American Brahman Breeders Association

Executive Committee Meeting Agenda

May 15, 2025, 4:30 PM CST
L'Auberge Casino Resort – Ballroom D
Lake Charles, LA

President David Miller called the meeting to order at 4:45 CST. Iridiana Ibarra called roll 8 present; a quorum was established.

Present
David Miller
Catherine Neumayr
Carolyn Falgout
David Domsch
Steve Hudgins
Hatch Smith
Amy Wilder
Mark Forgason

Staff
Paul Maulsby
Iridiana Ibarra

Guests
Billy Badilla
Rafael Badilla
Rodney Finch
Klaire Fontenot
Clint Galiano
Natalie Herzog
J'Boone Koonce
Kelvin Moreno
Luke Neumayr
Rodney Roberson
Dakota Smith
Val Walters
Mike West

Hatch Smith motioned to approve the minutes from the May 9th, 2025 meeting, and the motion was seconded by Mark Forgason. The motion carried.

Paul Maulsby addressed the Executive Committee, highlighting ABBA's efforts to strengthen its global presence, particularly in the areas of reciprocity and imported animal registrations. He shared that ABBA secured $50,000 in USLGE grant funding—the highest amount in five years—designated for international outreach. These funds are being used for advertising, education, and initiatives aimed at increasing ABBA's visibility and engagement with international members, alongside supporting domestic efforts.

Mr. Maulsby clarified that ABBA has well-defined procedures for reciprocity and the registration of imported animals, in compliance with USDA and other regulatory bodies. Animals registered with recognized international associations can be registered with ABBA, and proper registration procedures are in place for animals imported into the U.S.

Iridiana Ibarra elaborated on the distinction between reciprocity and imported animal registrations. She explained that reciprocity involves animals in foreign countries with valid certificates from recognized registries, allowing them to be registered with ABBA, marked with a "#" in the system. Animals listed in pedigrees with parentheses represent supplemental information from the foreign certificate. Reciprocity registrations require the registering breeder to be an ABBA member, and DNA is not required for these registrations. However, if semen

DRAFT

from such an animal is sold in the U.S., progeny registered from that bull will need DNA in accordance with ABBA policy.

Iridiana Ibarra used Australia as an example, where semen is registered through Neogen. She clarified that ABBA does not monitor or enforce import regulations—this responsibility lies with federal authorities. In cases of unauthorized importation, ABBA will comply with USDA instructions if notified.

A guest asked for clarification on how color is verified in pedigrees submitted through reciprocity, particularly from associations that don't distinguish between red and gray animals. He mentioned that this issue arose last year and some cleanup work was done, as color impacts classification in the ABBA system. He specifically inquired how ABBA determines the number of red animals when the information isn't clear on the foreign certificate.

Iridiana Ibarra explained that it's handled case-by-case. For example, ABBA worked with Australian pedigrees last year, where the registry system included color details, allowing accurate input. In cases like Mexico, where color isn't always specified, ABBA may need to contact the foreign registry for clarification before properly recording the information.

A guest requested clarification regarding DNA results in DigitalBeef. He noted that he always submits samples to Zoetis, but recently saw DNA results from Neogen for some of his animals. He questioned why Neogen data appeared when he had no dealings with them.

Iridiana Ibarra explained that a similar issue had occurred with another member, where both Zoetis and Neogen results appeared for an animal that had only been submitted to Zoetis. She followed up with the DigitalBeef programmer, who clarified that the discrepancy was due to how DNA marker data was imported, leading the system to incorrectly list Neogen results. This issue affected a small number of animals. Ms. Ibarra would follow up with Allison Hajny, the current DNA Coordinator, to confirm and correct the records.

The next item on the agenda was the proposed rule change regarding membership name changes. Catherine Neumayr explained that she had taken the lead on organizing this item, which originated from a concern raised during the previous Executive Board meeting in Beaumont.

She noted that during discussions, it became clear that the current ABBA rules lack clarity when it comes to name changes on membership accounts. While the rules address transfers and dissolutions, they do not outline any specific parameters or procedures for name changes. This gap has created potential loopholes, particularly where individuals might attempt to change a name in order to avoid paying the $250 new membership fee.

The proposed rule change aims to close that gap and establish clearer guidelines. Specifically, it would introduce a new provision—Rule I, Section 6(f)—which would require appropriate written documentation for any membership name change. Acceptable documentation could include a death certificate, divorce decree, or similar legal record. This would ensure that ABBA has proper records on file to support any changes, especially in the event of a future inquiry.

Mrs. Neumayr emphasized that the intent is simply to clean up the language and create a more transparent and enforceable process. She invited any questions or comments from the committee regarding the proposal.

> *Current Rule I, Section 6(b):*
>
> *"TRANSFER. An Active Membership may be transferred to an Active Member when that Active Membership is sold with the cattle, ranch name, and member number and the selling membership informs the Recording Secretary that the Active Membership name and number shall be transferred to the Active Member purchaser. There will be no fees for transfer of animals under the circumstances described above."*
>
> *Current Rule I, Section 6(c):*
>
> *"DISSOLUTION OF BUSINESS ENTITY. If a partnership, corporation, limited liability company, trust, estate, or other legal entity shall dissolve for any reason including death, any participant in same shall be entitled to Active Membership if he obtains Active Member status upon payment of the Active Membership fee. The membership may be transferred to any participant as provided by the Rules of Transfer in the Rules of the Association (see Rule IV, Section 5 & 7)."*
>
> *Proposed Addition – Rule I, Section 6(f): NAME CHANGE ON MEMBERSHIP ACCOUNT In cases where a name change is requested on a membership account, a written request must state the reason for the change, include the signature of the current or previous member of record (or their Designated Representative), and be accompanied by appropriate supporting documentation. Acceptable documentation may include, but is not limited to, a bill of sale in the case of a herd and membership transfer, a death certificate or estate documentation in the event of a member's passing, or legal documents such as a marriage certificate, divorce decree, or court order that support the change. All name change requests will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and approval is required before the change is recognized. A non-refundable Membership Name Change Fee shall be charged with each request, equal to fifty percent (50%) of the current New Membership Fee.*

Catherine Neumayr moved to add new Rule 1, Section 6(f), regarding membership name changes, and that it is to be done by the ABBA office and updated online by June 1st. The motion was seconded by Amy Wilder and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was the proposed policy regarding name corrections for animals. Catherine Neumayr explained that the intent of this policy is to provide an added layer of protection for breeders, particularly in situations involving private agreements—such as those related to the use of sires, flushes, or embryo transfer (ET) arrangements. She acknowledged that these agreements are common practice, and she herself has been involved in similar arrangements.

She noted that when individuals request a registration certificate, they are often required to provide details such as the holding brand and the animal's name. However, once the certificate is

issued, it is currently possible for someone to change the animal's name without the original breeder's knowledge or consent.

The proposed policy would require written authorization from the issuer of said AI or ET certificate before an official name change can be made, thereby preserving the integrity of naming rights and honoring the original breeder's intent. Catherine reiterated that this rule is designed to safeguard breeders' interests and prevent unauthorized alterations to animal identities.

There was extensive discussion among committee members and attendees regarding the proposed policy on name changes—specifically whether the approval should apply to the full name of the animal or solely to the prefix. After careful consideration, the committee agreed that the primary concern centered on the use of prefixes in relation to AI and ET agreements.

As a result, the committee approved a motion stating that any proposed prefix change or addition must require written authorization from the issuer of the AI or ET certificates.

> *Current Rule 3, Section 16(f):*
>
> *Current Rule 3, Section 16(f): "The name of registered males and females may be changed prior to the registration of progeny only after signed statement from the first and present owner(s) authorizing such a change is submitted to the Recording Secretary, along with the specified fee for this change. Any animal with registered progeny is not eligible for name change."*
>
> *Proposed Addition to 16(f):*
>
> *"In the case of an animal registered using an Artificial Insemination (AI) or Embryo Transfer (ET) certificate, any proposed prefix change or addition shall also require written authorization from the issuer of said AI or ET certificate. This ensures that the use of restricted or protected genetic material is properly credited and not misrepresented through later prefix changes."*

Catherine Neumayr moved to approve the proposed animal name changes. The motion was seconded by Hatch Smith and carried unanimously.

Catherine Neumayr shared her broader view on refining ABBA's rules, stressing that while specific solutions, like requiring written authorization for prefix changes, address immediate issues, her goal is to improve the association's overall rule structure. She pointed out that many disputes arise from unclear or incomplete guidelines, leading to unnecessary conflicts. She believes clearer rules can reduce conflict, promote fairness, and help the breed and membership move forward more cohesively, fostering a more transparent and structured environment.

Paul Maulsby opened the discussion on the importance of following proper procedures, especially as ABBA enforces rules at both ABBA-managed and independently approved shows. He noted that, without ABBA staff at every event, monitoring compliance in real time is challenging. He emphasized that animals with a "P" number (Pending Registration) are ineligible to show, and although the exhibitor was informed that the animal could not show, the animal was

DRAFT

entered and shown due to a mistake at check-in. The "P" prefix wasn't read aloud, and a protest was later upheld. He stressed that ABBA-managed shows can better verify eligibility and recommended the Executive Committee review the case to finalize action. The Show Committee voted for a one-year ban for the animal.

Discussion followed on why a registration certificate wasn't required at check-in. It was clarified that some shows use online check-in systems, which do not involve verifying registration papers at entry. One member emphasized the need for clear, consistent enforcement to set a firm precedent, despite the difficulty of making tough decisions, especially with youth involved. Taking a stand, he said, is essential to maintain rule integrity and avoid setbacks.

The executive committee agreed with the proposed disciplinary action from the show committee as follows:

> *No awards will be granted to the animal in question, its dam, or its sire that would have otherwise contributed to Register of Renown or show points.*
>
> *The animal will be ineligible to be exhibited by any owner or exhibitor at any ABBA-approved show or event, including but not limited to ABBA-approved shows, ABBA-approved points shows, the AJBA All-American, or any other open or junior show under the jurisdiction of ABBA or AJBA. This ineligibility is effective immediately and will remain in place through the conclusion of the 2025–2026 ABBA show year, ending June 30, 2026.*
>
> *Both the owner and the exhibitor will be placed on probation for violation of ABBA's official show rules, with the probationary period effective immediately and ending on June 30, 2026.*
>
> *Any future violation of ABBA rules or the conditions outlined above may result in further disciplinary action as deemed appropriate by ABBA.*

Hatch Smith made a motion to approve the show committees discipline recommendation. The motion was seconded by Steve Hudgins and carried unanimously.

Paul Maulsby addressed the committee and members, discussing his efforts to improve structure, transparency, and communication within ABBA. He noted that new committee members are often "thrown in" without clear guidance, so he has created Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and handbooks for committee chairs to outline responsibilities and expectations. These documents are flexible but serve as valuable references. They also include a pledge for accountability, inspired by practices from other breed associations.

He introduced Basecamp, a project management tool used to streamline operations and ensure continuity. If something happens to a staff member, Basecamp holds all job functions, tasks, and documents, along with committee-specific portals for accessing resources. In addition to staff and board handbooks, guides for interns and other roles have been developed, and all staff must

DRAFT

sign NDAs. The goal is not only to create individual committee structures but to foster greater cohesion between them.

Mr. Maulsby emphasized that while committees often work in isolation (e.g., shows, performance, youth), decisions made by one group affect the entire association. He used the metaphor, “Everyone is playing in their sandbox, but not on the same playground,” aiming to unify committees for better, well-informed decision-making. He encouraged committees to explore Basecamp, which has already been successful for the Youth Committee.

He acknowledged that he’s been particularly energized about streamlining communication and processes, and reassured everyone that both he and Iridiana Ibarra, along with the rest of the staff, are working hard to provide structure, clarity, and support for the committees. Tools like the handbooks and Basecamp are part of that effort—to equip members with the resources they need to work effectively and stay informed.

Hatch Smith asked about confidentiality expectations for committee members. Paul confirmed that all committee members sign an NDA, with similar protocols being developed for the Executive Committee. The goal is to allow internal discussions before sharing sensitive matters with the full board or membership. Paul reiterated his commitment to creating a collaborative process, not dictating decisions, and highlighted new protocols for office functions.

Steve Hudgins asked if a member from Mexico could register a bull with ABBA using Mexican registration papers, even if there is no DNA on file. Iridiana Ibarra clarified that if the registration falls under reciprocity, DNA is not required. However, for animals being imported into the U.S., ABBA does require a DNA profile due to the possibility that the sire or dam may lack DNA on file or only have STR markers instead of SNPs.

Mr. Hudgins expressed concern over consistency, suggesting that if ABBA requires DNA from domestic members, the same should apply to international members. Iridiana responded that the DNA Committee had discussed establishing clear DNA requirements for reciprocity and imported animals, noting the challenge that many foreign-registered sires and dams lack DNA or only have STR profiles, making parent verification difficult.

Paul Maulsby added that the current ABBA rules do not explicitly prohibit the described scenario, so the office has been processing requests within the existing framework. He agreed that the same standard should apply to both domestic and international registrations. He also mentioned that ABBA has been in communication with Neogen, the primary lab for international registries, to align international practices with ABBA’s requirements.

Paul Maulsby emphazied the need for consistency in DNA testing standards for all animals entering ABBA’s registry. He noted that Allison would present a DNA update for further insight. It was reclarified that misinformation has caused confusion between reciprocity and import protocol. Reciprocity involves animals born and registered in another country, whereas imports follow separate protocols, including DNA profiling.

Iridiana Ibarra explained that animals registered through reciprocity are identified with a pound sign (#), while imported animals are marked with an asterisk (*). Mr. Maulsby also mentioned

DRAFT

ongoing outreach to international breed associations to address DNA protocol concerns and foster a clearer, standardized framework for global DNA testing. He stressed that ABBA must recognize the challenges of international DNA testing and work toward a unified approach with global partners.

Paul Maulsby concluded by emphasizing the need for continued review and clarification of reciprocity, noting that ABBA is currently in full compliance with its rules but is actively working to develop more consistent and collaborative DNA standards internationally.

A member expressed strong concern over the recent lawsuit filed against ABBA, particularly pointing out that ABBA data was used to personally target and attack members. He emphasized that this misuse of association information is a serious issue and should not be accepted. He urged the committee and members to reflect on the fact that ABBA data was weaponized against fellow members, stressing that such behavior undermines the integrity and unity of the organization. He concluded by encouraging everyone to consider the broader implications of this situation under their leadership and responsibility within ABBA.

After no new business, Hatch Smith moves to adjourn Catherine Neumayr seconded, meeting adjourned.

DRAFT