

78 in the R.O.K in 2012, animal manure must be directly used as fertilizer on farmland;
79 however, as of 2013, the amount of animal manure exceeded twice the annual nutrient
80 demand that farmland could accommodate (309,000 tons of needs vs. 680,000 tons from
81 manure). This excessive manure is analyzed to be one of the direct causes that led to the
82 deterioration of the overall nutrient balance in Korean farmland [6]. In 2020, the R.O.K
83 had the highest nitrogen balance in farmlands among the Organization for Economic Co-
84 operation and Development (OECD) member countries at 230 kg/ha, and also the highest
85 phosphorus balance at 46 kg/ha. Particularly, the nitrogen balance increased by
86 approximately 7.8% over the two-year period from 212 kg/ha in 2018. [7,8]

87 Recently, methane gas emissions from the digestive process of ruminant animals such
88 as cattle, sheep, and goats have been highlighted in relation to climate change. In
89 conjunction with the ammonia, nitrous oxide, and methane gas emissions from animal
90 manure, there is a great need to reduce greenhouse gases in the animal agriculture sector.
91 With the government's establishment of the 2050 carbon neutrality goal, the Ministry of
92 Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) is developing various policy measures to
93 reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the animal agriculture sector by up to 30% by 2030
94 [9]. To address all these challenges, a transformation towards environmentally friendly
95 agriculture and SAA is required, along with considerations for animal disease control and
96 the improvement of production environments.

97 In the R.O.K, the concept of environmentally friendly animal agriculture began to be
98 introduced in the early 2000s. This concept ultimately aims to cultivate SAA through
99 environmentally friendly production practices, ensuring the healthy rearing of animals to
100 supply safe animal products. It involves fostering SAA through environmental
101 friendliness, natural recycling systems, and animal welfare. Despite the government's

102 efforts, there are still significant challenges in implementing environmentally friendly
103 agriculture and SAA in the animal agriculture field, which tends to linger on fragmented
104 and temporary policies. Therefore, the objective of this review is to establish the direction
105 that animal agriculture should take in the climate crisis era, and to develop effective
106 strategies for SAA tailored to the current situation in the R.O.K by examining the trends
107 in SAA in the U.S.

108

109 **1) Overview of SAA in the U.S.**

110 The definitions of sustainable development discussed in the U.S. vary, but most
111 encompass the concept that achieving practical sustainability requires a balance across
112 economic, social, and environmental aspects [10]. The United States Department of
113 Agriculture (USDA), overseeing agricultural policies in the country, defines sustainable
114 agriculture as managing agriculture in a way that protects the environment, supports and
115 expands natural resources, and maximizes the utilization of non-renewable resources
116 [11]. The legal definition of sustainable agriculture refers to the establishment of an
117 integrated system of crop and animal production methods that meets five conditions
118 applicable in the field over the long term; 1) it meets the demand for human food and
119 fiber; 2) it enhances the environmental quality and the foundation of natural resources
120 that underpin agricultural economics; 3) it efficiently utilizes non-renewable resources
121 and farm resources, integrating appropriate ecological cycles and controls; 4) it maintains
122 the economic viability of the farm; and 5) it fulfills conditions that improve the quality of
123 life for farmers and society as a whole [12].

124 Animal agriculture in the U.S. has been working towards creating a SAA system
125 where humans, animals, and the environment can coexist through government initiatives,

126 industry research, technological support, and individual efforts. Efforts have been made
127 to the develop a SAA by reducing emissions like carbon, and improving factors affecting
128 the environment such as the carbon footprint, odors, and greenhouse gases associated
129 with animal agriculture processes for animals such as cattle and pigs.

130 The U.S. inherently possesses favorable conditions for SAA, including vast land
131 areas ensuring a stable supply chain for feed, extensive barn space, the establishment of a
132 resource recycling system through integrated farming for crop production and animal
133 husbandry, and government support policies in the form of agricultural subsidies.
134 Furthermore, regional universities, research institutions, private organizations, and the
135 animal agriculture sector have established clusters, fostering a research and development
136 system for collaborative efforts between academia and industry. This has led to active
137 initiatives in carbon reduction and the establishment of smart farms utilizing digital
138 technology.

139 The National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment (NLAE), a USDA
140 sub-organization, acts as a control center for the treatment of animal manure and odor
141 issues. It efficiently collects all relevant information on animal manure in the animal
142 agriculture field and ensures its effective management. The laboratory is actively engaged
143 in on-site, practical research, including reduction strategies for animal manure,
144 technologies for animal manure treatment, and breed-specific feeding studies, aiming to
145 find solutions for the challenges that animal agriculture faces [13].

146 The transition to SAA in the U.S. appears to be primarily aimed at expanding the
147 consumption of safe animal products and securing competitiveness in overseas export
148 markets. The export of U.S. animal products has been increasing annually, and SAA has
149 been part of the marketing strategy to emphasize safe and environmentally friendly

150 animal products in international consumer markets. Utilizing various media and
151 online/offline activities, the U.S. Meat Export Federation (USMEF) promotes the safety
152 and SAA practices of U.S. animal products [14].

153

154 **2) SAA by species in the U.S.**

155 **(1) Swine**

156 The U.S. is the second-largest pork producer in the world, with over 80,000 swine
157 farms. According to a report from the research team at North Carolina State University
158 [15], the U.S. pork industry has consistently increased pig productivity over the 50-year
159 period from 1960 to 2015 while also reducing the environmental impact. Swine farms
160 have reduced water, land, and energy use by 25.1%, 75.9%, and 7%, respectively, resulting
161 in their carbon footprint decreasing by 7.7%. While the number of pigs harvested increased
162 by 29%, the number of sows actually decreased by 39%. Moreover, the feed conversion
163 rate, which represents the amount of feed needed to produce one pound of pork, has
164 significantly decreased from 4.5 in 1960 to 2.8 in 2015 [16]. On the other hand, the average
165 market weight of pigs showed an increase from 90 kg to 127 kg, indicating a 38% growth
166 [17].

167 Most swine farms in the U.S. are clustered around regions where crops are produced.
168 Corn and soybeans are crucial feedstuffs as they are primary sources of energy and protein.
169 They are predominantly concentrated in the Midwest region known as the Corn Belt,
170 which includes Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Minnesota, as well as in southeastern states
171 including North Carolina and South Carolina. The Corn Belt states produce approximately
172 three-fourths of the total pork in the U.S. [16,18].

173 From a geographical and crop production perspective, the U.S. swine industry

174 benefits from feed self-sufficiency and soil restoration through nutrient cycling
175 agriculture, facilitating a SAA system. However, the U.S. is also addressing societal
176 concerns about MIAA. Animal welfare or consumer organizations are advocating for
177 ongoing transformations, prompting changes in animal agriculture systems to reduce
178 stocking density and enhance animal welfare. Additionally, the U.S. is implementing
179 measures such as low-carbon feed adoption, feed formulation adjustments to improve feed
180 efficiency, and the utilization of animal manure for resource and energy conversion to
181 minimize its environmental impact.

182 Despite efforts toward a SAA system in the U.S. swine industry, recent inflationary
183 impacts and record-high production costs pose challenges. Concerns over labor shortages
184 and consumer demand slowdown further complicate the transition from the traditional
185 economically driven swine industry to a SAA because of its anticipated costs and time. A
186 recent quarterly economic report released by the National Pork Producers Council (NPPC)
187 for 2023 provides insights into the challenging realities faced by the current U.S. swine
188 industry. Feed costs account for more than 60% of the total swine production cost, and it
189 increased by 24% compared to a year ago. Additionally, other expenses such as labor,
190 utility, and miscellaneous costs rose by 18%. In particular, the average production cost
191 and breakeven point have increased by 9% compared to last year, reaching a level that has
192 risen by approximately 60% over the past three years [16]. The ongoing high production
193 costs pose a significant challenge to the profitability of pig farming, and pig farms find it
194 difficult to adapt to any changes without economic viability. Therefore, it can be
195 considered the most critical issue in the transition to a SAA system.

196 Recently, there has been a growing national interest in animal welfare, leading to
197 increased demand for sustainable animal products such as organic and antibiotic-free

198 animal products. In particular, starting this year, the state of California, which is the largest
199 consumer of pork in the U.S., has implemented a law prohibiting the sale of animal
200 products raised in MIAA facilities. Despite strong opposition from the pork industry,
201 including through lawsuits filed in federal courts to stop the enforcement of the law, the
202 ban on the sale of animal products from MIAA facilities in California has been
203 implemented after a preparation period of several years amid public sentiment.

204

205 **(2) Beef cattle**

206 The U.S. has the world's largest feed industry, primarily producing grain-fed beef for
207 domestic consumption and export. It accounts for approximately 20% of the world's beef
208 production, making it the largest beef producing country globally. Approximately 85% of
209 the grazing land for beef production in the U.S., totaling 770 million acres, is land
210 unsuitable for crop production. This land is utilized for forage production, pasture
211 utilization, and feed and forage crop cultivation, as well as for soil restoration through
212 animal manure, which contributes to the development of a SAA system. From 1977 to
213 2007, technological advancements in cattle genetics, production, and processing in the U.
214 S. led to a 30% reduction in the number of cattle needed to produce 10 kg of beef over a
215 span of 30 years, and the required amount of feed decreased by 19% [19]. This has allowed
216 a reduction in the use of natural resources such as land and water, which has helped
217 diminish the carbon footprint. The proportion of total greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S.
218 attributed to cattle production is only 1.9% [20].

219 The paradigm shift towards sustainability in the U.S. beef industry began with the
220 establishment of the U.S. Roundtable for Sustainable Beef (USRSB) in 2015. This
221 organization is actively working to promote continuous improvement to the sustainability

222 of the U.S. beef value chain. They have involved stakeholders at every stage of the beef
223 industry, including around 28,000 cattle ranchers, breeders, and grain-fed beef producers,
224 as well as participants from various sectors such as packers, meat processors, retailers,
225 NGOs, research institutions, and related entities. As of 2018, there are 111 member
226 organizations actively participating in the USRSB [21, 22].

227 The USRSB has established six core indicators to achieve its vision of a SAA with
228 environmental soundness, social responsibility, and economic viability. The six key
229 indicators for SAA are 1) air and greenhouse gas emissions, 2) land resources, 3) water
230 resources, 4) employee safety and well-being, 5) animal health and well-being, and 6)
231 efficiency and yield [22]. These indicators serve as the primary objectives for promoting
232 sustainability throughout the entire beef supply chain. In the early stages of the
233 organization's activities, there was a lack of motivation towards the efforts and costs
234 associated with implementing SAA because there was a respect for the autonomy of
235 producers and there were no enforceable obligations.

236 Especially from an environmental perspective, there was a lack of corresponding
237 economic incentives for producers in terms of external pollution control and greenhouse
238 gas reduction. However, SAA has become imperative for securing competitiveness in
239 future beef production and distribution with the government's strong regulations and
240 support, which are contingent on compliance, and the increasing voice of consumers
241 regarding animal welfare and the environment. The U.S. exports approximately 1 million
242 tons of beef annually, with a value of around 4 billion dollars per year [23].

243

244 **(3) Dairy cattle**

245 The U.S. dairy industry aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 30% by 2030

246 and achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. Additionally, they have developed the Net Zero
247 Initiative to optimize water use and enhance water quality for carbon zero emissions. The
248 Innovation Center for U.S. Dairy was established in 2008 to assess and improve economic,
249 environmental, and social sustainability throughout the entire dairy supply chain, from
250 production to consumption. According to a sustainability report from the center, as of
251 2017, the U.S. dairy industry has achieved a 30% reduction in water usage, a 21%
252 reduction in land usage, and a 19% reduction in carbon emissions to produce one gallon
253 (3.79 liters) of milk over the past decade. Milk productivity in the U.S. is the highest
254 globally. Currently, the annual milk production per cow is around 18,000 kg, more than
255 double the daily average production of 4,400 kg in the 1970s. Consequently, the average
256 carbon footprint per gallon of milk in the U.S. is maintained at a level nearly 50% lower
257 than the world average, showcasing a remarkable achievement in sustainability [24]. The
258 entire dairy industry, from feed production to consumption and waste disposal in animal
259 agriculture, accounts for 2% of the total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the US
260 according to an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announcement in April 2021
261 [20].

262 A climate change report released by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
263 of the United Nations and the Global Dairy Platform in 2019 investigating the GHG
264 emissions from 2005 to 2015 revealed that, among the ten regions studied, the North
265 American region, including the United States, stood out as the only region where both the
266 concentration and quantity of GHG emissions decreased while overall milk production
267 increased. While the average GHG emissions increased by 16.5%, the North American
268 region showed a decrease of -0.5% [2, 25].

269 According to a report by Devine in 2021 [26], the largest animal producers in the U.S.

270 could achieve net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions within the next five years. The
271 report suggests that achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions on animal production
272 could result in a restoration of annual profits of over \$1.9 million per farm. She conducted
273 a study to identify four key areas within animal agriculture for achieving net-zero GHG
274 emissions. These four areas were improving feed production and efficiency, reducing
275 methane emissions from the digestive processes of animals, enhancing animal manure
276 management and improving nutrient runoff, including nitrogen and phosphorus, and
277 promoting the production and sale of renewable energy and by-products. The research
278 focused on exploring strategies to reduce emissions in these areas while maximizing
279 potential profits. Key applied technologies included optimizing feed, converting animal
280 manure into fertilizers and energy, and employing biological treatment systems like
281 biodigesters for processing food waste. However, the report asserts that while achieving
282 net-zero GHG emissions is technically feasible, the economic aspect presents a significant
283 challenge. Implementing these measures at the individual farm level would incur
284 substantial costs and time. Therefore, the report emphasizes the necessity for government-
285 level financial incentives and supportive policies to facilitate and encourage the adoption
286 of these practices in the animal agriculture sector.

287 The U.S. dairy industry has organized the Dairy Sustainability Alliance, a consortium
288 that brings together over 180 organizations linked to the value chain for environmental
289 and sustainability initiatives within the dairy sector. This organization is actively engaged
290 in a variety of internal and external initiatives to pursue sustainability in environmental
291 conservation, animal welfare, and food safety, and to ensure the economic viability and
292 growth of the dairy industry [27].

293

294 **(4) Poultry**

295 The digestive processes of poultry, including chickens, generally generate a relatively
296 low amount of GHG compared to ruminants, which makes poultry production relatively
297 environmentally friendly compared to other animals. However, there are still
298 environmental impacts in the form of GHG emissions and/or issues like eutrophication
299 throughout the production stages from feed production to rearing and waste treatment.

300 In particular, the layer industry has faced persistent calls for a transition towards
301 sustainability in terms of food safety and animal welfare due to conventional cage farming
302 practices aimed at ensuring productivity and economic viability. The state of California
303 passed legislation prohibiting cage farming in 2008 and has been enforcing a transition to
304 cage-free farming since 2022 after multiple amendments. This law prohibits confining
305 animals in structures that restrict their free movement on farms and specifies a minimum
306 space of 0.09 m² per animal. Subsequently, other states such as Massachusetts, Colorado,
307 Washington, Oregon, Michigan, Utah, Nevada, and others have also begun specifying
308 deadlines for transitioning to cage-free farming and establishing minimum space
309 requirements. In Massachusetts, regulations are being developed to expand the minimum
310 space to 0.138 m², which is larger compared to other states. According to data from the
311 USDA, cage-free farming increased from 6% of the total layers in 2015 to 29.3% as of
312 March 2021. There is an ongoing plan to achieve a complete transition to cage-free
313 farming by 2025 [28].

314 There is also a movement away from MIAA systems in the production stage, opting
315 for animal welfare cage systems, free-range farming, and pasture-based systems with a
316 reduction in the use of antibiotics. Grain production for feed is moving towards a circular
317 farming system through the recycling of soil, feed, and manure. The resource efficiency

318 of animal manure is also being expanded through resource utilization and energy
319 conversion to reduce GHG emissions and mitigate the odor associated with manure.

320 The animal welfare standards for layers in the US are distinguished based on the roles
321 of the federal government, state governments, and private certification bodies. The federal
322 government provides standards solely for organic farming, while state governments
323 regulate only the forms of production. The actual detailed animal welfare certification is
324 independently conducted by private organizations, each having its own distinct criteria for
325 certification [29].

326 Private certification standards are primarily determined by factors such as the scale
327 of the farm and whether free-range practices are employed. There are various certifications
328 with different criteria, including those that require complete free-range practices like
329 Animal Welfare Approved, certifications that acknowledge selective free-range practices
330 such as Certified Humane, and certifications like Global Animal Partnership. Certification
331 bodies also offer a variety of certifications for different practices, such as “cage-free”, “free
332 range”, and “natural”.

333

334 **3) Digital Animal Agriculture (DAA)**

335 **(1) Application technologies and case studies of DAA for SAA**

336 In the US, key DAA technologies for SAA include hardware such as intelligent
337 devices or automated machinery like robots, drones, thermal cameras, autonomous farm
338 machinery, and sensors, as well as Internet of Things (IoT) devices. On the software side,
339 there are data analytics programs, computer vision programs, big data analytics, artificial
340 intelligence (AI), and blockchain technology.

341 There are examples of data collection through automated animal management and

342 monitoring in each of the different animal agriculture sectors. The swine industry utilizes
343 automated weight-detecting cameras, uses thermal cameras to measure temperatures and
344 identify pregnancy through changes in body temperature, and implements health
345 management systems using microphones or sensors to detect respiratory issues (Wikipedia
346 website). Data collection is also achieved through sensors that are installed inside and
347 outside of barns, and through real-time management of optimal breeding environments,
348 including temperature, humidity, and air quality. This involves integrating automated
349 feeding systems, health management systems, and behavior monitoring systems,
350 analyzing the data, and supporting optimal decision-making using AI.

351 In the beef cattle industry, wireless radio frequency identification devices (RFID) for
352 enhanced identification are utilized to collect specific information from individual animals
353 for individual identification, production management, and automatic weighing. By
354 installing smart tags on the cattle's ear or neck, the collection of behavioral and biometric
355 data from the cattle helps support optimal animal management, including health
356 monitoring, precise feeding, heat detection, and breeding program operations. Recently,
357 various forms of sensors, including oral capsules and implantable sensors, are being
358 employed to obtain more accurate data [30]. Additionally, for grazing cattle, wireless
359 RFID devices, smart tags, and global positioning system (GPS) trackers are employed to
360 track herd movements. Utilizing IoT sensors optimizes pasture management by tracking
361 individual cattle within the herd for signs of health issues or anomalies.

362 In the dairy industry, the use of robotic milking systems for automatic milking brings
363 about labor savings and increased productivity. Collecting relevant data allows for
364 efficient management of milk quality. Automatic feeding systems supply optimal feed to
365 dairy cows, and wearable sensors attached to the cow's ear or neck and bio-capsules for

366 oral use collect biometric data, which enables remote management of the cow's health
367 status, body temperature, pregnancy status, and more [30].

368 The poultry industry, including poultry farming, employs various technologies such
369 as automatic feeding systems, automated environmental management systems inside and
370 outside the barn, real-time monitoring systems using surveillance cameras, and health
371 management systems utilizing sensors. The most promising aspects of digital animal
372 agriculture include biometric and biological sensors, big data, artificial intelligence, and
373 blockchain technology. Through sensors, animal producers can collect real-time data on
374 the health and welfare of animals, enabling the development of proactive management
375 strategies for sustainable and safe animal agriculture.

376 Furthermore, big data analysis using AI can transform the data provided by sensors
377 into meaningful and actionable strategies. Additionally, leveraging blockchain technology
378 in the animal agriculture industry can enhance transparency and traceability, increasing
379 consumer trust and improving food safety [31].

380 The biometric and bio sensors discussed above play a role in monitoring and
381 providing information on the behavior and physiological aspects of the animals, which can
382 be classified into non-invasive and invasive types. Non-invasive sensors include
383 surveillance cameras, microphones, sensors in automatic feeding systems, weight
384 measurement sensors, GPS, animal activity sensors based on microelectromechanical
385 systems, thermal infrared image sensors, heart rate monitoring sensors, and face detection
386 monitoring sensors, which are installed outside the barn. Invasive sensors include RFID
387 sensors used in oral capsules, skin grafts, and ear tags [31].

388 A prominent example of invasive sensor usage is to insert sensors into the rumen of
389 the cows or cattle to monitor their internal physiological information such as health and

390 body temperature. Facial detection monitoring sensors use machine learning algorithms to
391 detect facial features of animals or monitor changes in emotional states, which is utilized
392 for animal welfare monitoring and early detection of diseases. Thermal infrared image
393 sensors detect the temperature of various body parts, providing information on activity
394 status, diseases, and environmental stress. This sensor, when integrated with various
395 applications, is effective in detecting inflammatory diseases in animals. It can also
396 monitor conditions such as mastitis in lactating cows, tail biting-induced chronic pain in
397 pigs, and fever states [30].

398 The information collected in the animal agriculture sector is divided into two
399 categories: animal-centric information and environment-centric information. For accurate
400 management and decision-making, both types of information need to be collected
401 simultaneously. The information collected through these various sensors undergoes big
402 data analysis, machine learning, and deep learning processes using specialized algorithms.
403 AI and blockchain are employed for separate data processing stages, ultimately providing
404 valuable insights and decision support. For example, data collected through biometric
405 sensors can be combined with big data analysis, AI and bioinformatics technology, and
406 applied to optimize breeding programs for layers [32].

407 Big data analysis is the process of extracting meaningful results from vast amounts
408 of information and diverse types of data through analysis programs. Exploratory modeling
409 involves analyzing past data to understand the potential impact, while predictive modeling
410 analyzes data based on specific criteria to forecast future occurrences. Through this data
411 modeling process, big data can be utilized to enhance an animal's production capacity,
412 productivity, and welfare. Furthermore, it can be employed to integrate the value chain
413 of production, distribution, and consumption related to animals or establish networks with

414 consumers.

415 Blockchain utilizes unique identification information for each farm and animal
416 producer, providing distributed, transparent, and immutable information throughout the
417 entire process from production to distribution and consumption. This is employed to
418 ensure quality management, traceability, and transaction transparency in the animal
419 agriculture sector. In the future, blockchain technology could prove valuable in the early
420 detection and tracking of animal diseases such as swine flu, foot-and-mouth disease, mad
421 cow disease, and avian influenza.

422

423 **(2) Trends and future prospects of DAA for SAA**

424 The California-based startup, Blue River Technology, utilizes intelligent devices and
425 AI algorithms to identify weeds and precisely apply herbicides only to the weeds. This
426 innovative approach has significantly reduced herbicide usage while increasing crop
427 yields [33].

428 Carbon Robotics, a company based in Seattle, employs lasers and AI to analyze
429 images transmitted from high-resolution cameras. This system distinguishes between
430 weeds and crops, using highly precise lasers to remove only the weeds. This physical
431 weed control method does not use chemicals, and provides a groundbreaking solution for
432 practicing organic and sustainable agriculture [34].

433 The AI precision technology offered by Soma Detect, based in New York, supports
434 dairy farmers in producing high-quality dairy products. Soma Detect utilizes an AI system
435 with automated optical sensor technology and deep learning algorithms to analyze the milk
436 quality and the health status of cows in real-time during the milking process. Through this,
437 the system detects diseases and nutritional conditions in cattle. As a result, it allows cows

438 to maintain optimal health, leading to the prevention of animal diseases and an increase
439 in milk production [35].

440 Farmwave, a software company based in Georgia, utilizes AI systems with machine
441 learning algorithms and an camera system attached to a combine to monitor harvest
442 operations in real-time. When a problem arises, it responds immediately, minimizing crop
443 losses during harvesting and maximizing profits. For instance, Farmwave monitors the
444 loss of beans during harvesting and adjusts the combine's fan speed to reduce the loss of
445 beans [36].

446 The Korean agricultural machinery manufacturing company TYM (Dongyang
447 Industrial) operates its distribution network, including intelligent tractors, from its U.S.
448 headquarters in North Carolina [37]. The T130 tractor developed by TYM features a
449 wireless vehicle internet service known as telematics and cutting-edge autonomous
450 driving capabilities. It is optimized for farming operations in the vast and large-scale
451 agricultural conditions of the U.S., enhancing productivity and minimizing resource
452 waste.

453 Farmers Business Network (FBN), headquartered in California, provides a digital
454 platform for agricultural data. This platform supports farmers in optimizing their
455 agricultural management through various services, including data analysis, procurement
456 and utilization of agricultural supplies, financial and insurance consultations, and
457 distribution network management. Additionally, FBN utilizes AI and machine learning
458 to analyze data related to crop yields, soil conditions, and climate patterns, providing an
459 optimal decision-making system [38]. Through this platform, farmers can obtain and
460 analyze data tailored for optimal agricultural management, thus enhancing their
461 competitiveness in agriculture.

462 Fertile-eyez, developed by Verility based in Indiana, is a smartphone application-
463 based solution and the first AI-based birthing support system in the animal agriculture
464 sector. This solution utilizes AI image recognition to quickly analyze cell morphology,
465 providing information on sperm quality such as the shape, motility, and concentration of
466 sperm, as well as detecting ovulation in females. Through this service, farmers can easily
467 analyze the sperm state and ovulation of animals on the farm [39]. Using this analysis
468 information, improvements in pregnancy rates can be achieved, leading to enhanced
469 productivity on the farm.

470 The Korean digital animal startup, uLikeKorea, was contracted to supply an oral IoT
471 bio-capsule to the Bella Holstein Farm in Colorado last year. When administered through
472 the cow's mouth, this system adheres to the rumen of the cow, providing accurate
473 biological information. Through artificial intelligence analysis, it offers real-time health
474 management services on an animal healthcare platform [40]. Unlike traditional methods
475 of collecting biological information from external parts of cattle such as the ears, neck, or
476 legs, this method allows for a more accurate and stable system operation by collecting
477 information from within the body.

478 As digital transformation based on networks and knowledge information accelerates
479 across society, the world DAA market size is also rapidly increasing. The digitization of
480 animals is emerging as an optimal alternative to overcome the crises in the agriculture
481 and animal agriculture sectors, creating new added value and opportunities. The global
482 market size of digital agriculture was estimated at \$19 billion in 2022, and it is expected
483 to grow at an annual rate of 10.1%, reaching approximately \$49.5 billion by 2032 [41].
484 With the projected 2.6-fold growth in the global digital agriculture market over the next
485 decade, this trend is expected to continue.

486 The U.S. stands as the largest market for digital agriculture, supported by substantial
487 investments aimed at building a stable food ecosystem for the future. The Asia-Pacific
488 region, though smaller in scale, is anticipated to be the fastest-growing market.
489 Additionally, the global animal digital monitoring market is estimated to be \$5.2 billion
490 in 2022, projected to reach \$6 billion in 2023, and is expected to expand at a compound
491 annual growth rate of 17.99% from 2023 to 2030 [42]. With the rapid increase in global
492 animal populations and the COVID-19 pandemic leading to a global risk-averse attitude
493 toward animal viruses, real-time animal monitoring systems are experiencing significant
494 growth. The adoption of these systems is increasing, driven by their effectiveness in real-
495 time prevention of animal diseases and the containment of their spread, and by their
496 substantial cost savings in animal management. Meanwhile, global IT companies like
497 Google and agricultural firms such as Monsanto are aggressively acquiring and
498 significantly expanding their investments in startups related to digital agriculture.

499 DAA is spreading globally, with many companies and startups developing and
500 promoting innovative products. However, there are various constraints and limitations
501 despite the ongoing development. Technologies associated with DAA such as precision
502 animal agriculture, big data, artificial intelligence, and blockchain, are still in the early
503 stages of application on farms. For universal adoption across farms, advanced
504 technological development is required, along with overcoming constraints related to time,
505 space, and cost. The core technologies driving DAA, such as AI and blockchain, are
506 evolving in the initial stages and face validation challenges when scaled up.

507 Furthermore, DAA technologies require integrated platforms that can classify and
508 analyze vast amounts of data for specific variables, supporting predictive decision-making.
509 This integrated platform demands the establishment of networks for sharing, facilitating big

510 data collection and analysis, and implementing AI through algorithms. During this process,
511 addressing issues related to data privacy, security, and integration remains a challenge. As
512 DAA undergoes numerous trials and evolves in the animal agriculture field, connecting all
513 of the resources in the animal agriculture sector will become possible, leading to the
514 development of an integrated platform. DAA is likely to spread more rapidly once it is
515 combined with innovations in digital solutions for animal agriculture to address food
516 security, environmental concerns, and food safety, and meet consumer demands.

517

518 **4) The societal demand for sustainable animal products in the U.S.**

519 U.S. consumers have a high preference for safe animal products and place significant
520 importance on environmental and social values in their purchasing decisions. With an
521 increasing concern for animal welfare, there is a strong aversion to unethical production
522 environments and practices that violate animal rights, particularly towards cage farming.

523 According to a survey commissioned by World Animal Protection and Crate-Free
524 Illinois and conducted by the Harris Poll in 2021 with more than 2,000 U.S. consumers,
525 over 73% of respondents expressed that they would not accept the practice of confining
526 pregnant sows in gestation stalls and would choose not to purchase products that used this
527 practice. Additionally, 56% of respondents stated that they would prefer pork produced
528 in a way that eliminates the practice of tail docking piglets [43].

529 According to an online survey conducted by Acosta, a U.S. market research firm, in
530 2021, environmental and sustainability factors are driving consumer purchasing
531 decisions. 65% of consumers considered sustainability as an important factor when
532 making purchasing decisions. Therefore, in the current U.S. retail industry, sustainability
533 is presented as a top priority, with some retailers specializing in and promoting products

534 with sustainable features. Additionally, certification is implemented to ensure that only
535 sustainable products are sold. In particular, 75% of the millennial generation considers
536 sustainability as a crucial factor in making purchase decisions, indicating a higher
537 purchasing intensity among young consumers. This trend is expected to strengthen further
538 in the future. Furthermore, 85% of consumers who purchase eco-friendly products stated
539 that they will continue to buy such products in the future, indicating a high level of loyalty
540 to environmentally friendly items. In a survey regarding consumers' willingness to pay an
541 additional amount for sustainable animal products, 74% of respondents expressed a
542 willingness to pay more for sustainable meat, while 78% were willing to do the same for
543 dairy products [44].

544 In the U.S. consumer market, sustainable animal products have been successful in
545 securing a stable and loyal customer base. The retail industry has responded by
546 specializing in the sale of products associated with sustainable animal farming, ranging
547 from stores exclusively offering organic products to various other formats that highlight
548 and sell sustainable animal products. According to on-site surveys of retail stores, the retail
549 prices for various sustainable animal products such as organic animal products, processed
550 items, free-range eggs, and grass-fed processed products are generally sold at prices that
551 are around 20% to 50% higher than regular products. Some products sold by Whole Foods
552 Market, an organic-focused retail store, are priced at more than 100% higher than regular
553 products. Despite the higher prices, they have managed to secure a stable base of loyal
554 customers.

555 Many global investment institutions, including the Government Pension Fund Global
556 in Norway, are setting 'ESG management' as a strong investment condition. In addition,
557 global companies in the food and retail industries, such as Unilever and Nestlé, are actively

558 participating in carbon neutrality efforts. Multinational companies including hotels are
559 adopting a policy of using sustainable raw materials as a key means of achieving carbon
560 neutrality [45]. In the U.S., retail and distribution companies such as Lidl US, The Giant
561 Co., and Sprouts, as well as processing companies like Bumble Bee and Kellogg Co., are
562 prioritizing sustainability by establishing certification and distribution systems centered
563 around their brands. The social awareness of various sustainable products, including
564 sustainable animal products, is expected to continue spreading across the food,
565 distribution, and hospitality industries, leading to a sustained increase in demand.

566

567 **5) Activation of SAA led by private organizations.**

568 Various private organizations are active in promoting SAA in the U.S., including the
569 National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition (NSAC), SAA associations by species,
570 consumer groups, environmental organizations, and the USMEF. Each animal agriculture
571 sector has specific associations and cooperatives to demonstrate and disseminate various
572 SAA specifications and management techniques on the ground. These organizations play
573 a key role in leading government support policies in the field of SAA.

574 Consumer organizations actively monitor the production systems of agricultural and
575 meat products from the perspective of consumer health rights. They aim to ensure safer
576 and economically viable agricultural and meat production systems. Moreover, these
577 organizations advocate for SAA practices that are aligned with consumer consumption
578 patterns. Environmental organizations advocate for the transition to SAA as a response to
579 various environmental pollutants and damages associated with agricultural production
580 and animal farming. Additionally, they call for an active assessment of the
581 implementation of major policies, urging proactive evaluation and feedback mechanisms

582 regarding environmental impact and improvement measures.

583 The USMEF is a non-profit organization established for the promotion of U.S. meat
584 exports. It was founded with the participation of domestic grain producers, animal
585 producers, meat processors, exporters, and other agribusinesses in the U.S. The
586 organization focuses on enhancing the international market presence of U.S. meat products
587 and providing support to domestic animal agriculture industries. This organization
588 employs SAA as a primary means of export marketing. Through this approach, it aims to
589 produce, process, and distribute safer meat products while contributing to global climate
590 crisis mitigation efforts. The incorporation of sustainability into meat export products
591 aligns with the organization's commitment to environmental responsibility and resilience.
592 Ultimately, this organization is working to expand the societal demand for meat produced
593 through SAA within the U.S. Simultaneously, it aims to create opportunities for the
594 widespread adoption of SAA.

595 The NSAC is the largest organization leading sustainable agriculture efforts in the
596 U.S. In response to the farm crisis in the U.S., local farmers and ranchers facing challenges
597 on the ground have come together to form organizations supporting sustainable agriculture
598 since the mid-1980s. They have been actively working to explore opportunities for small
599 to medium-sized family farms. The NSAC was established in 2009 through the merger of
600 the Sustainable Agriculture Coalition based in the Midwest and the National Campaign
601 for Sustainable Agriculture (NCSA), formed to influence federal food policies.

602 This organization is a coalition of over 130 member organizations nationwide,
603 formed with the purpose of advocating for and improving sustainable food and agriculture
604 policies at the federal level. Headquartered in Washington, DC, it collaborates with
605 regional grassroots organizations, conducting research, development, and advocacy for

606 federal policies. This approach aims to expand support, education, implementation, and
607 engagement of local farmers in sustainable agriculture.

608 Firstly, it collects opinions from farmers and ranchers practicing sustainable
609 agriculture, as well as those directly involved in local farms, food-related organizations,
610 and rural community groups. It develops policies based on this input and advocates for
611 them at Congress and the USDA. Additionally, this organization works to promote
612 sustainable agriculture as a strategy for small to mid-sized family farmers, who form the
613 backbone of U.S. agriculture and rural communities, to have stable farming opportunities
614 and ensure economic viability. This coalition functions as a collaborative effort involving
615 a diverse range of organizations, from large national entities such as the Sierra Club and
616 the National Farmers Union to small grassroots associations like farmer's markets and
617 food purchasing cooperatives. Additionally, consumers, environmental activists, wildlife
618 advocates, educational institutions, religious organizations, local community food
619 security groups, civic activists, and rural community organizations participate and
620 collaborate to promote sustainable agriculture. They work towards spreading sustainable
621 agriculture, engaging with consumers, and influencing changes in federal policies.

622 To promote sustainable animal husbandry, efforts are focused on research, policy
623 development, and on-field dissemination across all stages of animal management. This
624 includes establishing a cyclical rotational grazing system, integrating crop and feed
625 production with animal agriculture on the same farm in a cyclical farming system, creating
626 a trust system for the consumption and distribution of safe animal products produced
627 through SAA, reducing the use of antibiotics in animal agriculture, and implementing
628 environmental conservation and preservation systems.

629 Support programs related to SAA that take into account environmental safety, the

630 health of farmers, and animal welfare, include the Sustainable Agriculture Research and
631 Education Program, the National Sustainable Agriculture Information Service, the
632 Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, the Value-Added Producer Grant
633 Program, the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program, the Beginning Farmer
634 and Rancher Development Program, and the Agricultural Conservation Easement
635 Program under the Farm Bill (NSAC website).

636 In sustainable agriculture, there is an emphasis on diverse crop rotations, the use and
637 expansion of perennial crops, and pasture-based systems to underscore its
638 interconnectedness with SAA. Additionally, SAA provides stable nutrients through
639 manure and liquid fertilizer, preserving the surrounding environment. It can also be a
640 crucial component of sustainable agriculture by utilizing land unsuitable for crop
641 production to cultivate forage crops or pasture, contributing to its widespread adoption
642 and dissemination. To support region-based SAA, there is an emphasis on minimizing
643 environmental impacts throughout the production, processing, and distribution stages.
644 SAA focuses on responsible management activities that contribute to the production of
645 safe and environmentally stable food, including the reduction of antibiotic use (NSAC
646 website).

647

648 **Summary and Conclusion**

649 The transition of the U.S. towards SAA appears to be driven by both external goals
650 related to addressing climate change and the primary objectives of responding to the
651 demand for safe animal products, expanding consumption, and securing competitiveness
652 in overseas export markets. The demand for animal welfare, organic animal products, and
653 processed goods has been increasing in the U.S. consumer market. In response to the

654 growing social demands for GHG reduction, minimizing environmental impacts, and
655 environmental conservation in animal agriculture activities, there is an ongoing transition
656 from MIAA to environmentally friendly SAA.

657 The annual increase in the export of U.S. animal products reflects their growing
658 demand in international markets. The success of a marketing strategy emphasizing safe
659 and environmentally friendly animal products underscores the need for SAA in the global
660 animal agriculture sector. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that since the 1970s, the U.S.
661 animal agriculture sector has consistently reduced its carbon emissions through various
662 means, a significant achievement in the current era of climate crisis. According to
663 research findings, the beef production system in the U.S. exhibits significantly lower
664 carbon emissions compared to systems in other countries. Based on empirical results
665 indicating that feeding a combination of forage and grain is more effective in reducing
666 methane emissions than feeding forage alone, the U.S. animal agriculture sector has
667 adjusted the feed composition ratio, which has led to a reduction of approximately 34%
668 in methane emissions in the U.S. since 1975. A major factor in the transformation of the
669 U.S. animal agriculture sector in terms of livestock specifications is attributed to
670 environmentally friendly practices such as high-quality feed, heat stress reduction,
671 improvements in reproductive ability and growth period reduction, and efforts in animal
672 genetic enhancement [46].

673 The U.S. animal agriculture sector's practices have dramatically increased beef
674 productivity while reducing the use of natural resources such as water, land, and feed.
675 Additionally, these practices have led to a decrease in carbon emissions. Furthermore, the
676 extensive land area of the U.S. allows for the direct production of pasture, forage, and
677 grain feed such as corn and soybeans. The manure from animal agriculture is recycled

678 back to the fields, creating a circular agricultural system that contributes to a sustainable
679 and resource-efficient economy. This process has led to cost savings and increased
680 productivity for animal producers, contributing to enhanced farm income. It has also
681 facilitated supply and price stability in the domestic meat consumption market in the U.S.
682 The U.S. government continues to support research aimed at reducing carbon emissions
683 from the animal agriculture sector and encourages its transition to SAA. However, there
684 is no apparent plan to shrink the scale of the animal agriculture sector itself [46]. The U.S.
685 appears to support SAA as one of the measures to cope with the increasing domestic
686 demand for meat, ensuring stable price management, and securing income stability for
687 animal producers.

688 In the R.O.K, there has been a gradual spread of initiatives towards SAA, and
689 consumers have been increasingly seeking valuable consumption by considering factors
690 such as the environment and animal welfare. The agricultural sector in the R.O.K still lacks
691 precise measurement and verification methods for GHG emissions, reduction amounts,
692 and carbon sequestration, leading to situations where indirect estimations are used for
693 predictions. The lack of scientific measurement has been pointed out as an institutional
694 limitation in the transition to SAA [47]. Given the rapid implementation of government
695 regulations and support policies for climate change mitigation, there is an urgent need for
696 accurate GHG measurement methods and the establishment of standardized units. Based
697 on accurate measurement data, it will be possible to adjust and control carbon
698 sequestration or GHG emissions, allowing for feedback on policy measures.

699
700
701

702 **References**

- 703 1. Organization for economic co-operation and development (OECD). Review of
704 agricultural policies in Korea. 1999.
- 705 2. Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO). Climate change and
706 food security: risks and responses. 2015.
- 707 3. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Critical role of animal
708 science research in food security and sustainability. Washington, DC: The National
709 Academies Press. 2015. <https://doi.org/10.17226/19000>.
- 710 4. Oh SH, Whitley NC. Pork production in China, Japan and South Korea. *Animal
711 Bioscience*. 2011;24(11):1629-36.
- 712 5. Sung JH, Woo SH. An Analysis Regarding Trends of Dualism in Korean Agriculture.
713 *International Journal of Industrial Distribution & Business* 2017;8(6):87-95.
- 714 6. Kim CG, Jeong HK, Im PE, Kim TH. Directions for introducing total maximum
715 nutrient loading system of cultivated land. Korea rural economic institute. 2015.
- 716 7. Park H, Lee Y, Lee, C. The Current Status of Korean Nutrient Balance [Abstract].
717 ASA, CSSA, SSSA International Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO. 2023.
- 718 8. OECD Data. [cited 2024 Jan 14]. <http://data.oecd.org/agrland/nutrient-balance.htm>
- 719 9. MAFRA. 2022 Statistical yearbook of agriculture, food and rural affairs. 2023.
- 720 10. Mensah J. Sustainable development: meaning, history, principles, pillars, and
721 implications for human action: literature review. *Cogent Social Sciences*. 2019;5:
722 1653531.
- 723 11. Bird GW, Ikerd J. Sustainable agriculture: A twenty-first-century system. *The
724 Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1993;529(1):92-
725 102.
- 726 12. USDA National Agricultural Library (NAL) website. [cited 2024 Jan 14].
727 <https://www.nal.usda.gov/>

- 728 13. USDA National Laboratory for Agriculture and The Environment website (NLAE)
729 website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]. <https://www.ars.usda.gov/midwest-area/ames/nlae/>
- 730 14. U.S. meat export federation website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
731 <https://www.usmef.co.kr/main.jsp>
- 732 15. Kim SW, Gormley A, Jang KB, Duarte ME. Current status of global pig production:
733 an overview and research trends. *Animal Bioscience*. 2024. (In press;
734 <https://doi.org/10.5713/ab.23.0367>)
- 735 16. National Pork Producers Council (NPPC) website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
736 <https://nppc.org/>
- 737 17. Putman B, Hickman J, Banderkar P, Matlock M, Thoma G. A Retrospective
738 Assessment of US Pork Production : 1960 to 2015. University of Arkansas, College
739 of Engineering. 2018. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
740 <https://resilientfood.uark.edu/project/porkretro/>
- 741 18. National Pork Board (NPB) website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://www.pork.org/>
- 742 19. Capper JL. The environmental impact of beef production in the United States : 1977
743 compared with 2007. *J Anim Sci*. 2011;89:4249-61.
- 744 20. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
745 <https://www.epa.gov/>
- 746 21. Huh D, Kim TR, Kim SY. Sustainability of the U.S. Beef Cattle Industry. *KREI*
747 *World Grain Market*. 2020;9(4):210-234.
- 748 22. U.S. Roundtable for Sustainable Beef website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
749 <https://www.usrsb.org/>
- 750 23. USDA Economic Research Service website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
751 <https://www.ers.usda.gov/>
- 752 24. Innovation Center for U.S. Dairy website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
753 <https://www.usdairy.com/about-us/innovation-center>

- 754 25. Global Dairy Platform website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://globaldairyplatform.com/>
- 755 26. Devine K. An environmental and economic path toward net zero dairy farm
756 emissions. World Wildlife Fund. 2021.
757 [https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/an-environmental-and-economic-path-](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/an-environmental-and-economic-path-toward-net-zero-dairy-farm-emissions)
758 [toward-net-zero-dairy-farm-emissions](https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/an-environmental-and-economic-path-toward-net-zero-dairy-farm-emissions)
- 759 27. Dairy Sustainability Alliance website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
760 <https://www.usdairy.com/about-us/innovation-center/sustainability-alliance>
- 761 28. Kim JJ. The current status and challenges of the U.S. poultry industry. Korean
762 Poultry Journal. 2021;53(11):183-8.
- 763 29. Kim SJ. A study on improvement for animal protect legislations. Korea Legislation
764 Research Institute. 2004. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
765 <https://www.klri.re.kr:9443/bitstream/2017.oak/3930/1/30037.pdf>
- 766 30. Chizzotti ML, Chizzotti FHM, Assis GJF, Bretas IL. Digital Livestock Farming.
767 Springer. Digital Agriculture. 2022;11:173-93.
- 768 31. Neethirajan S, Kemp B. Digital Livestock Farming. Sensing and Bio-Sensing
769 Research. 2021;32:100408
770 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214180421000131>
- 771 32. Ellen ED, Sluis M, Siegford J, Guzhva O, Toscano MJ, Bennewitz J, et al. Review
772 of sensor technologies in animal breeding : Phenotyping behaviors of laying hens to
773 select against feather pecking. Animals. 2019;9:108. doi:10.3390/ani9030108
- 774 33. Blueriver Technology website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
775 <https://bluerivertechnology.com/ourmethods>
- 776 34. Carbon Robotics website. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
777 <https://carbonrobotics.com/laserweeding>
- 778 35. Soma Detect website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://somadetect.com/overview>
- 779 36. Farmwave website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://farmwave.io/case-studies>

- 780 37. TYM website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] [https://tym.world/en-us/media/stories-](https://tym.world/en-us/media/stories-articles/smart-farming-trends-2023-1/)
781 [articles/smart-farming-trends-2023-1/](https://tym.world/en-us/media/stories-articles/smart-farming-trends-2023-1/)
- 782 38. Farmers Business Network website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://www.fbn.com>
- 783 39. Verility website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://www.verilityco.com>
- 784 40. uLikeKorea website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://ulikekorea.com:442/index>
- 785 41. Precedence Research website. Digital agriculture market size to hit USD 49.5 billion
786 by 2032. [cited 2024 Jan 14] [https://www.precedenceresearch.com/digital-](https://www.precedenceresearch.com/digital-agriculture-market)
787 [agriculture-market](https://www.precedenceresearch.com/digital-agriculture-market)
- 788 42. Grandview Research website. Global livestock monitoring market size & share
789 report, 2030. [cited 2024 Jan 14] [https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-](https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/livestock-monitoring-market)
790 [analysis/livestock-monitoring-market](https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/livestock-monitoring-market)
- 791 43. Crate-Free USA website. [cited 2024 Jan 14] <https://cratefreeusa.org/news-media/>
- 792 44. Acosta website. Acosta Shopper Community Survey Oct 2021. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
793 [https://www.acosta.com/news/acosta-research-shows-65-of-shoppers-want-](https://www.acosta.com/news/acosta-research-shows-65-of-shoppers-want-retailers-to-invest-more-in-sustainability)
794 [retailers-to-invest-more-in-sustainability](https://www.acosta.com/news/acosta-research-shows-65-of-shoppers-want-retailers-to-invest-more-in-sustainability)
- 795 45. Lee SE. 2022. The U.S. Retail Industry: Sustainability is Not an Option, But a
796 Necessity. Korea Trade-Investment Promotion Agency (KOTRA) International
797 Market News. 2022. [cited 2024 Jan 14]
798 [https://dream.kotra.or.kr/dream/cms/news/actionKotraBoardDetail.do?SITE_NO=](https://dream.kotra.or.kr/dream/cms/news/actionKotraBoardDetail.do?SITE_NO=2&MENU_ID=3550&CONTENTS_NO=1&bbsGbn=243&bbsSn=243&pNttSn=194197)
799 [2&MENU_ID=3550&CONTENTS_NO=1&bbsGbn=243&bbsSn=243&pNttSn=1](https://dream.kotra.or.kr/dream/cms/news/actionKotraBoardDetail.do?SITE_NO=2&MENU_ID=3550&CONTENTS_NO=1&bbsGbn=243&bbsSn=243&pNttSn=194197)
800 [94197](https://dream.kotra.or.kr/dream/cms/news/actionKotraBoardDetail.do?SITE_NO=2&MENU_ID=3550&CONTENTS_NO=1&bbsGbn=243&bbsSn=243&pNttSn=194197)
- 801 46. Choi YJ. 2021. The reason the U.S. supports carbon neutrality without reducing
802 livestock farming. The Kyunghyang Shinmun article from September 24, 2021.
803 [cited 2024 Jan 14]
804 <https://www.khan.co.kr/opinion/contribution/article/202109242145002>
- 805 47. Green Labs. USDA's New Initiative for Sustainable Agriculture. Green Labs
806 Newsletter article from March 4, 2022. [cited 2024 Jan 14]

807

808 **List of Abbreviations**

809 **AI:** Artificial Intelligence

810 **DAA:** Digital Animal Agriculture

811 **FBN:** Farmers Business Network

812 **GHG:** Greenhouse Gas

813 **GPS:** Global Positioning System

814 **IoT:** Internet of Things

815 **MIAA:** Mega-sized intensive animal agriculture

816 **NCSA:** National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture

817 **NSAC:** National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition

818 **R.O.K:** Republic of Korea

819 **RFID:** Radio Frequency Identification Devices

820 **SAA:** Sustainable Animal Agriculture

821 **U.S.:** United States of America

822 **USDA:** United States Department of Agriculture

823 **USMEF:** U.S. Meat Export Federation

824 **USRSB:** U.S. Roundtable for Sustainable Beef

825