REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION

Chair: Bob Hillman, Austin, TX
Vice Chair: Kevin Maher, Ames, IA

Mr. Jim Akers, KY; Dr. J Lee Alley, AL; Dr. Joan M. Arnoldi, WI; Ms. Teri N. Baird, CO; Mr. John R. Behrmann, PA; Mr. Paul Brennan, IN; Mr. Allen Bright, NE; Mr. Matt Brockman, TX; Dr. James T. Case, CA; Ms. Karen Conyngham, TX; Ms. Caren Cowan, NM; Dr. Anita J. Edmondson, CA; Dr. James J. England, ID; Ms. J. Amelita Facchiano, TX; Dr. Glenn K. Fischer, TX; Dr. Robert Fourdraine, WI; Dr. Tony G. Frazier, AL; Mr. L. Wayne Godwin, FL; Dr. Larry M. Granger, Md; Mr. Robert R. Green, DC; Dr. Kent Haden, SC; Dr. Steven L. Halstead, MI; Dr. Jeffrey J. Hamer, PA; Dr. E. Ray Hinshaw, AZ; Mr. Joe N. Huff, CO; Dr. Julie Ann Jarvinen, IA; Mr. Jon G. Johnson, TX; Mr. Dick Jurgens, IL; Dr. Susan J. Keller, ND; Dr. Cleon V. Kimberling, CO; Dr. Terry Klick, OH; Dr. Ralph C. Knowles, FL; Dr. Maxwell A. Lea, Jr., LA; Mr. James W. Leafstedt, SD; Dr. Jim Logan, WY; Ms. Kelli S. Ludlum, DC; Ms. Jodi A. Luttropp, VT; Ms. Amy W. Mann, DC; Ms. Phyllis Menden, WI; Mr. Terry R. Menlove, UT; Dr. William Mies, FL; Mr. Richard E. Nelson, VT; Mr. Tim Niedecken, FL; Mr. Jim Niewold, IL; Mr. Tom Nunes, CA; Dr. Dwayne C. Oldham, WY; Dr. Kenneth E. Olson, IL; Dr. Angela Pelzel, TX; Ms. Laurie S. Prasnicki, WI; Dr. John R. Ragan, MD; Dr. Valerie E. Ragan, DC; Ms. Nancy J. Robinson, Mo; Mr. Bill Sauble, NM; Mr. Shawn P. Schafer, ND; Mr. Charly Seale, TX; Mr. J. Gary Shoun, CO; Dr. Rick L. Sibbel, IA; Mr. Glenn N. Slack, Ky; Dr. Bob Smith, OK; Dr. Mark Spire, KS; Dr. Joe Starcher, WV; Dr. Robert Stout, KY; Mr. Scott Stuart, CO; Mr. Richard C. Traylor, TX; Mr. Victor L. Velez, CA; Dr. Elizabeth K. Wagstrom, IA; Mr. Rick Wahlert, CO; Mr. David C. Warren, FL; Dr. Gary M. Weber, DC; Dr. John F. Wiemers, IL; Dr. Gary W. Wilson, OH; Mr. Ross Wilson, TX; Dr. Cindy B. Wolf, MN; Dr. Taylor Woods, MO; Mr. John F. Wortman, Jr., NM.

The Committee met on November 8, 2005, from 8 a.m. to 5:10 p.m. There were over 130 committee members and guests in attendance. Bob Hillman, Chair, presided, assisted by Kevin Maher, Vice-Chair. Hillman welcomed committee members and guests to the meeting, discussed the committee meeting expectations and addressed the association's Committee policies and procedures.

Neil Hammershmidt, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Veterinary Services (VS) National Animal Identification System (NAIS) Coordinator, provided a NAIS Implementation Status Report to the committee.

Hammerschmidt reported that the NAIS will be "phased-in" over time through the implementation of the following key components: Premises identification, animal identification, and animal tracking.

Premises Registration

An animal's birthplace and all location movements are essential information needed to track animals. Premises (locations that manage or hold animals) identification is the starting point of the NAIS. Each premises must be identified with a unique seven-character identifier, which would be known as a premises identification number (PIN).

Good progress continues to be made on premises registration. All states are operational on premises registration and 147,200 premises have been registered.

Animal Identification

Since eartags are the most commonly used method of individual animal identification, the November 8, 2004, interim rule (Docket No. 04-05201 Livestock Identification; Use of Alternative Numbering Systems) amended the definition of "official eartag." The previous definition of official eartag only allowed for the use of the National Uniform Eartagging System or a premises identification number used in conjunction with the producer's livestock production numbering system. The revised definition of official eartag was updated to include the Animal Identification Number (AIN).

- AIN Tags

The animal identification component utilizing the AIN in the NAIS is voluntary. Producers who elect to participate in the animal identification component using the AIN must first obtain a PIN. Animals that are identified as individuals may be identified with the AIN in the NAIS using devices or methods approved by APHIS. The basic criteria for AIN tags are:

- the tag must have the United States (U.S.) Shield imprinted. Two-piece tags must have the U.S. Shield and the AIN with "840" imprinted on both tags.
- the tag must bear the entire 15-digit AIN.
- the tag must be designed for one-time use (tamper evident).
- the printing on the tag may not be readily altered.
- the national identification number must be easily and reliably readable.

- The AIN Management System

The AIN Management System is a web-based program that administers AINs. The AINs are allocated to companies that manufacture official identification devices or technologies. Other individuals and organizations may perform roles that support the distribution of official identification devices to producers. The complete and accurate recording of the AINs distributed and assigned to each premises is imperative. The AIN Management System allows for many participants in various roles and provides the means to record AIN allocations to manufacturers and distribution to premises.

Key roles in the initial roll-out of the AIN Management System include: AIN Tag Manufacturers, Managers, and Resellers. Manufacturers have specific roles and responsibilities regarding the manufacturing of AIN Tags; managers and resellers have roles that support the distribution of AIN Tags to producers' premises.

NAIS Research/Field Trial – Cooperative Agreements

APHIS will award $3 million in cooperative agreements to States and Tribes for conducting research to develop or test potential solutions for animal identification and automated data collection in support of the NAIS.

Applicants are encouraged to propose research or field trial projects to:

- enhance the effectiveness of collecting animal identification data in typical production, market and abattoir environments;

- establish identity validation when official identification devices are lost, removed, or malfunction;

- conduct economic assessments of animal identification systems and technologies in typical production, market, and abattoir environments; and

- evaluate emerging animal identification technologies with advanced data collection systems to ascertain the adaptability of the technology for use in NAIS.

Applications will be available in the next week on www.Grants.gov. The deadline for application

is December 30, 2005.

Dr. Dale Blasi, Professor and Extension Beef Specialist, Kansas State University, presented a report on Current Radio Frequency Identification Devise (RFID) Technology. He reported that data capture and data management systems can be quite intricate (automatic information capture technologies such as RFID), or they can be very simple (pencil and clipboard). However, a major disadvantage of the simple option is the human factor. When recording data, humans are slow and prone to error. Moreover, as the complexity of data entry increases so too does the likelihood of creating an error. For example, in manufacturing industries that use human data entry, it is quite common to have one transposition error for every 300 keystrokes (Fales, personal communication). Manually collecting data with a clipboard is prone to data entry error at chuteside and again when inputting the collected data into a computer program.

Although USDA continues to maintain a technology neutral position in the developing evolution of this national initiative, the NAIS plan in its current form has identified low frequency (LF) RFID as the initial automatic identification and data-capture technology that will be used to achieve its goal of tracing an animal in a 48-hour time frame. The existing International Standards Organization (ISO) standards (ISO 11784 and 11785) will help ensure that data-capture transponders and readers are compliant although there are large apparent differences in performance between various manufacturers. The results of laboratory research conducted at the Kansas State University Animal Identification Knowledge Laboratory suggest that minimum performance standards be developed and implemented by USDA to ensure that RFID hardware meets livestock manager expectations.

The RFID reader's ability to consistently detect and interrogate every intended individual transponder that penetrates its read range is an important consideration. When judging the success of any RFID system, read range refers to the distance between the transponder and the reader's antenna. Read range can be affected by several factors. For example, the type of transponder and the proprietary tuning characteristics built into it by the manufacturer affect read range. This variation is likely responsible for a portion of the read range differences typically observed when using chips and readers from different companies. The power available to the reader, the power available within the tag to respond, antenna characteristics and size, and competition from other devices emitting electric signals also affect read range. In general, metal attenuates radio signals, especially at lower frequencies (125kHz to 13.56 MHz). There are a variety of approaches used to distance the transponder from metal, such as providing an insulating layer of air or foam, or replacing the metal sides on alleyways or processing snakes with other material such as polypropylene.

Dr. William Laegreid, U.S. Meat Animal Research Center, Clay Center, Nebraska, made a presentation on Single Nucleotide Polymorphism Markers as a DNA-Based Identification Technology to Audit Animal Identification Systems and Facilitate Traceback. Dr. Laegreid reported that accurate animal identification is essential for improving disease control and enhancing food safety. Selected single nucleotide polymorphism markers (SNP) have been identified in beef cattle populations that can be used to verify simple tracking in a commercial slaughter facility.

The technology has also been utilized to either identify or verify parentage or progeny and was utilized to confirm that the source of the Washington State Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) case was in Canada.

Results of work done on bovine SNP markers suggest that the markers can be used t verify accuracy of sample tracking in slaughter plants that process beef or dairy cattle. These markers may facilitate high-throughput, DNA-based, traceback programs designed to detect drug residues in tissues, control animal diseases, and enhance food safety. Additionally, Dr. Laegreid suggested that DNA-based assays should be considered an adjunct to other animal identification systems, such as NAIS, not a replacement for them.

Mr. Jim Burgess, Cattle Traq, reported on his company's high frequency RFID technology and discussed the potential benefits such technology could provide for identification and tracking of livestock. Two

distinct technologies underpin the RFID location and tracking component of Cattle Traq's system applications. These two technologies are direct spread spectrum (DSS) and ultra-wide band (UWB) technology.

Cattle Traq has successfully brought together combinations of these technologies to deliver impressive performance and value in extreme situations at an attractive cost. The Cattle Traq system provides tracking in real time, not a passive tag, but an "active" system, which is very similar in concept to a localized global positioning system or Global Positioning Satellite (GPS). A series of antennae are strategically placed to receive signals and read up to 200 head of cattle per second. Calculations are made and transferred to either a personal data assistant (PDA) unit or a computer. Information is sorted and stored at the owner's discretion. Information is then downloaded for future reference or is purged.

Mr. Burgess reports that this system is superior to any passive system available today.

Dr. Mark Spires, formerly at Kansas State University, provided an update on the Kansas NAIS Pilot Project, which was entitled "*Use of RFID Equipped Commercial Livestock Transports."*

The Kansas Animal Health Department developed a working cooperative group consisting of AgInfoLink, Destron Fearing, Kansas State University, National Beef, National Carriers, Osborne Industries and U.S. Premium Beef to develop the hardware and software necessary to collect, transmit and distribute data on loads of livestock shipped on commercial livestock transports. This project was initiated based on the fact that Kansas is a net importer of cattle from throughout the United States, Canada and Mexico. Based upon the number of cattle imported into the state on any given day, 500 to 600 loads of cattle are being shipped on commercial transports within Kansas.

The system is being designed and tested to equip commercial transports with ISO compliant RFID readers, data accumulators, GPS units, printers and sending units. At present, the sending units are based upon cellular level technology with redialing capabilities in case of absence of signal or loss of signal during data transmission. Data is collected from RFID transponder animals or animals being transported under a group/lot number. The date, total numbers of animals, RFID numbers, group/lot number, transport and driver identifier, transaction number, origination PIN and GPS, destination PIN and GPS, and Interstate Certificate of Veterianry Inspection (ICVI) number and/or brand certificate number, if applicable. This data is wirelessly transmitted to a central database, processed and notification sent to the appropriate animal health authorities via an internet-based network. Upon completion of the movement in and out reports, a final report is available to be sent to the state animal health authorities and the USDA-NAIS database, once established.

To date, RFID systems have been placed on commercial vehicles in Kansas and Nebraska. A total of 25 drivers have undergone training on the USDA NAIS program and operation and maintenance of the RFID system. Through supply channels developed through National Beef and U.S. Premium Beef, cattle have been recruited into the program from 10 states (NM, CO, TX, OK, KS, NE, SD, MO, IA and IL). A logistical system has been set up to coordinate loads of cattle and trucking companies. Data on each load is being collected to determine success/failure of the system and determinates of those outcomes based upon driver observations. Additionally, a performance-testing laboratory was established at Kansas State University to test and validate the capabilities of this equipment. This project is slated for completion in March 2006.

Dr. Saul Mercado, AgInfoLink, reported on the cross-border cattle identification and tracking project entitled "*Traceability Project for Mexican Cattle."*

Considering the importance of having a reliable and efficient system to identify the real source of origin of Mexican cattle exported to the United States, this Pilot Project was developed by a joint effort between Mexican and American animal health authorities and Mexican producer organizations utilizing AgInfoLink technology.

The following entities participated:

- USDA
- Texas Animal Health Commission (TAHC)
- Mexican Secretariat of Agriculture (SAGARPA)
- National Cattlemen's Confederation of Mexico (CNOG)
- Nuevo Leon Cattlemen's Association
- State government of Nuevo Leon, Mexico.

The U.S. contributed USDA funds through the Texas Animal Health Commission. The Mexican organizations contributed with in kind services.

The pilot project utilized 5 000 electronic ear tags over a period of 15 months, between May 2004 and August 2005. Of this number, ten tags were discarded due to human error at tagging and one tag was defective. The remaining 4,989 tags were placed on cattle and their basic information of origin was collected. All information collected on cattle was uploaded daily to a central database made available to the authorities participating in the project via a secure web site. Cattle enrolled in the project have now been exported to the U.S. or sold in Mexico. Some of the cattle are still awaiting harvest at the participating feedlots.

AgInfoLink-Mexico implemented and coordinated the project. AgInfoLink's traceability solutions enable the project participants to track each animal from origin to slaughter. At the time of slaughter, animals exhibiting TB lesions is quickly traced back to its herd of origin by consulting the corresponding web site.

The project also enrolled 30,483 animals to the herds of origin. Basic information on these animals was collected as well.

Dr. Mary Ann McBride, NAIS coordinator for North Carolina, reported on that state's NAIS implementation project entitled "*NCFarmID: Challenges and Opportunities of Implementing a Developing National Premises Identification Program in North Carolina."* Dr. McBride reported that progress is being made in implementation of the voluntary animal identification system in North Carolina. They started with premises identification and will add animal identification and animal tracking components later. She also reported that the state has had a swine and poultry database for 16 years and are now adding other livestock species.

Under the NCFarmID program, there is an ongoing outreach effort including such activities as meetings with producers and producer groups, mass mailings, and posters at markets and other locations.

Dr McBride also discussed some of the challenges faced by the agency as it attempts to achieve the purpose for the project and as we move forward with implementation of the national system. She expressed concern that implementation was like trying to hit a moving target, especially to recent change relative to animal tracking and believes these changes affect our credibility with our producers. She also expressed that the system as currently envisioned will place a significant hardship on market operators and many of our producers and could require producers to have different systems for different species on the same facility.

Dr. McBride reported progress in registration of premises, but also noted that many producers are not members of organized groups and are difficult to identify and convince of the need for an animal identification system causing difficulties in getting all premises registered. Dr. McBride also identified opportunities that would enhance development and implementation of the program. Producers in North Carolina were generally concerned with the same issues that are of concern in other states, such as confidentiality and cost.

Mr. David Cummings, USDA-APHIS-VS, Center for Epidemiology and Animal Health (CEAH), reported on Electronic Certificates of Veterinary Inspection (CVI) – Veterinary Services Process Streaming (VSPS) Initiative Specific to Interstate Movement Module.

He gave a status report and a call to action for an initiative first requested and supported by the Committee on Livestock Identification over five years ago. In December 2005, the first release of this internet-based software will be complete and ready for implementation in states beginning January 2006 and into 2007.

Electronic Certificates of Veterinary Inspection (eCVI) are one component of a larger project called the VSPS. The VSPS is designed to become accredited and state veterinarians' single point of access to all electronic applications and certifications required for interstate and international movement of animals and animal products.

Integrating with other USDA databases and the NAIS has been a driving influence for the VSPS. The ultimate goal is to fully integrate VSPS with the NAIS. Each eCVI would require a PIN, and each animal sighting would be reported to the national animal information repository.

Achieving this goal will evolve with the NAIS, because PIN's are voluntary and AINs' are being developed. In the meantime, VSPS will automatically capture a PIN for the origin address on each eCVI if a PIN exists, and will send a "sighting" report with PIN and AIN to the repository if the origin address has a PIN and animals have AINs.

The VSPS team asks State Veterinarians to contact them to consider what is the best timing for implementing this tool in your state, and to bring leadership and advocacy to this initiative in your state. Contact persons are David.J.Cummings@aphis.usda.gov, or Amelita.Facchiano@aphis.usda.gov.

With your willingness and commitment to participate in this state-federal initiative, you will have an eCVI that sets a new gold standard in animal health regulatory management and integrates with NAIS. Implementation planning is kicking off for eight states during this United States Animal Health Association (USAHA) week.

Dr. Robert Fourdraine, Wisconsin Livestock Consortium (WLIC), presented the results of a Survey of States – Premises and Animal Identification Legislation. This survey was developed jointly by WLIC and the Texas Animal Health Commission (TAHC) to provide a sense of the level of activity on the state level to address, through legislation or rulemaking, elements of the animal identification system and identify states that could have laws or rules that could serve as templates for other states. The survey consisted of six questions as follows:

1. does your state have requirements or legislation approved for livestock identification and reporting of livestock movements?
2. is your state pursuing legislation to mandate any components of NAIS prior to the USDA-proposed timeline?
3. does your existing or proposed legislation give your department or agency authority to charge a fee for administering the program?
4. does your existing or proposed legislation protect information from FOIA?
5. has your state selected or endorsed specific technology for official animal identification?
6. does your state currently accept the animal identification numbering formats outlined in the USDA interim rule as official identification for intrastate movement?

Results of the survey show that the western brand states are significantly ahead of most other states relative mandatory identification and reporting. Approximately 20% of the states either have or are pursuing legislation to require premises ID, animal ID and movement reporting. Most states are awaiting a USDA mandate. Only seven states have current or proposed laws or rules that would provide the ability to charge a fee for animal identification. Almost one-third of the states have authority to protect animal identification data from public release. The vast majority of states have not endorsed specific technology, but will utilize USDA-approved technology. Finally, almost all of the responding states accept the identification formats contained in the interim rule for intrastate movement.

Following these reports and presentations, the committee engaged in a discussion about the Private Animal Tracking Database /Data Repository. Chair Hillman stressed that the discussion should focus on

the animal-tracking component of NAIS and not drift to other issues. He also briefly discussed the reason for the Monday evening session and expressed the hope that the Monday evening session, in addition to animal identification discussion in several other venues during the Annual Meeting, would result in a product from the committee that could help lead continued development and implementation of NAS. Chairman Hillman asked Dr. John Clifford, Deputy Administrator and Dr. David Thain, National Assembly of State Livestock Health Officials, to speak on needs and expectations for federal and state animal health agencies and Mr. John Wortman, New Mexico Farm Bureau and past Chair of the Committee on Livestock Identification, to provide a report of the Monday evening session.

Dr. John Clifford, Deputy Administrator, spoke to the needs and expectations from USDA. Dr Clifford re-iterated points that had been made at the Kansas City stake-holder meeting and at the Monday evening discussion relative to animal tracking. He stated that VS is committed to supporting a private animal-tracking component for the NAIS. Dr. Clifford discussed four major points outlined by the Secretary of Agriculture: (1) that the role of government not be expanded; (2) that USDA is technology neutral; (3) that the animal-tracking component of NAIS be privately held (4) that the animal identification system must be flexible to address the needs of all of our livestock industries. Dr. Clifford also stated that USDA would prefer that a single database be developed to handle tracking for all species, but acknowledged that multiple databases utilizing a single portal would likely be accepted.

Dr. Thain spoke to the needs for state animal health officials and provided a report on Privatized Animal Tracking Database. He reported that The National Assembly of State Animal Health Officials (NASAHO) met with VS to address state concerns and needs for a private animal-tracking database in Chicago following the National Institute for Animal Agriculture (NIAA) meeting. A general list of needs were identified and agreed upon. Several other issues were not resolved.

Items agreed upon:

1. Non-negotiable access
    a. 24-7 direct query access at no cost for federal and state animal health officials for the following needs:
        1. A foreign animal disease investigation
        2. An animal disease emergency as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and/or the state animal health authorities
        3. A traceback/traceforward to determine the origin of an infection for a program disease (brucellosis, tuberculosis, etc)
        4. Surveillance for another domestic or emerging disease
2. Timelines for implementation of a privatized system
    a. April 1, 2006 - Formation of legal industry entity(s)
    b. July 1, 2006 - USDA establish an Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) with legal entity(s)
    c. July 1, 2006 - Availability of communication specifications for USDA to formulate data query ability

Items needing further clarification and discussion

1. Need to assist with resolving issues related to lost or stolen animals, in particular in natural disasters as well as supporting authorities with regard to the administration of stolen animals
2. Information need to determine compliance with future state and/or federal regulations relative to the reporting of animal movements with state animal health programs

An Information Technology (IT) working group was formed of state and federal resources to address the data needs of state and federal groups as well as data elements in state databases.

There was clear consensus regarding the need for USDA to make a commitment whether animal identification and movement tracking will become mandatory in the future as outlined in the plan or if the program will remain voluntary. Producers who embraced individual animal ID one year ago are backing away until there is clear direction. Industry and states need a commitment for future planning needs.

Another major issue (whether real or imagined) is confidentiality. A number of states have enacted new legislation to protect animal identification information. However, there exist major concerns on misuse of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). These concerns need to be addressed by legislation at the federal level.

State animal health official voiced frustration (both of industry and state government) regarding the midstream switch to a privatized animal-tracking database by USDA.

Finally, collectively we need to move forward and not squander the opportunity to establish a world-class animal identification system.

Mr Wortman provided the summary report from the Monday evening stakeholder meeting, as follows:

Dr. Bob Hillman, Chair, USAHA Committee on Livestock Identification, opened the meeting at 7 p.m. He described the current situation with the implementation of the NAIS and the challenges in moving forward with the development of the "animal-tracking" component.

There were brief updates by Dr. Hillman, Dr. John Clifford from USDA, and Dr. David Thain, President of the National Assembly of Chief Livestock Health Officials, summarizing the recently held meetings in Chicago and Kansas City about the NAIS.

Dr. Hillman stated that the purpose of the Stakeholders' Meeting was not to re-state concerns and preferences that had previously been discussed in meetings about the NAIS, but rather, the objective of the meeting was to determine what we (industry and government) needed to do to proceed. He asked the group to determine something that could be taken to the USAHA Committee on Livestock Identification the next day that will help answer "How do we move the animal-tracking component forward?"

There was discussion of concerns. The following are the suggestions for action that came from those that spoke to the group. These comments are not listed in order of preference; they are listed in the order that they were presented:

1. immediately establish an ad hoc committee of the Committee on Livestock Identification to identify the costs of implementing the animal-tracking component.

2. USAHA should be the organization that takes the lead and brings everyone to the table for agreement on how to proceed.

3. USAHA should take the lead in concert with the NIAA in determining how to move forward.

4. have an "entity" for each species group and let them work out the problems associated with their species.

5. use existing databases and integrate them into the national system.

6. we should have an open, distributive system, but we need a system integrator and system engineer. Define that system and then go to Congress and get the funding for implementation. This would allow for the confidentiality and ease of access that we need.

7. everyone affected needs to be invited to the table to help decide how to proceed. The speaker envisioned possibly as many as 100 people involved and stated we must ensure all groups concerned have direct input. He also advised that USAHA should be the organization to lead this effort, but invite more producers, given the usual low proportion of producers present at the USAHA proceedings.

8. limit the data collected to information needed for animal tracking and limit access.

9. get USDA back on track (pursue the original plan for NAIS implementation).

10. convince the Secretary of Agriculture and USDA to rethink their position and re-take the lead in finishing the development and implementation of the NAIS.

Mr. Wortman added a personal endorsement to Dr. Hillman's suggestion that USAHA formulate a group with the goal for people to come together to formulate and move forward a plan for making NAIS a reality.

Chair Hillman pointed out that the two resolutions from the 2004 Committee on Livestock Identification had been addressed by presenters during the meeting, and therefore would not readdress them.

The committee reviewed the Mission Statement and approved minor amendments to it. The revised Mission Statement reads as follows:

> The **purpose** of the Committee on Livestock Identification is to coordinate and evaluate methods of livestock identification and to make recommendations to United States Animal Health Association (USAHA) for the adoption or rejection of animal identification systems.
>
> The **goal** of the committee is to meet the expanding needs in national and international livestock identification, and to reach conclusions that are not only reasonable to the livestock industry but also to fulfill the purposes for which each livestock identification system is designed.
>
> A recommendation was proposed that the Committee urges the President of USAHA to help assemble a consortium of qualified specie representatives that will then assemble the necessary components of the Animal Tracking Database.
>
> After extensive discussion of this proposed recommendation a motion was made and seconded to table the proposed recommendation. The motion to table the recommendation was approved.
>
> The committee considered and approved four resolutions that were forwarded to the Committee on Nominations and Resolutions.
>
> A motion was made and seconded to remove the proposed recommendation from the table and to reconsider the recommendation. The subsequent vote failed to garner the required two-thirds vote to remove the proposed recommendation from the table.