

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK IDENTIFICATION

Chair: Bill Brown, KS

Vice Chair: Kevin Maher, IA

Sara Ahola, CO; J Lee Alley, AL; Joan Arnoldi, WI; James Averill, MI; Bill Barton, ID; Karen Beck, NC; Tony Benz, MO; C. Black, GA; Richard Breitmeyer, CA; Paul Brennan, IN; Becky Brewer-Walker, AR; Gary Brickler, CA; Charlie Broaddus, VA; William Brown, KS; Nancy Brown, KS; Jess Burner, TX; Jon Caspers, IA; Alan Clark, WI; Robert Cobb, GA; Matt Cochran, TX; Michael Coe, UT; Jim Collins, GA; Karen Conyngham, TX; Fred Cunningham, MS; Koren Custer, WV; Brandon Doss, AR; Anita Edmondson, CA; Adam Eichelberger, SC; James England, ID; J Amelita Facchiano, TX; Kathy Finnerty, MA; Betsy Flores, VA; Tony Forshey, OH; Robert Fourdraine, WI; W. Kent Fowler, CA; Tony Frazier, AL; Mallory Gaines, DC; Chelsea Good, MO; Alicia Gorczyca-Southerland, OK; Michael Greenlee, NV; Rod Hall, OK; Steven Halstead, MI; Neil Hammerschmidt, MD; William Hartmann, MN; Nephi Harvey, UT; Greg Hawkins, TX; Bill Hawks, DC; Jay Hawley, IN; Carl Heckendorf, CO; Julie Helm, SC; Kristi Henderson, IL; Bob Hillman, ID; Donald Hoenig, ME; Joseph Huff, CO; Dennis Hughes, NE; John Huntley, WA; Russell Iselt, TX; Regina Jensen, DE; Jamie Jonker, VA; Susan Keller, ND; Bradley Keough, KY; Bruce King, UT; Diane Kitchen, FL; Gerald Kitto, ND; T.R Lansford, TX; Maxwell Lea, Jr., LA; James Leafstedt, SD; Brad LeaMaster, OR; Mary Lis, CT; Jim Logan, WY; Laurent O'Gene Lollis, FL; Francine Lord, ON; Mary Luedeker, TX; Gordon 'Cobbie' Magness, SD; Kevin Maher, IA; Bret Marsh, IN; Stu Marsh, AZ; David Marshall, NC; Michael Martin, SC; Rose Massengill, MO; Jay Mattison, WI; Paul McGraw, WI; Thomas McKenna, MA; Shelley Mehlenbacher, VT; Ronald Miller, PA; Mendel Miller, SD; Ernie Morales, TX; Richard Odom, VA; Kenneth Olson, IL; Greg Onstott, MO; Elizabeth Parker, TX; Boyd Parr, SC; Alejandro Perera, MEX; Jewell Plumley, WV; Valerie Ragan, VA; John Ragan, MD; Jeanne Rankin, MT; Tom Ray, NC; Justin Roach, OK; Nancy Robinson, MO; Keith Roehr, CO; Larry Samples, PA; Bill Sauble, NM; A. David Scarfe, IL; Shawn Schafer, OH; Stacey Schwabenlander, MN; Andy Schwartz, TX; Charly Seale, TX; Laurie Seale, WI; Craig Shultz, PA; Richard Sibbel, IA; Kathryn Simmons, DC; David Smith, NY; Diane Stacy, LA; Robert Stout, KY; Nick Striegel, CO; Scott Stuart, CO; Paul Sundberg, IA; Tahnee Szymanski, MT; Manoel Tamassia, NJ; Beth Thompson, MN; Tracy Tomascik, TX; Arnaldo Vaquer, VA; Rick Wahlert, CO; Mark Walter, PA; James Watson, MS; Patrick Webb, IA; Richard Wilkes, VA; John Williams, MD; Kyle Wilson, TN; Josh Winegarner, TX; Thach Winslow, WY; David Winters, TX; Cindy Wolf, MN; Marty Zaluski, MT; Glen Zebarth, MN; Ernest Zirkle, NJ.

The Committee met on October 21, 2014 at the Sheraton Hotel in Kansas City, Missouri, from 8:00 A.M. to 11:35 A.M. There were 70 members and 41 guests present, of which 28 requested to join the committee. The USAHA committee guidelines were reviewed as well as a recap of the 2013 approved Resolution #26.

Committee Agenda

Time	Topic / Title	Presenter(s)
8:00 – 8:10	Opening Comments – Committee Purpose and Objective	Bill Brown, Kevin Maher
8:10- 8:30	APHIS VS ADT Update - emphasis on dairy and beef cattle implementation - including 'Monitoring and Compliance' report on 9 CFR Part 71.20 (Approved Livestock Facilities)	John Weimers, APHIS-VS
8:30 – 8:45	Data transfer standards committee update	John Picanso, APHIS-VS
8:45 – 10:15	Use of EID and other forms of official ID to increase the profitability of animal operation efficiencies, marketability, differentiation, with regulatory benefits	Industry presenters listed below:

8:50	Dairy (Victor) – Working use of ID outside of ADT requirements	Robert Fourdraine, AgSource
9:00	Beef –how to get the industry to move more toward EID mentality – such as test eligible animals	Mark Shaw, Micro Beef Technologies
9:10	Pork -: Pork industry’s ID and PIN - challenges with PEDv and related	Patrick Webb, NPB
9:20	Sheep and Goat	Cindy Wolf, U. of MN
9:30	Equine	Kent Fowler, CDFA
9:40	Export market – use of ID to easily obtain access to animal history	C. Gordon Thornhill, TK Exporters, Inc.
9:55 – 10:15	Panel - moderator will ask panel members written questions from the committee attendees	Moderated by Committee Leadership
10:15 – 10:35	Case example of a disease outbreak outside the US where the utility of animal ID made a real difference, or ID absence created challenges. (Applied to the US / CAN BSE incident)?	John Belfrage, APHIS
10:35 – 10:55	‘Livestock market ADT challenges’ Owner/shipper statements and challenges related to in-state vs. federal participation and enforcement.	Tom Frey, Creston Livestock Auction Market (Iowa)
10:55 – 11:15	Report from the Resolution #26 Working Group (Web-based solution for interstate movement of livestock)	Chelsea Good, LMA (Umbrella Group Chair)
11:15 – 12:00	Business Meeting	Committee members

Presentations & Reports:

Title: APHIS VS ADT Update - emphasis on dairy and beef cattle implementation - including ‘Monitoring and Compliance’ report on 9 CFR Part 71.20 (Approved Livestock Facilities)

Presenter: John Weimers

Affiliation: APHIS-VS

Tracing capability is directly associated with levels of compliance; that is, State and Federal animal health officials will not have information to support traceback investigations if they do not meet the regulation’s requirements. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) Veterinary Services unit (VS) has placed a priority on obtaining a high level of compliance with the traceability regulations through efficient and effective use of existing resources, including field personnel. Federal animal health officials will take the lead in enforcing the Federal requirements. However, States are encouraged to help oversee the various requirements. Likewise, accredited veterinarians have a key role regarding compliance with our regulations.

In March, 2014, a year after publication of the ADT rule, APHIS Administrator Kevin Shea, in a message to APHIS Stakeholders, stated, “... we will now pursue appropriate penalties in situations where an individual repeatedly fails to comply with the regulatory requirements.”

APHIS, VS, continues to implement the monitoring and compliance efforts outlined in the ADT Monitoring and Compliance document introduced at the 2013 USAHA Livestock Identification Committee meeting.

The guidelines address the need to continue to inform stakeholder of the regulatory requirements, initiate formal actions when appropriate through letters of information, document violations as they occur, and prepare and report cases to initiate IES investigation. APHIS encourages animal health officials to focus on the priorities: Official ID, ICVIs, and collection of ID at slaughter.

Traceability Performance Measures:

The question is often asked, "Why does APHIS have performance measures for ADT. The ADT program is "outcome based", not activity based. It is important to show that the funding for the program results in improvement. Without performance measurements, no improvement can be documented. The key to traceability is the timely retrieval of complete and accurate information.

APHIS is asking States to measure the time to answer specific questions:

- (1) What State was a tag distributed to?
- (2) Which producer was a tag distributed to?
- (3) What State was the animal shipped from?
- (4) What premises was the animal shipped from?

(1) and (2) are answered by searching records of tags distributed and applied.

(3) and (4) are answered by searching interstate movement documents.

States are to complete trace exercises as part of the ADT cooperative agreements in order to help establish national baseline values for each activity to be calculated mid-2014. Repeated activity will reflect progress over time as States are able to retrieve records more timely and consistently in the future. APHIS also conducted supplemental test exercise for activities (2), (3), and (4) to help validate the data provided through cooperative agreement reports. A Traceability Performance Measures Working Group was created to provide guidance in the administration of future trace exercises to measure current capabilities

Approved Livestock Facilities

The proposed rule to revise 9 CFR 71.20 which was discussed in the 2013 USAHA Livestock Identification Committee is now in clearance.

Brucellosis Calfhood Vaccination Identification

9 CFR 78.1 defines official vaccination eartag as:

"An APHIS approved identification eartag conforming to the alpha-numeric National Uniform Eartagging System which provides unique identification for each animal. The eartag shall have a "V" followed by 2 letters and 4 numbers. States which require more official vaccination eartags than the number of combinations available in the "V" series of tags shall use a "T" or "S" followed by 2 letters and 4 numbers. Duplicate reissue of official vaccination eartags shall not be made more often than once each 15 years."

In addition, an official calfhood vaccinate is defined as follows:

"(a) Female cattle or female bison vaccinated while from 4 through 12 months of age by an APHIS representative, State representative, or accredited veterinarian with a reduced dose approved brucella vaccine containing at least 2.7 billion and not more than 10 billion live cells per 2 mL dose of Brucella abortus Strain 19 vaccine or at the dosage indicated on the label instructions for other approved brucella vaccines; and (b) Permanently identified by a tattoo and by an official vaccination eartag in the right ear. However, if already identified with an official eartag prior to vaccination, an additional tag is not required. The tattoo must include the U.S. Registered Shield and "V," preceded by the quarter of the year and followed by the last digit of the year of vaccination. Individual animal registered breed association registration brands or individual animal registered breed association registration tattoos may be substituted for official eartags."

Although 840 AIN tags are not considered official calfhood vaccination tags, they may be used to meet the official identification for calfhood vaccinates. There is no color is specified for these tags, although approved 840 manufacturers have been requested to reserve the color orange for button-button RFID

ear tags for use by States that choose to wish to the use of orange 840 tags in lieu of official vaccination ear tags. The tags can be obtained directly from the State or as otherwise directed by the State. Information imprinted on the ear tag, other than the required information established through the CFR is at the discretion of the State. The USDA does not maintain or order orange RFID tags.

Title: Data transfer standards committee update

Presenter: John Picanso

Affiliation: APHIS-VS

AAVLD/USAHA Subcommittee on Information Standards Charter and Bylaws.

The subcommittee will endeavor to develop, or adopt existing, standards for information interchange by systems and services related to regulatory veterinary medicine as requested by its parent committee, the executive committees of either AAVLD or USAHA, or the National Assembly of State Animal Health Officials. Standards developed and/or adopted by the subcommittee will address the external exchange of information between systems, not with the internal representation of that information nor the user interface(s) exposed by any compliant system(s).

The next presenters provided brief updates of their industry or species perspective on use of EID and other forms of official ID to increase the profitability of animal operation efficiencies, marketability, differentiation, with regulatory benefits

Title: Working use of ID outside of ADT requirements

Presenter: Robert Fourdraine

Affiliation: AgSource Cooperative Services

Since the introduction of the AIN Numbering system and ADT rule, adoption of the NEUS and 840 numbering systems in the dairy industry have steadily increased. The need for a unique national identification number in the dairy industry has historically been driven by animals submitted into the US dairy genetic evaluation program managed by the USDA -AIPL. At the start, the dairy industry used the NEUS numbering system and/or unique breed registry assigned numbers to identify animals. With introduction of tamper evident tags in the 1990's the dairy industry adopted the American Identification numbering system. The American ID numbering system was a first step towards being able to use one single number across multiple industry uses such as milk recording, breed registration and participation in the US dairy genetics evaluation program. The American ID numbering system was administered by the dairy industry and was adopted by USDA APHIS VS as part of ADT on an interim basis.

Although American ID was well established, with the introduction of the 840 numbering system in 2008, the dairy industry started the switch from using American identification numbers on tamperproof tags to tags approved by USDA using the 840 AIN numbering system. Benefits were that the 840 numbering system could be used within the dairy industry and also used for animal health purposes. 840 AIN numbers quickly found their way into the US Dairy genetic evaluation, milk recording and herd book programs. While used on visible ID tags, the 840 numbering system also found its use on Radio Frequency ID tags.

As use of RFID tags and other visible ID tags with the 840 number continues to grow, examples of systems that are using 840 numbers on either visible or RFID tags are:

- parlor systems,
- herd management software,
- handheld data collection software,
- electronic milk recording systems,
- calf feeding systems,
- identification of cows sampled for genomic evaluations

The use of the NEUS tag still provides a cheap alternative for producers needing to obtain an official identifier and wish to participate in the dairy industry milk recording programs, however there is a structural problem in the dairy industry continuing the use of the NEUS numbering system as the sole

official identifier on an animal. The problem lies in the fact that the NEUS numbering system is not unique because states can reuse numbers previously assigned. For a dairy cow to qualify for participation in the US Dairy genetic evaluation program, the official ID number cannot be re-used. Animals assigned a re-used NEUS number are rejected from the US Dairy genetic evaluation program and must be re-identified with another ID tag that carries either an American ID, NEUS, or 840 number.

The second problem identified is related to the use of the 840 numbers that are recorded incorrectly. Recording errors have led to duplicate numbers or use of numbers that have not been assigned yet. As the use of 840 numbers will continue to grow, a system to validate the allocation of 840 numbers would add a layer of error checking that would limit the chance for duplication or incorrect recording.

With the implementation of the next phase of ADT, i.e. phase out the use of the American ID numbering system as an official identifier, the move towards the 840 numbering system will continue to grow. As dairy technology providers will build more recording systems around the use of the 840 numbering system, maintaining the integrity of the numbering system will have to be addressed by industry to avoid future problems.

Title: Beef –How to get the industry to move more toward EID mentality.

Presenter: Mark Shaw,

Affiliation: Micro Beef Technologies

For over thirty years, Micro Technologies has focused on animal identification evolving from the electronic barcode, to RFID, to Process Verification, to an Activity Based Monitoring System -based on infrared. The drivers to advance beef initiatives have been acceptance, value, and program based initiatives.

Examples of the base requirements for collaboration and innovation are data bases built on simple architecture, technology to support the speed of commerce, reporting to support the needs of commerce, and the building of a basic starter program to attract progressive producers.

Title: Beef – Pork industry's ID and PIN - challenges with PEDv and related herd management issues

Presenter: Patrick Webb

Affiliation: National Pork Board

Value of Official Identification in the Pork industry

Dr. Patrick Webb

National Pork Board

The adoption of official identifiers in the pork industry has primarily come by regulation, education and various industry requirements. The benefits or value derived from adoption of official identification as a part of a valid pre-harvest traceability system can go unrecognized by producers. This can be attributed to a lack of understanding of the role that pre-harvest traceability and identification plays in day to day regulatory activities, commerce and trade. Adoption of official identification can contribute to profitability, efficiencies, marketability and differentiation. It isn't necessarily related to a specific area, but is a combination of the ability to trade, enter interstate commerce or access markets.

The identification of swine in interstate commerce has been codified since the late 1980s, which has driven the use of official identification tags, devices or methods in the pork industry. Through the evolution of the U.S. Animal Identification Plan, National Animal Identification System and the Animal Disease Traceability Rule, the availability of the nationally standardized premises identification numbering system and Official Premises Identification Number Tag for breeding stock in harvest channels has provided opportunities to enhance pre-harvest traceability in the pork industry.

The official premises identification number (PIN) is the cornerstone of the swine ID program standards. This officially recognized site identifier provides benefits as a common denominator used for group/lot identification, official identification of animals in harvest channels, disease surveillance, emergency

preparedness and response, business continuity and product attribution. The industry has had recent opportunities to demonstrate the value of PIN-related data-sharing for business continuity purposes, as well as the response to Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea Virus in the U.S. pork industry.

The industry adoption of USDA's official PIN tags will enhance the traceability of breeding stock in harvest channels while benefitting disease surveillance for program and foreign animal diseases. The validated PIN imprinted on the tag provides the opportunity to develop the capacity to target sampling of sows and boars in harvest channels based on proximity to risk factors. The tag also provides benefit to the Pork Quality Assurance® Plus Program functioning as an accurate animal identification tool used within a production system to help facilitate herd health plans and for residue-avoidance protocols.

Title: Sheep perspective on “the use of EID & other forms of official ID to increase the profitability of animal operation efficiencies, marketability, differentiation, with regulatory benefits.

Presenter: Cindy Wolf

Affiliation: University of MN

Overview of the sheep and goat mandatory scrapie eradication program:

- For sheep and goats in commerce
- Required tagging influences compliance
- Highly effective in national scrapie eradication efforts
- Tags are used for management purposes
- But does the program add value to the species?

A well-established marketing group uses EID to:

- Automatically sort lambs twice a month for processing at target weights
- Automatically sort lambs on feed that have stalled out and should be processed due to diminished uneconomical weight gains
- All ewe performance records
- All lamb performance records
- Use data to conduct inter-farm comparisons to modify on-farm management

Example of on-farm application savings:

- Takes 9 sec per lamb to weigh, sort and record
- Saves 2 hrs. on data entry for every 400 lambs
- Virtually no errors
- ‘Computer’ sorts lambs into management groups(based on weight, sex, breed cross) at weaning
- Use integrated technology to sort ewes into 6 breeding groups
- Two people and system sort 700 ewes into 6 breeding groups in < 3 hours, and the record of which animal is where is generated
- Save at least 40 hours per year in data entry and manual lambing recording
- All sorting and weighing done by 1-2 people vs. 2-3
- Tightened up lamb market weights, reduced number of outlier lambs, can now ID slow growing lambs for early slaughter
- < 2 year payback on handheld recorder and software due to labor savings and data integrity
- Payback on drafting crate estimated to be 4-5 years depending on how much data you wish to gather and number of sheep being managed

Results from Marketing Group:

- 11 producers in marketing group now using integrated system, started with 1 producer in 2008
- Has improved flock profitability by using data to track ewe performance, marketing lambs at ideal weights, identifying lambs’ level of performance, reduced labor, improved data integrity
- First few years of use integrated system resulted in higher than usual level of culling which has now evened out

- Satisfies mandatory Scrapie program tagging requirements

Title: Equine Use of ID
Presenter: Kent Fowler
Affiliation: CDFA

Under the new traceability rule, equids moving interstate must be officially identified prior to interstate movement, with a few exemptions. Official identification for equids include one or more of the following: Description – including, but not limited to, name, age, breed, color, gender, distinctive markings, and unique and permanent forms of identification when present (i.e., brands, scars, cowlicks, tattoos, blemishes or biometric measurements). Electronic identification – Microchips that comply with ISO 11784/11785 or non-ISO electronic identification implanted into the equine prior to February 26, 2014. Digital photographs - Sufficient to accurately identify the individual equine.

The gold standard for equine “official” ID is the ISO compliant microchip. With current manufactured microchips, there is a very high degree of readability and if placed properly in the middle third of the neck in the nuchal ligament on the left side of the horse, it is unlikely to migrate. This information is, of course, only as good as the database that it is placed into. Current sources holding the data include the Jockey Club, breed registries, private microchip companies and private animal identification companies. There is currently also crossover into pet microchip database systems. The microchip “official” ID has great value in recovering stolen horses, accurate and positive identification in sample collection and accurate linking of management and production records on horse farms. The Federation Equestre Internationale (FEI) links the implanted microchip with the international competition passport.

With increased global livestock movement, the disease risk is greater to the United States (U.S.) horse population. Horse diseases considered high risk include, but are not exclusive to, equine piroplasmiasis, contagious equine metritis, dourine, glanders, equine infectious anemia, African horse sickness, equine viral arteritis and Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis.

There is an immediate need to establish a standard method of permanent identification and traceability for all horses imported into the U.S. A lack of a reliable and traceable permanent identification system for horses imported into the U.S. makes it difficult to conduct trace-back of animals that are potentially positive or exposed to an infectious disease. A 2014 Investigative Enforcement Services (IES) investigation in California led to the detection of an Equine Piroplasmiasis positive Spanish Purebred horse with a microchip originating in Spain. The lack of microchip recording and electronic capture on import records at the time of import, delayed the investigation of potential exposed horses as the microchip had to be traced through manufacturers to verify Spanish origin of the horse. Recent equine disease events involving horses imported to the U.S. demonstrate the risk of importation of various diseases. Traceability of these animals is a critical element in the protection of the U.S. horse population.

Title: Export market use of ID to easily obtain access to animal history
Presenter: C. Gordon Thornhill
Affiliation: TK Exporters, Inc.

T.K. Exports, Inc. (TKE) is a full service company dedicated to the export of live animals to international destinations. For the past 32 years, TKE has shipped US and Uruguayan animals to some 45 countries world-wide. These animals have been used mainly to improve meat and milk production by clients in their respective countries. For many years, these livestock shipments from the USA were very sporadic. For the last 8-10 years, these exports have grown in volume tremendously. This increase in numbers of animals exported is mainly due to the decrease in agricultural subsidies provided by the European Union. For many years the European Union offered incentives for farmers to export their excess animals. These excess animals could be purchased cheaper than the cost to raise them in the importing country. So livestock industries never really developed in the many countries of the Middle East and North Africa. Today, as economies grow and the demand for better food increases, coupled with increased costs for imported foodstuffs, many countries have started developing their own sources of meat and milk. This move for food independence has led to the greater development of livestock and has increased the demand for quality breeding stock.

Today, the United States has become a major player to supply countries with animals that either begin or improve meat and dairy production. Important markets for US animals have always been our neighboring countries of Mexico and Canada, but today, markets such as Turkey, Russia, Kazakhstan, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt (to name a few) have become importers of Dairy and Beef animals for reproduction purposes. Even the demand for smaller ruminants and pigs have increased in demand in markets such as China, the Philippines, and other countries. Of course, we enjoy our traditional markets of Mexico and Canada, but there are many new, non-traditional markets for US live animals which have increased the number of animals exported by two fold in the last 5 years.

The increased numbers of animals being exported has placed pressure on our exporting systems here. One of the biggest obstacles is the lack of a national Identification program for US animals. This causes serious problems for our health authorities and for those of us who have to put large numbers of animals together since the exporter is required to provide the supporting health and production information demanded by importing countries. So both exporters and the USDA-APHIS have had to re-think many of the rules and procedures used to gather and verify information about the animals we export.

The use of electronic Identification (EID) is something TKE began around 2008. As our business increased from 3-4000 animals exported per year to over 20,000 animals, we quickly implemented the EID system for our animals. For many years, we bought animals per our clients' demands in the "SPOT" market. However, as our business grew, we found it more and more difficult to supply animals on a monthly basis without having an inventory of animals available at all times. Having one unique number to track our inventory became paramount. As the export market demand increased the benefits and reasons for using unique ID'ing of animals has increased as well. One very important reason is that many countries require multiple blood tests for animals before they are exported. Some of these have to be done 30 days or more ahead of the actual official isolation and quarantine of the animals. We have found that using the old system of permanent ID's (metal tags) to be very difficult to manage and cumbersome to keep up with. With the implementation of using EID's and metal tags in every animal that we buy, which are inserted at the time we first test the animal, enables us to track multiple data on each animal easefully. So, the EID becomes the uniqueness we need and the metal tags become the backup identification for animals who lose their tags. We use one of several data bases to record information. Hopefully, this will be reduced to one in the near future so that animals can be tracked more easily than what they are now.

Exporters do many jobs in the US that counterparts in other countries do not have to do! In the EU for instance, the breed associations can provide information on the parentage of the animal being exported and the exporter or the farmer only needs to provide the number of the animal being exported. In the US, less than 10% of the animals in our population have their data recorded in a national data base. While many dairies record information, they do not share this with any association or national data base. So the US exporter has to find, obtain and compile this information for his clients.

Another important reason for EID's, is that US animals move around. Very few reside a life time in one place. Most folks do not understand how large dairies operate. Calves born today, move tomorrow to a calf ranch. Perhaps in another 8-10 weeks, they may move to another place which is the grower unit. In some cases, the female may move again to another unit (Heifer Grower) where she is inseminated and remains until about 7 months of pregnancy before moving back to the dairy. So, having a unique number that can be tracked is essential to this operation! Keeping up with the animal, its growth and breeding information is useful information to any operation.

Lastly, there is the sheer numbers of animals that are in most of the modern dairies. Statistics tell us that the USA dairies are decreasing but the number of animals on each of the remaining dairies are increasing. So the use of computers, scanners, and PDA's are essential. EID allows for the entering of all the IDs of animals into an electronic system quickly and efficiently with a high amount of accuracy.

For TKE, EID has also been a huge money saver, not only for our company personnel but for the fees we pay the USDA, too. Exporters pay User Fees to the USDA-APHIS for services. These fees can be rather high if the federal vets have to spend much time to check papers and ID animals. Paperwork fees are based on time with a cap or maximum for each certificate issued. However, the animal ID-ing process is based on time. So the longer it takes, the more the fee. TKE has reduced these fees in half by using EID. From the first time we used EID's for a ship, I believe we have decreased the user fees by \$10,000, which is about \$5 per animal, typically.

TKE believes that a national ID system, would help the export process immensely. We hope that in the future, we will be able to use some ultra- high frequency tags to record the testing, the sorting, loading

and unloading processes performed for export. This would eliminate the human error factor which is present in the process. Since most of our shipments go to multiple clients, the loading and unloading of the ship is always a flashpoint for mistakes in shipping wrong animals and sorting animals incorrectly to the different buyers. Therefore, we look forward to developing new and more efficient ways of doing the export process that will increase the accuracy and quality of the animal. We believe EID's are the key to improving the process.

Title: Case example of a disease outbreak outside the US where the utility of animal ID made a real difference, or ID absence created challenges.

Presenter: John Belfrage

Affiliation: USDA-APHIS-CEAH

Summary of Livestock Identification Presentation

John B. Belfrage, DVM, MPH, DACVPM

The December 2003 discovery of a bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) dairy cow in Washington State was a prime example of where identification (ID) was extremely helpful and where there were significant gaps in being able to use ID in tracing. The fact that the Holstein cow had come from Canada, where we had all the cattle from the origin farm identified, had available shipping documents, and additional identification, was an excellent start to performing the necessary tracing to find all the cattle of interest.

The BSE-affected cow was slaughtered and diagnosed right at Christmas. Using a combination of ID, a brand, and DNA validation, the cow was traced to the Index dairy near Mabton, WA. Based on the Canadian ID and shipping documents, the originating premises in Canada was also located within a day or two. It was quickly determined that the Canadian premises had undergone a dispersal sale of 113 head of Holsteins in 2001. We found that 82 head were destined for the United States, of which 81 actually entered the country. Another 17 head of heifers from the same Canadian premises were also potentially sent to the United States.

Canadian ID and other ID such as DHIA ID were used to trace and locate as many of these 98 head of cattle in the United States. In the end, we were able to positively locate 46 head, but could not definitively locate 52 head of these cattle.

There were a number of reasons for the failure of ID in this instance. Almost all the dairies had computerized data on every cow in their herd; however, we only found one dairy that actually put the Official Canadian ID into their database. For that matter, the only ID in almost all these databases was only the herd management tags. Also, official ID was not recorded at sales yards. Additionally, there was potential for lost Official ID and, in one case, a dairyman said he cut out all other ID and was not aware it was illegal to do so with Official ID. While we are just beginning to develop ID retirement at slaughter, at that time there was no retirement taking place and we could not account for any of cows culled for slaughter. Finally, the bull calf born to the affected cow just before she was diagnosed was sent to a calf ranch and had no ID at all.

Largely because Official IDs were not put into databases, sales documents, or retired at slaughter, we had to physically examine all ID on 75,000 cattle on 51 premises, slaughter 255 cows that either were or could have been Canadian origin cattle, and slaughter 449 unidentified calves. In the end, we positively identified 14 of the 25 high-risk Canadian cows, two of the heifer calves from the affected cow, seven of the 17 heifers from the Canadian origin premises, and 29 of the 81 cows imported into the United States. While we did not definitively find 52 of the 81 cows, based on local cull rates and the extra cows slaughtered, we felt confident that these cows not found were no longer alive. Also none of the slaughtered cattle other than the affected cow had any BSE positive tests.

In all likelihood, recording of Official or even DHIA ID would have given us more information where these 52 cows ended up. Also, we likely would have been able to verify that most, if not all, of those cows were culled for slaughter or located the remainder elsewhere.

Title: 'Livestock market ADT challenges' Owner/shipper statements and challenges related to in-state vs. federal participation and enforcement.

Presenter: Tom Frey

Affiliation: Creston Livestock Auction Market

Tom Frey, owner of Creston Livestock Auction, Inc. in Creston, Iowa and Livestock Marketing Association Executive Committee member spoke about Animal Disease Traceability from a livestock market perspective.

LMA's more than 800 members represent 77 percent of the regularly selling livestock markets across the United States. These markets serve as the junction between buyers and sellers by selling livestock on commission. Livestock markets consider themselves a partner in ADT, as they are often the location animals are identified before or, in some case, after moving interstate.

Markets continue to appreciate some of the flexibilities worked into the ADT rule, such as the ability to move cattle directly to slaughter with a backtag rather than an official identification device. Additionally, markets greatly appreciate and utilize the ability for cattle to move across state lines directly to an approved livestock facility (i.e. livestock market with USDA approval) prior to being identified and without a health certificate if moved on an owner shipper statement. The term owner shipper statement is defined in the regulation and, in many cases, an existing document, such as a tag in slip, meets the requirements. This provides livestock markets the flexibility to receive cattle from out-of-state customers and then help them meet the identification requirements of the ADT rule once the cattle arrive.

However, flexibility has also brought some confusion to the ADT rule, especially when considering some ADT decisions vary by state and other state-specific identification, documentation, and disease-specific requirements still apply.

Some of the concerns causing confusion in the country include low awareness of requirements amongst producers and varying levels of education provided by the states.

Tom discussed frustrations many markets have been having with the dairy steer component of the rule. In many areas, these animals are unlikely to come into the market with official identification. Many have difficulty justifying treating dairy steers differently than other beef animals. Even though ADT does not require dairy steer tags to be individually listed on health certificates, many state import requirements do require this. Handling these smaller animals a second time to read tags is frustrating to many as it risks animal injury and additional shrink, while also increasing the need for employee time and, in some cases, leading to long hours processing animals following the sale.

Tom also touched on the role of technology in ADT. One key component is the need for technology to work at the speed of commerce. Technology can also be cost prohibitive. Some states have used cooperative agreement or state money to kick start technology use.

Consistency in enforcement is key. Tom questioned how ADT requirements will be consistently enforced to ensure identification of all covered animals regardless of method of sale. He expressed concerns that enforcing only at markets could push producers out of this method of selling and harm the common goal of compliance.

Tom concluded by encouraged continued education and clarity of what enforcement will look like. Tom expressed enthusiasm about exploring opportunities with technology where appropriate. LMA also is supportive of USDA's current approach of focusing on smooth implementation of the federal rule, focusing on cattle 18 months of age or older, rather than expanding to feeder cattle.

Title: Report from the Resolution #26 Working Group (Web-based solution for interstate movement of livestock)

Presenter: Chelsea Good

Affiliation: LMA

Chelsea Good updated the committee on progress made towards USAHA Resolution #26, passed in October 2013, calling for a Web-based solution that would allow all interested parties to access movement requirements for livestock moved interstate. Chelsea was speaking as a member of the joint USAHA-NIAA leadership team working on this project. Her update included a funding announcement and timeline moving forward.

As background, there is a great deal of confusion about what is required to legally move livestock from one state to another. This is a result of an ADT rule that includes state decisions (e.g. brands as official identification) and differing state livestock importation, movement documentation, and disease-specific requirements (e.g. Tich. testing). Currently veterinarians or producers often call the state veterinarian office to ask what is required to move livestock. However, there is limited weekend availability in many cases and human error can create issues if requirements are not properly conveyed or fully understood.

In response to USAHA Resolution #26, USDA's National Animal Health Information Technology Board (NAHITB) created a sub group that analyzed options and provided a report recommending a dynamic, web-based solution. This concept has been discussed favorably by partner groups (NASAHO, USDA, Industry, and NIAA). A leadership team has been developed including industry, USDA, and state animal health officials. USAHA and NIAA have been designated as the appropriate co-host organizations to keep the project on track.

The desired system will be maintained as a Web-accessible, centralized database that ideally also has mobile accessibility and can be printed for those desiring a hard copy resource. When using the online resource, the user defines the shipment of livestock through a series of prompts or questions about things such as species, age, gender, etc. The system then retrieves the movement requirements specific for those animals. These requirements would be displayed in plain language and require almost no user interpretation.

Benefits of this system include increased compliance with federal and state requirements and reduced state veterinary staff time answering import questions. From a user standpoint, the system is always accessible in one place, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The plain language, written results will also reduce human error.

Chelsea announced that USDA funding has approved for initial creation and startup of the system. This will be paired with industry sponsors to be solicited for a 5-year commitment for sustaining the system.

The plan is for tool creation and maintenance to be contracted to the best suited entity. A request for Proposals (RFP) is currently being developed. Businesses will then submit proposals and the winner of contract would aim to create solution for launch in October 2015. The contract would include an annual maintenance fee to keep system current and functional.

It is through this USDA, state, and industry partnership that the goals set out in USAHA Resolution 26 can be achieved with the creation of a Web-based solution that would allow all interested parties to access movement requirements for livestock moved interstate.

Committee Business:

Called to order by new Committee Chair Bill Brown.

No old business.

New business resulted in a motion and unanimous approval of the following resolution that was also passed by the Committee on Infectious Diseases of Horses.

SUBJECT MATTER: RECORD AND ELECTRONICALLY CAPTURE RADIO FREQUENCY IDENTIFICATION ON IMPORTED HORSES

No further action occurred during the business meeting. The meeting adjourned at 11:35 A.M.