2013 DRPC Meeting Minutes

April 24, 2013

Attendees: Steven Sievert, Greg Palas, John Clay, Jay Megonigal (AIPL), Duane Norman (CDBC), John Cole (AIPL), Leigh Walton (CDBC), Bill VerBoort (AgriTech), Jay Mattison (NDHIA), Jeanne Marshall (AgSource), Robert Fourdraine (AgSource), Terry Zumbrennen (DHI Provo), Lee Day (DHI Provo)

1.0 Recording Secretary
   Motion was made to appoint Robert Fourdraine as recording secretary. Motion was seconded and approved.

2.0 Approval of minutes
   Page 1 under NDHIA QCS report change 4th sentence to "USDA/ARS National Program Staff"

   Motion made to approve minutes. Motion was seconded and approved.

3.0 Review of DRPC Auditing standards
   Steven Sievert provided the updated DRPC auditing standards guidelines to the group. Discussion followed.

   Discussion/Proposed Changes:

   Page 4 Description of Standard Transfer Formats
   Confirmed Format G and H are optional

   Page 5 Auditing of AIPL Test Herd Results

   Strike "AIPL" from Auditing of AIPL Test Herd Results title
   Strike "AIPL" from "AIPL test herd program in Test Herd Frequency paragraph
   Replace "AIPL" with "AIPL-CDCB" in Test Herd Procedure paragraph

   Replace "by QCS" with "by auditor" in section 2

   Replace "herd" with "herd(s)" in section 3
   Strike "2X" from all test plans in section 3

   Replace "to AIPL" in section 4 to "to the auditor and AIPL-CDBC database"
   Replace "used by AIPL" in section 4 to "used by AIPL-CDCB"

   Replace "Once the AIPL has received the test herds from each processing center, they will be compiled and made available to the auditor and to the contributing DRPC" with "Once the AIPL-

CDCB database has received the test herd(s) from each processing center, they will be compiled and made available to the auditor and contributing DRPC(s) via the AIPL-CDCB website. Results will be listed anonymously. "

Add to "The auditor… tolerances." Paragraph: "Deficiencies will be reported back to the respective DRPC"

Discussion took place on displaying the DRPC audit information on the future CDCB website similar to what was originally done through the AIPL website.

Page 6 Auditing of AIPL Deadline Compliance

Replace "AIPL" to AIPL-CDCB from Auditing of AIPL Deadline Compliance
Replace "USDA/AIPL web site" to "CDCB website" in Description of Formats paragraph

Replace "AIPL" to "AIPL-CDCB " Data Transfer Mechanism paragraph

Replace "AIPL" to "AIPL-CDCB " in Deadlines paragraph section 1
Replace "sent out" to "posted" in Deadlines paragraph section 2
Replace "AIPL" to "CDCB " Data Transfer Mechanism paragraph section 2

Page 7 Auditing of Report Generation Compliance
Confirmed replacing bulk tank with milk shipped

Replace "Service Provider" with "respective Service Provider" from Reporting Requirements paragraph
Remove "dairymen, or other allied industry cooperators" from Reporting Requirements paragraph
Remove "However, there is no requirement to provide these reports free of charge." from Reporting Requirements paragraph
Remove "or" from item C in Section 3 with

Page 8 Auditing of Other Criteria

Replace "AIPL" with "AIPL-CDCB" in On-Site security paragraph

Changes will be shared with DRPC's and document will be updated by Steven Sievert. Once DPRC's agree to changes, document will be sent to CDCB Audit Review Committee. Changes will become effective first month after the CDCB approves.

4.0 QCS/NDHIA Report

Jay provided an update on the agreement between AIPL and CDCB. Explained the working arrangement with AIPL and CDCB and how CDCB has brought in Duane Norman and Leigh Walton to assist in the CDCB operations. The operational aspects of CDCB are a work in progress and will take time to implement.

Need to have a discussion on Release and Use of Records, NDHIA Code of Ethics and Uniform Operating Procedures. Uniform Operating Procedures are broken out in 3 sections:
- Code of ethics
- Data collection (longer term process to update)
- Use and release of records (document due July-August, 2013).

Further discussion will take place on animal ID in the dairy, a group will start working on recommendations.

<u>Test Herd Discussion (Jerry Steuernagel brought in by conference call)</u>

Prior to the conference call with Jerry, there was discussion on what the uniform procedures specify how certain procedures are to be implemented at the DRPC level and how these are evaluated by Jerry. Concern was voiced that data is submitted to DRPC's that would not follow the normal process of reporting data to a DRPC, and cause issues with the QC evaluations.

How does Jerry evaluate the test herd data?
Jerry will focus the evaluation of the test herd on comparison between data provided back by AIPL and identifies the "odd man out" and requests the specific DRPC provide explanation as to how they arrived at that number.

Question was raised on what is reported in the "Other Solids" fields in data submitted by labs to the DRPC (SSF format). Some affiliates report different information in the same field. Should it be SNF or Other Solids? Discussion followed on how to address this in the future.

Question was raised about a situation where daily milk weights from one DRPC on a herd was different then what QCS calculated. Discussion followed on what possible reasons are for differences.

Question was asked about the use of the test herd now vs past use. There is value in using actual herds and a manufactured test herd.

Question was raised on determining abort events using DairyComp. Reported events are handled well, some question on deducted abort events.

End of conference call.

Discussion followed on data standards and how QC standards can follow up to maintain the credibility of the DHI system.

Robotic Milking

There is a request from AIPL to collect data that is collected from automated milking systems. Currently this information is not passed to AIPL-CDCB. How can DRPC's capture this information and code the automated milking systems in the records passed to AIPL-CDCB for R&D purposes. Proposal would update Reference 108 in format 14 to use code 4 to identify automated milking systems as a first step.

Motion was made to use code 4 from reference 108 in file format 4 and 14 to indicate automated milking system subject to AIPL-CDCB approval. Motion was seconded and carried.

Unresolved:
- How many days should the average daily milk yield be based on?
- How do we determine what the producer is currently using in their on-farm management system?
- What is the process for identifying the sample collection from automated milking systems?
- What are the best practices for collecting automated milking systems information?

Verification Tests

Can verification tests be removed from the Uniform Operating Procedures? Some breed registries once in a while request a cow verification tests, and a handful are requested by other entities. Suggestion is that language in Uniform Operating Procedures is changed from "will" to "can".

5.0 AIPL report

John Cole provided an update on AIPL. The first major step was undertaken by transferring the genetic evaluation process to CDCB. There will be an ongoing effort to move various processes over to CDCB. Priorities for AIPL are to transition the work to CDCB.

AIPL hired a new researcher with expertise in DNA, involvement with the dairy industry will be limited at this time.

Paul VanRaden's efforts will be focused on genomic evaluations. George Wiggans will be mainly working on CDCB issues. John Cole has been working on health data analysis together with John Clay and will be presenting at the ICAR meeting. He has been working on age at first calving and heifer fertility and lactation persistency.

Question was raised as to how the DRPC's and others in the industry could bring forward R&D projects to AIPL now that there is a new relationship between CDCB and AIPL. Past input to R&D efforts generally were provided through the AI industry. AIPL would be searching for input from the CDCB as to research priorities. Should there be a research group within CDCB that would provide direction to AIPL?

Question was asked if a new ID is reported to AIPL-CDCB, how this is handled and if an ID change should be marked. Is it pertinent that it is reported as an ID change? AIPL will take a look and refer to George Wiggans.

Duane requested DRPC's send termination records for cows that are dry to AIPL-CDCB in Format 4.

Jeanne Marshall raised the issue of reporting beef breed sires to AIPL and if these should be sent in the record format 4 and 5.

6.0 Council on Dairy Cattle Breeding

Duane Norman gave an update on CDCB operations. Duane explained how they are implementing the fee structure for providing genomic evaluations. Nominators will receive back a number for the fee to verify that the request was submitted with the correct fee code. Documentation is being developed to share with nominators to ensure CDBC receive accurate data for animals submitted.

Exchange of ID errors

John Clay reported that the amount of ID errors has increased with the increased use of genomic testing. Are we going to change Sire ID's on animals that have been provided a genomic test with a different sire. Discussion followed on how these ID errors should be handled.

To expedite the process of providing ID errors back to DRPC's the request is for AIPL-CDCB to provide ID error files onto an FTP site with a unique file name.

Six digit Control Numbers in format 4/5 records

There was discussion about the use of 6 digit control numbers and how AIPL-CDCB can incorporate these in the system. Suggestion was made to use a Base 36 Conversion, however it would be a better long term solution to update the record format.

7.0 NAHMS (conference call with Jason Lombard)

NAHMS has traditionally collected data through the USDA NASS system and there has been some discussion with Jason Lombard if there is role for DHI to collect data from dairy farms and pass this along to NAHMS. The understanding is that NAHMS has a CIPSEA exemption which means data

submitted would not be subject to FOIA. Is this a possible role DHI's/DRPC's are willing to assume if NAHMS is willing to pay for?

Jason Lombard gave presentation explaining the CIPSEA protection and processes currently in place to protect the data submitted to them. NAHMS would consider going to DHI to collect management practices from dairy farms at a for-pay service and compare non-DHI herds with DHI herds. The thought was that DHI technicians would provide a short questionaire to producers to collect additional information from the farm currently not collected through the DHI system. DHI data could be protected from being displayed to the general public if so desired.

Currently AgSource and DRMS are the only 2 DRPC's participating, a next step could be for DHI Provo and AgriTech to join. Data sent to NAHMS are general herd summary data.

Benefit from participation would be access to summarized data that could be provided back through DRPC's/DHI and add additional value to participation in DHI.

8.0 Engaging our industry partners

Discussion centered around should we involve industry partners in addressing problems identified with data exchange and data collection. For example how can we collect milking speed data in a consistent manner across different milking systems.

9.0 Research at Purdue on AM/PM factors

Jay reported he had an updated report from Purdue on the new AM/PM factors. Duane will provide a formula for 2X and 3X factors and suggested some tests are done validating the new formulas. Approach would be to run an internal test comparing daily milk weights using the old factors vs new factors.

Duane will share formulas with DRPC's within the next 4 weeks and DRPC's will report back.

10.0   Additional agenda items

Motion was made to have Bill VerBoort continue as Chair. Motion was seconded and approved