

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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 PUBLIC INTEREST)
FORUM ON:)
ANIMAL DISEASE)
TRACEABILITY)
)
-----)

Thursday, May 13, 2010
USDA Conference Center
4100 River Road
Riverdale, Maryland

The above-entitled public forum was
held, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m.

MODERATOR: DEBORAH MILLIS, USDA

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

MS. MILLIS: I want to welcome everybody, and I thank you for your patience in our slightly delayed start. We wanted to give everyone a chance to get here. There we go. Very good.

I want to welcome you all. My name is Deborah Millis, and I am an USDA employee, and my role here today is to kind of keep the meeting on track, make sure that everybody has an opportunity to weigh in on some of the things that we're doing.

Today, just let me go over the agenda briefly with you. After I do some logistical announcement, we're going to hear from Dr. Lisa Ferguson to welcome you officially from Veterinary Services and APHIS, and then we're going to hear from Sue Skorupski, the area veterinarian in charge in Ohio and West Virginia, and then we will hear a presentation that's coming out of our regulatory working group that's been working on the rule and regulation that we're in the process of writing.

1 After that, we're going to have the
2 opportunity to work in some smaller groups
3 focused on the traceability performance
4 measures that will be how we can measure that
5 we're being successful in our traceability and
6 developing our capabilities to do that. So
7 we'll talk about that a little bit later.

8 And with no further adieu -- well, let
9 me, first of all, give you logistics. Just
10 out near the door where you registered,
11 there's the necessary rooms. Our nearest fire
12 exit is out this door and to the right. I am
13 hoping that we won't have an opportunity to
14 use that, but if we do, let's step all the way
15 back to the other end of the parking lot.

16 Now I can introduce Lisa Ferguson, so
17 Lisa?

18 DR. FERGUSON: Thanks, Deb. Good
19 morning, and we appreciate everyone coming out
20 this morning. I recognize we've had folks
21 that have flown in from various parts around
22 the country, and that was a real challenge
23 yesterday with all the thunderstorms and the
24 lightning, so for those of who you spent a lot
25 of time sitting in airports or waiting, we do

1 appreciate it.

2 Our intent with all of our efforts
3 around the traceability regs and the framework
4 is to truly have this be a collaborative
5 process and to be very transparent and open
6 about what we're doing and how we're trying to
7 get there, so we really do want everyone's
8 input from all sides.

9 We recognize that our state partners
10 here are truly crucial, and I would just like
11 to acknowledge those at least that I recognize
12 that are in the room, and I see Dr. Bill
13 Hartman there from Minnesota, and Guy
14 Hohenhaus from Maryland and Heather Hirst from
15 Delaware, so I appreciate you guys coming.

16 If I've missed everyone else, please
17 let me know, and I apologize. I also see
18 representatives from various industry groups,
19 so I think we've got a good set of people here
20 today.

21 To get started, we have Dr. Sue
22 Skorupski. She is our ADIC in the Ohio West
23 Virginia area, and she's going to just talk
24 about the context around traceability. Sue
25 has been tapped at the last minute to give

1 these slides, so we appreciate her stepping up
2 to the plate, but she's also been with APHIS
3 for many years and has dealt with traceability
4 and how it fits into animal disease programs
5 in many different ways, so, Sue, welcome.

6 DR. SKORUPSKI: Good morning. I am
7 going to give thanks to -- I guess I'll give
8 thanks, I give thanks to Rich Breitmeyer, and
9 I'm not sure what I'll give to the other folks
10 that are here. I'm actually going to be
11 giving Rich Breitmeyer's presentation that he
12 gave at NIAA, so state animal health
13 officials, you will recognize this or at least
14 parts of this presentation from what he did
15 there.

16 Which way do I point it? Rich has
17 got -- his presentation was broken down into
18 several groups, starting with animal health
19 and disease concerns. Then we'll talk about
20 animal movements of interest and then current
21 traceability tools and traceability gaps, and
22 then finally recommendations that Rich had.

23 Relative to traceability, our emphasis
24 is on disease programs. The importance is for
25 tracing to be able to address our disease

1 issues, and sometimes people forget that
2 focus, but we want to emphasize that, and Rich
3 had that as a part of his presentation here as
4 well.

5 Predominantly his emphasis and his
6 examples are going to be related to cattle
7 disease of concerns, so if we think about what
8 kind of diseases in cattle we might be
9 concerned with and interested in, we have
10 bovine tuberculosis there at the top; bovine
11 brucellosis; bovine spongiform encephalopathy;
12 especially relative to imports, trichomonosis,
13 which right now, most of the western states
14 are concerned about or have a strong passion
15 around; foreign animal diseases are something
16 that every one of us is concerned with; and
17 then emerging diseases, which is something
18 that we never know when that's going to pop up
19 that can happen at any point.

20 I want to emphasize that tuberculosis
21 in particular is a disease that we're really
22 going to have difficulty with controlling and
23 identifying and tracing without an adequate
24 traceability program, and later in this
25 presentation, we'll give you some examples of

1 why that's the case.

2 If we look at, relative to cattle and
3 identification and tuberculosis, how have we
4 found and what have we done for surveillance
5 to identify and locate tuberculosis infected
6 herds since 1998, FY's fiscal year, which for
7 the federal government starts in October, so
8 since September or October 1 of 1997 through
9 2009, company infected herds we found, and if
10 we look at Michigan and Minnesota, we have 61,
11 with that light blue being tuberculin testing,
12 I'm assuming on farm testing is what he means
13 there, but we have to remember that those are
14 areas that are kind of -- parts of them are
15 almost endemic for TB.

16 So they did a lot of tuberculosis
17 testing there on farms and in live animals,
18 but the rest of the country, where we hadn't
19 identified a foci infection, some of that
20 was done with the kind of blue purple color
21 there. It was live animal testing, but then
22 we had 13 were from slaughter testing, and
23 then the even scarier part for me is that
24 there were seven identified as slaughter that
25 we could not trace back to a herd of origin.

1 And so kind of illustrating there how
2 important slaughter surveillance and
3 identification throughout the surveillance
4 system, not just at the slaughter plant, but
5 throughout the system, that we have
6 identification and traceability and what
7 happens if we don't have that.

8 If you want to look at the number just
9 to kind of see how many samples we have been
10 collecting at slaughter for TB surveillance,
11 we've had 364 TB cases identified in nine
12 years. Most of those were in fed cattle, and
13 one of the things that you may realize with
14 that is that not all of those fed cattle are
15 going to have official identification on
16 those.

17 The other part of it is some people
18 may think, well, it's a slaughter plant
19 problem, but if the ID isn't put on those
20 animals somewhere along the system before they
21 get to the slaughter plant and that
22 identification is not recorded somewhere, it
23 doesn't do any good for the folks at the
24 slaughter plants to be doing surveillance and
25 know that there's -- they'll collect the

1 sample. The lab will identify it as
2 tuberculosis infection, but we won't be able
3 to trace it anywhere.

4 So that surveillance, the work that
5 the people do at the slaughter plants and the
6 labs is almost wasted, and it's almost kind of
7 just a scary cloud above us knowing that
8 there's something out there that we can't
9 identify, so identification and recordkeeping
10 are key to any of our surveillance programs,
11 whether we're talking tuberculosis or other.

12 To show where to -- kind of
13 illustrate, kind of set the mindset of where
14 we had tuberculosis and TB status as of
15 December of 2009, the green states are the
16 free states, haven't had any TB infected herds
17 recently. Modified accredited advanced areas
18 are the yellow, and then modified accredited
19 are the kind of orangey colored areas, and
20 it's not just in one spot.

21 That's the idea here is that it's just
22 not one state or one part of the country. We
23 have it kind of scattered. The little animals
24 that are scattered around shows where we've
25 had recently identified TB herds since October

1 of 2008. It's been in beef. It's been in
2 dairy. It's been in cervid, but it's kind of
3 scattered throughout the country is kind of
4 the point here.

5 To show you what can happen, we had
6 Texas, which was one of those states that had
7 an infection, and Dr. Breitmeyer, during his
8 original presentation, gave thanks to Texas
9 for sharing this information, they had 5,208
10 exposed heifers that they identified and that
11 went to 22 okay -- at least 22 states, you can
12 see by the arrows leaving Texas, going out all
13 over the country. We got some into our state,
14 in Ohio, and so it's scattered throughout the
15 country.

16 75 herds and 131,000 plus animals were
17 tested to date as of the time Dr. Breitmeyer
18 received this slide, so a lot of animals
19 involved in that movement, and that's kind of
20 part of the issue that we need to think about,
21 too, is that today we have animals moving a
22 lot quickly and back and forth across the
23 country and across national borders.

24 In California, in 2002, they had some
25 TB situations, and this illustrates --

1 obviously the little squares we don't care
2 about, but the whole point of this is look at
3 all the trace ins. This is how many places
4 these herds bought animals from, so that was
5 potential sources of TB, and so it's an
6 incredible amount of work and money spent
7 trying to figure out where that disease might
8 have come from and to go back to see if we can
9 find that source and who else might have been
10 exposed.

11 Without enough identification or
12 recordkeeping, we have to kind of throw out a
13 big blanket to cover -- to try to find where
14 we might have gotten this animal from and
15 which one it really was, so this illustrates
16 how many possible herds we could get into.

17 Going the other way, where we have the
18 infected herd, where did they sell to and who
19 did they expose and which of those animals
20 expose people? Again, a huge number of herds
21 to look at in multiple states, and the amount
22 of paperwork that's involved and with certain
23 kinds of identification systems or lack of
24 identification systems, certain kinds of
25 recordkeeping systems or lack of recordkeeping

1 systems makes this take longer and be more or
2 less effective.

3 In that particular case in 2002, one
4 of the herds had animals in it from 33 states.
5 Another herd had animals in it from 22 states,
6 and another herd had animals from 5 different
7 states, so this is truly not an individual
8 locations problem. It's a national problem.
9 It illustrates how much animals move across
10 our country.

11 Then in 2009, California had another
12 TB incident that many of us were involved in,
13 and again the number of places that they
14 received animals from, the trace ins or where
15 did they come from, and so this illustrates
16 the vast number of locations that we have to
17 look at as potential sources of the disease,
18 that those are potential sources for this
19 disease incident. They may have been
20 potential sources for other folks that
21 received animals from those locations.

22 Going the other way, how many places
23 received animals from this infected herd?
24 Again, lots and lots of circles to look at,
25 and with appropriate identification and

1 recordkeeping systems, those methods and the
2 time to do this tracing and the ability to get
3 to that to help decrease the spread of that
4 would be greatly enhanced.

5 The summary of California's 2009 TB
6 event was four affected herds with eight
7 infected cows, with three different strains of
8 tuberculosis; 659 traces of 21,000 cattle, and
9 there was about 254 herds tested, totaling
10 419,000 cattle to date at the time this slide
11 was made.

12 One of the things that Dr. Breitmeyer
13 wanted to mention relative to their recent
14 incident and things that kind of worked well
15 and relative to the TB testing was they used
16 RFID tags, radio frequency ID tags in
17 California, and they provided 400,000 RFID
18 tags in that testing. It was well received by
19 the producers, which I think is one of the key
20 points that whenever we're working, we need to
21 make sure -- yeah, it sounds great for me to
22 stand up at the podium and say, We ought to do
23 this, but if it doesn't work in the field and
24 if the people we're working with, it doesn't
25 work for them, then it doesn't matter what I

1 say, so in the California experience, the RFID
2 tags were well received by the producers,
3 according to Dr. Breitmeyer.

4 One of the big things is that it
5 enhanced the accuracy and decreased the
6 testing time during retests. That I can vouch
7 for from here. We didn't have nearly the
8 number of animals to test that they did in
9 California, but we've had some of our own
10 herds, 2,000 cattle herds that we've had to
11 test and using RFID tags. I don't know if we
12 could have done it without having the RFID
13 tags, and if we had done it, we may not have
14 done it as well as we could have.

15 We have the ability to try to -- on
16 the first day you go out and inject those
17 animals, three days later we come back and
18 read the TB test, but we also need to make
19 sure we're examining the right animal, and to
20 go through and try to go through pages and
21 pages of 2,000 cows identification, no matter
22 what kind of identification methods you use,
23 would be just almost impossible to do on that
24 third day.

25 So then when you're talking about

1 writing numbers down, you've always got
2 operator error, so enhanced accuracy and
3 decreased testing time on those retests was
4 one of the definite advantages that they saw
5 in California.

6 They also selected that RFID
7 information on over 3,500 suspect animals at
8 the slaughter plant, so then they were able to
9 quickly reconcile that. Again you just think
10 of the volumes of numbers that you're trying
11 to keep track of, and if you're having to
12 write that down and then match it up, even if
13 you put it in the database, if you're doing
14 anything with somebody writing numbers down,
15 you're going to have a much greater chance for
16 errors than even with Excel files, it would
17 still be easy to have problems.

18 The other issue with RFID tags that's
19 a help is one we're talking about, large
20 numbers in a number of these herds, but even
21 in a smaller herd, those kind of transcription
22 errors can happen. You may not be working in
23 the most convenient environment. Most of us
24 that have worked particularly in the cattle
25 industry are used to seeing those silver metal

1 tags or those orange tags.

2 They're not always easy to read even
3 in the best conditions and the best daylight,
4 and so the RFID tags were definitely an
5 advantage in some of the environments where,
6 particularly in this California situation, the
7 large herds and the weather conditions. They
8 did a lot of things early in the morning.

9 It's pretty dark over there, and trying to
10 read one of those silver or orange metal tags
11 wouldn't have been an easy thing to do under
12 those conditions. Maybe here in the afternoon
13 might have been nice, but over what you see on
14 your right side would have been a little more
15 difficult.

16 The next area that Dr. Breitmeyer had
17 in his presentation was: What kind of animals
18 movements do we have? What are of interest to
19 us from the animal disease control standpoint?
20 And we've got interstate movements. We have
21 things going on at sales, and just animals
22 being trucked all over the country.

23 So the first area is international
24 movements, and in 2009, to give you an
25 example, in California, they received animals

1 from Mexico, and those animals are identified
2 in Mexico, and he said in some cases they may
3 even be better identified than some of our
4 animals. They received 55,700 imported
5 animals into California. They also have
6 animals that graze with their or near their
7 domestic cattle in central and southern
8 California, so those imports are very
9 important, not just because they're imported
10 animals that we're going to have here, but
11 they also then will be exposed to our domestic
12 animals or already exposed to them.

13 One of the issues though is that those
14 animals may change ownership, and that's not
15 just true with Mexico cattle but with domestic
16 cattle as well, but they often change
17 ownership numerous times before moving from
18 the feedlot to slaughter.

19 The other imported animals they
20 receive in California are from Canada, and the
21 numbers there are much smaller, at least for
22 California. Other parts of the country it may
23 be a little different, but they receive just a
24 couple hundred or 600 dairy and about 200 beef
25 that went directly to slaughter, but those are

1 in California. They're smaller issues, but
2 it's illustrating the point that those are
3 issues for the rest of us.

4 Interstate movements, California
5 examples, 39,000 shipments that they had
6 gotten from border reports. That's over 17
7 million animals in the year 2009. 4,247
8 permit were issued that was associated with
9 385,000 plus animals, so they require import
10 permits for most of their cattle, sheep, goats
11 swine, waterfowl and bison.

12 So it's kind of setting a tone for
13 what kind of volumes of animals they look at
14 in California, for example, and how they --
15 what they already have in place for keeping
16 track of those, and after exclusion border
17 stations, animals are inspected, and these are
18 kind of the number of shipments that they've
19 looked a lot and the kind of animals they're
20 seeing coming across those state lines.

21 Again as I mentioned earlier, almost
22 40,000 shipments were looked at in 2009 going
23 into California, and then there are other
24 permits side. This kind of shows you the
25 numbers of animals. Most of their cattle were

1 imported cattle where beef were going to
2 slaughter, but they had a good number of dairy
3 animals coming in, a lot of sheep, a bunch of
4 swine as well, and then a few other species,
5 so a lot of different animals coming into
6 California that they're keeping track of
7 somehow.

8 The next general area that Dr.
9 Breitmeyer was going to talk about was current
10 traceability tools, and so we can talk about
11 identification methods and recordkeeping
12 methods.

13 So on the official ID side,
14 historically, talking cows, we've got
15 brucellosis vaccination tags, or the Bangs
16 tag. That's the orange tags, like on the
17 animal there in the upper right. California
18 requires all heifers to be vaccinated,
19 including those imported from other states, so
20 they still have that requirement in
21 California, which is not necessarily true in
22 the rest of the country. Often in California,
23 that orange vaccination tag is the only one
24 that's seen at slaughter relative to
25 intrastate movement.

1 The other kind of ID that's used that
2 we're all familiar with is the USDA silver
3 bright tag. It's called bright because when
4 it's new at least, it looks bright. When it's
5 older, it's a little bit different, and often
6 the only official ID on interstate movement,
7 and if the animal is TB or brucellosis tested,
8 that tag will be used there if it doesn't have
9 any other official ID.

10 The advantage to those silver tags or
11 those orange tags? Man, they're cheap and
12 easy, easy to put in. They're cheap, and they
13 don't cost a lot for anybody to generate or to
14 obtain. The difficulty is they are very
15 expensive and difficult to read and record,
16 and we'll illustrate a couple things later,
17 but if you think about it, they're easy to put
18 them in, but I know from personal experience,
19 both as a practitioner and in the field, man,
20 trying to get that cattle to stand still to
21 read that little tiny ear tag, and I'm sure
22 today, and I'm in my 50s, it will be even
23 worse, because it will be even harder to read
24 that tag with my own eyes. So we'll
25 illustrate later a couple things that have

1 happened because of that.

2 Other official IDs that we do see in
3 this country, Canada and Mexico both have
4 official ID. The problem with that is
5 sometimes the ID is removed so we can't trace
6 it back to Mexico or can't trace it back to
7 Canada.

8 Another type of ID is brands, and as a
9 supplemental ID, it's helped traced animals
10 when there wasn't any other ID available. If
11 there's nothing else there, at least the brand
12 is helpful in that respect. A couple problems
13 with it is it's removed at slaughter. It's
14 not necessarily unique and especially not
15 unique to an individual animal, and then the
16 other is that there's only 14 brand states, so
17 the others -- if you bring a brand into Ohio,
18 it would be like, What am I supposed to do
19 with those, so there's a difficulty with only
20 14 brand states.

21 On the record side of things, how do
22 we keep records on the IDs that we do put in?
23 Brucellosis vaccination tags, obviously
24 there's a record that goes with that, and in
25 California, they had 800,000 heifers per year

1 vaccinated. Most of those are dairy, and they
2 have it in a California database, and they
3 manage the distribution of the tags and the
4 database on the vaccinated animals.

5 Another method of recordkeeping is
6 interstate Certificates of Veterinary
7 Inspection. California issued or received
8 18,000 of those from other states that
9 accounted for almost 600,000 animals. Most of
10 those are in paper format. A few of them are
11 electronic certificates, but most of them are
12 paper format, and they're not in any kind of
13 database, so that means that there's this big
14 pile of paper, and it's in there. If you want
15 to go trace it, have fun trying to find it.
16 It's possible to find, but it would take a lot
17 of time.

18 Then international certificates, that
19 information is available, if needed, but again
20 some of that at least is in a database but not
21 necessarily as accessible as some might need
22 it to be.

23 Other records, brand records, they
24 document many of the intrastate movements and
25 some interstate movements. Again, those are

1 also paper format, permits that the states
2 will have, and California is one that has
3 permits. It does record the location of
4 origin and the destination of the animal, and
5 typically that's just for interstate movement
6 available, but again the advantage to that is
7 at least we have a starting point and ending
8 point. It may not even be if the tag was put
9 in the animal on this farm at birth and then
10 knowing where the record is kept, this permit
11 record might at least be a middle stop before
12 it ends up in slaughter, for example, so it is
13 a way of getting some middle stop information.

14 Other records are private testing for
15 official programs, so it would be in the
16 system or the laboratories where those tests
17 are done for brucellosis or tuberculosis, and
18 the records that are kept there in whatever
19 format that may or may not be.

20 Finally, they're sale yard
21 consignments, so if we needed to at least try
22 to go through records at sale yards, again in
23 some cases these are electronic. In many
24 cases, especially the details, are in paper
25 format.

1 So what are the traceability gaps as
2 Dr. Breitmeyer sees them? One of them is the
3 new approach to brucellosis, and the new
4 approach is based on the fact that we don't
5 have as much brucellosis as we had 50 years
6 ago, so we're modifying our programs to
7 reflect that, and part of that is that first
8 point testing is being discontinued and also
9 that fewer states require brucellosis
10 vaccinations.

11 So we don't have reasons to put silver
12 tags or to put the orange tags in calves
13 anymore, so we don't have identification being
14 applied because the brucellosis, the disease
15 program has changed.

16 Then another issue is that movement
17 records don't exist for some animals. The
18 Mexican cattle imports, we have the entry at
19 the United States, but after that, the records
20 of where those animals move are not
21 maintained.

22 Some TB reactors found at slaughter
23 have a Mexican ID, but no records of movement
24 into the United States, so it will say, yeah,
25 it came in on this date, but it was quite

1 awhile after that when this animal went to
2 slaughter, so where was it in the meantime?
3 And then the other part of it is removal of
4 official ID continues to be a concern.

5 Other traceability gaps are that some
6 practitioners retag rather than recording
7 existing tags, and that was what I alluded to
8 earlier. Some folks just think, Man, I'm not
9 going to read this tag, I'll just put this
10 other one in and they'll never know the
11 difference.

12 Well, if you look at this cow on the
13 right, she's got four different tags in her
14 ear, and at least a couple of those are
15 official tags, and the issue there is if we
16 didn't match up those numbers, it looks, in
17 each of those different records we talked
18 about earlier, we could think we're talking
19 about four cows when really we're only talking
20 about one, so if we don't have a way to
21 identify that's easy to use and easy to put in
22 and easy to read, get the information back,
23 and we don't have a recordkeeping system on
24 that, if we're working on disease programs,
25 it's going to bog us down because, as I said

1 in this example, we could be looking for four
2 cows when really we need to only look for one.

3 Other issues are that dealers and
4 traders don't maintain adequate records, and
5 those of us that are in the regulatory arena
6 all experience that with what some of those
7 folks do or don't do.

8 Another issue that I've mentioned a
9 couple times in talking about records is that
10 many official records are in paper format, not
11 in any kind of a database. Certificates of
12 Veterinary Inspection, the brand inspections
13 and some of the official tests, they're paper
14 format so, yeah, we have great records but
15 they're paper, and when we talk about the
16 volumes we're looking at these days when
17 animals are moving across the country, it's
18 more difficult to try to track that
19 information, and then also the sale yard
20 consignments are the same way. In most cases
21 or in many cases, those are in paper format as
22 well.

23 I know from our experience in Ohio, we
24 have people that have electronic systems,
25 electronic databases, but some of the

1 information that we need is really still in
2 the paper side of it. Their electronics are
3 more for their business side of information,
4 so they move towards electronic databases, but
5 not so much for our disease tracing needs.

6 Additional gaps are exhibitions, and
7 those are areas where we've got animals moving
8 and exposing each other to things, but it's
9 also an opportunity for outreach that could be
10 used to help people understand, and we talk
11 about a lot of our programs, whether it's
12 trying to get kids to quit or not use drugs or
13 whatever, it's starting with the youth, and so
14 this would be an area of opportunity to help
15 them understand what needs might be in place.

16 Other areas that are of concern are
17 jackpot shows where there aren't records of
18 who is there or even sometimes when and where
19 the show happened.

20 Additional gap is that there's a lack
21 of standards across states. Different states
22 have what they consider official IDs and ways
23 of identifying locations, so currently that's
24 not a standard across all states.

25 Some groups of cattle will never have

1 an official ID or require movement records,
2 and that is of a particular concern of long
3 incubating diseases like BSE and I guess I
4 would throw TB in there as well, so the
5 discussion around that would be: What is the
6 cost worth of benefit of you putting an ID or
7 not having an ID on animals that don't have an
8 official test done on them, for example?

9 Examples using an economic impact,
10 California looked at their TB episode for
11 2002, and they used that to illustrate the
12 value added of effective traceability. The
13 staff at California Department of Food and
14 Agricultural reevaluated the cost of that TB
15 incident under the scenario that testing was
16 restricted to herds that were traced as
17 opposed to an area test.

18 For those that aren't familiar, what
19 we've done in the past in some situations is
20 you identified where the index herd was, and
21 then you kind of drew a circle, however you
22 big you needed that circle to be for whatever
23 disease you're working on, and tested
24 everybody.

25 So they compared what it would be if

1 they tested everybody in a certain geographic
2 area in that circle versus just testing
3 animals that they had to trace because they
4 had the appropriate records and
5 identification.

6 And so in 2002, the reduced cost to
7 the government, both California and USDA, was
8 \$880,000, and 500,000 was to California and
9 375,000 to the USDA. That doesn't include any
10 of the costs to the producer, and so if we're
11 talking looking at 688 herds versus 129 herds,
12 you've got more than 500 herd owners that
13 aren't even impacted, so the producer cost,
14 the decreased producer cost in just physically
15 having us there and the time spent doing it is
16 just monumental on that.

17 Another example of a program that's
18 working because of some of the issues that --
19 and taking account some of those traceability
20 gaps is the Scrapie program and their
21 identification program. There's a lot of
22 industry support in this program. I'm from a
23 state that has had a lot of Scrapie, and so
24 we've had our bumps in the road, but it's been
25 incredibly effective on finding TB on -- or

1 excuse me, Scrapie, and I don't think I ever
2 have said this, but we do have less Scrapie
3 today, definitely much less Scrapie. It's not
4 gone yet, but much less, so it's been a
5 successful program.

6 It's relatively simple from the ID
7 standpoint. One of the things is there are
8 different kinds of IDs that are available, ID
9 devices that are able to be used and methods
10 that are able to be used, and they're of
11 minimal cost, and so those have been some of
12 the features of the Scrapie program that have
13 made it work and be effective for controlling
14 that disease.

15 Our emphasis is animal health and
16 animal disease control and animal disease
17 programs, but one of the things that we can
18 remind people of is if we get our system in
19 place, if we get a system in place that works
20 so that we can trace and continue to improve
21 our program so we can trace what we need to be
22 able to trace from a disease control
23 standpoint, there are some benefits to some
24 other agencies that have inspection systems
25 and need to be able to trace certain animals

1 within the animal industry as well.

2 Food safety and drug residues are
3 areas that would be impacted by that. There's
4 a lack of identification. There is also a
5 problem for them. FSIS is now enforcing
6 residue HACCP programs and penalizing plants,
7 and the plants somehow have to respond, and if
8 the animal is untraceable, it may impact a
9 producer's ability to sell.

10 So we don't need to set our program up
11 specifically for FSIS or FDA, but there would
12 be an offshoot if we had a good traceability
13 program that could impact other parts of food
14 safety and animal health or animal industry
15 programs as well, and so USDA and FDA are
16 reaching out to the states to ask for help on
17 their side of the concerns as well.

18 So recommendations from Dr.
19 Breitmeyer. One is in the process area or one
20 of the general areas is in the process area,
21 and he says we need to identify and prioritize
22 traceability needs for existing disease
23 programs. We need to identify current
24 traceability tools that are effective. Don't
25 reinvent the wheel. Don't throw the baby out

1 with the bath water.

2 We need to identify what the gaps are
3 and find out where we've got the holes and
4 then fill those gaps, and then we need to
5 provide an appropriate message and
6 justification, so we all need to know why
7 we're doing what we're doing and have a reason
8 to say that so that people aren't confused and
9 think we're doing something for this reason
10 when really we're doing it for something else.

11 He had some -- using TB as an example
12 to identify and prioritize traceability needs
13 for an existing program such as TB, and he
14 says bovine tuberculosis because it's probably
15 the highest priority for cattle. As we
16 illustrated earlier, we found TB in several
17 different states in the United States, and
18 each of those states has had traces to many,
19 many other of our states, so it is a program
20 that we could definitely justify the need for
21 a national identification requirement with all
22 the states participating.

23 We can identify existing traceability
24 tools we have already in place, brucellosis
25 tags, silver bright tags, RFIDs, recommend

1 that we would accept all of those, but given
2 what Dr. Breitmeyer experienced and told us
3 about for California, and many of us have
4 experienced that in our own states, is to
5 promote the advantages of using things like
6 RFID identification methods, accepting the
7 others, but if there is the opportunity to use
8 RFID, definitely promote that.

9 Then finally on this slide is to
10 identify the high risk animals that need to be
11 identified, so we need to get everybody or
12 talking TB, who do we need to worry about, and
13 he proposes that we would be looking at
14 breeding animals, imported animals and rodeo
15 and event cattle, and I think we can kind of
16 list why we think those would be appropriate
17 choices.

18 Finally, we need to identify those
19 high risk movements or events where we want to
20 capture the data, if we're talking about a TB
21 program relative to cattle, so obvious choices
22 are movement from the herd of origin, whether
23 we're talking intrastate or interstate, times
24 when we vaccinate the animals. That's another
25 time when we can get an identification check

1 on the dairy cattle in particular.

2 Now, when we identify it from the herd
3 of origin, we're now going interstate after
4 they leave the herd of origin, so
5 identification moving out of the state, and
6 then any testing that's done for movement or
7 some investigation or a sale.

8 Then finally more towards the end is
9 if we look at the whole -- these lists are
10 kind of from the time the animal starts until
11 the time it's finished with its life, so
12 collection of ID at slaughter, and as you can
13 see that's important that we have ID all
14 along, not just that it gets put on at the
15 slaughter plant, so we do need that ID, but we
16 do need to collect it at the end so that we
17 know that one is done, she or he is no longer
18 with us.

19 Another part of that TB program, we
20 talked about putting ID in, and it's great to
21 put it in , but if we don't do anything with
22 the ID and don't write it down anywhere, it's
23 not really useful either, so recordkeeping
24 relative to TB program would be to support
25 databases that are needed in each of the

1 states because we mentioned interstate
2 movements and intrastate movements.

3 Linking to existing programs, various
4 states have different kinds of programs in
5 place, and USDA has various programs, so how
6 are we going to link all that information but
7 to ensure there are standards among states and
8 then strive for more automation? As we
9 mentioned, many states have paper copies, but
10 try for automation because of the time and
11 resources needed to search the paper copies is
12 sometimes a limiting factor.

13 Then finally, demonstrate to producers
14 and other stakeholders why animal disease
15 traceability is needed to eliminate TB. As we
16 mentioned, you combine the movement of animals
17 across the country and across states and
18 national borders, and you talk about the
19 disease and how it's transmitted and how long
20 it can incubate that we need to be able to
21 keep these records, gather the records and be
22 able to search them for a long period of time.

23 And that concludes my presentation,
24 and again I bow to Dr. Breitmeyer. I'm
25 definitely not Dr. Breitmeyer, but his slides

1 were easy to understand what his principles
2 were, which is kind of typical of Dr.
3 Breitmeyer's approach to things, and I hope I
4 did him justice by sharing this information
5 with you.

6 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, Dr. Skorupski,
7 for filling in for Dr. Breitmeyer, and now I
8 want to welcome Dr. Lisa Ferguson, who is
9 going to present to us some of the background
10 of the Secretary's announcement and some of
11 the decisions about traceability that have
12 been made.

13 DR. FERGUSON: Before I get started,
14 Sue, did you take the clicker? Sorry.
15 Technology sometimes gets the best of us.

16 As Vince is getting the slides up
17 there and as we're looking at pictures of his
18 lovely daughters, I would just like to again
19 welcome everybody. I see we have more folks
20 that have made it in today through the rain
21 which is very good.

22 Let me emphasize yet again that we
23 really appreciate everybody's cooperation. We
24 need the input from all of the producers, the
25 industry groups, states, tribes, anybody

1 concerned with animal production. We really
2 need your input as we develop this process.
3 I'll click through this. We'll try.

4 This meeting is one step in the
5 process as we develop this whole framework.
6 We had one public meeting in Kansas City
7 earlier this week, and we'll have another one
8 on Monday in Denver. We have more throughout
9 the summer. We also had a forum with our
10 state and tribal colleagues back in March.
11 These slides are actually essentially the same
12 ones that were presented at that forum in
13 March, so we would like to bring you guys up
14 to speed on what we did at that forum.

15 Also, as I'll describe through this
16 presentation, we've got a working group that
17 is set up to help us develop the regulation,
18 and that's also another way of gathering
19 input, so we are committed to maintaining
20 these cooperative efforts. We want full
21 engagement and collaboration from our states,
22 tribes, industry, producers, every partner out
23 there as we try and develop this critical
24 component with our animal health safeguarding
25 efforts.

1 Down goes forward? Thank you.

2 Clearly that went backwards.

3 So what are we going to do today?

4 What do we hope to get out of this meeting?

5 We will review and clarify the new
6 traceability framework. That's what I'm going
7 to go through now, and we will summarize a bit
8 of the traceability forum with the states and
9 tribes that I just mentioned. We will share
10 concepts of the traceability performance
11 standards, and then we would like to discuss
12 and obtain feedback on those performance
13 standards, so this again -- let me just
14 emphasize your input. We really need good
15 discussion and some good ideas on the
16 performance standards. Also, we will have
17 some discussion around evaluating performance
18 against those standards and compliance with
19 the performance standards.

20 So let's go back and review what the
21 new framework is and what the Secretary's
22 announcement is, so after the February 5
23 announcement, we not only set a new course for
24 our approach to traceability, but the
25 Secretary also described a series of actions

1 aimed at preventing the entry of animal
2 diseases into the U.S., and more importantly,
3 strengthening our ability to successfully
4 respond to animal disease, and really all of
5 our efforts around traceability are tied into
6 that crucial point, which is responding to
7 animal disease and outbreaks.

8 These actions include strengthening
9 our import regulations, enforcing existing
10 disease control regulations and finding ways
11 to provide more resources to the states and
12 tribes to combat emerging diseases. He also
13 announced, and this is the reason why we're
14 here today, that we will look to implement a
15 flexibility literature coordinated approach to
16 address traceability.

17 We want this approach to embrace the
18 strengths and the expertise of states, tribes,
19 producers. We recognize that locally folks
20 know what can work best for them. As Dr.
21 Skorupski mentioned in her presentation, we
22 can put something up here that looks great on
23 paper, but you guys down there locally are who
24 know what will work, and that's what we want.

25 We want an approach based on state and

1 Tribal Nations that will be supported and
2 coordinated with federal funds and resources,
3 and it will allow those workable solutions
4 really to come up from the local level. We
5 want to develop these appropriate standards
6 because these are critical in avoiding road
7 blocks that could impede interstate movement.
8 We want to be flexible yet remain committed to
9 developing compatible, consistent standards.

10 Let me emphasize a few of our
11 fundamentals here. First, and this is a
12 crucial point, the no approach to traceability
13 will apply only to certain animals moving
14 interstate. We heard loud and clear the
15 concerns about all animal movement, so we're
16 emphasizing here that this applies only to
17 animals moving interstate.

18 As we work through this process, we
19 will need to address what animals and what
20 specific types of movements, if any, will
21 warrant exemption from that rule, but in
22 general, overall we're looking at regulating
23 interstate movement of all farm raised
24 livestock and poultry.

25 Second, we want to build on what's

1 been successful. We've had successful
2 traceability through the ID methods used and
3 our disease eradication programs, brucellosis
4 and TB, and we want to build on those
5 successes.

6 Our biggest priority in this process
7 is cattle. We recognize that that's the
8 sector that probably has the biggest void in
9 traceability. As Sue mentioned through our
10 Scrapie program, we've made major strides in
11 the sheep and goat sector. I see a few of my
12 swine colleagues and poultry colleagues here,
13 and in the commercial end of those industries,
14 we're already doing pretty good with
15 traceability in those, so our priority here is
16 cattle.

17 In that, we want to get back to the
18 basics. We want to get back to those real
19 simple methods that have proven to be
20 successful. They've been widely accepted and
21 are cost effective. The nine character
22 alphanumeric silver tag or bright tag that Sue
23 had pictures of up here, that's an example,
24 and I believe everybody here has probably
25 heard Dr. Clifford say, We need to get more

1 cattle identified, we need to get those tags
2 in their ears, and we need to record
3 distribution so they are traceable, so we're
4 scaling back to those very basic points to get
5 started.

6 We recognize that some have advocated
7 a greater level of traceability or even full
8 traceability, and we understand that.
9 Hopefully we will get there at some point in
10 time, but we need to start with the basics,
11 and this basic approach will cost far less
12 than what we had estimated for the full
13 traceability level. I believe our estimate
14 was about 220 million for full traceability
15 with RFID technology.

16 So going back to bright tags, the
17 basic approach provides the greatest return on
18 investment and will be the most palatable
19 foremost producers. Once we've got those
20 basics in place, then we can make progress
21 overtime.

22 We want this new approach to be
23 flexible enough to allow for the use of
24 advancing technology. We recognize that there
25 are lots of options out there, all the way

1 from that little metal flip to an RFID tag,
2 and we want to be able to use all of those
3 options.

4 Our intent with this approach is to
5 put in place what many folks have suggested
6 all along, which is new regulations
7 traceability section in the CFR, so we will be
8 taking deliberate and transparent steps to
9 establish a framework for implementation. Our
10 first priority will be to publish, in the
11 regulations, in the CFR, a new animal disease
12 traceability section after allowing for and
13 considering public comment. This new rule,
14 again let me emphasize, will apply only to
15 animals moving interstate.

16 We plan on maintaining our ID
17 regulations for disease programs. We
18 recognize that there are many programs that
19 already have that component in the
20 regulations, so we plan on maintaining that,
21 but we will consolidate everything in one
22 traceability section.

23 In addition to reviewing those disease
24 program regs, we'll also review a couple of
25 specific identification sections, and these

1 are 71.18, which has requirements for
2 individual ID of breeding cattle or sexually
3 in tact females over 24 months of age that
4 move interstate, and then 71.19, which
5 requires swine identification, so we'll review
6 those and see how they fit in with the new
7 regs that we're proposing.

8 This new approach is going to be
9 outcome based. It's going to be built around
10 performance standards, and this is a different
11 concept than we're used to. We're very used
12 to having very prescriptive regulations that
13 say to move an animal from point A to point B,
14 you do X, Y and Z, but these regs are
15 definitely not going to be that specific.

16 Our intent is to have -- to define an outcome,
17 which is the performance standards, and then
18 leave the flexibility to the local folks, to
19 states and tribes, to define how you meet that
20 start.

21 This rule will require that animals
22 moving interstate be traceable and that
23 animals be officially ID'ed in accordance with
24 the regs that will provide various ID methods.
25 Each state and tribe will then develop a plan

1 that meets the needs of producers and then can
2 meet the outcomes as defined in our
3 performance standards.

4 Let me talk a bit about the
5 commitments that we're making from our side.
6 We recognize that many folks, states, tribes,
7 industry groups, producers invested heavily in
8 our program formerly known as NAIS. We have a
9 lot of efforts around that and worked hard to
10 make that a success.

11 As we transition into this new
12 framework, we want to capitalize on the
13 progress that we made in NAIS and determine
14 what we can use from that program to help
15 leverage our investment to support the new
16 approach.

17 One of the big components that was
18 successful and that was a good investment
19 through NAIS was some of the IT systems that
20 we developed. We plan on maintaining all of
21 those current systems, and we will make them
22 available to tribes and states that wish to
23 use them as they implement and administer
24 their plans. So those will be available to
25 folks that want to use them if they so choose.

1 We support the development and
2 publication of data standards and guidelines
3 to ensure the connectivity and compatibility
4 of information and ID systems. We want to
5 collaborate with states, tribes, industry to
6 establish performance measures and timelines
7 that will be created transparently throughout
8 the rulemaking process.

9 We've established a working group, and
10 I'll go into a few more details on that here
11 in a few minutes, to help us develop that
12 proposed rule, to define those performance
13 standards. In addition to that regulation
14 working group, we will establish a working
15 group to prepare standards for other
16 traceability related issues, for example, data
17 standards, a critical component, so that we
18 can help ensure that any of these systems that
19 folks develop can be compatible.

20 We are also establishing an advisory
21 committee, it does appear as the Secretary's
22 animal health advisory committee. This was
23 formerly known as the Secretary's advisory
24 committee on foreign animal and poultry
25 disease, and we're reformatting that committee

1 to make it broader and make it the Secretary's
2 Animal Health Advisory Committee Animal Health
3 Advisory Committee. Hopefully we will have
4 this established and put out calls for
5 nominations and get this started later this
6 summer, so that is in process.

7 We are looking for representatives
8 from a broad range of commodity organizations
9 and underserved communities to be on this
10 committee and to help us in evaluating and
11 operating input on our traceability efforts.

12 Finally, and this is a crucial point,
13 we are committed to help fund the
14 implementation of the traceability framework.

15 Let me digress a moment and talk about
16 our initiative where we're planning VS,
17 Veterinary Services, needs to be in the year
18 2015. Traceability framework fits in with our
19 2015 initiative, and the 2015 initiative
20 represents our long-term strategic vision.

21 Through this initiative, we're
22 adapting the mission and role of VS to meet
23 the animal health challenges of the 21st
24 century. We're also adapting our programs,
25 which would include animal disease

1 traceability in line with that mission and
2 role. We recognize that there are many things
3 out there that are driving the need for
4 change, which include changes in the animal ag
5 industry, technology, emerging diseases, as
6 well as threats beyond disease, food safety
7 concerns, expansion of international trade and
8 tightening budgets.

9 All of these are causing us to look at
10 what we do within VS and where we want to be
11 to be in line with those changes. We
12 recognize that the expertise and core
13 capabilities of Veterinary Services position
14 us not only to meet those animal health
15 challenges that might arise from all these
16 change in forces, but we also want to become
17 the national veterinary authority for the
18 United States.

19 Strong partnerships are a key
20 component of our 2015 initiative as they've
21 been a key component of all of our animal
22 health efforts. These strong partnerships are
23 also a key component in our development of the
24 new approach for animal disease traceability.

25 So how do we move forward? Where are

1 we going from here and how do we get to the
2 point where we've got regulation published and
3 then can implement? Before I turn that podium
4 over to some of my colleagues to then continue
5 with this presentation, we want to acknowledge
6 that a lot of the details of this approach
7 will be worked out, and again I can't say this
8 enough, in collaboration with folks like
9 yourselves in this room, all of the producers,
10 industry groups, states and tribes.

11 In this new direction and approach, we
12 wanted to address the number of issues that
13 we've been confronted with. We wanted to
14 address those gaps that Sue mentioned in her
15 presentation, and we also wanted to meet the
16 following components.

17 We want to achieve basic, effective
18 national traceability in response to animal
19 disease outbreaks without overly burdening
20 producers. This will only apply to animals
21 moving interstate. We want this approach to
22 be led and administered by the states and
23 Tribal Nations with federal support focused
24 entirely on animal disease traceability.

25 We want to allow for maximum

1 flexibility for states and tribes to work with
2 their producers, their local industry, to find
3 ID solutions that meet their needs. We want
4 to ensure that traceability data is owned and
5 maintained at the discretion of the states and
6 tribes, and we want to encourage the use of
7 lower cost technology.

8 This approach is outlined by the
9 Secretary in response to those concerns that
10 we heard repeatedly last summer and over the
11 past few months. Yet it still outlines a way
12 forward that supports and respects the works
13 of America's farmers and ranchers.

14 I'll touch a bit on financial support.
15 As I mentioned earlier, we have no intention
16 for this to be an unfunded mandate. Secretary
17 Vilsack has made that very clear. Our intent
18 is to provide funding to the states and tribes
19 to help intent our traceability approaches for
20 their producers.

21 This framework is focused on
22 traceability and tracing capabilities so
23 rather than counting premises registered, what
24 we need to do is set up ways to accomplish and
25 document that true tracing capability that

1 leads to the concept of performance standards.
2 Those are the key principles for documenting
3 progress and status of our system.

4 So to do this, clearly we do need some
5 funds. We do have Congressional support for
6 our traceability efforts. In the current
7 fiscal year with carryover money, we have
8 approximately 14.3 million, which is for us
9 throughout this year, and in the FY 2011, in
10 the President's budget, we requested 14.6
11 million. Funding requests for future years,
12 and actually even for 2011, what funding we
13 actually get, will hinge on how we collaborate
14 and collectively construct our traceability
15 plans.

16 Let's talk a bit about the proposed
17 rule and how we're getting there. The
18 proposed rule as I mentioned previously, will
19 contain the traceability performance
20 standards. Our regulations -- traceability
21 reg working group is providing us with input
22 on development of this rule, and the
23 objectives of the working group are to draft
24 the framework of a rule whereby states and
25 tribes will be responsible for their animal

1 disease traceability programs and where
2 compliance to performance standards directs
3 interstate movement of livestock from the
4 geographic area each state or tribe is
5 responsible for.

6 I would like to acknowledge and thank
7 the members of the working group. Many of
8 these folks have not been involved in
9 developing this type of a regulation, so I
10 think it's been a learning experience for
11 them, but we truly appreciate all of their
12 efforts, and up here we have a list of state
13 and tribal members in the working group, and I
14 believe we have Carry Sexton, I believe I saw
15 her come in on -- yes, sitting back there, who
16 is with the United States South and Eastern
17 Tribes as a member of the working group, and
18 she will be giving a presentation immediately
19 after mine to go over and update you on the
20 efforts of the working group.

21 For the regulation working group,
22 they're providing input on the proposed rule
23 and working systematically on key elements of
24 the proposed rule, and those key elements
25 again take the traceability performance

1 standards, protocols as to how we evaluate
2 that tracing capability, and last but not
3 least, compliance factors and issues related
4 to compliance with the new standards.

5 These are very crucial tasks that
6 these folks are working on, and they will be
7 seeking your input throughout this meeting.
8 They're also available for your input as we
9 develop this rule over the summer, and we're
10 going to go over each of these three points in
11 greater detail later in the meeting.

12 While those three elements are key to
13 the proposed rule, we want to develop these
14 collaboratively and transparently with
15 industry input. Our plan is to get that
16 industry input in addition to these public
17 meetings. We plan to give updates of progress
18 of the working group through the website,
19 through these public meetings, through other
20 industry meetings.

21 We're relying on our state colleagues
22 and tribal authorities to help get the word
23 out and do that outreach and get input. We
24 plan on making the content of the reg
25 available for discussion before publication as

1 a proposed rule. In addition, we'll consider
2 input on the suggested performance standards.

3 Various ways to get that feedback, you
4 can -- we'll ask for feedback on the website
5 during these public meetings. You can provide
6 written statements on meeting topics, from the
7 proceedings from the March forum. Any other
8 points that may be of concern or that you want
9 to put in there can be filed through the end
10 of the month, and the Federal Register notice,
11 and I believe there's copies on every table,
12 will give you the addresses to file those
13 written comments if you want to share that
14 with folks who couldn't be here.

15 We have sites that industries can also
16 provide feedback locally through their state
17 and tribal representatives. I know many of
18 the states and tribes are planning on outreach
19 efforts. You can also contact any of the
20 working group members to provide that input to
21 us.

22 So what are our timelines? The
23 working group is giving input on the content
24 of this by focusing on those three elements
25 that I mentioned earlier. With that input,

1 our goal is to publish a proposed rule next
2 winter, which is the winter of 2010.
3 Following the publication of the proposed
4 rule, we will have a public comment period of
5 90 days, and the goal then is to publish a
6 final rule eight to ten months after the
7 comment period closes.

8 Let me emphasize that some
9 requirements, and we're having these
10 discussions and we would welcome everybody's
11 input here today -- some of these requirements
12 may be phased in over time following
13 publication of the rule, so if you have
14 thoughts on aspects that will be phased in, if
15 there are different industry sectors that need
16 to be phased in, please, we would welcome any
17 thoughts and input that you have on that
18 point.

19 Again let me just say thanks for being
20 here today, and we look forward to some
21 frightful discussions, and I believe I'm
22 turning it back over to Deb.

23 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Dr. Ferguson. So
24 next up I would like to introduce Carry
25 Sexton. Carry Sexton represents the United

1 States South and Eastern traceability working
2 group, and she's going to update you on the
3 work that group has been doing on establishing
4 performance standards for the rules.

5 MS. SEXTON: Good morning, you all. I
6 hope you had an easier time getting here than
7 I did. I have toured lovely Riverdale,
8 Maryland, this morning.

9 All right. I love how our title page
10 doesn't actually have any animals in it. As
11 you just learned, there are a few clear
12 objectives for the working group. We have
13 been put together as a group of both APHIS and
14 federal representatives and civilians like me
15 representing both states, Tribal Nations, to
16 come up with the framework of this proposed
17 rule, not to actually put together what it's
18 going to be and how you're going to do it.

19 So the proposed rule is going to give
20 states and tribes the responsibility for their
21 animal disease traceability programs, and
22 through those programs, the direct interstate
23 livestock movement through the compliance with
24 performance standards. As someone who works
25 in Indian country, this both recognizes and

1 supports tribal serenity in a very unique way,
2 and it's refreshing to see that coming from
3 USDA.

4 In order to make this happen, the
5 working group responsibilities cover a couple
6 different areas. You will see that we are
7 recommending the traceability performance
8 standards themselves, the methods for
9 evaluating the tracing capability,
10 consequences for noncompliance and incentives
11 for compliance.

12 What is not there is we are not
13 recommending the ways that you will have to
14 make it happen as a producer, as a state. We
15 are working on how we will measure how well
16 that state or tribal nation likes to do this
17 on their own is actually performing.

18 Now, performance standards? Now, it
19 feels to me like I'm back in a statistics
20 class or calculation genetics back when we
21 were talking about this, but performance
22 standards describe a desired result or outcome
23 but not the methods for achieving that result,
24 so it's kind of going to tell how you're
25 doing, not how you're actually going to do it.

1 Probably the easiest example is the
2 miles per gallon rating. Everyone knows what
3 MPG is. It's just an index where everything
4 is being -- all cars are compared to the same
5 standard for performance for fuel efficiency.

6 So again with that index, you aren't
7 looking at how fuel efficiency is created, by
8 the car manufacturers, but how well they've
9 done at it, so these traceability performance
10 standards perform a uniform medium of
11 providing traceability capabilities.

12 The standards will focus on tracing
13 animals and not be disease specific, although
14 any of you who have participated in a tracing
15 activity understand that the information that
16 you use for each disease might be a little bit
17 different.

18 Okay. To establish this standard, the
19 traceability performance measurements, you
20 have to first define the activity that is
21 being measured. You have to define it in a
22 way that is measurable. You have to determine
23 what you think the goal or the actual
24 acceptable measurement for achieving the
25 desired performance will be, and putting those

1 together, come up with a traceability
2 performance standard.

3 We've come up with four key ones which
4 we'll go into a little bit later, so
5 measurable activity might be to trace the
6 animals to the state or tribe in which they
7 were initially identified, so once a suspect
8 animal or reference animal is identified in
9 one jurisdiction, that jurisdiction will need
10 to say, Okay, where did it come from
11 ultimately?

12 The measurement we're looking at, and
13 I'll go into that a little bit more, is that
14 95 percent of the time when the referenced
15 animal is selected, it should be able to be --
16 actually this is not what we're doing, but
17 this is -- this is an old slide. An example
18 would be 95 percent of the time they would be
19 able to be traced to their original location
20 within seven days.

21 To develop these standards, we've gone
22 back through the process that is gone through
23 when a reference animal is identified. We
24 talked about how traceability is actually done
25 in the field. So we've gone through those

1 typical actions. Some of the things that
2 we've come up with is you must notify the
3 state or tribal nation where a shipment
4 originated and notify the state or tribe where
5 the animal was officially identified.

6 From that we've been working on
7 defining the standard itself -- and is this
8 microphone touchy sounding to you as it is to
9 me? Do I need to back up some or am I good?
10 Thank you.

11 So the next step is determining the
12 value or timeline for each activity such as
13 how long does it actually take to notify that
14 tribe or state where the animal originated,
15 and how many work hours are needed to do it?
16 We want the performance measures to be
17 achievable. We want them to be realistic, and
18 we've gone through lots of work on how do you
19 actually do this in the field, what is -- what
20 are the efficiencies in the field, and really
21 what are the capabilities of the different
22 states or tribes that will be performing these
23 measurements -- or excuse me, performing these
24 tracing activities?

25 So from there, we've talked about

1 establishing a baseline. You can't measure
2 progress if you don't know where you're
3 starting from. Again we're really looking at
4 making these measures something that's
5 meaningful. We don't want to be measuring
6 things for the sake of creating more
7 statistics. We wanted to actually demonstrate
8 how well states and tribes are doing at actual
9 traceability activities, again making them
10 achievable.

11 We could say, Hey, great, let's notify
12 everyone within two hours of the first day
13 that referenced animal is found, which is a
14 great performance -- great thing to be able to
15 do and would definitely further animal disease
16 traceability actions, but you're not going to
17 be able to do that, and we recognize and
18 understand that. So we are looking together
19 at the actions being measured and the time
20 values that are needed to establish
21 performance standards.

22 This is a performance based approach.
23 We need to evaluate the actual tracing
24 capability and see if it meets the performance
25 standards we're proposing.

1 So we can look at actual tracing data.
2 We can look at exercises and check tests and
3 various different methods, for example, we can
4 look at random data from tests that are
5 already being done, from vaccination records,
6 from interstate movement certificates or other
7 records. We are considering establishing
8 other requirements, okay? If you don't have
9 this many traces that are done within your
10 jurisdiction, let's add some tests to see how
11 well you perform.

12 What we're finding, however, is
13 that -- what we're finding is we're going to
14 need your help even more on establishing that
15 baseline. Now, the what if. We establish a
16 baseline. We've defined the performance
17 measures. We know what we're going for, and
18 we think we've come up with something that's
19 reasonable for you to achieve. But what if
20 you don't quite make it? What would be the
21 penalty for noncompliance? What would be the
22 consequences of noncompliance, or what would
23 be the benefits of achieving compliance in
24 animal traceability?

25 These compliance programs must be

1 meaningful, and they will include
2 consequences. We're going for something less
3 than a heavy handed approach where if you
4 aren't compliant, you can't ship, period.
5 That doesn't make sense for our industry. It
6 doesn't make sense for producers, but it has
7 to be more than just something on paper. Oh,
8 you aren't in compliance.

9 It has to be something that will
10 incentivise producers, states and tribes,
11 everyone who is a stakeholder in this process
12 to actively participate and achieve
13 performance and animal traceability.

14 However, we don't know yet how to do
15 it, and that's one reason that I am
16 particularly listening to you here. I want
17 your input, okay. If you don't quite make it,
18 if you aren't in compliance, what's going to
19 get you there? What could be put in place so
20 that if you are representing someone at the
21 state level to help incentivise producers to
22 do their parts so that the state can be back
23 in compliance status?

24 If you are the neighbor and a co
25 producer with someone who isn't doing their

1 part, what do you think through USDA and
2 through this regulation we could do to help
3 you get someone else who can affect your
4 ability to sell, your ability to ship, et
5 cetera, if you aren't -- if your state is
6 deemed not in compliance with the standard to
7 get them going to?

8 I'm here in particular -- that's one
9 of the things I'm very interested in hearing
10 your input on. I'm also interested in
11 hearing -- so you're great, everything is
12 working great, your state has been in
13 compliance, how can you be rewarded for that?
14 Is there a benefit to it as well?

15 So in order to come up with these
16 things, to meet our objectives, we've been
17 meeting a lot. We're really getting to know
18 these folks. We started out discussing a
19 variety of key topics, the key points from the
20 Kansas City traceability forum, where
21 representatives from all the states and 60
22 individual Tribal Nations showed up and for
23 two days really discussed the heart of the
24 matter and what traceability is, what it will
25 be and how they saw the initial directives

1 from the Secretary and really getting a lot of
2 input from there.

3 Taking those key topics, we really
4 have been looking to what do state and tribal
5 animal health officials need to measure to
6 adequately assess their tracing capability?
7 So again measurability, performance standards.
8 We know what people are thinking in general
9 from their first response. Now, we're looking
10 at: What do we actually have to do to
11 determine that traceability is happening?

12 This is a big topic: What are the
13 current capabilities of states and tribes?
14 And we'll be talking a little bit more about
15 establishing that baseline and some of the
16 difficulties that are inherent within that.
17 And what performance standards are
18 appropriate? Again we want to measure things
19 that matter and we want to establish
20 performance goals that are, in fact,
21 achievable.

22 Again we've been talking a lot. We
23 have discussed what classes of livestock
24 should be exempt or should be phased into the
25 program. We've talked again about how the

1 states or tribes could be categorized or
2 assigned a status based on their compliance to
3 the traceability standards. We've talked
4 about what the consequences for compliance and
5 noncompliance should be, and also how what
6 we're doing should be communicated to the
7 public.

8 Again I would really like to hear your
9 input personally on that because sometimes
10 it's hard to get the word out effectively. I
11 don't think all of you get the Federal
12 Register contents every morning sent to your
13 Email like I do and have to peruse it, and if
14 you don't, good for you. I don't recommend it
15 for just fun reading, but we need to make sure
16 that what we're doing gets to the people that
17 need to know it, need to understand it.

18 We are committed to transparency in
19 this process. I am so glad that you are here
20 today to not only give us your input but to
21 take what you've heard back to the people you
22 represent.

23 So establishing that baseline, we
24 looked at how animal health officials
25 routinely perform traces now, so an animal or

1 a disease that is targeted or disease targeted
2 for surveillance monitoring control or
3 eradication, these activities aren't rare.
4 They happen more than I would have realized
5 before this. It's something that if done well
6 and efficiently just happens in your state,
7 and you may not even be aware of it, but they
8 are happening all the time.

9 So we've gone through this process of
10 what you have to do if a reference animal or a
11 suspect animal is identified. First, you
12 would have to trace an animal to the state or
13 Tribal Nation where it was officially
14 identified, where that one hopefully one tag
15 was put in the ear or whatever method is used
16 initially.

17 Next, tracing the animal to the state
18 or Tribal Nation from where it was shipped;
19 tracing an animal to its herd of origin, where
20 it started out or where it was first
21 identified; finding all the herds that the
22 animal has had contact with; it's commingling
23 that keeps getting bantered about; tracing
24 movements into and out of affected herds;
25 identifying adjacent herds for disease

1 monitoring and surveillance; and notifying the
2 state or tribe of origin of the animal's
3 movements.

4 So you have to find out the animal is
5 sick, talk to everyone along its chain of
6 custody until it ends up where it was
7 identified as sick and then find out who all
8 its friends were along the way. It sounds
9 like a big job. It sounds like really being
10 able to identify its friends along the way is
11 going to be one of the most crucial steps and
12 one of our biggest challenges in putting this
13 program together.

14 Some of the activities mentioned are
15 directly aligned with what we've been asked by
16 Secretary Vilsack to do. They affect the
17 interstate movement of the animals. Those are
18 where we're putting together the regulation.
19 These four areas are: Tracing animals to the
20 state or Tribal Nation where it was officially
21 identified; tracing an animal to the state or
22 Tribal Nation from where it was shipped; and
23 notifying the state or Tribal Nation of
24 origin.

25 These will provide an appropriate

1 basis for interstate traceability performance
2 standards, so again, we've recognized that the
3 steps taken to actually trace an animal do not
4 all directly pertain to establishing the
5 interstate performance standards. There's a
6 lot of this that will truly be the
7 responsibility of the states and tribes for
8 developing their own intrastate tracing
9 methods and mechanisms.

10 As I said, tracing activities are
11 happening constantly, and there's the
12 realization that a lot of these are
13 inadequate, that although there's not the type
14 of performance data being gathered that we're
15 talking about gathering in the future, we
16 aren't there right now. We aren't at this
17 performance measures right now.

18 One key part of this is that we're
19 talking about measuring what percentage of
20 animals could be identified or traced within a
21 certain timeframe, and right now for APHIS
22 disease programs, for a lot of the tracing
23 actions done within the states, that time
24 element isn't being captured.

25 So we're going to establish a baseline

1 and evaluate national tracing capability with
2 the help of the states and the Tribal Nations.
3 Co-op authors, those having cooperative
4 agreements with APHIS, will document their
5 current traceability. In addition, APHIS will
6 evaluate their tracing capability with its own
7 disease control programs on a national level.
8 Again this information will be gathered to
9 help develop minimum acceptable criteria.

10 So the working group has started to
11 draft what we think will be the general
12 requirements. These would be included in the
13 new section in Title 9 of the CFR. They
14 include: Unless specifically exempted in the
15 new CFR section, all livestock moved
16 interstate will be officially identified.
17 Livestock moving interstate must be
18 accompanied by an Interstate Certification of
19 Veterinary Inspection or ICVI. Those exempted
20 livestock not required to be accompanied by an
21 ICVI must be accompanied by a movement permit.

22 And we're looking at the ages and
23 classes of animals to be excluded from the
24 regulation, which will be defined as an
25 exemption in the CFR. Nothing we do with the

1 animal traceability program will supersede
2 what's being done in the animal disease
3 programs, so all livestock moved interstate
4 must be moved in compliance with all
5 applicable provisions of program disease
6 regulations.

7 We know that right now the CFR
8 recognizes and clearly defines certain classes
9 of animals as exempt from identification
10 requirements. We also recognize the
11 importance of differentiating from the need
12 for official identification and the need for
13 identification on an ICVI.

14 Some of the areas that we've been
15 discussing with regard to exemption are
16 identifying if there are classes of livestock
17 that should be exempt from individual
18 identification and from the -- well, from
19 identification, official -- try it again
20 because I'm going to say something wrong here
21 if I don't concentrate.

22 We are considering whether there are
23 classes of livestock that should be exempt
24 from official identification, for example, as
25 feeder animals current are. We are looking at

1 different types of interstate movements such
2 as routine movements within a production
3 system, so-called commuter herds, whether
4 those herds will need to be identified as they
5 move back and forth within the same ownership
6 to different areas of a ranch or different
7 types of production systems that happen to
8 cross interstate lines and movements directly
9 to slaughter.

10 We're looking at those existing and
11 possibly continuing exemptions, and again your
12 input it needed. It's the biggest phrase on
13 all of this for me. Please tell us what you
14 think on this. We need to have your input as
15 producers, as industry representatives on
16 exemptions, on communications, on
17 measurements, on consequences, but it comes up
18 here again, and we're here to listen to you.

19 The current thinking on performance
20 standards. States and Tribal Nations that
21 have implemented traceability plans for any
22 species of livestock that are consistent with
23 standards that are in the CFR and APHIS's
24 traceability performance standards document
25 will be considered to have an acceptable

1 status for traceability for that species.

2 So that that status which we've been
3 bantering about calling consistent or
4 inconsistent status because of the Scrapie
5 program, mainly because we needed something to
6 call it in order to communicate effectively
7 with each other, those requirements are not
8 yet defined, but we're working on it.

9 This status will be listed separately
10 for each of the applicable species for each
11 state or each tribe that participates as a
12 lone entity or Tribal Nation. So a state
13 could theoretically be consistent for cattle,
14 consistent for sheep and inconsistent for
15 poultry.

16 We've been calling it consistent or
17 inconsistent status. This is another area
18 where I'm asking for input. Does that make
19 sense to you all? Do you have something else
20 that you think it should be called, and
21 please, just like anything else that has
22 anything to do with the government, let's come
23 up with good nomenclature that isn't
24 confusing, and let's take advantage of the
25 opportunity to participate in that so we don't

1 get all these fun acronyms. Let's come up
2 with a good phrase.

3 As I mentioned, interstate
4 traceability performance standards must be
5 directly related to the animals that move
6 interstate and not to intrastate tracing, so
7 the performance standards that have been
8 recommended, we'll go through over the next
9 few slides.

10 State and Tribal Nations will need to
11 document enough tracing activities to
12 demonstrate how they're doing, whether this is
13 through actual traces or through exercises or
14 through check tests. You have to do enough to
15 know that you're doing it well.

16 We can look at that through ICVI's
17 movement or entry permits, test checks,
18 slaughter samples, collection forms, or
19 various methods that states can use to
20 demonstrate their traceability performance.

21 We have been using the term
22 traceability unit to refer to the geographical
23 location of consideration that the state or
24 the tribe will determine is needed to support
25 the traceability plan, so again, states or

1 Tribal Nations will get to define the
2 traceability unit for themselves, whether it's
3 an entire reservation, whether it is a county,
4 whether it is what had been defined through
5 premises ID number. That again is up to that
6 state or tribe.

7 However, the thinking there needs to
8 be carefully done because if there are
9 quarantine actions, if there are actions that
10 are taken for disease control, that
11 traceability unit may come into play.

12 So the first performance standard that
13 we're talking about measures how long it will
14 take the receiving state or tribe to notify
15 the state or tribe in which an animal was
16 officially identified, so if the animal is
17 identified as diseased here, how long will it
18 take me to get back to where it was identified
19 to let them know that that is happening?

20 It's the book ends, the front and back
21 book end of the program, and again that is
22 where the type of tag, the information that
23 can be determined by that receiving state
24 becomes very important.

25 It's a pretty simple process though.

1 Once you can look and tell where the animal
2 came from, it's a matter of picking up a phone
3 or picking up and making a phone call, sending
4 the right Email, making sure that they
5 received the information that the referenced
6 animal has been identified. We think that
7 because of the ease that should be associated
8 with making this call for an identified
9 animal, it should be able to be done 95
10 percent of the time within one business day.

11 The second performance standard that
12 we're considering measures stability of a
13 state or tribe in which the animals are
14 officially identified to determine the
15 traceability unit in which the reference
16 animals were identified. The working group
17 recommends that this progress be phased in to
18 provide achievable standards in the short-term
19 and higher standards as a long range goal.

20 So we aren't saying from day one, the
21 day that this regulation is put into place,
22 that you have to be able to 95 percent of the
23 time within two business days, which is the
24 ultimate goal -- to do it right then. We
25 understand it will take some time as state and

1 tribal rules are identified, as practices are
2 changed, to make it happen.

3 So for phase 1, right now we are
4 strongly considering recommending 75 percent
5 of the time within five days the animal that
6 is defined as a reference animal can have
7 their traceability unit, where they were
8 identified, determined.

9 In phase 2, however -- and again we
10 don't have the timeframe between the phases.
11 We don't know how long phase 1 will last. We
12 don't know how long phase 2 will last, and
13 we've been discussing ways to determine that,
14 whether we should come up with a set period of
15 time at the outset so that states and tribes
16 can anticipate and work on ways generally to
17 meet that performance measure in time or
18 whether we should monitor progress and
19 determine by success, by progress, when that
20 second phase should begin.

21 In phase 2, however, for this
22 particular traceability activity, we do say
23 that it should be able to be done 95 percent
24 of the time within two business days. In
25 phase 1 where it says 75 percent of the time

1 within five days, any time you see this day
2 measurement, think in your head business days.

3 The third performance standard that
4 we're looking at for recommendation measures
5 the state's and Tribal Nations' ability to
6 notify the state or Tribal Nation from which
7 the reference animal was shipped, so it's
8 going one step back in the process, where did
9 we get it from. We're also looking at phasing
10 this in, and again we have to determine the
11 time between the phases.

12 In phase 1, the activity should be
13 accomplished 95 percent of the time within
14 seven business days. In phase 2, the activity
15 should be accomplished 95 percent of the time
16 within three business days.

17 The fourth performance standard
18 measures the ability of states and Tribal
19 Nations to identify the traceability unit from
20 which the reference animal was shipped.
21 Again, we're looking at a phased in approach.
22 In this one we would match that in step number
23 2.

24 If you notice the steps -- excuse,
25 me -- performance standards number 1 and 3

1 match up with each other, and steps number 2
2 and 4 are those that will be the
3 responsibility of the state and Tribal Nation
4 to identify something that came from within
5 that state or Tribal Nation.

6 So this fourth performance standard
7 measuring the ability to identify the
8 traceability unit from which the animal was
9 shipped should be accomplished 75 percent of
10 the time within five business days, and 95
11 percent of the time within two business days.
12 We'll have more on this as we go on.

13 So let's look at an example. We've
14 got a scenario in which an animal that was
15 officially identified in Iowa is shipped to
16 Nebraska, then to Kansas, then in Kansas to
17 Missouri. In Missouri, the animal is
18 identified as a reference animal for the
19 performance measurement process. It could be
20 we're doing a test. It could be that it's
21 actually diseased.

22 Even though there were many movements
23 going on here, the performance standard
24 activities that apply to the bookends, which
25 mean where it was first identified and where

1 it ended up, the bookends are the ones to
2 which these performance standards apply so
3 let's go through it. The animal was
4 identified in Iowa. It was shipped from Iowa
5 to Nebraska. The animal was shipped from
6 Nebraska to Kansas, and then the animal was
7 shipped from Kansas to Missouri, where it saw
8 something absolutely other than flat land for
9 the first time in its entire life.

10 So with these, what performance
11 traceability activities are going to happen?
12 Well, the animal has been identified as a
13 reference animal in Missouri. The first
14 activity, Missouri will contact Iowa. It's
15 been able to determine using the appropriate
16 databases that that animal's tag number was
17 placed on the cow back when it was in Iowa.
18 Iowa finds out where the animal was
19 identified, using their own intrastate system.

20 Missouri also contacts Kansas because
21 according to the ICVI, it was shipped from
22 Kansas, and Kansas goes into its own systems
23 to determine exactly from where the animal was
24 shipped.

25 So how do we know if it's working

1 right -- or excuse me, what do we do once we
2 know whether it's working right? So we're
3 determining it -- we need to know how to
4 determine whether or not it's in compliance.
5 We need to know who is going to administrate
6 that. We need to make sure that that is being
7 done consistently across all the states and
8 all the Tribal Nations that are performing.

9 So we are really in the process of
10 researching how to fairly evaluate compliance
11 with performance measures, and again input is
12 needed. It's my favorite phrase today. Tell
13 us what you think.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Carry. I
16 appreciate that. Let me tell you what we're
17 going to do next for our break-out sessions,
18 and then we will actually take a bio break
19 here for about 15 minutes.

20 Up next, one of my colleagues is
21 passing out some question sheets, we know that
22 you've sat very attentively and courteously
23 and listened to a lot of presentations. You
24 may have some questions that have arisen in
25 your mind, and we would like you to have an

1 opportunity to ask those. We're going to ask
2 that you write those on those sheets.

3 Next we're going to break up into
4 groups by industry or by focus area, if you're
5 interested in poultry and how these standards
6 might impact poultry or equine or perhaps
7 you're here interested in aquaculture, and we
8 know there's a lot of folks interested in
9 cattle. There's labels on the tables. You
10 can pick those up and move them to a different
11 table.

12 So we'll ask you when you come back
13 from break to congregate around the table
14 based on that species, and we're going to look
15 at these within our small groups to see, Does
16 that standard make sense to you, how do you
17 think it could be measured, to give feedback
18 and input on what those standards are.

19 At each of these tables, there will be
20 an APHIS representative there helping
21 facilitate the conversation, helping to take
22 notes around that so that we can capture the
23 feedback.

24 At the end of each break out time,
25 then we will do a report out from the group,

1 so I will go over that again, but I just
2 wanted you to know when we come back, we'll
3 probably all be moving around. If you're a
4 group of cattle folks that are all gathered
5 around a table already, you maybe don't have
6 to move, but others that are in other parts of
7 the room maybe want to move.

8 We have poultry, equine. This one
9 that says nonspecific species, if there's a
10 species we missed. There's a sheep and goat
11 table and there's swine, so we would like you
12 to, after break, come back and gather around
13 one of those tables.

14 In the meantime, during break or
15 sometime this morning, if there are questions
16 that are arising for you, please write them on
17 those papers, and we're going to collect them.

18 Now, for my USDA APHIS folks, I would
19 like you to meet me in the back corner during
20 the start of this break, so we're doing to ask
21 you to come back at 15 minutes after the hour,
22 and by my watch that will be 10:15. So that
23 gives us about a 20-minute break.

24 If you came in later, the necessary
25 rooms are right here. If you want a cup of

1 coffee or a pop or something like that, just
2 down the hall to your right, and then take a
3 left, and we'll see you back here at 10:15.
4 Thanks.

5 **(Discussion off the record from 9:54**
6 **a.m. until 11:24 a.m.)**

7 MS. MILLIS: So we've had a lively
8 discussion in the room, and I welcome you back
9 from that, so at each of your tables, let's
10 figure out who is going to speak for your
11 table, and then what we're going to do is go
12 around to each table and hear what some of the
13 input is that came out of your discussions
14 that you would like us to reflect on as we're
15 going forward in this rulemaking process.

16 So this group here, would you be
17 willing to go first? Okay, Harry? Thank you.
18 I am going to have you speak into the mike
19 because people just would love me to give it
20 up.

21 MR. HARRY SNELSON: Okay. From the
22 industry perspective, as everybody probably
23 knows, the swine industry has worked on animal
24 identification animal traceability for a long
25 time. This actually goes back to the late

1 '80s in regards to the pseudorabies
2 eradication program, so commercial swine
3 producers are fairly familiar with identifying
4 animals and trying to follow movements and
5 that kind of thing, so it's not as large a
6 jump for them to do that as it is for some of
7 the other species.

8 To that end, when we were working with
9 USDA on the national identification system, we
10 took the existing swine identification program
11 pseudorabies and modified that to add the
12 additional necessities that were identified
13 through the NAIS program, and have termed that
14 the swine ID plan, which is the plan that
15 we're currently implementing within the swine
16 industry today.

17 The key to that hinges on premises ID
18 and premises registration, where somewhere in
19 excess of 85 percent or so of our producers
20 now have a premises ID number, and that was
21 spurred on in huge part by a lot of the
22 processing facilities starting to require that
23 their suppliers were certified under the poor
24 quality assurance plus program through the
25 National Pork Board, and as part of that

1 program, the National Pork Board is requiring
2 that the renewal in PKUA plus that you have a
3 premises ID number. So as all of that folds
4 out, the vast majority of our producers will
5 have a premise ID.

6 As part of a swine ID plan, we've
7 recognized two or three gaps in our production
8 flow that was not adequately addressed at a
9 result of the original pseudorabies
10 identification systems, and those groups were
11 moving some culled animals, things like that.
12 Animals that moved through the exhibition
13 routes were not addressed in the pseudorabies
14 program, and so those two groups have been
15 adequately addressed again in the swine ID
16 plan.

17 The other issue that we talked some
18 about is those folks that don't move within
19 the normal commercial channels, which those
20 are going to be a challenge. Fortunately they
21 make up a fairly small percentage of our
22 overall industry but that's still an area that
23 we need to have a better ability to capture
24 that information, and we are working with some
25 of the livestock markets and groups like that

1 to work on ways that we can make sure that we
2 can identify some of those animals.

3 As we looked at the traceability
4 performance standards document here, one of
5 the things that came up was a reference to the
6 standard to a business day. As with all
7 livestock production, our business days are
8 only those days that end in the letter Y, so
9 we're moving animals on a 24/7 time schedule,
10 and within the swine industry, we don't have a
11 lot of built-in excess capacity.

12 So if something shuts our movements
13 down for a relatively short period of time, as
14 little as five to seven days, we're starting
15 to have to make decisions on what we're going
16 to do with those animals because there isn't a
17 space there, excess space to put those
18 animals, so if we are looking at waiting two,
19 three, five, seven business days to get this
20 kind of information back, that's way too long
21 for us, particularly when we're talking here
22 reference animals which are animals that are
23 suspected of having been exposed to some
24 disease. Then we need a more rapid response
25 than two to five, two to seven business days,

1 so that was one issue that came up here.

2 What else did we get on the list?

3 Did that cover it?

4 MS. MILLIS: All right. Thank you
5 very much. Let's see. This table, would you
6 be okay going next? So those who focused on
7 equine.

8 MS. ABBY YIGZAW: Okay. We really
9 didn't -- my name is Abby Yigzaw. I'm a
10 public affairs specialist for USDA, and
11 basically what we discussed, we didn't -- we
12 just got into a general discussion, and some
13 of the things that were raised were horses are
14 unique in their movement, especially not
15 comparable to cattle because the largest
16 movement of them are really recreational or
17 show horses and they're moved on an individual
18 basis.

19 And on that, this table feels we can
20 trace back with what we have with their
21 movement because there is a trail of papers
22 that follow them, like Coggins and CBIs. What
23 else?

24 And another concern was that it's no
25 longer a requirement at the federal level for

1 pins, but it could be at state levels, so that
2 was something else that was raised. And is
3 that it?

4 Oh, yes, and that for the imports,
5 horses imported from Mexico or anywhere,
6 that's really basically where all the diseases
7 are coming in from, so we don't even keep
8 track of horses coming in from outside, coming
9 into the United States, so why is it that --

10 MS. MILLIS: Would you mind speaking
11 into the mike?

12 MS. BARBARA STEEVER: It's just a
13 feeling that the horse industry already has a
14 pretty good handle on controlling disease
15 among the horses in this country. The
16 problems are what we're seeing or the diseases
17 that are being imported that we don't have
18 currently in this country. We would like to
19 see stricter controls on imports.

20 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Was there
21 anything else from your table?

22 MS. YIGZAW: That's all.

23 MS. MILLIS: Do you want to pass the
24 mike back to the poultry group, and I think it
25 wasn't just poultry at your table, was it?

1 Did you have also some aquaculture there.

2 MR. GUY HOHENHAUS: We had
3 aquaculture, but we agreed that we weren't
4 going to have them as part of our formal
5 report because they're reporting through other
6 mechanisms.

7 I'm Guy Hohenhaus with Maryland
8 Department of Agriculture, and I was unlucky
9 enough to be chosen to be the spokesperson. I
10 think you will hear some things in our report
11 that's very similar to what the pork people
12 reported because you have industries that have
13 a lot of parallel.

14 We really have -- to understand the
15 poultry industries in this country, you really
16 have to understand there are lots of species,
17 but there's also several production systems.
18 We lumped them loosely into three areas.
19 There's commercial poultry where you have a
20 high level of vertical integration, and then
21 you have some commercial operations where you
22 don't always have -- they may have the size of
23 scale, but you don't have the same level of
24 vertical integration and business control over
25 where animals are coming and going to, and

1 then you have the backyard small producers
2 that are really a mixed bag of all manner of
3 different things, from one bird in the
4 backyard in Baltimore Washington, all the way
5 to many thousands of birds.

6 So it's important to understand that
7 the problems are very different with those
8 three groups, and so obviously the problems or
9 different solutions are going to be different.

10 I have to put my glasses on so I can
11 see my notes here. We also talked about the
12 general costs to industry of regulatory
13 requirement that might be imposed in some way
14 or another, and there is costs to industry
15 that, obviously the cost of an ID system or ID
16 scheme, tracking and all those devices that
17 might be involved.

18 There's also potential costs during
19 investigation, how long are you down for, and
20 as our friends at the swine table talked
21 about, the commercial production systems are
22 moving fast and furious with very little
23 reserve capacity to store -- they can't store
24 the product very well. They can't store the
25 animals very well, so an investigation, a

1 quarantine or some other similar event grinds
2 that system to a halt as we're trying to
3 search paper records. That's a problem.

4 Now, the good news for commercial
5 poultry is that the business systems that are
6 in place today and have been for someplace are
7 fairly automated. The animals tend to move in
8 lots. Thousands of animals, hundreds of
9 thousands of animals in some cases at a time
10 move, and they move from one place to another
11 in a very orderly movement, very well
12 documented.

13 So if you have a problem with one
14 animal, you probably have a problem with a lot
15 of animals in that lot, and so you focus on
16 that lot rather than on the individual
17 animals, so individual animal ID in that
18 setting is really not important, and it may
19 not even be important -- the table or the
20 consensus at this table was that traceability
21 goals could largely be met today for the
22 commercial poultry.

23 When you talk about commercial
24 traceability that's not fully vertically
25 integrated, thinking about laying operations

1 where a certain percentage of the production
2 gets sent into a live bird market situation,
3 so if the birds are disposed of to more than
4 one place, they don't go to the company
5 slaughter plant, they go here and there,
6 wherever they can bring the best dollar,
7 wherever a contract might exist when you have
8 a situation like that where you have a
9 commercial production system where you don't
10 have full vertical integration, you have birds
11 going to different places, now you have more
12 challenges with ID.

13 Perhaps some of those birds are going
14 as a lot, and those could be managed by lot
15 identification, crates, cages, trucks,
16 multiple sets of trucks that are all going to
17 one place from another place, carrying
18 animals, all that came out of the same co
19 host, it gets much more like a backyard bird
20 situation at the point in time when the birds
21 are going to multiple locations in onesies and
22 twos, and that really starts to require that
23 there's going to have to be some type of a
24 species production system, appropriate
25 identification for the individual animal, and

1 therein lies the real complexity of the whole
2 situation.

3 So what you really have gotten into is
4 a commercial scope and scale has all the
5 features of the backyard poultry.

6 Talking about backyard poultry, again
7 anything from one to several thousand animals
8 in all manners of different species and
9 systems, the same issues I just mentioned
10 apply. You really need to have species, age
11 and production system appropriate individual
12 identification to capture exhibition, markets
13 and all the places these birds go.

14 We also talked about the business
15 incentives that might be employed to make
16 people be more enthusiastic about an
17 identification traceability system. I've
18 talked about some of those. There may be some
19 short-term incentives that could be provided
20 to kind of jump start a process where the
21 process is not already going.

22 We talked about confidentiality
23 concerns and concerns that data that's kept
24 federally could be subject to the Freedom of
25 Information Act, and that's possibly a

1 problem, but it's not completely clear from
2 the courts and the lawyers, although there's
3 some encouraging signs we're told.

4 At the state level, it's all over the
5 board. It's one of 50 possibilities all the
6 way from states have very good ability to
7 protect confidentiality of this type of data
8 to the state has no ability to protect it, so
9 that raises questions for a state hosted
10 database if there is not full confidentiality
11 ability at the state level, so then that leads
12 into the legislation or that maybe the data
13 will be kept in a federal database.

14 Just kind of background, we talked,
15 the Maryland Delaware representative at this
16 stable, and both our states have a very
17 similar mandatory poultry premise
18 registration. You have poultry in Maryland or
19 Delaware, you need to be registered with the
20 state. Maryland has the ability to keep it
21 confidential. Delaware unfortunately does
22 not, and so we have kind of a good model for
23 that discussion right here at this table.

24 Last but not least, we discussed the
25 possibility of having some federal support

1 through the states that are managing this
2 data, and I know that's been one of the things
3 that's been discussed in some of these other
4 venues. The states -- where it makes sense
5 for the state to maintain the database or
6 participate materially in the database, there
7 probably needs to be some federal support if
8 we're going to be able to do it and do it
9 right.

10 Did I forget anything, folks? Thank
11 you very much for your time, and we look
12 forward to the rest of the discussion.

13 (The following was inserted in the
14 record: The makeup of the poultry table is
15 one poultry industry member, two state
16 regulators, one informational technology
17 industry representative, one non poultry
18 industry representative and USDA facilitator.)

19 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Guy. I
20 appreciate that. Let's go back to this table,
21 and have you guys chosen a spokesperson? Sue?

22 DR. SKORUPSKI: Sue Skorupski with
23 USDA Ohio and West Virginia. We're at the non
24 specific species table. For those of us who
25 didn't know, I know we did have one real

1 animal owner, and she represents a group that
2 isn't often represented at some of these
3 people. She has a diversity of animals, a
4 small producer, and those folks in my
5 experience are the ones that have been most
6 concerned with any of the traceability
7 programs, whatever names they've had, and so
8 we had a lot of discussion at our table about
9 what are some of the concerns and how could we
10 address those.

11 I commend her because she spent a lot
12 of time thinking about it and has some real
13 drive for animal disease protection, but at
14 the same time protecting the integrity of her
15 own information, and so I can tell she's
16 thought about how to deal with this, and like
17 the rest of us, hasn't come up with a
18 solution, but I appreciate that she's thought
19 of it.

20 The rest us at our table are either
21 government employees or work for other
22 industries that are interested in what they
23 can do for traceability, so I would say that
24 most of our discussion was talking to each
25 other about what do we need, what's the

1 purpose of some of these programs and how
2 could different industries help support that,
3 and more kind of an explanation of
4 discussions, and a lot of it leans towards the
5 small producer situation and how that's
6 different from the large commercial operation
7 where they're talking swine or poultry and
8 what the emphasis should be in our program as
9 we start it.

10 And one of the discussions was, well,
11 most other industries would start with, okay,
12 what's your most risky and what do you deal
13 with and just deal with that, so that you can
14 bite off the whole elephant at one time, so I
15 think that's some of what, as we talked about
16 it -- my perception anyway personally was
17 that's the idea that we're requiring this and
18 maybe looking at certain exemptions, where
19 should we be putting it in.

20 So those are some of the kinds of
21 thoughts going into all these discussions, so
22 we rounded around and talked about a lot of
23 different things, but not anything specific to
24 these things because they didn't necessarily
25 apply to our group.

1 Does that cover it pretty good?

2 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, Sue. We
3 appreciate it. We're going to come back here
4 to the cattle group. And, Ann, you're going
5 to speak?

6 MS. DUNCAN: Ann Duncan. I work with
7 the USDA APHIS policy development. We also
8 had a robust group, and I think we found
9 ourselves more engaged in a discussions and I
10 don't know that we focused on the questions
11 that we should be, but one thing related to
12 performance standard that came up was: How in
13 the absence of -- I think if I'm capturing
14 this correctly, in the absence of 100 disease
15 outbreaks, how do with capture 95 percent?
16 How do we relate these numbers to real life
17 situations?

18 And we heard some ideas on doing some
19 test exercises and options to evaluate these
20 percentages, but thinking about not just the
21 action, but how we're going to capture these
22 numbers, these denominators.

23 Other things that were discussed at
24 the table, we discussed a little bit about
25 tagging. Metal tags are difficult to read. I

1 think there were some folks at the table in
2 favor of the RFID tags. A little bit of
3 discussion about where something will be held,
4 why in this situation it will be held at the
5 state level versus the federal level.

6 I would like to address the issue of
7 exemptions. We had a brief discussion about
8 feeder cattle. I think some thoughts were
9 that, and forgive me if I'm not capturing this
10 correctly, if you exempt feeder cattle, we
11 still have the issue of commingling and how do
12 we address that.

13 I think that pretty much captures it.
14 Did anybody want to add anything from the
15 group?

16 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Ann, and we'll
17 move up here to the group that focused on
18 cattle, and did you have your spokesperson?

19 MR. JAY MATTISON: I'm Jay Mattison
20 from National Dairy Herd Improvement
21 Association, and our cattle group, I think you
22 have to remember that cattle have the longest
23 generation interval of what we're looking at
24 here.

25 As we looked and started out on this,

1 I think the first thing that we identified is
2 that we maybe needed to look at the baseline
3 of where things are at and identify the gaps,
4 so that we know what metrics we're measuring
5 against or what those are. That was I guess
6 the first thing that we looked at.

7 Then we took the grid, the discussion
8 grid, and we spent a lot of time, like the
9 other cattle group, discussing and looking at
10 what the clarification of the steps scenarios
11 were so that we had a better understanding of
12 the terms of reference and some of the
13 definitions and how that fit together or how
14 those actions and the standards I guess were
15 tied together.

16 We came up with that, and I think
17 we've got a better understanding, but I don't
18 know that we had any solutions or a lot of
19 questions, but the last thing we looked at was
20 I guess what we would call official ID and
21 issues and that we've got some in place now,
22 how those would fit into the system, how
23 they're operating, and how we could go forward
24 in the system.

25 And we see that as something that

1 needs further clarification or how each I
2 guess, what do we call it, traceability unit
3 fits in and uses that ID is going to be pretty
4 critical of how things go forward.

5 So I think -- does that cover it?

6 MS. MILLIS: I appreciate that, thank
7 you. So our discussions are not over yet, but
8 it is time to take a lunch break, and so by my
9 watch, it's about just about ten minutes to
10 noon, and I want to remind you of a couple
11 things. One is that there's some forms out on
12 various tables for any clarifying questions
13 that you might have or any concerns that you
14 might have, and we are gathering those
15 together.

16 If there are questions that we can
17 answer today, we'll sure try to, and also you
18 may have already had some of those questions
19 answered in your small group break out
20 sessions.

21 In the afternoon session, we would
22 like to come back and we're going to get back
23 into these same groups when we return, and if
24 you want to step into another group, that's
25 just fine. We would like to take a look at

1 how -- if these are our standards that are
2 laid out in the regulation, the ones that you
3 see on this blue chart, we would like to take
4 a look at how would we be able to evaluate our
5 tracing capabilities and what happens -- have
6 a discussion to think about during your lunch
7 is what happens if states or tribes are not
8 able to meet those performance standards or be
9 thinking about how industry could contribute
10 to states in trying to meet these performance
11 standards.

12 So let's gather back here at one
13 o'clock this afternoon, and we'll come into
14 our groups here. Let me remind you across the
15 hall of course the rest rooms. Most of you
16 have discovered that already. Down the hall
17 to our right and then left a little bit down
18 the way is a cafeteria. They have really
19 great food, and you're welcome to step in
20 there.

21 If there's not enough seating in
22 there, please feel free to bring your plates
23 and things back here that would be just fine.

24 (Whereupon, a lunch recess was taken
25 from 11:50 a.m., to 1:00 p.m.)

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2 (1:00 p.m.)

3 (Discussion off the record from 1:00
4 p.m. until 1:44 p.m.)5 MS. MILLIS: All right. If we could
6 come back together as a group, we would like
7 to go around and hear the feedback from each
8 of these groups, and I guess we'll start with
9 the this first table up here to hear what
10 kinds of discussions that they had and, Guy,
11 you're going to do that again?12 MR. HOHENHAUS: Yes, I guess I got
13 drafted. Again Maryland --14 MS. MILLIS: Just a moment. We'll
15 wait until everybody can give you their
16 attention.17 MR. HOHENHAUS: I can give a good
18 quiet and I don't need --19 MS. MILLIS: Do a little duet? How
20 about if you and I do a little duet?21 MR. HOHENHAUS: I used to be in the
22 Army. Go ahead.23 MS. MILLIS: Could you hold on just a
24 moment? Our court reporter can't hear so we
25 really can't get it for the record, and that's

1 important to us so the Secretary can see it as
2 well as all of you on the web site.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. HOHENHAUS: Guy Hohenhaus Maryland
5 Department of Agriculture, we're reporting for
6 the poultry committee. We had one poultry
7 industry rep, two state regulatory officials,
8 a couple of APHIS folks and one person from
9 the IT industry on the committee.

10 With regard to the question how could
11 states and tribes be evaluated against the
12 standards, a simple records review, similar to
13 what's done with some of the other programs
14 like the Scrapie audit for consistent or non
15 consistent status versus the federal
16 regulation and the program.

17 You could get a little more involved
18 in an inspection scheme where you would show
19 up in places like markets where you could look
20 at rates of animals or tags coming in, rates
21 of animal tags going out, things like that,
22 that are meaningful metrics towards the
23 meaningful ID program in states.

24 There's some states that probably
25 right now have plenty of data. If we just ask

1 them, they could show us that they were doing
2 a -- they were somewhere on the compliance
3 ladder. In other states that don't trace that
4 many animals, and so the sample might be
5 pretty small, and it might not be very
6 representative of what they're capable of or
7 not just because of the variations in the
8 small numbers.

9 And so in a state that had that kind
10 of situation, you could do a simulated
11 exercise where you could pick some animals out
12 of the system and test it as if it were a real
13 event. It would be a way to get to those
14 states.

15 The next question about the status of
16 the information, our consensus here was that
17 there was -- a result of such an evaluation
18 would probably in most cases be public
19 information. We were quick to add that we
20 probably don't want USDA making an above the
21 fold press release about a state's failure or
22 lack of status, but at the end of the day,
23 it's not going to be hidden very well from
24 anybody.

25 And then we talked here, I'm looking

1 at the notes of our scribe, that along this
2 discussion -- we talked about identifying
3 sectors within a state, animal industry
4 sectors to focus on where your priority for
5 compliance would be. I think that may be an
6 after thought from the previous topic.

7 Third, what happens to those that are
8 not meeting the standards? I think there's
9 certainly a lot of precedent for that already
10 in various state, federal cooperative
11 programs, come back again to the Scrapie model
12 that's been mentioned several times today.
13 You're either consistent or you're not.

14 In the case of a program where we're
15 trying to jump start something that has not
16 really ever fully existed, you probably would
17 want to have something with more than just a
18 yes no success, no success, so maybe something
19 with three or four levels, terrible, bad, fair
20 and very good or something of that nature, and
21 we would have to define those things, but then
22 that would lead into having a need for a
23 baseline, something establishing some type of
24 a baseline, so where are you today or where
25 are you at the end of this year or at the

1 beginning of next years funding cycle, or
2 whoever you want to do it.

3 But you would have to have someone
4 where you are so you can have an idea where
5 you need to go and whether you've gotten there
6 once you try to get there.

7 We also talked that what would be
8 important would be not to -- the goal would
9 not be to strip a state of status or a tribe
10 if they weren't compliant. The real goal is
11 to get them compliant and using all of the
12 carrots and sticks that are available to again
13 keep them complaint would be the desired end
14 state with the stick eventually that a state
15 would lose its status if it wasn't making
16 sufficient progress after some period of time.

17 How would the industry help? We
18 looked at industry very broadly. The
19 temptation is to look and think, okay, poultry
20 industry, swine industry, beef, dairy, the
21 traditional animal industries but there are
22 probably a few other industries out there that
23 we need to think about, so we have some
24 industries that are out -- animal industries
25 outside of our traditional livestock and

1 poultry sector. We need to think about those.

2 We need to think about particularly
3 our food animal, veterinary industry because
4 they're an important partner and no small
5 force in their own right. We need their
6 cooperation, just like we need the cooperation
7 of the traditional animal industries, and then
8 there's a whole bunch of other folks out
9 there. We've got a participant at our table
10 from the information technology industry, and
11 certainly we aren't going to have any
12 meaningful traceability without real robust
13 hardware and software to do the things we
14 would need to be able to do manning
15 information.

16 The industry needs to be made to feel
17 that -- now I think we're talking about animal
18 industry, needs to feel there's uniformity and
19 fairness across various market sectors and
20 industry sectors and states, so that you folks
21 are getting treated the same across the
22 country.

23 We talked about the fact that most
24 states license dealers and auctions and
25 various folks that move animals around and

1 engage in transactions with animals -- most of
2 these folks throughout the country are
3 licensed, and so that licensing does give
4 states leverage to get some cooperation on ID
5 related things.

6 Again we talk about other industries.
7 Transportation is another one I didn't mention
8 earlier. The folks that move these animals
9 around are an important part of -- we talked
10 about one of our standards. Those animals are
11 generally not walking across the state line.
12 They're usually in a conveyance of some kind.

13 Industry, particularly the animal
14 industries, they are a very important partner
15 in providing updated and timely and important
16 outreach to the members of their constituent
17 industries, explaining why this is a good
18 thing, explaining why some of the fears that
19 people may have are perhaps not so scary.

20 There was a discussion that something
21 that we might do as government agencies would
22 be to hold -- and perhaps as an industry
23 entities also to hold stakeholder jam
24 sessions. I would say this is a jam session
25 here. We don't have the guitar and the

1 keyboard, but that the jam session in the
2 modern world, those with some government, are
3 a couple decades behind in the modern world as
4 some of these things go on the Internet, but a
5 jam session is a real quick way that people
6 can get feedback into a central place or
7 person.

8 Once upon a time I think we called it
9 a brainstorming session, but it's high tech.
10 You can go worldwide, nationally in a very
11 short time and get people's ideas. Probably
12 something of the ideas aren't really good and
13 some of the ideas are complaints dressed up as
14 an idea, but the way to reach out to the folks
15 who, for whatever reason didn't come to this
16 room. The folks that are in this room are
17 probably some of the people you don't need to
18 talk so much to. The folks that didn't come
19 here for some reason are not the same as the
20 people who did come here, and so we're missing
21 out on a very different perspective, and we
22 really need that perspective.

23 And this jam session and online 24
24 hour electronic sharing of ideas is one of the
25 ways that's been done in industry. I think

1 that the based on some of the listing sessions
2 that the Secretary held over the last year or
3 so, we probably can predict some of the
4 answers we would get on that jam, but we also
5 might get some real good ideas that would help
6 us move this thing forward.

7 And I think subject to the table here,
8 did I miss anything? Sorry I took so long.
9 Thank you very much.

10 MS. MILLIS: Thanks, Guy. I
11 appreciate it. How about the table that
12 focused on equine issues? Carry has
13 volunteered to report out for the table.

14 MS. SEXTON: Sure, I volunteered, and
15 I'm only doing it with one microphone. We had
16 some discussion on the nature of
17 identification for horses. We talked about
18 that as a starting point. You can't really
19 talk about evaluation until you have more
20 understanding of the identification itself,
21 and one of the ideas that was extensively
22 discussed was the idea of a noninvasive means
23 of permanently and officially identifying
24 specific courses so that you can tell by a
25 five year old, completely vague quarter horse

1 gilding when it comes across with its test
2 results.

3 We talked about perhaps using a very
4 complete form that owners, breeders, et
5 cetera, can do the initial work, noting
6 cowlicks, noting permanent features of that
7 horse that could then stay with it throughout
8 its life, so it's a noninvasive way of
9 matching up those clear test results with that
10 particular animal before it becomes an issue.

11 Of course that also does leave the
12 option of using RFID, using tattoos, using
13 individually specific brands, et cetera, to
14 identify animals. We talked about what may be
15 one of the ultimate benefits of states that
16 maintain consistent status, which is -- the
17 example that was given of people who live on
18 the border between states and may crossover
19 what may be one bridge into the next state for
20 daily horse shows, back and forth.

21 And I can think there are many areas
22 of the country where there's this regional
23 group where the horses will go back and forth
24 fairly often, and one of the benefits of
25 achieving consistent traceability status in

1 those states may be something that's somewhat
2 similar to what poultry does in the Delmarva
3 area where, okay, you can move fairly freely
4 back and forth before the state decides
5 that the entry may be open to horses coming in
6 from those adjacent states because
7 traceability has been proven to be possible
8 already with those animals that are moving
9 back and forth.

10 We talked about one more thing. Maybe
11 not. Oh, we talked about the nature of the
12 performance measures, that they are really not
13 species specific, so much that if traceability
14 can be done at a level of 95 percent within so
15 many days upon the results of state's
16 traceability being put into place, that's a
17 fair and consistent way -- if it's a sheep, if
18 it's a horse, if it's a cow, that that state's
19 -- each state's system should be robust enough
20 to meet that performance measure across the
21 board with few exceptions.

22 If there is an industry that doesn't
23 quite work the way that we anticipated, for
24 example, I know of an Indian tribe that is one
25 of the world's leading producers of crawdads

1 and has asked me to look into what their
2 responsibilities will be with regard to
3 traceability, could potentially be with regard
4 to shipments of crawdads.

5 I don't know that industry well enough
6 to answer that, and I'm sure that we might not
7 have someone in the room that can, so we can
8 only assume at this point that 95 percent of a
9 group plot ID for crawdads would be traceable
10 within two days.

11 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. And this
12 table in the center focused on swine issues?

13 MR. SNELSON: I'll Harry Snelson with
14 the American Association of Swine
15 Veterinarians, and I think ultimately we
16 probably had more questions than we did
17 answers, but the first question was: Who is
18 going to be conducting the evaluation? Is
19 that going to be USDA APHIS or what's the
20 model there?

21 And the model that we were familiar
22 with within the swine industry goes back to
23 the pseudorabies eradication days where we had
24 a government industry control board that met
25 early on, met a couple times a year, and then

1 as things went on, fewer, but that control
2 board actually sat down and looked at the
3 standards and each individual state and how
4 they progressed through the process and made
5 the determinations of who was progressing at
6 what rate and those kind of things.

7 So I think because compliance and the
8 consequences associated with noncompliance
9 ultimately are going to affect the producer's
10 ability to conduct business, it's important
11 that the industry and producers be involved I
12 think very intimately with establishing what
13 standards are going to be necessary and
14 particularly on evaluating who is complying
15 with those standards and who is not.

16 And I think as the poultry guys
17 mentioned, it's not only important to know who
18 is complying and who's not, but why are they
19 not complying and what can we do to bring them
20 into compliance, and again my pseudorabies
21 days, we had a lot of those, for various
22 reasons, states had reasons to participate or
23 not participate, and ultimately I think the
24 control board and the industry was very
25 important in bringing those other states along

1 to get to where we are today where we finally
2 have eradication within the commercial swine
3 population. So I think this is a very good
4 area particularly for strong industry
5 participation.

6 For that reason too, I think it's
7 important that these standards be kept out of
8 the CFR and kept as standards, so that we do
9 have the flexibility to make those changes
10 from various states or various tribes, or as
11 the process continues, that those changes can
12 be made. If we put it in a CFR, then it's
13 much more difficult to modify those standards.

14 Of course certain parts of those can
15 be regulatory and obviously they would have to
16 be, but as much of it as we can keep in
17 performance standards, I think the better off
18 we would be.

19 Were there other issues that we talked
20 about? I think the poultry industry touched
21 on what we have. Do you have any others?

22 MS. MILLIS: All right. Thank you.
23 We'll move over to this group that focused on
24 cattle, and who was going to speak for your
25 table today? All right. Thank you.

1 MR. MATTISON: Jay Mattison, National
2 Dairy Herd Improvement Association, and our
3 group looked at that tracing capacity or
4 capability and what metrics -- or again we
5 talked about the benchmarks last time, that we
6 need to have those established, but it get
7 into the actual tabs of demonstrating or
8 showing that compliance or those percentages.

9 We need some kind of evaluation using
10 either simulation or live data that could be
11 used in the system to kind of flex or exercise
12 to demonstrate how that compliance was
13 available, but also in that, I think the
14 follow-up to that is you have to be careful of
15 how many times you go out to the field so it
16 doesn't become invasive or you bother the
17 commercial entities.

18 So they have to be -- understand what
19 it's demonstrating, and we're talking about
20 livestock markets or things like that. It's
21 got to be kind of a group effort, and I think
22 you will hear that through all of what we've
23 looked at.

24 Also, you talk about the reporting or
25 what's the public consumption or dissemination

1 of that status? Well, you would have to have
2 some type of a system. Whether that's a
3 tiered system or how you report that is going
4 to be really important because folks are going
5 to use that and look at that, and it's also --
6 I think as the swine groups, there needs to be
7 USDA review or participation of how that
8 happens and how that demonstration goes
9 forward.

10 So those areas we've got, and then the
11 next one too about: How is that compliance --
12 if the standards or the compliance is below
13 what the expectation is? You don't meet those
14 performance standards, how is that handled
15 because that is really big? And I think we've
16 heard previously, you can talk about how you
17 incentivise, what's the carrot, what's the
18 stick.

19 But the real bottom line, I think
20 what we need to demonstrate from an animal
21 health and a traceability standpoint is
22 getting folks to gain that compliance so it
23 needs to be the resources. I think that is
24 what we have to talk about. This thing cannot
25 be under-resourced or otherwise it's going to

1 become a real dilemma, and we're going to have
2 a lot of issues with that.

3 So gaining that compliance and also
4 talking about our index areas and our
5 geographic reporting areas, our traceability
6 units, the proximity to any index on a
7 traceability exercise is really key, and we
8 heard about horses going across the bridge,
9 but I think our group said there's entities
10 that are one operation, that's an operation
11 that has animals moving daily across state
12 lines, and that's all one operation, because
13 they have heifers or breeding stock or milking
14 animals.

15 And you could have two states
16 affected, but it's a really tight geographic
17 index in there, so that's important, and then
18 also looking at the tribes because we have
19 that. You can have a tribe travel area that
20 could affect three different states depending
21 on how that proximity was, and so how will we
22 define again those areas is a big question
23 that needs to be answered and looked at.

24 And then how can the industry
25 contribute to that? We talk about these

1 definition benchmarks. We need to buy in. We
2 need to work together, and it needs to happen,
3 and I think this is a starting point or we
4 felt this was a starting point.

5 Stakeholders need to be at the table,
6 and we need to develop it. It can't be a top
7 down, and it can't be a bottom up. It's got
8 to be a hybrid, so that we come up with
9 something that's workable, and I mean, really
10 gets us to where we need to go so it's kind of
11 a forced multiplier so we gain that leverage
12 to have it work for commerce and a producer
13 and the animal health and the regulatory
14 folks.

15 Is that everything?

16 MS. MILLIS: Nicely done. We'll go
17 back to this table over here. You've got it.

18 DR. SKORUPSKI: We lost our a few
19 people, but we gained a consumer, which I'm
20 not sure that there's a consumer in any of the
21 other groups, so I'm glad she came to join us
22 because she represents a group that's
23 important to this whole process.

24 We agreed to disagree a couple times,
25 and I value her opinion. I'm not sure that --

1 I'm not sure that I included her or not, but
2 we'll continue for the rest of the afternoon.

3 We spent a lot of time -- again as a
4 nonspecific species group, we spent time
5 discussing how does this fit with the small
6 producer we have and with the consumer and the
7 questions and concerns we had there. Again it
8 illustrates to me as a person on the inside of
9 Veterinary Services that those on the outside
10 don't have enough information about what we do
11 and how we do it to be able to even help
12 evaluate some of these things.

13 One of the questions or the first one
14 was how are states going to be evaluating
15 against these standards, so one of the
16 questions was, well, do you do anything like
17 that now and are there any programs? And I
18 mentioned like Bruce Willis' program, those
19 kind of things, that there might be a similar
20 kind of process we could use.

21 So sometimes in asking some of our
22 stakeholders questions, it's an -- I'm guilty
23 of that sometimes or not guilty, but I don't
24 have enough information to contribute, so we
25 talked a little bit about some of the things

1 we already do, and so kind of building on the
2 processes we already have in place or
3 implementing something that would be a similar
4 way of measuring how we came to that.

5 Relative to the results of the
6 evaluations being public, that was kind of a
7 given that it should be there. We talked a
8 little bit about how to do that and websites
9 and that kind of thing, and sometimes we meet
10 people that aren't that interested, but if you
11 are interested, you kind of work for it, but
12 one of the options that was considered was
13 that if it is made public and public enough,
14 that those who are impacted then see the
15 results, if they're good at their job, that,
16 well, look this is the end result of you doing
17 a good job and you participating and those in
18 the industry that are not participating can
19 see the consequences of not participating
20 because if it's not made public, people say,
21 so what, it didn't matter.

22 So it was actually published and
23 presented somehow that everybody who did or
24 didn't do what they needed to could see the
25 effect of that.

1 Then what happens when a state or
2 tribe doesn't meet the performance standards?
3 The first joke was take the state's money
4 away, and I kind of laughed because we always
5 say take the state's money away, and I know
6 you guys don't want to us do that, but then
7 there is something to that that a lot of
8 this -- when we're talking producers or
9 anybody involved in this, there is definitely
10 an economic impact, an impact of the expense
11 of it, but then if we do it correctly, we,
12 meaning the whole we, state, federal, industry
13 and all of those involved -- if we do it
14 correctly, there will be an economic advantage
15 that you've got animals that are healthy or
16 that you have a herd that isn't exposed and
17 you have the records to say it's not exposed
18 so you don't have to go through the test
19 process so there is some economic incentive to
20 doing it the right way or a disincentive if
21 they're not.

22 Then we didn't get to a lot of
23 discussion on what the industry can do to
24 contribute to the states. Again the industry
25 is going to need to do that and some of the

1 outreach of what it is we're doing and why,
2 continue to kind of share some of that
3 information that we as sometimes insiders
4 think everybody knows and everybody doesn't.

5 So that was kind of summary of a long
6 discussion about a lot of different things.
7 Do you want to add to anything more of what I
8 said?

9 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, sue. I
10 appreciate that. Now our final table.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: We'll try and be quick.
12 I'm Vince Chapman. I'm with the Veterinary
13 Services with the traceability staff, and we
14 didn't give specific answers to the questions,
15 but all of our discussion bore on those
16 questions, and some of the things we talked
17 about was whether or not there would be
18 opportunity to add more value to the idea of
19 compliance for a state or reward for
20 compliance, if you will.

21 But we also had in our discussion that
22 penalty, whether it was specific or implied,
23 was also inevitably part of the discussion.
24 We also talked about benchmarks from the
25 standpoint of what our are percentage goals of

1 ID in terms of traceability? Are we looking
2 for particular numbers and suggesting that we
3 should have some ideas in terms of what our
4 goals were in that particular area.

5 There was a suggestion that could one
6 of the performance measures be that 100
7 percent of the animals moving across state
8 lines would have to be identified, and there
9 was some follow on discussion about whether or
10 not -- how that would be enforced in terms of
11 making certain that that did occur.

12 We also felt that, I wrote down -- I
13 used the term exercising but testing of a
14 state's level of traceability was going to be
15 very important to the process because
16 obviously we weren't always going to be doing
17 or be in a situation where we were doing
18 specific testing for disease and modeling and
19 doing exercises to test the state's ability to
20 trace what's going to be very important to
21 keeping the system strong.

22 We also had some discussion about in
23 terms of those exercising, testing, whether or
24 not a state is consistent or inconsistent, who
25 should do that? Should it be the state?

1 Should it be some federal entity or someone
2 else that was also part of our discussion? We
3 didn't come up with a solution, but that was
4 part of the discussion.

5 We also -- there was a comment made at
6 the table just in terms of -- I think that
7 there was some discussion going on earlier in
8 terms about whether or not this idea of
9 traceability adds a greater burden in terms of
10 time affecting an industry or that type of
11 thing, and some of the discussion that we had
12 here at the table was that currently what
13 occurs if a diseased animal is found or
14 something is that the idea of traceability
15 does not necessarily add any greater burden in
16 terms of time or whatever than already exists
17 in a normal situation, what stoppage we have
18 or how it would affect our particular area.

19 We had an individual at our table that
20 works with small producers, and one of the
21 things we did talk about was that in some
22 regards, there may be some small producers
23 that don't feel at this particular time that
24 there's enough information about how we would
25 move forward for them to make a decision when

1 something is workable or not workable and are
2 certainly kind of holding back, waiting to see
3 more details, especially as it relates to what
4 specifically the states will enact once the
5 performance measures are put in place and then
6 have a better sense of kind of what the net
7 effect will be for them.

8 We talked about examples versus where
9 a small producer may only want to have an
10 animal go to slaughter, but because of where
11 they live in the proximity of the state, they
12 may have to cross a state line to go to a
13 slaughter house or be faced with having to go
14 a further distance within the state to be able
15 to do the same thing and what effect that
16 might have.

17 In terms of, we talked about also the
18 importance of incentives and kind of -- as
19 opposed to talking about penalties, that we
20 should try to put a happier face, if you will,
21 on focusing on what would be the incentives of
22 compliance as opposed to focusing on only
23 penalties, if you will.

24 We also talked about cost in a number
25 of areas, one specifically with regard to when

1 you talk about cost, you also have to look at
2 costs to who? A cheaper tactic may mean
3 initially a lesser cost, but down the road is
4 it more expensive to read and having some
5 understanding of what we really mean or what
6 we're really talking about when we're
7 discussing costs?

8 The question was also raised: Has
9 there been any analysis with regard to the use
10 of a metal tag versus an RFID tag? And there
11 was also the suggestion that -- one of the
12 participants felt that it may be APHIS's role
13 and responsibility to do that type of study as
14 we go forward or have that information as part
15 of the determination and the discussion.

16 There was also information shared with
17 regard to multiple different types of tags,
18 state tags with different numbers and so
19 forth, multiple type official tags, whether --
20 there was a question raised as to whether or
21 not it would be more efficient to have one
22 standard tag, and we also shared that from a
23 manufacturer's perspective, it's obviously a
24 lot easier to effect one standard as opposed
25 to having to prepare -- as a manufacturer to

1 produce 50 different types of devices.

2 I will just ask if there were any
3 things here at the table that I might have
4 missed that we need to include? Thank you.

5 MS. MILLIS: Thank you, Vince, and
6 thank all of you. This kind of input is
7 extremely helpful as we move forward in
8 developing the traceability performance
9 standards and in evaluating how we can
10 together, as industry, producers, consumers,
11 understand how we can show that we're meeting
12 those traceability capabilities.

13 Now, you will see in your agenda or on
14 the list of questions, there was an
15 opportunity for other participant concerns,
16 and that's the point of the meeting that we're
17 at right now, and as some of you wrote your
18 questions on there, I put those together, and
19 we've kind of passed them out to some folks
20 who might be in a position to be able to
21 address them.

22 Now, one question that came up was how
23 did people find out about this meeting and how
24 can they find out about the future meetings?
25 So, Michael, I'm going to ask you to address

1 that.

2 MR. MICHAEL DOERRER: Sure. The three
3 meetings that went on in Kansas City this past
4 Tuesday, today's meeting and the meeting in
5 Denver the next Monday, on the 17th, notices
6 went out went out in the Federal Register and
7 an announcement was put up on our website a
8 couple weeks ago. Also APHIS Veterinary
9 Services maintains a list of state, industry
10 and Tribal Nations stakeholders list, so if
11 you received an Email from us, that means
12 you're on our list.

13 If you did not receive an Email, that
14 means you're not on our list. If you would
15 like to be on other list to receive
16 announcements like this in the future or just
17 to receive informational updates about
18 traceability or other issues, we have sign-in
19 sheets up at the front desk right outside, and
20 you can just leave us your Email address, and
21 as we plan future meetings, perhaps this
22 summer, you'll notification early on.

23 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Lisa, I'm
24 going to turn the floor over to you. Some of
25 the questions were addressing issues that you

1 might be able to respond to.

2 DR. FERGUSON: Okay. A couple of
3 questions that have come up, the first one
4 relates to funding, and the question is: How
5 can states meet these standards with
6 decreasing federal support? Very good
7 question.

8 Actually this is a question that we
9 often ask ourselves as to how we can meet our
10 programs with decreasing support from
11 Congress, but in all seriousness, that will be
12 an issue for all of our programs going
13 forward, but what I can say here is the
14 Secretary has committed, as I mentioned
15 earlier, that this will not be an unfunded
16 mandate, and our intention is to provide an
17 appropriate level of funding to maintain this
18 program.

19 Now, it is crucial though at this
20 point in time, there's a lot of attention
21 being paid to what we're doing, how we're
22 developing these standards and how we're
23 making progress in this program, so it's
24 crucial that we do make that type of progress.
25 We come up with standards that are realistic

1 and achievable, yet have some type of merit.

2 We would like to be able to make good
3 progress so that we can help convince our
4 appropriators that, yes, we are working with
5 all the different components of the animal
6 industry. We're all agreeing on how we're
7 going about this, and this is our way forward,
8 this is where we see ourselves a bit down the
9 line.

10 As we develop these plans, as states
11 and tribes develop these plans, once we get
12 the standards in place, that will give us a
13 better idea of what type of funding that we
14 need to request in future years, but the
15 crucial point right now is that we do show
16 that we are making progress, so that we can
17 convince our appropriators down on the Hill
18 that we're doing what we need to do.

19 Another question here was related to
20 interstate movement, and how is a decision to
21 require traceability for only interstate
22 movement derived? This is a actually fairly
23 simple one to answer. Our authority under the
24 Animal Health Protection Act applies to
25 interstate movement, so this is completely

1 tied to our authority. Clearly if we get into
2 an emergency situation, we get into
3 declarations of emergency, things might
4 change, but just in general at this time, our
5 authority applies to interstate movement.

6 Do you want me to run through these?

7 MS. MILLIS: Yes.

8 DR. FERGUSON: Then the next one, and
9 I'll probably call on Neil to help me out on
10 this one, a very good question here, and this
11 is one that we're still trying to sort
12 through: How will different states or
13 different Tribal Nations interact? This is a
14 crucial one that we've all been struggling
15 with as we start this process because the last
16 thing we want is 50 different standards out
17 there that are going to confuse producers as
18 to what they need to do to identify their
19 animals move interstate.

20 So we're hopeful that a lot of the
21 inclusive process that we're doing will help
22 define those standards in a clear enough way
23 that everybody can buy into them. We're also
24 planning on setting up some different working
25 groups to help define some basic standards,

1 especially some data element standards, you
2 know, for example, to stay NID has to have at
3 least these components in it or this number
4 needs to have these components in it to get
5 some minimum standards.

6 At this point, I'm going to throw it
7 to Neil and ask him if he wants to add
8 anything into that because he might be a bit
9 closer to that than I am? Sorry to wake you
10 up there, Neil.

11 MR. NEIL HAMMERSCHMIDT: No, I'm wide
12 awake.

13 With regards to the standards, again I
14 think the working group can certainly input
15 from the states and industry about concern
16 about 50 different systems resulting from this
17 approach has I think brought us closer
18 together in maximizing the value of
19 standardization, and that's certainly for the
20 appropriate identification methods, yet
21 allowing enough flexibility for a species to
22 have different options within what works for
23 different management systems, but yet having
24 in the CFR, as Lisa mentioned, for example, an
25 official ear tag is a pretty basic, the

1 concept of a metal tag, but having an official
2 numbering system available for the appropriate
3 identification devices.

4 Two or three different number systems
5 that can work well for different types of tags
6 seems appropriate and so that a producer knows
7 if he tags his calves at a young age, for
8 example, with one of these official devices,
9 that animal is good to go throughout the
10 country, so that's part of what we're looking
11 at to make sure I don't have to tag animals 40
12 different ways to move it through 40 different
13 states, and I think that's the practicality of
14 what we're working on.

15 There's some concern about the makeup
16 of the traceability working group. Let me
17 explain the working group just a little bit.
18 It's certainly a working group that is helping
19 provide input to development of the
20 regulation. It's not a formal committee that
21 runs an official meeting with voting and
22 things like that. It's.

23 More helping APHIS prepare the
24 appropriate framework and having it supported
25 through a regulation so while it's fairly

1 informal, we certainly believe there's a
2 process that allows us to get appropriate
3 input from the state and private authorities.

4 There's a question about the makeup:
5 Why aren't there any dairy states? Why are
6 half the representatives from the tribes,
7 things like that? Again, as we tried to
8 develop the working group, we actually had the
9 appropriate industry organizations, U.S.
10 Animal Health Association or equivalent
11 provided five to seven names that they would
12 like to see on the working group, and we did
13 the same with the tribal industries that had
14 representation in that area as well.

15 So it's -- those working group members
16 were not selected by USDA per se. They have
17 come through recommendations of the
18 appropriate bodies that represent those
19 organizations.

20 Another question, very briefly on
21 again the comment about the business in
22 regards to the standard. I think what that
23 really reflects is how we would conduct the
24 test. If we're going to Minnesota to examine,
25 if you will, their tracing capability once

1 their performance standards are established,
2 let's say we, if you will, flew up there
3 Thursday night. We don't think it's
4 appropriate to have people work over the
5 weekend to evaluate the traceability standard
6 that those days probably wouldn't be
7 appropriate to count. Paying personnel to
8 conduct the exercise might not be justified,
9 working into the normal priorities of the day.

10 And so it's just a matter of knowing
11 when people would be available to support the
12 examination. Certainly we understand that in
13 a real situation, those animal health
14 officials would probably work through the
15 workday to get the job done, but to actually
16 validate the test, that's why the business
17 days was used as a reference point.

18 I believe there are some other
19 questions that I can run through a little bit.
20 Lisa and I will toss them back and forth a
21 little bit.

22 I think a lot of the questions that
23 we've had even earlier this week revolves
24 around official identification tags. I think
25 the cattle group here had a real good

1 discussion on the value and the lost
2 opportunity with the official identification
3 tags, if they're not administered properly.

4 So one of the questions is about the
5 840 tags and the uses of premises ID number.
6 We've used the -- what we referred to as the
7 bright tag for many many years, and although
8 the last few years, 840, whether you're using
9 any of the numbering systems, the value of
10 recording or associating the distribution of
11 those tags is imperative.

12 This group noted that if we had
13 official identification tags and we just threw
14 them out there or made them readily available
15 through farm stores and had no record of where
16 they went, they're not really of value to the
17 traceability effort, so maintaining a record
18 of where those tags went is appropriate.

19 The states, in the new framework, have
20 the opportunity to administer location ID, if
21 they so desire. Minnesota is a good example I
22 believe, that you've used your location
23 identifier for quite some time. The new
24 framework would enable Minnesota to use --
25 whether it's the 840 tag or the bright tag,

1 associate those official identification
2 devices to their format or location ID.

3 So while we're not requiring the use
4 of a pin per se, we still want to maintain a
5 record of where official identification
6 devices go because that's critical in a
7 tracing activity.

8 Another one that there will be
9 exceptions for crossing state lines without
10 transfer of ownership, transport to slaughter,
11 close by properties. Certainly as the working
12 group went through their report this morning,
13 Carry, there is certainly acknowledgment of
14 exemptions to the requirements, again no
15 proposed rule in place, but it's understood or
16 supported by the working group that there
17 needs to be some exemptions, direct to
18 slaughter?

19 There's this belief that you need to
20 put an official ear tag on an animal that's
21 going just to slaughter. We believe it's not
22 necessary because that animal does not go out
23 and commingle with other animals from that
24 point obviously, so making that tag or another
25 process would certainly be adequate so, yes,

1 appropriate exemptions for certain movements
2 of animals that move across state lines.

3 Another one is with regards to the
4 existing information and registration systems.
5 Again that has been and will continue to be
6 administered by the states. The states have
7 the authority to decide how they want to
8 manage or maintain that information from this
9 point forward if they want to allow a producer
10 to opt-out. That's been an option in the
11 past, and it is certainly the state's
12 prerogative to consider that as an opportunity
13 or an auction for those that wish to do so in
14 the future, again a state decision, not one
15 for USDA.

16 Lisa, if you want to pick up on maybe
17 some of the others that you feel more
18 appropriate to respond to?

19 DR. FERGUSON: Okay. One of the
20 questions here was about imports. Essentially
21 what are penalties and consequences for
22 importing from known diseased countries? I
23 wouldn't frame this as far as from known
24 diseased countries, because there are certain
25 diseases that countries may have for which we

1 have a formal process of recognizing either
2 that they're free of or that they're infected,
3 and for example mouth disease, if we consider
4 a country affected with that, then there are
5 certain prohibitions that apply.

6 But as far as penalties and
7 consequences for importing against our import
8 requirements, clearly if someone is bringing
9 in an animal or attempts to bring in an animal
10 that does not meet our import requirements,
11 our best case scenario is we identify that at
12 the time they present the animal or while that
13 animal is in our quarantine station, and we
14 find out, no, this doesn't meet our import
15 requirements, this animal either goes back or
16 in some instances may be euthanized depending
17 on what the situation is.

18 I mean, keep in mind, we're bringing
19 in things that vary from budgies to many
20 thousands of dollars worth of a race horse, so
21 each of those situations would be handled
22 somewhat differently. But an animal that does
23 not meet our import requirements would not be
24 allowed entry.

25 Now, there have been instances where

1 our import requirements, essentially our
2 testing methodologies may change over the
3 years, as testing methods improve, and
4 sensitivity and specificity will change our
5 requirements, so animals that came in many
6 years before might have been tested using less
7 sensitive tests, could potentially have a
8 disease.

9 I think folks are familiar with our
10 changing requirements for equine
11 piroplasmosis. That's a situation where we're
12 now using different tests than we did several
13 years ago so we very well may have some horses
14 out there that were legally imported several
15 years ago that might have piro. At that point
16 in time, when we identify that those animals
17 were legally imported, we can't deny them
18 entry after the fact.

19 But then it's incumbent upon us to
20 deal with any type of an outbreak situation
21 that might result from those types of imports
22 if we know that that has happened.

23 MS. STEEVER: Can I add something to
24 that?

25 DR. FERGUSON: You can.

1 MS. STEEVER: Well, since we were
2 talking about import requirements and it comes
3 in from some countries that have disease which
4 is why I ask the question. I know that USDA
5 is trying to regionalize Brazil, which has
6 hoof and mouth disease. I'm one of the people
7 that thinks that regionalizing is a bad idea.
8 It didn't work in Argentina, and it didn't
9 work in -- I believe it was Korea. I don't
10 recall if that was it.

11 But the USDA is trying to bring in
12 livestock from a country with a disease that
13 we don't have, and that strikes me as being
14 improper.

15 DR. FERGUSON: I appreciate that, and
16 I would encourage everyone that has comments
17 on these, to please submit those comments
18 through the process. Thank you.

19 MR. SAMPLES: There's also a second
20 side to that. We're trying to --

21 MS. MILLIS: Hold on. We do want to
22 make sure our court reporter can get this.

23 MR. SAMPLES: We've been fighting for
24 years to regionalize the United States for
25 export animals around the world, so I mean,

1 it's a two sided street.

2 MS. STEEVER: I think it's bad on both
3 sides.

4 MR. SAMPLES: It maybe, but if you're
5 exporting cattle, sheep, goats, whatever, it
6 might change your mind.

7 MS. STEEVER: If you're exporting.
8 What if you're importing?

9 MR. SAMPLES: Who's importing in
10 today's economy?

11 MS. MILLIS: A couple other questions
12 that you were able to address?

13 DR. FERGUSON: Yes, there were. One,
14 and actually I might through this one a bit
15 back out to the group, the question is: Would
16 USDA post cooperative agreements with states,
17 tribes on our website?

18 And our approach in the past has been
19 no, we don't post copies of complete
20 cooperative agreements on our website.
21 There's generally information in those
22 cooperative agreements that could be
23 considered sensitive such as taxpayer IDs,
24 status numbers, those types of things so
25 clearly they're not going to post that type of

1 information on our website.

2 However, if, as a group, stakeholders
3 will be some value to having some level of
4 information regarding cooperative agreements
5 made public, we would be very interested in
6 hearing specifically what that type of
7 information might be, and we could consider
8 that type of info, so I will throw a bit of
9 that back out to the group.

10 MS. MILLIS: Anybody have any comment
11 or feedback on that, input to that? Hold on.

12 MS. STEEVER: I can understand the
13 leading sensitive information that might not
14 be essential to the agreements, but it would
15 make it a lot easier to find information on
16 what generally those agreements are saying.

17 DR. FERGUSON: Anybody else have
18 thoughts that they would like to throw in on
19 that one?

20 MS. MILLIS: Did I see a hand back
21 there?

22 DR. FERGUSON: Okay.

23 MS. MILLIS: No.

24 DR. FERGUSON: I believe that was it.
25 Michael?

1 MR. DOERRER: There's a question
2 about why there have been no meetings in
3 Wisconsin for purposes of the NAIS. I'll take
4 that as an invitation? How does next Thursday
5 work for you?

6 First, let me say that as we develop
7 the rule, we feel strongly that the best sort
8 of outreach that can happen about the
9 development of the rule and about how it's
10 going to work with the states and tribes at
11 the local level, so we're committed -- VS,
12 Veterinary Services, is committed to working
13 through our area and the area in charge to
14 conduct outreach with producers, industry and
15 the states at local levels and get input at
16 local levels. That's number 1.

17 With this series of public meetings,
18 the three that are this week and next Monday,
19 and any future meetings that we would plan, we
20 basically tried to have as broad a geographic
21 representation as possible. Obviously it's
22 not -- I want to say it's not possible to hit
23 all 50 states, although we're getting there,
24 so we don't cherry pick the states. We
25 basically try to find places that are

1 accessible, easy to get in and out of, and we
2 also have cost considerations as well.

3 However, if a particular state or
4 region wants a meeting, you can always ask,
5 and I will take this as a request for a
6 meeting in Wisconsin, and I will run that up
7 the line, but we're open to doing any type of
8 outreach that producers, industry, the states
9 want us to do, so that's that.

10 DR. FERGUSON: Let me add one comment
11 to Michael's answer. We're also encouraging
12 our state and tribal counterparts to reach out
13 to their local industry and to get input in
14 that manner, so it does -- it's not just us,
15 APHIS Veterinary Services out there getting
16 input. We're relying on our state and tribal
17 counterparts to get that local input as they
18 work through this.

19 MS. MILLIS: I think there's another
20 question, and I'm going to open the floor to a
21 few questions if you have a question to ask or
22 you thought of something in the meantime?

23 (UNIDENTIFIED MAN): It's a follow-up
24 to what you said like you said. We have an
25 advisory committee in Minnesota that deals

1 with this. If we have input, how do we get it
2 back to you?

3 DR. FERGUSON: IN all seriousness,
4 whatever way might be easier for you. You can
5 feel free to submit it to Neil, send it to
6 myself. You can work through the members of
7 the working group, especially if it relates
8 directly to the performance standards. You've
9 got that list of folks on the working group.
10 Contact any one of them and throw that input
11 in if there's any other way you want to get it
12 to us, feel free.

13 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Anyone else
14 with a question? Do you have another one.

15 MR. HARTMANN: I don't have a
16 question, but a comment if that's all right.
17 I just wanted to express some concern with
18 these performance standards. I think we're
19 opening ourselves up to some issues of
20 interstate trade and that sort of thing, so to
21 take a simple test like this for a very
22 complex issue and evaluate an entire state
23 based on that, I would caution the working
24 group that that may not be the ideal way to do
25 this.

1 There have been, and the swine group
2 talked about it, where there are advisory
3 boards, the pseudorabies advisory board, which
4 is made up of state, industry people who could
5 evaluate states in a more concrete,
6 comprehensive way, so I think there needs to
7 be some thought about that, that maybe we're
8 trying to find a too easy solution to evaluate
9 how states are doing.

10 The other thing is, the reason the
11 Scrapie program was successful with, is this
12 consistent versus is it a non consistent
13 state, is that they allowed states a chance to
14 adjust to what they were doing before they
15 evaluated them, and by the time they evaluated
16 them, of course every state was consistent
17 because they had a chance to do that, so we
18 need to do something similar I think to this
19 program.

20 DR. FERGUSON: Very good point. Thank
21 you.

22 MS. MILLIS: Any other comments?

23 MS. STEEVER: I have a comment. I'm
24 full of comments. I just wanted to comment
25 that I'm speaking as a private horse owner.

1 I'm not part of an industry group. I'm
2 somebody who has for the last several years
3 been very deeply opposed to the NAIS program
4 as it was, but I wanted to let USDA know now
5 that because of that, myself and a lot of
6 people like me have a very deep distrust of
7 USDA.

8 Even if you have the best intentions,
9 at this point, we do not trust you. We are
10 going to be watching like a hawk because
11 you've destroyed any trust we ever had, and I
12 think you need to realize this when you work
13 with people like me who are not in the
14 industry.

15 MS. MILLIS: Thank you. Are there any
16 other comments or questions? Concerns?

17 Well, Lisa, I'm going to turn the
18 floor back to you to close out the day.

19 DR. FERGUSON: Thank you. I'll just
20 express again our appreciation for everyone
21 coming out today to attend this meeting. We
22 have gotten some good input. We truly value
23 everybody's comments.

24 Now I'm going to choke. Anyway, our
25 intent is to continue with an open and a

1 transparent process, and to make as many
2 avenues available for folks to get their input
3 to us, so please check in on the website
4 fairly frequently.

5 As Michael has said, leave your Email
6 address. You will get on our list and get
7 information sent directly to you. Also,
8 please don't hesitate to contact any of us
9 within APHIS Veterinary Services or folks
10 within the working group.

11 Thank you for your time, and we look
12 forward to our continuing progress in
13 developing this program as we go forward.

14 (Whereupon, at 2:55 p.m. the public
15 industry forum was concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Debra L. Maheux, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were recorded by me via stenotype and reduced to typewriting under my supervision; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were transcribed; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

DEBRA L. MAHEUX