

Progress Report (2015): “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada, 2012”

Project Committee

The following people worked on this initiative which was facilitated by the National Farmed Animal Health and Welfare Council (NFAHWC)

Jeffrey Spooner: NFACC Bison Code Secretary / Consultant – Project Lead

David Fraser – University of British Columbia

Ed Empringham – NFAHWC Secretariat

Samantha Benattar – Secretariat to NFAHWC

Acknowledgements

The project committee would like to thank all survey participants who voluntarily contributed to this project.

Table of Contents

Background	3
Scope of the project	3
Timeline	4
Brief summary of survey findings	4
Survey findings	5
1) Progress on the twenty two recommendations of the NFAWSC (2012)	5
Leadership and coordination.....	5
Research.....	6
Standards.....	7
Education, extension and communications.....	8
Compliance assurance.....	9
Notable results	11
Recommendations	12
2) General responses to “NFAWSC 2012”	12
2.1 General comments/support for advisory statement.....	12
2.2 National/comprehensive VS. Provincial/self-regulatory considerations.....	13
2.3 Minor objections, concerns or confusion.....	12
2.4 Groups omitted/not consulted.....	13
2.5 Funding related concerns regarding NFAWSC, 2012.....	13
2.6 Corrections, oversights and clarifications.....	13
2.7 NFACC focus.....	14
2.8.a Need for basic (i.e., future focussed) research funding.....	14
2.8.b Call to address unique Canadian research needs.....	14
2.9 Recommendations and supplemental considerations.....	14
2.10 Make reference to animals directly.....	14
2.11 Veterinary considerations.....	15
2.12 Innovative ideas.....	15
2.13 Calls for other national bodies to act.....	15
2.14 NFAHWC related comments or suggestions.....	15
2.15 Animal Welfare Research Capacity Project, 2014.....	15
Group/Organization Legend	16
Appendix 1. Example survey	
Appendix 2. Response data used to generate summary survey findings #1	
Appendix 3. Response data used to generate summary survey findings #2	
Appendix 4. Participant feedback of note	
Appendix 5. Participant survey responses	

Background

In 2012, the NFAHW Council released an advisory statement “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada (2012)” which proposed a series of recommended actions to achieve an envisioned farm animal welfare system for Canada. The full document can be found at: http://www.ahwcouncil.ca/pdfs/animalwelfarestatement/NFAHWC%20animal%20welfare%20visi%20cover%20page_2012.pdf

Recommendation #3 in the advisory statement stated:

‘That NFAHWC, through appropriate communication with NFACC and other groups, (a) lead consultations on how best to develop national policy on farm animal welfare, and (b) conduct periodic review of progress and additional needs in Canada’s national farm animal welfare system’.

In 2014, the NFAHWC commissioned Dr. Jeffrey Spooner to conduct an open-ended survey of the key groups and organizations identified in the advisory statement. The survey was to (i) evaluate progress made on the twenty-two recommendations contained within the advisory statement and; (ii) to elicit feedback on the overall advisory statement. The survey project committee is pleased to present findings for the consideration of the Council.

Scope of the project

The project reports on the steps taken and progress made on the recommendations presented in the NFAHWC’s “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada (2012)”. It also summarizes stakeholder views on the advisory statement.

Surveys were prepared and forwarded to 24 groups/organizations identified in the advisory statement as providing leadership on the welfare of farm animals in Canada.ⁱ

Recipients were asked to indicate whether steps had or would be taken regarding all recommendations made of their specific body and to offer feedback on other key components of the overall advisory statement. See Appendix #1 for an example.

Sixteen participants provided written feedback. Six participants provided verbal feedback (i.e., by participating in telephone interviews that were recorded and transcribed). Two groups did not provide feedback.

Responses were subsequently categorized, coded and summarized. Summarized passages appear within the body of the report below. Progress updates are provided on each recommendation. Responses used to generate summaries on recommendation related progress and key components of the advisory statement are found in Appendix #2 and Appendix #3 respectively.

Some participants indicated that their participation in the survey process was of benefit to their organization. See Appendix #4.

All written and transcribed participant responses appear as Appendix #5.

Timeline

May, 2014: Acceptance of survey proposal by NFAHW Council

September, 2014 - May, 2015: Survey development, distribution and feedback response period

June, 2015: Initial presentation of report to NFAHW Council

Brief summary of survey findings

Considerable progress is being made on the 22 recommendations advanced in “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada (2012)”. Almost all recommendations explicitly addressing NFACC, AAFC and the NFAHWC have been addressed and are either completed or are progressing toward an anticipated positive outcome (8 recommendations). While other recommendations are also progressing, their anticipated outcomes remain uncertain (6 recommendations). Two recommendations are either not progressing or have been rejected. Progress on the remaining six proposals are unknown. Hence, the issues that they were intended to address or remedy presumably remain unresolved.

Stakeholders typically expressed strong support for the Council’s vision of a comprehensive farm animal welfare system. Concerns were raised, however, as to the implications or limiting effects of constitutional divisions of power in Canada, the costs associated with a national system and the future of basic animal welfare research. While a number of minor objections, corrections and suggestions were advanced, most groups/organizations offered formal recommendations that could serve as the basis for future updates or revisions to the 2012 advisory statement.

Survey findings

1) Progress on the twenty two recommendations of the NFAWSC (2012)

Leadership and coordination

It is recommended:

- 1. That NFACC: (a) define its roles and responsibilities in more detail as a basis for clarifying how it can best contribute to a national farm animal welfare system, (b) evaluate the adequacy of its membership and its capacity to consult with stakeholders, and (c) ensure that it has adequate means of communication with provincial/territorial governments, perhaps using the CCCVO and FPAW as conduits for communication and consultation*

NFACC has addressed all aspects of this recommendation. The CCCVO agrees with and is willing to provide assistance regarding communication with provincial and territorial governments. While NFACC considers efforts to involve “the public” an ongoing challenge, it cites committee related interactions with restaurant/food service providers, retail stakeholders and the CFHS as providing important “conduits” to the public. This recommendation may be classified as progressing.

- 2. That relevant government agencies, producer organizations and all sectors of the animal source food system ensure that NFACC has secure funding to continue providing national leadership, including the continued updating of Codes, once the specific roles and responsibilities of NFACC have been defined and agreed*

While the CFHS voiced strong support, no government or producer groups made firm commitments in response to this recommendation. This may reflect an inability to guarantee support on an on-going-basis. If so, this could represent a significant threat to the NFAHWC’s comprehensive vision of Canada’s national farm animal welfare system. This recommendation may be classified as unresolved.

- 3. That NFAHWC, through appropriate communication with NFACC and other groups, (a) lead consultations on how best to develop national policy on farm animal welfare, and (b) conduct periodic review of progress and additional needs in Canada’s national farm animal welfare system*

The NFAHWC cites (i) “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada (2012)” and the; (ii) “Progress Report (2015): A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada (2012)” as the first two steps in this ongoing process. The Council will also continue to provide high-level monitoring of policy and progress on the issue.

It is notable that while the CFHS expressed strong support, one producer association felt that NFACC was the correct organization to implement this recommendation. This may highlight a need to clarify the complementarity between the two organizations on matters of animal welfare. This recommendation may be classified as progressing.

- 4. That FPAW formalize its terms of reference, and that senior management of the respective agencies give official recognition to the work of the committee, perhaps by constituting it as a sub-committee of the committee of regulatory assistant deputy ministers*

FPAW agrees in principle but does not have the jurisdiction to act on this recommendation and continues to use only informal channels of communication. As a result, the goal of achieving a more structured harmonization of FPT efforts remains unresolved. This recommendation may be classified as unresolved.

- 5. That all organizations that provide leadership in animal welfare review their needs and hire appropriately trained individuals or secure training for existing personnel*

One producer organization responded and felt that it had adequate expertise. The collective lack of response may mean that nothing specific has been done on this recommendation. This recommendation may be classified as unknown or unresolved.

- 6. That national producer organizations ensure the involvement of relevant service industries (e.g., breeding companies, nutrition companies, engineers) in addressing animal welfare*

Varied responses were received from producer associations. Some supported the recommendation outright and cited examples of compliance. Others appeared to be acting in accord with the recommendation without recognizing or acknowledging such. Some commentators suggested that provincial producer organizations should play a bigger part here given their key roles in producer communication and the roll-out of programs. Presumably there are a range of compliance activities taking place. This recommendation may be classified as progressing.

Research

- 7. That AAFC facilitate consultation among sectors on the full range of animal welfare research in Canada with the goals of identifying research needs and opportunities (taking international work into account), promoting communication, identifying efficient funding mechanisms, and moving Canada toward a comprehensive and well-targeted program of animal welfare research including relevant social-science research*

AAFC has completed a consultation as recommended (i.e., “Animal Welfare Research Capacity Project, 2014”). The consultation identified significant gaps in research and inefficiencies in the funding system. It thus identified several further steps to be taken.

One finding was that a shift has occurred from government funding to private-sector funding of farm animal welfare research. This has led to a lack of research on “public good” aspects. As a follow-up, the NFAHWC has begun a process to define areas of public-good research that cannot be expected to be funded by the private sector. Hence, the recommended action is complete and the NFAHWC is now trying to help plug the gaps that have been identified.

It was also pointed out that as animal welfare research is increasingly led by industry groups, welfare topics that cut “horizontally” across commodities have, and will continue, to fall-off the agenda (e.g., social science research on public concerns about farm animal welfare, research on the effectiveness of extension activities, basic work on non-invasive measures of stress, etc.). This is a concern that commentators felt will need to be explored. While this recommendation may be classified as completed, considerable effort will be needed to meet the needs identified in farm animal welfare research.

Standards

8. That NFACC (a) review Codes of Practice at least every five years, and update them at least every ten years, and (b) consider feasible alternative methods of generating standards for minor groups of farmed animals for which full development of a Code is not practical

NFACC appears to support this recommendation. They state, however, the need to (i) develop clarity around how to decide when a revision is required; (ii) to have a smooth process with a manageable work load and; (iii) to avoid compromising the code development process in order to maintain the credibility of all codes. How to finance codes for minor species may require creative efforts. While the overall recommendation appears to have been accepted and may be classified as progressing, it will require additional efforts for full implementation.

9. That relevant government agencies and all sectors of the animal-source food system ensure the financial means for regular review and updating of Codes of Practice

The sparse feedback received about this recommendation may indicate a lack of commitment of resources into the future (perhaps because neither industry nor government can commit beyond relatively short time horizons). Given the significance of regular reviews and the updating of Codes to the NFAHWC’s comprehensive vision of a national farm animal welfare system, the status of this recommendation will remain a concern. This recommendation may be classified as unresolved.

10. That CFIA publish proposed regulatory changes based on the pre-consultation which it conducted on the federal Transportation of Animals Regulations

CFIA has completed this recommendation. Implementation of the proposed changes will depend on political decisions. Hence, this recommendation is progressing though the outcome remains uncertain.

11. That FPAW, through appropriate consultation, (a) review and recommend options for moving toward uniform humane slaughter standards across the country, and (b) review how Codes are used and referenced in different jurisdictions, together with the legal implications of the different approaches, with the view of identifying an approach that can be recommended to all provinces and territories

FPAW members see the merit of acting and are taking steps as time allows but are not sufficiently empowered or resourced. Comments were also received regarding the way in which the wide variation in animal welfare law(s) and enforcement remains an impediment for Canada moving toward a systematic approach to farm animal welfare. The lack of a formal, resourced FPT consultative body

will continue to undermine the NFAHWC’s vision of a nationally comprehensive farm animal welfare system. This recommendation may be classified as progressing but a continuing concern.

- 12. *That committees developing Codes of Practice maintain a clear distinction between ‘requirements’ which refer to regulatory requirements or industry-imposed expectations outlining acceptable and unacceptable practices, and ‘recommendations’ that promote continuous improvement and encourage a high level of care***

NFACC directors confirmed that this distinction will be maintained. This recommendation may be classified as completed.

Education, extension and communication

- 13. *That national producer organizations, NFACC and other organizations help to disseminate available, high-quality education/extension resources across provinces and industry sectors***

While NFACC does not see this as their role, producer organizations provided varying responses. Some supported the recommendation outright and cited numerous examples of compliance. Others appeared to have interpreted the recommendation as calling for the widespread distribution of resources/materials (outright or through provincial bodies) rather than prototypical or exemplary resources/materials. Differences in reaction to this recommendation may reflect differences in how groups define their roles. It was also pointed out that different industries handle this matter differently (i.e., with some relying mostly on provincial agencies to develop extension materials). Given the risk of duplication, greater coordination among agencies could result in potential efficiencies. This recommendation may be classified as progressing but variable among different sectors. It will also require clarification and follow-up action.

- 14. *That as national animal producer organizations update Codes and implement Animal Care Assessment programs, they also develop plans on how to communicate the value of these activities to a broad public audience***

A range of responses were received. While there was widespread support in principle, compliance varied among sectors based on available resources and priorities. The proposal appears to have been widely accepted but not entirely embraced. This recommendation may be classified as progressing, with further action needed.

- 15. *That retail and food service companies become involved in the Canadian farm animal welfare system so as to ensure that any animal-welfare-related purchasing requirements they create are well informed and likely to support good animal welfare, and that NFACC and producer organizations facilitate this involvement***

NFACC has initiated and is realizing significant progress here. The NFAHWC has approached the retail sector to invite their participation on Council. Producer organizations are more varied in their

relationships with, and attitudes toward, the retail sector. This recommendation may be classified as progressing.

16. *That industry organizations and extension services review the adequacy of their capacity for animal welfare education/extension and hire trained individuals or secure appropriate training for existing personnel*

No responses provided. Hence, no obvious commitment (perhaps owing to insufficient resources). This recommendation may be classified as unresolved.

17. *That producer and other organizations encourage and support research on the effectiveness of animal welfare extension activities*

Groups may not have interpreted this recommendation as a call to conduct – within their own programs -- research on the effectiveness of different extension activities (e.g., lectures, farm visits, bench-marking etc.). Hence, there remains a lack of available research to guide the choice of extension activities. This recommendation may be classified as unresolved.

Compliance assurance

18. *That NFACC lead consultations on (a) producer-driven compliance activities such as industry hot-lines and cooperation with enforcement personnel, and recommend whether and how to extend such programs to other industry sectors and jurisdictions, and on (b) the benefits of involving medical and social services in cases of serious breakdown in animal care, and how best to secure such services when they are needed*

NFACC is taking action on both counts. CCA notes that there are promising MOU's between producer organizations and enforcement. There is general agreement/acceptance of this recommendation among groups. While NFACC is providing national consultation as requested, implementation will need to take place on provincial and local levels. This stage will require further efforts. This recommendation may be classified as progressing with further action needed, especially at a provincial level.

19. *That the CCCVO, with appropriate consultation, (a) consider and recommend options whereby provincial/territorial officials could be empowered to participate in enforcing federal Transportation of Animals Regulations, and (b) lead a consultation to identify appropriate means and levels, best practices, and practical metrics of animal welfare enforcement*

19(a) *That the CCCVO, with appropriate consultation consider and recommend options whereby provincial/territorial officials could be empowered to participate in enforcing federal Transportation of Animals Regulations*

The CCCVO recommends against empowering provincial or territorial officials to enforce federal Transportation of Animals Regulations, asserting that enforcement should be done by CFIA alone. Hence, concerns over inconsistent enforcement of transport regulations will remain. This will challenge the NFAHWC's comprehensive vision of Canada's national farm animal welfare system.

Progress Report (2015): “A National Farm Animal Welfare System for Canada, 2012”

This recommendation may be classified as not progressing and will require further review. Perhaps a revised Transport Code, especially if referenced in provincial legislation, may help create more uniformity in enforcement of humane transport.

19(b) That the CCCVO, with appropriate consultation lead a consultation to identify appropriate means and levels, best practices, and practical metrics of animal welfare enforcement

The CCCVO is acting in compliance with this recommendation and will be providing forthcoming guidance on appropriate measures of enforcement. The CCCVO also notes that enforcement occurs in different ways in different provinces. This lack of uniformity is apt to weaken the NFAHWC’s comprehensive vision of Canada’s national farm animal welfare system. This recommendation may be classified as progressing but the concern over inconsistent enforcement is likely to remain.

20. That national producer organizations in all animal production sectors develop Animal Care Assessment programs suited to the specific nature of their sector, and that this be done in consultation with NFACC so as to achieve sharing of effective methods and approaches across sectors

There is uniform agreement on the approach outlined here. Strong progress is also being made in implementing this recommendation. NFACC suggests that there is a need to better integrate the development of Codes and the development of animal care assessment programs (i.e., to develop future Codes in accord with/through commensurate ACAM lenses). This recommendation may be classified as supported and progressing.

21. That CFIA conduct and publish audits to demonstrate that federal inspectors conduct humane slaughter enforcement to a satisfactory and consistent national standard at federally inspected facilities

While the CFIA accepts the intent of this recommendation, other respondents questioned whether the information on audits is genuinely being made available. This recommendation may be classified as progressing but there will be an on-going need to clarify how CFIA is complying and how outside parties might access information on audits.

22. That FPAW lead a consultation to determine whether existing capacity to enforce federal Transportation of Animals Regulations is sufficient for a uniform and satisfactory level of enforcement

FPAW has declined to act on this recommendation because FPAW considers it an area of federal responsibility. Hence, concerns over inconsistent enforcement of transport regulations will remain. This will challenge the NFAHWC’s comprehensive vision of Canada’s national farm animal welfare system. This recommendation may be classified as rejected.

Notable results

- 1) The NFAHWC (as per the “NFAWSC, 2012”) had hoped to see FPAW strengthened and formalized in a role that could advise on harmonizing responses among jurisdictions. This has not proven possible. While the CCCVO may be able to assume some of this function this remains an unresolved concern that threatens to undermine NFAHWC’s comprehensive vision of Canada’s national farm animal welfare system (Re: Recommendation 4).
- 2) There appear to be varying relationships between national and provincial producer organizations (and related provincial groups/agencies) across sectors. This is an important issue with regard to recommendations entailing provincial or local ramifications (Re: Recommendations 6, 13 & 18).
- 3) Funding related recommendations that were not addressed or guaranteed remain a concern (Re: Recommendations 2, 5, 9, 11 & 16)
- 4) Neither the CCCVO nor FPAW will be addressing either of the NFAWSC, 2012 transport related recommendations (Re: Recommendations 19(a) and 22, respectively)
- 5) FPAW will not be facilitating the identification and recommendation of an approach to the legal use and referencing of Codes suitable to all provinces/territories (Re: Recommendation 11b).*
* This could be partially offset by forthcoming guidance that the CCCVO has indicated it will be providing regarding animal welfare enforcement (Re: Recommendation 19b).
- 6) Slaughter related standards and enforcement issues included in two recommendations are not expected to be addressed (Re: Recommendations 11 & 21).
- 7) There was limited feedback – and apparent little action taken – on specific animal welfare related leadership, communication, education and extension activities (Re: Recommendations 5, 14, 16 & 17).
- 8) There appears to have been instances of misunderstanding associated with the intent of some recommendations (Re: Recommendations 13 & 17).
- 9) Recommendation 7, calling upon AAFC to lead research consultations, was made when AAFC was still extensively involved in animal welfare research. As this is no longer the case, there was considerable comment that AAFC was no longer well positioned to conduct this consultation (even with the consultation being led by AAFC’s Market Industry Services Branch, rather than its Science and Technology Branch).
- 10) Various government/legislative groups have been called upon and/or will be required to take action in order for certain recommendations to be realized (Re: Recommendations 10 & 19(a))
- 11) Any/all recommendations that have been classified as having an unknown or unresolved status are notable and of potential concern (Re: Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 9, 16, 17).

Recommendations

- 1) As per the status update on recommendation #3, it may be helpful to clarify the complementarity between NFACC and the NFAHWC on matters of animal welfare.*

* For example; NFACC is well positioned to provide coordination among producer groups and other players in the value chain, but lacks NFAHWC’s clear reporting relationship to senior levels of government. In addition, NFAHWC is charged with overseeing the implementation of the National Farm Animal Health and Welfare Strategy, and hence needs to continue to monitor those general aspects of animal welfare that fall under the strategy. Nonetheless, the two organizations must and do work in close communication to avoid any duplication.

- 2) It may be helpful to clarify the wording or intent of recommendation #13.
- 3) It may be helpful to clarify the wording or intent of recommendation #17.
- 4) It may be helpful to address the suitability of AAFC’s continued role in leading consultations associated with, or emanating from, recommendation #7.
- 5) Further attention will need to be given to those recommendations with an “unknown” or “unresolved” status (Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 9, 16, 17), those not progressing (Recommendation 19a) and those rejected (Recommendation 22).
- 6) Further attention will need to be given to those recommendations classified as completed or progressing but requiring future monitoring (Recommendations 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18, 19b & 21).

2) General responses to “NFAWSC 2012”

2.1 General comments/support for advisory statement

Groups provided a range of general comments on the NFAWSC 2012 strategy paper. Many pledged support for, and a willingness to assist, Council in its efforts to realize a comprehensive vision. Many also expressed support for the inclusion – and occasional exclusion or rejection – of specific items. Some organizations offered examples of where the Council’s strategic efforts and recommended actions coincided with their own and listed examples of relevant activities. Some offered opinions on where they envisioned future challenges.

2.2 National/comprehensive VS. Provincial/self-regulatory considerations

Many groups spoke about the Council’s efforts to implement a national welfare system in the context of Canada’s *de facto*, constitutional distribution of power. AAFC stressed that leadership and governance must be based on collaboration and coordination between all major governmental and

industry stakeholders (i.e., operating in a nationally “horizontal” or shared, rather than top-down/pyramidal, manner). CFIA echoed AAFC’s views while emphasizing the need to recognize and respect provincial and territorial boundaries, responsibilities and authoritative limits. Others, including the University of PEI, acknowledged existing boundaries and limitations but identified opportunities for, and the importance of, strategic enhancements within respective jurisdictions/areas of influence while emphasizing the need for federal government intervention.

2.3 Minor objections, concerns or confusion

Some groups expressed confusion about the meaning of, or the groups addressed, in selected passages. The CCCVO, for example, also expressed discomfort about (i) implicit misrepresentations that could ensue from specific phrases and; (ii) recommendations running counter to traditional reporting structures or administrative chains of command within government.

2.4 Groups omitted/not consulted

Species-specific veterinary organizations expressed support for the Council’s vision. Most were surprised, however, to have only learned of the strategy paper after the fact and regretted not having been invited to participate previously. For future reference, it cannot be assumed that documents sent to the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association will necessarily be distributed to specialist veterinary organizations.

2.5 Funding related concerns regarding NFAWSC, 2012

Some groups pointed out that designated resources would be needed to see the envisioned strategy made manifest.

2.6 Corrections, oversights and clarifications

A number of organizations offered minor corrections on specific recommendations or other passages (e.g., technical oversights, updates or additional inclusions).

2.7 NFACC focus

Many groups offered comments about NFACC and its assigned leadership and coordination roles in the “NFAWSC 2012”. AAFC envisions NFACC as; (i) the embodiment of the five necessary components of the NFAWSC system and; (ii) the manifestation of the collaborative process by which a Canadian system must/will be realized. Others stressed the need for NFACC to be sufficiently resourced if it is to successfully manage all recommendations made of it. Still others commented on

or suggested amendments to NFACC’s procedural processes/practices in an effort to enhance its net effectiveness.

2.8.a Need for basic (i.e., future focussed) research funding

All academic bodies, plus one producer association, expressed the need for basic research funding to continue alongside or in addition to more applied/immediate/industry focussed studies. Emphasis was placed on the need for basic research to suitably inform policy and to address the future welfare-related needs of all stakeholders.

2.8.b Call to address unique Canadian research needs

Some academic researchers also emphasized the need for research funding to address areas of key/unique interest to Canadian stakeholders (i.e., where or when such research has not been conducted elsewhere/internationally).

2.9 Recommendations and supplemental considerations

Virtually all groups/organizations offered suggestions or additional recommendations for future consideration by Council. AAFC felt that the NFAWSC 2012 recommendations should make room for more market-based mechanisms in fairness to producers/industry. The CFHS offered many additional inclusions to be inserted into existing recommendations and key passages. Others, including the CFC, recommended that more central roles for and/or recognition be given to national producer associations.

2.10 Make reference to animals directly

Some groups, including the CFIA, recommended that risks to the welfare of farm animals themselves be explicitly listed as a fundamental driver of the NFAHWC 2012 system.

2.11 Veterinary considerations

A number of groups felt that greater attention should be paid to veterinarians within the NFAWSC 2012 (both with regard to the potential/central importance of their role and the prospective need for additional or continuing education in the area of farm animal welfare).

2.12 Innovative ideas

Efforts were made by some to offer helpful/strategic means of advancing the NFAWSC 2012 (e.g., by leveraging existing interrelationships between key stakeholders)

2.13 Calls for other national bodies to act

Groups such as the CVMA and the CFHS expressed support for further efforts intended to advance and/or remedy long awaited/overdue amendments to federal animal transportation regulations

2.14 NFAHWC related comments or suggestions

Some comments, recommendations and questions were offered/posed with regard to the nature, activities and effectiveness of the NFAHWC.

2.15 Animal Welfare Research Capacity Project, 2014

As an extension of Recommendation #7 (i.e., AAFC to consult on animal welfare related research in Canada) a number of groups offered mixed comments on the recently prepared Animal Welfare Research Capacity Project (2014). While NFACC, CFIA and FPAW expressed general agreement with most recommendations made, the CFHS and some university bodies expressed disappointment over perceived omissions (e.g., failure to benchmark Canadian research relative to other countries and inadequate consideration/provisions for long term research planning).

ⁱ **Group/Organization Legend**

National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC)
The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)
The Federal-Provincial Animal Welfare group (FPAW)
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)
The Canadian Council of Chief Veterinary Officers (CCCVO)
The Canadian Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA)

Various species-specific veterinary organizations:

- Canadian association of Bovine Veterinarians (CABV)
- Canadian Association of Poultry Veterinarians (CAPV)
- Canadian Association of Swine Veterinarians (CASV)

The Canadian Federation of Humane Societies (CFHS)
The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC)

National producer associations:

- Canadian Cattlemen’s Association (CCA)
- Canadian Hatching Egg Producers (CHEP)
- Canadian Pork Council (CPC)
- Chicken Farmers of Canada (CFC)
- Dairy Farmers of Canada (DFC)
- Egg Farmers of Canada (EFC)
- Turkey Farmers of Canada (TFC)

Universities:

- University of British Columbia (UBC)
- University of Calgary (U of Calgary)
- University of Prince Edward Island (U of PEI)
- University of Guelph (U of Guelph)