Association of American Feed Control Officials

2014 AAFCO Annual Meeting Committee Reports

July 25–27, 2014

Hyatt Regency

Sacramento, California

Contents

Business Meeting Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, 8:45–9:15 am, New Orleans, Louisiana

1) Business Meeting called to order by Doug Lueders at 8:51 a.m.
2) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors approved the following Committee Reports from the August 2013 meeting in St. Pete Beach: Collaborative Check Sample, Current Issues and Outreach, Education and Training, Enforcement Issues, Feed and Feed Ingredient Manufacturing, Feed Labeling, Ingredient definitions, Inspection and Sampling, Laboratory Methods and Services, Model Bills and Regulations, Pet Food and Strategic Affairs. and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Sam Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES.**
3) Acceptance of Committee Recommendations:

   Check Sample 1

   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors approved the Offer of the Pet Food Program for ingredients as a stand-alone Program that does not require subscription to the regular AAFCO Program. and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Tim Darden Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES.**

   Ingredient Definitions 1-8

   1) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to move the following definitions from tentative to Official:
      a) T12.6 Barley Distillers Protein Concentrate page 363
      b) T36.11 Dried ___ Fermentation Product page 387
      c) T36.16 Dried L-Lysine Fermentation Product page 387
      d) T36.10 Condensed ___ Fermentation Solubles, Page 387
      e) T36.1 Condensed, Extracted Glutamic Acid Fermentation Product page 387
      f) T36.17 Liquid L-Lysine Fermentation Product page 388
      g) T57.73 Seaweed-Derived Calcium page 410
      h) T57.265 Ammonium Chloride page 411
      i) T57.28 Metal Methionine Hydroxy Analogue Chelate page 411.

      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ben Jones Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   2) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to delete the current tentative definition for T60.111 Biodiesel –derived Glycerin on page 417. This will enhance clarity with a more acceptable tentative definition being proposed.
      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Meagan Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   3) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Renumber Ferrous Fumarate on page 401 from 57.75 to 57.164. It shared a number with another ingredient.
      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Dan Danielson Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   4) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Edit the Header for the Feed Terms section on page 341. Text provided in attachment A.
      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ken Bowers Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   5) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Accept new feed terms and edits of existing terms: Part, Physical Form, Process, Protein, Fiber, Dextrose Equivalent, Diluent, and Roasted. Text provided in attachment A.
      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Claudia Coles Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   6) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Edit the section 100 name. Text provided in attachment A.
      and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Stan Cook Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

7) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Sort a large number of ingredients in table 87 and definition 33.6 into the special purpose and technical additive sections. List of items and new section provided in attachment A.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Meagan Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
8) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the recommendation from the IDC to Remove Rapeseed Meal from the collective term list on page 370.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Bob Church Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

Ingredient Definitions 9

9) Ingredient Definitions Committee proposes the following tentative definitions (Text provided in attachment A).
   a) TT36.16 Dried L-Lysine Fermentation Product
   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted this recommendation and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Sam Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   b) TT60.111 Biodiesel-Derived Glycerin
   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted this recommendation and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Claudia Coles Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   c) T57.165 Zinc Hydroxychloride
   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors Board recommends sending back to the investigator in light of new information. and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Tim Darden Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   d) T93.9 ____ Wheat Gluten
   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted this recommendation and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Dan Danielson Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
   e) T54.33 Bovine Colostrum
      i) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors recommends against publication as a tentative definition in the Official Publication and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ben Jones Seconds. **MOTION DEFEATED**
      ii) Alan Harrison MOTION: that we accept the committee's recommendation to accept the definition as tentative. Ben Jones seconds. MOTION CARRIES
   f) T54.34 Dried Bovine Colostrum
      i) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors recommends against publication as a tentative definition in the Official Publication and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Sam Davis Seconds. **MOTION DEFEATED.**
      ii) Alan Harrison MOTION: moves that we accept the committee's recommendation to accept the definition as tentative. Tim Lyons Seconds. MOTION CARRIES
   g) TT73.100 Yeast for the Production of Distillers.
   Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted this recommendation and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Sam Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

Model Bill 1-5:

1) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the MBRC recommendation that the printed 2014 AAFCO Official Publication content be restored to include all of the content headings included in the 2012 printed official Publication.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ken Bowers Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
2) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the MBRC recommendation changes to the dairy animal classes listed in Regulation 3(a)(4)(iv)(a) as submitted by the Feed Labeling Committee (attachment A-1) with the recommendation that they be presented to the membership for inclusion in the Official Publication.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Alan Harrison Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

3) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the MBRC recommendation to change PF3(b)(1) as submitted by the Pet Food Committee (attachment A-2) with the recommendation that they be presented to the membership for inclusion in the Official Publication.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ken Bowers Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**
4) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the MBRC recommendation to change Committee Guidelines, printed on pages 80-87 in the 2013 Official Publication (attachment B), as submitted by the Strategic Affairs Committee and edited by the MBRC with the recommendation that these revised Committee Guidelines be presented to the membership for inclusion in the Official Publication.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ken Bowers Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES.**
5) Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the MBRC has reviewed the civil penalties provision submitted by the EIC and edited it to conform to the Model Bill. The MBRC provides the attached proposed language (attachment C) and recommends that it conforms to the Model Bill and asks the BOD to review the proposal for future consideration by the Association membership.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Meagan Davis Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

Strategic Affairs 1

Richard Ten Eyck states the AAFCO Board of Directors accepted the By-Laws amendments regarding "approved food additive petition ingredient listing directly as Official (no tentative)" be moved to the membership for approval.
and recommends the same to the membership. I so move. Ken Bowers Seconds. **MOTION CARRIES**

4) Credential Report – FASS
Number of States Represented – 27
Number of FDA Representatives – 9
Number of Life Members – 3
Total Meeting Attendance - 285
5) Doug Lueders Adjourned Business Meeting at 9:58 a.m.

Minutes approved on 5/5/14

Collaborative Check Sample Program Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, 1:30–5:30 p.m., New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations: None

Board Recommendations: Report was accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

Name	Representing	Telephone	Email
Victoria Siegel[1] *By phone	Office of Indiana State Chemist	765-494-1561	vsiegel@purdue.edu
Aaron Price[1]	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	613-773-6266	aaron.price@inspection.gc.ca
Nancy Thiex[1]	TLS / AAFCO Consultant	605-695-3098	nancy.thiex@gmail.com
Sharon F. Webb[1]	UK Div. of Reg. Services	859-218-2451	Sharon.webb@uky.edu
Teresa Grant[1,5]	NCDA	919-857-4124	Teresa.grant@ncagr.gov
Mary Koestner[1]	Missouri Department of Agriculture	573-751-8320	Mary.koestner@mda.mo.gov
Mark Le Blanc[2]	LDAF / LSU Ag Center	225-610-4302	markl@lsu.edu
Robert Sheridan[1]	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	518-457-8885	Robert.sheridan@agriculture.ny.gov
Andy Crawford[3]	Consultant	626-333-1842	andy@crawford.org
Lars Reimann[3]	Eurofins		larsreimann@eurofinsus.com
Ken Riter[3]	Nestle Purina	314-982-4056	ken.riter@purina.nestle.com
Gail De Greeff[3]	Prince Agri Products Inc.	217-257-8335	Gail.degreeff@pahc.com
Jimmie Ward[3]	P&G Pet Care	513-478-2969	Ward.jl@pg.com
Yvonne Salfinger	AFDO consultant		yhale@aol.com
Michele Swarbrick	MN Dept. of Ag.		Michele.swarbrick@state.mn.us
Adela P. Ramic	MN Dept. of Ag.		Adela.parganlijaramic@state.mn.us
Robert Kiser	U.K. Regulatory Services		rkiser@uky.edu
Marla Luther	FDA / CVM		Marla.luther@fda.hhs.gov
Jody Morrissey	P&G Pet Care	513-626-8785	Morrissey.jm@pg.com
Laszlo Torma	Pickering Laboratories	406-587-7900	Laszlo@pickeringlabs.com
Deepika Curole	LA Dept. of Ag.		dcurole@ldaf.state.la.us
Bilan Jessie	LA Dept. of Ag.		bjessie@ldaf.state.la.us
Mary Beth Rollins	LA Dept. of Ag.		mrollins@ldaf.state.la.us
Kristen Hafler	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	518-457-9102	Kristen.hafler@agriculture.ny.gov
Jennifer Mirabile	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	518-457-9102	Jennifer.mirabile@agriculture.ny.gov
H. Dorota Inerowicz	OISC	765-494-1565	inerowic@purdue.edu
Keith Wegner	CO Dept. of Ag.		Keith.wegner@state.co.us
Daniel Berg	Covance Laboratories	608-241-7220	Dan.berg@covance.com
Joe Warnick	EPL-BAS		jwarnick@eplbas.com
Bill Hall	Mosaic	863-559-2197	Bill.hall@mosaicco.com

Christina Johnson	EPL Bio Analytical Service		cjohnson@eplbas.com
Shari Shea	APHL	240-485-2739	sharon.shea@aphl.org
Kristi McCallum	CO Dept. of Ag.	303-867-4261	Kristina.mccallum@state.co.us
Patty Lucas	FL Dept. of Ag. & Consumer Services	850-617-7835	patricia.lucas@freshfromflorida.com
Tom McKamey	Silliker Group Inc.	708-769-7893	tom.mckamey@silliker.com
Mark Stenske	MI Dept. of Ag. & Rural Devt.	517-203-1385	stenskem@michigan.gov
Sean C. White	EPL Bio Analytical Services		swhite@eplbas.com
Brenda Snodgrass	OK Dept. of Ag, Food & Forestry	405-522-5440	Brenda.snodgrass@ ag.ok.gov
Louise Ogden	MN Dept. of Ag.	651-201-6682	Louise.ogden@state.mn.us
Robin Johnson	MT Dept. of Ag.	406-994-3383	robinjohnson@mt.gov
Heidi Hickes	MDA Montana		hhickes@mt.gov
Dennis Givens	Cargill Inc.	402-533-1532	Dennis_givens@cargill.com
Lawrence Novotny	SDSU – retired		Lawrence.novotny@sdstate.edu
Ken McManus	MD Dept. of Ag.	410-841-2721	Kenneth.mcmanus@maryland.gov
Tom Phillips	MD Dept. of Ag.		Tom.phillips@maryland.gov
Caroline Monliney	Diamond V Mills		cmonliney@diamondv.com
Lori Flugum	Diamond V Mills		lflugum@diamondv.com
Xochitz Javier	Silliker Inc.		xochitz@javier@silliker.com
John Szpylka	Silliker Inc.		John.szpylka@silliker.com
Gale Hagood	Mississippi State Chemical Lab	662-325-2955	ghagood@mscl.msstate.edu
Ashli Brown	MS State Chemical Lab		abrown@mscl.msstate.edu

[1]Indicates members of the committee
[2]Indicates liaison to the AAFCO Board of Directors
[3]Indicates industry advisors
[4] Indicates AFDO liaisons
[5] Indicates APHL liaisons

Committee Report

Committee Activities

MOTION: "Review and approval of meeting agenda" Sharon Webb / second: Aaron Price – passes
MOTION: "To adjourn the meeting" Aaron Price / second Sharon Webb – passes

Committee Minutes

1) The meeting was called to order at 1:31 pm. No new business was added to the agenda. Sharon Webb moved to accept the agenda, seconded by Aaron Price. The motion passed. (Reminder: Annual Meeting Committee Reports were accepted by e-vote in October 2013).
2) Any revisions to the committee roster (either as member or industrial advisor) as it is published in the AAFCO OP 2014 need to be submitted to Vicki Siegel via email or state as such now. (No comments were made as to any revisions during the meeting.) If anyone, industrial advisor or committee member, wants to be added or removed from the CCSP or the Quality Assurance Oversight Team, let Vicki Siegel know directly via email.
3) Jennifer Roland (FASS) provided data for the financial report
4) **Program Participation report**
   Current enrollment for 2014 Regular AAFCO Program is 166 labs of which
   - 96 (58%) US labs *108 (53%)*
   -56 (34%) International labs *75 (37%)*
   -14 (8%) Canadian Labs *21 (10%)*
   *Current enrollment updates shown in *italic text*
   Enrollment in 2013 was approximately 275 labs, and this is a typical rate of renewal for this time of year. Included in the participants are nine new labs, eight international and one in the U.S. The international numbers are expected to increase because their enrollment applications tend to

come in later than U.S. and Canadian customers. The participation numbers are fairly typical for this time of year. Lars asked about the international representation in the CCSP and was told the international customers are well-represented, with almost each continent having at least one laboratory. He asked a follow up question regarding the customers in Brazil. There are significant challenges with delivery in Brazil. An upgraded international shipping option (with full tracking) is available this year for an additional fee that is about half the cost of courier delivery per sample. Labs that have on-going issues in receiving samples are required to try this option to participate this year. The CCSP has been using this upgraded shipping option for QRM sample deliveries this year and have seen good results. It was pointed out that there is no real cutoff on signing up for samples for any of the Programs and there are links on the AAFCO website to the subscription forms.

Pet Food Program

Current enrollment for the Pet Food Program is 41 labs in the U.S. A special group of 118 analysts at 18 different lab locations (17 in the US and 1 in Canada) will enroll in the Pet Food Program this year. This program has quarterly samples of ingredients used to manufacture pet foods and labs enrolled only in the Pet Food Program also will be shipped samples of dry or canned pet foods offered in the Regular Program as part of the fee. The Program is offered only to labs in the U.S. in 2014, however, any laboratory may purchase our left-over portions as Quality Reference Materials (QRMs) using the forms on the CCSP page of the AAFCO website.

Mycotoxin Contaminants Program

Current enrollment for the Mycotoxin Contaminants Program is 20 labs in the U.S.
Currently only open to interested laboratories in the U.S. due to challenges faced in shipping internationally.

5) **Method code needs.**

Update on Revisions/Additions to the method codes: The unit changes that were voted on at the annual meeting have been added to the new Data Reporting Website (DRW). The new DRW was demonstrated and seems to have addressed the requested changes that the customers have asked for and it looks great! The new DRW is currently in the final editing stages and will move to beta-testing in January with a target to go live for reporting of the January sample for the 2014 Regular Program. (*Update – finalization of the new DRW has been delayed but will definitely be available for reporting of the first Mycotoxin Contaminants sample.*) The unit updates are more standardized for international clientele. A new screening project for collection of data on residues of veterinary drugs will move forward with the availability of new method codes for veterinary drug residues. Following up on a request discussed at the annual meeting, Dr. Siegel verified that method codes already exist for the following ions by ion-selective electrode (ISE): Na, K, and Ca but there is no current code for Cl^-. There are current codes for salt by ISE (033.05) and some of the existing salt codes are Cl specific (033.00 Salt by soluble Cl AOAC 943.01; 033.01 Salt by potentiometric titration of Cl AOAC 969.10). A long discussion ensued as to whether additional codes were needed for Cl by ISE or not. Raised points included: not a direct method of analysis, that salt is a calculated value based on either sodium or chloride tests, and this is a term that is getting less use internationally. However, it was pointed out that salt was a label requirement in the U.S. and the codes are needed. Opposing sides agreed that CCSP should keep offering the method reference code as salt and that an ISE, IC, and titrimetric method code for Cl^- would be sufficient. Dr. Siegel stated she would further investigate this issue. Also, fatty acid method codes will also be added once the new DRW is up and running.

6) **Additional Samples**

There will be another canned pet food sample this year. Dr. Siegel will send out a survey (probably in February or March) to determine those labs wanting to participate in the testing round. She stated the canned sample would be shipped probably at the end of the 1st quarter of the calendar year. There will be no need to pre-order it by the case; cases will be available for purchase as a QRM using the QRM order form on the CCSP page of the AAFCO website. Dr. Siegel asked for suggestions for the feed ingredient sample for the summer. Sharon Webb suggested another mineral sample with similar values to that from 1999-31 to accompany the ingredient sample. Dr. Siegel said she would see what is available. Suggested ingredients were meat and bone meal and fish meal.

7) Updates on FDA grant-activities related to Program expansion

- **Data Reporting Website (DRW)**
  A new website for data reporting has been developed by FASS and will be operational in the near future. One of the features is that Dr. Siegel can set up login information for users, not just labs.

The new website will send an email with the link to the DRW and provide the password. The username will be your email address. Each lab can have more than one user! There are easy to navigate tabs across the top. On logging in, the default tab the user is in is the "Samples" tab. The options under this tab is "Past Samples"', "Samples & Analytes" that data is reported for. The website will be color coded to help differentiate the different Programs and associated samples to ease any confusion. Other tabs include "Program", "Sample Number", "Sample Name", "Due Date"' and "Analyte Number". A template can be made by the user and used to report data for samples in each program. The first time, the user will build their template, and then the website will save the template. The template can be easily adjusted. The unit is populated, the method reference, and analyte can be saved in the template. The method code can be selected from a drop down list. The new reporting website creates a pdf of results upon saving as a submission receipt. Alternatively the user can download an Excel spreadsheet to save their data and then import into the DRW after saving the Excel file as a csv file. (Any imports will replace any data already entered for that sample.) Clicking upon "Sample ID" gives you the AAFCO label. The Mycotoxin Contaminants Program has required development of a new result report template in the DRW. The labs must identify each test result as a "Detect" (Yes) or "Non-detect" (No) based upon the Limit of Detection (LOD) for their test method. If "yes" is chosen, then a non-zero value must be entered. If "No" is chosen, the result field will be greyed out and the LOD must be entered in a separate field. The codes developed for mycotoxins allow for reporting of the different components separately (for example AB1, AB2, AG1 or AG2) or as Total aflatoxin. The statistics to analyze the contaminant data were approved at the Annual Meeting in 2013. The calculations determine the probability of detection. All data reported using the previous DRW will be imported into the new DRW. Overall, the new DRW is more user-friendly for the administrator, allowing more options and greater efficiency for Dr. Siegel to facilitate. Now is the time to fix any errors in the method code list. Email Dr. Siegel to let her know which method codes need revision.

- **Pet Food Program**
  For 2014 the Pet Food Program is offered as a stand-alone Program but is better value if purchased by labs also enrolled in the Regular Program. Enrollment is open all year.
- **Mycotoxin Contaminants Program reporting**
  Andy Crawford gave a presentation on the planned reporting output for the Mycotoxin Contaminants Program. The samples for this program have assigned values (including uncertainty) from an expert laboratory so that quantification can be done. Results reported as "Detects" will receive a Z score. Non-detects will receive a POD (Probability of Detection.) The POD calculation can handle 1 or 2 non-detects in a pair of results. Discussion was had as to whether the POD should reflect lab bias or POD for the assigned value. The final decision was a POD for the assigned value. The presentation will be available in pdf format as an attachment to the minutes.
- **Heavy Metals contaminants Quarterly Program for 2015**
  Plans to prepare a prototype sample for a heavy metals contaminants program in 2015 is currently being worked on with help from Nancy Thiex. The triple vet drug/vet drug residue premixes are currently at the prep lab.
- **Triple vet. Drug / vet drug contaminants project plans**
  Method codes in the 300's were created for residual veterinary drugs and the units are μg / kg (ppb). The units for the feed levels of veterinary drugs will be mg / kg (ppm) when the new DRW is in use. A suggestion was made to include a method code for a single quad (LC-MS) in addition the triple-quad method code. Participants wanting to screen the current regular program samples for residual drugs can report data using these new codes and we will use the data for preliminary assessment for development of a quarterly veterinary drugs contaminants Program in year four of the FDA grant. The low-level samples will be prepared by dilution of the feed level samples with non-medicated feed or feed ingredients. The materials for preparation of the prototype triple vet drug sample are currently with the sample preparation laboratory.

8) Updates on FDA grant activities related to accreditation to ISO 17043 / ILAC-G13

- **Training of volunteers and Staff Members**
  Documentation that our Staff Members and volunteers are experienced and technically

competent to run the Program has been accomplished using the Education and experience form. The form was sent out to all volunteers and Staff members with a copy of the AAFCO conflict of interest policy in December. The form has an e-mail button to send it back to Vicki and there is an option to include a CV or resume if available. Please send in your forms to Vicki if you have not yet done so.

- **Stability testing**
  Three AAFCO samples have been sent to an ISO 17025 accredited lab for homogeneity and stability testing. These include 201326 (medicated chicken starter), 201342 (soya flour) and 201328 (medicated swine grower). Andy presented the statistical analysis for stability and our assessment of the data. A pdf file of his presentation will be sent out with the minutes.
- **Documentation**
  The progress has been a little slow, but should speed up now. Andy Crawford has collected relevant documentation together for a web link that will be posted to document the statistical analysis performed and referenced materials for resources. The QA oversight team will schedule more calls to review first drafts of the quality documents (manuals, plans and SOPs).

9) Other business
   - **NPN listing in AV table of AAFCO Official Publication**
     The AV table in the 2014 OP lists it as "NPN Protein", but it isn't equivalent to crude protein. A discussion ensued on what was being reported. A suggestion was made that it should be changed to "NPN Nitrogen" in the AV table of the OP. The online OP should be easier to change, but it will not be changed until the 2015 OP is printed.
   - **Eurachem workshop**
     A Eurachem Workshop on proficiency testing in analytical chemistry, microbiology and laboratory medicine will be held in Berlin, Germany in October 2014. There will be lectures, posters, and training sessions on ISO 17043 and ISO 13528. The CCSP committee agreed that this would be beneficial for Dr. Siegel to attend. She will request approval for travel funding from the AAFCO BOD.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Vicki Siegel	New method codes	Make final edits to method code changes (CI, LC-MS for 300s) and unit changes in new DRW; update method code documents; send to Andy; post on website	Prior to release of new DRW (est. March 2014)
Vicki Siegel	Canned pet food sample survey	Survey labs to establish participation in the testing round; add cases to QRM order form inventory	Due before annual meeting (August 2014)
Vicki Siegel	Edit AV table in OP	Change "NPN Protein" to "NPN Nitrogen"	Due by end of September 2014
Vicki Siegel	Data Reporting Website	Select beta-testing labs and develop guidance document; roll-out new DRW to all labs	Due by March 2014
Vicki Siegel	Veterinary drug residues screening project	Let participant labs know about the vet. Drug project; add residual vet. Drugs to the "Determine as desired" section of AAFCO sample labels	Prior to release of new DRW (est. March 2014)
Vicki Siegel / QOT	Accreditation	Vicki to complete first drafts of required documentation; QOT to review and finalize documents	Application target is Summer 2014
Vicki Siegel	Accreditation	Schedule conference calls with QOT	Spring 2014
Vicki Siegel	Subcontractor assessments	Share final drafts of necessary documentation as available; complete assessment reports	Prior to application for accreditation / August AAFCO meeting
Vicki Siegel	Training	Provide as relevant training in: Quality Management Plan	Before application for accreditation

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
		SOPs Document on training forms	

Current Issues and Outreach Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, 10:15 a.m., New Orleans, LA

The meeting of the Current Issues and Outreach Committee was called to order by Sam Davis, committee member at 10:15 a.m.

Committee Board Recommendations and Associations Actions

There are no Committee recommendations for Board and Association Actions.

Board Recommendations: Report was accepted on 5/5/14

Committee Members Present

Jennifer Godwin, Tim Darden, Sam Davis, Tim Lyons, Eric Nelson, Richard Ten Eyck, Shaness Thomas

Committee Members Absent

Ali Kashani, Donna Dicesare, Steve Gramlich, Chad Linton, Isabel Pocurull, April Wilcox

Committee Advisors Present

Scoot Ringger, David Dzanis, David Ailor, David Meeker, Jason Vickers, Kurt Gallagher

Committee Advisors Absent

Krista Krafta, Ed Rod, Ben Morgan, Bryan Rudolph, Matthew Gibson

Committee Report/Minutes

There were two general topics discussed at the above Current Issues and Outreach Committee meeting: 1) Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards and 2) When randomness is not enough, an Introduction to *GOODSamples*

Committee Activities

The agenda had been distributed for the midyear meeting via email.

Committee Minutes

Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards

The first portion of the meeting included a presentation on the animal feed regulatory program standards. Jenny Murphy, with the Division of Animal Feeds, Center for Veterinary Medicine, spoke on the animal feed regulatory program standards. This program establishes a uniform foundation for the organization and management of State programs responsible for the regulation of animal feed. Through implementation of the standards, a State program will be better able to achieve and maintain program improvements that help ensure the safety and integrity of the US animal feed supply.

When Randomness is Not Enough, An Introduction to GOODSamples

The second portion of the meeting included a presentation by Charles Ramsey of EnviroStat, Inc. Mr. Ramsey is working with Nancy Thiex on the cooperative agreement grant the three associations, AAFCO, AFDO and APHL received from FDA. The presentation entitled *When Randomness is Not Enough: An Introduction to GOODSamples*. This presentation laid out the history of the workgroup developing GOODSamples (Guidance On Obtaining Defensible Samples) beginning with the Partnership for Food Protection Laboratory Task Group. The talk then discussed the critical elements that must be addressed to ensure the equivalency of data among state and federal agencies. The philosophy of GOODSamples to meet the critical elements was presented. The philosophy of GOODSamples is to develop a system to enable the user to design a sampling protocol to meet project objectives. The basic elements of collection of representative samples were presented. Quality control was discussed as a method to measure sampling error.

AAFCO Education and Training Committee

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, New Orleans, Louisiana

Board Recommendations: Report was accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Attendees

Tim Lyons	Sam Davis	Jenna Areias
Tim Darden	Darlene Krieger	Carlos Gonzalez
Kent Kitade	Mark Glover	Meagan Davis
Jennifer Godwin	Shannon Jordre	Jim Fear
Jim True	David Read	Gloria Dunnavan

Committee Meeting Minutes

The meeting was opened with introductions of members and other attendees.
The first agenda item was discussion of the draft document from the Workgroup developing procedures for how the Education and Training Committee will coordinate training events and the role of the Committee in training events. Meagan Davis was the only Workgroup member attending this meeting and she explained the frame work of the document. The Committee discussed the amount of time needed for comment on the document and we decided on 30 days. There was some discussion of the make-up of the training proposal review group. The Committee felt there should be some limit on serving on the review group with the possibility of rotating a member off after a certain time period. The Committee also felt that the Board liaison should be one of the members.

The Committee agreed to accept the workgroups document and will have 30 days to comment before final acceptance by the Committee. [The document has since been sent to the Committee with a due date for comments of February 12, 2014.] This is a keystone to the functioning of this Committee so this document is critical.

The next agenda item discussed was the Certificate Program. Bob Geiger had submitted a document last year which had been forwarded to Committee members for review. We did not have a real discussion of the substance of the document. Committee members wanted additional time for review. We decided on a 60 day time frame for comments. This is a very rough draft document so it will need a lot of thoughtful time for review. [The document has since been sent to the Committee with a due date of April 4, 2014.]

Jim Fear from FDA has asked AAFCO for volunteers to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for a Job Task Analysis (JTA) of a feed inspector. FDA has a cooperative agreement with the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) to conduct the JTA. Rance Baker, Program Administrator with NEHA, will be heading up this project. AAFCO has agreed to participate in this JTA so the Education and Training Committee will be coordinating this project for AAFCO. Jim and Rance explained what will be involved in this project. They will be hoping to have 8 to 15 SMEs. The group will spend 3 days developing the tasks an inspector uses in performance of their job. The meeting will be in either Denver or Orlando and all travel and related expenses would be covered by the cooperative agreement. The work would be shared with all of AAFCO and then a follow-up meeting will develop questions related to the work and a smaller group will answer those questions. Jim True and Tim Lyons will work together to develop criteria for selection of volunteers and seek volunteers for the project. This work will assist ETC in development of the curriculum of the Certificate Program which may help with implementation of the Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards, Standard #2, Training.

Tim Lyons reported on progress for the Feed Microscopy training. He has been in touch with Dr. Majowski who has agreed to do the training. He is trying to nail down some dates/times for the training but we are aiming for something in early summer at Messiah College in Pennsylvania.

Craig Kaml, Ph.D. with the International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI) provided a discussion on IFPTIs role and development of training for the Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards. The Power Point for this presentation is included at the end of this report. IFPTI could be a

good resource for this Committee in developing and delivering training. Tim Lyons remains the contact with this organization.

Kim Young, FDA/CVM Division of Compliance, discussed FDA's plans for training under FSMA. There is an Alliance of industry and regulatory officials that will be developing training for industry for the new regulations. AAFCO representatives are Mike Davidson and Bob Waltz. As a member of the Alliance, AAFCO will be involved in the development of the training and AAFCO has been approached to issue Certificates for completion of the training and to conduct "train the trainer" sessions. The Board has not reached a decision on participation with the training Certificates. We will need to keep apprised of that decision in determining the training AAFCO might want to do for FSMA to industry.

In addition, FDA will be developing training for regulators. They will be developing a Compliance Program for these regulations which will describe the inspectional and regulatory approach. All of the training is tentative right now because the regulation is out for comment. Depending on comments the regulation may be revised. So until it is final, training plans are tentative. ETC has asked to stay involved in any training initiatives by FDA. ETC is developing a 5 year training plan and both FSMA and the AFRPS will be expected to be part of that plan.

We did not get to any of the other agenda items because of time. Before the meeting was concluded, we decided to try for a conference call around mid-March. Darlene Kreiger will send out a survey monkey to find a specific date and time.

Gloria Dunnavan
Committee Chair

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Workgroup #2 (Davis,MacIntire, Benz, Thompson)	Draft procedures for Committee activities for training events	Workgroup will draft procedures based on clarification discussions during the 2013 annual meeting of the Committee	Draft due by October 31, 2013 Draft Completed and sent to Committee for comment – DUE 2-12-2014
Gloria Dunnavan	Certificate Program	Review draft document developed by Bob Geiger, discuss with Bob, and share with Committee for comments	Document with comments from Glo sent to Committee for review and comment DUE 4-4-2014
Judy Thompson	Survey Committee Chairs for training needs	Develop survey through the AAFCO Feed BIN of Committee Chairs for training needs for next 5 years as step towards developing a 5 year training plan and use the Committee Chair meeting of the 2014 mid-year meeting to discuss with Chairs	
Tim Lyons	Feed Microscopy training	Discuss proposed training with Bob Geiger and trainer to define training location, dates, costs, and needed materials	Tim is in contact with trainer to identify specific dates/times/location – aiming for early summer 2014
Darlene Krieger	Committee Conference call	Develop Survey Monkey of Committee members to identify date and time for a November Committee conference call	Survey Monkey has been issued aiming for call in mid March 2014

Feed Admin. Seminar Working Group (Godwin, M. Davis, Johnson, S. Davis)	Agenda Items for Feed Administrators Seminar	Workgroup will develop agenda for Administrators Seminar. Committee will assist this group to help find presenters and topics for this meeting.	Tim Lyons working with this group
Scott MacIntire	FDA Training possibilities	Explore FDA trainings with the Office of Partnership to determine if feed inspectors should be trained on certain aspects of FSMA	
Tim Lyons	IFPTI/ ETC collaboration	Work with the International Food Protection Training Institute on training courses for feed personnel	IFPTI discussed their role in training at 2014 mid-year meeting – Tim will continue liaison with this group
Gloria Dunnavan	Strategic Planning Committee Work Plan	Collaborate with the Strategic Plan Committee to align their work plan with ETC Committees goals.	Plans provided to Linda Morrison December of 2013 – need to share with the Committee but did not have time at the mid-year meeting
Jim True/Tim Lyons	JTA with FDA/NEHA for feed inspectors	Work with NEHA to develop criteria and identify volunteers SMEs for the proposed JTA	

Feed and Feed Ingredient Manufacturing Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 9, 10:30–12:00, New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations

Approved by committee to be sent to the board for approval and sent to the membership for voting at 2014 Annual Meeting.

Board Recommendations: Report was accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

Members present

Ken Bowers, Bob Church, Mike Davidson, Gloria Dunnavan, Jamey Johnson, Ben Jones, Darlene Krieger, Doug Leuders, Dragan Momcilovic, Shaness Thomas, Judy Thompson

Advisors present

David Ailor, David Dzanis, David Fairfield, Matt Frederking, David Meeker, Jessica Meisinger, Richard Sellers, Charles Starkey

Committee Report/Minutes

1) Meeting called to order by Judy Thompson at 10:30 am EST. Members, advisors and guests introduced themselves.
2) The minutes from the 2013 Annual Feed and Feed Ingredient Manufacturing Committee Meeting held on Tuesday, August 13th, 2013 were voted on and approved on September 23, 2013. These were posted to the website. No further action is needed.
3) Review of Action Items (See Action Item Table)
   - Work Group – FSMA Comments – Judy Thompson Requested Comments from the Committee. Work Group should have something put together in a couple of weeks.
   - Bill Burkholder – Reviewing current member list and it is not necessary to search for additional members (including retired member Dave Syverson).
   - Bill Burkholder will distribute materials to the group and intends to have something to the Committee by the Annual Meeting.
   - Strategic Plan – Emergency Response
   - Requested a follow up from the survey that was to be sent as an action item from the Mid-Year Meeting with a comment closing period of December 2013. This survey was not completed for the requested time but Gloria Dunnavan will have the survey completed and distributed by January 17th. Responses will be evaluated and a report will be provided to the Committee during the Annual Meeting in Sacramento.
4) Canadian Regulatory Update - Judy Thompson provided the Membership with a regulatory update of the current and planned changes for the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). (See Attachment A)

   A question was asked regarding Canada's licensing requirements would apply to totally integrated facilities; response: CFIA doesn't differentiate between commercial facilities and on-farm facilities (other than farms no labeling requirements) though the inspection frequency for farms is considerably less intensive than that for commercial feed mills based on risk.
5) US Federal Regulatory Update/Discussion on Development of FSMA Feed Rule Comments

   Eric Nelson provided the Membership with the opportunity to follow up on the presentation he had given during the Current Issues and Outreach Committee. Sound legal and scientific comments are being requested. Richard Sellers asked for recognition of the extended comment period for the Preventive Control (PC) Rule of March 31st.

American Feed Industry Association (AFIA) represented by Richard Sellers: Regarding the language carryover from the Human Food (PC) Rule, what was the reasoning the requirements for handwashing stations and other employee cleanliness requirement inclusion in the Feed PC Rule?

FDA (Eric Nelson): The language carryover from the Human Food PC Rule is one of the reasons FDA is requesting sound legal and scientific comments for the Feed PC Rule, as some of the requirements may be unnecessary for feed manufacturers (additional examples: stainless steel sinks, etc.) AAFCO should also comment on this particular issue.

- Nancy Cook requested a recap of what Eric Nelson had presented during the Current Issues and Outreach Committee for those that had not been able to be present.
- All 5 proposed rules have been released for comment and are in draft status
- Requested comments specific to 4 things:
  1) Are GMPs applicable across the board?
  2) Sound legal arguments regarding the very small business exemption values
  3) Is it reasonable to request the supplier verification as a component of the Feed PC Rule?
  4) Final product testing: this is currently not a component of the Feed PC Rule proposal but consideration as to whether or not it was valid for some products/all products/finished products?

Pet Food Institute (PFI) represented by Peter Tabor: Question regarding supplier verification and the extent to which stakeholders will see the proposed language. Eric Nelson recapped the FDA procedure for releasing draft language for comment, then the release of the final interim rule, then another period of comment and review.

Jon Nelson expressed concerns about FSMA's application to integrated operations. Eric Nelson responded that it's a possibility. With QA/QC methods already in place at these types of operations, most likely the applied burden would be minimal. Again, FDA recognizes that the proposed rules are expensive so again, comments are encouraged.

National Grain and Feed Association (NGFA) represented by Dave Fairfield: How does the Feed PC Rule deal with hazards reasonably likely to occur and management oversight?

FDA (Kim Young): The hazards reasonably likely to occur definition doesn't coincide as the definition doesn't come from the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

AFIA (Richard Sellers): Questions regarding control production of product going into feed; for example mined products such as limestone, etc; as the ingredient will very as it's not manufactured but naturally occurring. Eric Nelson responded that the intended use of the product should be the focus.

Judy Thompson requested comments on supplier verification for feed manufacturers.

- PFI (Peter Tabor): requested flexibility/discretion for the manufacturer to choose what best works for their operation; a tool but not a requirement.
- AFIA (Richard Sellers): Not ready to comment on that yet.
- NGFA (Dave Fairfield): Not ready to comment but thinks that foreign and domestic supplier verification should come hand in hand.

Final Product Testing (currently not required)

AFIA (Richard Sellers): Could be potentially applied to the pet food manufacturers but not for livestock/food-producing animal feed and feed ingredient production. There's still some discussion as to what it applies to (nutrients was not the intent but more food safety concerns.

FDA (Eric Nelson): If environmental sampling was common practice and if it could be used to verify implementation of a critical control point. Not really for livestock/food-producing animal feed and feed ingredients but somewhat related to pet food manufacturing. Ultimately, the end product cannot be adulterated or misbranded and the current practices to confirm this are not ideal.

NGFA (Dave Fairfield): Flexibility should be provided. How can final product testing and environmental sampling be valuable to the industry?

Eric Nelson further explained that FSMA encourages FDA to partner with states and compels FDA to be more proactive and there are resources in the works to change how FDA functions. The goal is the production of safe food and feed, not because a FDA form 483 was issued and compliance required, but because compliance was achieved by the industry prior to inspection.

6) Industry Stakeholder Updates

AFIA: Safe Quality Food Institute Option 34 Safe Feed/Safe Food benchmarked. Global Food Safety Industry initiative. Pet Food Program benchmarked too.

Richard Sellers asked AAFCO if the organization planned to comment on the proposed regulations for Veterinary Feed Directives (VFD) and at this point in time, AAFCO has not assigned a group to do so. AFIA wants to ensure that the VFD process works better under the proposed regulations than it currently does now. AFIA also has concerns about whether or not training will be available for veterinarians.

NGFA: In conjunction with AFIA, NGFA will host two International Grains Programs at Kansas State in April and October of 2014.

National Renderers Association (NRA) represented by David Meeker: 110 plants – certified code of practice that is similar to a HACCP Plan which the Association hopes will comply with the PC Rules.

National Oilseed Producers Association (NOPA) represented by David Ailor: The Association has commented on the Human Food PC Rule.

PFI: No updates to provide.

Meeting adjourned as there was no other business.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Judy Thompson	Establish working group and develop FSMA comments for Board of Directors	Recruit working group members and develop process for collecting comments. Working Group Members – Doug Leuders, Ken Bowers, Tim Darden, Judy Thompson (lead)	January 2014 Completed
		Draft comments for approval by BoD	March 12, 2014
Ali Kashani	Request NASDA comments	Request comments on food preventative controls from NASDA and provide copy to working group	Completed
Sharon Benz	Lead for Mineral Guidelines Working Group	Sharon Benz to identify lead from CVM for Mineral Guidelines Working Group	September 15, 2013 **Completed** – Dr. Burkholder has been identified as lead for this working group
Mineral Guidelines Working Group	Review and Revise Mineral Guidelines	Working group to develop plan to review and revise Mineral Guidelines in the OP for discussion at Mid-Year **Workgroup Members**: Bill Burkholder (lead) Jon Nelson, Tim Costigan, Jennifer Kormos David Syverson, Bill Hall, Dave Dzanis, Roger Hoestenbach	July 2014 Annual Meeting
Judy Thompson/ Glo Dunnavan	Strategic Plan – Emergency Response	Circulate proposed member survey and workplan for tabletop exercise to working group and FFIMC members and advisors and request comments to Glo by September 15, 2013 (Judy)	August 31, 2013 Completed
		Survey AAFCO members regarding their emergency response plans (Glo)	January 2014
		Evaluate survey responses and review	July 2014 Annual

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
		current AAFCO Emergency Plan guidelines (Glo and working group) **Workgroup Members**: Gloria Dunnavan, (lead), Darlene Krieger, David Fairfield, Dragan Momcilovic, Liz Higgins, Tim Darden, Sergio Tolusso	Meeting

Attachment A – Canadian Regulatory Update Presentation

The Canadian Regulatory Update Presentation is not included here, but may be viewed online at http://www.aafco.org/Meetings/AnnualMeetings/2014.aspx

Feed Labeling Committee Meeting Report

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 10th, 10:15 a.m.–12:00 p.m., New Orleans, LA

The committee has no recommendations for the board or membership action.

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14

Committee Recommendations to MBRC:

1) The Feed Labeling Committee recommends that the Equine Nutrition Panel Workgroup recommendation #1 (see Appendix A) be forwarded to the Model Bill & Regulations Committee (MBRC).
2) The Feed Labeling Committee recommends that the Nutrients Guarantees Table Workgroup recommendation #1 (see Appendix B) be forwarded to the Model Bill & Regulations Committee (MBRC).
3) The Feed Labeling Committee recommends that Johanna Phillip's recommendation #1 (see Appendix C) be forwarded to the Model Bill & Regulations Committee (MBRC).

Committee Participants:

Members present
Ken Bowers (KS), Tim Darden (NM), Richard Ten Eyck (OR), Jan Jarman (MN), Scott Ziehr (CO), Mika Alewynse (FDA/CVM)
Members on conference phone
Miriam Johnson (NC), Johanna Phillips (ID)
Advisors present
Sue Hayes (WBFI), Jim Barritt (PFI), Kelvin Hawkins (PFI), Jan Campbell (NGFA), Angela Mills (AFIA), Sue Carlson (AFIA), Dave Dzanis (ACVN/APPA), James Emerson (USPA), Ellen Slaymaker (NGFA), Charles Starkey (USPA),
Total: 8 members and 10 Advisors

Committee Report:

Committee Activities

1) ACTION: FLC accepts recommendation #1 (see Appendix A) made by Equine Nutrition Panel Workgroup.
   MOTION: Motion to accept recommendation #1 made by Richard Ten Eyck, seconded by Scott Ziehr. Motion carries by committee vote.
2) ACTION: FLC accepts recommendation #1 (see Appendix B) made by Nutrients Guarantees Table Workgroup.
   MOTION: Motion to accept recommendation #1 made by Richard Ten Eyck, seconded by Miriam Johnson. Motion carries by committee vote.
3) ACTION: FLC accepts recommendation #1 (see Appendix c) made by Johanna Phillips.
   MOTION: Motion to accept recommendation #1 made by Johanna Phillips, seconded by Richard Ten Eyck. Motion carries by committee vote.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Miriam Johnson	Action Item #1	Submit item to MBRC for review	Immediate/in process
Richard TenEyck	Action Item #2	Forward the language on to Model Bill Committee to be sent on to membership	Immediate/in process
Richard TenEyck	Action Item #3	Forward the language on to Model Bill Committee to be sent on to membership	Immediate/in process

Feed Labeling Committee Meeting Minutes

Committee Participants:

Members present

Ken Bowers (KS), Tim Darden (NM), Richard Ten Eyck (OR), Jan Jarman (MN), Scott Ziehr (CO), Mika Alewynse (FDA/CVM)

Members on conference phone

Miriam Johnson (NC), Johanna Phillips (ID)

Advisors present

Sue Hayes (WBFI), Jim Barritt (PFI), Kelvin Hawkins (PFI), Jan Campbell (NGFA), Angela Mills (AFIA), Sue Carlson (AFIA), Dave Dzanis (ACVN/APPA), James Emerson (USPA), Ellen Slaymaker (NGFA), Charles Starkey (USPA),

Total: 8 members and 10 Advisors

Welcome & Opening Remarks

Tim Darden: New Mexico Department of Agriculture

Equine Nutrition Panel Update

Miriam Johnson: North Carolina Department of Agriculture

During the 2013 Annual Meeting held in St. Pete Beach, FL, Miriam Johnson was charged to return to the Equine Nutrition Panel Workgroup for a vote to determine if the requirement for Minimum Copper should have the language "if added" added to Regulation 3(a)(4)(V)(b)(6) and 3(a)(4)(V)(c)(5). She reported the results from the expert panel as follows:

- Multiple attempts to engage the entire panel were made.
- As a result 5 total members of the panel of 10 responded
- Of those responses 4 responded yay to adding the additional verbiage and one nay.
- As a result, and in the interest of time, "if added" was recommended to be added to the required Nutritional Indicator, Copper, for Equines as the majority of responding members were in favor of the additional language.

The following amendment was presented to the FLC for vote to send to the Model Bill Committee for incorporation into the model regulations. The voting results are listed below:

Model Regulations for Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Complete Feeds, Supplements, and Mineral Feeds Regulation 3. (a) 4 (V) (page 123 of the 2014 OP)

b. Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Complete Feeds and Supplements (all animal classes)
   6) Minimum Copper in parts per million (ppm) **(if added)**

c. Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Mineral Feeds (all animal classes)
   5) Minimum Copper in parts per million (ppm) **(if added)**

MOTION: Motion to accept recommended verbiage presented and forward to the MBRC for update to the Official Publication was made by Richard Ten Eyck, seconded by Scott Ziehr. Motion carries by committee vote.

ACTION: FLC accepts recommendation #1 (see Appendix A) made by Equine Nutrition Panel Workgroup.

Dairy Cattle Nutrition Panel

Miriam Johnson: NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

A request was made to form an expert nutritionist panel to review labeling of dairy formula feeds to determine which nutrients are important to dairy cattle. The NRC will be convening working groups to determine nutrient requirements for dairy cattle therefore at this time the establishment of the panel will be delayed to allow for the NRC to finish their evaluations. A request was made for members to brainstorm as to whom they would like to recommend for the dairy nutrition panel so that it may be formed once the NRC group has completed their work.

ACTION ITEM: Miriam Johnson will continue to monitor the progress of this workgroup.

Swine Nutrition Panel

Miriam Johnson: NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

A request was made to form an expert nutritionist panel to review labeling of swine formula feeds to determine which nutrients are important to swine. The Expert Panel has been formed (see listing below) and the first conference call has taken place. At this time we are awaiting the initial responses and recommendations from the group. The second conference call will be tentative for the middle to end of February 2014.

University Representatives & Affiliation:	
Eric van Heugten	NC State University
Dale Rozeboom	Michigan State University
Thomas Crenshaw	University of Wisconsin
Merlin Lindemann	University of KY
Brian Kerr	USDA/ARS (Iowa State)
Industry Representatives & Affiliation:	
Gawain Willis	Purina/Land O Lakes
Randy Walker	DPI Global
Ernest Keith	Lallemand Nutrition
Chad Risley	Berg+Schmidt America LLC
Jeffery Escobar	Novus International, Inc.

ACTION ITEM: Miriam Johnson will continue to monitor the progress of this workgroup.

Selenium Labeling Working Group Update

Richard Ten Eyck: Oregon Department of Agriculture

Richard Ten Eyck reported he had spoken with Nate Bartz. Nate was in contact with the National Pork Producers and at this time no further recommendations have been made. This closes out this line of inquiry.

Review of Nutrient Guarantees Table and Model Regulations Workgroup Report

Richard Ten Eyck: Oregon Department of Agriculture

A request was made during the Annual Meeting in St. Pete Beach, FL to review inconsistencies between the Nutrient Guarantees by Species table in the Official Publication and the corresponding species-specific guarantees section of the Model Regulations.

The workgroup presented the following recommendations to the FLC to clarify the exemptions in XII and send them to Model Bill for concurrence and publication in the Official Publication:

> (4) Guarantees - Crude Protein, Equivalent Crude Protein from Non Protein Nitrogen, Amino Acids, Crude Fat, Crude Fiber, Acid Detergent Fiber, Calcium, Phosphorus, Salt and Sodium shall be the sequence of nutritional guarantees when such guarantee is stated. Other required and voluntary guarantees should follow in a general format such that the units of measure used to express guarantees (percentage, parts per million, International Units, etc.) are listed in a sequence that provides a consistent grouping of the units of measure. **Individual nutrient guarantees are not required if listed as exempt in section XII.**

MOTION: Motion to accept the Nutrient Guarantees Report from the workgroup made by Richard Ten Eyck and seconded by Miriam Johnson. Motion carries by committee vote.

MOTION: Motion that committee accepts the language in the first recommendation be forwarded to the MBRC and then to membership for inclusion in the Model Bill made by Richard Ten Eyck and seconded by Miriam Johnson. Motion carries by committee vote.

> XI. The required guarantees of grain mixtures with or without molasses and feeds other than those described in regulation 3(a)(4) **(I thru X)** shall include the following items in the order listed:

MOTION: Motion that committee accepts the language in the second recommendation made by Richard Ten Eyck and seconded by Miriam Johnson. Motion carries by committee vote.

MOTION: Motion to forward the language on to MBRC to be sent on to membership for inclusion in the Model Bill made by Richard Ten Eyck and Seconded by Miriam Johnson. Motion carries by committee vote.

Review of the Minimum Warning Statement Type Size Table

Johanna Phillips: Idaho State Department of Agriculture

The Pet Food Committee is updating the table within Regulation PF2(i) (page 137 of the 2014 OP) and PF3(c) (page 138 of the 2014 OP) for Pet and Specialty Pet Food Model Regulations. A request is being made to update the table within the Model Regulations Regulation 7(d) (page 131 of the 2014 OP) for consistency by amending the table to include greater than, less than, and/or equal to symbols to prevent regulatory confusion in instances where the panel size could fit into two warning statement type size categories. Johanna Phillips stated that the table was modified to conform to the language in 21 CFR 501.105(i). Dr. Mika Alewynse stated that 21 CFR 501.105(i) pertained to requirements for the declaration of net quantity of contents, not raw milk warning statements. Dr. Dave Dzanis clarified that the less than/ greater than/ or equal to symbols in the table were modeled after the format in 21CFR 501.105(i), and the edits were simply intended to provide clarity to the table. Richard TenEyck requested an edit, to change 'sq. in.' to in². Johanna Phillips indicated that there was no objection on her part to the requested change. Please reference the table below for proposed changes:

Panel Size	Minimum Warning Statement Type Size
≤5 **in²**	1/16"
>5- **≤** 25 **in²**	1/8"
>25- **≤** 100 **in²**	3/16"
>100- **≤** 400 **in²**	1/4"
> 400 **in²** +	1/2"

MOTION: Motion that committee accepts the changes to the table within Model Regulation 7(d) with edits was made by Johanna Phillips and seconded by Richard Ten Eyck. Motion carries by committee vote.

MOTION: Motion to accept recommended verbiage presented and forward to the MBRC for update to the Official Publication was made by Richard Ten Eyck and seconded by Johanna Phillips. Motion carries by committee vote.

Future Labeling Workshops

Tim Darden: New Mexico Department of Agriculture

There is great interest in hosting a medicated feed labeling workshop during the 2015 Mid-Year Meeting. However at this time the workshop will be held off until a chair and additional volunteers can be found to monitor the overall planning. A workshop will be tentative for 2016 with the intent on hosting additional workshop every 3-4 years.

Additional Topics

If the committee is aware of additional financial needs please bring them to the attention of Richard TenEyck.

At this time a Committee Chair needs to be identified.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:04 AM

Appendix A—FLC Recommendation #1

Model Regulations for Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Complete Feeds, Supplements, and Mineral Feeds Regulation 3. (a) 4 (V) (page 123 of the 2014 OP)

d. Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Complete Feeds and Supplements (all animal classes)
   6) Minimum Copper in parts per million (ppm) **(if added)**

e. Guaranteed Analysis for Equine Mineral Feeds (all animal classes)
   6) Minimum Copper in parts per million (ppm) **(if added)**

The FLC Committee proposes the amendment as shown in the above language. Add “if added” to the end of d(6) & e(6). Recommend the finished language be passed to model bill for incorporation into the model regulations

Appendix B—FLC Recommendation #2

The workgroup presented the following recommendations to the FLC to clarify the exemptions in XII and sends them to Model Bill for concurrence and publication in the OP:

> (4) Guarantees - Crude Protein, Equivalent Crude Protein from Non Protein Nitrogen, Amino Acids, Crude Fat, Crude Fiber, Acid Detergent Fiber, Calcium, Phosphorus, Salt and Sodium shall be the sequence of nutritional guarantees when such guarantee is stated. Other required and voluntary guarantees should follow in a general format such that the units of measure used to express guarantees (percentage, parts per million, International Units, etc.) are listed in a sequence that provides a consistent grouping of the units of measure. **Individual nutrient guarantees are not required if listed as exempt in section XII.**
>
> XI. The required guarantees of grain mixtures with or without molasses and feeds other than those described in regulation 3(a)(4) **(I thru X)** shall include the following items in the order listed:

The FLC Committee recommends these amendments as shown in the above language. Insert a sentence at the end of regulation 3(4) on page 120 of the 2014 OP. Insert "(I to X)" on page 126 of the 2014 OP. Recommend the finished language be passed to model bill for incorporation into the model regulations

Appendix C—FLC Recommendation #3

Panel Size	Minimum Warning Statement Type Size
≤5 **in²**	1/16”
>5- **≤**25 **in²**	1/8”
>25- **≤**100 **in²**	3/16”
>100- **≤**400 **in²**	1/4”
>400 **in²** +	1/2”

The FLC Committee proposes the following amendment to the above language. Recommend the finished language be passed to model bill for incorporation into the model regulations

Minutes and Report approved by membership by a vote on April 29, 2014.

Ingredient Definitions Committee Report

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 9, 4 p.m., New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations to Membership:
(detailed language is in attachment A)

1) **Publish the following new definitions as tentative in the Official Publication:**
   a) T60.114 Pulse Flour
   b) T60.115Pulse Protein
   c) T60.116Pulse Starch
   d) T60.113 Pulse Fiber
   e) T33.10 ____ Distillers Oil, Feed Grade
   f) T60.111 Bio-Diesel Derived Glycerin
2) **Delete the TT60.111 Bio-Diesel Derived Glycerin definition on page 415.** (allows item 1 (f) to take clearly its place.)
3) **Publish T51.15 Fish Stock/Broth definition in Attachment A in the OP.** It modifies 51.15 by lowering the protein level required.

Board Recommendations to Membership: accepted Report on 5/5/14. Board accepted recommendations 1-3 as presented by the committee.

1. **Publish the following new definitions as tentative in the Official Publication:**
   a. **T60.114 Pulse Flour**
   b. **T60.115 Pulse Protein**
   c. **T60.116 Pulse Starch**
   d. **T60.113 Pulse Fiber**
   e. **T33.10 ____ Distillers Oil, Feed Grade**
   f. **T60.111 Bio-Diesel Derived Glycerin**
2. **Delete the TT60.111 Bio-Diesel Derived Glycerin definition on page 415. (allows item 1 (f) to take clearly it's place.)**
3. **Publish T51.15 Fish Stock/Broth definition in attachment A in the OP. It modifies 51.15 by lowering the protein level required.**

Association Actions: None

Committee Report and 1/9/14 Minutes:

Committee Members Present:
Richard Ten Eyck (Chair), Alan Harrison, Shannon Jordre, Judy Thompson, Mark LeBlanc, Mika Alewynse, (on phone: Erin Bubb, Johanna Phillips, Steve Gramlich, Liz Higgins)

Industry Advisors Present:
Charles Starkey (new), David Meeker, Jonathon Goodson, Steve Traylor, Jill Franks, Jan Campbell, Vincent Sewalt, Jon Nelson, Leah Wilkinson, Dave Dzanis, Kristi Smedley, David Ailor, Susan Thixton, Mollie Morrissette

The agenda order was changed and items to vote on were moved to the top. Discussion presentations were made while discussing the particular topic.

Actions taken on definitions:
T51.15 Fish broth – Shannon moved to ACCEPT; Mark seconds. MOTION PASSES.
T60.114. Pulse Flour. Mark moved to ACCEPT; Shannon seconds. MOTION PASSES.
T60.115. Pulse protein. Shannon moved to ACCEPT; Alan seconds. MOTION PASSES.
T60.116. Pulse starch, Shannon moved to ACCEPT; Mark seconds. MOTION PASSES
T60.113 Pulse fiber. Mark moved to ACCEPT; Shannon seconds.
Mark amends motion to exclude pods. Shannon seconds. AMENDMENT PASSES.
MOTION PASSES.

T33.10 _____ Distillers Oil, Feed Grade, Shannon moved to ACCEPT; Mark seconds. MOTION PASSES.
T60.111 Biodiesel-derived glycerin. MOTION TO ACCEPT: Mark moved, Shannon seconds. MOTION PASSES.
Chair seeks motion to delete TT60.111 definition accepted by membership 1/8/14. Mark moved; Shannon seconds. MOTION PASSES.

Discussion Items:

MOTION To disband Harmonized Tariff Schedule WG. Judy moved, Shannon seconds. MOTION PASSES*. The group found little interest in pursuing this large endeavor.*

Meat Meal Work Group Report – Meagan Davis, They are working and will report again in August.

Report on Ingredient Monograph Pilot - Kent Kitade, Group is preparing 3 monographs for public comment to better describe what "feed grade" means for particular ingredients. They will present findings and recommendations to the board in May.

Mustard Meal- Bob Church would like comments on changing definition 71.30.

T71.30 Mustard Meal, Solvent Extracted** is the product obtained by grinding the cake which remains after removal of some of the oil by mechanical extraction, and removing most of the remaining oil by solvent extraction. *It is obtained from the seed of cultivated mustard plants grown to produce condiments for human food (Brassica juncea, B. nigra, and Sinapis alba (formerly Brassica alba)). Rations should be restricted to cattle and sheep and not contain more than 10% for cattle and 10% for sheep. It should not be fed to lactating dairy cows if milk production is for human consumption because of objectionable taste and/or odor. (Proposed 1972, Adopted 1973). IFN 5-12-149 Mustard seed meal solvent extracted*

Mika Alywynse, CVM gave a presentation on color additives. A copy of her slides are in the feed BIN library and on the AAFCO.org ingredient definitions website at: http://www.aafco.org/Portals/0/AAFCO/committees/IDC/AAFCO_color_additives_2014_final.pdf There are no natural colors approved for animal feed.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Richard	Preservative Section	Sort out antioxidants vs. preservatives	
Mika	Chromium Levels	Identify and edit other definitions containing chromium	
IDC	GRAS –No Questions	Policy on posting in the OP. – Currently they must come through the definition request process.	
Bob Church	Mustard Meal	Adopt language presented at mid year 2014	August 2014
Ali	SUIP on feed terms	Language Rejected by MBRC Jan 2014	
Kent	Monograph Pilot	Report out monthly to IDC on progress	
Meagan	Meat Workgroup	Report out at each meeting on progress	

Fiscal 14-15 Needs: None identified

Meeting was adjourned around 6PM central time.

Minutes accepted in the IDC forum on 2/14/ 2014 by a vote of 4 in favor, 0 against and 12 not voting.

Attachment A (IDC Jan 2014)

T60.114 Pulse flour is the fraction remaining after removal of fiber from pulse seeds. It is obtained from mechanically dehulled and dry milled pulse seeds. This flour fraction must be free of fiber and/or seed hull/pod, except in such amounts as might occur unavoidably in good manufacturing practices. Pulse crops include the edible seeds of legumes (excluding oil seeds). Acceptable pulse crops are listed below. The ingredient must contain not less than 20% crude protein and not more than 3% crude fiber on a dry matter basis. If a conditioning agent is used, the name of the conditioning agent must be shown on the product label as an added ingredient. If the ingredient bears a name descriptive of its kind or origin, it must correspond thereto (e.g. pea flour).
Accepted pulse crops:
IFN 05-17-726 – Pea (Pisum sativum L.)

T60.115 Pulse protein is the mechanically separated protein fraction free of the fiber and/or seed hull/pod, except in such amounts as might occur unavoidably in good manufacturing practices. It is obtained from dehulled, dry milled and air-classified pulse seeds. Pulse crops include the edible seeds of legumes (excluding oil seeds). Acceptable pulse crops are listed below. The product must contain not less than 53 % crude protein on a dry matter basis. If a conditioning agent is used, the name of the conditioning agent must be shown as an added ingredient. If the ingredient bears a name descriptive of its kind or origin, it must correspond thereto. (e.g. pea protein)
Accepted pulse crops:
IFN 05-17-726 – Pea (Pisum sativum L.)

T60.116 Pulse starch is the fraction remaining after removal of protein and fiber from pulse seeds. It is obtained from mechanically dehulled, dry milled and air-classified pulse seeds. This starch fraction must be free of fiber and/or seed hull/pod, except in such amounts as might occur unavoidably in good manufacturing practices. Pulse crops include the edible seeds of legumes (excluding oil seeds). Acceptable pulse crops are listed below. The product must contain not less than 65% starch on a dry matter basis. If a conditioning agent is used, the name of the conditioning agent must be shown on the product label as an added ingredient. If the ingredient bears a name descriptive of its kind or origin, it must correspond thereto. (e.g. pea starch)
Accepted pulse crops:
IFN 05-17-726 – Pea (Pisum sativum L.)

T60.113 Pulse fiber consists primarily of the outer coverings and/or hull of pulse crops derived from pulse dry milling. Pulse crops include the edible seeds of legumes (excluding oil seeds). Acceptable pulse crops are listed below. The product must contain not less than 23 % crude fiber on a dry matter basis. If a conditioning agent is used, the name of the conditioning agent must be shown as an added ingredient. If the ingredient bears a name descriptive of its kind or origin, it must correspond thereto. (e.g. pea fiber)
Accepted pulse crops:
IFN 05-17-726 - Pea (Pisum sativum L.)

T33.10 _____ Distillers Oil, Feed Grade is obtained after the removal of ethyl alcohol by distillation from the yeast fermentation of a grain or a grain mixture and mechanical or solvent extraction of oil by methods employed in the ethanol production industry. It consists predominantly of glyceride esters of fatty acids and contains no additions of free fatty acids or other materials obtained from fats. It must contain, and be guaranteed for, not less than 85% total fatty acids, not more than 2.5% unsaponifiable matter, and not more than 1% insoluble impurities. Maximum free fatty acids and moisture must be guaranteed. If an antioxidant(s) is used, the common or usual name must be indicated, followed by the words “used as a preservative”. If the product bears a name descriptive of its kind or origin, i.e. “corn, sorghum, barley, rye”, it must correspond thereto with the predominating grain declared as the first word in the name.

T60.111 Biodiesel-derived glycerin is a liquid co-product of biodiesel production by a base catalyzed transesterification process. It must be derived from processes utilizing sources of fatty acids compliant with the term “feed grade” and if animal fat of ruminant origin is utilized, sources must not contain more

than 0.15% insoluble impurities. It is intended as a source of energy in livestock diets. It must contain not less than 80% glycerin, not more than 15% water, not more than 0.5% methanol, and not more than 5 ppm heavy metals. It may contain up to 8% salt. It must be labeled with guarantees for minimum percentage glycerin, maximum percentage moisture, maximum percentage sulfur, maximum percentage ash, and maximum percentage methanol as well as the statement "For further mixing into livestock feed." It is for use in an amount not to exceed 15% of the complete feed for ruminants and 10% of the complete feed for all other livestock species, including poultry.

T51.15 Fish Stock/Broth is obtained by cooking fish and/or other marine animal products, including bones, shells, parts, and/or muscle, but not including fish solubles. The crude protein content of the stock/broth base material must be no less than ~~90%~~ **80%** on a dry matter basis. In order for the stock/broth to be labeled as such, the moisture-to-crude protein ratio must not exceed 135:1 (135 parts water to 1 part crude protein). If the product bears a name descriptive of its kind, composition or origin, it must correspond thereto: and may be called either stock or broth.

Inspection and Sampling Committee Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations

1) Board approval of minutes
2) Place LDAF sampling videos in the AAFCO Feed Bin
3) Plan an AITS for the Fall 2014

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

BOD Members Present:
Richard Ten Eyck, President Elect
Tim Darden, Immediate Past President
Sam Davis, Junior Director
Dan Danielson, Junior Director
Committee Members Present:
Jennifer Godwin, NC
Bob Church, MT
Meagan Davis, LA
Tim Lyons, MI
Gloria Dunnavan, Life Member
Barb Schroeder, MN
Jim True, KY
Dan Danielson, TN, Co-Chair / BOD Liaison
Advisors Present:
Chris Olinger, NGFA
Jan Campbell, NGFA
Martha Smith, ADM
AAFCO Meeting attendees

Committee Report

1) Welcome and Introductions – Dan Danielson
2) Minutes Approval: Minutes were previously approved by e-vote (9/9/13)
3) New Business: None
4) Defensible Sampling Presentation, Chuck Ramsey, Envirostat, Inc.

Ben Jones asked if Mr. Ramsey had the opportunity to look at the common tools used by feed inspectors and the feeds commonly sampled by feed field staff. Mr. Ramsey responded that the tools out there are "good and reasonable" but not everyone has access to all the necessary equipment in the field. He also stated that the tools may not be used correctly in the field.

Sam Davis asked Mr. Ramsey to clarify his statement about cleaning the equipment. Mr. Ramsey responded that the first step was to use a cloth to wipe away visible dust and carryover from the previous product sampled. He also suggested that "good housekeeping" should be established for the field staff to provide necessary information for caring for equipment.

Gloria Dunnavan asked Mr. Ramsey to clarify his presentation question of "what's the point of taking a sample?" Mr. Ramsey pointed out that if sampling is not done correctly we cannot know what the sample represents or if it's even a good sample.

Ben Jones asked if Mr. Ramsey was aware of the AAFCO Inspector Manual and Guidelines for sampling, especially the part of sampling for contaminants and analytes.

*How will the APHL Grant Work Group impact the inspection and sampling group?

The AAFCO Feed Bin was discussed and its use encouraged by Dan Danielson.

AAFCO Inspectors Manual – Jennifer Godwin stated that all chapter revisions have been completed and agreed upon by the committee. Once the basic overview of the Inspector's Manual has been completed, the revised manual will be available online by the end of February 2014.

Basic Inspector Training Seminar – Meagan Davis recapped the two BITS Trainings that were hosted in Louisiana in 2013. She also informed those in attendance that during the Fall BITS training the LSU Agriculture Communications group captured footage of various sampling techniques and will complete videos for the following sampling stations: Bulk Truck Sampling; Bulk Feed Sampling, Bag Feed Sampling, Liquid Feed Sampling and Block and Tub Sampling. These videos will be publically available once editing has been finished by LSU.

Advanced Inspector Training Seminar – Meagan Davis announced that Louisiana would host an AITS training in New Orleans in the fall of 2014.

Gloria Dunnavan discussed the plan for a certificate program that will be discussed during the Education and Training Committee that will set a standard for training events and once that process is complete, these trainings must provide a test to determine pass or fail of the course. There is a potential for AITS and BITS to be involved in this curriculum but first they must be standardized. First the group is working on the process and procedures, then will determine how many levels and potential training events are needed, then the group will develop the curriculum. There is also a potential for a Job Task Analysis to be performed to determine the needs of a State Feed Inspector. The group also has the goal to help implement Standard 2: Training of the Animal Feed Regulatory Program Standards. This certificate program would help support the State Feed Regulatory Programs meet the requirements in Standard 2.

Adjourned at 2:26 PM

Laboratory Methods and Services Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 9, 8:00 am–5:00 pm, New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations:

The committee recommends that the Board approve the 2014 revisions to the AAFCO QA/QC Guidelines for Feed Laboratories that were presented to the committee as final.

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

(C *Committee members, ** Advisors)

Aaron Price*	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	aaron.price@inspection.gc.ca
Brenda Snodgrass*	OK Dept. of Agriculture	Brenda.snodgrass@ ag.ok.gov
Gale Hagood*	Mississippi State Chemical Lab	ghagood@mscl.msstate.edu
Jennifer Mirabile	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	Jennifer.mirabile@agriculture.ny.gov
Heidi Hickes	MT Dept. of Ag	hhickes@mt.gov
Ken McManus*	MD Dept. of Ag.	Kenneth.mcmanus@maryland.gov
Kristi McCallum*	CO Dept. of Ag.	Kristina.mccallum@state.co.us
Lawrence Novotny*	SD Ag Labs	Lawrence.novotny@sdaglabs.com
Louise Ogden*	MN Dept. of Ag.	Louise.ogden@state.mn.us
Mark Stenske*	MI Dept. of Ag. & Rural Devt.	StenskeM@michigan.gov
Mary Koestner*	MO Dept. of Ag	Mary.Koestner@mda.mo.gov
Nancy Thiex*	TLS / AAFCO Consultant	nancy.thiex@gmail.com
Robert Sheridan*	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	Robert.sheridan@agriculture.ny.gov
Sharon F. Webb*	UK Div. of Reg. Services	Sharon.webb@uky.edu
Teresa Grant*	NCDA	Teresa.grant@ncagr.gov
Tom Phillips*	MD Dept of Ag	Tom.Phillips@Maryland.gov
Alex MacDonald**	Pharma Science	beemac201@aol.com
Andy Crawford**	Consultant	andy@crawford.org
Bill Hall**	Mosaic	Bill.hall@mosaicco.com
Chuck Ramsey**	Envirostat	chuck@envirostat.org
Dennis Givens**	Cargill Corn Milling	Dennis_givens@cargill.com
Ken Riter**	Nestle Purina	ken.riter@purina.nestle.com
Lars Reimann**	Eurofins Scientific	LarsReimann@EurofinsUS.com
Laszlo Torma**	Pickering Laboratories	Laszlo@pickeringlabs.com
Mark Coleman**	Elanco	mcoleman&elanco.com
Sean White**	EPL Bioanalytical Services	swhite@eplbas.com
Adela Ramic	MN Dept. of Ag	adela.parganlija-ramic@state.mn.us
Bilan Jessie	LA Dept. of Ag	bjessie@ldaf.state.la.us
Bob Pesselman	Covance Laboratories	bob.pesselman@covance.com

Caroline Mohling	Diamond V Mills	Cmohl;ing@diamondv.com
Craig Kaml	IFPTI	craig.kaml@ifpti.org
Christina Johnson	EPL Bio Analytical Services	cjohnson@eplbas.com
Daniel Berg	Covance Laboratories	Dan.berg@covance.com
Debra Nickelson	PBI-Gordon	dnickelson@pbigordon.com
Deepika Curole	LA Dept. of Ag	dcurole@ldaf.state.la.us
H. Dorota Inerowicz	OISC	inerowic@purdue.edu
Jason Kong	Ohio Dept. of Ag	jason.kong@agri.ohio.gov
Jimmie Ward	P&G Pet Care	Ward.jl@pg.com
Jody Morrissey	P&G Pet Care	Morrissey.jm@pg.com
Joe Warnick	EPL Bio Analytical Services	jwarnick@eplbas.com
John Szpylka	Silliker	john.szpylka@silliker.com
Keith Wegner	CO Dept. of Ag.	Keith.wegner@state.co.us
Kristen Hafler	NYS Ag & Markets: Food lab	kristen.hafler@agriculture.ny.gov
Kurt Rosentrater	DGCT	karosent@iastate.edu
Lori Flugum	Diamond V Mills	lflugum@diamondv.com
Marla Luther	FDA CVM	Marla.luther@fda.hhs.gov
Mary Koestner	Missouri Department of Agriculture	Mary.koestner@mda.mo.gov
Mary Beth Rollins	LA Dept. of Ag	mrollins@ldaf.state.la.us
Michele Swarbrick	MN Dept. of Ag	michele.swarbrick@state.mn.us
Nickki Sriperm	Adisseo USA	nickki.sriperm@adisseo.com
Patty Lucas	FL Dept. of Ag. & Consumer Services	patricia.lucas@freshfromflorida.com
Perry Doane	ADM Research	perry.doane@adm.com
Pierre Jaouen	Royal Canin	pierre.jaouen@royalcanin.com
Robin Johnson	Montana Dept. of Ag.	robinjohnson@mt.gov
Scott Stewart	TruRX	scott@trurx.com
Saber Ahmed	OH Dept. of Ag	ahmed@agri.ohio.gov
Shari Shea	APHL	sharon.shea@aphl.org
Tom McKamey	Silliker Inc.	tom.mckamey@silliker.com
William Grzy	SPF	wgrzy@dianz-petfood.com
Yvonne Salfinger	AFDO consultant	yhale@aol.com

Committee Report

Committee Activities

ACTION: Agenda Approval
MOTION: “Motion to accept the agenda for the 2014 Mid-year meeting of the Lab Methods and Services Committee” passes (all in favor) (Doc #1)
ACTION: Approval of the 2014 Revision of the AAFCO QA/QC Guidelines for Feed Testing Laboratories
MOTION: “Motion to accept the Revision of the AAFCO QA/QC Guidelines for Feed Testing Laboratories as presented by the co-editors Brenda Snodgrass and Louise Ogden” and forward to the AAFCO Board of Directors for final approval. Name/Second - passes (all in favor)
ACTION: Approval of the Multi-Analyte Pesticide Method Needs Statement
MOTION: “Motion to accept the Multi-Analyte Pesticide Method Needs Statement as presented by K. Hafler as final” Name/Second - passes (all in favor)

Committee Minutes

- The Laboratory Methods and Services (LMS) committee membership roster and industry advisor listing is currently in review. New AAFCO policies and procedures necessitate reducing the "member roster" to "Active Members" only. The committee plans to develop established roles within the committee and maintain working groups to help distribute the work. Members are expected to respond to e-mails, be active in a Committee task and vote when requested. Note: you do not need to attend the AAFCO meetings to be a member of the AAFCO committee.
- People wishing to volunteer for any of the working groups should contact Aaron Price or Nancy Thiex.
- The AAFCO website may be updated pending approval of the AAFCO Board. A tab for lab issues has been set up on the current web site. The committee should identify the information and documents that should be added to update our tab.
- Updates on collab studies:
    - Starch collaborative study (update provided by Nancy Thiex): 15 labs participated in the analysis of 10 samples. AOAC to put together an Expert Review Panel (ERP) to review the study. Contact AOAC if interested and qualified to be member of the ERP. Mary Beth Hall to complete manuscript by end of January.
    - AOCS Fatty Acid Collab almost complete. Update provided at next meeting.
- Working Group updates:
    - Tylosin WG – Tom Phillips reported that he had used a Waters UltraPerformance Convergence Chromatography ($UPC^{2)}$ system that looks promising. It is based on principles of supercritical fluid chromatography. He is not considering HPLC-MS/MS because FDA's aversion for that technology.
    - Vitamin A WG – Ken Riter current Chair. Ken reported that there had not been much activity since last meeting - he is still planning to review check sample data. The WG decided to merge with the Vitamin E WG to create a Fat Soluble Vitamins WG (see below).
    - Vitamin E WG- Dorota Inerowicz current Chair. Dorota has sent an e-mail looking for interested labs. 4 labs expressed interest in working with her. The WG had had one conference call where they agreed to merge with the Vitamin A WG and form a "Fat Soluble Vitamins" WG. The two WGs to be merged mid-January. Will test submitted methods for A and E either together or separately. In the process of collecting samples and looking for suggestions/donations from manufacturers. People interested in joining should contact Dorota or Ken. In the future, vitamin D could be added to this group.
    - Sugars (mono- and disaccharide) WG - Jeff Horst current Chair. Jeff presented the responses to his recent survey (Docs #2a and 2b). It was agreed that not everyone had interpreted the questions the same way. Next followed a presentation by Andy Crawford and Jeff on the outcome of the ring trial involving the analysis of two standard solutions (0.1% and 1% sugar) (Docs #3a,3b and 3c). The ring test indicated a CV of around 10% for each solution but did not indicate any clearly superior technology as judged by the performances in the hands of the participating labs. During a get-together following the committee meeting it was agreed that the next step would involve Silliker Labs reviewing their extraction studies and if possible, share the data with other members. It was also recommended that labs do sugar determination as part of the AAFCO Check Sample program.
    - Mycotoxin WG - Vicki Siegel current Chair. Nancy mentioned that Vicki is very busy with the Check Sample program and asked for volunteers to take over as chair for the Mycotoxin Working Group. Robert Sheridan and Mary Koestner volunteered and representatives from OH Dept. of Ag expressed interest as well.
    - Best Practices WG – Lawrence Novotny co-Chair. The group has focused on "Crude Fat" as the analyte on which to establish a template. Lawrence presented a draft of the Recommendations

for comments (Doc # 4). Jimmie and Lawrence asked for feedback as to the usefulness of the document and expect to review check sample data to determine the preferred method/matrix combinations and needs for expansion of method scopes. It was recommended that the final version be posted on the AAFCO web site or similar easily accessible location to serve as a reference for regulators and industry.

Next analyte for consideration is phosphorus. People interested in participating should contact Lawrence.

- AAFCO Web-site (BIN) – Tom Phillips is one of the BIN administrators and demonstrated its capabilities. Currently the purchase of the electronic version of the OP ($70 for regulatory officials, $125 for industry) is required in order to get access. Since many industry people actively involved with AAFCO Lab related issues are unlikely to purchase the OP, Tom will check into the possibility of "duplicating" the content on the "Lab" tab on the AAFCO web-site. Tom to report back at the August meeting.
- Sampling and total uncertainty – Chuck Ramsey presented on Total Uncertainty and Sampling related issues (Docs #5a, 5b and 5c). He highlighted that sampling is becoming a hot subject. Many organizations including ISO are working on drafting guidelines covering sampling activities and accreditation for this activity may be required in the future.
- Method Needs Statements (MNS) – Aaron Price reported that the current MNS are listed on the AAFCO web site albeit somewhat buried.
    - Multi pesticide residue MNS – Robert Sheridan and Kristin Haefler presented their current version. A motion was made and the vote was unanimous to accept the draft as the final product. Next step will be to advertise for methods likely to meet the MNS.
- FDA Cooperative Agreement (FCA) –
    - QA/QC Guidelines under revision by the Quality Assurance Working Group – Brenda Snodgrass and Louise Ogden presented an overview of the revised AAFCO QA/QC Guidelines, including the recommendations above and beyond ISO 17025 for a laboratory providing analytical testing in support of feed regulatory programs. Brenda Snodgrass and Louise Ogdens's team completed the 3-volume document which is currently available for purchase ($25 for regulatory officials, $125 for Industry members). The motion was made and passed to consider the books the "final" draft ready for AAFCO Board approval and distribution.
    - Sampling WG - Ken McManus reported on a multi-lab sample preparation variation study. (Doc #6). The data will be analyzed further and a final presentation will be made at the August meeting.
    - APHL Update – Shari Shea discussed APHL activities associated with FCA including the activities associated with the Food/Feed Testing Subcommittee (Doc #7). Also reviewed were the features of the APHL web site including its discussion board (not industry accessible). Accessing the Accreditation Discussion Board on the APHL website. If you do not have a "MyAPHL" account, go to www.aphl.org and create a new account at the top right hand corner. Once you do this, you will have access to the board by simply clicking on this link; Food and Feed Laboratory Accreditation Discussion Board. If you see an access denied screen, don't give up, just click on the "request access" link. To ensure notification of all postings to the board, you may click on "set post alerts" on top of the main page to the board and provide the email address through which you want to receive alerts and specify the kind of alerts you would like to receive. APHL also has a Resource file that is open to the public as well as assist unfunded labs in getting ISO accredited.

      The updated, December 2013 version, ISO 17025 Accreditation "Available Training" Document is now available. To download it, go to the APHL Food and Feed Laboratory Accreditation-Training Resources page at http://www.aphl.org/aphlprograms/food/laboratory-accrediation/Pages/Training-Resources.aspx. The ISO/IEC 17025 Accreditation Training Steering

Committee compiled the informational resource identifying training opportunities that may be useful for those seeking ISO accreditation. The materials listed in the PDF document are training activities or materials that could be relevant to ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation. The items on the list are not specifically endorsed or recommended by APHL, AFDO, or AAFCO. The document is current as of December 18, 2013 with a planned update in six months. If you have any questions about this document, please contact Josh Rowland (josh.rowland@aphl.org).

- Collaborative Check Sample Program – Andy Crawford presented the stability study executed as part of the scheme to the program ISO approved. (Doc #8)
- AFDO update – Yvonne Salfinger reviewed AFDO deliverables under FCA. (Doc #9) Looking for professionals to register as Subject Matter Experts and offers a listing covering the contact information for Sr. Stagg at regulatory establishments in different States.
- PT program listing – Thiex reported that the PT program listing needed to be reviewed and updated. Tom Phillips, Sharon Webb, Teresa Grant and Kristina McCallum volunteered to spearhead this task. Suggested enhancing the current format by adding web links to the different supplier web sites. This task must be completed in July in time for AAFCO Board approval at the August meeting.

Discussion followed on the best way to illustrate the products resulting from the FCA and how to help labs by having activities such as roundtable discussion / webinars / workshops on how best to address accreditation challenges.

- Fertilizer ISO TAG activities and related activities – Bill Hall reported that the TAG associated with Fertilizers (ISO TC134) had been very busy, completing definitions and now evaluating new methods.
- Feed related ISO activities (ISO 34 Subcommittee 10) - Aaron Price monitors this for Canada. Nothing to report.
- AOACI Ag community – Hall reported that the Community sponsored a symposium at the AOACI annual meeting - good speakers, relatively low attendance (approx. 40) and several posters. The sampling symposium scheduled for the upcoming 2014 AOAC meeting (90min) complements well TDRM's symposium on the same subject. A WG is preparing videos addressing fertilizer sample prep and analysis by ICP.
- AAFCO Ingredient Committee related issues - Tom Phillips has been assigned the role as a liaison to the Ingredient Committee for the purpose of verifying that Ingredient Definitions list appropriate methods for verifying compliance with the definition. Lars Reimann would represent Industry on this task.
- Curriculum Framework for Laboratories – Craig Kaml presented the current status of the International Food Protection Training Institute's (IFPTI) work on putting together a competency framework and curriculum for regulatory laboratory personnel (Docs 10a and 10b).

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
All	Joining the vitamin A /E working group	Let Ken Riter and Dorota Inerowicz know if you are interested in joining	Prior to next meeting
Ken Riter & Dorota Inerowicz	Vitamin A / E working group	Review data from check sample program (CSP) to draw conclusions regarding methods in use.	Prior to next meeting
All	Vitamin A reporting	If you're reporting vitamin A data, send V Siegel an email letting her know what method you're using and give her permission for your data to be used by the working group.	Prior to next meeting
All	Carbohydrate working group	John Szpylka, Silliker to check if Silliker sugar extraction methodology comparison could be shared with other AAFCO members	By end of February
All	Best Practices working	Review draft of "Crude Fat" "Best Practices".	By end of February

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
	group	Send comments to Lawrence Novotny	
All	Best Practices working group	Contact Lawrence Novotny if interested in phosphorus methodologies.	By end of February

Model Bills and Regulations Committee (MBRC)

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 8, New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations

1) The MBRC recommends that Feed Labeling Committee changes to Model Bill Section 3(a)(4) (appendix A-1) conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership.
2) The MBRC recommends that Feed Labeling Committee changes to Model Bill Section 4(i)(1)(a) (appendix A-2) conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership.
3) The MBRC recommends that Feed Labeling Committee changes to Model Bill Section 3(a)(3)VII (appendix A-3) conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership.
4) The MBRC recommends that Pet Food Committee changes to the Dog and Cat Nutrient Profiles (appendix C) replaces existing language found on pages 149-164 in the 2014 *Official Publication* and conforms to the Model Regulations for Pet and Specialty Food, and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership.
5) The MBRC recommends that the Pet Food Committee changes to Dog and Cat Feeding Protocols (appendix D) replaces existing language found on pages 165 -175 in the 2014 *Official Publication* and conforms to the Model Regulations for Pet and Specialty Food, and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership.

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14. Board accepted recommendations 1-5 as presented by the committee.

Association Actions: None

Committee Report/Minutes

Model Bills and Regulations Committee Chairman Doug Lueders called the meeting to order at 4;08 p.m. on January 8, 2014. He welcomed committee members, industry advisers and guests who were present, and reviewed the agenda. He asked if there were any additional agenda topics, and none were offered.

In addition to Mr. Lueders, committee members participating were: Ken Bowers (KS), Bill Burkholder (FDA), *Richard Ten Eyck (OR),* Ben Jones (TX), Mike Davidson (CA), and joining via phone John Breitsman (PA), April Hunt (MI), and Paul Bachman (FDA).

Industry advisers present were: Kristi Krafka and Leah Wilkinson (AFIA); Jan Campbell and David Fairfield (NGFA); Angele Thompson and Pat Tovey (PFI); Dave Dzanis (ACVM & APPA) and Sue Hays (Wild Bird Feeding Industry).

Chairman Lueders informed members and advisers that committee minutes from the AAFCO 2013 Annual Meeting and the October 28 e-meeting had been previously approved and are posted on the AAFCO web-site and were also included in the mid-year General Session packet..

Old Business

There was no Old Business before the committee.

New Business

The committee proceeded to consider new business.

- **Feed Labeling – Regulation 3(a)(4):** The committee reviewed proposed changes to Regulation 3(a)(4) Guarantees, as submitted by the Feed Labeling Committee (appendix A-1). There was discussion about whether or not an approved AOAC method to calculate Neutral Detergent Fiber (NDF) was available. It was confirmed that the AOAC method was finalized in 2004 by USDA chemist, Dr. David Mertens. The number and title are; **AOAC Official Method 2002.04 Amylase-Treated Neutral Detergent Fiber in Feeds.** It was moved by Mr. Ten Eyck to accept the Feed Labeling Committee proposal as edited for the correct citation (appendix A-1) and forward it to the BOD with the recommendation that it conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the

proposal for future consideration of the Association membership. The motion was seconded by Dr. Burkholder. The motion was approved by a voice vote

- **Feed Labeling – Regulation 4(i)(1)(a):** The committee reviewed proposed Regulation 4(i)(1)(a) as submitted by the Feed Labeling Committee (appendix A-2). After some discussion about the wording change it was moved by Mr. Jones and seconded by Mr. Bowers that the committee accept the proposed changes as recommended by the Feed Labeling Committee and forward such changes (appendix A-2) to the Board of Directors with the recommendation that it conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership. Committee members approved the motion by a voice vote.
- **Feed Labeling – Regulation 3(a)(3)VII:** The committee reviewed the proposal submitted by the Feed Labeling Committee to add a purpose statement for a single ingredient feed (appendix A-3). After discussion about why this new purpose statement was needed it was moved by Mr. Ten Eyck to accept the Feed Labeling Committee proposal as edited for the correct citation (appendix A-3) and forward it to the BOD with the recommendation that it conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bowers. The motion was approved by a voice vote.
- **Ingredients Definitions – SUIP on feed term parts:** Mr. Ten Eyck provided background on why this SUIP (appendix B) is brought forward to the committee. It goes along with changes to the feed terms section header and modified feed terms that were approved by the AAFCO membership earlier in the day. After considerable discussion about the merits of the SUIP, Chairman Lueders reminded the Committee members and advisors that the SUIP language was previously discussed in the Ingredients Definitions Committee, approved and submitted to the Model Bill Committee for review of its consistency with the Model Bill. It was moved by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Breitsman, to send the SUIP on feed term parts (appendix B) back to the Ingredient Definitions Committee. The motion was approved by a voice vote.
- **Pet Food – Dog and Cat Nutrient Profiles:** The Pet Food Committee submitted for review Dog and Cat Nutrient Profiles to replace existing language found on pages 149-164 in the 2014 *Official Publication*. Mr. Ten Eyck made a motion that the submitted Dog and Cat Nutrient Profiles (Appendix C) be forwarded to the BOD with the recommendation that it conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership. Mr. Bowers provided a second. In the substantial discussion that followed committee advisors Ms. Thompson and Ms. Wilkinson raised the concern that the maximum calcium levels for dogs was a change not recognized by industry until after the revised Dog and Cat Nutrient Profiles were passed out of the Pet Food Committee. They encouraged the Model Bills and Regulations Committee to either accept the proposed appendix C less the maximum calcium level for dogs or not accept the proposal and return it to the Pet Food Committee. Chairman Lueders reminded the committee that their purpose is to determine if the proposed changes concur with the Model Bill and that it is up to the Pet Food Committee to discuss the technical aspects of the proposal. Chairman Lueders reminded the committee and advisors that if this motion passes, there is still opportunity for debate when it is presented to the AAFCO membership for their approval. The motion was approved by a voice vote with Dr. Burkholder abstaining.
- **Pet Food – Dog and Cat feeding Protocols:** The Pet Food Committee submitted for review Dog and Cat Feeding Protocols (appendix D) to replace existing language found on pages 165 -175 in the 2014 *Official Publication*. Dr. Burkholder explained that the document contained explanatory text that was not meant to be inserted in the protocols section. Dr. Burkholder made a motion, seconded by Mr. Jones, to accept the submitted Dog and Cat Feeding Protocols (Appendix D, online portion) be forwarded to the BOD with the recommendation that it conforms to the Model Bill and that the BOD

review the proposal for future consideration of the Association membership. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Mr. Ten Eyke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bowers, that the explanatory notes for the Dog and Cat Feeding Protocols (appendix D) be included in the minutes for this meeting and be referenced in the "what's new" section of the Official Publication when the protocols update. The motion was approved by a voice vote.

Adjournment

Given that no other business was identified, the committee meeting was adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

On behalf of the Model Bills and Regulations Committee, I respectfully submit this semi-annual report and request acceptance of the report and recommendations by the Board of Directors and the Association Membership.

Appendix A—Model Bills and Regulations Committee (MBRC)

Attachments for January 8, 2014 meeting

Appendix A-1

Regulation 3(a)(4) Guarantees - Crude Protein, Equivalent Crude Protein from NonProtein Nitrogen, Amino Acids, Crude Fat, Crude Fiber, Acid Detergent Fiber, **Neutral Detergent Fiber,** Calcium, Phosphorus, Salt and Sodium shall be the sequence of nutritional guarantees when such guarantee is stated. Other required and voluntary guarantees should follow in a general format such that the units of measure used to express guarantees (percentage, parts per million, International Units, etc.) are listed in a sequence that provides a consistent grouping of the units of measure.

Appendix A-2

Regulation 4(i)(1)(a)

(i) Guarantees for dietary starch, sugars, and fructans for Commercial Feeds, other than customer-formula feed, Pet Food and Specialty Pet Food Products:

(1) A commercial feed which bears on its labeling a claim in any manner for levels of "dietary starch," "sugars," "fructans," or words of similar designation, shall include on the label:

(a) Guarantees for maximum percentage of dietary starch and maximum percentage sugars, in the Guaranteed Analysis section immediately following the last fiber guarantee.

Appendix A-3

Regulation 3VII. The statement of purpose for single ingredient feeds shall be stated as "Single Ingredient Feed" or "Feed Ingredient". The manufacturer of a single ingredient feed or feed ingredient shall have flexibility in describing in more specific and common language the intended use of the feed ingredient dependent on species and class."

Appendix B—SUIP Feed Term Policy on Parts

"It is acceptable to use a combination of a "process" feed term and a defined ingredient or common or usual name when describing an ingredient in the ingredient statement as long as the ingredient is not nutritionally altered from the original. If the ingredient has gone through a recognized review process the name may include a "part" feed term."

Appendix C—PFC Proposed Revisions to the AAFCO Dog and Cat Food Nutrient Profiles

For the sake of brevity, Appendix C, containing the proposed revisions, is not included here, but may be viewed in full at http://www.aafco.org/Meetings/AnnualMeetings/2014.aspx.

Appendix D—Proposed Updates to the AAFCO Dog and Cat Food Feeding Protocols

Rationale for Changes to the AAFCO Dog and Cat Food Feeding Protocols

The proposed changes made by the Feeding Protocols Expert Subcommittee (FPES) are identified throughout the proposed updates to the AAFCO Dog and Cat Food Feeding Protocols, using underlined text to indicate text to be added and ~~struck-through text~~ to indicate text to be deleted. A few changes are editorial without substantive effect on how the protocols are performed or interpreted. The remaining proposed changes are substantive. The FPES felt these substantive changes were needed in order to unequivocally indicate how a specific aspect of a protocol was to be accomplished and to ensure the validity of the protocols for establishing nutritional adequacy of products. All substantive changes, as well as some of the editorial changes, are discussed and justified below.

A paragraph was added to the beginning of the AAFCO Dog and Cat Food Feeding Protocols to clearly indicate that successful passage of a protocol validates the nutritional adequacy of the tested product's ingredient formula and the resulting nutrient profile for the species and life stage(s) to which the product was fed. The paragraph adds the clarification that for the claim to be valid, the nutrient profile of the product as formulated and tested should remain stable through the end of the product's expected shelf life.

Editorial Changes

A sentence was inserted in the paragraph titled "DOGS" in the MINIMUM FEEDING PROTOCOL FOR PROVING AN ADULT MAINTENANCE CLAIM FOR A DOG FOOD to clearly indicate that historical colony averages must be determined from animals in the testing facility and that those animals must accurately represent the size and breed of the animals in the test group. An identical sentence was also inserted in the paragraph describing the animals (i.e., CATS, PUPPIES, KITTENS) in each of the subsequent protocols for the same reason and consistency.

The outline format used in certain sections throughout the protocols was standardized for consistency to that used in other sections. The format is: uppercase letter followed by a period, alphanumeric number followed by a period, lowercase letter followed by a period (i.e.,

A.
B.
    1.
    2.
        a.
        b.)

The first instance of such a revision in formatting occurs in the section titled CLINICAL OBSERVATIONS AND MEASUREMENTS in the MINIMUM FEEDING PROTOCOL FOR PROVING AN ADULT MAINTENANCE CLAIM FOR A DOG FOOD. Similar revisions for the same purpose occur in other sections throughout the protocols.

Substantive Changes

The current AAFCO Feeding Protocols state, "Daily food consumption may be measured and recorded." As written, this statement makes any measurement and record of daily food consumption optional; it may be, but does not have to be, measured and recorded. Furthermore, the daily food consumption does not have to be assignable to an individual animal. The FPES believes that any well- conducted feeding protocol would have individual daily food consumption measured and recorded as basic, standard data collected during performance of a feeding protocol. The FPES considered that some facilities may feed animals as groups rather than individuals, but also notes that the protocols allow for individual animals to be removed during the first two weeks of the study "for non-nutritional reasons or poor food intake." As a compromise to requiring that individual daily food consumption must be measured and recorded under any and all conditions, the FPES proposes that if the option of removing animals for poor food intake is to be exercised, then poor food intake of the individuals removed from the study must be documented and thus individual food intake must be measured and recorded. To state the condition another way, the language inserted into criterion A. of the CLINICAL OBSERVATIONS AND MEASUREMENTS section of

each protocol effectively causes the option of removing animals for poor food intake to be forfeited if individual food consumption is not, or cannot, be measured and recorded.

Minimum Feeding Protocol for Proving an Unqualified Representation of Nutritional Adequacy for a Dog or Cat Food

The words “an unqualified claim for” were added to the first sentence of the first paragraph in the section titled MINIMUM FEEDING PROTOCOL FOR PROVING AN UNQUALIFIED REPRESENTATION OF NUTRITIONAL ADEQUACY FOR A DOG OR CAT FOOD to indicate what type of nutritional adequacy claim the “minimum testing” was substantiating. As previously worded, it could be argued that the minimum testing necessary to prove nutritional adequacy was something less extensive than sequential gestation/lactation and growth protocols. The word “weaning” was inserted into the last sentence of the paragraph because a lag period of several days to weeks could occur between weaning and the beginning of a growth protocol. The FPES deemed that test animals used in the growth protocol should receive only the test diet during any intermittent lag between the end of lactation and the beginning of growth protocols when the protocols were run sequentially for establishment of an unqualified (i.e., an All Life Stages) claim.

Probabilities, Standard Errors and Allowance for Normal Variation for Interpretation of Protocol Measurements

The FPES considered changing the probability of committing a type I error, plus the associated parameter values for standard error and allowance for normal variation, to 0.05 (5%) and associated values for normally distributed data with a sample size of n=8. A Type I error is judging the values for a nutritional indicator parameter in a control versus a test group to be different when in fact they are not. For a given sample size, the probability of committing a type I error is inversely proportional to the probability of committing a type II error. A Type II error is not judging the values for a nutritional indicator parameter in a control versus a test group to be different, when in fact they are different. A smaller probability, or likelihood, of a type I error, increases the probability, or likelihood, of concluding that the test diet is equal to the control diet when, in fact, it is not. This means the test diet passes the protocol and is certified as nutritionally adequate when it is not adequate.

However, during full committee review of the proposed changes, historical knowledge revealed that a probability of 0.05 had initially been used when the protocols were established but appeared overly strict with few products passing the protocols to which the products were subjected. A reexamination noted that, particularly for blood parameters, multiple comparisons were being performed and that some control for committing Type I errors was required. Given that there were 4 blood parameters in dogs (hemoglobin, packed cell volume, albumin, alkaline phosphatase) and 5 in cats (hemoglobin, packed cell volume, taurine, albumin, alkaline phosphatase) being determined on one sample, a Bonferroni correction was applied that lowered the value to 0.01 (1%) for each individual comparison and an approximate value of 0.05% for all combined comparisons of the blood parameters.

The FPES noted that for comparison of body weight and weight gain the probability was set at 0.05 for adult maintenance protocols, but at 0.01 for mothers and offspring in the growth and gestation/lactation protocols. Comparison of litter size was also set at 0.01 in gestation/lactation protocols. The FPES returned the probability for committing a type I error to the generally used value of 0.05 (5%) for comparisons of body weights in all protocols and litter sizes in gestation/lactation protocols, but retained the probability of 0.01 (1%) for comparison of blood parameters.

Minimum Feeding Protocol for Proving a Growth Claim for a Dog Food (Growth— Dog)

Because there are documented differences in the rate and magnitude of increased body weight between growing male and female dogs within the same breed, the FPES inserted additional language in the PUPPIES section. The proposed changes now require that historical colony averages for weight gain must be determined for each sex. The colony average for weight gain of male puppies must be determined using a minimum of 30 male puppies and similarly a minimum of 30 female puppies to determine the colony average for weight gain of female puppies. This is in addition to the previously discussed specification that historical colony averages be acquired from a similar population of animals within the same testing facility accurately representing the size and breed of the test group. Unlike weight gain, the other measured parameters specified in the protocol have not been shown to be gender

dependent, so historical colony averages for parameters other than weight gain can be determined from a minimum of 30 individual puppies. All of the data for all of the non-weight gain parameters must come from the same puppies. The remaining changes in the PUPPIES section were made for clarity and readability.

In addition to the previously noted changes in the statistical values for weight gain comparisons, the FPES increased the weight gain criterion in C.1 for passing the GROWTH – DOG protocol from 75% to 80% of the historical colony average. The FPES notes that for cats the criterion has been 80% and sees no reason why the criterion for puppies should be less than that for cats.

Given that gender is a factor in the amount of weight gained during growth, the influence of gender must be accounted for in the statistical evaluation of weight gain and the mathematic equations for doing so are slightly more complex than for comparison of other parameters. Therefore, the FPES created two appendices that contain, respectively, the formulas for calculating the adjusted historical colony average and standard error used in criteria C.2, and the average weight gain and normal variation from the concurrent control group used in criteria C.3 for evaluating weight gain. Reference is made to the appropriate appendix in each of the protocols where weight gained of growing animals is a parameter evaluated for documenting nutritional adequacy of the test diet. As discussed above, the factors used in calculating the standard error and normal variation have been adjusted for weight gain to those associated with a probability of 0.05 for committing a type I error with n=8 subjects per group.

Minimum Feeding Protocol for Proving a Growth Claim for a Cat Food (Growth—Cat)

The same changes discussed above for the GROWTH - DOG protocol were made in the GROWTH - CAT protocol other than the change for INTERPRETATION criterion C.1 which was already at 80% of the historical colony average.

Minimum Feeding Protocol for Proving a Gestation/Lactation Claim for a Dog Food (Gestation/Lactation—Dog)

In addition to changes indicated and discussed above, the FPES deleted the references to normal litter size and the allowance for redistributing puppies among bitches of the same breed with smaller litters based on lack of practical applicability. Similar to the increase from 75% to 80% of the historical colony average for average body weight in INTERPRETATION C.1 section of the GROWTH – DOG protocol, and for the same reasons, the FPES increased the criterion in D.1 of the INTERPRETATION section of the GESTATION/LACTATION - DOG protocol to 80% of the historical colony average for average body weight of puppies at the end of lactation.

Minimum Feeding Protocol for Proving a Gestation/Lactation Claim for a Cat Food (Gestation/Lactation—Cat)

All of the changes that occur in the GESTATION/LACTATION - CAT protocol also occur in other feeding protocols and have been discussed above. The FPES proposes to delete the provision for removing kittens from queens with litters larger than five kittens for similar reasons for removing the like provision in the GESTATION/LACTATION – DOG protocol.

Criteria for Substantiation of Continued Validity of Nutritional Adequacy Based on Feeding Protocol Results

The FPES established a new section and requirement to address formula stability and continued validity of feeding protocol-based nutritional adequacy claims.

For the purposes of describing the criteria for substantiating continued validity of nutritional adequacy of products based on feeding protocol results, the FPES defined a “protocol substantiated formula.” As stated in the new paragraph added to the beginning of the AAFCO DOG AND CAT FOOD FEEDING PROTOCOLS, a feeding protocol validates the nutritional adequacy of the tested product’s ingredient formula and the resulting nutrient profile for the species and life stage(s) to which the product was fed. The FPES specified formula changes that would require re-substantiation of nutritional adequacy using either a newly performed feeding protocol or demonstration that the resulting formula meets the criteria of being a Pet Food Product Family member formula with the “protocol substantiated formula” being the lead member of the Pet Food Product Family.

Because nutrient composition may be altered over time by many factors, including ingredient sources or changes in processing techniques, the FPES felt it prudent to establish criteria for substantiating continued validity of nutritional adequacy. A formula established as stable confirms the continued validity of nutritional adequacy of products based on feeding protocol results. This is to be done every five years for protocol substantiated formulas and Pet Food Product Family members.

For protocol substantiated formulas, continued validity of nutritional adequacy can be demonstrated either by: re-performing the feeding protocol; or by demonstrating that marketed protocol substantiated formula(s) bearing a feeding protocol substantiated claim for nutritional adequacy contain at least 95% of each of the key nutrients used for establishment of a family member product compared to the content of these nutrients in the product used in the original feeding protocol(s). Monte Carlo simulations using check sample data for estimating variances of the 6 nutrients used for dog foods, or 8 nutrients used for cat foods, to establish Pet Food Product Families predict that 95% of the products should be capable of meeting the criteria for successful demonstration of product stability. Pet Food Family member products must demonstrate the currently marketed product still meets the criteria for being considered a Pet Food Product Family member compared to data from the original “protocol substantiated formula” being used as the reference nutrient values of the lead member of the Pet Food Product Family.

For the sake of brevity, the revisions are not included here. Appendix D, including the proposed revisions, can be viewed in full at http://www.aafco.org/Meetings/AnnualMeetings/2014.aspx.

Pet Food Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 9, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m., New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations: None

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

Committee members present included Jan Jarman (MN) Chair, Kristen Green (KY) Vice-Chair, Bill Burkholder (FDA-CVM), Stan Cook (MO), Sam Davis (SC), Eric Nelson (FDA-CVM), Richard Ten Eyck (OR) BOD Liaison, Lizette Beckman (WA). Committee members present by conference call included: Liz Higgins (NM), Johanna Phillips (ID), Donna Dicesare (NY), Charlotte Conway (FDA-CVM).
Committee advisors present included: David Fairfield (NGFA), Jason Vickers (AFIA), David Meeker (NRA), Angela Mills (NGFA), Angele Thompson (PFI), Pat Tovey (PFI), Dave Dzanis (ACVN & APPA), Leah Wilkinson (AFIA), Susan Thixton (AFTP), Mollie Morrissette (AFTP), Charles Starkey (USPEA).
103 Industry and Consumer Representatives and Guests along with 25 Control Officials were in attendance at the Pet Food Committee (PFC) Meeting in person or by conference call.

Committee Report

Committee Activities

ACTION: PFC accepted the Report from the AAFCO Pet Food & Specialty Pet Food Labeling Guide and Label Review Checklist Working Group, containing the proposed revisions to the Pet Food Label Review Checklist.
MOTION: Liz Higgins (NM) moved, Stan Cook (MO) seconded. Motion carried.
ACTION: PFC accepted the proposed revisions to the tables in Model Regulations PF2(i) on page 137 (2014 OP) and PF3(c) on page 138 to include 'greater than' (>) and 'less than or equal to' (≤) symbols; and a revision to the title of the table in PF3(c) to state 'Maximum "with" Claim Type Size' and submits the revisions to the Model Bills and Regulations Committee.
MOTION: Johanna Phillips (ID) moved, Kristen Green (KY) seconded. Motion carried.

Committee Minutes

- **Announcements (Jan Jarman, MN)**

  Jan Jarman (MN) introduced new PFC Members Stephanie Walthall of the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and Lizette Beckman of the Washington State Department of Agriculture, and new Advisors Charles Starkey and James Emerson, representing the U.S. Poultry and Egg Association (USPEA).

  Chair Jan Jarman (MN) reminded the committee that Liz Higgins of the New Mexico Department of Agriculture has resigned as Co-Chair of the PFC although she will remain a member. The PFC sincerely thanks Liz for her years of dedication to the PFC.

  The PFC minutes from the 2013 Annual Meeting in St. Pete were previously accepted by e-vote by the committee on October 11, 2013.

  Richard Ten Eyck (OR) discussed the status of the "AAFCO Talks Pet Food" consumer level website. Dave Syverson is writing the content and Dave Dzanis will be editing the content. The PFC will review once the basic content has been prepared.

- **Modifications to the Agenda (Jan Jarman, MN)**

  Due to the controversy and procedural issues surrounding the maximum calcium values in the revised Dog Food Nutrient Profiles, Jan Jarman (MN) requested that additional discussion be added to the agenda, prior to the last agenda item.
  MOTION: Sam Davis (SC) moved to add this as an agenda item, Kristen Green (KY) seconded. Motion carried.

- **Small Manufacturers Working Group/AAFCO Pet Food Website (Jan Jarman, MN)**
  Jan Jarman (MN) reported that the work group has not met recently. The dates on some of the fact sheets on the Business of Pet Food website may need updating. Johanna Phillips (ID) mentioned that the revised Pet Food Labeling Checklist may require the addition to the website of links to certain federal labeling requirements and she will communicate this information to Jenny Bibb (MS).
- **Carbohydrate Working Group (Jan Jarman, MN)**
  Jan Jarman (MN) reported that the Working Group is currently looking at draft regulations to allow inclusion of Nitrogen Free Extract (NFE) content statements on pet food labels. While a starch analysis method for animal feed will be available shortly, a sugars method is likely several years away. Listing the NFE content on a label is a way to provide some carbohydrate information to customers, because total carbohydrates cannot be guaranteed. The NFE value is a calculated value, but it is already being utilized within the context of making calorie content statements. This would not be a guarantee, but a statement similar to calorie content statements. Regulations for stating NFE on pet food labels could be separate from, but similar to, PF9 and/or PF10; or could be included in PF9 and/or PF10. The Working Group expects to present a final report to the committee prior to the 2014 Annual Meeting. Richard Ten Eyck suggested that draft language should be submitted to the Laboratory Methods and Services Committee, but others did not think this would be necessary because NFE is not a laboratory method.
- **AAFCO Pet Food & Specialty Pet Food Labeling Guide and Label Review Checklist Working Group (Johanna Phillips, ID)**
  The Working Group has completed revisions to the Label Review Checklist to be consistent with changes that have been made to the Model Regulations for Pet and Specialty Pet Food. The Working Group also added sections on direct-fed microbials, enzymes, raw milk and specific information relevant to specialty pets. The next course of action for the Working Group will be to update the Pet Food and Specialty Pet Food Labeling Guide.

  There was some discussion about whether the Checklist should go to the Board of Directors or the Model Bills and Regulations Committee. While there were no objections to the Checklist by industry advisors, there was concern that there was not sufficient time or the ability to provide information to review to their members. Therefore, the committee accepted the report and plans to discuss it in Sacramento.
- **Listing of ingredients which themselves contain two or more ingredients (William Burkholder FDA-CVM)**
  Control officials have lately been seeing many examples of labeling including lists of ingredients in parentheses. For example: "Protein products (chicken, beef, etc.)", "Fruit pomace (apple, grape, etc.)" or "Vegetable and fruit blend (carrot, apple, etc.)." Bill Burkholder (FDA) stated that federal regulations allow for parenthetical listings if the ingredient in question is itself comprised of two or more ingredients and which has an established common or usual name, conforms to a standard established pursuant to the Meat Inspection or Poultry Products Inspection Acts, or conforms to a definition and standard of identity established pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The examples cited above do not conform to these requirements and therefore cannot be listed in this fashion on pet food labels but should instead be listed by each accepted common or usual name in order of their inclusion by weight in the overall formula. FDA recognizes AAFCO defined feed ingredient names as the common and usual names. If a firm wished to pursue parenthetical labeling as described above, they would need at a minimum to pursue a feed ingredient definition and would need to be careful that they are not trying to create a collective term because collective terms are not allowed on pet food labeling. The minerals and vitamins parenthetical listing is an example of enforcement discretion by FDA-CVM and it is not expected that additional enforcement discretion for other similar parenthetically listed ingredients that fall outside of the standards of identity would be granted.
- **Proposal to amend the tables PF2(i) on page 137 (2014 OP) and PF3(c) on page 138 to include 'greater than' and/or 'less than or equal to' symbols; and amend the title of the table PF3(c) on page 124 to state 'Maximum "with" Claim Type Size' (Johanna Phillips, ID)**
  Issue: PF2(i) includes a table specifying the minimum type size of the warning statement required on the label of raw milk distributed as pet food or specialty pet food. The minimum type size of the statement is based on the area of the panel. The way it is currently written, the table indicates two different minimum type sizes for the warning statement on a panel of 25, 100 or 400 sq. in.

The proposal is to amend the panel sizes in the table to include '≤' or '>' symbols so that only one minimum warning statement type size is indicated for each range of panel sizes. This change also corresponds to how these values appear in 21CFR 501.105 (the height of the declaration of net quantity of contents in relation to the area of the principal display panel). There was discussion about the relationship between 21CFR 501.105 and these tables, and concern was raised about changing the tables. It was clarified that the "greater than" and "less than or equal to" symbols in the table are modeled after the format in 21CFR 501.105(i). The addition of the symbols is simply intended to provide clarity to the table and better mimic the format in 21CFR 501.105.
The proposed revisions are:

Panel Size	Minimum Warning Statement Type Size
~~<~~≤ 5 sq. in. (replace '<' with '≤')	1/16"
> 5 – ≤ 25 sq. in.	1/8"
> 25 – ≤ 100 sq. in	3/16"
> 100 – ≤ 400 sq. in.	1/4"
> 400 sq. in.~~+~~ (delete '+')	1/2"

Issue: PF3(c) includes a table specifying the maximum type size of a "with (ingredient)" claim when it appears in a product name or elsewhere on the product label. The maximum type size of the "with" claim is based on the area of the panel. The way it is currently written, the table indicates two different maximum type sizes for the "with" claim on a panel of 25, 100 or 400 sq. in.

The proposal is to amend the panel sizes in the table to include '≤' or '>' symbols so that only one maximum type size of the "with" claim is indicated for each range of panel sizes. This change also corresponds to how these values appear in 21 CFR 501.105. In addition, the heading for the column of maximum "with" claim type sizes is revised to change the position of the closing quote symbols in the heading.
The proposed revisions are:

Panel Size	Maximum "with" Claim~~"~~ Type Size (delete " after Claim)
~~<~~≤ 5 sq. in. (replace '<' with '≤')	1/8"
> 5 – ≤ 25 sq. in.	1/4"
> 25 – ≤ 100 sq. in	3/8"
> 100 – ≤ 400 sq. in.	1/2"
> 400 sq. in.~~+~~ (delete '+')	1"

- **Discussion of Maximum Calcium Values in the Dog Food Nutrient Profiles – Added Agenda Item (Jan Jarman, MN)**

There has been significant controversy and confusion about the maximum calcium value listed in the revised Dog Food Nutrient Profiles that were forwarded at this meeting from the Model Bills and Regulations Committee to the Board of Directors. The minutes from the 2013 Midyear meeting in Albuquerque show the revised maximum calcium value as 1.8% for all life stages of all dogs. The original recommendation from the Canine Nutrition Expert Subcommittee (CNES) was for a maximum of 1.8% calcium only for growth and reproduction of large size dogs. Several committee members and advisors do not recall discussing or changing the maximum calcium value from the CNES recommendation at the Albuquerque meeting. Because of these issues, it was decided to address the maximum calcium values at the 2013 Annual Meeting in St. Pete. At that time it was voted to set the maximum calcium value at 1.8% for growth and reproduction of all dogs, and 2.5% for maintenance. Committee advisors have expressed concern about the short amount of time they had to review the values that were presented and accepted in St. Pete.

Angele Thompson (PFI) and Jason Vickers (AFIA) commented on the impact of these values on industry and consumers. They noted that the changes in the calcium maximum will put a regulatory burden on the regulatory officials and industry. There would be a considerable difference in regulatory burden to industry between setting a maximum calcium value of 1.8% for growth and reproduction of all size dogs vs. just large size dogs. A potential change to 1.8% maximum calcium for growth and reproduction of all size dogs would affect products with existing consumer usage.

Companies need to evaluate all approaches which could include reformulation and/or labeling changes.

A maximum calcium level of 1.8% for growth and reproduction of all dogs would also apply to foods formulated for all life stages. In order to keep the 'all life stages' nutritional adequacy statement, products intended for all sizes of dogs and containing more than 1.8% calcium would have to either be relabeled for maintenance only, and new products created for all life stages; or reformulated to contain no more than 1.8% calcium. The estimated cost of this reformulation would be more than 36 million dollars. Either option could result in products being removed from the market and lost to customers. If a maximum calcium level of 1.8% were to be set for growth and reproduction of just large size dogs, products intended for all life stages and containing more than 1.8% calcium could be relabeled to exclude growth and reproduction of large size dogs only, rather than excluding growth and reproduction of all size dogs. Reformulation of existing 'all life stages' products with more than 1.8% calcium, or development of new products, would only need to be done for products for large size dogs.

There is also concern about the availability of appropriate protein sources needed to meet the lower maximum calcium value of 1.8%. It was noted that the CNES considered only the science and that the Pet Food Committee (PFC) should also consider the regulatory aspects of revising the Nutrient Profiles.

Susan Thixton (ATAPF) asked if the nutrient concentrations and availabilities of "whole" foods could be considered in any review of the Nutrient Profiles. She stated that the National Research Council (NRC) nutrient recommendations were based on the nutrient content and availability of ingredients used in the most popular pet foods, but there are so many different types of pet food available now, including those made with "whole" foods. Jan Jarman (MN) stated that the development of the revised Nutrient Profiles was a long and arduous process and has been under discussion for so long that only the maximum calcium values could be reconsidered. Bill Burkholder (CVM) said that nutrient availability was discussed in the first few paragraphs of the Profiles document. It was also noted that meeting the Nutrient Profiles is not the only way to substantiate that a food is complete and balanced. Formulas substantiated by feeding trials would not be limited to a maximum of 1.8% calcium.

Jan Jarman (MN) asked if the PFC members and advisors want to consider these additional issues prior to the 2014 Annual Meeting. Only the maximum calcium value in the revised Dog Food Nutrient Profiles would be discussed. Of concern is ensuring that the Nutrient Profiles stay on track for consideration by the general membership in Sacramento, given the enormous amount of time and effort the CNES and the PFC put into the revised Nutrient Profiles. It was also noted that an implementation time period had not been set for the revised Nutrient Profiles, similar to what was set for the recent revision of PF9.

Jan Jarman (MN) will send to the PFC the documents pertinent to the maximum calcium discussion. Some options suggested include (1) to recommend to the Board of Directors that they send the Dog Food Nutrient Profiles back to the PFC, (2) to do nothing and allow the general membership to vote in Sacramento on the revised Nutrient Profiles as they currently stand or (3) to form a new working group to look only at the maximum calcium value.

- **Discussion of unclear and ambiguous items in the Model Regulations for Pet and Specialty Pet Food Under the Model Bill, and potential revisions (Jan Jarman MN)**
  Tabled due to lack of time.
- **MOTION to adjourn:** Sam Davis (SC) moved, Kristen Green (KY) seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 3:33 pm.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Jan J.	Revisions to Tables in PF2(i) & PF3(c)	Submit to Model Bills and Regulations Committee	April 1, 2014
Jan J.	Maximum calcium values	Resubmit to PFC the question of maximum calcium values in the AAFCO Dog Food	April 1, 2014

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
		Nutrient Profiles.	
Jan J.	Carbohydrate Working Group report	Submit to PFC.	2 mos. prior to 2014 Annual Meeting
Johanna P.	Pet Food and Specialty Pet Food Labeling Guide	Working Group to begin work. Provide Jenny Bibb with appropriate links to federal regulations to place on the Business of Pet Food website.	Ongoing
Jenny B.	Business of Pet Food website	Review publication dates of documents linked from the website.	

Strategic Affairs Committee Report/Minutes

2014 AAFCO Midyear Meeting
January 10, 8:00–10:00 a.m., New Orleans, Louisiana

Committee Recommendations:

1) To send the Terms and Conditions for Committees, etc., language (Appendix 1) to the membership for vote. Section editor, Ken Bowers, will integrate the text into the Committee Guidelines section of the OP.
2) To send the Budget Creation Procedure language (Appendix 2) on to the membership to vote for inclusion in the OP.

Board Recommendations: Report accepted on 5/5/14. Board accepted recommendations 1-2 as presented by the committee.

Association Actions: None

Committee Participants

Full Committee Members

Linda Morrison	Paul Bachman	Ken Bowers	Sam Davis
Andy Gray	Roger Hoestenbach	April Hunt	Jamey Johnson
Shannon Jordre	Ali Kashani	Mark LeBlanc	Chad Linton
Dragan Momcilovic	Jenny Murphy	Aaron Price	Richard TenEyck
Nancy Thiex	Judy Thompson	Robert Waltz, Vice Chairperson (Board Liaison)	

Finance Sub-Committee

Ali Kashani, Chair	Ken Bowers	Jamey Johnson	Mark LeBlanc
Chad Linton	Richard TenEyck	Judy Thompson	

By-Laws Sub-Committee

Ken Bowers, Chair	Sam Davis	April Hunt

Committee Advisors

Dave Ailor	Nancy Cook	Dave Dzanis	Bob Ehart
Dave Fairfield	Kurt Gallagher	Kristi Krafka	Ed Rod
Richard Sellers			

Committee Report:

Working Group (Roger/Shannon/Bob):

- Terms and Conditions for Committees, Working Groups etc., (Appendix 1)
  - Finalized draft received and distributed for Committee consideration December, 2013. No additional feedback has been received.
  - Integrate into Committee Guidelines section of the OP (pages 94-101)
    MOTION: "To accept the report for the Terms and Conditions for Committees, Working Groups etc. (Annex 1)." Shannon / Richard: Motion: passes
    MOTION: "To send the language (Appendix 1) to the membership for vote. Section editor, Ken Bowers, will integrate the text into the Committee Guidelines section of the OP."
    Richard/Shannon: Motion passes
  - The Board has requested that definitions also be created for Committee Chairperson, Co-Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.
    ACTION: Judy and Ken will work on a draft for consideration at the Annual meeting.
- Committee coordination processes - Procedures Manual review
  ACTION: Working group will begin work for consideration at the Annual meeting.

Sub-Committee activities:

- By-Laws: Ken
  - Nil report
- Finance: Ali
  - Annual budget creation procedure report was accepted by the committee in August. No addition

feedback has been received.
MOTION: "To send the language on to the membership to vote for inclusion in the OP."
Richard/Mark: Motion passes
ACTION: Sub-Committee Chair to review and provide recommendations on incorporation into the OP

- Strategic Plan Priority Activities 2013-16
  - Review workplan status for all priority activities: Linda
    - Workplans reviewed by Board, December 2013:
      1) Sound financial planning / More cost effective operations: Ali
      2) Revenue Generation Plan: Ali
      3) Process for new members: Jennifer G./ Ali
      4) Build leaders with AAFCO background who support AAFCO: Linda/Glo
      5) Emergency Preparedness Exercise: Judy
      6) Partnership establishment: Jennifer G./ Ali
      7) Support APHL Grant: Nancy
      8) Enhanced Communications (6 sub-elements): Jennifer G./ Ali
    - Plans acceptable with request for slight reorganization of one activity by CIOC and request that CIOC add timelines to their plan
    - All workplans will be integrated into a tracking system in the FeedBin. Richard has started work but a small group is needed to establish overall organization, integrated tracking and individual workplan content.
      ACTION: Bob W. (Vice) (lead), Jenny and Richard will work on an integrated template with FASS support for detail input. Kurt (PFI) may be interested and will follow up. It was suggested that a webinar be held, including Linda, for the initial conversation, preferably at the beginning of February.
  - Review SAC related work plans – updated documents to be provided by Sept. 30th, 2013
    - Sound financial planning / More cost effective operations: nil report as Ali unable to make meeting
    - Revenue Generation Plan: nil report as Ali unable to make meeting
    - Build leaders with AAFCO background who support AAFCO: timeline delayed a bit.
      ACTION: Jenny and working group will be updating timeline at the beginning of February.
- Committee structure review
  - post implementation evaluation needs to commence.
    ACTION: Mark (lead), Judy and Richard. Suggestion is to start with survey of Committee chairs, advisors and members. The group will put forth a proposed plan at the Annual meeting.

Committee has not identified any specific financial needs from the 2014-15 budget.
MOTION: "To accept the Strategic Affairs Committee report, subject to minor edits/formatting."
Mark/Richard: Motion passes.

Action Item Table

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
Working Group: Roger, Shannon, Ali and Ken	Phase 1: Review terms and conditions of Committees, Sub-Committees, Working Groups, Task Forces and Investigators, for more efficient effective work flow	Revised version was submitted to SAC August 9, 2013 and discussed at the SAC meeting August 14, 2013. Draft returned to WG to align text for Advisors and Task Forces with that in the OP (pp. 80-87 and 121 respectively). Final version shared with SAC December 2013 and accepted at Midyear, January 2014. Committee recommendation to Board/membership for vote/acceptance	Complete pending membership acceptance
	Phase 2: general review of the Procedures Manual to ensure timely work flow between	Goal: increased engagement with related Committees such as Model Bill and Regulation to minimize work movement between Committees and the Board as well as minimize double voting with sub-Committees and	WG to provide first draft for Committee consideration at Annual meeting, August 2014

Responsible	Item	Action	Timing / Status
	Committees	Committees. Align with Phase 1 timeline. Ken Bowers added to the WG to coordinate with OP pp. 80-87 revisions.	
Ken and Judy	Create definitions for Committee Chairperson, Co-Chairperson and Vice Chairperson		Provide draft for consideration at the Annual meeting, August 2014
Finance Sub-Committee	Building base budget and scenarios for new revenue streams Sub-Committee also needs to develop: - Budget - Long term investment strategy	Charge: "Provide oversight of financial planning for long-term financial stability. Identify and pursue revenue generating opportunities by conducting analyses, sourcing funds and making recommendations to the Board. Further identify productive uses and justification for funding needs." 2013 Budget developed and approved by Board January 21, 2013. Investment strategy developed and implemented May 2013 (Complete). Budget creation procedure report submitted and accepted by SAC, August 14, 2013. Standardized funding request format will be added to the committee report template. SAC to budget creation procedure accepted and forwarded to the Board membership for vote/acceptance	Budget creation procedure complete pending membership acceptance. Sub-Committee Chair to review and provide recommendations on incorporation into the OP.
Work group: Bob W. (Vice) (lead), Jenny and Richard [Kurt (PFI) may be interested and will follow up]	Strategic Plan and identification of Priority Action Items	Strategic Plan key priorities for 2013-16 completed by Board October, 2012 (Washington, D.C.). Priority goals, outcomes, activities and Committee assignments established and posted on web site. Shared with Committee Chairs for review, work assignment and workplan drafting (November 2012-January 2012). December 2013: All workplans submitted and reviewed by the Board of Directors. Workplans accepted with adjustments requested of CIOC (slight re-structure and addition of timelines	Integrated Tracking system will be implemented in FeedBin with FASS support for detail input. Suggested a webinar be held initially, including Linda, preferably at the beginning of February. Updated workplans will be requested based on work at Midyear 2014 (Linda).
Strategic Affairs: Mark (lead), Judy and Richard	Schedule review of Committee structure two years after implementation to make sure re-organization has been of value.	Suggestion is to start with survey of Committee chairs, advisors and members.	Proposed plan will be presented at the Annual meeting. August 2014

Appendix 1—Functional Collective Terms for AAFCO Working Structure

(Version 2, edited January 19, 2011 (Roger Hoestenbach); Version 3, September 17, 2013 (R.D. Waltz); Version 4, October 9, 2013 (Linda Morrison); Final Draft Version, December 16, 2013 (Linda Morrison & R.D. Waltz); accepted and approved by SAC, January 10, 2014

Advisors – May be requested by the President to represent industry/trade and consumer groups on AAFCO committees, task forces, or working groups. Following all nominations, the President, with the advice of the Board, may accept representatives. The President may also choose to appoint other individuals. Generally, the President and Board take into consideration the individual's demonstrated expertise on a given subject matter, their willingness to work with others in AAFCO, and their ability to facilitate the goals of the organization. These advisors will be called upon to answer questions relevant to animal nutrition, analytical expertise, industry practices, or other pertinent questions. The number of advisors is usually limited by the size of the committee. In accordance with the By-Laws, advisors cannot vote.

Committees - May be established by the Board of Directors. Members of Committees are appointed by the President, with the advice of the Board. Committees may have regularly scheduled meetings at the Mid-year and Annual meetings. Priorities and goals should be established at the Annual Meeting. These are to be submitted to the President-Elect after the Annual Meeting. Committees are composed of AAFCO members. Size of the committee may depend on both the duties of the committee and interest in participating in that committee's charges.

Coordinators - Are generally individuals, or small groups appointed by the President that serve in place of a standing committee when the role that needs to be filled is either very limited in scope or would function less effectively as a larger committee. (e.g., *Feed Safety Coordinator*)

Expert Panels – May be convened at any time, by a Committee, Task Force, or Investigator if deemed necessary to assist in the provision of advice. The terms of reference and duration of the panel shall be set out when the Panel is created. If the AAFCO Board has not expressly identified any experts in specific fields of expertise, then the Committee/Task Force/ Investigator is encouraged to make their own selection based on most knowledgeable persons that can be identified. The experts are not limited to academia but expert panelists should not have corporate financial interest for, or against, the proposal.

Investigators - Are generally individuals that serve in place of a committee within the limited scope of a category of ingredients for the purpose of coordinating the development or modification of Official Definitions and/or Terms used to describe the ingredients. Investigators are generally appointed by the chair of the Ingredient Definitions Committee (IDC) and also serve as *de facto* members of the IDC.

Subcommittees - Are made up of committee members, and are "task/topic specific" (e.g., By-Laws Subcommittee of Strategic Affairs), used to divide responsibilities, or focus work, into more manageable groups of interest or expertise. Subcommittees do not generally have time restrictions imposed on their existence, and work tends to be a subset of the standing committee charge(s). Subcommittees may be created by a committee chair, as needed, to address the needs of the committee function. Advisors may be asked to provide input into the subcommittee makeup.

Task Forces - Are utilized to fulfill a need for "specific charges", within a specific and limited time, both of which are established at the time of appointment. Task Forces are appointed by the President and serve at the discretion of the Board of Directors. Membership of a Task Force focuses on expertise in the area to be addressed, and may include any individual needed to function within its charge. (e.g., *the Canine and Feline Nutritional Expert Task Force*)

Working Groups - May include AAFCO Members, Advisors, Academia, or others, as needed to function within its charge. Working Groups are "task specific" and are appointed by a committee chair, coordinator, or investigator to address a specific issue. Working Groups have a limited life span and purpose, both of which should be addressed at the time of appointment. Working Groups (e.g., Sugar Working Group) serve at the discretion of the appointing individual.

Appendix 2—Budget Creation Procedure

August 2013

Finance Subcommittee Recommendations:

1) Add the process below (**Association Budget Requests from Committees)** to the committee guidelines section of the OP at 2013 OP page 83.
    - **Phase 1** *Identifying current revenue stream, works in progress and new ideas and expenses*:
        - Secretary Treasurer will send request to identify actions that may impact the budget to committee chairs by December 1 each year. Last year's activities should be provided so committees can update them.
        - Revenue opportunities should be identified along with their lead contact, current status and deadlines. They should be sorted into tables of current revenue items, works in progress and ideas for future revenue.
        - Revenue neutral items are included so we can keep an eye on the amount activities we are undertaking. The lists should include anything that brings funds into AAFCO, even if the event is not intended to make a profit.
        - Revenue Potential Activities are due by March 1 to Finance Subcommittee.
        - Committees should also identify any budget requests (revenue or expenses) for the next fiscal year in their midyear meeting committee report in the template's budget request section.
    - **Phase 2** *Revenue potential activities prioritized by Finance Subcommittee:*
        - Work with lead contact for each item in "works in progress" table to identify costs and revenue potential (e.g. return on investment to develop, implement and maintain).
        - Prioritize projects to fund by evaluating: 1.) Fit with Organizational needs and plans 2.) Benefits to members; 3.) Revenue potential.
        - Prioritized list due by April 1 to Secretary Treasurer.
    - **Phase 3** *Incorporate committee requests into draft budget:*
        - Secretary Treasurer to take prioritized revenue activities and the committee budget requests and place them into proposed budget.
        - Proposed Budget, prioritized activities, committee budget requests and the Secretary Treasurers recommendations on them is due to Board of Directors by May 1.
    - **Phase 4** *Board approval of the budget:*
        - Board to discuss proposed budget at face to face meeting in May (seminar)
        - Board to affirm priorities and approve resources using budgeting process.
        - The Board may add budget notes detailing further information needed from the committee prior to funding or endorsing an activity. (i.e. training event organizer needs to provide budget to Board 65 days before event)
        - Once approved in the annual budget, most activities typically do not require further Board approval. The expectation is that the committee or Management Company will take care of the details of the activity and report accomplishments to the board after the event.
        - Approved Budget is due to Secretary Treasurer by June 1.
    - **Long Term Projects**
        - Projects that will take two or more years to accomplish should provide to the Finance Subcommittee by March 1:
            - Next fiscal year budget as outlined above and total project budget.
            - Business Plan outlining:
                - Overall Budget of expected income and expenses.
                - Executive summary detailing the purpose of the project, who is overseeing and participating in it and benefits to the AAFCO membership.
                - Resources needed including monetary, grant requests, volunteer time, Management Company support, software, etc.
                - Implementation Plan that includes specific benchmarks and deliverables.