

## Breakout Group 2B

Questions 1 and 2 -- What gaps do you agree and/or disagree with? Why?

Gap 1: *The AFSS Team is developing a method for ranking risks to animal and public health from potentially hazardous biological, chemical and physical contaminants in animal feed. The risk-ranking exercise will rank feed risks overall and also for specific feeds and/or feed ingredients (product-related risks), manufacturing processes (process-related risks), and types of facilities--feed manufacturers, transporters and on-farm mixers (facility-related risks). The AFSS Team will use this risk information to develop a risk-based approach for 1) determining which feed contaminants present the greatest risks to animal and human health and 2) deciding how such risks can be prevented or controlled.*

1. Agree: As long as science based
2. Disagree: #1

Gap 2: *If the AFSS Team decides that limits for additional feed contaminants need to be established as action levels, tolerances, regulatory limits or guidance, analytical methods for detecting those contaminants in feed matrices will need to be developed and validated. The FDA will need official regulatory methods. Industry and government could use rapid, inexpensive and reliable test kits for monitoring of feed and feed ingredients.*

1. Agree: Complete #1 prior to attempting #2
2. Disagree: Training needed levels need to be established by regulatory agency standards review regularly standards levels needed to be realistic - based on science

Gap 3: *Some of the feed hazards identified by the AFSS Team are those that may arise from deliberate contamination of feed and feed ingredients, such as bioterrorist acts. While the authority for ensuring feed safety rests principally with the FDA and the states, the USDA has the responsibility for controlling livestock diseases, even those that can be transmitted through contaminated feed, such as foot and mouth disease, classical swine fever and swine vesicular disease. USDA has traditionally accomplished this control through the regulation of garbage feeding and disease surveillance. However, the AFSS can help USDA improve methods of preventing, coordinating responses to, and investigating terrorist incidents involving the deliberate contamination of feed or feed ingredients with an exotic animal disease.*

1. Agree: Needs clarification (agree with principle after exotic animal disease is diagnosed).
2. Disagree: Prevention in the form of biosecurity

Question 3). What gaps have we missed?

1. Risk assessment must be species specific where appropriate.
2. Identify laboratories capable of analyzing hazardous contaminants for industry/producers within limits of the identified toxic levels.

## 2b. Matrix effects

Question 4). What solutions do you recommend to fill the gaps?

1. Cooperative effort between federal, state, academia and industry groups.
2. Consider international standards.
3. Laboratory certification by type of analysis.
4. Unlimited research funding

Question 5) Did we explain clearly enough how we plan to use the risk information? What was confusing about our explanation? What additional information can we provide to make it clearer?

1. No. Did not establish level where risk is regulated.
2. Additional information: Examples of level where currently regulated substance will figure into risk assessment.

Question 6) Do you think the AFSS should use a risk-based approach to determine which feed contaminants need to be reduced, eliminated or controlled in feed and feed ingredients? What other approaches should we consider?

Yes

B. What other approaches should we consider?

Question 7) We have modified the definition of risk-based. Is the new definition more understandable?

Yes..... "likelihood of human and/or animal..."