Committee Recommendations
Committee recommendation summary or list.
(1) None.

Board Recommendations
Board recommendation summary or list.
(1) None.

Association Actions
Association action summary or list.
(1) None.

Committee Participants *Note sign up sheet misplaced. Attendance and participation were excellent!
Members Present: List here.

Advisors Present: List here.

Committee Report
Committee Activities
ACTION: None

Sub-Committee Activities
ACTION: None

Committee Minutes

1.) Review and Approval of Agenda

2.) Introductions – sign-up sheet sent around.

3.) Feedback on DRW updates. Mark Budden – Upgrade review of DRW (Note: Slides will be available on Feed Bin and public website):
   a. DASHBOARD UPDATES:
   b. Shipment tracking
   c. Improving client experience – Dashboard NEW features
   d. Support for a continuous program, instead of distinct programs each year.
   e. Submitters can now view, edit, and track shipments.
   f. Online Subscriptions are automated. – All can be done on the DRW.
   g. Shipping Options – USPS or Lab’s Courier Account – by
      i. Program-specific analyte/methods
      ii. Support for a continuous program
      iii. Support for samples crossing programs
   h. Dashboard – Examples: Add/Edit Data reporters, shipping address, history and tracking information available.
   i. DRW (DATE REPORTING WEBSITE) UPDATES:
   j. Increased automation
k. NEW – Supports program specific method lists - Can save method as default for multiple programs.
l. Can change shipping method
m. Supports program specific method lists
n. Samples can be shared between programs; i.e. regular, pet food, mycotoxins, etc.
o. Finalizing transition to new website:
p. Disable old DRW and redirect
q. Move remaining documents to new DRW
r. Number of subscribers: Same amount of members for most programs – Mineral Program has approximate 3x more subscribers than last year.
s. Questions:
t. Downloads been tested? Yes – they should be fine.
u. Credit Card information being store? – It is stored encrypted IMIS.

4.) Program Discussions, Materials, subscriptions, etc.

a. Participation – Andy Crawford – Presentation will be available (Feed Bin and public website).
b. Regular Program Summary – 13 samples, 279 labs submitting, 210 participating, more feeds for different animals,
c. Pet food Program – 4 samples, 64 subscribed for 2016
e. Mycotoxin Program - 35 labs, very focused.
f. Vet drugs
   i. Participation/reporting is low.
   ii. Some of the methods have no data (Narasin, Neomycin, Salinomycin, etc.) Per Nancy T – there is a lot of resources dedicated to adding the vet drugs. Need to assess the process and viability. Cost effective?
   iii. Residuals (PPB) – Lasalocid & Monensin – Low data (proto types).
   iv. Aaron – Medicated vs. Residue
g. Incorporation of veterinary drugs – added to the regular program (table of 2015 samples provided for review: (Amprolium, Bacitracin, Decoquinate, Lasalocid, Monensin, OTC, CTC, Sulfamethazine, Tylosin, Neomycin, Penincillin, Nicarbazin, Narasin, Methoprene, Roxarsone, Fenbendazole)
   i. 201525 – Equine Feed – Trace Level Monensin & Lasalosid
   ii. 201530 – Dairy Feed – Monensin
   iii. 201621, 22, 23 – all have medicated items (4-5 drugs for each sample variable)
   iv. Problems: Finding feeds with drugs in them are difficult to find. Trying to add the medications. Carbadox and Bacitracin are desired analytes. NEEDS: trying to find premixes but not type A. Type A is a mixing nightmare. Kentucky has volunteered to assist.

5.) Number of samples per year with drugs – drops to six. Possibility of a two-year rotation?
6.) Roxarsone – Banned substance (have the raw material- to add or not?)
7.) Vitamin & Mineral – adding mineral/vitamin mix to some feeds. How is the response?
8.) For sample 201521 – only one lab analyzed for biotin and folic acid. Water-soluble vitamins low participation.
9.) 201591 - was a vitamin mineral premix – had good participation for vitamins.
10.)201621 – NPN – 6.25 is the factor. (Yes this came up and is now on the label)
11.)201622- Lamb Feed - Long labels has vitamins/mineral premix added.
12.) 201525 – Equine Feed – Review of where the residual levels. (SIDEBAR – Question regarding enforcement on residues – Labs do not do the enforcement (Sharon - Kentucky – Regulatory does). From Aaron - Canada does have residual specifications and enforcements. HPLC vs. LC-MSMS.)

13.) Goal to have four samples with residuals – 2 samples are just residuals, 2 samples are residual w/drugs.

14.) Review of schedule for Check sample Programs – Samples (so far)

15.) Regular Program – Beef Supplement, Lamb Starter, Chick Starter....

16.) Pet food program – Tomato Pomace, Lamb Meal, Cheese Powder....

17.) Mineral – Swine Feed, Lamb Feed (Copper), DDG, Beef Supplement, Forage Product. Maybe a pet food. (NOTE DDG- not really a concern)

18.) Suggestion – Add a catfish food – (after break – it was noted that the fish food sent out previously and although labeled as Fish food but was actually Catfish Food.)

19.) Little excitement – residues in Forage Product? Group excitement about that possibility

20.) Notes: Few bags leftover from 2015 for QRMs. Samples are kept for 2 years. Mineral samples were not added to the sample availability list – This is available on the website.

21.) Program Promotional Efforts
   a. Created a one page – AAFCO paged (on website).
   b. Created a banner that is at the registration desk.
   c. Banner and flyers are traveling with the AAFCO group – to the poultry show.
   d. Developed a set of slides – Email Nancy Thiex
   e. Currently there are no webinars for the check samples programs.

22.) Introduction of Bob and Amy – They make the check samples for the AAFCO program. They are located about hour north of Chattanooga, TN. Archived samples are stores ambient temperature. They grind and split materials for AAFCO and several other PT organizations.

<<Refreshment Break>>

Quick Review of some Items from before the break: Catfish food, adding pet food to the minerals and concerns that the bagged forage might be wet.

23.) Accreditation Efforts.
   a. Trying to find a QA manager - was fruitless.
   b. Nancy contacted Belinda Snodgrass and Louise Ogden for assistance – they volunteered to write the Quality Manual and SOPs.
   c. Gap analysis has been performed (60 -70 page document), SOPs are in draft but there has been no movement since the last meeting.
   d. QA group for the laboratory side will need a new leader.

24.) Financials
   a. None to display – available on the Feed Bin.

25.) Program Leaderships
a. Adding Belinda Snodgrass and Louise Ogden – have to restructure to include them but how this will be done is still in the works. This will affect the Laboratory group.

26.) Review of Roster
   a. Please let Nancy know if you want to be on the committee.
   b. No review of roster from 2015

27.) Questions:
   a. What will be the cost increase on the check sample program once it has been accredited?
      b. -Not much, currently there are volunteers assisting and the thought is it will be ~20%.
         1. If labs would volunteer to do homogeneity (some have) this could reduce overall cost.
   c. -Cost will be considered later on down the road.

28.) Meeting Adjourned - 15:35pm
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Appendix

Attachments:

Budden presentation: DRW Upgrade Review Presentation – Mark Budden 20160118

Crawford presentation: AAFCO Check Sample 2015 Program Participation and AACO Check Samples 2015 Vet Drugs Program