



Industry Symposium
Breakout Sessions
Summary

Jackie McClaskey

November 22, 2019



Question 1a:

Challenges: Trust/Grassroots

- **Willingness of producers to participate/adopt, esp. cow/calf – all 7 rooms**
 - Creating buy-in
 - Need critical mass engaged
 - Number of cow-calf producers makes program difficult to manage
 - Including cattle not in “traditional” supply chain (video auctions)
 - Balancing costs/benefits between packers and cow-calf
- **Producer education, communication**
 - Reaching all producer segments
 - Creating understanding - Getting accurate wording out
- **Data security /privacy concerns**
 - Balancing confidentiality vs. value-added
 - Government involvement/access/control – “people don’t trust the government”
- **Cost/trust/ability continuum**
 - **Time and labor requirements**
 - Timelines, regulations on time



Question 1a:

Challenges: Process & Logistics

- Mandatory or voluntary?
- Quality control, program integrity
- Speed to implement
- **Infrastructure**, facility capabilities, broadband access IIII
- Needs simplicity, eg. tag application, Continued tech cost
- How data is moved, ease of providing data
- Technology shift/selection
 - getting everyone on one system)
 - integrating current EID technology
 - lack of govt standards for UHF
 - Rate of change in technology
- Ear tag quality/durability (will it last)
- Making sure all animals are being traced (sightings, point-to-point)
- Liability
- Enforcement



Question 1a:

Challenges: Costs vs. Value

- **Cost vs. perceived benefit/value** (esp. for cow/calf producers) – all 7 rooms
- High level “Why?” and “What for?”
- Change – value of change - why now?
- Political and governmental support
- Economic burden to cow-calf producers
- Establish values down the chain
- Quantify the cost of a disease outbreak
 - How do you **place a value on something that hasn't happened**
 - insurance policy
 - Responding to multispecies FAD
- International acceptance of a private program
- How is it funded?



Question 1b:

Benefits: On-Farm/Producer

- **Management tool for producers/inventory management**
- Increase use of technology on the farm
- Availability of individual history
- Better animal welfare
- Standardization of systems/technology
- **Producer driven is key**
- Outbreak insurance policy
- Depends on size of program (small/targeted vs more comprehensive)



Question 1b:

Market Benefits

- Perceived efficiency and handling process – speed of commerce
- **Consumer confidence, trust**, access to information
- **Value-added opportunities** (data/info) – perceived vs. actual
 - Feedback on performance
- International trade and markets
 - **Export market increase/Open new markets/regain markets**
 - more data collection required?
 - Improve balance of trade
 - Continued market access during an outbreak
 - Limit economic impact during an outbreak



Question 1b:

Disease Response Benefits

- **Intervention during disease outbreaks**
 - quicker response to outbreaks
 - increased/improved disease traces
- **FAD insurance/management**
- Cost benefit of investigation
- Eliminate undue expense in process
- Ability to track disease resistance



Question 2a:

Who can access the data?

Did a majority of the people in that room agree?

- State animal health officials/state vet – 7 of 7 rooms
- State ADT coordinator – 5 of 7 rooms
- USDA animal health officials – 4 of 7 rooms
- State animal health staff – 3 of 7 rooms
- State agriculture agency head - secretary/commissioner/director – 2 of 7 rooms
- U.S. Secretary of Agriculture – 1 of 7 rooms
- Governor – 0 of 7 rooms
- Others mentioned: FSIS, producers (access to their own data)



Question 2b:

How does gov't access data?

Only 5 rooms discussed this issue

- Set Triggers – 4 yes, 1 maybe
- CattleTrace program manager – 2 yes, 2 maybe
- Board Approval – 1 yes, 2 maybe
- Automatic – all 5 rooms said no



Question 2b:

How does gov't access data?

Lots of conversation in this room. Lots of “maybe/if/it depends”

- Parameters/guidelines should be established by the board that lead to triggers
- Differentiate approval between presumptive vs. confirmed
- Depends whether on reportable disease list
- Board and advisory committee need to have broader representation



Other Thoughts/Notes About Data Access

*** Taken directly from the “parking lot” tear sheets in the breakout rooms ***

- Automatic access – needs a verification of a presumptive positive, not just word of mouth
- Board defined triggers & policy for automatic access to defined individuals (state animal health officials)
- Triggers – disease based levels – state vs federal reportable disease list
- Can media access data through FOIA/other?
- Depending on circumstances, the “who” may be very broad
- What role does research play in access?
- Definition of “real time” info (instant/4 hr delay, etc.)
- Unintended consequences



Question 2c:

When should data be released?

Did a majority of the people in that room agree?

- Risk of disease spread – 7 of 7 rooms
- Public health risk – 6 of 7 rooms
- Mortality rate – 2 of 7
- Cost – 2 of 7 rooms
- Trade Impact – 2 of 7 rooms
- Public perception – 1 of 7 rooms
- Economic impact – 0 of 7 rooms
- Other considerations? reportable disease



Question 3:

Who should be responsible for funding traceability?

How many rooms placed these groups in the Top 2?

- Packers/Processors – 7
- Federal Government – 2
- Cow-Calf Producers – 2
- Wholesalers/Retailers – 1
- Exporters – 1
- State Government – 0
- Livestock Markets/Dealers – 0
- Feedyards – 0

Consumers mentioned in 3 rooms



Question 3:

Who should be responsible for funding traceability?

Percentage of responsibility lies with:

- Packers/Processors – 23%
- Cow-Calf Producers – 16%
- Federal Government – 15%
- Feedyards – 13%
- Wholesalers/Retailers – 11%
- Livestock Markets/Dealers – 9%
- Exporters – 8%
- State Government – 5%



Question 3:

Who should be responsible for funding traceability?

General consensus:

There should be a public/private partnership as long as it doesn't impact how data is accessed.



Other Thoughts/Notes About Funding

*** Taken directly from the “parking lot” tear sheets in the breakout rooms ***

- Cost share- device infrastructure, investment/tax credit to producers
- Who is responsible = collection points
- Belief the fee/assessment will always trickle down to cow-calf
- Funding – using a rebate program vs gov’t subsidy
- Still see a cow-calf producer bearing the brunt of the cost
- Future funding – step process
- Answer to who pays changes if mandatory vs voluntary



Other Thoughts/Notes From Breakout Sessions

*** Taken directly from the “parking lot” tear sheets in the breakout rooms ***

Value

- Has to become economically viable – either value for participation or discount for not
- Need some benefit
- Desire to somehow merge ADT & value add info within the system
(controlled access & sharing)



Other Thoughts/Notes From Breakout Sessions

*** Taken directly from the “parking lot” tear sheets in the breakout rooms ***

Industry Support

- Adoption rate is crucial
- Immediate need – talk to packers/processors to be more targeted and not have to reach thousands of producers



Other Thoughts/Notes From Breakout Sessions

*** Taken directly from the “parking lot” tear sheets in the breakout rooms ***

CattleTrace Operations

- Board and advisory committee need broader representation
- Encompassed species – broader than cattle
- Board liability/CattleTrace liability
- Need for “mirror” database so one server doesn’t crash when multiple folks access it
- Confidentiality during a trace
- CattleTrace does not have responsibility to inform public – state/fed PIOs



Thank You

CONTACT:

Cassie Kniebel

Program Manager

P: 785-564-7446

E: info@cattletrace.org

FOLLOW US:

www.CattleTrace.org

