**Issues Carried Over From Version 1**

**Horse Names as ID**

These get translated to a LargeAnimalGroup with quantity 1 in my translation from the eCVI. This is because our definition of LargeAnimal has Tag and TagNumber required. Not all individual large animals actually require a "tag number."

Proposed solutions:

1. Allow description as alternative to tag number in Large Animal.
2. Make sure LargeAnimalGroup includes the concept of a single animal without official ID tag (or chip).
3. Put horse description as AnimalTag/Number even when listed as "other ID" in source.

**Field Lengths in General**

Some users translating from the States eCVI PDF have run into problems with the 200 character limit on the GroupLot description. Are any of the other string lengths causing problems that we need to address?

**Namespace for Certificate Number**

As systems consume CVIs from different sources there can be certificate number collisions. For these to be treated as unique identifiers, receiving systems need a way to identify the source of the Certificate Number. When these are received directly from the source system, this can be inferred from the source, but if the data are stored, forwarded, etc. the identity of the generating system is lost.

I would suggest adding a Certificate Number Namespace attribute. This would ideally be a universally unique ID such as an OID, or we could just have an agreed upon list that we maintain.

Alternatively, if we could get consensus on a prefix pattern say paper always start with State code, mCVI start with mcvi, eCVI always start with ecvi. This would mean all electronic CVI vendors update their numbering schemes. I don't like this much. Just a thought.

**Non-cvi Data**

Sightings, Transcribed Partial CVIs, Alternative Movement Documents, etc. All are based on but not necessarily compliant with this standard.

Moved to a separate project. Where? Who?

**Namespace vs. Schema location**

There is confusion over the URI used to define the document namespace vs. a location where the schema can be found. The former is found at the top of the schema itself.

But the question raises the issue that we have not made it easy to find the copy on the USAHA site. While most of us use the "working copy" here on GitHub, we had agreed to keep it on USAHA for neutrality and "official" status.

That URL by the way is: <http://www.usaha.org/Committees/AnimalHealthSurveillanceandInformation/AHSISDataStandards.aspx>

You can get there by following the committee structure on the USAHA.org site, but it took me a while.

**OTHER values**

In PurposeOfMovementType all the enumeration values are lower-case and 'other' is included rather than 'OTH'. (I much prefer spelling out the word FWIW). Making the enumerations more consistently styled throughout the document would be a nice touch.

Also where 'other' or 'OTH' is an option should there always be an option for including the other value/ValueOther? Similar to what is available in ProgramStatusType > Value

**Tag Types**

I've had a couple of queries recently asking about the meaning of the tag types - I will prepare a modification that adds annotations explaining what the short codes mean.

Animal name as a tagType seemed odd to me. What about including it as an optional attribute of the animal.

"tag" Type always bothered me because we are really saying "identifier"Type. This would include microchips, tattoos where allowed, and registered names such as thoroughbreds. It is kind of hard to make a cohesive concept domain because we are talking about both the identifier and the object that carries that identifier. So tagType stuck.

Yes, tagType is a little odd, we use idTypes as a more generic, but the name of the label wasn't really where it felt weird. I guess that these idTypes/tagTypes feel more formal, and probably more often than not animals entered in GVL have a informal name that they are referred to by. A horse name or pet name, not a registered name. In our system Groups/Lots also have a 'name' like 'lot#140' for example and that seemed like it fit in description okay, but for an animal including the name as a tag type seemed like less of a good fit.

Trying to fill in the tagTypes very few of the types we suggest to vets fit obviously into one of the types listed. For now I am putting almost all as 'OTH' which I assume to be other... and while we're at it can we change that to 'OTHER' since there isn't a 3 character length limit?

Unfortunately, the change from OTH to OTHER didn't get done in the v1.0 standard. I think it is now unwise to change this as it would be a "breaking change."

**Species Codes**

Ongoing issue. See: <https://github.com/tracefirst/usaha_committee/issues/42>

Plus:

The one part of this standard that almost certainly will need maintenance as we move forward is the lists of terminology, especially those that are more content than "structural".

As an example, I just stumbled upon the fact we don't have AVI in species to allow avian CVIs. While we do almost all of these on NPIP forms instead of traditional CVIs, some do move that way.

I would ask everyone "testing" the standard to be especially careful to look for these terminology issues so they can be discussed and appropriate (but not excessive) amendments made.

**Structure of Accession**

Ongoing but resolved in v1 See: <https://github.com/tracefirst/usaha_committee/issues/35>

The use of ID/IDREF to allow accession to be recorded once and referenced multiple times was and is controversial. Fits large bovine consignments but not individual animals nor multi-horse consignments. (Editor's note: The historical origin of this may be in the ill-defined word "accession.")

**Tests on GroupLot**

This issue has been raised but the use-case not detailed. Need to examine.

**Structure of Brand Inspection Image**

As we look at the current xsd, a brand inspection is per animal, which is practical if each animal has a different brand, and sometimes, rarely this might be the case. But for the case where the brand is the same on all animals within a group, would it be practical to also have the brand located on an "Animals" node that is a parent node to all the individual animals. We might be able to do this with other elements that are the same too. The practical concern is if 1000 animals are on a CVI and each has the same brand, the way that it currently is that the base64 representation of the brand is against each animal, making a overly bloated file. IF we move it into the Animals above the individual level as an option, it would only be necessary to send the brand once, making the files much more compact.

I wonder if we can use the ID/IDREF technique again? This would solve the problem you've identified but I don't know if it is possible to have two separate ID/IDREF pairs in a single schema -- [@mkm1879](https://github.com/mkm1879) do you know if this is possible?

Alternatively, we could house the brands in a registry and then refer to them by a reference number in the Animal element --- this was how I had implemented Accessions before moving to the ID/IDREF approach....

Yes, you can have multiple ID/IDREF pairs, but I don't know of a way to say that the IDREF has to refer only to ID in the correct place. So an image could include the ID of an Accession and the schema validator wouldn't catch it. (I could well be wrong on this point. I'm really barely an intermediate level XML geek.) But a home-made reference isn't enforced by the schema either so it would really be a wash.

**Signature Element**

We suggest adding a signature element like <xs:attribute name="Signature" type="xs:base64Binary" use="required"> in the vet node and the origin node.

Yes, but we have other non-necessry data in the standard that is being passed but not required for various reasons, so why not the signature. If the receiving party/DB does not want it, it can ignore it. But if it is pertanent, the standard should provide a way to send it. Otherwise, the first thing that will happen after the standard is written, is interested parties will break the standard by passing data (i.e. signatures as an example) that they need between them and then the standard is no longer adhered to. This is not a matter of legal document, it is however, pertinent data that may be needed between two interested parties. Thanks, and have a great Thanksgiving!

**Sex Value Set**

Intact male  
Neutered male  
Intact female  
Neutered female  
None of the above

* (only on GroupLot) Mixed gender

Currently also has True Hermaphrodite but not Freemartin, etc.