

MINUTES
E-Commerce Committee
AAFCO 2009 Annual Meeting
Saturday, August 1, 2009
3:30 PM – 5:00 PM

1. Welcome and Introductions

Isabel opened the meeting at 3:41 pm. She welcomed those in attendance. Everyone introduced themselves. There were a total of XX in attendance.

Isabel asked to revisit the purpose of the committee. She asked if there was anything that needed to be changed? Some projects going for a while and need to be ended. The committee may want to look at new projects. Isabel can present new projects to Board if we think we need to move in a different direction. Two projects may need to be wrapped up:

- a. Surf Day – data can be submitted to the Enforcement Committee
- b. Tonnage Project

Isabel read the E-commerce Purpose as listed in the AAFCO Procedures Manual. She asked if anyone thinks of new projects, let her know. Liz asked about the committee charter, and Isabel said she would mail that out to the committee members.

2. Tonnage Project

Rick reported that not much has been done. He wants to break down the OP and take information from each feed ingredient. Each state can take it to any level of detail they wish. Each industry would report in exactly the same way. Rick presented an on-screen description of the ingredient coding on the model tonnage reporting form.

Rick suggested the UFTRS (Uniform Fertilizer Tonnage Reporting System) program could also be used for feed. Rick said depending upon the copyright, the “F” could also mean “feed”.

Rick says the electronic form his state uses has more detail.

This ingredient list could be given to industry, and the codes would be the same for any state. The state would have to do some work to perfect the ingredient list. Kris Stein asked if Rick had looked at other state’s forms. Rick says he has looked at some, and much info is the same. Detail about the ingredient sold would be the same, regardless of the state. Kris discussed how pet food would be entered. Rick said they would just report “pet food”. No further breakdown is needed. Each company would receive a list of what they sell, and industry would report back how much they sell.

This would be a tool to help make reporting easier for industry. A more uniform numbering system would make it easier to compile a national report.

Rick explained that his state would set the code for how industry would report.

Ellen Slaymaker asked how states that require licensing with no registration, some states go by species, some ask only for total tons. How would this apply? Rick explained the state's data could be converted to the same format. Kris says some states exempt small packages, and there will never be an accurate total number. Rick says it would still give us good information and a standard coding system. Kris said some states would have to go to their legislature to change their forms. This would be a nightmare. It was noted that the industry would not be able to provide the level of detail of each ingredient listed in the OP. Jill said this detail would be used only if the industry was selling that particular ingredient. Rick said he has two lists: one for ingredients and one for finished feeds.

Rick is looking for a standard format that all states can use. Make it easier for the reporter. There would be only one coding system, not 50 different reporting systems. Kirk said some states may not want to change their reporting system. There could be a state page for each state. Jill said this would provide a template to each state if they wanted to use it.

Steve Traylor said they could not report the level of detail. That could require his company of giving proprietary information about what they sell. Brenda said this would then become public information. Kirk said the states could not ask for more information than what their laws requires. He suggested we look at what is required.

Rick said the state would then categorize the individual reporting codes. Steve said that whatever they report, this would be public information. It was suggested that the committee could ask for each state's form to see what they need. Jill says this should determine whether they require a breakdown as to ingredients or finished feed. Kirk expressed his concern about FOIA requests. Rick said his state law prevents tonnage reports data from being released. He said some states may not have this in his law. Connie said she is not sure to what level her state protects individual company's data.

Rick says he will poll the states for their forms. Liz Higgins offered to help Rick collect these forms and compile info. They could divide up what they need to do.

Brenda asked if each state would report to a national report, or if they would accept a standard form. Rick said a standard form would be ideal. If a state exempted out certain products, that data would be ignored.

Jill said once they get the forms, the most detailed form would be used as the standard form. If a state exempted certain ingredients, the company would not report tonnage for that ingredient to that state. Rick said the sum of the detail would determine the final form.

Garry mentioned the Kelly reporting system which is completely electronic.

Ellen Slaymaker suggested looking at the states' laws to see what is required to be reported. Liz noted the laws may be available online. Liz does not mind making phone calls to those who don't complete the survey form.

Rick noted the OP lists which states require tonnage reporting. Steve indicated his company has this information as well. Rick said about 35 states require tonnage reporting.

Rick said he appreciated the input from the group. Ellen said there is no uniformity in the forms. She said the simpler reporting codes the better. Rick said some states do require more detail. Jill said some states may ask for the detail for a long time, but they don't do anything with the data. A request may allow the state to reduce the level of detail they require.

Liz will work with Kris to collect the states requirements.

3. Surf Day Data Project

Isabel showed the data that was collected from the last Surf Day for Dairy Feeds and dairy supplements in 2006. Rick compiled the data in a spreadsheet. It has been 3 years since the data was collected. She has been asked to provide any concerns from this database to the Enforcement Committee. She asked the committee to break down the database. She asked for commitments from each member to revisit the website to see if the website has been corrected, disappeared, or if it is still a problem. The Board asked the committee to do this, but it hasn't been done yet.

Ellen asked if this information has been shared with industry. Isabel said it had not. It was question if this information could be shared with industry. Jill asked what if the product had been approved, but the product was listed as a concern. Roger H. said since it is 3 year old data, it might be better not to distribute to industry in case the ingredient was no longer a concern.

The list will be divided among the state members of the committee. Each member is asked to do a little bit of work to see if the website has changed, company name has been changed, etc., and not only state the website no longer there. Rick said if Ben had a concern about a specific ingredient, we could search the database for that ingredient. Rick cited an example of Acai berries that are unapproved for feed but is the rage now.

Isabel asked if there were any new projects for the E-Commerce Committee. She asked the attendees to think about new projects and get back to her with ideas.

Rick asked for any new agenda items. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn. Liz Higgins motioned to adjourn. Teresa seconded the motion. The committee meeting was adjourned at 4:44 pm.

Prepared by Teresa Crenshaw, Delaware Department of Agriculture
Comments: Isabel Pocerull, FDA/CVM