

**ALBERTA BEEF PRODUCERS
MINUTES FOR THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE MEETING
FRIDAY JANUARY 10, 2020, 8:30 a.m.
AT THE ABP BOARD ROOM, CALGARY, AB**

Present: Fred Lozeman - *Chair, Zone 2*
Graeme Finn - *Zone 3*
Ralph Buhler - *Zone 6*
Martin Clausen - *Zone 7*
Rod Carlyon - *Zone 7*
Jodi Flaig - *Zone 8*
Mike Nadeau - *Zone 9*
Craig Lehr - *CFC representative*

Staff: Karin Schmid - *Beef Production*
Rosanne Allen - *Office Administrator*

Absent: Jesse Williams - *Zone 4*
Stuart Somerville - *Zone 5*
Kevin Stopanski - *CCC representative*

Guest: Stacey Domolewski - *BCRC*
Reynold Bergen - *BCRC*

The chair called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

1. Adoption of Agenda

(a) Adoption of Agenda:

Motion by Carlyon/Lehr:

“That the agenda be approved as presented.”

Carried

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

(a) Minutes of the September 6, 2019 meeting:

Motion by Clausen/Buhler:

**“That the minutes of the September 6, 2019
Research Committee meeting be approved.”**

Carried

3. Financial Report

(a) Financial Statement ending December 6, 2019:

On the operations side we are sitting at 54% of the budget. Potentially we may have a meeting with the new committee before the end of the fiscal year. Schmid explained the notes on the financial statement that were from 2017.

Motion by Lehr/Carlyon:

**“That the financial report be accepted for
information purposes only.”**

Carried

4. Decision Items

(a) Proposal Review – Feed & Forage Production & Utilization:

FRG.08.19: Is ergot an issue in hybrid rye? Thought to be more resistant than open pollinated rye. There is a project beginning in Saskatchewan testing the effect of copper fertility on ergot development. What is the optimal time to silage hybrid rye? This research is looking specifically at forage potential. High, but can't fund due to all the dollars going to AAFC

FDE.06.19: Small reviewer concern about using single markers, but long-term goals need to be supported. Barley will be supporting this project with small funding amounts. Comments around targets for feed grain varieties; what about the nutritional packages. Concern about what the future of the province looks like in regard to the future of FCDC. As long as they're not working towards a GMO barley don't care how they do it, as long as better varieties are released. High

FRG.06.19: Project could be valuable as it addresses a gap in knowledge in certain regions of the province. Low cost, simple and should be able to give immediate results. Not many producers are doing this, and it will be interesting to see the results. High, but can't fund due to all the dollars going to AAFC

FRG.16.19: Very interesting project, but difficult to see how it helps on the farm. Could provide some insight into feed efficiency – any extra knowledge in this area is valuable. High

FDE.01.19: Reviewees were very positive. Very interesting initial results, so need to see if they can be replicated or pinpoint the cause. High

ANH.17.19: There is a lack of beef information regarding colostrum. Reviewer concern about sample size and not sure it is worth the cost. Bottom line: does what you feed the cow make a difference in the development and quality of colostrum? If the answer is yes, this is important for producers to know. High

FRG.17.19: How many producers will do this on small acreage? Some will, some won't, but would like to have viable options to help reduce salinity. The crops that are being looked at do better in more saline soil. Medium-high to high priority, but can't fund due to all the dollars going to AAFC

FDE.02.19: Reviewers thought this was an outdated idea. Would be difficult to scale up. Low

FRG.12.19: This came to BCRC last year as part of a bigger project that was not funded but the NIR part was thought to be unique and innovative. If it works, there is potential down the road to easily identify feed efficiency and could be huge to the industry. Medium-high

FDE.03.19: Some vagueness in the proposal and is likely long-term. Can we learn something from this research? What kind of sampling would a producer need to rank their cattle? Again, could provide another piece of the feed efficiency puzzle. Medium

FRG.09.19: Will be very difficult to control which crops cattle are grazing when. Cattle are particular about what they eat and how. Difficult to see how this would work in practice. Low

FRG.05.19: Novel approach but very high risk and concerns were raised by reviewers on viability. High investment value for a very long shot. Low

FRG.02.19: Peer reviews were not optimistic, due to the lack of an identified commercialization plan. Without this in place, it is unlikely the market will pick up the new inoculant. Low

FRG.01.19: No direct impact on beef producers, some major gaps in methodology. Low

ANH.14.19: Interesting, but opinions were swayed by one extraordinarily negative reviewer. The interesting piece here is how forage inclusion rate remains the same as conventional finishing rations, but simply varies the timing. If it works, could be adopted immediately. Medium.

Motion by Finn/Buhler:

“That the Research Committee support the funding of projects FDE.06.19; FRG.16.19; FDE.01.19; ANH.17.19; FRG.12.19; FDE.03.19; and ANH.14.19 up to \$1.5 million combined.”

Carried

(b) Proposal Review – Internal funding:

ANH.10.19: important issue. Anecdotal reports about changing treatment regimens. Will be interesting to see if usage patterns have changed. Important to collect data for public confidence purposes. High

ANH.18.19: The full proposal is very different from the LOI that the committee originally saw. The project was expanded to build on Tim McAllister’s RPA diagnostics project that ABP previously funded to refine and optimize the assays for field use. High

ANH.01.19: Reviewers were positive overall of research; one reviewer thought it could lead to new treatment options. New Zealand may be doing work in this area as they are eradicating *M. bovis*, and it was suggested that the researchers see if there’s something they can learn from the NZ experience. High

ANH.02.19: Why do liver abscesses form; when do they form? This should provide some information as to the underlying causes of liver abscess formation. High

ANH.11.19: beginnings of an on-farm surveillance program run by CIPARS to look at AMU and AMR in feedlot cattle. This ask is to add sensitivity testing for *Pasteurella* and *Histophilus* in addition to *Mannheimia*. This would let us monitor trends in AMU and AMR, and the beef industry has been asking for an on-farm surveillance program for years. Medium

ANH.16.19: concerns around sample size and experimental design. Most notably, that cows in a research herd are unlikely to be trace mineral deficient, and thus what results would we expect to see? Low

ANH.24.19: reviewers were critical of team’s knowledge; lack of contingencies if results not as expected and pointed out some legitimate concerns about the methodology. Low

Orsel preconditioning project: aim is to either confirm or refute anecdotal claims that pre-conditioned cattle mixed with auction market cattle lose all of their pre-conditioning benefits in terms of health and performance. Lots of discussion of whether industry structure would allow for much adoption, but agreed that this was a good project with solid science behind it. It was noted that this is a “Cadillac” version of pre-conditioning, but if you can’t see results with the best model, you won’t see results by only using parts of it.

Motion by Carlyon/Nadeau:

“That the Research Committee support project ANH.10.19 in the amount of \$20,000; projects ANH.18.19, ANH.01.19 and ANH.02.19 in the amount of \$15,000 each; and support ANH.11.19 in the amount of \$10,000.

Carried

5. Discussion Items

(a) Alberta Agriculture and Forestry Research & Extension:

There were significant layoffs in Alberta Agriculture which will reduce capacity, especially in terms of extension. More layoffs are rumoured to come in March. It is unclear whether research funding and research staff will remain. There are a number of consultations on “Farmer-Led Research” in the province, as well as an online survey, please encourage everyone you know to participate. ABP has been invited to an organizational consultation (invites include more than the commissions) on January 27th. The more input we have as an industry the better.

(b) 2016 AMR/AMU Call Update:

The final reports were received in November; two of the reports need some revision. There will be a lay article of the tylosin project in Grass Routes and Canadian Cattlemen’s magazine. Schmid asked if the committee wanted to wait until all of the reports are ready, or do they want the reports immediately? Consensus was to circulate as lay articles/fact sheets are produced.

(c) 2018 Research Call Update:

Nothing much to report yet. One project is waiting for further funding before it can start.

(d) Rancher Researcher Pilot/KTT Project/Alberta Beef Forage and Grazing Centre Update:

The final report for the Rancher/Researcher project is due in March and is almost complete.

The pasture school modules are still being developed as part of KTT project, as is Forage-U Pick (for forage species selection). Have had lots of pick up on the feed testing tools.

The annual meeting is February 5th in Lacombe and is open to any producer who would like to attend.

(e) BCRC Update:

Will be meeting in Saskatoon at the end of January to discuss projects for funding.

(f) Other:

Committee likes using Dropbox.

6. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned on a motion by Buhler at 3:00 p.m.