

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

USDA

ANIMAL DISEASE TRACEABILITY

PUBLIC INDUSTRY FORUM

MAY 11, 2010

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

1 MS. MILLIS: Good morning. Good morning.
2 Let me, first of all, introduce myself. I'm Deborah
3 Millis, and I'm with USDA, and I have a role here to keep
4 our meeting on track. And I think I'm off to a great
5 start, thanks to technology. You know technology is a
6 wonderful thing, when it works.

7 So I want to welcome all of you. I know many
8 of you have traveled through storms to get here, and I
9 really appreciate your presence. Let me tell you about
10 our agenda today, and then turn the floor over to
11 Dr. T.J. Myers.

12 As you know, throughout the past year we've
13 had many listening sessions. We've had some public
14 meetings with our tribal and state partners, and this is
15 not a listening session, but more of a working session,
16 seeking solutions to some of the challenges that we're up
17 against as we form rules and regulations for how we're
18 going to manage animal traceability in this nation.

19 Today we'll be working in some small groups.
20 We've labeled some of the tables, and those of you who
21 are in the center table, you know that if the table got
22 too populated, we can just flip those over and rename a
23 table or something. So we'll be using those as we do our
24 small breakout sessions this morning a little bit later.

25 I want to call your attention to the

1 necessary rooms, and as you go out this door and to the
2 right, the ladies' is there. The men's room is down the
3 hall to your left and then take another left.

4 So to call attention to the agenda, we will
5 hear some presentations from Dr. Breitmeyer from
6 California, and following that we'll hear from Dr. Becky
7 Brewer from Oklahoma about the work of the Regulatory
8 Working Group. Then we're going to break out into some
9 small sessions that I'm going to explain to you a little
10 bit later.

11 So if there's anything you need or I can
12 assist you with, please feel free to call upon me. I am
13 not an animal health professional, but I am pretty good
14 at running a meeting. So with no further ado, I'm going
15 to turn it over to Dr. T.J. Myers with veterinary
16 services in USDA. Thanks.

17 DR. MYERS: Thank you, Deb.

18 Good morning, everyone. I want to take this
19 opportunity to welcome you. My name is Dr. T.J. Myers.
20 I'm the Associate Deputy Administrator in APHIS
21 Veterinary Services for Policy Development. I want to
22 extend the welcome of Dr. John Clifford, who's our Deputy
23 Administrator in Overseas Veterinary Services and also to
24 welcome Cindy Smith, our APHIS administrator.

25 I really do appreciate everyone's attendance

1 here today. As Deb says, we recognize that a lot of you
2 drove through storms or flew in, and I know it's taking
3 time from your business schedules to be here today, so we
4 really do appreciate your participation.

5 What I hope that you see from today is that
6 the theme for the day is collaboration. We are working
7 diligently to develop a new approach for animal disease
8 traceability in the U.S. As you know all of us in this
9 room have been involved in animal disease traceability
10 over the years, and last year our new secretary, Tom
11 Vilsack, asked us to take a breath and take a look at our
12 work on traceability and to hold some listening sessions,
13 as Deb mentioned, and we did that. We heard everyone's
14 input, and the secretary absorbed that input. And on
15 February 5th of this year, announced a new direction, a
16 name framework for animal disease traceability.

17 So since that announcement on February 5th,
18 we've been working diligently to put that new framework
19 into practice, and this meeting today is part of that --
20 part of that effort. We have established a working
21 group, and you're going to be hearing from that working
22 group later today. That working group is made up of
23 state and tribal and federal officials, and we feel that
24 it is absolutely key that, as we move forward with our
25 developmental work, we fully engage the animal production

1 industries, producers, the public, to seek their input on
2 the development of our new traceability regulations.

3 So that's what this meeting is about today.
4 We are seeking your input and your feedback. We hope
5 that this is a very collaborative dialogue that we have
6 today.

7 So having said that, we do want to kick this
8 meeting off with three presentations. First Dr. Richard
9 Breitmeyer, the state veterinarian of California is going
10 to be speaking about the need for and the utility of
11 traceability from his perspective in the experience of
12 California.

13 The second presentation, I will talk about
14 the new framework and give you some description of where
15 we are in moving that new framework forward.

16 And then third, Dr. Becky Brewer, the state
17 veterinarian of Oklahoma, who sits on the Federal State
18 Tribal Working Group will be discussing the progress of
19 that group in developing performance standards for the
20 new regulations that we hope to have published as a
21 proposed rule by next winter.

22 So once we have those presentations, then as
23 Deb Millis has indicated, we'll be breaking into smaller
24 groups to discuss some of the issues that we need to hear
25 your input on in order to effectively develop those

1 rules.

2 So with that, I would like to introduce
3 Dr. Richard Breitmeyer and thank him for coming today and
4 sharing his thoughts on traceability. Rich.

5 DR. BREITMEYER: Thanks, T.J. It's a
6 pleasure to be here this morning. I'm going to give you
7 a presentation that I gave last month at National
8 Institute for Animal Ag. I know a few of you in the room
9 were at that meeting, so if you want to get up, step out
10 and get a cup of coffee, you won't hurt my feelings.
11 Although I'm going to ask, can somebody bring the picture
12 up on the computer?

13 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: No.

14 THE COURT: I'll have to look this way
15 because I have no notes other than these. This issue has
16 been very much politicized over the last several years,
17 probably some for good reason. I know there's a lot of
18 opinions about animal ID, a lot of opinions about the
19 former NAIS. I want to avoid some of the politics, and
20 just talk about why, as an animal health official, we
21 need traceability. I have served as a state veterinarian
22 of California for 17 years. I've been through a lot of
23 disease eradication programs, many emergencies, many
24 chronic, frustrating things. I've seen good
25 veterinarians get frustrated with the system and leave

1 because of the difficulties we have. And that's been, I
2 think, a challenge for all of us. So I want to walk
3 through some of the issues.

4 I want to talk about some of the animal
5 health diseases, the animal movements of interest, what
6 we currently have for traceability tools, and a few
7 recommendations at the end. And I'll try to go through
8 this pretty quickly.

9 But what I want to do is I want to focus not
10 on traceability for traceability's sake, but why we need
11 it to eradicate the diseases that we all have concerns
12 about. As state animal health officials, we're hired to
13 do a job. We work primarily for our industries to take
14 care of very serious diseases that industries and private
15 veterinarians can't take care of on their own. So you
16 guys pay us good salaries to try to get these diseases
17 under control. And sometimes it's frustrating to do that
18 without the tools we really need.

19 I'm going to spend most of the time today
20 talking about bovine tuberculosis, because I think a lot
21 of the concern has come from the cattle industry. You
22 know, I've listed some other foreign animal diseases.
23 Trichomoniasis in the west is important. We all dealt
24 with BSE several years ago, and it continues to be a
25 threat hanging over us a little bit. Brucellosis is not

1 years, 364 recorded TB cases in nine years. And I
2 guarantee you that number is probably tenfold for the
3 ones we never found, that didn't record. So that's still
4 a lot of TB out there. And this is a disease at the
5 early part of my career, 25 years ago, we were about
6 ready to eradicate, and we're still fighting it today.
7 And it's probably more entrenched in our cattle
8 populations today than it was 20 years ago. So we've got
9 to have that ID at slaughter.

10 This is just a map to show that it's not an
11 issue in the West. It's not an issue just in Michigan,
12 Minnesota. This is a national issue. We've got
13 disease -- and this is just where cases of disease are.

14 In fact, there's at least -- since I gave
15 this presentation about three, four weeks ago, I know
16 there's at least two additional states that have active
17 tracing going on for suspected TB. I'm not going to get
18 into specifics, but I saw a report just a couple of days
19 ago. So this is very active. I really think TB can
20 serve as a national model, if you will, or a national
21 need for traceability, because without traceability, we
22 are not going to get this disease under control.

23 This is a slide I stole from Texas. They had
24 a new dairy herd that was positive with TB, and it was
25 actually found by a practitioner testing the herd for

1 dispersal. This dairy was going to be sold and
2 dispersed. Prior to the dispersal sale, heifers had been
3 sold to 22 states. Over 2,000 exposed heifers. And, you
4 know, how can we find where those animals went without
5 traceability. It's impossible.

6 These are some pictures we put together.
7 We've had two incursions of TB in California over the
8 last decade. At the same time we had Exotic Newcastle in
9 2002, 2003. We also had some large dairy herds in the
10 Central Valley of California with TB. This is, I think,
11 our first dairy herd in that herd. These are the number
12 of traces into that index herd. So these are all animals
13 from different sources. It was a put-together herd. Got
14 some other -- and this is the trace-outs.

15 You know, these dairy animals -- we are very
16 much an importing state, as I'll show you in a minute, in
17 California, so we get animals from all over. And I
18 suspect we're continuing to import this disease from
19 different parts of the country.

20 Again, this is a summary of the three herds
21 we found with TB. First herd had cattle in from 33
22 states. Second herd, 22 states; and the third herd had 5
23 states represented. Here we are in 2009.

24 We had four herds in this last incursion over
25 the last couple of years. Here's our trace-ins of our

1 first index herd, trace-outs. Kind of a pattern
2 developing here. We see this routinely in our big dairy
3 herds in the animals coming and going.

4 In this last TB event we've spent over
5 20 million dollars eradicating this disease in four herds
6 in California, and that doesn't include the industry
7 cost. That's just the government costs. To find four
8 affected herds, and we found eight cows. And we spent
9 that kind of money. 659 traces, 21,000 cattle, 254
10 herds, 419,000 head of cattle. I know there's APHIS
11 folks in this room that came and assisted us because of
12 the massive amount of testing we had to do.

13 I want to talk about a little bit about RFID.
14 I know USDA has come out promoting the cheap flat tags.
15 And I think that's appropriate. I'm not against putting
16 as much ID in animals as we can. But RFID, I think, at
17 least on the dairy industry -- I think we need to promote
18 the best ID we can, and in circumstances where it could
19 do the most good.

20 In our TB outbreak we found -- or we provided
21 over 400,000 RFID tags. It was very well received by
22 producers. Those producers that didn't already have them
23 in were very willing to put them in before the herd
24 tests. It really enhanced our accuracy and decreased the
25 amount of time it took to do the testing. And then we

1 were also able to use the RFID to reconcile over 3500
2 animals that were suspect animals in those herds that had
3 to go to slaughter and be really closely evaluated for
4 lesions. So it really helped in that.

5 Many of our big diaries -- and this is true
6 all over the country. You're often working in situations
7 where the light's not very good. We're in the
8 summertime, so a lot of these herd tests started very,
9 very early in the morning, probably working a couple
10 hours before the sunlight even came up. Trying to read
11 those little flat tags in those kind of situations is
12 pretty tough. A lot of mistakes are made. You transpose
13 numbers. You got to get the manure off the tag. It's
14 pretty touch, and probably 10 percent errors or even
15 higher. So it really helped having, you know, that kind
16 of RFID for accuracy, labor speed, and safety.

17 So a little bit about animal movements of
18 interest. Obviously, international movements we want
19 those cattle identified. We want to be able to tell are
20 those native cattle or are those cattle imported from
21 either Mexico or Canada or other countries. We import a
22 lot of feeder cattle into California. USDA provides
23 reports and information to us from those that come
24 directly from the border. But we know a lot of cattle
25 come into Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and different

1 ports, and then migrate into California as basically
2 native citizens once they cross that border. We know the
3 ownership changes, and a problem we have, you know, in
4 Mexico at the border they do a good job of identifying
5 those tags. Sometimes those tags are removed and we
6 can't the those animals back as Mexican cattle.

7 At slaughter the hide is removed. So you
8 don't have the brand any more. And if that tag is
9 missing, it becomes a domestic animal if we can't prove
10 it's an animal from Mexico. So we've really got to work
11 together as industry and regulatory officials to make
12 sure those tags stay in. I think we need some stiffer
13 penalties for people that are removing those tags. It's
14 really important that those stay in.

15 I won't go inasmuch as Canada. We used to
16 get a lot of dairy heifers coming in from Canada prior to
17 the BSE find. We're not getting so many of those, but I
18 think equally as important, especially in the northern
19 states, those cattle coming in from Canada are
20 identified, and that that identification stays.

21 Interstate I'm not going to spend a lot of
22 time because these are just California numbers, but
23 because of our large specialty crop industry we try to
24 keep bugs and pests out of our fruits and vegetables, so
25 we've got inspection stations and all cattle trucks and

1 animals coming in, they're actually recorded at the
2 border so we know how many animals are coming in. We
3 provide obviously permits on animals that need test
4 requirements and those things. But if you look, we bring
5 in millions of animals every year into our state. So a
6 lot of animals coming in.

7 Permits, obviously, not nearly as many.
8 These are primarily breeding animals and animals that
9 have to have special requirements, but we try to keep
10 track of those, and with a small staff without good ID
11 and good recordkeeping, that's a pretty insurmountable
12 task, so if you look at our current traceability tools,
13 we pretty much rely on our brucellosis Bangs tags and our
14 flat tags that are put in for different test
15 requirements.

16 We still require adult or calfhood
17 vaccination in California. So any heifer, beef, or dairy
18 coming into our state has to be brucellosis vaccinated,
19 so we do have that identification. If they don't have
20 the orange vaccination tag, then a veterinarian is
21 required to put on a silver bright tag. And that's
22 really the best ID we still have today. It's cheap and
23 easy to place, but as I said, it's really expensive once
24 you try to gather cattle and read it and record it and
25 mistakes. So it's probably a good book end on one end,

1 but once you have to use the information and track it or
2 read it, from that point on, it's a lot tougher.

3 Canada and Mexico certainly have official ID,
4 but as I said, sometimes that ID is removed, and doesn't
5 help us when we don't have it.

6 Brands. We have a brand program in
7 California. We utilize our brand inspectors. It's a
8 great assistance, and it's a great help, and it's often
9 the only tool for traceability when other ID is not
10 present, but it really is just a tool, and an assistant.
11 Again, as I said, the hide is removed at slaughter. So,
12 you know, if you have a lesion on an animal, you really
13 can't go back and look at that hide at the slaughter
14 plant. It's not unique and certainly limited numbers of
15 states have brands. So, you know, brands are a great
16 tool. We're not going to eliminate our brand program,
17 but replacing official ID, I don't think that's going to
18 work nationally.

19 Again brucellosis vaccination, we tag
20 about -- or we vaccinate about 800,000 animals. We've
21 got a database. So if one of our tags shows up around
22 the country and you give us that number, we can tell you
23 which veterinarian put it in and which farm. I think
24 most states keep that kind of information.
25 Unfortunately, it's not -- it's a unique database to

1 California. So, you know, it's not searchable by anybody
2 else. And it's often difficult to keep it up to date
3 with the staff we have.

4 Interstate certificates of veterinarian
5 inspection or CVIs, we receive a lot of those, again,
6 though, and we receive them from other states, but the
7 majority of those are paper. So we've got them in boxes.
8 If we need to, we can dig through them, but it's not a
9 very friendly way to get information. So we really want
10 to work with USDA and promote electronic certification.
11 I think it will save the producers money. It will give
12 us access in real time to get information. And we've got
13 to have a database that's compatible.

14 International certificates, again, we get
15 those directly from the border, but only on those cattle
16 coming directly from the border.

17 Brand records, as I said, we use those a lot.
18 That's often the only thing we have to get back to the
19 farm of origin, when we do have a brand. And, again,
20 most of those are paper format records and it takes some
21 time, and our brand inspectors, you know, the industry is
22 paying them to be out inspecting cattle, not to helping
23 us trace, but they do assist us quite a bit.

24 We require a permit on many animals coming
25 in, so we know which type of animals, where they're

1 going. That's very good information. And sometimes that
2 may be better information than a CVI, because it does
3 give us real time information on where cattle are moving.
4 Then if animals are tested for official programs, for TB
5 or brucellosis, those tests are performed by accredited
6 veterinarians, and those tests are forwarded to the
7 office of destination. We have those, again, in paper
8 records. Then, of course, sale yard consignments we use
9 daily to try to track information. And, again, paper
10 records mostly, but a lot of help to us in traceability.

11 Some gaps with -- you know, we're not seeing
12 brucellosis where we've been successful in eradicating
13 brucellosis, so those tags are largely going away, USDA
14 is pulling back on some of their funding for first-point
15 testing, so we're going to have fewer cattle identified
16 at those points and fewer states are requiring
17 brucellosis vaccination. So many of those females no
18 longer have that information. And as we certainly know,
19 movement records on many of these animals once they get
20 from the point of original, we just don't have that
21 information.

22 As I mentioned before, removal of official ID
23 is really a concern. So that's something we've really
24 got to work together on. Industry, all segments of
25 industry need to understand how important that it is and

1 that those tags are not removed.

2 Some practitioners, because those tags are so
3 difficult to read, if they're testing a group of animals,
4 they might already have a brucellosis tag in, and they
5 just don't want to take the time to read them, so they'll
6 put in another flat tag in, which is legal. And here's
7 an animal that's got four flat tags in her ear. She's
8 probably moved around quite a bit. I guess I'd rather
9 have four than none. But, you know, it just shows the
10 difficulty reading those tags and why those flat tags
11 might be good for one book end, but they're not very good
12 through the system. No surprise to any of you in this
13 room, any dealers and traders don't maintain adequate
14 records and sometimes it's difficult to know where the
15 source of those animals are. And as I've said many
16 times, most of these records are in paper formats.

17 Exhibitors move a lot of animals in and out
18 of states for different shows. We have lack of standards
19 among states, so a lot of different -- you know, I think
20 one of the things, when the states came together with
21 USDA a few weeks ago, we agreed we need consistency, we
22 need standardization. So I think the state veterinarians
23 all agreed we need to work together to have that
24 consistency.

25 And then some groups of cattle will never

1 have an official ID or require movement records. Again,
2 depending on the class. And at the same time, though, I
3 think we need to look at what is the value of having that
4 ID versus just having ID to have ID.

5 Just one little example of the economic
6 impact of not having good ID, back in 2002 and 2003, when
7 we had our TB incursion at that time, the first herd we
8 had, even though we had cattle from all over the place,
9 we had very good ID in that herd. And we were able to
10 really pinpoint the trace-outs of the herds we had to go
11 to. It was a lot of herds, but we were able to identify
12 those.

13 The second herd we found had absolutely no
14 ID. And we knew this guy was almost a dealer kind of a
15 situation, sold cattle all over. So instead of being
16 able to go to specific herds, even though it might have
17 been 100 plus herds, we basically had to do an area test
18 of the entire Southern San Joaquin Valley, three entire
19 counties. And so instead of having to test 130 herds, we
20 actually had to test almost 700 herds in the area, and
21 our staff at the time figured that we probably added
22 almost \$1 million or \$880,000 of both USDA and our
23 department costs.

24 And that's government costs alone. And many
25 of those 700 diaries, you know, that was an expense to

1 the herd owners as well, catching those animals multiple
2 times, losing animals, because anytime you do a dairy
3 herd in our state, you typically find one or two of the
4 animals that are positive on the skin test. So, in 1,000
5 cow dairy, that might be 10 to 40 animals that have to go
6 to slaughter, because that's the only thing that we have.
7 So it really is an expense on the producer as well. And
8 I think just as an example of the amount of money we
9 sometimes spend because we don't have good traceability.

10 This is my only -- for the sheep folks in the
11 room, this is my only slide on sheep, but I threw it in
12 because I think the industry has embraced this program,
13 not that everything has worked perfectly, but it's a very
14 inexpensive, very flexible information and identification
15 at minimal cost. And I think the industry has embraced
16 it because it's serving a purpose. It's helping them
17 eradicate a very important disease, scrapie, from the
18 flocks. And it's not just because they need ID, but they
19 need ID for a purpose. And that purpose is the
20 eradication of a very important disease.

21 Other issues: I know a lot of people have
22 said, we don't want to turn this into a food safety
23 program. And I'm not here to promote anything in the
24 realm of food safety, but I will tell you that USDA meat
25 inspection side, FSIS, is now enforcing the residue side

1 of the Hazlet rule, meaning that if a plant is killing
2 cattle or other animals and they animals with residues,
3 they now have to have a plan that keeps that source of
4 animals with residue out of their system. And if they
5 don't have identification, if they can only identify it
6 back to a market or a dealer, they're going to have to
7 assume no animals from that dealer or market can come
8 into their plant or they're going to be penalized by
9 their inspector. If they can get it back to a farm, then
10 they only need to have a plan to address not buying
11 cattle from that farm.

12 And in California, this is primarily a culled
13 dairy cow issue and a veal calf issue. So what I'm
14 telling our producers in the dairy industry in
15 California, without traceability you guys may not have a
16 market for your cull animals. And I think that's a very
17 serious issue. So again, I'm not standing up here as a
18 state animal health official because this is out of my
19 jurisdiction.

20 We had our cattle industry together in
21 California about two weeks ago, and we had a plant
22 operator there who said exactly the same thing. USDA is
23 holding our feet to the fire on residue. And if we can't
24 raise those animals, we might not be able to buy your
25 cattle. So I think that's a real issue that the industry

1 needs to be aware of.

2 Some of the -- I'm going to skip a couple
3 here to save time. Just some of the recommendations and
4 examples that we -- that I just want to end with. You
5 know, clearly as I hope I've made the case that bovine TB
6 is a national problem, and we, as state animal health
7 officials, cannot eliminate -- not us, we never eliminate
8 anything. We work with you guys, with the industries to
9 eliminate these diseases. And I think it's a pretty big
10 priority for cattle right now.

11 Sideline, when we first started with TB,
12 20 -- well, I our started 20, 30 years ago, our
13 forefathers started almost 100 years ago, TB was -- you
14 know, we find the animal. We control it. You know, the
15 marketplace didn't have that big of a concern. I'll tell
16 you today in one state, I was aware of a milk
17 cooperative, when a herd was found to be positive for TB,
18 despite the fact that all the TB suspects are taken
19 immediately out of the milk stream, they would not buy
20 the milk from that dairy. And this is the marketplace
21 speaking. This isn't a regulatory official. This is a
22 buyer. This is a customer saying, I don't want your
23 product if you can't assure me it's safe.

24 And I think these are the kind of issues we
25 need to keep in perspective. So I really believe we've

1 got to get our arms around TB in this nation. We're
2 going the wrong way. And without traceability we're not
3 going to do that.

4 And I've mentioned the existing traceability
5 tools we have. I think in order to -- and I guess I
6 would ask us to look at traceability and prioritize the
7 needs of getting rid of the disease. And I think
8 starting with the high-risk animals, like breeding
9 cattle, imported cattle, these rodeo event cattle that
10 stay in the country for years and often expose our
11 breeding animals in different venues, I think we need to
12 get a better handle on those animals as well.

13 And then identify those high risk movements.
14 It's not just putting that tag in. I know that's the
15 book end approach, but some of these high risk animals,
16 we need to be able to record information on those animals
17 as they move through the system, whether it's moving from
18 the herd of origin at the time of vaccination, interstate
19 movement, if we test them for investigations, it's not
20 just the ID and the animal, we got to have the record and
21 be able to go back that record and retrieve that
22 information, or it's no good anyway.

23 And then as I tried to make the point,
24 collection of ID at slaughter. And I just jotted a
25 couple of things down. I wanted to make a point because

1 we've got a compatible lesion at slaughter we're tracing
2 right now in California. This just means that one of our
3 plants in California killed an adult cow that's got a
4 lesion, a lymph node that looks like it could be TB.

5 It's not been confirmed yet, but this animal,
6 unfortunately did not have any official ID at slaughter.
7 Came in with a back tag. It had a bangle tag, but it was
8 a lot of 30 animals from a dealer from six different sale
9 yards. Five sale yards in California. One in the state
10 of Washington. We've got 8 invoices with 14 potential
11 source herds representing 32,797 animals.

12 So because we don't have good ID on this
13 animal, we're going to have to now trace -- we're going
14 to have to put the burden on 14 herds to be tested and
15 spend a bunch of money testing over 32,000 animals. So I
16 mean, that's just a real case that's going on as we speak
17 today.

18 We talked about recordkeeping. I think those
19 of us in states know, and we really need support from
20 USDA, to create databases that we can search, we can find
21 information quickly. I know there's concern about
22 confidentiality. We need to address those concerns, but
23 we've got to be able to access that information.

24 As I've said, I think state vets agree we
25 need standards among states. I think, you know, we're in

1 a national, global economy today, and many of these
2 cattle are moving. And it's difficult when a guy sells
3 his cattle, at least in California, if they're feeder
4 cattle, he doesn't know if they're going to Nebraska,
5 Kansas, Texas, Colorado. He doesn't want to have to deal
6 with four systems. He wants to deal with one system.

7 And then I think over time we all need to
8 strive for more automation, such as electronic health
9 certificates, electronic databases. And, again, our job,
10 I think, as animal health officials, and I hope I've done
11 that today, is demonstrate to producers that we don't
12 need traceability just for traceability sake. We need it
13 to eliminate the diseases that you guys have hired us to
14 try to help you do.

15 So with that, I thank you for your time.
16 I'll be around probably till about 3:00 o'clock today, so
17 if there's anything I can do, be happy to chat with
18 folks, and thank USDA for a chance to spend a little time
19 with you.

20 DR. MYERS: Thank you, Dr. Breitmeyer. That
21 was an excellent presentation and really does put things
22 in perspective.

23 All right. Following that wonderful
24 introduction to the need and the utility of traceability,
25 what I would like to do is to talk about the new

1 traceability framework and how we're progressing with the
2 development of that.

3 Our meeting objectives today, first, as I
4 said, I'd like to review and clarify the new traceability
5 framework. After I've done that, then Dr. Brewer will
6 come up and talk about and summarize the March
7 traceability forum that we held with states and tribes,
8 and also to share some concepts of the traceability
9 performance standards that are being developed.

10 After her presentation, Deb indicated then
11 we'll be discussing and obtaining your feedback on those
12 performance standards and other issues.

13 As Dr. Breitmeyer mentioned, traceability
14 doesn't exist just for traceability sake. Whenever the
15 secretary announced the new framework for animal disease
16 traceability back on February 5th, he indicated that,
17 along with taking a new direction for traceability, we
18 needed to look at our other programs as well, and make
19 sure that we were doing everything we could to prevent
20 the entry of diseases into the U.S. and to successfully
21 respond to animal diseases. So we are continuing our
22 efforts in those areas, along with looking at a new
23 traceability framework.

24 Dr. Breitmeyer spoke quite a bit about
25 tuberculosis this morning. We do have out on the street

1 for review a concept paper on the tuberculosis program,
2 as well as the brucellosis program. So we are looking at
3 making changes and improvements to those programs, just
4 as a couple of examples. So, again, traceability is not
5 for traceability sake alone. It is in this larger
6 concept of how do we improve our ability to aid all of
7 you to control these economically important animal
8 diseases.

9 The framework that the secretary announced in
10 February has some very basic tenets. One is that it
11 needs to -- we need to implement a flexible and
12 coordinated approach, and we need to embrace the
13 strengths and expertise of states and tribal nations, one
14 of the things that we heard in the public -- or the
15 listening sessions that we had last year was the need to
16 really depend on the states and tribes for leadership in
17 the area of traceability.

18 Also the new framework will be supported with
19 federal funds and resources, and I'll talk about that a
20 little bit later in my presentation, and that the basis
21 of the framework needs to be developed around appropriate
22 standards. And, again, we are going to be talking about
23 what those standards could be as we go through our
24 discussions today.

25 So what I'd like to do with these next two

1 slides is to really capture the fundamentals of the
2 framework and the regulatory changes that are going to be
3 coming up. So if you got in late last night, you haven't
4 had your coffee yet, really, this slide and the next one
5 are the key ones that I'd like to you focus on.

6 First of all, the new traceability framework
7 from the federal standpoint will only apply to animals
8 moving interstate.

9 Second, we want to build upon what has been
10 successful. As Dr. Breitmeyer said, there are a lot of
11 traceability opportunities that have been used over the
12 years through our various disease control programs, like
13 brucellosis and scrapie. So we need to build on those
14 successes that are out there.

15 Our first priority right now is cattle, and
16 if you picked up from Dr. Breitmeyer's presentation, a
17 lot of the gaps that we're seeing and a lot of concerns
18 that we have are with cattle traceability.

19 So in doing this new framework, we do want to
20 get back to the basics, back to what is cost effective
21 identification. And so as one example, the
22 nine-character alphanumeric silver or bright tags is one
23 very cost effective mechanism for traceability that we
24 have available to us right now.

25 Dr. Clifford, our deputy administrator, is

1 fond of saying, we need to get tags in ears right now,
2 and so he's anxious to see us move forward and really
3 improve our ability to trace cattle. And not only to get
4 tags in ears, but also to record the distribution of
5 those tags so that they are -- so that they are
6 traceable.

7 Another fundamental of the new framework is
8 that we expect to see progress over time. We're not
9 going to accomplish everything right away. We're not
10 going to have a Cadillac program immediately, but we will
11 attempt to start with getting back to the basics and then
12 progressing over time. And then finally, we do need to
13 allow for advanced technology. Even though we are
14 getting back to the basics, taking that cost effective
15 approach, there are a lot of folks who have invested in
16 RFID technology, and we want to make sure that continues
17 to be available and included as part of the new
18 framework.

19 So in order to establish this new framework,
20 we do need to develop regulations, and that's where we
21 are right now, working on the development of those -- of
22 those new regulations.

23 We plan to publish a new animal disease
24 traceability section in the 9CFR, and, again, this will,
25 from the federal side, apply to only animals moving

1 interstate.

2 We intend, as we develop the rule, to
3 consolidate the ID regulations, the identification
4 regulations that are already in place for disease
5 programs into a new traceability section. And I want to
6 stress that those rules that are already in place for
7 disease specific rules will continue to be in effect.
8 This rule will not displace those or supersede them.

9 There's other regulations that we need to
10 look at as well. Section 71 of 9CFR is a general
11 provision section for interstate movement, and so there
12 are some provisions in there, 7118, which deals with the
13 movement of cattle, and 7119 which deals with the
14 movement of swine. We are going to need to review those
15 sections and fold those into the new traceability section
16 that we're working on.

17 We do, as we're developing this real need to
18 define traceability performance standards. And that
19 really is the heart and soul of the new regulation, and
20 that's going to be a large chunk of what we talk about
21 here today.

22 So what is a performance standard? That's
23 what Dr. Brewer is going to be talking about in her
24 presentation. But just a very simple definition of a
25 performance standard is it's a rule that's based on

1 measuring a desired outcome rather than a prescriptive
2 role that prescribes or defines the methods for getting
3 something done. So it will define what needs to be
4 accomplished in traceability without telling you exactly
5 what type of ear tag to use or that sort of thing.

6 So, again, when we get to Dr. Brewer's
7 presentation, she's going to be going into performance
8 standards in much more detail, defining what those are.
9 But for the purposes of my talk, I want you to be aware
10 that those performance standards really are the crux of
11 the new rule.

12 And then finally, again, we will require
13 official identification for animals moving interstate.
14 However, there will be options for the various methods
15 for identification. And, again, you know, rather than
16 identifying one specific type of identification.

17 USDA is making a number of commitments to
18 make sure that this new framework succeeds. First of
19 all, we do want to capitalize on the progress that has
20 been made earlier. We don't want to throw away
21 absolutely every accomplishment that we've had. We do
22 need, of course, to change direction a bit, but we
23 recognize that a lot of folks in industries and a lot of
24 producers have spent a lot of money developing their
25 traceability capabilities, and we don't want to discount

1 that. So we do want to capitalize on the progress that
2 we've made to date.

3 And as one example of that, we've put a lot
4 of investment into information systems, and so we want to
5 continue to be able to provide those information
6 technology systems to states and tribes, and so we will
7 commit to continue to do that.

8 Along with that, we will support the
9 development and publication of data standards and
10 guidelines to support those information technology
11 systems. And also we are strongly committed to
12 collaborating with states, tribes, industries, producers,
13 in order to make this effective, and this meeting today
14 is one example of that.

15 There are some specific steps that we've
16 taken, though. I've mentioned already the state and
17 tribal, federal working group that is underway right now
18 and is looking at performance standards. That's one
19 group that we have formed.

20 We will also need to form an additional
21 working group to look at some of the IT and other issues,
22 and also we are in the process of restructuring the
23 Secretary's Animal Health Advisory Committee. This used
24 to be called the Secretary's Committee on Foreign Animal
25 and Poultry Diseases. That committee has been renamed

1 and restructured the Secretary's Animal Health Advisory
2 Committee so that it has a broader purpose than just for
3 foreign animal diseases.

4 And one of the subcommittees that we would
5 like to form under this new Secretary's advisory
6 committee will focus on traceability, and we hope to have
7 that committee up and running late summer or early fall,
8 and we'll look to that group to help us with looking at
9 the traceability regulation as it's being developed.

10 And then finally, we are committed to helping
11 fund the traceability efforts, and I will talk a little
12 bit about the funding in another slide here in a few
13 minutes. But the secretary has committed that this will
14 not be an unfunded mandate.

15 I just wanted to take one slide to talk a
16 little bit about the veterinarian services 2015
17 Initiative because this new approach to traceability fits
18 in with where our agency is headed as it develops its
19 mission and purpose for the coming years. The 2015
20 Initiative is our latest strategic effort in looking at
21 the future and deciding how our organization needs to be
22 positioned in order to deal with the challenges that we
23 see coming down the road for animal health. And so we
24 need to identify and meet the needs of those challenges.

25 Some of the driving forces that we see as

1 being important in the coming years, there are a lot of
2 changes that have occurred in the animal agriculture
3 industry, the way it's consolidated over the last 20,
4 30 years, and will continue to do so. New technologies
5 come along, not only in production, but also in the
6 ability to do diagnostic testing.

7 There are emerging diseases that are always
8 presenting new challenges. Food safety and the growing
9 expectation that there is a farm-to-fork approach to food
10 safety is going to be a challenge that will need to be
11 addressed in the coming years.

12 Expansion of international trade. That grows
13 every year. And budgetary challenges. At best our
14 budgets are flatlined, and at worse they continue to
15 shrink on the federal and also on the state side. So we
16 need to deal with that reality as well.

17 So traceability fits into helping us deal
18 with diseases as well as all of those other challenges,
19 and veterinarian services is committed to meeting those
20 challenges and to being recognized as the national
21 veterinarian authority of the U.S.

22 But we can't do any of that alone. We really
23 need to strengthen our partners and enhance our
24 collaboration with all of you in order to accomplish
25 that.

1 So with that collaboration in mind, how do we
2 move forward with traceability? There are some areas
3 that I wanted to highlight here in that collaborative
4 approach in order to achieve basic and effective national
5 traceability.

6 This new framework can't overly burden
7 producers. As I've mentioned already, it will apply to
8 only animals moving interstate, and we really need it to
9 be led and administered by states and tribal nations. We
10 need to make sure the traceability data is observed and
11 maintained at the discretion of the states and the
12 tribes, and we are, as I said earlier, encouraging the
13 use of lower cost technology.

14 Financial support. As I mentioned, we don't
15 want this to be an unfunded mandate, which means that we
16 need to continue to garner Congressional support for
17 traceability. And, as I mentioned, as we're developing
18 performance standards, our traceability efforts need to
19 be outcome based. We need to be able to show that we do
20 have the capability of tracing animals in that disease
21 control kind of context.

22 So the measure of success is not going to be
23 how many premises get registered. The measure of success
24 needs to be are we effectively tracing animals in a
25 disease situation. And, again, that goes back to

1 developing effective performance standards. And, again,
2 we'll discuss that further today.

3 These measures need to be realistic, but they
4 do need to be effective if we are going to continue to
5 see that congressional support for the cost of this
6 program.

7 During the fiscal year, fiscal year 2010,
8 with the funds we have currently available with our
9 carryover funds, we have approximately 14 million dollars
10 available this year. And the FY 2011 President's budget
11 proposes a similar amount. And then, again, our ability
12 to get additional funds in coming years is really going
13 to depend on our collective success with this program.

14 The rule that's being developed, we really
15 are looking at the traceability regulation working group
16 to assist us with this. So as a means of introducing
17 Becky's presentation, the objective of that working group
18 is to draft the framework of a rule whereby states and
19 tribes will be responsible for their animal disease
20 traceability programs, and where compliance to
21 traceability program standards directs interstate
22 movement of livestock from the geographic area each state
23 or tribe is responsible for.

24 So that's the objective of the group that
25 Becky's going to be talking about here shortly. Here are

1 the members of that group. I won't read them to you.
2 We're really glad that Becky is here representing them
3 today. But you can see that it does have a variety of
4 state and tribal representatives.

5 And the responsibilities of that group,
6 again, are to provide input to USDA on those traceability
7 performance standards, but also to help us develop
8 protocols for evaluating tracing capability, and to help
9 us identify compliance factors.

10 And, again, as I mentioned at the beginning
11 of today's talk, today is all about collaboration. And
12 so we are looking to all of you for input on this
13 process. We plan to continue communicating with you and
14 to providing updates on the progress of the development
15 of the regulations. We have a web site. We're holding
16 this public meeting and another one this week and another
17 one next week. There'll be further industry and producer
18 meetings. We'll be getting information out and
19 interacting with our state and tribal counterparts.

20 Once we get to the point where we actually
21 have some regulatory language that we feel is going to be
22 workable, we will be sharing the content of that language
23 with the public before we publish a proposed rule. So
24 everyone will get a chance to take a look at that before
25 the proposed rule comes out next winter.

1 We're also drafting what we're calling for
2 discussion traceability performance standards, and I
3 believe a copy of that is in your packet today, and,
4 again, Becky will be describing those in a few months.
5 Here's the web site that I mentioned. Please go on there
6 and provide any comments that you might have. And,
7 again, this is in your handout, so you won't need to jot
8 it down.

9 The notice that came out with this public
10 meeting indicates if you couldn't attend or even if you
11 didn't attend, we will accept written statements through
12 the end of the month. So after you leave today, you have
13 additional thoughts, there's an avenue to get that to us.

14 States and tribes are holding discussions
15 within their local jurisdictions, and with the industries
16 within their states and tribes. So you do have that
17 opportunity to provide feedback through your state or
18 tribe to us as well, if that's another avenue you would
19 like to use.

20 We will also be continuing with collecting
21 information through tribal consultation and various
22 national industry organizations and groups. So we are
23 really trying to gather as much of your thoughts and
24 inputs during this regulatory drafting process as we can.

25 Finally, our general timeline is to publish a

1 proposed rule by next winter. And once that proposed
2 rule is published, it will carry with it a 90-day comment
3 period. And then once we receive and analyze all of
4 those comments, we hope to publish a final rule within
5 8 to 10 months after the close of that comment period.

6 We recognize, as I mentioned earlier, that we
7 want to start with the basics and then progress over
8 time. So some of the requirements in the rule may be
9 phased in over time. And that will be part of -- or some
10 of the feedback that we hope to hear from you today.
11 What's doable now? What's doable in the future? So do
12 watch closely for that regulatory language to come out
13 and provide your input.

14 And with that, I want to thank you for your
15 attention. I hope that provides a general overview of
16 where we are now and where we're headed. And, again, I
17 talked a lot about performance standards really being the
18 crux of the new framework and the new regulation, so
19 that's my opportunity to introduce Dr. Brewer, who's
20 going to talk about the work of the group that's been
21 looking at those standards. Becky.

22 (Applause).

23 DR. BREWER: Good morning. I want to thank
24 you all for coming. My report is on the working group,
25 and I would say that the working group really has a

1 primary focus which are performance standards. We have
2 talked about a lot of things besides performance
3 standards, and the group is made up of a group of state
4 veterinarians and quite a few animal health officials
5 from USDA and some other representatives. A lot of
6 tribal members. Do we have any tribes here represented
7 today?

8 One of the things that we have to do in,
9 especially in our western states, but in many states is
10 look at tribal entities and what their concerns are.
11 Some tribal entities have a very strong infrastructure
12 for animal agriculture within their tribes and their
13 lands and others do not. So I will probably not touch on
14 that too much today since we don't have any tribal
15 representatives here.

16 One of the things that I had a little -- I
17 struggled with when I first came into regulatory animal
18 health from private practice was measurable outcomes.

19 If one is to receive a cooperative agreement
20 or a grant, one must have measurable outcomes that you
21 can document what is your progress. And at first I
22 thought, you know, in private practice, in the real
23 world, we don't have measurable outcomes. I don't know
24 how to categorize that sort of thing.

25 But actually I have learned we all do have

1 measurable outcomes. And so looking at these performance
2 standards and comparing them to some of the measurable
3 outcomes that we have, just in our own everyday way of
4 doing business, might help us to understand where we need
5 to go.

6 For me a measurable outcome was did the cow
7 and calf both walk out of my chute and my pens on their
8 feet alive and well to go on and reproduce again.
9 Another one might be, did my client pay me in a timely
10 manner. But we all live by measurable outcomes.

11 I think one of the problems that we had with
12 the old system that we were looking at, it wasn't do we
13 need traceability. There's not a regulatory animal
14 health person in here that doesn't know we need
15 traceability. There's probably not a one of you in the
16 producer realm out there that doesn't realize we need
17 traceability. When the 2001 foot and mouth disease
18 outbreak in Great Britain cost 19 billion dollars, and
19 the 2007 FMD outbreak in Great Britain cost 200 million
20 dollars.

21 The difference was traceability, stop animal
22 movement, the ability to confine and contain disease.
23 It's real obvious the difference between 19 billion and
24 200 million is incredible. We have a need to trace
25 disease. We have a need to find it, localize it, close

1 it off from the rest of our industry, and eradicate it so
2 that we can go on doing business.

3 And that's why we're here. We wouldn't, any
4 of us, be here if it weren't for the fact that we want
5 industry to be able to function, to grow, to thrive, and
6 continue to feed this nation and continue to feed the
7 world.

8 So when we had benchmarks before, those
9 benchmarks probably weren't a realistic measure of where
10 are we going and how are we performing. A benchmark.
11 How many premises are registered? What does that mean?

12 So we've tried very hard for our performance
13 measures coming out of this working group to be something
14 that's real, that's attainable and will tell us how we're
15 doing in our ability to trace livestock. That wasn't
16 Oklahoma. We have some mountains, but we don't have them
17 that look quite that good.

18 Basically we've been now given the
19 responsibility, as a state and a tribe, to develop a
20 protocol for traceability that's going to work for our
21 industry and for our states.

22 Interstate movement is the focus in this
23 particular program. And one of the things that was a
24 little bit hard for the working group to grapple with is
25 where does interstate movement fit in to what we do every

1 day within our state, because we may trace something
2 that's within our state, that that animal never moves
3 across the state line, and, therefore, it does not fit
4 into this program, and, yet, it's still something that we
5 have to do. Originally we came up with, I would say,
6 maybe 25 performance standards. And we had to weed those
7 out to what are those performance standards that really
8 do pertain to interstate movement.

9 The rest of them we looked at, and they're
10 incredible building blocks for the ability we have within
11 our state to be able to have the framework to be able to
12 trace animals so that we can then meet those requirements
13 for interstate traceability.

14 Our job was designed -- was given to us as
15 the task of having input into the proposed rule,
16 performance standards, how do we evaluate those
17 performance standards. One that none of us likes are
18 consequences for noncompliance. You know, there's two
19 different kinds of consequences for noncompliance. Those
20 that this group and USDA comes up with that will affect
21 our states and how we do business, and those that are
22 similar to the consequences of a disease outbreak,
23 whereby we cannot trace those animals and we cannot
24 confine and eradicate disease in a timely manner. And
25 then some incentives for compliance.

1 Basically slide number 4, just has four
2 points on it, but the papers they gave me, I have a whole
3 page to you read to you about page 4.

4 Compliance measures a result and outcome, a
5 means to achieve that result and outcome. How do we
6 evaluate those equally, not only across what the outcomes
7 are in states, but across species. And they need to
8 focus on tracing animals. Yes, it is a disease issue.
9 Yes, we need to apply it to disease issues, but the focus
10 is on tracing animals.

11 So you have a measurable activity. And we
12 need to identify what those activities are, what that
13 measurement is, and that equals a performance standard.

14 For example, trace an animal to the state or
15 tribe in which it was identified. By identified, I mean
16 a tag put in a ear, a microchip put in a horse. You
17 know, a lot number assigned to a group of swine or a
18 group of cattle moving within the same little group.

19 So an example would be, 95 percent of the
20 time that we're asked to do that trace, we can do that
21 trace within 7 days. There's been a lot of discussion
22 about what is that percentage. And I will tell you from
23 my point of view what that percentage is. I think there
24 might be some disagreement out there with the
25 statisticians, but to me, if you give me 100 traces, I

1 can do 95 of those traces in 7 days.

2 If you give me 10, I can do 9 of them in 7
3 days. I mean, it's basically what are you looking at?
4 How many times do you have to go do this activity, and of
5 the times you do that activity, what percentage of those
6 can you get done in the allotted time that's been listed.

7 We have to determine what activities are
8 measured. Those are the performance standards. Those
9 are the ones I told you we came up with like 25. And
10 ultimately honed it down to four. Four that are
11 realistic and four that make a difference.

12 So for this particular time, let's just say a
13 shipment originated in Oklahoma, and it went to another
14 state. And that state then has to trace an animal that
15 was in that shipment. Where was that animal ID'ed. How
16 do we do that? If we have our bangle tags -- I mean, if
17 we have pass tags, our bright tags, we're going to read
18 and it's going to say 73BB1257. Well, that's an Oklahoma
19 cow. That cow was somewhere in a market in Oklahoma,
20 somewhere by a veterinarian in Oklahoma, who either did a
21 brucellosis test or a brucellosis vaccination, or it was
22 tested for TB and it was tagged. So that should be
23 something that's pretty quick and easily done.

24 If it's a 940 -- if it's an 840 tag, if it's
25 an ID that's electronic, then we have to take that number

1 and we have to query a system. How long does it take to
2 query that system and find the state in which that animal
3 was identified. How long does it take to do it? How
4 many working hours are needed?

5 Let me give you a little example of something
6 that happened in Oklahoma. Right after we received our
7 cooperative agreement outline -- guidelines, I read
8 through it, and I realized that what's happening really
9 is the onus is now going to be put on the states. The
10 states are going to be the ones required to come up with
11 how do we keep the data, how do we respond to the
12 requests, how do we have give the answers back to those
13 states which inquire of us, for information from us.

14 You know, that's not a bad thing. It's what
15 you, industry, asked for when you came to the listening
16 sessions. It's what many states want to do anyway is
17 hold that data within a state. We feel like maybe our
18 state industry members are more comfortable with it being
19 held at a Board of Animal Health or at a Department of
20 Agriculture. But we have to be able to get to it.

21 Some states are using the national program,
22 and they need to continue if that's what they chose to
23 do. In our state we have a lot of folks in PVPs and
24 QSAs. We need to maintain that national data so that
25 they can continue to be involved in these value-added

1 programs. However, how long does it take and how many
2 work hours do we need to get to it.

3 I got a call right after I got my cooperative
4 agreement instructions, and it was from Nebraska, and
5 they had a 73 tag, an Oklahoma animal that was in an
6 exposed herd. And I thought, well, this is a perfect
7 example to find out how long it takes us to get this done
8 and I started a stopwatch. How long is it going to take
9 me to find out where that animal was tagged. And it was
10 an easy one. You know, I could go right to a paper file,
11 went to a brucellosis -- first of all, called our little
12 lab who sends out those tags, found out what veterinarian
13 was issued that tag. Went to a file under that
14 veterinarian's name, and was able to pull a paper where
15 that animal was brucellosis vaccinated. And could tell
16 the animal health official with -- it took me about an
17 hour and 45 minutes, because the lab folks upstairs that
18 had the data were at lunch. An hour and 45 minutes to
19 call the Nebraska official back and say, this animal was
20 vaccinated by this veterinarian. It came from this farm.
21 This was the owner.

22 Now, that's the perfect deal. If that works
23 every time, the paper-based system works, and it works
24 efficiently.

25 But we had another incident where we traced a

1 TB animal back into a state herd that was the herd of
2 birth for that animal prior to going to an adjacent
3 state, which had a heavily infected TB herd. We actually
4 had two of those. First one we traced easily, just like
5 the Nebraska request. The other one we never found the
6 herd of origin. We narrowed it down to four diaries.
7 Four diaries that it could have been. So instead of
8 testing one dairy, we tested four.

9 So I think Rich mentioned those kinds of
10 problems that they've had with TB. But that's the kind
11 of performance measures we need to look at.

12 Where are we today. I just gave you a little
13 scenario about how in Oklahoma we're trying to discover
14 where we are today in our ability to trace animals.
15 We've got to establish a standard value for each
16 activity. It's got to be meaningful. It's got to be
17 achievable.

18 Routine tracing of suspect and reactor
19 animals. We can have test exercises. USDA can go pull
20 some numbers out of the systems, whether they're off of
21 ICVIs, vaccination records, any calfhood test charts, and
22 just give us a number within the state and see how long
23 and if we can actually trace that animal.

24 What are the consequences? You know, this is
25 a big question, and it's a big question for you as

1 producers and us for states. What are those consequences
2 going to be. And even though we've touched a little bit
3 on those consequences, as we've talked in our working
4 group, I think we're going to need some input from this
5 group and from other groups like this group about what
6 they need to be. Incentives for compliance. Don't need
7 to be too heavy handed. Think in terms of non-consistent
8 and consistent status in the scrapie program. That may
9 be the way that we need to go. Scrapie's a model that's
10 out there that's worked pretty well. It's pretty simple,
11 pretty low cost, pretty low tech. So those are some
12 things we need to think about.

13 I think this just sort of repeats what we've
14 discussed. This was the discussion, key points out of
15 our discussion, where are we, how do we get where we want
16 to be, and what are those appropriate standards going to
17 be discussed.

18 We all sort of have a way of doing business
19 now. Every producer in every state does. And they're
20 all a little bit different. And so we have to look at
21 those differences and see how they fit into this system.
22 Some states actually don't require a CVI for animals
23 moving across the state line. Some states don't require
24 individual ID for specific classes of livestock. Some
25 livestock move on lot and group IDs, if you look at the

1 swine industry, and you look at the poultry industry. So
2 we have to take those kinds of things into consideration
3 as we come up with compliance issues and as we come up
4 with these standard measurements.

5 Also one of the things we've discussed is how
6 do we get the information out to you. I think there was
7 some misinformation that came out of the Kansas City
8 meetings that we were so -- I was very pleased about that
9 meeting and who all came to that meeting. John Clifford
10 came and stayed the whole time. You know, look at a
11 these guys. They got on black suits. See, they all wear
12 their little black suits. And you know the USDA people
13 because they got on black suits. John Clifford had on
14 jeans and he had on a shirt, and he took his jacket off,
15 he took his tie off, and he rolled up his sleeves, and he
16 worked with that group for two solid days. He stood at
17 the microphone. He listened to what you had to say. He
18 even a came up with a couple pretty good ideas on his
19 own.

20 How do we, as animal health officials, trace
21 animals in disease issues today. We want to know where
22 was it officially identified. From where was it shipped?
23 Okay. I get an animal in Oklahoma, and I call Nebraska
24 that's got a Nebraska tag, I know where the tag was put
25 in, but I don't know where it was shipped. What data do

1 use? What information do we use? Certificates of
2 veterinarian inspection. Permits. Those kinds of
3 documents. If a group of feeders comes into Oklahoma on
4 a bill of lading or a bill of sale, which they can, I
5 don't have any way. There's no way. I have no
6 documentation in my office to be able to trace where
7 those animals came from.

8 So trace to where it came from. What's its
9 herd of origin. Then you have to find all of the animals
10 that have been involved with that animal commingling,
11 because those are possibly exposed. Certainly need to be
12 looked at. Trace movements into and out of affected
13 herds. Identify adjacents. For specific diseases you
14 have to look at adjacent herds.

15 When we did our TB investigation in the
16 panhandle, the ranch that had TB was 30,000 acres. They
17 had 15 adjacents, each with a very similar land mass. So
18 that was a county. You got to go test the whole county.
19 Then notifying the state and tribe of origin of those
20 animals' movements.

21 Basically these activities provide the basis
22 for interstate movement, traceability standards. Our
23 current capabilities are inadequate. They're fragmented.
24 They're in a variety of locations. They're in paper
25 files. They're in boxes. They're in boxes in buildings

1 that aren't even in some of our buildings because we
2 don't have the room to keep them for periods of time.
3 They're in boxes at livestock markets. 454's. We may
4 have to go to markets to look at 454's.

5 Some states have been proactive and have put
6 in some pretty good electronic abilities to capture data.
7 Where we need to focus now with this new opportunity --
8 and we must look at it as an opportunity -- is to get
9 this data in places that is easily accessible. So we
10 have to establish a baseline. Our 2010 cooperative
11 agreements are requiring us to do that. Set up how long
12 does it take us to actually conduct certain number of
13 activities. And then APHIS will evaluate those
14 capabilities and help us to establish a baseline.

15 Now, don't have a coronary when you read this
16 slide. Let me get all the way through the next two
17 slides.

18 All livestock moving interstate must be --
19 and remember "all" doesn't necessarily mean "all" in
20 government work. So let's get through the slide.

21 All animals must be officially identified.
22 That would be a gift from God if every animal had an
23 official ID that was traceable to the place that it was
24 identified. All animals in interstate commerce must be
25 accompanied by an interstate certificate of veterinarian

1 inspection. Health certificate is kind of what our
2 producers know it as, or a movement permit, and there's
3 the all. It's the exemptions are to be defined, because
4 we all have some exemptions. And we need to kind of look
5 at those.

6 So what are exemptions for official ID, and
7 what are exemptions for a certificate of veterinarian
8 inspection.

9 Feeders. That's the one people get up in
10 arms the quickest about. Do feeders need to be
11 officially identified? I have one veterinarian in Texas
12 who ships 50 pods to Oklahoma to go on grass and wheat.
13 50 pods. Well, he doesn't want to individually ID those
14 animals on those 50 pods. He doesn't even want to write
15 a health certificate for those animals on the 50 pods.
16 But we have a gentleman's agreement that he will write a
17 health certificate. He will tell me how many animals in
18 the entire shipment. He will tell me how many pods are
19 coming into Oklahoma, and what time period they're coming
20 and what their destination is?

21 States are going to require and do require
22 today that those 50 pods, every animal on that load, must
23 have an official ID. There are many states that require
24 that today.

25 John Clifford had a great idea standing in

1 front of that meeting in Kansas City that what if we
2 required those animals to have an official ID, and the
3 veterinarian writing the ICVI merely had to look at them
4 in the pens and say, yes, they have official ID. At
5 least the book-in system would be begun. We would be
6 able -- if one of those animals gets railed out of the
7 feedlot and goes to Booker and has TB lesions, at least
8 we can go back to the origin of that animal having an ID
9 put in its ear, because that happens on a regular basis.
10 Railers end up frequently being TB cattle.

11 So feeder animals. What about types of
12 movement that might preclude you from having an ICVI.
13 Routine movements within production systems, so you're
14 looking at the swine industry. You're looking the
15 poultry industry. But maybe you're also looking at a
16 cattle industry.

17 If you have a group of cattle that's staying
18 in a specific group or lot, and you're moving from Texas
19 to grass in Oklahoma to a feedlot in the Oklahoma
20 Panhandle and to a slaughter facility in Nebraska, and
21 those cattle are not commingled until they get to the
22 feedlot, that could be -- those cattle could move by
23 group or lot number. Remember the key here is
24 commingling. We sure don't want those branded cattle
25 mixing with our dairy heifer replacement cows.

1 What about movements directly to slaughter?
2 We need input from this group on what those exceptions
3 need to be both to ID and to ICVIs. Because it may be
4 that we definitely want to move toward a system where
5 everything has an ID, but we got to do it in incremental
6 bits and pieces because if it doesn't work for you, the
7 industry, it isn't going to work for us as animal health
8 officials. Because truly what is our mission? Our
9 mission is to make sure you can do business, you can do
10 business and make as much money as possible that you can
11 in whatever endeavor you chose to be involved.

12 Consistent status, states and tribes have
13 traceability plans that are consistent with interstate
14 traceability performance standards. What are those kind
15 of requirements going to be? We do need to have -- one
16 of the discussions -- we had a meeting here a week ago, a
17 two-day working group meeting. And one of the things we
18 struggled with, do performance need to be -- and status
19 need to be different for species?

20 And basically I think we're going to try to
21 keep our performance standards the same. There may be
22 phased in and out, that might not be the same for
23 different species, but there needs to be a separate
24 status for species. If you've got a species in your
25 state that for some reason just isn't on board, you don't

1 need to penalize the swine industry or the poultry
2 industry if they're on board.

3 The name of the status has been batted
4 around, consistent, non-consistent, as the scrapie
5 program, but, again, we don't really have a name for that
6 at this time.

7 The bottom one kind of gives you a cold pit
8 in your stomach. If you're not consistent, you're going
9 to be on a list to where producers can go and look and
10 say, hum, you know, may not want to go to Oklahoma or
11 take animals from Oklahoma.

12 So we came up, I think I told you, with four
13 performance standards. So I'm want to go through those
14 four performance standards with you, and each of these is
15 directly tied to interstate movement.

16 A receiving state is able to contact the
17 state in which the animal was officially identified.
18 That means where was the tag put in the ear. If it's a
19 cow, if it's a horse, where was the microchip put in.
20 Don't get upset, you horse people, we're not talking
21 about microchipping horses as the key here. Or where was
22 the group lot put together, if it was swine or if it was
23 poultry.

24 We feel like right now, chances are, we need
25 to aim for 95 percent of the time in the one business

1 day. Go back to my example for Nebraska. The
2 performance standard is on Nebraska's shoulders here.
3 How long is it going to take Nebraska to tell me,
4 Oklahoma, that animal was IDed in Oklahoma. So Nebraska
5 called me. I don't know how long it took him to go down
6 that list and see he had a 73 bright tag and call
7 Oklahoma. But that shouldn't really take very long, if
8 you can identify -- the bright tags really good for that
9 because you've got 73. If you've got an electronic tag,
10 that state making that call is going to have to go to an
11 electronic database somewhere.

12 Here's performance standard 2. The state in
13 which the animal was officially identified -- so now that
14 becomes me, because Nebraska has called me and told me
15 they've got a 73. The state in which the animal was
16 officially identified is able to find the traceability
17 unit in which that animal was IDed.

18 Now, traceability unit. I mean, that's
19 probably a word -- what does that mean? It means the
20 herd. However, for your state, you may have to look at
21 what do we want to call a traceability unit. Is it the
22 state? I can tell you right now, if it's the state of
23 Oklahoma, check the box, because it was 73 tagged. Is it
24 the county? Is it the township? Is it the herd? Is it
25 the production system. Those are things that we need to

1 look at and talk about. For me, in animal health, I want
2 it to be the herd where that animal was IDed.

3 So we have two phases, because chances are
4 it's going to take us a while to get us to where we need
5 to be. This one might be a little bit more difficult. I
6 was lucky that day. I was unlucky with the TB traces out
7 of the dairy of the adjacent state.

8 So phase 1 would be 75 percent of the time
9 within 5 days. So if you call me on 100 cases, 75 of
10 those cases I can find in five days is the simplest way
11 to think in terms of what is 75 percent.

12 Phase 2, you know, at some point out, as we
13 build our capability, as we build our IT systems and our
14 ability to query data, 95 percent of the time within 2
15 business days. That's our goal is to get to this higher
16 level of traceability.

17 Okay. Number 3, a receiving state is able to
18 contact the state from which the animal was shipped. So
19 now we don't really have the book-ins. We don't have
20 where did it end up, where was it tagged originally or
21 identified. This is in the middle. So we have to know
22 from where was it shipped. So Nebraska knows it's an
23 Oklahoma animal, but Nebraska from that cannot tell you
24 who shipped that animal into the state, because it might
25 have come from Oklahoma, but it might have come from

1 49 -- 48 other states.

2 So phase 1, 95 percent of the time within 7
3 business days.

4 Phase 2, 95 percent of the time within 3
5 business days. This is going to take a little bit
6 longer.

7 Now, when we have electronic CVIs, one of the
8 funds that we have given us for our cooperative agreement
9 today in Oklahoma is to take CVIs and to input the
10 individual ID on those CVIs and associate with them with
11 that event. At the end of a year for something that came
12 into Oklahoma in the year 2010, I'm going to nail that
13 first one, but that's going to be a building process.

14 And then the last of our performance measures
15 from a state: The state from which the animal was
16 shipped, able to identify the location from which that
17 animal was shipped.

18 Phase 2, 75 percent of the time within
19 5 days -- Phase 1. Phase 2, 95 percent of the time
20 within 2 business days.

21 This is a little scenario to kind of help go
22 through it. I may have to have my cheat sheet for this
23 one, just to kind of -- this goes back over those
24 performance measures, what they are, and whose obligation
25 it is to get the information.

1 So here we've got a movement where we want to
2 consider a case where an animal was officially identified
3 in the great state of Iowa. Dave Schmidt doing a great
4 job with his producers there, and it was officially
5 identified in Iowa.

6 That animal was shipped from Iowa to
7 Nebraska. Subsequently it was shipped from Nebraska to
8 Kansas, and then, Chuck, you get it in Missouri. And
9 animal was shipped in from Kansas to Missouri.

10 So even though there are several movements
11 involved in this scenario, the initial performance
12 standard activity involves the book-in, and that's where
13 was it identified, and where did it interstate movement
14 prior to entry to the last or current state or tribe.

15 In this case, Missouri is expected to conduct
16 performance activity number 1, which is to notify the
17 state of Iowa that the animal was officially identified
18 there. So, oh, reference animal Missouri, sorry. So
19 Missouri contacts Iowa. That's the first activity.
20 Chuck's got the easiest job. He calls Dave on the phone.
21 He says, give me some information.

22 The second thing that happens is Iowa finds
23 out where that animal was identified. So that is your
24 second performance activity that Iowa identifies the
25 traceability in which that animal was IDed.

1 So think back to my Nebraska scenario for our
2 case. Nebraska called me. So Nebraska took care of that
3 particular activity by calling me and notifying me.

4 Next thing that happens is Missouri contacts
5 Kansas. So that's performance standard and activity
6 No. 3. Missouri notifies Kansas.

7 And 4, Kansas finds out where that animal was
8 shipped. So from what location in Kansas was that animal
9 shipped.

10 We do this every day in states. It takes a
11 lot of our manhours, a lot of our woman hours, our
12 administrative assistants. It's something that happens
13 every day, because we trace disease reactors. We trace
14 disease suspects. We trace animals that come out of
15 Rich's infected dairy. Rich traces things that come at
16 of Oklahoma.

17 So in an actual animal disease event, the EPI
18 investigation would trace animals involved to and from
19 all states. So it becomes a really big, big project. So
20 now what we have to come up with is a way to evaluate
21 compliance and how long is it going to take us to achieve
22 each step.

23 And the shorter time that we can do this,
24 remember the difference, 2001, 2007, 19 billion, a ten to
25 the ninth, 200 million, ten to the sixth. That's a huge

1 difference in money. The only thing that cost the UK
2 greater financially in the history of the United Kingdom
3 than the 2001 foot and mouth disease outbreak was
4 World War II. There were 60 suicides involved in the
5 2001 outbreak. What's the difference in the outbreak in
6 2001 and the outbreak in 2007? Mandatory animal ID. The
7 ability to immediately stop movement. That was the
8 difference.

9 So UK's the size of the State of Oregon.
10 This is the United States. We will face a disease that
11 will affect our industries, whether it's classical swine
12 fever, whether it's foot and mouth disease. Shoot. We
13 don't know. It may be something we're not even aware of
14 what that is. But I guarantee you, it will happen. So
15 let's prepare. Let's get ready. Let's throw off all of
16 our negative feelings about what's happened to date.
17 Let's get in the trenches. Let's make a plan that works
18 for all of us, and the entire nation and your state and
19 your industry will be better for it. Thank you very
20 much.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, Dr. Brewer, and,
23 Dr. Breitmeyer, and, Dr. Myers. For our next session,
24 which will occur following a break, we're going to do
25 some work around the tables, and we want to evaluate some

1 questions at each table.

2 We're going to be looking at these
3 traceability performance standards. As Dr. Brewer
4 mentioned, there's things that we need to talk about or
5 think about. That's what this session will be about.
6 You know, we also need to figure out how we can evaluate
7 that tracing capabilities because after the rule or
8 regulation is put into place, we are going to have to be
9 able to evaluate that we're being successful in our
10 capabilities to trace, and then there may be some other
11 concerns that you all have.

12 And we want to invite you to list those
13 questions. So my colleagues are passing around a paper
14 that looks something like this. And what we'd like you
15 to do is take a few minutes, just before you go to break
16 or just when you get back, and write down what those
17 concerns are, any questions that you've had.

18 You've all listened very politely this
19 morning, and you've not had an opportunity to ask
20 questions. Concerns that you have about any of these
21 issues. Remember we will be speaking specifically at the
22 tables around traceability performance standards as well
23 as our ability to evaluate those tracing capabilities.
24 So any other questions that you might have, please take
25 an opportunity to write those down because in our third

1 there's going to be a lot of lively discussion at each of
2 our tables today, so we'll ask you to collect around
3 tables related to the species that you're interested in
4 discussing.

5 And I just wanted to mention a couple
6 particulars about how this will work today. You may have
7 noticed that we have a court reporter who is gathering
8 all the information that we're hearing in the
9 presentations, and after a while, after each group has an
10 opportunity to discuss these issues, we'll have a report
11 out from each group, and she'll be able to capture that
12 as well. So when we do the report-outs following these
13 sessions, we'll ask you to speak into the microphone so
14 we can make sure we're heard. And then as each of you
15 are gathered around the table, we'll ask the USDA person
16 who's there if they can identify themselves, because
17 they'll be one of your table moderators.

18 Now, before the break we asked you to
19 complete or fill in any questions that may have arisen
20 for you during the course of the morning or during the
21 presentations, and we'll ask you to keep those with your
22 table moderator for now.

23 Now, we know that while you have some of
24 these discussions on the topics today, that more
25 questions may arise, so we'll ask your table moderator to

1 kind of keep track of those questions. We'll be picking
2 those up at lunchtime. So now I'm going to ask Neil
3 Hammerschmidt to come up and recap the first issue that
4 we're going to have in discussion at each table.

5 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Thanks, Deb. So the
6 first discussion topic is specific to the performance
7 standards, traceability performance standards. I think
8 Dr. Breitmeyer really helped set the stage in this
9 discussion, not that we want to get into it in great
10 detail, but I think now we're looking at the species
11 sectors, it might be appropriate for there to be some
12 initial discussion to help identify within that species
13 where the void or highest risk that you might want to
14 acknowledge, just because I think it is helpful in this
15 discussion.

16 When we look at the traceability performance
17 standards, I think another key bullet is the overall
18 merit of these standards. While they were generic, those
19 four applied to all the species. We also need to look at
20 their merit specific to that species. When we talk about
21 merit, do they help us achieve traceability? Will they
22 move us in the right direction, as we've identified the
23 gaps in traceability. Will they help fulfill or fill in
24 those gaps? Are there other performance standards that
25 are appropriate, and Dr. Brewer mentioned that certainly

1 from an animal health official's perspective, there are
2 certainly other performance standards in their area of
3 work that is applicable, and you can certainly define
4 those. But the work of the regulations working group are
5 traceability performance standards that apply
6 specifically to animals that move interstate. So you
7 want to keep that in mind.

8 Then the alignment performance standards with
9 the species sectors, this is, again, with the
10 understanding about this, all livestock and that there
11 might be animals that are exempt from the risk area or
12 not necessary. Animals moving direct to slaughter.
13 Maybe that's a permanent exemption. There might be
14 others that are more phased in.

15 In the cattle sector, where's the highest
16 priority today? What other portions of the livestock or
17 cattle sectors might they need to apply to a couple of
18 years down the road.

19 Again, the chart that Dr. Brewer went over,
20 traceability, performance standards, what activity's
21 being measured, what actions does an animal health
22 official take when there's a disease event. That's the
23 activity. The time, the percentage that they achieved
24 that. You put those in combination. That is the
25 traceability performance standards. Again, the point is

1 we're not counting how many premises. We're measuring a
2 state or tribe's capability to perform traceability
3 actions or activities.

4 That chart's in your handout. It's very
5 busy, but that's why we put it in your handout. That's a
6 more thorough evaluation on a one chart format of those
7 performance standards and their explanation. And, again,
8 that is in your handout with a walk-through of the
9 performance standards.

10 Our focus in this discussion today is really
11 on traceability performance standards. Hopefully we can
12 stay focused on that to a big degree, and these are the
13 questions that are in your handout. I might have added
14 the first one, I'm not sure. What are the priorities or
15 population sectors within the species needing the most
16 improvement relative to disease traceability as a
17 starting point. But those are the questions that we're
18 trying to focus on as much as possible. Obviously, there
19 might be others.

20 But feedback to the regulations working
21 group, the state members, the tribal members, APHIS, VS
22 members we'll take your feedback to the table as we
23 continue to define more thoroughly those performance
24 standards. This is a group exercise, wanting input from
25 industry on the current line of thinking, on the

1 standards that Dr. Brewer laid out so we can continue to
2 bring those forward.

3 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Neil. So for -- until
4 11:00 o'clock, we have to work on this issue. So we'll
5 ask at each of your tables that you engage in a
6 discussion so that we're ensured that we have your input
7 as we reflect on these performance standards. If you
8 have questions that you recorded on a sheet like this,
9 turn those over to your table moderator. We'll ask at
10 each table that the USDA individual there kind of
11 identify themselves.

12 If you have questions that come up during
13 your discussion that are kind of off topic of stuff, you
14 can gather those questions there, and we will pick those
15 up as you head off to lunch today, and those will be
16 fodder for our afternoon discussion. Thank you.

17 (Discussion session.)

18 MS. MILLIS: All right. I want to bring us
19 back to order. So if you could tie up your discussions
20 at each of the tables, we're going to go around and hear
21 from a spokesperson from each of the tables about the
22 things that you've come up with, as you've reflected on
23 those traceability standards. So if I could ask us to
24 come back to order now, I'd appreciate it.

So to begin with, okay, we're coming back to

1 order. And I'm going to start with the swine group back
2 here, as you've reflected on these traceability
3 standards, if we could have somebody speak for your
4 group. I wanted to point out that the court reporter is
5 capturing these because it's important to the secretary
6 who reads each of the items what's being stated here, and
7 we really do need your input.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. Anyone else here from
9 the pork industry? Just so I know. Well, there's one.
10 Good. All right.

11 Just for everybody's background, we have been
12 working on, for years, our own set of program standards
13 for ID. And they were developed to work currently with
14 the way Code is currently written, and to enhance our
15 traceabilities by using a standardized national premises
16 identifier and the recordkeeping and ID components of it.
17 So our program standards have been the ones we've been
18 implementing over time since about 2005 starting with the
19 premises registration, with the standard premises
20 identifier.

21 And our industry has actually incorporated
22 that identifier into current production practices, as far
23 as recordkeeping components, ID components, and also as
24 part of the program, our pork quality assurance program,
25 our site assessment, which is the welfare component of

1 that, we actually use the standard prem identifier as the
2 method by which we identify those folks who have site
3 assessments in our database. So we've integrated this
4 into our programs, also into your surveillance programs
5 for pseudorabies and swine brucellosis. So for us, as an
6 industry, having a standard identifier be the basis of
7 our program is what we wanted to achieve and that's what
8 our program standards are built around.

9 And so when I look at the questions that were
10 asked here, you know, for us -- and I'm speaking only for
11 swine -- we believe strongly in species specific program
12 standards that work with the species that have to deal
13 with them. So, you know, when it looks -- when you're
14 asked, will these performance standards address current
15 gaps in traceability, based upon my understanding of what
16 I've seen today and how our program standards would fit
17 into that, I would say we're addressing the gaps on the
18 swine side.

19 When you look at what performance standards
20 need to be considered or what other ones, I think at
21 least, again, based on my understanding of what I've
22 heard today that our program standards would fit fairly
23 well with what I've seen so far.

24 We talked a little bit about exemptions, and
25 defining exemption is whether or not that animal has to

1 have a physical identifier in their ear, unique
2 individual identifier.

3 Within the Code of Federal Regulations, we
4 have a couple of abilities to move pigs in groups and
5 lots based upon them being in a defined production
6 system, which is defined in the Code of Federal
7 Regulations. And so we would still want that system to
8 be in place. We'd want the current, you know, Code, the
9 way that it's written, for brucellosis -- the ID of
10 animals for brucellosis and pseudorabies to continue to
11 be in the Code; although streamlined in with traceability
12 standards. So we still would have some areas of, quote,
13 exemption, but they would already be ID systems that are
14 accounted for in the Code for swine, that are moving in a
15 group or a lot based on the production system.

16 If you look down at capabilities, I think
17 that, at least for our program standards, states and
18 tribes -- oh, just the first three? Oh, that's later?
19 I'm sorry.

20 And we did talk a little bit about -- what
21 was the other one? Did I get them all?

22 Oh, we talked a little bit -- oh, movements
23 to harvest. You may not know, but currently swine that
24 move into harvest channels are all individually
25 identified back to the owner. That usually occurs either

1 at the buying station or at the packing plant on the
2 market hog side with a tattoo. And in the past, and what
3 we're moving away from, it was a back tag on sows and
4 boars that were entering harvest channels. And we're
5 actually transitioning away from the back tag to an
6 official premises identifier tag that would go into the
7 ear of the sow or boar, which really the doctors in the
8 industry are currently using right now, and those are
9 accompanying animals in the harvest channels and are
10 being collected as part of our pseudorabies surveillance
11 program at the south plants.

12 And so for us, animals are already identified
13 going into the harvest channel. And that needs to stay
14 the same, and we need to continue to improve it by moving
15 away from the back tag and into the premises ID tag.
16 That's what we're currently moving toward. For us
17 animals identified in harvest channels is very important
18 for traceability.

19 MS. MILLIS: Appreciate it. We're going to
20 call on this table here that worked on the sheep and
21 goats issue. And as we go around, you may have similar
22 things at your table that you've already heard at
23 another, and you can just ask them to ditto them. And
24 you don't necessarily have to repeat them.

25 DR. MYERS: Thanks Deb. Somehow I got tagged

1 to do this, even though I'm not a sheep or goat producer.
2 But just to correct what Dr. Brewer said earlier, my suit
3 is blue, not black. So maybe that makes me a little less
4 of a bureaucrat.

5 Anyway, the three items under traceability
6 performance standards, first of all, any gaps, the group
7 felt that the standards that are in place for the scrapie
8 program are really doing a good job, and we were not able
9 to come up with any gaps or any additional performance
10 standards that would be necessary. So there was a view
11 that the scrapie program needs to continue as it is and
12 meets the traceability needs.

13 Also not really a lot of discussion about
14 exemption or any new or different exemptions that would
15 be necessary through that program.

16 Our discussion around the table kind of
17 focused on something a little different, so I'll share
18 with you what those are. And it focused more on the
19 state side of things. And I know that our discussion
20 here was about those federal rules that need to be in
21 place to govern interstate movement, but I think some
22 specific messages that wanted to come from this table
23 were that the discussion that we had earlier about tags
24 being available and being a very simple low cost
25 approaches, that was supported by the folks at this

1 table, and that there needs to be options that those tags
2 are available either through the state or through
3 individual veterinarians.

4 And also data that is held -- should be held
5 by the state and by those -- by those veterinarians. And
6 so what it really underscored, and I think the take-home
7 message from this table, is that the kind of meeting they
8 were having today to talk about what are those important
9 issues that need to be addressed at the federal level
10 from the standpoint of interstate movement, this same
11 kind of meeting needs to be held back home in each state
12 to talk about what those traceability programs within
13 each state need to look like. So I will ask our two
14 friends here to make sure that I've adequately
15 represented the views of the table. Do you want to take
16 the mike and add to that?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Basically the discussion at
18 our table was predominantly about where the information
19 is held, how that information is controlled, and where it
20 is disseminated.

21 Now the scrapie program has been effective.
22 Part of the reason that it's been effective is that it
23 does not identify the feeders and the young stock. It
24 identifies the breeding herd. Also of paramount
25 importance in the scrapie program is that the flock or

1 herd identification number stays with the owner as
2 opposed to sticking with real estate or property. So say
3 I took my herd and I moved to a different place. I would
4 still have the same herd number, but my property would
5 not have any identification upon it. Okay. And that's
6 really important as, you know, we move forward trying to
7 redevelop some kind of a trust in the USDA from those --
8 the debacle of the National Animal Identification System.

9 So that's something that I think everyone
10 needs to be aware of with the scrapie program. Now, I
11 don't think it's going to cross apply to every species,
12 and I don't believe that it should, but it's been okay,
13 and hasn't resulted in a tremendous amount of further
14 consolidation amongst that particular species sector. So
15 thank you.

16 DR. MYERS: Thanks.

17 MS. MILLIS: All right. Let's move on -- are
18 there any other groups that talked about other species
19 than cattle? All right. We're going to turn it over to
20 you folks. Who's your spokesman at your table?

21 DR. BREWER: Beck.

22 THE COURT: And, T.J., I'm sorry. It is navy
23 blue and my table pointed out to me I have on black.

24 First of all, I want to thank this table.
25 This has been an excellent table. Very good discussion,

1 very good dialogue, and we have a wide variety. We've
2 got Farm Bureau. We've got R-CALF. We've got Geneseek.
3 We've got lawyers. So it was truly productive, good
4 discussion.

5 On Neil's first discussion, where are the
6 gaps, feeders usually don't have any ID. Breeding age
7 cattle, because of the loss of brucellosis program -- you
8 know, not in Oklahoma. We're IDing them in Oklahoma.
9 But there are some places where that's going to be a gap
10 as we stop first point testing. And they live the
11 longest. You know, they're the ones that are out there
12 that we have to address in these more longevity type
13 diseases.

14 Another gap is speed of commerce. Electronic
15 is more time efficient. The cheaper bright tags are more
16 cost effective, and then in a gap also, for some reason
17 in here we talked about the book end approach, because we
18 have brand states at our table. And certainly their
19 comment was they're not in favor of the book end approach
20 for the farm of origin being where the tag needs to be
21 put in. That quite possibly that needs to happen at the
22 first point of commingling.

23 And then the issue of reliability.
24 Reliability is maybe a gap that we haven't thought about,
25 that whatever we come up with, they've got to reliable

1 measures that all states participate in.

2 How will performance standards address these
3 gaps, and the devil's in the detail. How is each
4 separate state of 50 states -- how are they going to
5 address and meet those performance standards and what's
6 going to be the uniformity in that? Basically we had
7 comments that 50 states can't have 50 different
8 methodologies that will work. Kind of, people, we're
9 talking about the old system that's gone. So we have to
10 accept and realize that there were parts of that system
11 that need to be carried over into this one.

12 We need speed and uniformity. The weakest
13 standards of the standards that were put on the board are
14 the parts in between the book ends. It's pretty
15 strong -- I can call Chuck and say this is a Missouri
16 animal. But in-between pieces are the weakest right now.

17 Overall, I think -- and you all can argue
18 with me. I think the group liked the performance
19 standards in just a general umbrella. On the issue of
20 exemptions, feeders, we're kind of pro and con. That
21 feeders should be exempt from individual ID. And I don't
22 know as we came up with a consensus in looking at certain
23 diseases, TB -- I mean, TB is one of them, believe it or
24 not, because even though we think of TB as being a
25 longevity type disease, having feeders off of the radar

1 screen is going to hurt us. So maybe that depends on the
2 disease as to what's important as far as feeders are
3 concerned.

4 One of the things this group came up with is
5 the idea of free tags are an excellent move. Bright tags
6 for people who want the low cost, low tech. But one of
7 our members stood up and said, we think USDA should make
8 available for folks who want electronic ID and want to
9 work at a little higher speed of commerce, free RFID tags
10 as well.

11 We got into a question that wasn't on the
12 list, and that is of exemptions for interstate
13 certifications of veterinarian inspection. And I think
14 the consensus of the group was that it should be a state
15 decision if you're going to require -- if Rich Breitmeyer
16 is going to take a permit for California, so be it, if
17 Becky Brewer is going to require a certificate of
18 veterinarian inspection, then that's what it needs to be.

19 Do you all have anything to add to that?
20 Notice I looked right at the people that might want to
21 add to that.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just one of the things that
23 comes to my mind when we're talking about this program,
24 in some level, the agricultural organizations have come
25 together and presented a plan for ID. And in that plan

1 was we need to use the TB and brucellosis programs as a
2 model for animal ID. And I didn't bring that up in our
3 discussion, and I'm glad I didn't, but that's all I had
4 to say.

5 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, I appreciate that.
6 And who's going to be the spokesman for this table. Is
7 that you, Neil?

8 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Certainly some good
9 discussion. I think we came around to a good discussion
10 on the performance standards, but we got there by way of
11 talking about maybe solutions a little bit, number one,
12 within the cattle sector, good support for making the
13 silver or the bright tag readily available to the
14 producer, with the understanding that the state that
15 administers those tags need to keep a record of where the
16 tags went.

17 Probably the biggest question and differences
18 of opinion is who is responsible for tagging the animals,
19 the producer where the animal originates or point of
20 first commingling and pros and cons of the market doing
21 the tagging, cost of the tagging, and sendings for the
22 tagging. So I'm not sure we ended up with a specific
23 consensus of the group of where that is achieved, but
24 certainly having a record of where the tag is distributed
25 is the key point.

1 Again, funding for the tag is critical. When
2 we looked at the performance standards, certainly with
3 the first clarification that we're looking at the
4 breeding cattle population to apply the current
5 performance standards. With the feeder cattle currently
6 or being exempt period, we didn't get into long-term
7 inclusion or exclusion that breeding cattle 24 months of
8 age and greater. Number one, it's a no-brainer because
9 the appropriate type and class of animal would be
10 identified with a record of where the tag went. So doing
11 that a high percentage of the time, a minimal time
12 requirement was achieved very easily, as would be, number
13 two, because if the animal was tagged in Kansas, Kansas
14 should have a clean record of where that tag was
15 distributed in the administration of those tags.

16 The performance standards that I think raised
17 the question and not the concern, but it got the group
18 talking about a gap, is an animal that was born and
19 tagged in Kansas, moved to Nebraska, and now is in
20 Missouri, and Missouri needs to determine -- advise
21 Nebraska that the animal came from Nebraska to Missouri.
22 They could very easily let Kansas know that we got a
23 Kansas animal, because Kansas code would be on the tag,
24 or the 840 would have a record of where the tag
25 distribution was.

1 How would they have a record that the animal
2 came to Missouri from Nebraska? So the group was keen on
3 making better use of the interstate certificate of
4 veterinarian inspection, and felt that moving forward as
5 aggressively as possible on an electronic format of those
6 certificates would be appropriate to make that look-up
7 more effective, but certainly they identified that
8 certificate or other permitting type system that would
9 actually have the number of that animal coming into
10 Missouri would be the appropriate solution, that we need
11 to do a better job of to fill that void or inability in
12 tracing today.

13 The other point about that traceability is
14 clarification of what is official identification, making
15 sure that if the animal is going back to the farm or
16 ranch for breeding purposes that we need more than a back
17 tag. Some type of permanent ear tag that would remain
18 with the animal.

19 Other questions or points that I missed from
20 any of the group?

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I got -- it's not a
22 question really, as far as the electronic paper. You
23 made the statement earlier, and maybe someone can answer,
24 is it federal law that animals moving, you know, by
25 interstate right now have to have their health

1 certificate in all states?

2 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: No. It's not a
3 requirement.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Did it used to be?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. Most states that I am
6 aware have a requirement during the brucellosis program
7 that animals come in with a health certificate, but now
8 that has been dropped by some states in lieu of a
9 permanent.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 17E.

11 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: 7118 and, John, you're
12 the expert on the regulation, requires breeding animals
13 24 months of age or older to be officially identified
14 with some type of record, a bill lading and others could
15 be that type of option versus a specific health
16 certificate, but there is some reporting or method of
17 that in 7118 for breeding animals 24 months and older.
18 It does not specify a certificate of veterinarian
19 inspection.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're fortunate in the
21 state of Missouri that we still do that for calves. You
22 know, whenever they come to a livestock market, they go
23 to a vet, and the tag gets recorded and it gets sent to
24 the State of Missouri. So as far as state commerce
25 market, it works fine. Nothing's changed. It been that

1 way for years. That's the way, as a market owner, I'd
2 like to keep, you know, and I think it'd be the simplest
3 way to keep it is do what we've done in the past on the
4 brucellosis. It worked. Got rid of it.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And the market streamlining
6 hardware, software that we use in Missouri markets will
7 produce a printed certificate of veterinarian inspection
8 by searching the record from the identification chart.
9 So it's extremely rapid and easy in Missouri.

10 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Let's go to this
11 table here.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. We had a fairly
13 lively discussion about these performance standards, and
14 we discussed feeders and that's already been covered.

15 Two things that we came up with that I don't
16 know if you'd call this an exemption or what, but cattle
17 going from a federally approved market to, say, someone
18 in Missouri just takes an animal over to Illinois to a
19 federally approved market. Do they have to be ID'ed to
20 cross -- to go to that market. And we came up with
21 probably -- and I guess this is something we need to talk
22 about, probably they would be ID'ed. That would be the
23 first point of concentration. So that's probably where
24 they would get their identification.

25 The second thing that I don't think has been

1 touched on is there was some discussion about when we're
2 talking about these standards, we say number 4,
3 75 percent is -- on number 4, it's completed 75 percent
4 of the time in 5 days. How many are never completed?
5 How many are never traced? And this is probably some
6 data we need to look at to get some idea of how many are
7 never traced. And I think that's something that the
8 working group probably needs to look at.

9 Any other comments from the group? Okay.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, sir. Good points.

12 We'll go to this table over here.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In terms of question 1, the
14 gaps that the performance standards will address, and we
15 assumed that we are effectively identifying the target
16 population, whatever we're trying to identify that we've
17 got tags in ears, and so that step 3, where we -- it's
18 kind of that in between that Neil discussed earlier; that
19 that is where we would get some significant improvement
20 over what we have today, if we have tags in ears and
21 we're able to somehow get that number on the ICVI and be
22 able to search that and go back.

23 You know, we agreed steps 1 and 2 we could
24 pretty easily do that. But that step 3, that's where
25 we'd be making a big leap. And that's the performance

1 standard, where we recommended a modification from what
2 the draft is. And we said 75 percent should be the
3 threshold for that third step. That's not based on
4 anything scientific except there was 75 percent in
5 another performance standard. So that's the one where we
6 identified maybe something different.

7 Again, the focus on breeding cattle or test
8 eligible cattle. And that's some distinction that I
9 think is important, that, you know, where's the line. We
10 talked about the feeder heifers that are out on grass or
11 in a feedyard, but there's 8 or 10 or 20 of them that are
12 pretty nice, so they get pulled out, bred and put into a
13 herd. How do we handle those? Me personally, we need to
14 be careful that we don't collect a bunch of feeder
15 heifers because they might end up back in the herd and we
16 just create a big mesh.

17 So that distinction, we discussed that, and
18 how we define breeding animals. Is it an age? Is it
19 intent. I think that's going to be a key part of the
20 discussion going forward.

21 The other thing that I'll point out that our
22 group discussed is we talked about, okay, you know, is
23 phase 1 breeding animals, is phase 2 feeders. And our
24 discussion was that, let's worry about phase 1 and not --
25 we're not going to talk about feeders. Part of the

1 struggle where we've been the last few years is producer
2 pushback. And so let's focus on the high risk animals,
3 and that's breeding cattle. And if there's a phase 2,
4 we'll deal with that later, but let's don't include that
5 when we start. Let's deal with phase 1 first.

6 MS. MILLIS: Thank you very much, and we'll
7 go to this table.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We also had a pretty lively
9 discussion. Reviewed many of the pain points of the
10 former program, and came to the conclusion that we felt
11 the bright tags are a good place to start. And the
12 biggest concern was with the USDA issuing the tags. The
13 post solutions were to have the data stored by a private
14 service provider who will then make the information
15 available in a timely manner to the states. Many of the
16 other issues that we cover, I think have already been
17 brought up by some of the other tables.

18 Is there anyone else at our table that had a
19 point to bring up?

20 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Appreciate that, and
21 we'll go to this last group. And who's your spokesman
22 here? Let me get over to you. Here you are, sir.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm a spokesman because I'm
24 the only one volunteering. There's some very intelligent
25 people here, a lot more than I am, because I'm just a cow

1 calf producer.

2 I think many of the things we brought out in
3 this group. In fact, I learned a few things. I didn't
4 know what a bright tag was. I always thought it was just
5 an old silver tag.

6 We had the opportunity for Dr. Breitmeyer to
7 offer something, a man from Texas, an auction barn
8 person, too. So if anybody disagrees with what I say,
9 correct me.

10 But it seems like -- the same thing with the
11 groups here. We thought maybe there are some priorities
12 on this identification that -- dairy breeding herds
13 should probably have maybe the highest priority at first.
14 And I personally brought up important cattle, which I
15 think should have definitely the highest priority because
16 of the possibility of mad cow disease -- yeah, that plus
17 hoof and mouth is more serious than that. If that comes
18 around here, it doesn't matter what kind of
19 identification system you're going to have, you got a
20 big, big, big, big problem, but that's my personal
21 opinion.

22 And there was concerns that the bright tag is
23 not going to do the traceability as far as interaction
24 between animals. And that's true. That I think, you
25 know, the producers have spoken and said they don't want

1 to go any further than bright tags, which if we --
2 personally, I'm not speaking for any group. I would have
3 no problem using the bright tags on our calves when we
4 work them on the farm, to start out. I think that's
5 reasonable. And I think we're talking about just common
6 sense solutions.

7 Anyone in the group want to add to what I
8 said if I didn't cover it? Would you like to say
9 something, Matt, from Texas?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It was my idea, but I think
11 there was some emphasis that maybe the show cattle and
12 rodeo cattle, any cattle that are congregated, need to be
13 identified, just because of that commingling.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The man right here, he had
15 some comments, too. Would you like to say anything.
16 Auction barn man ought to say something. We had a good
17 group here.

18 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. I appreciate that.
19 And now moving into the next discussion, Neil, you want
20 to give us a little background on it, and while Neil gets
21 ready, what we'll do is within our same groups, or if you
22 need to move to another group, that's fine with us, we're
23 going to discuss this next topic during the next
24 50 minutes. Go ahead.

25 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Thanks, Deb. So now that

1 we have a better understanding of what the performance
2 standards are, how do we achieve that level of
3 traceability? What's the incentive to get there, because
4 if there isn't some type of process to document how a
5 state or tribe is in comparison to those standards,
6 they're probably not of much merit or value. So that's
7 kind of the point of discussion is making sure that there
8 is a way to evaluate them, so that there is credibility
9 in the overall plan. Indirectly, I think that provides
10 the incentive.

11 The working group, while we don't have a lot
12 of information to throw darts at like we did on the
13 performance standards, we do make reference, as an
14 example, to scrapie consistent state, is the term they
15 use if they're in compliance with their program
16 standards. Again, consistent probably isn't the right
17 phrase, but that's the concept. And we evaluate whether
18 a state or tribe is meeting those standards or is not.
19 Do you have ideas on how that information should be
20 presented, published so everybody across the country has
21 equal access to know about that information? Visit with
22 some of the state and ABICs at the table in regards to
23 the incentive that the scrapie program provided because
24 it's my understanding all states except one because it's
25 not applicable to them -- all states are consistent

1 status for the scrapie program. So there was obviously
2 an incentive for states to get there. So that might be
3 an idea.

4 But bottom line is we need ideas that we can
5 take back, again, to the working group on how we evaluate
6 the standards, what's the appropriate evaluation
7 processes that can be considered, and from your
8 perspective how should we present the information after
9 it's been evaluated. Do you have an appropriate -- is it
10 you are or you are not meeting those standards, or is it
11 level 1, 2, 3, 4 in comparison. Those types of ideas
12 would greatly be appreciated by the working group. And,
13 again, how public, what's the best way of sharing the
14 results of that evaluation, with the acknowledgment that
15 we're talking further out there. But as we develop the
16 proposed rule, some of that definition will have to be
17 contained in the proposed rule. But it will be years
18 down the road before we're actually ready to do the
19 evaluation of the standards.

20 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Neil. And so for the
21 next 45 to 50 minutes, we'll ask that you discuss this
22 topic, how we're going to evaluate whether it was
23 successful or how we're going to measure what our tracing
24 capabilities are. How are we going to know we did it.
25 And that's the topic and then we'll report back out.

1 (Discussion session.)

2 MS. MILLIS: All right. I'm going to bring
3 us back to order, and we're going to do the same thing
4 that we did on the earlier question, and that is go from
5 table to table. What's different about this is we're
6 going to go in the reverse order that we did before.

7 So let's begin with this table. As
8 you reflected on how we would -- whether we were
9 successful in our traceability, what did you folks
10 come up with?

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think the first
12 question -- we had some really good discussion around
13 this table and a lot of different sectors that were
14 represented.

15 And in looking at just, first of all, how are
16 the states going to evaluate themselves or is USDA going
17 to evaluate them against the standards, we looked at the
18 first thing that needs to be done is just establishing
19 some benchmarks of what's being done now.

20 The other thing we talked about was -- and
21 Rich was helpful on this -- the program diseases that
22 they have to comply with traceability standards as they
23 are now and report to USDA on an annual basis, look at
24 expanding that type of an evaluation process to the ADT
25 system.

1 Some of the -- just the discussion about
2 that, though, who should really be responsible for
3 evaluating the program? Is this something that the
4 states should be required to do themselves or USDA?
5 Obviously, state funds and state personnel are very
6 short, and to go through the exercises of, you know,
7 saying how well they're complying would add a lot of cost
8 and time commitment to those states. So the consensus
9 here was this should be a function of USDA.

10 As for the second question then, the results,
11 how should they be made public. Well, certainly,
12 programs like this, should there be federal funding
13 involved, the information would need to be public in some
14 way, but the thought around the table here is it's public
15 information, but you don't need to necessarily publicize
16 it because it could be detrimental to some states' animal
17 industries or cause some competition between states that
18 may not be good for the industry as a whole. So
19 something that -- again, it is public information but
20 probably shouldn't be publicized, necessarily.

21 As far as what happens when performance
22 standards are not met by a state, well, some of the
23 hammers that were discussed around this table is
24 obviously some movement limitations of animals to or from
25 those states. And then also since cooperative agreement

1 funds are used largely to administer these programs,
2 obviously that could be cut off or curtailed in some way
3 to incentivize the state to come into consistency or
4 compliance, or whatever you want to call it.

5 Then the fourth item then is how can the
6 industry help contribute to the states and the tribes
7 meeting these financial -- these basic standards then.
8 Industry has a very big role to play there. But the
9 standards would need to be very, very clearly
10 communicated to industry so they could help carry the
11 message. Obviously that wasn't done during the NAIS
12 days. A lot of the basics of that program were
13 extrapolated and bastardized to where you really didn't
14 know what those standards were, those basic elements,
15 which creates a lot of misunderstanding and obviously
16 mistrust. So certainly industry can carry a lot of water
17 on this, given the right tools and right messages.

18 Just some general comments this group had in
19 talking about -- again, coming back to the feeder
20 animals, very, very strong opinion that they should be
21 exempted because, again, the risk factor is not nearly as
22 high as with the breeding herds. But then in order to
23 help encourage participation in the program and
24 compliance or consistency, maybe do an evaluation and
25 say, you know, because the dairy sector is very much more

1 friendly toward RFID and they have uses for it and
2 they're much more in line to use that type of technology,
3 maybe when you exempt the feeder cattle from the
4 programs, the number of bright clips would be given to
5 feeder cattle producers, that cost may be offset if you
6 could make RFID available to anybody in the cattle
7 industry that wants to use it for breeding cattle,
8 obviously not the feeder cattle. So again, the thought
9 if you did something like that, you might encourage
10 participation at a different level.

11 Anything I miss? Oh, yes. Thank you.

12 The other thing is, you know, a big question
13 here is right now there are several types of official ID,
14 and should those other systems i.e., American ID or some
15 of the manufacturer codes, should they be sunsetted. And
16 I think there was a general feeling -- I don't think we
17 had a complete consensus, I suppose -- to really create
18 some standards, and the standards that follow should
19 probably be sunsetted as this program moves forward.

20 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. And now we'll go to
21 this table over here.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, we spent a lot of
23 time on the first one, and we decided it ought to be a
24 uniform measure to start that. And I kind of used the
25 example, maybe it's too common sense, but that each state

1 would evaluate at the end of each year why they may be
2 behind or ahead, meaning that they may have had a
3 situation where they had a really big disaster in one set
4 of cattle and something, and they could evaluate that.

5 We thought state vets should be very much
6 involved in that audit and accountability of it.

7 Funding, I kind of like the other table. I
8 won't go into that, but we feel that there's going to
9 have to be some federal money put up, but we have a
10 couple producers at our table. I'm one of them, and our
11 concern is the producers don't want to have a lot to do
12 with the federal government. Sorry guys, but that was
13 kind of the consensus at our table. So I think we
14 covered a lot of the same things.

15 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Go back to this
16 table.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Question 1, we
18 sure -- we talked about options for kind of a phases or
19 categories of compliance and, you know, you reach one
20 level and then you're working toward the next. And that
21 working toward initial compliance is different than
22 failing, you know, or dropping below that standard. So,
23 you know, maybe that lead-in you're treated differently
24 than if you got there, but then something fell apart.

25 Certainly thought that your status or your

1 compliance level with those performance standards should
2 be available publicly, so that other animal health
3 officials know what the deal is, as well as producers.

4 Talked about an auditing process to
5 determine, you know, what level you're at, that a key
6 part of that would be corrective action and a timeline
7 for taking that corrective action. We, too, talked about
8 funding being a hammer that can be used to ensure
9 compliance. Talked about an incentive that maybe there's
10 a way to incentivize adoption of higher technology
11 identification, that that may be a way for everybody to
12 win, more easily reach those performance standards, maybe
13 some management advantages for the producer. Those state
14 animal health officials can do those trace-outs a little
15 easier with the higher technology device.

16 Talked about the other -- another thing that
17 we talked about was some threshold, you know, if a
18 state -- some states may do a lot of trace-outs in a
19 year. I don't know what a lot is, but have some to do in
20 a year. Some may not. And that maybe there's a
21 threshold that if you do 10 in a year, you know, that
22 satisfies the requirement. If you don't, then maybe
23 periodically there's a check of your system to ensure
24 that if you needed to do a trace-out that your system is
25 actually effective. Does that cover it, folks? We're

1 ready for lunch. Thanks.

2 MS. MILLIS: And we'll go to this table here.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Some of the things that we
4 talked about is, again, as you look at how do you
5 evaluate against the standards, and we think there really
6 is probably a difference between high volume states and
7 low volume states. That if you're a high volume state
8 and you're already doing 100 to 200 to 500 trace packs a
9 year, you probably have a good statistical basis for
10 doing that, but the what if you do 10 a year. Missing
11 two doesn't necessarily mean you're underperforming.
12 It's a matter of statistical evaluation.

13 It does beg the question of -- and I think
14 there's a lot of thought needs to go into what is the
15 role of test samples. Do you give low volume states test
16 samples but then if they're not -- if they only do 5
17 trace packs in a year, and you give them 20 trace packs
18 to do to get a statistical sample, have you just
19 increased their workload that they're not geared to do?
20 And so there's some real questions here about how you
21 balance against low volume states versus high volume
22 states.

23 What is the overall risk assessment? Does
24 the department, USDA, need to do a risk assessment and
25 stratify, if you will, what is the risk of

1 underperformance from a very low volume state. And is
2 there maybe that part of the classification. There was a
3 comment that -- it's probably not the direct goal of
4 this, because the direct goal is really at the federal
5 level geared to interstate movements, trace packs across
6 interstate.

7 The federal government has made it clear that
8 their interest is interstate movement, but clearly the
9 better your ability to do trace packs of interstate
10 movement are, it should improve your intrastate trace
11 pack capabilities. And there was a comment that states
12 need to be held accountable for their performance within
13 the state as well as across, but yet this program is not
14 geared for that. It may be a positive undetected
15 consequence.

16 With regard to what happens when a state
17 doesn't meet the performance standards, any -- I think we
18 really got to think about that. I think we all would
19 agree, carrots are preferable to sticks, and I think we
20 have to be very careful about taking resources away from
21 a state that is not meeting the standard in order to
22 spite ourselves. Do we make the whole system worse by
23 taking resources away from the state that already is
24 struggling to meet a standard. And yet how do you craft
25 an incentive program that allows the -- everyone to get

1 better, you know, without, you know, bringing down the
2 system. But obviously some of the things, you know --
3 when you think about penalties or incentives -- and I
4 think the design of either the penalties or incentives
5 are likely to structure what your classification is going
6 to be, not the other way around.

7 I think however you design whatever incentive
8 system or penalty system will naturally fall out then how
9 do you classify the performance. But are you going to
10 make the penalties, i.e., something like eligibility for
11 federal indemnity.

12 Yeah. But whether or not you're eligible may
13 have some big issues there. What does it do to
14 cooperative agreement funding? But, again, be very
15 careful of pulling dollars away from somebody who's --
16 they're meeting 92 percent instead of 95 percent. Do you
17 start pulling their funding. I think we have to be very
18 careful about those things.

19 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. And this table. Is
20 it you again, Neil?

21 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Sorry. Yes.

22 MS. MILLIS: You don't need to apologize to
23 me.

24 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I think some of the
25 highlights -- so not to duplicate number one, the group

1 wants to make sure the evaluation process reflects high
2 integrity so that it is a thorough process that has
3 meaning, whether it's an audit, whatever.

4 The group as a whole would prefer some type
5 of tiering categorization instead of yes or no to help
6 maybe the industry and the producers see that if they
7 drop another notch, it's not good for them, so they have
8 the opportunity to support the state, knowing which
9 direction they're headed.

10 Certainly to make the information available
11 publicly, but maybe we don't have to take out ads in
12 national publications to provide the media the
13 information.

14 In regards to what happens in regards to the
15 state, this group felt more that maybe it is
16 self-controlling, that trading partners, whether it's
17 across the country or the adjoining state, the value of
18 cattle from that state, there might be a lot of things
19 that would fall in place automatically versus it being
20 done through specific regulations as the incentive.
21 Other comments from the group?

22 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, Neil. We'll come
23 back over to this table.

24 DR. BREWER: I tried to get out of it. It's
25 not that easy. Okay. Point No. 1. How could the states

1 and tribes be evaluated against these standards?

2 We discussed a check test or an audit,
3 similar to the source and age verification audits.
4 Certainly the measure of normal surveillance activities
5 that take place within state animal health officials'
6 offices on a regular basis. And this is a question, not
7 a consensus: Should there be an evaluation that involves
8 industry? Like in a feedlot, et cetera. So, again, good
9 food for thought.

10 One of the things that we talked about --
11 because we don't have tribal entities here. We still
12 discussed what would happen if a tribe was inconsistent
13 within a certain state. And ultimately, you know,
14 because disease does not know a geopolitical boundary,
15 whether it's a state or a tribe or whatever. So we think
16 federal sovereignty of a tribe should not affect a
17 state's status if a tribe is not consistent. Just a
18 point that came up.

19 How should these results and evaluations be
20 made public. A simple web site was kind of -- that was a
21 bit of a consensus among the group.

22 What happens when a state or tribe doesn't
23 meet standards? One, we think -- and we agree with your
24 table -- do not take cooperative agreement funding away.
25 It just makes it harder for that state to become

1 consistent, and then it just is a downward spiral. I
2 think there was a consistence, if there would just be
3 increased requirements for movement, usually based on a
4 state who was going to allow an inconsistent state's
5 animals into their realm, increase testing, that
6 increases the cost of doing business, and, therefore,
7 might be an incentive to producers for their state to
8 become compliant.

9 One of the things that we feel like we need
10 to very much guard against, and that is one species
11 compliance not affecting another species compliance. So,
12 therefore, species compartmentalization when it comes to
13 is that state compliant.

14 Another thing we talked about -- and we
15 didn't, I don't think, come up with any really good ideas
16 of what those should be, but a slap on the hand versus a
17 death sentence, which we know a death sentence would mean
18 you can't move animals. I want everyone to know that it
19 is no one's desire nor focus to have us not be able to
20 conduct business and move our livestock across the state
21 line.

22 How could industry -- this was the best one.
23 They came up with the best ideas for the last point. How
24 could industry contribute to states and tribes meeting
25 performance standards? And education came up. The issue

1 is that the Oklahoma Pork Council or the Oklahoma
2 Cattlemen's Association or the Poultry Federation conduct
3 educational meetings or -- or Livestock Market
4 Association, educational meetings for their constituents
5 so that they could learn more about this process and this
6 business of what do we need to do within our industry,
7 within a given state or tribe, to become compliant. And
8 to be sure and remind folks, invite your state animal
9 health officials to all or as many of your meetings as
10 you possibly can, because it's really hard to be
11 adversaries when you are friends. And you become friends
12 at the grass root level.

13 And then the third thing was have industry
14 participate in audits and check tests.

15 Is there anything any of you want to add to
16 that? Good job, table. Good job.

17 MS. MILLIS: Yes. Good job all tables.
18 Let's move over here to the sheep and goat industry or
19 focus area. Okay. Frank.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm a nuts and bolts kind
21 of guy, so a lot of these are pretty specific, but I
22 think it's mentioned over here. We think it's necessary
23 to separate this process by species and to start with
24 breeding herds. We called the testing a fire drill, but
25 one of the things we thought would be useful in that fire

1 drill was to have other states in the evaluation of an
2 individual state. That would help with the
3 accountability, I think Neil mentioned over there.

4 There needs to be probably an evaluation
5 period to establish the baseline or the benchmark. We
6 would expect a bell-shaped curve for these results,
7 because not all states are going to be at the same level.
8 And this probably would lead to use of classing the
9 individual states into groups.

10 And lastly, a concern that I had was, we've
11 got to make sure that we set a timeline for this
12 evaluation, and to periodically revisit the process.

13 MS. MILLIS: All right. And to our group
14 that focused on swine.

15 DEFENSE COUNSEL: A lot of this stuff we
16 talked about already's been talked about, but one of the
17 key points we wanted to make sure that we captured was
18 that in the evaluation process, it should evaluate all
19 the animals that have moved interstate, not just the ones
20 that were identified.

21 So in other words, understanding a state's
22 capability to trace back, we need to look at their
23 ability to trace non-identified animals, too, in that
24 percentage that we're looking at so they don't just
25 cherry pick the ones that are easy to identify, because,

1 after all, we're looking at traceability and not just
2 tracing tags.

3 And how to do that? Well, there's ways of
4 randomly selecting numbers through ICVIs, slaughter
5 records, fairs and exhibitions, first points of
6 concentration where you can go in and ask them where do
7 these pigs come from, where do those sows come from, and
8 so forth.

9 Let's see. There is an important
10 consideration, too, through consequences, as has been
11 pointed out to not restrict the movement, because in the
12 swine industry a restriction beyond three days could be a
13 significant welfare issue due to the backup in the system
14 as to where those pigs will be going. So that's to give
15 producers a way to move their pigs. Maybe there's extra
16 documentation that needs to be made, but don't restrict
17 commerce.

18 Also if a state fails to meet its
19 requirements, that there should be a period of time to
20 correct the situation. I think that was brought up
21 over -- at one of those tables over there, that there
22 should be a period of time to allow corrective action to
23 be taken, and I think everything else has been already
24 discussed, and so it's lunchtime.

25 MS. MILLIS: And I'm the only thing standing

1 between you and that door.

2 So on your tables you had some questions that
3 you gathered, and I'm going to ask the table moderators,
4 the folks that were from USDA, to pass those to me at the
5 door, and just to call to your attention the hotel is
6 having a pasta buffet that's down there in the
7 restaurant, which is just past -- or to the left of the
8 desk as you head down that way. And let's be back at
9 about one hour from now, so at 1:33. Let's be back in
10 this room.

11 (Recessed for lunch.)

12 MS. MILLIS: Welcome back. I hope everybody
13 enjoyed their lunch. I know it was kind of late for
14 those of you from the east. So here's what we're going
15 to do for the afternoon.

16 As we went through the questions that people
17 answered, the questions that were burning in people's
18 minds, we noticed a few themes. And there were some
19 clarifying questions that we could pretty easily answer,
20 so I'm going to ask Neil Hammerschmidt to come up and
21 address some of those things. And one is about tags and
22 tagging and things like that, and then we're going to
23 talk a little bit about further engagement. You can be
24 up here, Neil.

25 THE COURT: I'd rather be down here.

1 MS. MILLIS: All right.

2 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: As we went through some
3 of the sheets that came back, it appeared that there were
4 several questions that we could review on tags,
5 especially the bright tag, but there might be also, Deb,
6 if it's okay, opportunity to answer -- have a dialogue on
7 some of the discussions on tagging the animals
8 themselves. But for point of clarification, the bright
9 tag or the silver tag that's historically been used for
10 official disease programs, interstate movement, official
11 ID requirements, the numbering system is very similar to
12 what's used for the Bang's tag. The first two spaces are
13 a state code. 35 is Wisconsin. What's Kansas?

14 DR. BREWER: 73. Oklahoma is 73.

15 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: So every state has a
16 two-character number that is assigned to it. So
17 basically it is a state-based numbering system.

18 The next three spaces of the nine are alpha
19 characters. If it's a Bang's tag on -- an orange tag,
20 it's my understanding, the first space would be a V.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Or S or T.

22 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: If they've been
23 duplicated for recycling to keep the number uniform.

24 The next four spaces are numeric. So that
25 numbering system is nationally unique, okay. And that's

1 the intent. And by regulation, they're required to be
2 unique for at least a 15 year period, and that's why some
3 numbers have to have, on the Bang's tag, a letter -- a
4 letter other than V to keep the uniqueness for that
5 period of time.

6 The brucellosis or the Bang's tag for cattle
7 vaccination is and, in my understanding, will always be
8 administered through a veterinarian for an accredited
9 vaccination historically. The referenced bright tag has
10 historically been used by accredited veterinarians for
11 various purposes, but basically administered through the
12 state to accredited veterinarians, AVIC offices, I'm
13 assuming as well. And normally this tag and others,
14 correct me if I'm wrong, it is actually required that the
15 tag be applied by an accredited veterinarian.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Or under supervision.

17 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Under their supervision.

18 So one of the thoughts that came out of the previous
19 Kansas City meeting -- and it actually came up over the
20 last few years -- is to make that tag available outside
21 the distribution to an accredited veterinarian. So if a
22 producer wanted to receive the tags themselves and apply
23 the tag through whatever herd management practices they
24 preferred, they could apply the tag themselves, and it
25 would be just as official as if an accredited

1 numbering system. They've had some alpha characters
2 reserved for their use, John.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Historically, yes.

4 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: DHIA. Basically there
5 was a provision in the VS policy to allow the dairy
6 industry, through the Dairy Herd Improvement Association,
7 the option to use that tag in milk recording or DHIA as
8 official for their program, but also recognized for
9 interstate movement when official ID and such was used.
10 So it also has been historically used by the dairy
11 industry as well, through an agreed-to policy with the
12 Dairy Herd Improvement Association. Thanks for adding
13 that clarification, Robert.

14 Any other questions on the silver, quote,
15 bright tag.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just have a question
17 regarding the distribution, and I'm assuming similar to
18 the scrapies program. If producers wanted to tag, then
19 they would also be supplied with the apparatus to apply
20 the tag. So that equipment would be sent with the tags
21 at the expense of the federal government?

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's a good question.
23 Certainly in many cases the applicator or the pliers is
24 going to be more expensive than several years of use of
25 the metal tag. So we have to decide, determine if we're

1 going to have adequate funding to make the applicators
2 available in addition to the tags. But that's certainly
3 a question that we have to deal with because those tags
4 are very specific to that applicator. So the appropriate
5 applicator has to be used. And good possibility a lot of
6 producers don't have that type of applicator. It's a
7 point well taken.

8 DR. BREWER: All the veterinarians will have
9 that.

10 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: All the veterinarians
11 will have that.

12 DR. BREWER: Producers won't have that.

13 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: All the accredited
14 veterinarians will have those. But if a producer is
15 tagging their own animals, they'll want those applicators
16 locally. Other questions on tags, so to say?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, if you're going to
18 put up bright tags of that nature directly to producers,
19 then they're going to be logged in the database that
20 they've gone to a producer, but there's no evidence on
21 the tag which herd it really went in except in the
22 database, what keeps that producer from not passing along
23 to somebody else, et cetera, et cetera. Is that a
24 concern that they might move from neighbor to neighbor or
25 from uncle to nephew, et cetera, or not?

1 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Yeah. Thanks, Dan.
2 That's a valid point. Actually that came up in our
3 discussion about the education that needs to go along
4 with that, that these tags -- you're really creating
5 problems for yourself if you start sharing these tags
6 that have been allocated to you with your neighbors and
7 such. So that's education, what this means as far as the
8 need for you to keep that tag within your own operation
9 for your own use within your own herd, part of the
10 education that needs to go along with it.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, we talked in our
12 group about that if you make the liability very clear
13 that these tags are assigned to you and will be
14 permanently assigned to you, our table felt that that
15 liability spelled out very clearly and very firmly to
16 whoever was signing that I received these tags would be
17 enough disincentive to share those tags with somebody
18 else, because if your neighbor or whoever, your nephew
19 that you gave that tag to, puts that tag in an animal
20 that came back positive, you're not going to have a leg
21 to stand on to say it's not yours.

22 MS. MILLIS: Just very quickly, if you want
23 to make a comment, wait for the microphone. All the
24 comments are being transcribed, and we want to make sure
25 you're heard. So just raise your hand and we'll bring a

1 microphone over to you.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, just to clarify, if
3 we look at a system that provides -- I guess in part of
4 the discussion it's been clear -- free-of-charge bright
5 tags as a baseline for the system, but there are many
6 multiple other tags available, is it going to be the
7 same, we're out to market for all of these other devices,
8 or is it going to be commercially accessed, as it is
9 generally today for these tags? I mean, what changes do
10 you see to the existing approved devices that are out
11 there? What's going to necessitate a change as we move
12 forward.

13 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: For tags other than the
14 nine-character bright tag?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

16 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: We really don't see any
17 change to the scrapie tag. That system is up and running
18 and seems to be working extremely well. The 840 tag, we
19 have multiple providers, manufacturers, managers and so
20 forth of the 840 tag. That will stay in place. Those
21 are obviously available in both electronic tags as well
22 as the plastic bangle visual tags. That process will
23 stay in place as it is.

24 Then for those that aren't aware of that,
25 those tags initially were developed as official tags that

1 could be distributed directly to a producer for their use
2 as official ID for federal disease programs, as well as
3 any other marketing programs that they had belonged to or
4 continue to belong to.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just as an adjunct to that
6 then, for the producers that are engaged in different
7 programs right now and they're using manufacture coded
8 tags that aren't necessarily registered in the 840
9 database, but they're in private databases, and valid ID
10 devices, is that going to be recognized as an official
11 device, or does it have to be registered in the 840
12 database?

13 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Again, now, when we go
14 back and look at our objective, it's to enhance disease
15 traceability efforts. The whole idea of the manufacturer
16 coded numbers was to transition into the 840 that we
17 maintain a record of their distribution on. It's still
18 our intent at this point in time to set a transition to
19 840 being the only version of the AIN number, which
20 currently has three formats, manufacture code that
21 identifies who manufactured the tag, and also the
22 abbreviation USA.

23 So to standardize that, possibly through this
24 proposed rule a sunset date to transition to 840 being
25 the only version of 840. So we would still have at least

1 three official animal numbering systems for when
2 individual animal ID is appropriate. What we call the
3 National Uniform Air Tagging System that's put on the
4 metal tags, nine characters. The AIN, 840 numbering
5 system, and the combination of the flock premise,
6 whatever we want to call that, plus the unique herd
7 management number that's basically used very fully in the
8 scrapie program.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And swine, too.

10 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And swine. Certainly not
11 a specific species tag, but most practically frequently
12 used in those species at this point in time. But cattle
13 guys could certainly use those tags as well if they want
14 to start using that type of numbering system.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's my understanding
16 there's also a different variety of your metal bright tag
17 that has just two letters? Is that one official ID I
18 think is being used in the sheep and goat industry.

19 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I'll have to call on our
20 expert again on that specific question, John.

21 JOHN: That eight-character alphanumeric tag
22 is available for species with smaller ears, such as that
23 was typically the feeder pig tag. And it was used in the
24 sheep and goat, but they don't recognize that numbering
25 system in the scrapie program.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's still being used.

2 JOHN: Yeah. That eight-character tag is not
3 recognized for scrapie; although it might be used for
4 feeder show pigs or something -- show lambs or something
5 like that.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, will you consider as
7 part of your numbering system allowing RFID tags that are
8 part of a USDA PVP?

9 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: At this point in time,
10 for example, approved numbering systems through AMS, if
11 they're not specifically defined in our part of the Code
12 of Federal Regulations, we have not opted -- we currently
13 do not have those numbering systems recognized as
14 official for specific disease programs.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Well, just to follow
16 on with that, what if, as you write the new CFR, there's
17 consideration being an 840 number or manufacturer code
18 RFID? If you have that as part of a USDA audited PVP
19 process, why not allow those producers safe harbor with
20 the current program as opposed to requiring yet another
21 form of identification. Would you consider that is my
22 question?

23 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Certainly those points,
24 again, I think if it meets the objectives of the state
25 and federal animal health officials to have a number

1 that's highly traceable, those discussions certainly are
2 appropriate before we go too far down the road
3 definitely, Mark, thanks.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, on those brucellosis
5 tags, on the back there's a U.S. shield also on the back
6 of the tag.

7 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: There is a U.S. shield on
8 the bright tag as well.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And the orange shields have
10 VAC on the back also.

11 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: For vaccination.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, maybe just a comment.
13 At our table we were discussing some of the private
14 companies that have not just information gathering, but
15 they may use them for herd management -- we'll just say
16 Dairy Comp, or something like that. Like in California
17 if there had been a way to get a hold of that list, I'm
18 sure a lot of those cattle that they were chasing around
19 were in those lists. I mean, is that something we can --
20 is that infringing on just private enterprise?

21 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Again, others in
22 California and other parts of the country, Wisconsin and
23 others where dairy cows are widely used, again it's
24 widely used in different parts of the country in dairy.
25 But my understanding is when a herd is part of a disease

1 investigation, those records are readily made available
2 to the animal health authorities so they don't have to
3 dig through paper records, that they provide them the
4 animal ID records as -- via an output, for example, when
5 herds are tested, those records are electronically moved
6 from the desktop Dairy Comp system to the handheld
7 computers that the veterinarians use.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Some of them didn't
9 understand the question. What I was saying, I think Neil
10 got it, is that other than maybe value added to make
11 cattle worth more money -- we do in beef -- in the dairy
12 where they're using them as a management tool. We were
13 just talking at our table, we think those dairy cows were
14 probably in a list that they were chasing around all year
15 trying to find, if you could have got to the private
16 Dairy Comp. I'm just using them as an example. I mean,
17 I go on many herds in California, thousands of cows are
18 on that, but there's not any other identification on them
19 other than the RFID and maybe the ID tangle tag.

20 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: That's certainly --
21 Robert's right that the dairy men in many cases had made
22 that data set available to the individuals from the state
23 or federal team local that's on their farm going through
24 their records because they can obviously sort the
25 information much more quickly, and they're moving that

1 information at the direction of the producer to our guys
2 locally.

3 MS. MILLIS: The point is sometimes that's
4 private data, but often in the event of an outbreak,
5 that's shared in cooperation with. And we have a
6 clarifying comment back here, and then I'll give you the
7 mike, sir.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: There was a question about
9 the VS shield being on ear tags. Currently the policy is
10 that on all tags that USDA purchases in bulk that are
11 warehoused in Kansas City, that the VS shield is on all
12 those tags.

13 If a state wishes to buy their own tags, they
14 can have the postal code abbreviation on the back of the
15 tag in lieu of the VS shield. If Iowa wanted to purchase
16 their own tags, it could say Iowa on the back of it in
17 lieu of the VS shield. That's the current policy, but
18 certainly all the ones that we -- and the majority of the
19 states get their tags from the warehouse in Kansas City,
20 so there would be a VS shield on there.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is more follow-up to
22 Collins. I work for an IV company, which we have been
23 put in a very uncomfortable position, and this may not be
24 a very comfortable comment to make to this group. But
25 we've had USDA and state agency come to us and say, this

1 is a private ID system tag. We want to know who you sold
2 it to.

3 By nature of what the question was, it's a
4 private sale. We're not going to report that, because
5 producers are making the decision not to choose in that
6 case an 840. They've chosen a non-840 tag. This is what
7 we do, just to answer your question. We will contact the
8 person we sold it to you because we know. We say, look,
9 this person at USDA is trying to find this out, you give
10 them a call, but we're not -- and unless they take it to
11 court -- we don't.

12 DR. BREWER: Tell me what the first three
13 numbers are in your tag?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 928.

15 DR. BREWER: 982.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, ma'am.

17 DR. BREWER: Okay. Got your number down.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But it's a very
19 uncomfortable position to put us in because we have
20 producers that are making the decision, they do not want
21 to be in a federal database. They want to be in a
22 private database and keep their own information. That's
23 not my right to supersede that decision they're making
24 out on the farm.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Glenn, maybe not my turn --

1 I'm fine with that position, but does that mean you're
2 willing to have your manufacturer code not be an official
3 ID?

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If they register -- the way
5 the system works today, correct me if I'm wrong, that
6 somebody buys a manufacturer coded tag. They can elect
7 at any time in that animal's life to register that in the
8 database, the federal database. When they do that, they
9 now have it in that system. If they've taken the active
10 choice, doesn't matter if it's a 982 or a 985 or 986 --
11 whatever, if they make the decision not to, it's really
12 not our position to supersede that.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Agreed. I think it
14 complicates, maybe, determination of what's an official
15 ID and what it isn't. Perhaps maybe not.

16 DR. BREWER: It does.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, that was my question.
18 That's an official ID, your manufacturer code ID?

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If they register that in
20 the database it is.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Under NAIS.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If they don't, it's not.

23 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Let me explain.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm going to get hung here,
25 but I think it's all manufacturers. Not just me.

1 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I don't know how many
2 years ago we expanded the definition of official
3 identification numbering systems. At that point in time
4 we identified the animal ID number as a 15-character
5 number, it could be one of three formats, and we had the
6 understanding with the industry that we did not want to
7 cause animals to be retagged to meet official ID
8 requirements. So it was understood that we would
9 transition into 840, over time transitioning away from
10 manufacturer coded tags. And the justification was from
11 a traceability disease control standpoint that, if
12 there's a tag out there that's got a manufacturer code
13 number on it and we can't trace the tag, it's of no value
14 from a disease control perspective. And that was the
15 justification, the line of thinking at that point in
16 time, just trying to clarify some of the past
17 discussions.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. And I'm sorry if I'm
19 beating this up a bit. The old system, the four letter
20 word nobody wants to talk about, that system allowed for
21 people to have 840 tags, and they'd be part of the
22 system. There was also a very, very well-developed
23 system of private databases and systems that producers
24 could choose to put their data into, because that's the
25 option that USDA gave them. You can come into the

1 federal system or you can go to a private system, and
2 that's a vote everybody made individually as a producer.
3 It was their right to make that vote, and so they did
4 that.

5 Now, when they chose to go with a private
6 database and not with an 840 tag, they did so with the
7 set of understandings that this would not be in the
8 federal database unless at some point in the future I
9 decided I wanted to do that. There was an overarching
10 structure put in place with the USDA that you had
11 partners that were in these disease traceability
12 databases, and how data could be accessed. And that's
13 all fine. I'm just trying to understand how that all
14 transitions into that program.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The fact of the matter is
16 that today the manufacturer coded tags are official ID.
17 They meet the definition of an official ear tag. In our
18 definition of official ear tag today, there's no
19 requirement for what data has to be kept on the issuance
20 of those tags. Simply says what the nature of the tag
21 has to be, tamper evident, you know, permanent, and have
22 the format according to one of the three numbering
23 formats that Neil mentioned. And I think the idea was
24 that, even though this tag was not -- may not be linked
25 to the place or it was initially attached to the animal,

5 So it's a unique number that's unique to
6 that -- to the industry and unique in all the world. So
7 it's a highly valuable number, even though it's not --
8 may not be linked to the initial farm that was attached
9 to the animal. It still could be a traceability tool,
10 and that's why we thought, well, let's transition into
11 it. Let's use it for what it can be used with the
12 knowledge that we're going to go forward and have -- and
13 transition to another one. But today it is considered an
14 official identification ear tag.

17 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I think I covered the
18 ones specific to tags.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER:

25 First, with regard to this meeting, USDA

1 intends to put all the information that you've received,
2 including questions and answers, the presentations you
3 saw -- we're going to put basically a record of the day
4 up on our web page, up on USDA's web page. If you gave
5 us your email address when you registered, we can be sure
6 to send you an email with that link, so you can get that
7 information easily. If you didn't give us your email and
8 want to, at the front registration desk, there are forms
9 you can put your email address there, and we'll send you
10 an update so that you can get all this information.
11 That's number one.

12 Talking about long-term engagement, we
13 realize that for this new framework, to be successful,
14 engagement really has to happen at the local level. So
15 USDA is committed to enabling that local engagement as
16 much as possible.

17 Number one, we're working closely right now
18 with our AVICs in each state to enable them to reach out
19 at local levels, to local industry, to work with their
20 state counterparts, to present information about what
21 we're doing, especially as we continue to make progress
22 on the rule, and as there are new developments.

23 So we hope to be able to use our AVICs in
24 each state as a primary tool for engagement. They know
25 their producers best. They know their counterparts best.

1 So we're hoping to take advantage of those relationships
2 as much as possible for engagement. That's our primary
3 tool.

4 Number two, we continue to put as much
5 information as we can about the entire process related to
6 this new framework and its development up on our web
7 page, and we're going to continue to put additional
8 resources on our web page, additional information as we
9 have updates on the direction we're going; as new details
10 are developed, we're going to put as much as we can on
11 the web page so that we can get that information out as
12 much as possible.

13 We're also working on some additional web
14 based tools, interactive tools, for example, where people
15 can submit specific questions and get feedback. They can
16 submit ideas around certain themes, certain aspects of
17 the framework, and they can get feedback on. That's
18 number two.

19 Number three, we are committed to have two
20 more meetings like this one. We're going to have one in
21 Riverdale, Maryland, on Thursday, and we're going to have
22 one May 17th in Denver. USDA is looking at the
23 possibility of holding additional meetings, especially as
24 we develop more details about the program, and as we have
25 more to talking about, more specifics to talk about,

1 we're contemplating having additional meetings to help
2 get information out about what we're doing, as much as
3 possible.

4 So that pretty much captures our focus on
5 engagement. Local engagement. Engaging through the web
6 and having meetings when appropriate, and when we have
7 something good to talk about with you.

8 Are there more specific questions about
9 engagement? Our thing that we could be doing or you
10 think we should be doing in order to get information out
11 to you, in order to get feedback from you? Oh, and John
12 is reminding me, we're also doing extensive tribal
13 outreach. USDA is reaching out to our tribal partners,
14 holding meetings with them, getting their feedback. We
15 also have tribal representation on our Regulatory Working
16 Group. That's the other point I wanted to make. It's
17 important that industry work with their state animal
18 health officials, because state animal health officials
19 can feed feedback and perspectives into the regulatory
20 process through the Regulatory Working Group that we
21 have. So you engaging with your state animal health
22 official, there are channels for getting that information
23 back into the regulatory process as we develop the rule.

24 Are there other questions, comments?

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You mentioned outreach to

1 the AVIC at the state level. Is that coordinated with
2 the state veterinarian's office or is the AVIC's office
3 undertaking that?

4 MICHAEL: No, it is coordinated. We're
5 working right now to enable -- to give our AVICs enough
6 information, enough tools, so that, in coordination with
7 the state animal health officials, they can organize some
8 outreach, some engagement at the local level.

9 DEFENSE COUNSEL: Does that include the local
10 industry groups --

11 MICHAEL: Yes.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- or are they invited?

13 MICHAEL: No. Yeah, to engage with local
14 industry. Absolutely.

15 MS. MILLIS: So if I understand you
16 correctly, the AVICs are coordinating with their local
17 partners as well as the industry?

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When?

19 MS. MILLIS: And the question comes up when?

20 MICHAEL: It's an ongoing process.

21 MS. MILLIS: It's already started at this
22 table over here.

23 MICHAEL: It's already started. We're
24 working to move it forward as much as possible, to
25 formalize that engagement as much as possible, as quickly

1 as possible. Other questions?

2 MS. MILLIS: Over here. Just a moment.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Given the timeline that we
4 somewhat know of at this point in time, do you expect to
5 be on target? I mean, here you've got three public
6 meetings, perhaps more to come, engagement between the
7 AVIC, state veterinarians and industry groups, and what I
8 understand was you're going to have -- start writing the
9 rule by June, proposed rule? Is that right?

10 MICHAEL: I'll say we're on an aggressive
11 timeline to write the rule. We're not sure of the
12 specific date, when we'll have it done. However, the
13 Secretary has made it clear that engagement is his
14 priority, and that he's committed to listening to
15 everything that's said. So, you know, if we have
16 additional public meetings, regardless of the date, that
17 feedback will be considered and worked into the process.

18 MS. MILLIS: Are there other questions that
19 individuals may have? Let me go here and then we'll go
20 over there.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess I have a two-part
22 question, one to follow up on Nancy's question a second
23 ago.

24 Outside of the three public meetings that
25 have been announced, are there -- is there any other type

1 of a project plan that lays out milestones, key
2 milestones between now and the time a draft rule is put
3 out?

4 I mean, if there's one thing that we that
5 have been involved in this for a long time and should
6 know is we better have plenty of time to talk about all
7 the unknowns, which we're just scratching the surface
8 here today. I mean, if we want to fail, then let's just
9 blast on through aggressively let's go ahead and get
10 something out because the secretary wants it. I hope
11 we've learned that we need vigorous debate in small
12 groups like this. And I think, Neil, a project plan with
13 key milestones between now and that time before you
14 publish something would be invaluable. So that's one
15 point.

16 The second thing would be that -- and I don't
17 know if this is the appropriate time for the question.
18 If it's not, then let's table it so I don't hold you up.
19 But one of those things relative to implementation,
20 what's the plan? What's the -- what is the requirement,
21 the plan, the expectation for retiring these tags on the
22 other end of the chain? I haven't heard any discussion,
23 haven't read anything about that yet. So if we're
24 identifying cattle -- I'll just pick on cattle. If we're
25 identifying cattle at the ranch of origin and we're going

1 to do a book end system, then how are our practice
2 partners going to play with a bright tag?

3 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And so I answer the
4 specific question, are we looking at tag retirement when
5 the animal's slaughtered is your specific question?

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, what's the plan is
7 what I'm asking. To start with, and if it is retirement,
8 then how.

9 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Basically we're -- the
10 question is so we have a -- you know, if we're working
11 with the basic concept of a bright tag as being the basic
12 element to consider for traceability, we're looking more
13 at a book end system, which would call for knowing where
14 the animal was first tagged and the concept of the book
15 end, knowing where the animal was terminated, and I think
16 the question is, will that number actually be retired to
17 indicate that the animal is no longer in the population.

18 We've had some discussions, Mark, on that. I
19 don't think it's 100 percent yet if we're going to
20 actually try to manually retire that tag number from the
21 system to indicate that the animal is no longer in the
22 population. I think what the animal health officials
23 want us to do a better job on as the number one priority
24 is to make sure the tag is collected at slaughter so that
25 it can be cross-referenced, maintained to that

1 appropriate caucus through inspection.

2 Will the number actually be physically
3 retired as far as a tag, the number -- to indicate that
4 the number has been retired. So, you know, again, I
5 think on the books, that's been a federal requirement,
6 and maybe we need to put more emphasis on making sure
7 that actually happens.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, are you saying that
9 you want to basically match a bright tag to a caucus at
10 slaughter?

11 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Again, right now, John,
12 help me out other AVICs, when we talk about breeding
13 animals over 24 months of age, right now we've been
14 collecting that ID and bagging it with the blood for a
15 long time. So maintaining that similar process to make
16 sure that official ID for that class and type of animal
17 is maintained, we've been doing it, you know, for the
18 blood collection for quite sometime.

19 JOHN: That ID collection regulation is
20 already in effect. It's been on the books for years.
21 It's one of FSIC's regulation that the plant employees
22 will collect the ID, maintain it through -- with the
23 caucus through final inspection.

24 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And that's for animals
25 over two years of age.

1 JOHN: No, for all animals. All animals
2 regardless of species or class. That's the regulation.
3 How it's enforced at the local level is another issue.
4 That's the issue we've been dealing with for years, too.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have some questions, but
6 I'm not really sure if -- they're not really about the
7 tags. It's kind of more about the overall program.

8 What I'm having difficulty understanding is
9 how state run traceability, if you will, is going to
10 differ at all from the current program diseases, wherein
11 a state veterinarian, if you come up with a suspect
12 animal, you have to call the other state veterinarian to
13 find out information about that animal.

14 And this -- it's a concern because of the
15 databases, and the amount of data that is accessible to
16 people. There are privacy concerns predominantly
17 involved in the foundation of this question, and I don't
18 understand how -- if we're going to have independently
19 run state traceability, how it is going to be any
20 different from what we have already with program
21 diseases? What's the differentiation here?

22 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Well, I can certainly
23 start and T.J. and others. I think the approach today is
24 not administering the program specifically as the
25 brucellosis eradication program that gave us animal ID.

1 Realizing there are a lot of animals no longer
2 vaccinated, so we have a void in animal ID. So the
3 principle is different, that we're trying to fulfill that
4 void in animal ID in lieu of not having a specific
5 disease program.

6 We talk about the sheep scrapie program,
7 pretty -- or the sheep industry, not the focus today
8 because they are currently eradicating a disease that
9 allows them to have a high level of ID, resulting in a
10 high level of traceability.

11 The cattle sector's fortunate not to have
12 that type of specific disease. So even in the breeding
13 animals, there's more animals that are not officially
14 identified. So the concept is not anymore a specific
15 disease program. It's a traceability solution that, in
16 lieu of a specific disease, we have the ability to trace
17 an animal. Because we can't put in traceability after
18 the fact, and maybe that's what we're trying to do today.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But I'm having trouble
20 understanding how, if the states can run it -- say, for
21 instance, a state decided to run with their two number
22 ala brucellosis or the postal code via some other form of
23 tag.

24 Now, if the state is tagging all animals that
25 go into interstate commerce, regardless of species, with

1 that kind of a postal code, and it's kept at state level,
2 the database is not an overarching federally held
3 database that is not accessible to all of the various
4 state veterinarians. It's the state held database and
5 there still has to be communication between the state
6 veterinarians via telephone or via email or something
7 else.

8 I mean, how is that kind of thing going to
9 improve traceable time? I guess that's kind of the
10 bottom line of it. I'm not sure that I'm being perfectly
11 clear here. What I'm hearing from the USDA is that they
12 want the states to decide how to do this.

13 Now, the states have a number of different
14 methods that they can use to promote this identification
15 while retaining their producers' information, which is a
16 major concern amongst producers. And if the states
17 retain that information, there still has to be manual or,
18 you know, slow time contact between the various officials
19 in a disease control issue.

20 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: So, again, let's look at
21 the cattle discussion. This group, I think we
22 acknowledged that for animals moving to interstate,
23 especially the breeding animals, we need ID that lives
24 longer on the animal than a back tag.

25 So today's requirement for interstate

1 movement, allows the animal, even a breeding animal,
2 moving back to a farm or ranch to move on a back tag. So
3 today we have an animal that might have been moved on a
4 back tag show up and have no ID.

5 Part of the solutions being discussed here
6 would have a more permanent method of ID. So, in
7 essence, I think one of the things we identified to this
8 group is that we'd actually be increasing the number of
9 animals within that population with an official ID that
10 is traceable. Where today the slowness isn't calling the
11 state veterinarian where the animal came from; it's
12 determining who to call because there's no ID on the
13 animal, as Dr. Breitmeyer indicated. That if you don't
14 have an ID to work from, you do a very manual intensive
15 backtracking, where an official tag would give you, in
16 this case, the nine-character number, a state-coded tag
17 so you know immediately when you have the tag who to
18 call. And so that's the time difference right there,
19 number one, by having more animals officially identified.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is my last question,
21 okay. Will the states be able to withdraw all of their
22 enrolled citizens from the National Premises Registration
23 database?

24 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: As in the past, the
25 state's administered premises registration, and they have

1 the authority to administer premises registration in the
2 future. Their call.

3 MS. MILLIS: We have a comment back here.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't mean to beat this
5 subject much. But I want to follow up on something that
6 Glenn Fisher referred to, which was -- I understand what
7 you're talking about with the bright tags. Has the
8 consideration been given to -- this is for the cattle
9 industry I'm referring to. For the USDA subsidizing the
10 states in the -- to allow producers to obtain official
11 versions of plastic visual tags and RFID tags as they
12 will be subsidizing the bright tags, recognizing that the
13 latter two, if they have a decent numbering system, will
14 in point, in fact, be a little easier for officials to
15 read than that bright tag, and, therefore, there is an
16 argument for the government, if it had money -- and I saw
17 the amount of money they don't have.

18 So I'm not suggesting that there's a lot of
19 coins to do this, but I'm thinking ideologically, it
20 would be a nice idea to subsidize the visual tag system
21 with plastic visual tags which would allow bigger numbers
22 and easier to read and more information than the
23 nine-digit bright tag. And likewise with the RFID tag, a
24 certain amount of subsidy might make the ID medicine go
25 down better.

1 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Without question, if
2 adequate funding was made available to subsidize tags
3 that are maybe a little bigger, more valuable for herd
4 management, that would certainly be considered. Given
5 our funding level today -- we know what a metal tag
6 costs. If we put that 5 cents or 7 cents to work toward
7 one of the other tags, we'd probably have more
8 administrative costs than what we'd actually be able to
9 subsidize. So it's really a future -- or a funding
10 issue.

11 I think all of those things are in the cards.
12 If we hear feedback from the stakeholders that, you know,
13 if we use this tag, it would not only work good for the
14 animal health officials for disease control, but it also
15 gives us a little bit more management tool, and we'd put
16 that tag in more readily ourselves versus down the chain
17 someplace. So I think all those things certainly need to
18 be considered, but we need feedback from the industry,
19 just like you've provided, Stan. So thank you.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neil, I heard you talking
21 about the paper back tags. Are we going to still be
22 allowed to use those for slaughter cows and bulls that go
23 directly to slaughter?

24 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Again, so I'm not
25 misquoted, those are discussion questions that have not

1 yet been determined. I think it's some of the thinking
2 that, if we want to improve traceability, we need maybe
3 to work with more permanent forms of ID for animals that
4 stay in the breeding herd. But certainly to move animals
5 directly to slaughter, the back tag, somebody mentioned
6 on our table, that 98 plus or minus percent of the time,
7 that gives us trace-back for that period of time. So I'm
8 assuming that we would be comfortable maintaining that
9 type of process because it works.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: One of the questions that
11 was discussed at the table here this morning was about
12 the current situation you have in a state if you receive
13 animals from out of state that happen to show up
14 unidentified. And if there's a disease issue with one of
15 those animals, then it becomes the state that received
16 the animals issue.

17 Is there any consideration within USDA to
18 discuss under this new framework what might happen if
19 animals show up in a state unidentified that might have
20 come from out of state that's going to be to a state's --
21 well, the receiving state's status?

22 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: You know, now others have
23 been involved in some of the earlier discussions, and I
24 don't know if this gets at your question yet or not. You
25 know, we talked about the traceability performance

1 standards. We didn't reference some of the thoughts that
2 we also want to record or track, and that's compliance
3 levels.

4 I.e., if this animal -- if this population of
5 animals were required to be identified for movement in
6 interstate, what percentage of them were identified. So
7 there are some compliance factors that we probably want
8 to start tracking, evaluating because we can't have
9 traceability if we don't have compliance with that part
10 of it. So I think there's a thought process that, in
11 addition to the performance, the end results, how well
12 are those requirements being complied with along the way.
13 Whether that gets at your question or not, I'm not sure.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess is the receiving
15 state still going to be held liable for those animals as
16 it is today?

17 MS. MILLIS: Can you repeat the question,
18 Neil?

19 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: The question is, who is
20 responsible if a state -- if an animal moves interstate
21 unidentified. I'm not going to comment because I don't
22 know. Others that might have worked with the -- not the
23 enforcement but the interpretation of existing
24 regulations like that? For breeding. No comment from --
25 so, you know, we've got another -- and I don't want to

1 call it enforcement, but, you know, in that case Robert
2 has a good question.

3 To be eligible to move interstate, the animal
4 should have been identified if it's within that
5 designated population. Certainly the responsibility of
6 the seller and the buyer. How's it shake out from the
7 authority level, we'll make good note of that, Robert,
8 thanks.

9 MS. MILLIS: Over here.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know several states have
11 passed laws to prevent -- to help the confidentiality of
12 this information, restricting it just to disease control,
13 exempting it from the state level freedom of information
14 acts, but that's not a majority of the states that have
15 done so.

16 Is there any -- is there anything that's
17 going to happen to make sure that this information stays
18 confidential or used only for disease control or can
19 anyone FOIA this information?

20 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And I'm not going to
21 pretend to be the FOIA expert, so I probably won't touch
22 that very strongly. I don't know many specific states
23 that are moving forward with exemptions from FOIA, FOIA
24 laws. I'm too far removed to comment.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think there's a dozen

1 states that have that so far, but obviously that's not a
2 majority of the states.

3 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And, again, early on we
4 have minimal information. I think that needs to be
5 understood, that we're maintaining a record of what tags
6 went to what person. So we're not building gigantic
7 information of databases that are sometimes perceived.

8 MS. MILLIS: And, again, just as a reminder,
9 these meetings, the one that's happening here, the one
10 that will happen Thursday in Riverdale, and the one
11 that's Monday the 17th in Denver, are an opportunity that
12 we're providing so that stakeholders, such as industry
13 producers and others, can give us more input as we write
14 this regulation.

15 So are there any final questions? I've got
16 some back here. We're getting the mike over there to
17 you.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question relating
19 back to the presentation that Dr. Myers gave this
20 morning. In one of his slides he said one of the
21 commitments that USDA would do would be to provide
22 information systems. Can you explain what that means?

23 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: Certainly.

24 DR. MYERS: Go ahead, or if you want to talk
25 about concept, you can talk about that.

1 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: And others can jump in.
2 We've developed in the past, as you know, systems that
3 the states have used to administer NAIS, whether it's
4 premises registration and so forth. Those systems we
5 have commitment direction from the Secretary to make sure
6 those tools are maintained as they have in the past. And
7 if the state elects to use them, that's their choice to
8 do so. And that's our commitment to make those --
9 maintain those tools.

10 The AI management system, what we call the
11 standardized premises registration system or premises
12 identification system, those systems will be maintained,
13 and it's at the discretion of the state if they elect to
14 use those systems or not.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So, Neil, what about an
16 animal movement database as well as the first recording
17 of an animal link to a premise or however you're going
18 to -- whatever you're going to call those in the future.
19 Historically we say a number linked to a premise in a
20 database searchable. Are you going to -- are you
21 providing that?

22 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: At this point in time, as
23 you know, when we did the animal tracking database
24 systems, the movement records were external. If the
25 states request that we make available to them a database

1 that allows records that we've defined previously as
2 move-in, move-out records, we'd certainly take that under
3 advisement and probably make that available if the states
4 are requesting that type of information system to be made
5 available by USDA, again at the discretion of the states.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Just for the record
7 then. I'd say that's in conflict with those in the
8 private sector that have spent many, many dollars over
9 many years to develop those kind of systems. So for the
10 record we have a little difficulty when we compete with
11 our own government. So we can have that discussion on
12 line. But, anyway, thanks for the clarification.

13 MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I appreciate the comment,
14 Mark, very much.

15 MS. MILLIS: So are there any final questions
16 before we close out for the day? Well, on behalf of the
17 secretary's office and APHIS and Veterinarian Services, I
18 want to extend my thanks. I know this is a commitment of
19 your time, your brain power, and that your input is
20 invaluable to this process. I want to thank you all for
21 coming, and please let your colleagues know about the
22 meetings in Riverdale and in Denver coming up this coming
23 Thursday and the 17th in Denver.

24 DR. MYERS: And just to close out, I just
25 want to thank everyone as well. As I said first thing

1 this morning, today is all about collaboration, and I
2 really appreciate the collaborative effort we had today.
3 Thank you all, and safe travels.

4 (Meeting concluded at 2:33 p.m.)

5 - - - -

6 -oOo-

7 ---

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25