ADT Trace Performance Measures (TPMs)
Missouri completes TPMs as required.

4.4 Data requirements
• Fully describe standards to be used for official animal identification, including arrangements with other States, Tribes, Territories, as well as official identification methods/devices used within the cooperator’s jurisdiction. Missouri references CFR for use and requirements of official identification devices.
• What tag distribution record keeping systems are being used? AIMS and USAHerds.
• What data requirements exist for commuter herd agreements? N/A
• What forms are approved for interstate movement in addition to ICVIs? Swine Health Plans
• How and when will data be shared with other States, Tribes, Territories, and USDA? Currently on an as needed basis, however data is messaged to AHER.
• How will group/lot official numbers be handled within the system? Same as with other official identification numbers.

4.5 Information technology plan
Missouri will utilize the current IT system but will need computer upgrades and replacement computers in the future. The State of Missouri contracts with an outside vendor to provide cloud services to host current computer software.

4.6 Resource requirements
• Is specific expertise needed that is not currently available? No
• Will consultants be needed? No
• Is a continuity of operation plan (COOP) in place and how frequently is it tested? Yes, annually.
• Are automated data capture resources needed? Nothing more than already provided through cooperative agreements.

4.7 Organizational needs
• Does a need for organizational change exist? No
• Can additional resources be leveraged within the current administrative structure? No

4.7.1 Executive support
[This section is intended to describe how current administrative authorities view the importance of a sound ADT system to the well-being of the livestock and poultry industries affected.
• Is additional support from executive management needed? No
• Is accountability provided? Yes
• How are officials briefed on progress and baseline measures of performance? Through results and briefings.

4.7.2 Coordination and oversight procedures
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• What is the make-up of the applicant’s ADT advisory group? How frequently are they engaged? Industry, state, and federal partners. They meet on an as needed basis with other meetings as outlined in the cooperative agreement.

• How are emergency preparedness resources engaged or responded to when necessary? Missouri has an Agri-Security position who coordinates the emergency management response.

• How is compatibility with other States, Tribes, Territories, and USDA monitored? Through collaboration with the various entities. MDA participates in many conference calls, national meetings, and other venues. USAHerds user group meetings and conference calls are very useful when keeping those states compatible with others.

• How are responsibilities assigned for implementing the plan? Through the directive of the state veterinarian.

• How are disputes arbitrated? Through discussions and consensus.

• How is feedback obtained relative to perception of successful implementation above and below the administrative authority? Through communication with field staff via conference calls, conferences, etc.

• How is transition achieved when administrators are replaced? Through documentation of the plan and directives to implement the stages in the future.

4.7.3 Policy

• How does the applicants’ policies align with the ADT general standards document and achievement of traceability goals? It matches very well.

• Is there a need to address or change a state policy to align with 9CFR part 86 or the ADT General Standards document? No

4.7.4 Staffing

• How is full-time, paid support staff justified? Missouri and other states have made tremendous strides in becoming less paper dependent, however there is still a lot of work and programming to be done to alleviate paper. Staff is needed to enter data from paper and to verify electronic data is accurate and complete. USAHerds requires a tremendous amount of data entry to adequately utilize the traceability capabilities of the software program.

• What qualifications are needed? Accuracy, attention to detail and ability to focus on data entry.

• What personnel are needed to implement the plan? Program manager, administrative assistants, and data entry staff.
Can other human resources be leveraged to assist in implementing the plan? Yes, we currently have individuals providing data entry for other animal health programs which utilize official identification.

Are professional credentials and certification an issue? No

Are job descriptions for the roles needed provided? The job descriptions are available through the human resource division.

Is ADT information a distinct function within the unit or an add-on “coordinated by committee” versus an individually coordinated, stand-alone sub-unit? The animal disease traceability information is coordinated with several animal health programs and systems.

4.7.5 Budget requirements

How are you funded for ADT? State, Tribe, Territory versus Federal? Through a combination of state and federal resources.

What are the funding requirements projected by year for first, second and third year for implementing this plan?
- FY2022--$640,000
- FY2023--$680,000
- FY2024--$720,000

How is cost sharing achieved? The state funding will provide some personnel cost, travel, IT support, equipment maintenance, supplies, communications and other as needed. The federal funds will be utilized to provide help provide outreach to accredited veterinarians, some personnel costs, some software maintenance costs, travel and mileage, communication costs and other as outlined in the cooperative agreements.

How can the applicant insulate against budget cuts and shortfalls? In the event of significant budget cuts, Missouri will continue the current system and utilize funds to maintain. The completion of the established goals of the road plan will be delayed due to the inability to acquire the necessary staff.

Can other funding sources be leveraged to support this plan? Missouri has utilized Homeland Security Funds in the past to acquire data management software; however, the availability of funding from Homeland Security has diminished and would not be available. The availability of state funding to fully support this plan is not a viable option.

4.7.6 Outreach
4.7.6.1. Accredited veterinarians

Accredited veterinarians are instrumental to the advancement of ADT in livestock and poultry.

- What is the plan for informing accredited veterinarians of the new guidelines for official ID and the specific three-year plan for implementation? Missouri will continue to utilize the district veterinarians and Animal Health Officers to inform accredited veterinarians. MDA will participate in professional and commodity conferences to distribute and inform the profession and producers.

- What continuing education is being planned for improving data quality relative to animal health information systems being used? We will continue to promote the use of an electronic CVI to our accredited veterinarians, this will serve as a method to provide additional training and implementation of electronic animal health forms. Submitting official forms in a timely manner?

- What is the plan for enhancing the use of eICVIs, if any? MDA promotes the use of eICVIs and will continue to monitor the adaption of such and will look for ways to enhance the ICVI as needed.

- What role, if any, does the accredited veterinarian have in providing low-cost, official identification tags/devices to producers? The accredited veterinarians will be able to distribute official identification tags to producers or utilize them as a means of identification outside the parameter of an animal disease program.

4.7.6.2. Slaughter plants

Because of frequent commingling of livestock, and sometimes poultry, at livestock markets, increased biosecurity risks are incurred and, as a result, the importance of access to traceability information when needed is important.

- What continuing education efforts are being planned for addressing the concerns of the slaughter plants in the jurisdiction? Missouri
will utilize the district veterinarians and field staff to provide information to the livestock markets. MDA will also provide information via the participation at livestock and poultry seminars and meetings.

- What is the plan for accessing or requesting traceability information from slaughter plants? Missouri will utilize the market streamlining system currently implemented and maintained in livestock markets.

4.7.6.3. Industry as a whole
Implementation of any plan to advance ADT impacts a variety of constituents, likely none more so than industry itself.

- How is industry being informed of the implementation plan? Missouri informs the livestock and poultry industries of the program through meetings with producers and staff. MDA also participates in commodity association meetings and trade shows.
- How is the advisory committee being leveraged for this continuing education purpose? Through meetings and conference calls as needed.
- What other resources are available for industry outreach? MDA’s website and attendance at industry meetings, conferences and conventions.
- How are under-represented and underserved communities being included in the outreach plan? The district veterinarians and field staff are distributed throughout the state, including under-represented areas. In addition, the under-served areas may be served by attending a livestock or poultry meeting or tradeshow.

4.8. Monitoring and reporting interstate movement activity
[The traceability framework is focused on interstate movement and the accompanying ICVI or similar documentation for that movement.]
• How will the number of animals and the number of shipments be monitored that move interstate? Interstate movement is captured in USAHerd and reviewed by staff for compliance and accuracy.
• How will the data be verified or validated? ICVIs are monitored and reviewed daily for compliance.
• The following data should be tracked and available upon request:
  o Number of ICVIs and other interstate movement documents created within the State/Tribe/Territory on a year-to-date basis for move-out animals
  o Number of ICVIs and other interstate movement documents received for move-in animals
  o Number of animals by species and class for move-in events associated with ICVIs and other interstate movement documents, indicating the number of animals officially identified and the number not officially identified
  o Number of animals by species and class for move-out events associated with ICVIs and other interstate movement documents, indicating the number of animals officially identified and the number not officially identified
  o Volume of distribution for each official numbering system/device issued by the State/Tribe/Territory and/or AVIC office, including backtags by market or slaughter facility

V. ADVANCING TRACEABILITY
5.1 Ranking of priorities for advancement
This section is intended to show the breadth of elements encompassed in advancing ADT. This ranking should identify sufficient projects prioritized for funding over the next three years. It will be the basis of comparison for the annualized cooperative agreement work plans. What specific steps are needed to advance from where the initiative currently resides?
• Is a phased-in approach appropriate over the three-year period? Yes, the implementation of the plan will be completed over the next three years.
• Are various components dependent upon measurable successes rather than defined time periods? Yes

5.2 Implementation of objectives
Accepting that each year’s cooperative agreement work plan will likely be a collection of objectives, this section is intended to identify each of the objectives prioritized in V.5.1. and correspondingly listed in IV.4.7.5. and describe how each project will be conducted or approached. Objectives should be listed and ranked as priorities for each of the planned three years, aligning with the three-year budget plan.
FY2022
Continued input data into appropriate systems. Improve retrieval of available traceability information.
Continually monitor ICVI data quality. Continued development and implement the utilization of electronic interstate certificates of veterinary inspections. Continued develop and implement the utilization of electronic interstate certificates of veterinary inspections. Establish compatible standards for sharing data with States/Tribes/Territories and USDA when needed.

FY2023
Continued develop and implement the utilization of electronic interstate certificates of veterinary inspections. Continue outreach programs to accredited veterinarians to increase the quality and processing of electronic forms and health certificates. Continued input data into appropriate systems. Continually monitor ICVI data quality. Establish compatible standards for sharing data with States/Tribes/Territories and USDA when needed.

FY2024
Establish compatible standards for sharing data with States/Tribes/Territories and USDA when needed. Integrate surveillance and traceability data. Continued develop and implement the utilization of electronic interstate certificates of veterinary inspections. Continue outreach programs to accredited veterinarians to increase the quality and processing of electronic forms and health certificates. Continued input data into appropriate systems. Continually monitor ICVI data quality.