

Braunvieh Association of America

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Held on 8/9/22 - 8/10/22 @ Double Tree Hotel, OK City, OK

**Tuesday, 8/9/22**

**Board Members Present:** Robert Williams, Colby King, Nesha Smith, Benny Phillips, Daniel Roberts, Deana Imhoff, Jason Pfeifer, John Hall, Larry McAfee, Molly Mirassou, Todd Hill plus managing director, Montie Soules

**Board Members Absent:** Bob Gunnett

**Guests Present in Room:** Clydene Pittman, Larry Lane, Edsel Keith, Tyler Lister, Crystal Lister, Lennon Lister

Mark Nelson joined zoom call for part of performance committee report.

Wade Shafer with IGS joined zoom call later part of day for IGS report.

Australian Braunvieh Association joined via zoom to discuss coming on board with BAA.

**Wednesday, 8/10/22**

**Board Members Present:** Robert Williams, Colby King, Nesha Smith, Benny Phillips, Daniel Roberts, Deana Imhoff, Jason Pfeifer, John Hall, Larry McAfee, Molly Mirassou, Todd Hill plus managing director, Montie Soules

**Board Members Absent:** Bob Gunnett

**Guests Present in Room:** Clydene Pittman, Larry Lane, Edsel Keith

**\*\*MEETING HELD ON Tuesday, 8/9/22\*\***

President Robert Williams called the meeting to order at 8:01 am CST.

**KPI Report:**

Montie Soules discussed key performance indicators including registrations by category, memberships, and THR assessments. Montie reminded assessments and memberships are on an annual basis while other info such as financials are based on a fiscal year ending August 31. Compared to last year, registrations have increased. Total adult memberships are up and strong while junior memberships have held steady. Noted last year, had big jump in new junior membership and have retained them this year. One KPI that jumped a lot was cows assessed per year. Membership responded well to the THR changes made.

**Minutes:**

*The Board unanimously approved the minutes as presented from the board meeting held on July 5, 2022. Note, no meeting was held in June due to conflicts in schedules. During the minutes discussed, it was asked what the 501c3 had been named. Possibly wanting to change the name but would discuss later in that committee report.*

**Treasurer Report and Discussions During Treasurer Report:**

Montie Soules had previously emailed month of July 2022 and YTD financials to all board members. Montie went over some of the key notes he had made in email. Overall, BAA is in

good shape, BAA has had a strong year up to this point, Junior Nationals came out really good in the end, and BAA and JBAA net income are ahead of budget.

Different questions and discussions were made of accounts receivables, monthly expense for social media, website advertising, Jr National expenses, professional fees, management fees, depreciation. Accounts receivables are higher than last year but believe since majority is under 90 days, will receive majority of receivables. It was also asked does it cost BAA to be partner with IGS. Montie explained it does not cost BAA a separate fee; ASA pays IGS per original agreement made between ASA and BAA. Montie explained Digital Beef is the registry which information is stored and then once a week Digital Beef sends download to IGS to perform genetic evaluations to produce the EPDs. IGS later sends EPDs to Digital Beef where they are then uploaded into system. One small item, website income, on financials was questioned rather an expense or income – Montie to get with accountant to confirm.

*The board unanimously accepted the financials as presented for the month of July 2022 and YTD (year to date) financials.*

#### **Breeders Guidelines Committee Report:**

Daniel Roberts stated nothing to report.

#### **Exhibition Committee Report:**

Marilyn Brink, chair, absent so Molly Mirrasou gave committee update. The committee is continuing to work with a possible manager for National Sale. Someone reached out to committee regarding a possible show in NE but due to limited resources and interest, will table right now. Proposed sale terms have been worked on and emailed to all board members for review – will discuss during meeting later.

Clydene stated OEF points have been uploaded to Digital Beef already and upload went smoothly.

#### **Genomics Committee Report:**

John Hall stated we need to continue more education to membership regarding genomics and benefits of 100k test. Montie stated yellow highlighted numbers on EPD are genomically enhanced EPDs. Usually takes 2-3 weeks once test complete before it shows up in yellow on Digital Beef. Genomically enhanced EPDs increase accuracy. It was asked, what is a good accuracy rate – closest to 1. Board viewed an EPD online as an example and discussion was made. Board also viewed new DNA form online. Different discussions were made of the NW AR Sire Evaluation Project. First set of calves from project are being shipped to feedlot today.

#### **Junior Committee Report:**

Jessica Bartley not present – no report.

#### **International Committee Report:**

Dwight Alexander not present but updated was given by Montie regarding the Australian Braunvieh Association, the association is ready to be a part of BAA. Will do a zoom call later in day.

#### **Performance Committee Report:**

Mark Nelson not present at beginning of report but later in committee report, Mark joined call. Todd Hill on behalf of the committee passed out information to board regarding upcoming Green Springs and PX Feeders bull test and sale. Information included date of births for participating

bulls, delivery dates, test competition dates, and proposed online sale date of 4/15/23 but could possibly move date to not conflict with other Braunvieh events such as TX State Show and Braunvieh Sales. Dates were determined by committee trying to accommodate majority of breeders breeding windows. Committee would like to continue with similar dates each year to be consistent. Different discussions were made of sale expenses, how many bulls should take to test, what top percentage to take to test, maybe tying Green Springs bull test with Herdbuilder Sale.

Mark Nelson stated committee recently had meeting where discussed objectives to work on sire evaluation project and start covering information regarding the University of Missouri feed out. Mark added details of the calves in route today to feedlot from NW AR project. Next step for project is data entry of weaning weights and determining sire of calves. Discussion was made of the steer feed out program – Mark to get more details of program before giving information to post. Lastly, Mark mentioned proposed performance advocacy program which will be discussed later in meeting.

Adjourn for lunch at 12:01 pm – returned from lunch at 12:45 pm and Robert Williams called meeting back to order.

#### **Corporate Sponsorship Committee Report:**

Randy Allgood absent. Tyler and Crystal Lister gave update on behalf of the committee. Tyler said little progress has been made, looking to answer some questions to be able to proceed. Crystal Lister presented the proposed tri fold brochure to explain the new foundations purpose. It was recommended taking the brochure to the attorney to work on bylaws.

Tyler stated committee had recommendation to amend foundation name from American Braunvieh Youth Development Foundation to proposed name of Braunvieh Youth Foundation. *The Board unanimously approved the recommendation to change the name to Braunvieh Youth Foundation. It was then recommended and motion made the foundation to be for the use of youth activities to benefit only the JBAA membership - the Board unanimously approved. Motion was made and Board unanimously approved for foundation to initially have 7 board members. Separate motion made following approval, foundation board should have at least one BAA board member designated – Board unanimously approved as well.* Tyler stated committee would bring back 6 names for the remainder of the foundation board.

Clydene stated approximately \$1,000 has been already received on behalf of the foundation. Montie instructed she can send funds to the BAA office with distinctions made to put in premium funds for juniors.

Question was asked regarding the expenses of the foundation – foundation will be responsible for its expenses, estimated \$2,000-\$5,000 per year plus an audit to be done.

#### **IGS Report:**

Montie stated IGS does an annual review of every breed to tell how that breed compares with other breeds participating in IGS. Board viewed multiple page document provided, “Report of the BAA Results of the 2022 IGS Partner Data Analysis Report.” Montie stated when you compare to all the other breeds in IGS, Braunvieh done pretty well. Wade Shafer with IGS joined zoom call, discussed what IGS does for the breed. Wade stated BIF has a standard set of adjustments for BW, WW, etc and those adjustments been in place a long time but IGS is able to be more specific in those adjustments. With IGS adjustments, will approve their capability and

BAA EPDs will be more accurate. Wade discussed the importance of correct contemporary grouping.

### **Registrations and Transfers Committee Report:**

Benny Phillips announced all board members should have received copy of proposed revised rule changes for section 12 – Performance Data. Different changes made including the use of IGS, expanding the range of dates for example, weaning and yearling weights. It would allow more of a window to weigh. Different discussions were had including the seasons and it was mentioned possible to combine the four seasons into one. *Motion was made to make seasons in Digital Beef into one season – Board unanimously approved.*

Board reviewed Section 12 but added #6: data turned in outside the date ranges listed in 3,4,5 that fall inside IGS acceptance, will be used to calculate EPDs but won't be used to calculate adjusted weights in BAA registry. After revision was made, committee brought forth recommendation to approve revised Section 12 – Performance Data. *The Board unanimously approved the recommendation from the Registrations and Transfers Committee presented by Benny Phillips, Chair to revise Section 12 of Rules and Regulations – Performance Data. See final copy of approved rule change.*

Board reviewed graph provided by Neogen– BAA samples by month – showed DNA is sporadic.

### **Promotions Committee Report:**

Colby King stated American Rancher is exceptionally high on new rates and are not willing to negotiate at this time so moving forward, committee has been in contact with Cattlemens Congress. Bulls would have to be on display 1/6/23 – 1/9/23 which does not coincide with the Braunvieh show – BAA could sign up beginning in November, deadline is 12/3/22. Colby gave details including space would be 10x10, \$800 pays for 2 head for 3 day; however, if wanted to display more bulls, would be required to pay extra fee of \$100 per head. All rules can be found on Cattlemens Congress website under Herdsire Display. Discussion was made of what possible bulls could be used – idea is to promote the breed, opposed to any one bull or individual.

Colby announced OKC has agreed to BAA having a sale there – they are very inviting.

Colby suggested if not going to use American Rancher at this time, need to funnel proceeds elsewhere for advertisement coverage. Stated he had friend who is into billboards – thought that might be a possible route for BAA advertisement. It was recommended maybe BAA could do a 15 minute show with another breed. Different shows along with different digital marketing means and pricing were discussed.

### **Discussion of Proposed Sale Terms and Conditions:**

On behalf of the Exhibition Committee, Molly Mirasou brought forth proposed sale terms and conditions. Different discussions were made, decided needing further revisions so tabled for now.

### **Discussion of Australian Braunvieh Association:**

Australian Braunvieh Association joined zoom call to confirm some items that had been discussed in prior months.

5:19 pm - President Robert Williams announced recess. Board met for dinner later in evening.

**\*\*MEETING HELD ON Wednesday, 8/10/22\*\***

President Robert Williams called the meeting to order at 8 am CST; however, began as closed session so all guests left room.

President Robert Williams called meeting to order with guests present at 8:20 am CST.

**Nomination Committee Report:**

John Hall brought forth on behalf of the committee, six proposed board member nominees: Randy Olson, Eric Armintrout, Eddie Ziegenbein, Larry McAfee, Tyler Lister, Sean Lehmann. There would be four positions to fill for current members: Larry McAfee (in for Evan Bartley), Colby King, Bob Gunnett, and Nesha Smith. *The Board unanimously approved the recommendation from the Nomination Committee presented by John Hall, Chair to accept the list of nominees to be voted on by membership at upcoming annual meeting to be held January 2023.* Discussed deadline dates, etc and plan to send out eblasts with list of nominees and explanations to help membership understand process.

**Continued Promotions Committee:**

Board had further discussion of possible bulls to use for OKC Herdsire Display. Colby to look into further.

**Performance Advocate Program:**

Board reviewed some criteria for a proposed performance advocate program. This program would encourage breeders to meet certain criteria and be recognized. Different discussions were made. *Motion was made to develop a performance advocate program and let the performance committee set the regulations. The Board unanimously approved.*

**Braunvieh World Publication Update:**

Blueprint Media representatives not present – no report.

**Planning Committee Report:**

Montie Soules went over PowerPoint presentation – BAA Strategic Plan Draft. Board members broke into groups, gathered various information including values, who are the heroes and champions, threats, competitor assessments, goals, etc. After gathering all the information, board looked at current mission and then worked together to revise the mission. *The Board unanimously approved to amend current mission statement to the revised mission statement: “The mission of the Braunvieh Association of America is to serve and empower the members, protect the integrity of the herdbook and expand the use of Braunvieh genetics in the beef industry.”* Discussions were made of revising the vision statement; different thoughts were discussed but due to time, tabled for time being.

**Social Media Update:**

Clydene Pittman gave update of social media activity - 1,958 likes (up 23 people), reached 8,135 this month, had 2,165 engagements, 283 page views, and 286 on Instagram with 586 Instagram followers.

**Old Business:**

Robert Williams said it was brought to his attention regarding TC breeders getting EPDs on certain animals. For lack of discussion, it died.

**New Business:**

Larry McAfee stated he was impressed with Kendall Schlakes presentation given recently at the Field Day regarding the history of Braunvieh. Larry asked if it would be ok to gather information from various breeders to put something together to share with all. Board welcomed the idea.

**Adjourn:**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:11 pm.

Submitted by Nesha Smith, BAA Secretary

Approved: 9/27/22

## **BAA RULES & REGULATIONS**

### **SECTION XII – PERFORMANCE DATA**

#### **A. General**

1. BAA Policy – The Braunvieh Association of America and its members are committed to recording performance information on their animals that gives relevance and reliability to the performance database for Braunvieh and Braunvieh influence cattle. The BAA is a partner in the International Genetic Solutions (IGS) across-breed Genetic Evaluation.
2. The policies and science that the IGS uses for across-breed EPDS are the same policies that are used when calculating the BAA EPDs. These policies are scientifically proven through research of over 20 years of Genetic Evaluation comparisons. The Meat Animal Research Center in Nebraska and the recommendations from the Beef Improvement Federation (BIF) have had a large influence on the data formulas. There is a large amount of proven data for the across-breed EPD Genetic Evaluation. The past 20 years of information have gone into the formulas and calculations of the current IGS data bank, which has well over 20 million head enrolled.
3. BAA performance data is collected from cattle enrolled in the THR Program.

#### **B. Expected Progeny Differences (EPDs)**

Expected Progeny Difference (EPD) values are relative; they do not indicate absolute levels of performance. Rather, they can be used to predict differences in the performance of progeny sired by different bulls. EPDs are generally reported in units of measurement for the trait or as probabilities for threshold traits. EPDs should only be used when comparing two animals or an animal against the breed's average.

##### **1. Growth and Maternal EPDs**

###### **a. Calving Ease Direct (CED)**

CED EPD predicts the probability of calves being born unassisted out of two-year-old heifers. Calving ease scores and birth weights are used in the calculation of CED. Higher values indicate greater calving ease. In the IGS system, the BW EPD is 70% of the CED.

###### **b. Birth Weight (BW)**

BW EPD predicts the difference, in pounds, for birth weight and is also used in the calculation of CED. Because the birth weight is included in the CED calculations, it is recommended to only use CED EPD or BW CED in your selection process. If you use both, you are double selecting for the

same trait. When evaluating a BW EPD, you should select the lower number. The lower number insinuates that the Birth Weight should be less.

c. Weaning Weight (WW)

WW EPD predicts the difference, in pounds, for weaning weight. This is an indicator of growth from birth to weaning.

d. Yearling Weight (YW)

YW EPD predicts the expected difference, in pounds, for yearling weight. This is an indicator of growth from birth through a year of age.

e. Milk (MILK)

MILK EPD predicts the difference in maternal production of an individual animal's daughters as expressed by the weaning weight of their calves that is attributed to her milk production.

f. Total Maternal (TM)

TM EPD predicts the difference in weaning weights of calves combining with milk production and growth genetics of an animal's daughters. TM is generally figured by adding up half of the WW EPD and the Milk EPD to equal TM.

g. Calving Ease Maternal (CEM)

CEM EPD is a prediction of calving ease relative to the daughters of a sire and their calving ease. CEM is based on calving ease scores for a first calf heifer. There generally is a correlation to the growth traits for CEM.

h. Stayability (STAY)

STAY EPD quantifies expected differences among individuals in the probability of their daughters staying in the herd to at least six years of age. Stayability data is derived from THR records, largely disposal codes of culled animals. A higher STAY EPD indicates a higher likelihood of a bull's daughters staying in the herd longer.

i. Docility (DOC)

DOC is the expected difference of an animal or progeny of the animal to have extra docility. This has been proven as an economically relevant trait. Science and research prove that animals with

extra docility have higher gains and are more profitable. Docility scores are used to calculate the DOC EPD, with higher DOC EPDs indicating more docile offspring.

## 2. Intake and Carcass EPDs

### a. Carcass Weight (CW)

CW EPD predicts differences in carcass weight of progeny at harvest.

### b. Rib Eye Area (REA)

Rib Eye Area (REA) predicts differences in carcass rib eye area between the 12th and 13th rib. Ultrasound and actual carcass data both factor into the calculation of REA EPDs.

### c. Marbling (MARB)

MARB EPD predicts differences for carcass marbling score as expressed in marbling score units (using both ultrasound and carcass data). Higher marbling scores are positively correlated with higher carcass quality grades.

### c. Back Fat Thickness (CFAT)

CFAT EPD predicts differences for carcass fat depth over the 12th rib, as expressed in inches. CFAT EPD is negatively correlated with carcass yield grade.

### d. Residual Feed Intake

The trait known as residual feed is a measure of feed efficiency. It is a measurement of how much feed an animal consumed compared to how much it should have consumed based on its growth and weight data while on feed test. The RFI EPD is measured in units of pounds of feed per day. A lower number for the RFI EPD indicates animals who eat less feed than expected for their size and growth.

## 3. Selection Indexes

Selection indexes are calculated based on an equation combining multiple EPDs, emphasizing the traits that would be economically important for the purpose of the index. All indexes have a production goal in mind when they are constructed.

### a. All Purpose Index (API)

The API index attempts to combine both terminal and maternal facets of commercial production into one index. This index assumes that heifers are being retained for the cow herd, while the steer mates are being marketed in a quality-based program as fat steers.

b. Terminal Index (TI)

The TI index follows the same methodology as API, only with a different end goal in mind. The TI calculations consider EPDs of economic importance in a strictly terminal breeding scenario. All calves are expected to be fed to harvest on a quality-based grid marketing program.

4. Most Probable Producing Ability (MPPA)

The estimate of a cow's future production for a trait is based on her past productivity. Indicates and compares a cow's ability to produce for a trait (weaning or yearling weight) based on her past track record.

5. Accuracy scores (ACC).

The accuracy of the EPD listed is extremely important. It is shown with the acc letters.

EPD accuracy is the relationship between the estimated genetic value of the animal (an EPD) and its "true" genetic value. Accuracy values range from 0.00 to 1.00. An EPD's accuracy value corresponds to a standard deviation value (also known as a possible change value) that defines the range for which the true genetic value of that animal most likely lies. As the accuracy value increases for an EPD, the standard deviation value will decrease, thus shrinking the range in which that animal's true genetic merit likely falls. Accuracy values increase by turning in data on the animal (as well as closely related animals), genomic testing, and recording progeny data once the animal is in production.

- a. When a new calf is recorded, and there is no data turned in on it, the letters PE may be shown as the accuracy. The PE stands for Pedigree estimate. When an accuracy is able to be calculated on this animal, it will be a very low accuracy (as low as .01 if there is no or limited information on the sire or dam).
  - i. In these cases, your accuracy is so low that the value of the EPD is very low as well. To make selections based on very low accuracy EPDs is not like looking at an animal with .60 or .80 accuracies on heavily used, proven sires.
- b. If the individual animal is genomically tested the accuracy improves a lot and can reach as high as .25 on cattle with minimal data. On animals with a number of genomically tested animals in their pedigree, the starting point can be as high as .30s, giving the breeder making genetic selection a head start on selecting genetics that will fit the profile of the individual.

## C. Data Collection and Reporting

It is important to turn in the data for all the animals in each contemporary group. This is the only way to get accurate EPDs to use in your genetic selections.

1. All weights must be determined using a scale or other accepted form of a measurement tool. Guessing weights is not an acceptable form of turning in data.

2. Calving Performance

a. Actual birth weights should be reported. A tape used for birth weights is acceptable as there is a field identified as Weight Method to indicate using a tape or scales when entering the birth weight. If no BW is recorded, then there will be no adjusted weaning weight calculated.

b. Calving Ease Scores should be reported to evaluate the differences in CED and CEM.

You can select one of the following five options labeled CE

- Unassisted/unobserved
- Some assistance
- Hard Pull
- Cesarean Section
- Abnormal Presentation

3. Weaning Weights are needed to calculate a WW EPD. Birth weights must be recorded to calculate an adjusted 205-day weaning weight.

a. Weaning weights must be taken when the calf is between 150 to 280 days of age.

1. All calves within a weaning group must be weighed on the same day.
2. All calves in the weaning group will be separated into groups according to sex.
3. For best results, the calves should be weighed as close to 205 days as possible.
4. All weaning weights will be adjusted to a 205-day weight.

4. Yearling weights are needed to calculate a YW EPD. There needs to be a weaning weight before an adjusted yearling weight can be calculated.

a. All yearling weights must be taken when the animal is between 300 and 450 days of age.

b. All animals in the yearling group must be weighed on the same day.

c. All Yearling weights will be adjusted to 365-day weights.

5. Carcass Performance by Ultrasound measurements to calculate high accuracy carcass EPDS.

a. All ultrasound measurements must be taken by a certified technician. The resulting images must be processed or interpreted at a BAA-certified lab. The lab will send the results to the BAA office to be entered into the registry software.

- b. Ultrasound performance data must be taken when the animal is between 300 and 550 days of age.
- c. Ultrasound data for ribeye area, back fat, and intramuscular fat will be adjusted to 365 days of age for each animal.

6. Data Turned in outside the date ranges listed in 3, 4, and 5 that fall inside the IGS acceptance will be used to calculate EPDs. But will not be used to calculate adjusted weights in the BAA Registry.

7. Those BAA members turning in performance data should be a THR breeder.

#### **D. Contemporary Grouping**

To get an accurate evaluation of the herd or group, all animals in the contemporary group must be turned in so they can be compared and ranked. Because the BAA is part of the IGS across-breed genetic evaluation that tabulates the EPDs for the BAA, percentage, purebred, and full-blood Braunvieh animals can be in the same contemporary group. Any animal recorded in the BAA registry can be part of a contemporary group, regardless of breed or breed percentage.

1. Contemporary Groups are determined when the birth weight is recorded. This becomes the contemporary group for the lifetime of the animals in the group. The group may become smaller over time as cattle are sold, die, or if managed differently than the rest of the group. The remaining animals in the group are compared for life as a contemporary group from birth on.
  - a. Contemporary groups are separated by sex.
    - B for Bull or Male
    - C for Cow or Female
    - S for Steer
  - b. Calves must be born within 90 days of the oldest calf to be considered for the same contemporary group.
    - i. If the breeder includes animals outside the 90-day window, then the computer will separate them into a new group.
  - c. Contemporary groups may be broken into a smaller group inside the original birth group at weaning or yearling. The groups just become smaller inside the IGS formulas.
  - d. Contemporary groups should all have the same management code, or the computer will break them out as per the management code. Examples are choices below for feed codes at weaning:

- Dam only
- Dam/Creep
- Bucket fed no dam
- Twin
- Raised on foster dam

2. Performance Ratios, Ratios listed in the registry refer to the position or ranking of the animal based on the average of the contemporary group.

- a. The ratio of 100 is always the average of the group
- b. If the ratio is listed at 101 or higher, that means the animal's performance was above average compared to other animals in the group. The higher the ratio, the higher the animal's performance is ranked.
- c. If the ratio is 99 or lower, that means the animal's performance is below the average compared to other animals in the group. The lower the ratio, the lower the performance of the animal in the group.

#### **E. Weight Adjustments,**

Adjustments are made to different weights, as science and logic have proven that the age of the dam influences birth and weaning weights.

- a. 2-year-old females will have birth weights adjusted as they will likely have the smallest calf of their life as a first calf heifer. This way, they are compared equally to older females.
  - i. Because of the adjustment of birth weights on 2-year-olds, it is recommended that the calves born from 2-year-olds be kept in a separate contemporary group from the older cows in the herd, if possible.
  - ii. If young cows are managed differently than older cows (supplemental feed), they most certainly need to be separated into their own contemporary group.
- b. Weaning weights receive an adjustment for the age of the dam. Science has proven that 2-year-olds or first calf heifers do not milk as well as a mature cow. The age of the dam will get additional pounds added to the weaning weight till the female is considered a mature age.

Section XII Rules and Regulations are updated on August 9, 2022