Pacific NorthWest Economic Region

Cross Border Livestock Health Conference

2012 Pacific Northwest Economic Region Annual Summit Saskatoon, SK

Cross Border Livestock Health Conference
July 17-18, 2012

Sheraton Cavalier
612 Spadina Crescent East
Saskatoon, SK S7K 3G9

Prepared by:
Kathryn Ross
Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture
Room 202-3085 Albert St.
Regina, SK S4S 0B1
(306) 787-5142
kathryn.ross@gov.sk.ca

Thank you to our sponsors

CAHC CCSA

Alberta
Freedom To Create. Spirit To Achieve.

SCA
SASKATCHEWAN CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Background and Objectives

The 2012 Cross Border Livestock Health Conference (CBLHC) took place July 17 and 18, 2012 in conjunction with the 22nd Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER) Annual Summit. The CBLHC focused on 3 topic areas over the day and half which included; livestock specific Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) Action Plans, animal welfare issues affecting the US and Canada and improving on-farm disease detection in both countries.

The main objective of the day and a half conference was to enhance cross border cooperation on animal health issues. Specific objectives were:

- Enhanced relationships and build networks between US state and Canadian provincial jurisdictions
- Exchange information on animal health issues/concerns
- Develop a common understanding of disease policies
- Exchange information on emergency response for emerging and foreign/transboundary animal diseases
- Advance Canadian and American animal health interests
- Identify and execute action items to collectively address animal health and cross border issues

The conference began with welcoming remarks from Honourable Lyle Stewart, Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture and new president of PNWER. Following the welcoming address there was a stakeholder feedback session on the RCC Action Plans specific to livestock, which included veterinary drug submission harmonization and zoning for foreign animal diseases. After lunch the conference shifted focus onto animal welfare. These discussions included information on North American beef cattle transport, swine transportation training initiatives, National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC) and Canadian Animal Health Coalition's (CAHC) Farm Animal Care Project, welfare and disease issues at the southern border and role of veterinarians on detecting animal welfare issues. At the end of the day there was an update on the progress of the e-certification pilot project in live cattle. The morning session on the following day was focused on improving on-farm disease detection, presentation topics included: cultural change in veterinary usage since Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE), changing workload of western Canadian and American veterinarians and methods to improve on-farm disease detection.

Action Items

At the end of the session action items were developed based on the discussion that took place over the past two days. Action item leads and team members were to be determined following the conference. Action item updates will be communicated to the conference participants through email and postings on the CBLHC website http://www.cblhconference.com/index.html. Conference action items will be presented to the PNWER Executive Board, which is comprised of state and provincial legislators from around the region. These action items will also be presented to federal leadership in Washington, DC and Ottawa, ON to further advance regional animal health concerns. The CBLHC website will be maintained and used as a communication tool to share information with past and future conference participants. PNWER will also collaborate with the CBLHC Action Item Team to identify how the organization and legislators can advocate on behalf of the group.

AGENDA

Tuesday July 17, 2012 Morning

Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) Action Plan Stakeholder Panel Discussion

South Room, Sheraton Cavalier

612 Spadina Crescent East Saskatoon, SK

Time	Session	Speaker
9:15 – 9:20 AM	Welcome Address	**Honourable Lyle Stewart** – Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture
9:20 – 9:30 AM	Opening Remarks	*Co-Chairs* **Dr. Robert Gerlach** – Alaska State Veterinarian **Mr. Robert Harding** – Executive Director, Canadian Swine Health Board
9:30 – 10:00 AM	RCC Working Group – Veterinary Drug submission harmonization	**Dr. Mary-Jane Ireland** – Health Canada **Dr. Steven Vaughn** – Food and Drug Administration
10:00 – 10:30 AM	Stakeholder Feedback on Veterinary Drug submission harmonization	*Moderated by* **Dr. Don Herriot –** United States Department of Agriculture: Animal and Plant Inspection Service (USDA-APHIS)
10:30-10:45 AM	Break	
10:45 – 11:15 AM	RCC Working Group – Zoning for Foreign Animal Diseases	**Dr. Francine Lord** – Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) **Dr. Cheryl James** – CFIA **Dr. Kelly Rhodes** – USDA-APHIS
11:15 – 11:45 AM	Stakeholder Feedback on Zoning for Foreign Animal Diseases	*Moderated by* **Dr. Susan Keller –** North Dakota State Veterinarian
11:45 AM - 12:00 PM	Closing remarks for RCC session	*Co-Chairs* **Dr. Robert Gerlach** – Alaska State Veterinarian **Mr. Robert Harding** – Executive Director, Canadian Swine Health Board
12:00 PM	Adjourn for Lunch	

Tuesday July 17, 2012 Afternoon

Animal Welfare

South Room, Sheraton Cavalier

612 Spadina Crescent East Saskatoon, SK

Time	Session	Speaker
1:30 – 2:20 PM	North American Beef Cattle Transport National Pork Board's Transport Quality Assurance Program (TQA)	**Dr. Karen Schwartzkopf-Genswein** – Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada **Mr. Harvey Wagner –** Saskatchewan Pork Development Board
2:20 – 2:45 PM	Panel Discussion on transportation initiatives	**Dr. Karen Schwartzkopf-Genswein** **Mr. Harvey Wagner** *Session chaired by*: **Dr. Cynthia Gaborick –** USDA - APHIS
2:45 – 3:00 PM	Break	
3:00 – 4:15 PM	National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC) and Canadian Animal Health Coalition Farm Animal Care Project Southern Border Issues: Animal welfare and disease Role of veterinarians as the first line of defence on detecting animal welfare issues.	**Ms. Jackie Wepruk** – National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC) **Dr. Dave Fly** – New Mexico State Veterinarian **Dr. Chris Clark** – Western College of Veterinary Medicine
4:15 – 4:45 PM	Panel Discussion on animal welfare	**Ms. Jackie Wepruk** **Dr. Dave Fly** **Dr. Chris Clark** *Session chaired by*: **Dr. Cynthia Gaborick –** USDA - APHIS
4:45 – 5:05 PM	Update on Washington-British Columbia Live Cattle E-certification Pilot Project	**Mr. Aaron Canart** – Agri Beef Co. **Mr. Mike Nikolaisen** – British Columbia Association of Cattle Feeders

5:05 – 5:30 PM	Update and discussion on 2009-2011 Action Items. Written updates on Action Items will be provided.	*Co-Chairs* **Dr. Robert Gerlach** – Alaska State Veterinarian **Mr. Robert Harding** – Executive Director, Canadian Swine Health Board
5:30 PM	Adjourn	

Wednesday July 18, 2012 Morning

Improving On-Farm Disease Detection

South Room, Sheraton Cavalier

612 Spadina Crescent East Saskatoon, SK

Time	Session	Speaker
9:15 – 9:30 AM	Opening Remarks	*Co-Chairs* **Dr. Robert Gerlach** – Alaska State Veterinarian **Mr. Robert Harding** – Executive Director, Canadian Swine Health Board
9:30 – 10:30 AM	Cultural change in veterinary usage since Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) Changing workload of Western Canadian and American Veterinarians	**Dr. Josie Smart** – University of Calgary, Department of Anthropology **Dr. Murray Jelinski** – Western College of Veterinary Medicine
10:30 – 10:45 AM	Break	
10:45 – 11:15 AM	Methods to improve on-farm disease detection	**Dr. Eugene Janzen** – University of Calgary, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
11:15 – 11:45 AM	Panel Discussion on Improving On-Farm Disease Detection	**Dr. Josie Smart** **Dr. Murray Jelinski** **Dr. Eugene Janzen**
11:45 AM – 12:00 PM	2012 Action Items Discussion/Closing Comments	*Co-Chairs* **Dr. Robert Gerlach** – Alaska State Veterinarian **Mr. Robert Harding** – Executive Director, Canadian Swine Health Board
12:00	Lunch	
	Conclusion of the 2012 CBLHC	

PRESENTATIONS

All presentations are available on the CBLHC website
http://www.cblhconference.com/2012-presentations.html

DAY 1
Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) Action Plan Stakeholder Panel Discussion

RCC Working Group – Veterinary Drug Submission Harmonization
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-rcc-vet-drugs-july17-12.pdf
Dr. Mary-Jane Ireland – Health Canada
Dr. Steven Vaughn – Food and Drug Administration

Discussions on some background information on the Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) Joint Action Plan. The Veterinary Drug Initiative is one of 29 initiatives outlined in the RCC plan and being a part of the RCC action plan allows for stakeholder engagement at all levels. The overall goal of this project is to further align American and Canadian veterinary drug regulations and review practices involved in drug submission/approvals. Each country plans to maintain its own sovereign regulations and decision making but there would be sharing of information and data coordination to avoid duplicate testing, and also determine differences and how they can be better aligned between Canada and the USA. Currently regulatory alignment between both countries is good and with an existing confidentiality agreement already in place, sharing of information is simplified.

The goal of this project is to facilitate simultaneous new animal drug submissions, for example, a pharmaceutical company doing a North American approval rather than solely a Canada or US one. The USA are very well-resourced because they have up to date user fee program and are able to receive funding in order to do efficient reviews but Canada is not as well resourced, therefore, the harmonization will help improve efficiencies. Another goal of this project is to further align Maximum Residual Limits (MRL) where possible. Currently most MRLs are similar and the ones that are different are not significantly different.

Stakeholder Feedback

Are you at liberty to mention the name of the drug you have almost jointly approved? Do you have targets in mind as to timelines?

At this time, we cannot tell you what drug it is, due to confidentiality. The targets for other products we are looking at are 8 different applications and continue to review our

list on a quarterly basis. Sponsors are the third parties and have to be willing to make simultaneous submissions with the same data. It is very difficult when data is received from one sponsor and is different in both countries.

There are some controversial drugs that are involved in trade of swine and beef. Are you working together in submission of data of a drug like ractopamine? It is a significant drug, especially in beef when you are trading with countries, such as Taiwan. This issue has not been resolved so are you working on anything like that?

It (ractopamine) is already approved in Canada and the US so the issues regarding trade are beyond our border which is outside the role of the RCC. The ractopamine MRLs for cattle and swine were adopted; however, there are still significant trade issues that need to be worked out at the WTO level, to whether or not those controversial compounds will be allowed to be used in food producing animals and if the commodities from those animals will be allowed to be used in other countries. Codex is not a trade organization so market accessibility issues are not within the scope of Codex nor the RCC.

If I hear you right, you are both getting full submissions. They're simultaneous reviews, not joint reviews?

Yes they are simultaneous, not joint. The pharmaceutical company puts in a submission and in Canada require a full package but USA accepts the application in pieces. The Veterinary Drugs Directorate has changed their submission processes to allow for technical submissions to come in pieces, as well. Scientists can find synergy; ask questions at the same time, etc. That's what this initiative is really about. Both countries are making full reviews and at the end of the day we are making our own decisions. The goal is to achieve a simultaneous drug submission with the hope that it would be approved at the same time, and simultaneous access, but not for one drug to automatically be added to the other country, it is not legal with our statutory obligation from Congress to have another country make our decisions.

Are you moving toward joint reviews or not? Is it possible that each agency could take parts of the work, sign off on it? Would that fulfill the requirements or not?

Statue prevents that because if we got sued, we would end up in court and we don't want to put ourselves in that situation where we have to wait for Canadian colleagues to come down. While joint reviews sound good they do not really give an advantage.

Within the US, the FDA is moving toward a process where animal drugs will be affected with a veterinary feed process and through a prescription. By statute in the

US, extra-label use of drugs is prevented. Is that being considered in by the RCC? Are there attempts to synchronize extra-label use between two countries?

Anti-microbial drugs for use in feeds is what those laws are in place for. That is not something that we have encountered (extra-label use) that we have to work toward yet. So basically that is a separate initiative outside of the RCC, and it's important to recognize that it is critical to have a veterinarian involved in making treatment decisions to minimize the loss potential effectiveness in the animals themselves etc. A veterinary would have a lot of expertise to help make those funding decisions. That is the US direction.

In Canada multi-label drug use is a provincial jurisdiction issue. Extra label drug use is not an issue unless it has to do with food safety. It is outside the scope of the RCC unless it was a debate over whether it was 'prescription' status or not. When Congress passed the ADMUCA, provisions put in statute staying that there can't be extra-label use of any drug in a medicated feed, mostly from the feed industry, this dates back to 1994.

Is there a possibility after the procedure is gone through that each country has a different decision on the drug, different MRLs, etc.?

Yes. Considering the tonnage that is traded south of the line after being raised in Canada and vice versa, we are dealing fairly with human health issues by doing that. This situation has not been run into yet and we have a good chance of things working out so that we are closely aligned so scientists talk to scientists and hopefully reasonable people come to the same conclusions. We will have to see how it plays out because sovereignty needs to be maintained.

I hear frequently that the fact that the Americans have a large market, Canada has a small one, so drug companies apply to the US and not to Canada so more drugs are approved in US and not Canada. Does it simplify the process for the company so that when they're applying for one so they apply for US, might as well apply for Canada as well, and level the playing field?

That's a great question. The feedback from manufacturers is that this is huge; the ability to send data in pieces instead of waiting. To coordinate with their US regulatory counterparts to send those files in has been a good thing, and it's a bit of work on Canada's side to get our processes changed re: project management, etc., but our early indication from sponsors is that they're keen. Now they know RCC is underway, they're keen for asking us; the benefit is they can keep it rolling in, but also technical experts then can be put on notice and are able to answer questions about a study from 2-3 years ago, don't have to answer them all at the same time. So early indication is it's a

good thing because it finds efficiency for regulatory affairs for people in these large companies.

There will be benefits for having the same products approved at the same time. The issue I see now is that there are products that are the same in the US and Canada and the prices are quite different, does this initiative deal with cost differences across the border?

The aspects of cost and crossing the border are beyond the scope of Food and Drug Act and the RCC.

The availability and opportunity to import a drug would itself deal with a pricing issue. Do you deal at all with products going across the border?

We're hoping simultaneous access in both countries will avoid the crossing the border business. It's also enabling people to buy the approved product in the country in which they live, so hopefully the RCC will avoid the issue or contribute to having the same products available throughout North America. Also be aware there is a third party involved in this; it's the US, Canada, and the pharmaceutical industry. And it could be a good topic for this forum to invite that industry in and talk about pricing structure and what causes prices to be different. There's pre-market work to be done and post-approval work to sustain. Technical support, defending liability, etc. are some of the considerations that go into the pricing scheme. We're just like Canada in the US, as far as we have nothing to do or no statutory obligation or responsibility for pricing and markets; it's outside of our mandate.

There are historical differences in pharmaceutical use between our countries; is there any enthusiasm in the RCC Working Group to examine those differences? That might be the answer to some of the issues, if the labelling differences were harmonized, then the industry would have more enthusiasm to market in a different way.

We're not always completely aligned in our indications. I don't think we're that far off in terms of where we land. What the RCC will challenge Canada is to think about why we use wording the way we do and the indication wording. Provide an opportunity to come to the same conclusions, the pharmaceutical companies determine their market, dose/indication and it's their prerogative to determine that.

If you were to dream how you could further integrate structurally, what would it look like?

There are still some challenges. The VICH is a trilateral (EU-Japan-USA) programme aimed at harmonising technical requirements for veterinary product registration which

will help harmonize member countries. Ultimate goal is not only regulators getting together but pharmaceutical companies getting together, in order to have global submissions.

Will you change requirements to harmonize with the US, or is it expected that the drug companies will adapt?

If we have differences we'll look at what they are and try to figure out if they are different and what they are, and we're hoping we land in the same places at the end with the same dataset.

RCC Working Group – Zoning for Foreign Animal Diseases
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-rcc-zoning-fads.pdf
Dr. Francine Lord – Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Dr. Cheryl James – Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Dr. Kelly Rhodes – Animal and Plant Inspection Services.

Canada and the US developed a work plan, where they are working toward making a common framework for diseases and if a disease outbreak occurred they would ensure trade could still occur in unaffected zones. This initiative began many years ago without the RCC, but continued under its umbrella. Began with the Quad, which is a US, Australia, Canada, New Zealand forum that meets regularly. New Zealand and Australia is interested in policy learning from the Canada-US trade agreement. This all started with the evaluation of the vet infrastructure and the International Emergency management signed recently which will be available for other countries to utilize because we are leaders, and that's why they count on us and we want it to be available to everybody.

Zoning is the key; with disease zoning, it is vital. We could continue trade in disease free zones, and the animal welfare will not suffer. At the stakeholder meeting in Washington DC with zoning being under RCC has given it a lot of momentum and now we have the attention of senior management and it will allows us to accomplish more. The appropriate term for what we're signing is an 'arrangement' – document of intention that we will recognize each other's zoning decisions.

Some of the stakeholder comments in Washington, DC were: in general, there were positive comments; wanted plans in place so we don't shut down industries totally. The common need is to have industry partners and in provinces, states – a lot of on the ground experience that we needed to engage with these groups to make this work. Since we are working in 2 countries, there are differences in the way we do consultations. There are a lot of groups when we're starting to talk about stakeholder

engagement – it is easier in Canada, more complicated in the States – who do we bring in and when? Also some of the considerations include fiscal restraint. As well, diseases don't respect borders and they tend to move with vectors that move in ecological areas, which cut across borders between US/Canada.

Stakeholder Feedback

This totally reformulates the concept around borders, but you haven't mentioned anything about zoning criteria. What is your thinking?

The truth is that Canada and the US have the same zoning goals; we want to stop, control and eradicate the spread of disease, but we don't do it the same way. From the US perspective we have an infected zone and then we have a buffer zone. That is our control area – two zones. Then we have a surveillance zone. CFIA has an infected, buffer and surveillance zone that is NOT part of their free zone like in the US. So there is a difference. It is also one thing to mention the Beyond the Border initiative and Canada and US going to a third country. This way we share the same information, we know what each other are doing, etc. Also you don't want to overemphasize our differences. We do have the ability to work toward equivalent outcomes.

Does this RCC initiative include compartmentalization?

Eventually, we are working on compartmentalization, and right now the sector is recognized by the poultry industry; we did visit Germany and Holland and we are going to the UK to find out what they're doing. We hope to recognize and be part of it right now but the goal is, if you have a compartment in a free zone, you can recognize. Zoning is a geographical barrier with a different animal health status. The first big step is dealing with FMD, and all of the other pieces will most likely be covered after all of this is done. A zone is a geographic area with a different animal health status. This does not include compartmentalization. We are looking at the ability to move animal livestock and products among disease-free zones in both countries. It could lead to other initiatives, but not at the present time. The poultry genetics industry – there was mention of 'business within business' – poultry wants a compartment in the US, Canada, UK or wherever and be able to move product between those areas in Canada. Poultry is the only area we are looking at for that right now regarding compartmentalization.

Have you considered how to deal with a disease that we wouldn't normally vaccinate for like foot & mouth disease? Are you going to handle things together in a way that is not trade disruptive?

We are now considering FMD vaccination in Canada and the USA is also considering it, it is not proper to continue on the way it is. As for trade-unfriendly groups – we're going to consider all comments that come our way, and hopefully we can come to a common understanding. The North American FMD Vaccine Bank (NAFMDVB) has been formed for USA, Canada and Mexico and if something happened, the 3 countries have regular meetings, are talking, etc., and have the ability to obtain FMD vaccine if required.

As a provincial representative, I assume there'll be a role for other stakeholders on the Canadian side. I encourage you to consult so we know what our role would be. But I see the big challenge is along the line of traceability – how much of a challenge is the current state of that on both sides of the border posing for an initiative like this?

Certainly there's been a lot of work done on Canadian traceability and it's a big initiative for Canada, to get that system up and running. We still have a long way to go on that. The West Hawk Lake Zoning Initiative is one of those and premises ID and movement reporting is on its way but there are a lot of steps. National Animal ID is out of the scope for this project.

Most state producers do not belong to any organization. I wondered if the goal is still disease prevention and introduction. What about in wildlife?

We believe in traceability but also biosecurity; hopefully wildlife would not be in contact; please be sure you have good biosecurity so wildlife cannot be introduced. And we're looking at what happens after there is a disease outbreak. Both agencies want prevention wildlife contact; however, this is out of scope for this RCC action plan. Wildlife is a large concern; however, a vector borne disease would also be very troublesome to deal with.

With the last 2 cases of CWD in mule deer now makes 14 states in the US with CWD and also a study that showed CWD transfer to humanized mice. Is CWD a concern regarding this zoning initiative?

CWD is not being considered because of how it spreads and it is not highly transmissible like FMD, which is aerosolized and easily transmits to other animals.

You end up dealing with highly infectious disease outbreaks somewhere, how efficient is your containment with respect to business proposition? Business isn't going to just stop moving animals. How is that addressed? Through interactions with livestock producers?

You're actually asking about zoning procedures and how it would be placed? And that the borders would be not porous? I'm going to refer your question to the National

Center for Animal Health Management. The answer will come from the people on the ground. The federal level can set up all the plans you want, but it's only going to be through cooperation with industry and with people at the state and territorial and provincial level that we will make it work. The Secure Milk and Secure Egg program work very well and we wish we had some way to deal with live animal movements that quickly. It is very important to consider livestock producers as your stakeholders also. When Minnesota developed TB regulations were geopolitical and not zoning.
We need to do this more transparently and there needs to be discussion about why we're doing that. We talked in this action item 2 that part of what we need to do is figure out how it works on the ground. If you have input or ideas please share.

West Hawk Lake zoning initiative – MB/ON information – we have the dataset that is actively able to help manage a foreign disease outbreak in animals. We have the capability to cease movement at that point; we have retrospective traceability data that goes back through periods. For my group, the work of the RCC is important. One of the fundamental objectives of the West Hawk Lake zoning initiative is for trade continuation from the disease-free side, so having pre-negotiated arrangements is critical. Is there a message I can take back in terms of the resources you need to move this forward, how we can get to the next steps in terms of other opportunities?

We need all stakeholders to work together, so the communication plan is vital. We are developing that right now. We need to be involved and have practice so that the processes can improve.

Keeping FMD out of North America – would like to see a strong statement for both countries to keep it out of here because US has free trade agreements that are threatening safety; will cost the country a significant amount of money be really and if both countries come together, we can prevent/not accept at risk products coming into our countries.

Tourists; biosecurity is the key; you can't stop everything. Protect your farm. This is the beginning of stopping any kind of infectious disease, not just foot and mouth. Customs and Border Protection in the US are critical for international ports in US – it's not just live animals that are the concern, it's what people bring into the country. FMD vaccinations are the next step because we need to deal with the realities.

Animal Welfare

North American Beef Cattle Transport – Current Welfare Research and Future Directions

http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-animal-welfare-cattle-transport.pdf

Dr. Karen Schwartzkopf-Genswein – Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

The public sees transport more than anything else in the livestock industry, and it has received a lot of public scrutiny. It is the number one complaint to the agricultural ministry, also curb the cruelty publications and animal rights groups are becoming increasingly popular. There is an eight hour rule for feed, food and water in the European Union but they have feed and water on the trucks. Our (Canadian) regulations are 30 years old and how are they in line with the OIE? What science can we base new regulations on? There are not any Canadian/American studies on loading densities and food/water intervals, and we cannot base these on European Union studies because conditions are not the same due to distances and types of trucks.

This project started with a transport benchmark study which was developed by industry; because we wanted to see transport norms and extremes. Questions included average minimum and maximum loading densities, transport densities, feed, water and rest intervals, as well as the differences between short haul and long haul (> 400 km) results. Approximately 290,000 cattle were involved in the study and most were from AB going into US, BC or eastern Canada. Temperatures were recorded during the journeys with the average being 16 °C, the minimum temperature was -42 °C and the maximum was greater than 30 °C. The most common trailers used were quad axles. Bedding was used in 23 % of all loads; however, bedding was not typically used for fat cattle.

The study ended in December and COOL was implemented in Sept so three months of COOL data was provided, this showed that COOL caused an increased delay at the border. In Canadian regulations the maximum transit time of 45 hours, and also note that time in truck and off loaded still means time in transit. Driver experience was shown to be very important on how much shrink is recorded, drivers with more than 6 years of experience produce less shrink. Also, when driver experience is between 0-5 years there was much higher numbers of totally compromised animals there is also a relationship between temperature and shrink. Greater than 15 °C, the shrink increases quite rapidly. Duration, temp, driving experience, time/origin of loading, type of animals all affect shrink. No difference between fats and feeders. Take home message for welfare issues, the cull cows/calves made up the greatest proportion of dead, down and lame. For future evaluations – a study on cull cow, calf and feeder welfare during long haul transport would be very beneficial for the industry.

North American Transport Initiatives
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-animal-welfare-swine-transport.pdf
Mr. Harvey Wagner

The main issue on hog transport in Western Canada issue is there is a significant amount of distance between farms and packing plants, so more transport is required. Weather extremes are frequent and can also be an issue. Other issues to consider are biosecurity requirements on farms and the difficulty of retaining drivers. Many new drivers do not have that much experience with animals, which can make animal transport that much more difficult.

The Canadian Quality Assurance (CQA) program is an On-Farm Food Safety (OFFS) program, which allows for uniformity across the country and it was developed by the Canadian Pork Council and based off of HACCP. High level of participation in Western Canada, close to 100% participation rate because the major slaughter plants require enrolment. The Animal Care Assessment Program, is another program with more of a welfare component but similar to the CQA. In Canada, we also have a transportation codes and codes of practices and all farm species are covered which help promote sound animal welfare practices on Canadian hog farms.

Some other programs within the swine industry are the National Swine Farm-Level Biosecurity Standard and transport was a big part of the standard. Pig Trace Canada and the Can Pork initiative currently track farm to slaughter by ear tags on every farm that has premise identification and we are moving forward to full movement tracking and electronic submissions. Regulations on this were presented recently and the implementation will be in 2013. Trailer with license plate will be recorded in this program, in order to trace animals once they are off the farm.

Why do we need transport training to prevent negative animal welfare outcomes? One of the main goals is to stabilize driver turnover. There have been a large number of dead pigs, recorded by USDA, found at the slaughter plants. Some of the thoughts on to why this happened; possibly due to change in genetics, pigs are now larger and leaner and feeding regime have changed.

Drivers can make a big difference on fatigue in pigs. TQA program was developed by National Pork Board and is also used for live pigs imported into the USA. Voluntary, but most plants require it because there is a link to meat quality and animal welfare. The passing level required is > 90 % and need to recertify every 3 years. This was specifically developed for transporters, producers and handlers. Proper animal handling is also an important part of the training. Other topics included are cold weather issues, emergency response, laws, audits and regulations, and how driver's actions can directly affect the plant. CLT program was developed by the Alberta Farm Animal Care (AFAC) and is going under a major revision right now and released this year. The interaction at a training session is beneficial but it will also be available online.

Panel Discussion on Transportation Initiatives

Is there a risk for pathogens with respect to air change per hour?

The only research that comes to mind in regards to compartments and temperature/humidity index and its effect on respiratory disease in the feedlot for calves. It did increase in the compartments that were hotter but it did not measure air exchange and I am unfamiliar with any research that looks at air exchange.

These studies should look at swine as well as cattle. The fitness at arrival is different between cattle that are unloaded for feed, rest and water, compared to those that are not unloaded? Has there been any research on duration of rest time (4, 6, or longer hours)?

There has been no work under North American conditions looking into that, there have been proposals submitted though. When cattle were offloaded in Thunder Bay, they do consume water, but the question is how far they have travelled. Feed, rest and water intervals is a critical next questions in this research. Europe has requirements that they have to be offloaded every so many kilometres. In the USA, regulation is 6 hours.

Is it possible that there is more stress on animals from loading and unloading than leaving them on the truck?

Problem we face in Western Canada is we changed the way we sell cattle in the past 15 years. Now it is mostly pre-sort calf sales. Calves start gathering on Sunday morning for a Tuesday sale making the barns overcrowded. Half the problem is how the cattle are handled from the ranch to the end of the auction mart period. In my opinion I don't think transport is as much of a problem other than the shortage of drivers.

The transportation courses that were mentioned, CLT & TQA, are they required or voluntary?

If they want pick up animals off the farm it is needed, comparable to a driver's license. Most drivers want to get better at their job and those who don't are not the best suited to hauling livestock. Many of the commercial plants require drivers to have these courses, especially in the USA. Some plants even have signs up that state that you cannot unload here unless the courses have been taken. Now a lot of people besides drivers are also interested in the course and drivers needing it has become commonplace.

Addressing Domestic and International Market Expectations Relative to Farm Animal Welfare

http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-animal-welfare-nfacc-cahc.pdf

Ms. Jackie Wepruk

National Farm Animal Council of Canada (NFACC) has the formula and opportunity to advance animal care while supporting agriculture and the industry. The people who are directly responsible for the animals ensure that they are in control. The Canadian Animal Health Coalition (CAHC) provides secretariat and infrastructural support, manages funds on NFACC's behalf and administers the farm animal care project. NFACC's approach to advancing animal care and market expectations is based on principles for dealing with conflict. NFACC's partners are federal and provincial government, farm organizations, processors, welfare advocates and the veterinary community. Having this group together builds trust that is cultivated among people who don't work together all the time is a key strength of NFACC. How we understand welfare and the importance we attribute to it is different and that is why it is important to work together. People tend to create stereotypes about people that we don't understand and the problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue but they are incomplete; they emphasize how we are different and not how we are similar.

The project began Nov 2009 and ends in 2014 and the major focus areas are: codes of practice, science committee report, and broad animal welfare initiatives. There are three overlapping concepts: veterinarians on biological function and health, the general public behavioural point of view and effective states of animals feeling pleasure or pain. Debates around animal welfare arise from not understanding that people come from different value systems and weighting. The Code Development Committee works closely with the Scientists Committee in order to reflect different values and views and allows for consensus decision making and the codes are not completed until a consensus is reached.

Currently, 8 codes are being updated right now and 6 should be done by the end of 2013. This reflects the commitment of animal industry to responsible animal care. The Animal Care Assessment Model (ACAM) has a collaborative leadership style that adds value to what we do. Producers have their hands on the steering wheel and the reality is that the groups who are there have a strong voice and there are others helping to make it successful. Codes are vitally important and the foundation of everything else for animal welfare in Canada but alone they are not enough because demonstration is necessary. Last, activity on deliverables brings together a discussion on Canada's strategy on disease outbreak and welfare issues and what our animal welfare system would look like. Funding for NFACC is not long term at the moment but how can it be maintained? A few questions to be left with: what type of workshop and who needs to be there? What is the cost of not doing the codes and not doing them correctly?

Southern Border Issues – Animal Welfare & Disease
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-animal-welfare-souther-border-issues.pdf
Dr. Dave Fly

The New Mexico Livestock Board (NMLB) has given 125 years of service to the livestock industry and is 80% funded by industry. The Board is still mandated by law to provide an ever increasing role in the protection of a 1.6 billion dollar livestock industry. It is one of the oldest law enforcement agencies in the state and New Mexico (NM) is a brand law state. Inspection is based on district zones which works well but many issues arise. NM has an electronic inspection system (NMLB livestock permit). NM is the 5th largest dairy state in the USA, diverse beef industry, significant sheep and goat industry, many small swine operations and a large and economically important horse industry.

A large problem in NM right now is a large population of feral horses, estimated at >90,000, 38,000 alone are on US public lands. These horses have a negative effect on the land for both livestock and wildlife. The USA drought this year has exacerbated this problem. In NM 72% of the land is classified in a drought and this has caused issues for cattle feeders due to increased feed costs and also the lack of rain has increased fires causing rangeland and timberland to be lost. This is a large problem in Mexico as well. Other issues are diseases, such as vesicular stomatitis in horses and control of feral hogs. Ports of entry have been closed 12 to 13 times due to lesions this past year. Tuberculosis has been eradicated and zoning helped this initiative; however, sport cattle are the biggest risk at reintroducing the disease to NM.

Violence on the border has also affect animal health programming in the state of NM. Port closures have occurred due to violence and the USDA tick riders had to be pulled away from the border. Animals coming in from Mexico must be dipped prior to entry for ticks; however, antelope are maintaining the population of the ticks in NM.

Welfare issues are stray horses and cattle used for smuggling purposes; these also create disease issues after abandonment. In NM, they are running out of places to put all of these abandoned horses.

Role of Veterinarians as the First Line of Defence on Detecting Animal Welfare Issues
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-animal-welfare-vets-welfare.pdf
Dr. Chris Clark

One of the biggest problems we deal with is having welfare for something that we are slaughtering. Canadian census from 1907 to 2006, for every farm in Canada there were 8 people per farm, and now 1 farm for 50 people. The public has concerns with how farmers raise animals, however many of the people with concerns are not aware of normal farm practices, some even go as far as not knowing that milk comes from cows. Modern pressure groups, such as the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), largest welfare concerns are the fact that animals are getting slaughtered (they are against using animals for food). This has forced the food animal industry to be very reactive. They need to have someone who is trusted and independent of inspection of the production in order to be accountable.

Veterinarians are still highly trusted and are now getting even more training on welfare issues. However, a vet's role can become quite complicated. There is little question when animal abuse is observed, a vet would report abuse to the authorities immediately. The difficulty comes when there are financial issues for producers, this can cause the vet to have empathy and guilt for reporting a client. Also some producers may have a lack of knowledge and/or personal problems (illness, mental health) which makes them unable to take care of their animals.

Another issue is the general public making raising concerns regarding non-welfare issues i.e. cows out in the cold. For a veterinarian routine clients can be friends, they pay your fees therefore there is a potential dilemma with reporting clients. However, most producers who utilize a vet often are good clients. Can a veterinarian actually report an issue? There is a need to respect the right of confidentiality; however, a vet can report animal welfare issues when its conflicts with law.

Occasional clients with welfare issues are typically nutritional cases/ malnutrition, although often the client believes a disease outbreak is occurring. Building a relationship with the regulators can help get these people the resources they need. The real problems are on farms that never seek a veterinarian's advice. In Saskatchewan, working with the SSPCA, can be very beneficial to help these people, by providing advice and getting additional feed out to these animals as needed. The worst offenders wouldn't pay for a vet so everyone should report actual issues and you have to ask yourself on what would be the welfare issues you would report if they were occurring at your neighbours. We need to help educate routine practices to the general public and ensure them that these are not welfare issues.

Panel Discussion on Animal Welfare

Are all farmers who don't call veterinarians bad farmers?

To clarify, some of the farmers who do not utilize veterinarians may have some welfare issues on their farm. Certainly not all producers who don't use vets are not bad farmers.

In the NFACC steering committee, the members seem to be not properly distributed because there are quite a few dairy members and not enough beef members, what is the reasoning behind this?

Obviously the production systems are different but dairy was the first sector to test the code. Beef could take the animal care assessment program and develop it themselves.

The beef industry does not want this to be just a paperwork exercise and there needs to be a benefit to them. Having farm animal care councils and 1800 numbers to alert authorities to welfare issues as well as education for public on broad issues are all very important aspects.

What is New Mexico's plan to deal with the ~90,000 stray horses?

This issue is just going to get larger since many of the horses do not have access to feed and the public will start seeing starving horses. Already feedlots are feeding ~40,000 horses.

What about the welfare issues surrounding livestock operations that deliberately do a specific management practice for financial gain?

If you ask producers for a broad picture view and the general public is looking at how food is produced. Would you feel comfortable with that management practice being published in a magazine?

Electronic Certification (E-Certification) Pilot Project for Feeder Cattle Between British Columbia & Washington
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-e-cert-pilot-project-july17-12.pdf
Mr. Aaron Canart & Mr. Mike Nikolaisen

The process to export cattle is very complex and a significant amount of paperwork is required. The topic has been discussed for the past 3 years at CBLHC. The e-certification working group is hoping that since one of the RCC's focuses is on e-certification of meat products, this project may align with that in order to speed up the process of cattle exports.

Issues with the current process are industry is forced to travel long distances in order to have papers physically endorsed by a CFIA veterinarian. This also slows down the time it takes for the state to receive data which is important for traceability purposes. Truckers are the ones whom end up transferring all the paperwork, such as duplicate copes and brand manifests, therefore, there is potential for security issues.

The working group is hoping to get permission between regulators from CFIA and USDA to complete a pilot project between Washington and British Columbia. The scope would be very small to start to see if the electronic system would work. The state of Washington has an electronic import permit process that could be utilized. It was launched July 10, 2012 with success and general consensus is that it improves efficiencies and traceability. By using this system the working groups hopes to provide users with a better front end process and use the pilot to fit in current USDA and CFIA e-certification initiatives.

What are the next steps for the working group? Security is the biggest obstacle with a new technology, therefore CFIA, USDA, and border services need to approve the technology for movement across the border. There needs to be a proof of ability for the governments to go ahead. The working group was able to attract some new members to the group to help with pushing this initiative forward through an updated action item.

DAY 2
Improving On-Farm Disease Detection

Canadian Swine Health Board Disease (CSHB) Update
Mr. Robert Harding

For years there had been news of animal viruses and health crisis in other parts of the world but in North America we figured that they wouldn't be an issue here, until circovirus. The Canadian Swine Health Board (CSHB) was formed to deal with leadership, support to manage the national herd and is an industry group comprised of several groups. The CSHB works closely with the Chief Veterinary Officers, CFIA and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. There are 3 focuses of the CSHB, which are biosecurity, research and emerging diseases and long term disease management. Sustainability of the programs is also the goal when the organization is done in March 2013. The CSHB developed the Canadian Swine Health Intelligence Network to have early response for diseases, such as circovirus. The on-farm information in not captured by CASHN, it only reports laboratory data. The access to the data is restricted. All of the vet colleges across Canada are linked to this network.

BSE and its Impact on the Use of Veterinary Services – An Anthropological Perspective
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-disease-detection-bse-vet-services.pdf
Dr. Josephine Smart

The study looked at two communities – Bonneville, AB (Zone 8) and Saddie Hill, AB (Zone 9). Interviews were conducted with local veterinarians, industry, local abattoirs and meat processors & farmers. The sample size was small; it was a qualitative research method therefore cannot claim to be representative of the situation throughout Alberta and Canada. What this data offers is hearing the opinions, concerns, how they do things, why they do things of farmers and stakeholders, in their own words.

Did BSE affect the demand of veterinary services at the farm? Yes because the animal was not worth any money therefore producers did not want to pay for vet services. Famers involved in this survey allowed their names and farm locations to be included in the survey because they felt that their voices were not heard by policymakers. The loss of the value of the animal caused a sharp increase in the among of cull cows. The Vet Service Incentive (VSI) was an Alberta cost-share program

between the RM and the farmer, (RM 60 % and farmers 20%). This program was available in Bonneville but it wasn't universal.

Veterinarians were frequently called upon previously for preg testing, semen testing and embryo transfer in the pure bred cattle industry. Cow-calf producers typically called their vets when something was affecting multiple animals. Folk knowledge and practices in farm animal health management are very apparent. Farmers have a culture, a particular body of knowledge and practices that work for them. They are able to recognize problems and then refer to vets for treatment information. Transfer of knowledge is typically an oral tradition which is not normally written down. If these are not passed on to children then the tradition can be lost. On-site learning can be more of an intergenerational learning activity. Also many farmers learn from other farmers i.e. at the auction mart, coffee shop, meat processor or over the phone. Now the internet is also used extensively for information.

Relationships now between vets and farmers, farmers consider vets consultants and help with training farmers in animal health management. Farmers like vets who are knowledgeable about large animals (compared to companion animals), friendly and are available to answer their questions. Farmers expect to learn from the vet on every occasion when they are contacted.

What was the impact of BSE on animal health management? Veterinary services dropped right after BSE, many clinics were mixed animal practices, therefore it did affect the large animal case load. Now farmers do more health management practices such as administer antibiotics, breeding selection & later calving. More sick animals are euthanized on farm. Professional knowledge of vets and folk knowledge form an integrated approach to animal health management on the farm.

Changing Workload of Western Canadian and American Veterinarians
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-disease-detection-changing-workload-vets.pdf
Dr. Murray Jelinski

Currently the train of thought is there is a big shortage of food animal veterinarians. There is a misconception of veterinary needs because there is no shortage but there is a perception that there is, expect in some rural areas where there really is a shortage. In these smaller areas, there may be no veterinary practice because there is no financial support. Veterinarians follow other industries where they go where the market demand is. The actual number of veterinarians is growing and it is getting near saturation. Over 80% of students go into companion animal practice, with only 4% exclusively livestock.

What has caused the change in the veterinary service model? Producers are now doing procedures that used to be exclusively performed by veterinarians, i.e. C-sections. Now there are more cattle per farm, farms are getting larger which impacts veterinary

services. The age of producers is rising, ~48% of producers are over 55 years of age and half of producers will be retired in 10 years. After BSE, food animal practiced declined and companion animal and equine increased. The increased implementation of herd health programs has now increased pregnancy checks and bull evaluations. The veterinary profession is becoming companion animal dominated, the consolidation with the industry is driving that, larger farms, less producers, fewer farm calls, clientele better educated and more independent and easier to do surveillance because animals are more concentrated.

Methods to Improve On-Farm Disease Detection
http://www.cblhconference.com/pdf/2012-pres-disease-detection.pdf
Dr. Eugene Janzen

In order to detect what's going on (i.e. disease) we need support of some kind like updating our understanding of a diagnostic support system. Whether we have veterinarians, feed specialists or livestock inspectors everywhere, it does not matter because at some point in them we need diagnostic improvement. The University of Calgary's Diagnostic Support Unit found that students only used 40% of this grant.

Historical veterinary presence on farm with federal, provincial and municipal brucellosis control programs. Pregnancy checking became common place due to this program. Federal/provincial BSE surveillance programs, as well as the provincial veterinary services incentive in northern Alberta were all government programs which supported veterinarians being put on farms.

Current veterinary presence numbers can be misleading since 350 cows that are pregnancy checked are considered the same number as one dog being vaccinated. These numbers do not accurately reflect the drastic upturn in bull evaluations that have been happening recently.

Existing animal identification and tracking in Canada, the Canadian Cattle Identification Agency has successfully tagged all Canadian cattle and the Livestock Identification Services successfully tracks all cattle movements in real time with electronic manifest filing system.

Methods to increase animal health intelligence include: increased use of veterinary stock attendants, follow and record animal movement, capture and file data from the individually identified, embellish and amalgamate the use of existing databases and increase the use of "tele-vetting" where appropriate. One of the most important in this list is the databases, more resources should be allotted to getting all of these together because there is a lot of places to get information but we need to find a way to use it. Some existing infrastructure to be used is fallen stock recycling services can serve as a crude indicator of possible problems and also educate producers into not leaving fallen stock for wildlife to scavenge since this spreads disease and can habituate wildlife into your range.

On-farm veterinary support is developing by training stock attendants with systematic protocols, treatments and examinations, utilizing computers for treatment protocols chuteside, and necropsy examination protocols could be taught and monitored utilizing technology.

To summarize, collate all sources of animal health intelligence into one database and deal with the issues such as privacy. Capture more animal information on site and upgrade and facilitate the use of selected diagnostic support. Recent announcement from the Government of Canada is that it is providing $500,000 to create a single data system and $265,000 is to help the Canadian Cattle Identification Agency (CCIA) and Agri-Traçabilité Québec (ATQ) improve their data management capabilities.

Panel Discussion on improving on-farm disease detection

In regards to tracking movement of animals (similar in swine) we are not tying together the movement of the trucks that haul the animals, we don't know where the truck went after it unloads and we are only tracking it on species by species basis, is there a way to improve this?

CFIA has instituted a heavy duty program to look at biosecurity and for each of the commodity groups they have come up with a biosecurity standard. One of the things is that this is a huge concern of CFIA. Not sure if anybody has an answer but it is high on the radar screen but unsure on how they plan to deal with it.

In the concerns of the changes of veterinary services as a result of BSE and shifting of availability of vet services, etc. has there been any work done looking at welfare concerns related to that?

Difficulty of connecting with some of the people that you need to because it is very difficult to get to the people who aren't using vet services that require them. Need to differentiate between animal welfare and animal care because they are different. For example, painkillers for dehorning, society is shifting and livestock producers are way ahead of us and they are asking about how to medicate. Nobody is asking them to do that, they just are. Veterinarians are being asked to facilitate the animal health/welfare/care concerns. Animal welfare and health are organically tied to farmer health. During droughts there are rumoured to be significantly more suicides. Drought is a highly visual trauma where BSE was silent.

Vet school enrolment is tied to the increasing farm sizes, how will the market handle this increase?

The market will figure out the requirement because the students will fluctuate to where the wages are. If you oversupply the market the wages will decrease, but the veterinary

profession drags behind other professions i.e. $60,000 debt for school on a $60,000 salary.

How much of the downward data number of cases reflected in dollar value of animals at the time (i.e. post BSE)? Given the recent upswing are vet services more?

The data presented was a snapshot, people are using vet services more as an overall trend, with the best example as a move to whole herd health, rather than individual animals because size of herds has increased. The public though wants individual animals to be cared for.

Animal Health Intelligence – the notion of gathering different sources into one spot is a great idea, but will be faced with challenges. How will it be done? And if things are happening at the national level there will be a need for time and money.

In the USA the same problem exists. USDA has developed reporting systems that allow reporting from the field and from diagnostics. The key is diagnostic laboratories because these diagnosticians can train vets to look at unusual disease and cycle it to the labs but funding continually gets cut. We need to make a lot noise to make sure people recognize that this is key portion of industry.

The point of vets training livestock owners will impact the number of calls because we have been teaching producers how to prevent the use of veterinarians which reduces the use of vets. Are they cutting their own feet off at the ankles?

Career path is not ending soon; the way the farmers talk the vets are critically important to them. But also the rural aspect of farm life animals has the informed producer being a good thing so the animal does not suffer before the vet can make it there.

ACTION ITEMS

Action Item 1 – Active involvement in livestock specific Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) Initiatives

Description of Action Item – Provide continued support for livestock based RCC initiatives. Provide a forum for communication for stakeholder engagement.

Team Lead - TBD

Team Members – Mr. Ryan Beierbach: Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association; Dr. Ed Empringham: Canadian Animal Health Coalition; Dr. Gerald Hauer: Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development

Action Item 2 – Electronic Certification and Live Cattle

Description of Action Item – CBLHC to resubmit proposal for pilot project on and support e-certification in live cattle. Request specific criteria for system needs to fulfill data and security requirements from USDA and CFIA.

Team Leads – Mr. Aaron Canart: Agri Beef Co.; Mr. Mike Nikolaisen: BC Association of Cattle Feeders; Dr. Louis Desautels: Canadian Cattlemen's Association

Team Members – Mr. Bill Jameson: National Cattle Feeders Association; Dr. Larry Delver: Alberta Beef Producers; Dr. Bob Gerlach: Government of Alaska

Action Item 3 – Disease Prevention, Detection and Response

Description of Action Item – Reevaluate past action items to include aspects of disease prevention and detection as part of emerging animal disease response.

Team Lead – Dr. Jagdish Patel: Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development

Team Members – Ms. Nadia Shah: BC Dairy Association

Action Item 4 – Animal Welfare

Description of Action Item – Support further animal welfare initiatives for the development of science based guidelines/requirements. Need for consistency of requirements for animals crossing international, state and provincial borders.

Team Lead – Ms. Jackie Wepruk: National Farm Animal Care Council

Team Members – Ms. Lorna Baird: Alberta Farm Animal Care; Dr. Karen Schwartzkopf-Genswein: Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Previous CBLHC Action Items to Continue

Action Item 5 – Small Ruminants

Description of Action Item – Expedite rule making process to restore trade of sheep and goats to the US.

Team Lead – Mr. Rick McRonald: Canadian Livestock Genetics Association

Team Members – Dr. Brian McCluskey: USDA; Dr. Kathleen Parker: Alberta Lamb Producers; Dr. Lynn Tait: Canadian Livestock Genetics Association

Action Item 6 – Animal Disease Testing

Description of Action Item – Address the speed of non-negative animal disease tests results reported across the border so as to not negatively affect cross border trade (border interruption).

Team Lead – Dr. Bill Barton: Idaho State Veterinarian

Team Members – Mr. Kevin Boon: BC Cattlemen's Association

Action Item 7 – Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) Vaccination

Description of Action Item – Work with stakeholders to prepare in advance and build a common understanding of the tools (vaccination) and strategies that can be used to respond to an FMD outbreak in both Canada and the USA.

Team Lead – Dr. Tom Smylie: CFIA; Dr. Jane Rooney: USDA (Dr. Rooney has accepted a new position so will no longer lead on this file. She will provide the name of her replacement when available).

Team Members – Dr. Jag Dhanda, CFIA

2012 CROSS BORDER LIVESTOCK HEALTH CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	State/ Province
Althouse, Betty	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Anderson, Brian	Canadian Cattle Identification Agency	SK
Beierbach, Ryan	Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association	SK
Bouchard, Brian	Bouchard Livestock Int.	AB
Brackett, Bert	Idaho Senate	ID
Canart, Aaron	Agribeef Co.	ID
Chandler, Rep. Bruce	Washington State Representative	WA
Clark, Chris	Western College of Veterinary Medicine	SK
Delver, Larry	Alberta Beef Producers	AB
Desautels, Louis	Canadian Cattlemen's Association	AB
Douglas, Greg	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture	ON
Elford, Mark	Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association	SK
Empringham, Ed	Canadian Animal Health Coalition	ON
Fairfield, David	National Grain and Feed Association	IA
Fischer, Andee	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	ON
Fly, Dave	State of New Mexico	NM
Fournier, Brad	Alberta Livestock and Meat Agency	AB
Gaborick, Cindy	United States Department of Agriculture	ID
Gerlach, Robert	State of Alaska	AK
Gerold, Ron	RCC Secretariat	ON
Govindasamy, Nithi	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Harding, Robert	Canadian Swine Health Board	ON
Hauer, Gerald	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development	AB
Heemskerk, Joe	British Columbia Association of Cattle Feeders	BC
Herriot, Don	United States Department of Agriculture	OR
Heyden, Jenifer	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Honeyford, Jim	Washington State Senate	WA
Hundley, James	Binghamton University	NY
Ireland, Mary-Jane	Health Canada	ON
James, Cheryl	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	ON
Jameson, Bill	National Cattle Feeders Association	SK
Janzen, Eugene	University of Calgary Faculty of Veterinary Medicine	AB
Jelinski, Murray	Western College of Veterinary Medicine	SK
Jespersen, Lorrie	Alberta Milk	AB
Johnson, Paul	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Keller, Dwight	United States Cattlemen Association	ND
Keller, Susan	State of North Dakota	ND

Name	Organization	State/ Province
Ketilson, Neil	Saskatchewan Pork Development Board	SK
Kettel, James	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Kononoff, Wally	Corman Park Veterinary Service	SK
Larson, Paula	Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association	SK
Lindsay, Rick	Agri Food Council	SK
Lord, Francine	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	ON
Lorna Baird	Alberta Farm Animal Care	AB
MacPherson, Chad	Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association	SK
Mauro, Donna	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development	AB
McAlpine, Rory	Maple Leaf Foods	ON
McCreary, Meredyth	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
McIsaac, Alex	Canadian Food Inspection Agency	SK
McRonald, Rick	Canadian Livestock Genetics Association	ON
Nikolaisen, Mike	BC Association of Cattle Feeders	BC
Payne, Lavar	Member of Parliament	AB
Peterson, Jim	Montana State Senate & Beef Producer	MT
Possberg, Florian	Canadian Swine Health Board	SK
Radford, Morgan	Canadian Swine Health Board	ON
Rhodes, Kelly	United States Department of Agriculture	MD
Ross, Kathryn	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Rousell, Leanna	Canadian Animal Health Coalition	SK
Schwartzkopf-Genswein, Karen	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	AB
Simmons, Kathy	National Cattlemen's Beef Association	DC
Smart, Alan	University of Calgary	AB
Smart, Josephine	University of Calgary	AB
Stewart, Lyle	Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture	SK
Swallow, Rob	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Thomas, Fred	United States Department of Agriculture	ON
Vaughn, Steven	Food and Drug Administration	MD
Wagner, Harvey	Saskatchewan Pork Development Board	SK
Walton, Bryan	National Cattle Feeders Association	AB
Warnyca, Bonnie	Saskatchewan Cattlemen's Association	SK
Wepruk, Jackie	National Farm Animal Care Council	AB
Wilkins, Wendy	Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture	SK
Woods, Marcie	Canadian Animal Health Coalition	MB
Yates, Dan	Western Producer	SK