President’s Message

Greetings from the west slope of the continental divide. It is a great honor to serve as your next president. I am way out of my “comfort zone,” but I will do the best I can. Thank you to Dr. Tom Rea for his service as last year’s president. Good job, Tom! Thanks also to the outgoing Board members, Dr Larry Kennel and Dr. “Whit” Whitaker. It was a privilege to serve with both of you, and what a wild ride the last 3 years have been.

Please take the time to read in this newsletter the Joint AETA/CETA ACTE meeting summary as there are a lot of thank you’s that shouldn’t be missed. Our joint meetings keep getting better and better every year. The Ottawa meeting is already taking shape with Dr. Ron Heron and Dr. Ron Kling as the co-chairmen. If you have any speaker ideas or contacts, please contact either one of them. I hear Ottawa is very pretty in October with all the fall colors in full showing. Please plan on attending.

I would like to introduce a new feature that will appear in the “Closer Look.” I have asked Dr. John Hasler if he would be interested in participating in a new and hopefully long-lasting question and answer column. I promised to let everyone know it wasn’t his idea. The feature will be set up so members can e-mail Dr. Hasler (askjohn@assochq.org) with any question, and he will do his best to answer them. All topics are fair game. The success of this will depend on members sending in questions, so please participate! The newsletter also needs articles for reprint. This is the most difficult part of the newsletter, and I beg all of you to help out. Please send any articles of interest to the AETA headquarters office (aeta@assochq.org) or to Dr. Hasler so we have a bank to look through for each newsletter.

Updating the GMO resolution issue, as of November 9th our settlement agreement has been signed by the AETA. All that is needed now is for a few more signatures from the other involved parties. Our share of the settlement should be received shortly after this is completed. I don’t want to get excited yet until the check clears the bank. Hopefully sometime in the near future this will all be over! Thank you to the entire GMO Resolution Committee for all their hard work

All of the Committee Chairs are in place. If anyone wishes to volunteer for a committee, please contact someone on the Committee of choice or any Board member. We always need more help. I am reminded by the use of the word “volunteer” that all Committee members and Board members are volunteers, and we need to be grateful that someone is willing to give to this association so that the rest of us can enjoy.

Thanks, and I look forward to serving all of you!

Pat Richards, DVM
### Past President’s Message

I hope that our recent meeting in Minneapolis was informative and entertaining for those of you who were able to attend. Pat Richards and David Duxbury should be commended for a job well done. The speakers were excellent, and the activities were outstanding. The convention appears to have been financially successful as well.

I would like to thank the past and present board members with whom I have served for their friendship and support. I would also like to extend a special thank you to my committee chairmen and members and the staff at FASS.

As chairman of the Nominating Committee, I would encourage anyone who would like to be involved in this organization to contact me. It has been a truly rewarding experience for me. The strength of the AETA is in its membership and the individuals that chose to be involved as board members or as committee members.

It has been a privilege to serve as president of the AETA. I look forward to seeing you in Ottawa next fall.

Thomas Rea, DVM

### Future Meetings of Interest!

**IETS**

- **2006 IETS Annual Meeting**  
  Orlando, Florida  
  January 8–10, 2006

**AABP**

- **2006 AABP Annual Meeting**  
  St. Paul, Minnesota  
  September 21–23, 2006

- **2007 AABP Annual Meeting**  
  Vancouver, BC, Canada  
  September 20–22, 2007

**SFT/ACT**

- **2006 Annual Meeting**  
  St. Paul, Minnesota  
  August 22–26, 2006

### Save These Dates!

**AETA**

- **2006 AETA & CETA/ACTE Joint Convention**  
  Ottawa, ON, Canada  
  October 5–7, 2006

- **2007 AETA Annual Meeting**  
  in conjunction with  
  *The Society for Theriogenology*  
  Monterey, California  
  August 7–12, 2007

### A Closer Look Advertising Rates for 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Card</td>
<td>$50 per issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ Page</td>
<td>$75 per issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Page</td>
<td>$150 per issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Page</td>
<td>$200 per issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Schedule and Deadlines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ads are due the 15th of each issue month. If you would like to advertise in the next issue, please contact AETA at aeta@assochq.org or 217-398-2217.

*AETA can now accept ads electronically or camera-ready for publication.*

“The AETA supports the FDA guidelines as stated in the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act of 1994 [AMDUCA].” More information about this topic can be found at http://www.avma.org/scienact/amduca/amducal.asp.
One-Stop Shopping for Your Reproductive Healthcare Needs

Our pharmacists are always available to answer your questions.

Toll Free 1.866.646.2233
Arizona: 480.946.2223     Toll Free Fax 1.866.646.2235
2930 North Hayden Road, Scottsdale AZ 85251

It is said that work, well done, is art. At Diamondback Drugs, we continually strive to perfect the art and science of veterinary pharmaceuticals.
Partnar Auction Contributors

Mineral Contributors:
Dr. Lee Jones $875.00
Dr. Scott Allenstein $1,000.00
Dr. Mark Henderson $2,500.00
Dr. Roger Davis $1,000.00

Tank Contributors:
Transova: $4,500.00

The following donated $100.00 as part of consortia, totaling $2,000.00.

Blue Ridge Embryos
Bickett Genetics
Ashby Herd Health Services
Cornerstone Genetics

Meeting Summary

The 2005 Joint AETA / CETA ACTE meeting in Minneapolis turned out to be another good one. The meeting was well-attended with 229 delegates from the AETA, 53 from CETA, and 5 from outside the USA and Canada. Every meeting needs the help from many individuals and companies to make it a success; my thanks need to be passed on to all who helped.

Thanks to Bioniche for the wonderful time Thursday evening at Nicollet Island. What a beautiful setting and atmosphere for visiting with old friends and meeting new ones. Thanks to all the sponsors for the other social events as well. Schering Plough Canada pitched in on the golf and Pfizer on the fishing. We would also like to thank IMV for the generous gift bags given at the banquet. Everyone who participated had a great time.

Thank you to all the sponsors and exhibitors who generously support our two organizations. This year the sponsorship money totaled close to $33,500. The meeting couldn’t go on without your support.

Thanks to all the speakers for taking the time out of their busy schedules to present such timely material.

Thank you to all who joined in the fun with the auction to raise money to help the Membership Committee reach out for new members. The Bonnie Mohr prints that were auctioned off brought in $6150.00, which will be split equally between AETA and CETA. Thank you to Bonnie Mohr for donating these prints and to Dr. Duxbury for having them framed.

Noah’s Wish, which is a hurricane relief fund, was the recipient of two more items auctioned. Partnar Animal Health donated a nitrogen tank that sold for a total of $6,500 and Vitafirm donated some minerals that brought in $5,375. Thank you to all who supported these worthy causes. Good job to Bob Stevenson as auctioneer.

Every meeting needs a person close to the venue to handle all the “little” stuff, so I offer a special thanks to Dr. Dave Duxbury for arranging the golf, fishing, spouse tours, and helping to coordinate the Thursday social.

Financially, this year’s meeting was also a success. The AETA Board has a goal of getting the association back into stable financial shape by having in reserve one year’s operating budget; hopefully, over the next 5-10 years with meetings like this, we will reach that goal.

For a meeting to be successful you need great speakers, generous sponsors, enthusiastic exhibitors, and good attendance. This year’s meeting had them all. Thanks again.

Pat Richards, DVM
Program Committee co-chairman
Annual Meeting Photos

Banquet

Master of Ceremonies: Dr. Dan Hornickel.

Dr. Tom Rea presents Dr. Randell Hinshaw with President’s Award.

Dr. Tom Rea presents Dr. Pat Richards with Program Chair Appreciation Award.

Dr. Richard Remillard presents Dr. Ron Herron with Program Chair Appreciation Award.

Auction winners

Dr. Tom Rea presents Jim and Judy Griffin with Appreciation Award.
2005 AETA Past Presidents’ Breakfast

General Meeting Photos

Dr. Reuben Mapletoft and Dr. Gabriel Bo.
2005 Golf Tournament

1st Place Team

2nd Place Team

3rd Place Team

Golf Luncheon
THANK YOU TO OUR 2005 CONVENTION SPONSORS

Pre-Conference Social
Evening at Nicollet Island Pavilion
BIONICHE ANIMAL HEALTH, INC.

Golf Tournament
SCHERING-PLough ANIMAL HEALTH MAKERS
OF ESTRUMATE®

Fishing Tournament
PFIZER ANIMAL HEALTH

Breakfast
Friday Morning, Sept. 9
IMV INTERNATIONAL

Coffee Breaks
Friday Morning, Sept. 9
REPRODUCTION RESOURCES

Saturday Morning, Sept. 10
VETERINARY CONCEPTS

Lunch
Friday, Sept. 9
PROFESSIONAL EMBRYO
TRANSFER SUPPLY, INC. (PETS, INC)

Social Hour Entertainment
IMV INTERNATIONAL

Banquet Favors
IMV INTERNATIONAL

Sessions & Speakers
Speaker: Dr. Gabriel Bo
DIAMONDBACK DRUGS

Session: Equine ET 101
Presented by: Dr. Phil Matthews
and Dr. Ed Squires
PARTNAR ANIMAL HEALTH

Session: Practitioner’s Forum
Moderated by: Dr. Reuben Mapletoft
PARTNAR ANIMAL HEALTH

THANKS TO OUR 2005 CONVENTION EXHIBITORS

AGTECH

BIOGENICS

BIONICHE ANIMAL HEALTH CANADA

BIONICHE ANIMAL HEALTH USA

BIOZYME

BUECHEL INSURANCE LLC

CLASSIC MEDICAL SUPPLY INC.

CYAGRA, INC.

DIAMONDBACK DRUGS

IMV INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

IVX ANIMAL HEALTH

KANE ENTERPRISES

MILA INTERNATIONAL

MINITUBE OF AMERICA INC.

PARTNAR ANIMAL HEALTH, INC.

PFIZER ANIMAL HEALTH

PROFESSIONAL EMBRYO TRANSFER
SUPPLY, INC. (PETS, INC.)

REPRODUCTION RESOURCES

ROCKY MOUNTAIN MICROSCOPE CORPORATION

STEAURT LABS

VETERINARY CONCEPTS

VETERINARY SALES & SERVICE
"I thought the F20 (Agtech) sheath worked and held up equally as well as the IMV sheath. Based on similarity in performance the Agtech sheath is a better value."
Dr. Allan Oltjen, Canyon, TX

"I prefer Agtech because I can get just about all the supplies I need from one place at a reasonable price."
Jeff Eichhorn, Olathe, CO

"The Zona (Agtech) filter is the better value as it performs very similar to the EmCon but is much less expensive."
Landi Beck, Cody, WY

Call Tom Patterson, Agtech’s Domestic Sales Manager, to place your order 800.367.4016.

Agtech, Inc.
www.agtechinc.com, tpatterson@agtechinc.com
800.367.4016 USA & Canada, 785.776.3863 World Wide
Hello to the AETA membership. I have been asked to start a “Dear Abby” column for readers of ‘A Closer Look.’ I am both flattered and intimidated by this opportunity. I would like all of you to know that I do not consider myself any more qualified to manage this column than are many of you. Furthermore, I am not competent to go it alone on many of the issues that I suspect will come this way in the future. I anticipate often seeking help and advice from other persons, both in the field of commercial embryo transfer and in the academic realm. I am very fortunate in having been able to lean on many persons for help in the past. In addition, I would not be part of this industry today were it not for the many fine professionals who worked with me at Em Tran, Inc. and Em Tran-West, Inc. over the years. I really owe much of what I know to their efforts. I am grateful to those former colleagues, and I am particularly proud of the fact that, with the recent election of Allen Rushmer to the AETA board of directors, a total of six Em Tran alumni have served on the board.

Since this is the first edition of my column, no questions have as yet been presented. Therefore, I thought it might be appropriate to make a few comments on a recent paper published in *Theriogenology*, the abstract of which appears in this issue of ‘A Closer Look.’ The research comes from the laboratory of our Virginia Tech friend Bill Beal, and the first author is Scott Purcell, Bill’s former student who now is here at CSU studying with George Seidel. What I found most interesting in the paper is the use of flunixin meglumine (Banamine®) in bovine recipients receiving embryos. Banamine was injected just prior to embryo transfer and did not affect pregnancy rate at two locations but resulted in a significantly higher pregnancy rate compared to controls at a third location. One practitioner transferred all the embryos at all three locations, so it is unlikely that transfer technique or handling of the uterus was involved in the higher pregnancy rate at one location. The reason(s) for the improved pregnancy rates in recipients that were injected with Banamine remain obscure. However, as the authors pointed out, some practitioners may choose to use Banamine at all locations because of its relatively low cost and ease of administration at the time of transfer. Obviously, we have not heard the last word on this subject and further research is necessary to determine why Banamine is beneficial in some circumstances but not others. Research in this area currently is being pursued by Neal Schrick and I am sure that we hear will more from his lab in the future.

**Welcome New Board Members!**

Dr. Allen Rushmer  
and  
Dr. Byron Williams
University of Georgia (UGA) scientists have developed a method for eliminating the harmful E. coli O157:H7 pathogen in cattle watering troughs.

An estimated 73,000 cases of E. coli O157:H7 in humans are reported each year in the United States. Studies have shown that the pathogen can be transferred from one cow to another through the animals’ drinking water.

“Cattle drinking water is often contaminated with cud (rumen content),” said Michael Doyle, a UGA microbiologist and director of the Center for Food Safety in Griffin, GA. “Cattle water can also have manure in it, and together, this leads to E. coli contamination.”

In the past, disinfectants like chlorine have been ineffective at removing E. coli O157:H7 from cattle drinking water. With funding from the American Meat Institute Foundation, Doyle led a project that focused on identifying practical treatments for eliminating E. coli O157:H7 in cattle drinking water.

The UGA scientists first screened various chemicals in search of an effective control. “We knew right away that chlorine and ozone treatments had little to no effect,” Doyle said. “But we were able to ultimately identify two chemical combinations that are highly effective.”

The best treatments were a combination of lactic acid, acidic calcium sulfate and caprylic acid and another combination of lactic acid, acidic calcium sulfate and butyric acid. “Both treatments include a base chemical, acidified calcium sulfate, or Safe2O,” Doyle said. “This chemical has a very low pH, less than 2, which makes it very acidic.” Doyle’s laboratory studies found that the two chemical formulations not only eliminated E. coli O157:H7, but also killed other enterohemorrhagic E. coli which are related to E. coli O157:H7.

But what do the cows think of this new power-drink? UGA animal scientist Joe West fed the treated water to a group of test cows. “We use Calan doors, which are electronically controlled doors,” he said. “Each cow has a transponder that works as the door’s key.” In this way, West can monitor how much water a cow truly consumes. For the study, he measured how much water the cows drank over the seven days and compared that to what they normally drink. He found that the cows drank 19 liters per day of the lactic acid water, compared to 30 liters per day of non-treated water. “They’ll drink the treated water, but obviously, they’re reluctant to drink it,” he said. “So it’s not suited for continuous feeding.”

West said cows could survive on the reduced water intake. But when a cow’s water or feed intake is reduced, her growth and milk production also decline. To keep from reducing cows’ water intake, the scientists recommend farmers periodically treat their water tanks with the chemical treatment.

“A farmer could treat his tanks for 20 minutes and basically sanitize his watering system,” Doyle said. “He could treat the holding tanks and the troughs, then flush and refill them with clean water. This would kill the organism and then provide fresh water for the animals.”

Adding the chemical to his cattle’s water supply would be an added task and, for now, a voluntary action for the farmer, Doyle said.

“Until someone down the line gets serious about controlling E. coli at the source, this is just a control method available to farmers,” he said. “If on-farm controls should be mandated, we have a treatment available that will work.”

Adding the chemicals to cattle drinking water shouldn’t be cost-prohibitive for farmers. “The material is fairly dilute, and we’ve determined that a very dilute combination can still be effective” Doyle said.

Sharon Omahen, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Georgia

A promising pre-harvest, live animal pathogen reduction technology could receive a stronger look from government regulatory and meat industry officials after scientists have found that it doesn’t jeopardize the health of consumers because of potential residue fears.

Efforts to reduce deadly pathogens in meat have most recently included utilizing compounds that would rid animals’ systems of bacteria before they are slaughtered and taken through the rest of the processing system. One of the most promising pre-harvest, pathogen-reducing food safety technologies in cattle is the use of sodium chlorate in drinking
water and/or feed a few days before cattle are loaded and transported to the packing plants. However, use of this feed additive has not been approved by regulatory organizations because it is not known whether significant enough residues are present in edible tissues of treated animals and create a human health risk.

Earlier this year, research indicated that moderate to heavy sodium chlorate doses do not result in a level of meat residue harmful to humans.

In the final report of the research finished this past April, Agricultural Research Service (ARS) researcher David Smith said that residue levels were not high enough to represent a health risk to humans who consume meat from animals treated with sodium chlorate.

“Results of this study indicate that further development of the product is warranted because residues of the parent compound were fairly low and because the major metabolite, chloride, is naturally present in all life forms,” he said. Sodium chlorate is said to be most effective when offered to cattle three to five days prior to being shipped to packers. It kills and results in “sloughing” of dangerous bacteria, specifically E. coli O157:H7, from the stomachs of cattle.

Researchers said the compound is a common sense approach to meat safety because the more bacteria that is removed from an animal’s system prior to it entering the plant, the less bacteria there is to contaminate meat once an animal is slaughtered and eviscerated. They did say, however, that more emphasis needs to be put on rinsing the hair and hide of animals upon entering the processing facility because the more bacteria that is excreted the more bacteria contamination there is on the skin and hair of individual animals.

Additional research is scheduled, however, officials with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) told WLJ last week that the preliminary study concerning sodium chlorate will probably give them enough impetus to move on with preliminary probes into granting the product certification for use as a feed additive at the feedlot level.

Steven D. Vetter, WLJ Editor
Growth and fertility of bulls cloned from the somatic cells of an aged and infertile bull

Kazuho Shiga\textsuperscript{a}, Hidenobu Umeki\textsuperscript{a}, Hideaki Shimura\textsuperscript{a}, Tatsuo Fujita\textsuperscript{a}, Shinya Watanabe\textsuperscript{b}, and Takashi Nagai\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a}Oita Prefectural Institute of Animal Industry, Kuju Naoiri, Oita 878-0201, Japan
\textsuperscript{b}Department of Animal Breeding and Reproduction, National Institute of Livestock and Grassland Science, 2 Ikenodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0901, Japan


Abstract

In the present study, somatic cell cloning technology was used to produce eight newborn calves from an aged, infertile bull. Average birth weight of these calves was significantly higher than that of calves produced using AI. Four of the cloned calves died during the peripartum period; the remaining four (Clones A–D) survived and were used in this study. Two of the surviving calves (Clones C and D) were castrated; growth rates of the intact and castrated clones were similar to those of intact and castrated bulls, respectively, that had been derived by AI. Both uncastrated bulls (Clones A and B) began to produce normal semen at approximately 12 months of age. Semen produced by these clones, and their nuclear donor, was subsequently used for IVF; the proportion of IVM-IVF oocytes developing to the blastocyst stage was 23.4% (50/214), 28.4% (52/183) and 30.9% (63/204), respectively. Conception rates for AI were 54.5% (12/22) and 62.7% (64/102) for semen derived from Clone A and from the nuclear donor, respectively. The length of pregnancy and birth weight of the calves derived from semen collected from clones were similar to those of calves obtained by conventional AI using semen from their nuclear donor. Therefore, sires cloned from the somatic cells of an aged and infertile bull had normal fertility.

Keywords: Somatic cell; Cloning; Cattle; Growth; Fertility

Corresponding author. Tel.: +81 29 873 7382; fax: +81 29 873 7383.
Effect of a CIDR insert and flunixin meglumine, administered at the time of embryo transfer, on pregnancy rate and resynchronization of estrus in beef cattle

S.H. Purcella, b, W.E. Beala, and K.R. Grayb

aDepartment of Animal and Poultry Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0306, USA
bCross Country Genetics North Inc., Westmoreland, KS 66549, USA


Abstract
The objectives of this study were to evaluate the effects of flunixin meglumine (FM), an inhibitor of PGF2α synthesis, and insertion of an intravaginal progesterone-releasing device (CIDR), on pregnancy rates in beef cattle embryo transfer (ET) recipients, and to examine the effect of a CIDR after embryo transfer on the synchrony of the return to estrus in non-pregnant recipients. Cows (n = 622) and heifers (n = 90) at three locations were assigned randomly to one of four groups in a 2 × 2 factorial arrangement of treatments with FM administration (500 mg i.m.) 2–12 min prior to ET, and insertion of a CIDR (1.38 g progesterone) immediately following ET as main effects. Fresh or frozen embryos (Stage = 4 or 5; Grade = 1 or 2) were transferred on Days 6–9 of the estrous cycle and CIDR devices were removed 13 days after ET. Recipients at Location 2 only were observed for signs of return to estrus. Recipients that returned to estrus at Location 2 were either bred by AI or received an embryo 7 days after estrus. Following the initial ET, there was an FM × location interaction on pregnancy rate (P < 0.01; Location 1, 89% versus 57%; Location 2, 69% versus 64%; Location 3, 64% versus 67% for FM versus no FM, respectively). Pregnancy rates of embryo recipients were not affected by CIDR administration (P > 0.05; 65% with CIDR, 70% without CIDR), however, the timing of the return to estrus was more synchronous (P < 0.01) for recipients given a CIDR. Pregnancy rate of recipients bred following a return to estrus did not differ between cows receiving or not receiving a CIDR for resynchronization (P > 0.13). Effects of FM on pregnancy rate were location dependent and CIDR insertion at ET improved synchrony of the return to estrus.

Keywords: Embryo transfer; CIDR; Flunixin meglumine; Beef cattle

Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 540 231 4750; fax: +1 540 231 3010.

1Present address: Animal Reproduction and Biotechnology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA.
The following abstract is reproduced with permission from Theriogenology, Volume 64, Issue 8, November 2005, Pages 1716–1728.

Low dose insemination in cattle with the Ghent device
Steven Verberckmoes, Ann Van Soom, Jeroen Dewulf, Mirjan Thys, and Aart de Kruif

Department of Reproduction, Obstetrics and Herd Health, Ghent University, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, 133 Salisburylaan, 9820 Merelbeke, Belgium

Received 23 August 2004; revised 12 April 2005; accepted 12 April 2005. Available online 23 May 2005.

Abstract
A new artificial insemination device for semen deposition near the uterotubal junction (UTJ) in cattle (Ghent device) was developed at Ghent University (Belgium). In this study, UTJ insemination of dairy cows with the Ghent device was compared with the conventional insemination technique to evaluate the effect on pregnancy rates after insemination with different doses of semen.

In each of three field trials, the cows \((n = 795, 659, 360)\) and heifers \((n = 253, 182, 231)\) were randomly assigned to receive 12 million sperm deposited in the uterine body using conventional techniques (control) or a reduced sperm dose (RSD) deposited in the same manner as the control or bilateral deposition near the uterotubal junction using the Ghent device (Ghent). Sperm dosages for RSD and Ghent inseminations were 8, 4, and 2 million sperm for field trials 1–3, respectively. In the multivariable analysis, the pregnancy rates were significantly affected by the parity of the cow \((p = 0.008)\) in each of the three trials, by the sire \((p = 0.014, 0.009)\) in trials 1 and 3, and by the inseminator \((p < 0.001)\) in trial 2. In none of the trials were the pregnancy rates significantly affected by the insemination technique, the order of insemination (first, second, or third), the breed of the bull or the dosage sensitivity of the bull. In conclusion, neither sperm dosage nor site of semen deposition influenced pregnancy rates in the present study.

Keywords: Uterotubal junction; Cattle; Low dose insemination; Ghent device

Corresponding author. Tel.: +32 9 264 75 50; fax: +32 9 264 77 97.
2006 IETS Annual Conference

IETS would like to extend an invitation to the members of the American Embryo Transfer Association join us at the next annual conference of the IETS, scheduled for 8-10 January 2006 in Orlando, Florida, at the Caribe Royale Resort & Convention Center.

The theme of the IETS 2006 program is:
“Gametes to Fertilization—Impact of New Technology on Embryo Production”.

The program highlights the latest scientific findings on the biology of sperm and eggs and the processes leading up to fertilization, the control of which is crucial for improvements in embryo production and fertility. Special emphasis will be on new technologies for gamete preservation, manipulation of the male germ line, and applications to species conservation. The LOC is planning some exciting social events with details to come later. There are also plans for a practitioner’s forum. Additionally, the meeting will have short communications showcasing the latest research results from leading laboratories around the world. The program will conclude with a keynote lecture by Dr. Richard Behringer on Developmental Diversity in Mammals. Details on the program, including the invited speakers and titles of their presentations, are currently available on the IETS website at: http://www.iets.org/2006

The main conference will be preceded by a half-day IETS Pet Cloning Symposium (Friday morning, January 6) and two different one-day Pre-conference Symposia (both on Saturday, January 7). The topic of the first pre-conference symposium, organized by Dr. Reuben Mapleton, is “Challenges and Opportunities for In Vivo Embryo Production in Cattle,” and the topic for the second pre-conference symposium, organized by Dr. Barry Bavister and Dr. Carol Brenner, is “Non-Human Primate ART to ES Cells.” The main meeting will be followed by a one-day Post-Conference Symposium, organized by Dr. Peter Hansen and the Local Organizing Committee, on “Realizing the Promise of IVF in Cattle: Optimizing Embryonic and Fetal Survival.” Mark your calendars and plan to attend and be informed by a great series of presentations as well as entertained by the evening social programs. Bring your family and friends and stay a few extra days to visit some of the many attractions in Orlando. All of these events will also be held at the Caribe Royale, Orlando, Florida.

Registration information is now available on the IETS 2006 Meeting website (www.iets.org/2006).
Thank you for your continued support

Your Embryo Transfer Professionals. Embryo Transfer has always been our only business. Customer service is our priority. Customer satisfaction is our only goal.

We now have a Y Foley Connector which is SOLVENT FREE that will fit and HOLD in ANY CATHETER, including silicone catheters.

Come see us at the IETS in Orlando, FL January 8-10 2006 !!!!

We are also pleased to offer two complete lines of media.

**IMV**
- Complete Flush Media W/ BSA
- Full line of freezing, thawing, holding media

**BIONICHE**
- Complete Flush Media W/ BSA
- Complete Flush Media W/ PVA
- Full line of freezing, thawing, holding media

Please feel free to call with any questions or concerns. Don’t forget to stop by our web site [www.pets-inc.com](http://www.pets-inc.com)
NEW AETA STUDENT MEMBERSHIP

Who is eligible? Full-time students at recognized colleges and universities

Cost: $25 per year

Non-Voting Membership

Benefits include:
- Included in e-mail distribution list
- Access to online newsletter, A Closer Look (quarterly)
- Access to online, searchable membership directory
- Access to online proceedings
- $25 annual conference registration fee for the scientific sessions only
- Free conference (redeemable at one meeting attended during the first three years after graduation)

Apply now at www.aeta.org
Bioniche Animal Health USA proudly introduces another major innovation for embryo transfer and reproduction specialists: SYNgro™ Holding, an embryo holding medium in a non-refrigerated, non-animal origin formulation.

The latest research indicates that the embryo has unique needs, including ideal pH and osmolarity. SYNgro Holding addresses these needs with a formula that specifically eliminates bovine serum albumin (BSA) and all other materials of animal origin.

Importantly, the product does NOT require refrigeration, thus it eliminates reliance on costly refrigerated freight services. It also provides practical storage and handling benefits for the practitioner.

SYNgro Holding represents the first in a complete line of technologically-advanced media that also offer practical and economic advantages to all reproductive specialists due to their non-refrigerated format.

Practical Benefits with Every Use

- Eliminates concerns regarding animal-based formulas
- Eliminates costly second day air shipments of refrigerated media
- Eliminates the ‘down-time’, waiting for media to warm to room temperature with each use
- Eliminates wastage of ‘re-warmed’ refrigerated medium; store extra SYNgro medium at room temperature
- Eliminates need to change current procedures - just substitute for any holding medium now used

All SYNgro™ brand media bearing this symbol are made with a non-animal origin formulation from Bioniche.

SYNgro Holding

Product Codes:
- ESM024 - 50ml
- ESM224 - 20ml
- ESM824 - 8ml x 6 vials

For more information, contact your reproduction product distributor or Bioniche Animal Health USA, Inc. at 1-800-335-8595. Visit www.Bioniche.com