



# Growing Forward

What We Heard:

Report from

February 13, 2008 Consultation



Alberta



Manitoba



Québec

Newfoundland  
Labrador

NOVA SCOTIA  
NOUVELLE-ÉCOSSE

New Brunswick  
Nouveau Brunswick

Prince  
Edward  
Island  
CANADA

Yukon  
Government



Canada

## **Growing Forward – What We Heard: Report from February 13, 2008 Consultation**

For additional copies of this publication or to request an alternate format, please contact:

Publications Section  
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada  
Sir John Carling Building  
930 Carling Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C5

Telephone: (613) 759-6610 or (toll-free) 1-800-635-7943 (Canada and U.S.)

TTY: 1 800 465-7735

Fax: (613) 759-6783 or (toll-free) 1-800-565-7757 (Canada and U.S.)

E-mail: [publications@agr.gc.ca](mailto:publications@agr.gc.ca)

Electronic version available at [www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward](http://www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward)

This information may be reproduced without permission for review, discussion and consultation purposes only provided that the source of the information is fully acknowledged and that the reproduction is not represented as a final and official version of the information reproduced.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2008

AAFC No. 10638E

ISBN 978-0-662-48735-7

Cat. No. A34-10/2008E-PDF

Aussi offert en français sous le titre :

*Cultivons l'avenir – Ce que nous avons entendu : rapport de la consultation du 13 février 2008*

# Table of Contents

---

Introduction	4
Growing Forward	5
Overview of Discussion Document	6
What We Heard – A Competitive and Innovative Sector	8
<i>Capacity to Innovate</i>	8
<i>Regulatory Performance on Key Industry Priorities</i>	9
<i>Industry Success in Global and Domestic Markets</i>	11
<i>Capacity to Adapt and Succeed</i>	12
What We Heard – A Sector That Contributes to Society’s Priorities	13
<i>Food Safety</i>	13
<i>Improving Environmental Performance</i>	13
What We Heard – A Sector That Is Proactive in Managing Risks	15
<i>Preventing and Preparing for Problems</i>	15
<i>Business Risk Management</i>	16
What We Heard – Program Delivery Approach	17
What We Heard – General Comments	18
Concluding Remarks	19
Annex A – List of Participant Organizations	20

## Introduction

---

Federal, provincial and territorial (FPT) governments have committed to working with the agriculture and agri-food sector and the Canadian public to develop Growing Forward, the next generation of agriculture and agri-food policy through national, broad based consultations. This is a report on a national meeting that was held in Ottawa, on February 13, 2008, as part of these consultations.

The consultation process has been designed to stimulate a dialogue among Canadians about how governments and others can work together to ensure a competitive and profitable Canadian agriculture and agri-food sector that provides safe, innovative and high quality products and services with benefits for all Canadians.

The first round of consultations, which began in late 2006, involved stakeholders with specific interests or expertise in six thematic areas: business risk management, market development and trade, renewal, innovation and science, food safety and quality, and environment. More than 400 participants attended round one sessions.

The second round of consultations consisted of over thirty public consultation sessions held across the country, with almost 2000 participants in total. These one-day sessions consisted of a discussion on a vision and principles and the six thematic areas. Participants were presented with an overview of the process and a brief look at each thematic area, with a focus on the proposed policy direction. Following these presentations, participants were asked to reflect on whether any elements were missing, what the roles for industry and governments should be, and what should take priority.

Interested individuals were also encouraged to make their voices heard through an online consultation forum, by sending written submissions or through participation in workshops on aboriginal agriculture. Many people participated through these fora with 890 contributions online, 138 individuals sending in written submissions, and 235 participants in the workshops on aboriginal agriculture. These views were an important part of the consultation.

As part of the next phase of consultations, a national meeting was held in Ottawa, on May 16, 2007. Participants for this meeting were chosen through a consensus process by FPT governments to ensure representation from across the entire value chain on a national basis. The objective of this meeting was to engage industry stakeholders in a focused discussion on what we heard during the consultations to date and on the proposed framework and architecture for Growing Forward.

The reports from all three rounds of consultations are available on the Growing Forward web site at [www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward](http://www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward). Reports from individual public consultation sessions across the country and a number of written submissions are also available on the website.

This report outlines what FPT governments heard during the February 13, 2008, national meeting. While this report tries to capture the essence of all of the ideas that arose during the discussion and in subsequent written submissions from participants, it is a summary and therefore cannot include every specific comment put forward.

Thank you to everyone who participated in the meeting and sent written submissions. Your efforts will help inform the ongoing development of Growing Forward.

# Growing Forward

---

## Vision

---

The Growing Forward vision is a profitable and innovative agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products industry that seizes opportunities in responding to market demands and contributes to the health and well-being of Canadians.

## Outcomes

---

### Focusing on building a competitive and innovative sector

An agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products industry equipped to compete successfully in domestic and international markets, innovate, adapt to change, and seize new opportunities, thereby achieving sustained growth and profitability.

### Ensuring the sector contributes to society's priorities

An agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products industry that generates benefits for the sector and all Canadians by contributing to broader FPT government priorities, ranging from food safety to environmental sustainability to health and wellness.

### Being proactive in managing risks

An agriculture, agri-food and agri-based products industry that is well-equipped to manage and mitigate risks that impinge on the profitability of enterprises and sectoral prosperity.



## Overview of Discussion Document

A discussion document was distributed in advance of the February 13, 2008, meeting to invited participants. This document is available at [www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward](http://www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward).

FPT governments have been developing a set of potential programs and initiatives that would complement the new Business Risk Management (BRM) suite.

### Potential Growing Forward Initiatives

<b>A Competitive and Innovative Sector</b>	<b>A Sector that Contributes to Society's Priorities</b>	<b>A Sector that is Proactive in Managing Risks</b>
<p><b>Capacity to Innovate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipating and responding to long-term opportunities</li> <li>• Targeting science capacity at key priorities</li> <li>• Translating new technologies into commercial gain</li> </ul>	<p><b>Food Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Science to advance food safety</li> <li>• Support for on-farm food safety</li> <li>• Support for post-farm food safety</li> </ul>	<p><b>Preventing and Preparing for Problems</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad strategies to mitigate risks</li> <li>• Implementing systems to reduce risks</li> <li>• Science support</li> </ul>
<p><b>Regulatory Performance on Key Industry Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving capacity within government</li> <li>• Regulatory modernization</li> <li>• Facilitating regulatory approvals</li> </ul>	<p><b>Improving Environmental Performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted support for improved environmental performance</li> <li>• Improved research capacity to support environmental performance</li> <li>• Enhanced environmental performance policy</li> </ul>	<p><b>Business Risk Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved program suite to help mitigate production risks and producers' income losses</li> </ul>
<p><b>Industry Success in Global and Domestic Markets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting the implementation of industry-led strategies</li> <li>• Differentiating Canadian products from those of the competition</li> <li>• Providing market intelligence and support</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Capacity to Adapt and Succeed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helping farmers put in place management plans to develop and adapt their businesses</li> <li>• Enhancing farmers' knowledge and skills</li> </ul>		

## Seeking Input

---

After a short presentation on the potential programming and activities for each outcome, participants were asked the following questions, with some slight variations:

- Are these the most effective program initiatives to achieve this policy outcome?
- Are there any gaps? If there are gaps, what would be the best way to complement these programs?
- What should be taken into account in program design?
- What have we learned from the Agricultural Policy Framework (APF)?
- Are there areas that merit greater (or less) emphasis?
- Are there other issues to discuss?

## Program and Service Delivery

---

Participants also discussed the potential approach for delivery of non-BRM programs, and Growing Forward program and service delivery objectives. After a short presentation on integrated program suites, participants were asked the following questions:

- What would an integrated program suite look like?
- What programs could be delivered in an integrated suite?
- What services could be integrated or simplified?
- What lessons have we learned from the APF?
- Are there other issues to discuss?

## What We Heard – A Competitive and Innovative Sector

### Capacity to Innovate

- Anticipating and responding to long-term opportunities
- Targeting science capacity at key priorities
- Translating new technologies into commercial gain

While farmers may innovate at the farm level, many farmers in alternative sectors **lack the financial resources to bring those innovations to market.**

At the same time, primary producers may be limited in their ability to effect change on the farm, because of the **high costs of implementing new technologies** and transitioning to innovative production systems. Similarly, it was recommended that governments invest in industry to upgrade capital equipment and reduce capital costs.

Proposed initiatives in this area raised other concerns, such as who owns the **intellectual property** (IP) for research conducted jointly by governments, universities, and industry; whether governments would be competing with private companies by doing research and developing products for commercialisation; and who sets research priorities. The importance of solid IP policy was stressed.

The comment was also made that provincial capacity for **technology transfer** and extending Best Management Practices (BMPs) to producers has been eroded, and it is unclear who will take on the leading role in this area.

Several participants noted that **innovation is not limited to developing new products and processes** and made the following recommendations:

- Canada should not fall behind in primary production research (e.g., integrated pest management) and crop systems (e.g., organic farming). Governments should continue with current primary research in addition to increasing the focus on innovation.
- Canada needs to adopt and adapt existing innovations from around the world.
- We should consider innovative ways to reduce input costs and develop new revenue streams, such as environmental tax credits for the use of technologies like wind and solar power on farms.
- An innovative environment should support “high value, low volume” innovations that may reach only a small number of firms, but with a high return.

### **FPT governments can build on current activities within the sector:**

- FPT governments were asked to work with existing organisations when implementing new initiatives under Growing Forward, and to financially support successful science clusters where they already exist.
- Funding should be provided to help small commodity associations maintain core business activities.
- Care should be taken to ensure sufficiently broad representation when developing and implementing collaborative work plans.
- Innovation Symposia should address the gap between late-stage product development and commercialization.
- Regional offices could be used to liaise with industry-led groups, rather than creating a new national council. A preference was also expressed for regional, rather than national, innovation councils and research clusters. Direct contact between the sector and researchers was also recommended, as well as better communication of government research activity to industry.
- The Pacific Agri-Food Research Centre in British Columbia was raised as an example of excellence in research.
- The timing of grants was raised as an issue, when funds need to be spent by the end of the fiscal year but are not available far enough in advance.

Several participants suggested **changes to the tax system** to increase incentives for investment, such as reducing capital gains taxes and increasing investment incentives and depreciation allowances to make Canada more competitive with the United States and Mexico.

An effective farm safety net program was also identified as a way to support a competitive and innovative sector.

## **Regulatory Performance on Key Industry Priorities**

- Improving capacity within government
- Regulatory modernization
- Facilitating regulatory approvals

**Increased co-operation between Federal government departments** was raised by several participants. Health Canada, Environment Canada, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT), Industry Canada (IC) and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) were all identified as potential partners to work with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) towards shared regulatory objectives, or commit to working separately towards the same overall goals.

### **Participants raised several issues with the current regulatory system:**

- It can be very difficult to have inputs with novel traits approved for use on-farm.
- CFIA seems to make inconsistent rulings and there are often delays in rulings.
- Regulatory burden imposes a high cost on small businesses and farmers.
- CFIA seems to be facing a labour shortage as demographics shift and employees retire without an adequate pool of trained successors.
- Farmers cannot bear the high cost of meeting regulatory standards without some kind of funding, and regulations should be cost-effective for producers. Regulations are also a concern for the processing sector.

- Uncertainty about how long the regulatory approval process will take can be a concern to investors who are interested in commercializing innovations.
- Regulatory reform is not the same as deregulation.
- It's important to avoid adding new levels of bureaucracy.

At the same time, there were many suggestions on possible **improvements to the regulatory system**:

- Plants with novel traits, novel foods, minor use pesticides, minor use drugs in food producing animals, industrial products for plants, bio-regulators, fertilisers, and the variety registration system were all singled out as areas where regulatory change is needed.
- Greater investments are needed to improve the efficiency and transparency of the drug approval process, including aligning/harmonizing approvals with other countries.
- Stakeholder advisory groups could help increase communication and strengthen ties with industry.
- Government regulators need to be better equipped to deal with innovation. More resources are needed to increase the knowledge base within government and speed up the regulatory process.
- Governments need to do more to build public confidence in the regulatory system and demonstrate how the regulatory system protects the public.
- The government should end the restrictions of the Canadian Wheat Board.
- The government should support single-desk selling mechanisms.

Many participants raised the issue of a **level playing field with respect to imports**. Many inputs that are banned in Canada are used in the production of food imported from other countries. Participants felt this puts Canadian producers at a disadvantage relative to international competitors.

Differential pricing was also raised in this context. Many inputs are less expensive in the United States, but if farmers save money by purchasing across the border, local suppliers are negatively impacted.

**Humane treatment of food-producing animals** was raised as an area which requires attention. While industry has taken initiative in this area, a request was made for national recognition for standards and methods of care. Standards of care were also raised as a potential non-tariff barrier to trade.

Product labelling was raised as a concern throughout the day. Participants consistently expressed strong support for **clear product labelling** to specify "Grown in Canada" and reduce consumer confusion related to current "Product of Canada" labelling rules. One participant also suggested "Processed in Canada" for use by the processing sector. This issue extends to Canadian products in international markets.

**Inter-provincial barriers to trade** were raised in several contexts:

- Issues range from pesticide regulations to abattoir standards.
- Different standards between provinces and nationally are a key issue in many sectors, preventing or significantly hindering inter-provincial trade.
- Resources will be needed to implement reforms and ensure that internal trade agreements are respected.

## Industry Success in Global and Domestic Markets

- Supporting the implementation of industry-led strategies
- Differentiating Canadian products from those of the competition
- Providing market intelligence and support

A number of participants expressed an interest in **increased domestic marketing** under Growing Forward. In particular, participants highlighted:

- Local food production and systems, ranging from food boxes to farmers' markets to programs with restaurants;
- Supply management as a domestic success story;
- Campaigning positively for Canadian products, rather than campaigning against imports; and
- Government procurement policy as a means of increasing the domestic market for Canadian products.

It was also noted that governments should ensure funding for market development and participation at Value Chain Round Tables does not exclude producers who are not export-focused.

Participants had many different views about **Brand Canada**:

- Marketing should be left to private industry, and that national branding would not draw returns from the marketplace.
- To be effective, Canada must maintain the integrity of the brand and use meaningful standards that consumers understand.

- Companies are best placed to brand their own products, but there is room for industry to collectively brand attributes such as conservation and environmental practices.
- Brand loyalty is more important than a national brand.

With respect to **international markets**, participants commented that Canada should:

- Increase funding in order to achieve international competitiveness;
- Protect its existing markets, in addition to improving access to existing and emerging markets;
- Take into account violations of trade rules by our trading partners when developing Canadian trade policy;
- Improve export promotion tools;
- Explore linkages between Canadian industry and government, and industry and foreign governments, and engage industry to lobby foreign governments about trade barriers; and
- Renew the Canadian Agriculture Food International (CAFI) program.

Some participants asked for funding to support product research (such as nutritional information) to improve marketing and strengthen specific sectors. The comment was also made that market intelligence from industry sources is more useful than information collected by the government.

**Trade advocacy and Technical Barriers to Trade** were suggested as two more areas of focus under Growing Forward. Further integration between government departments and agencies (specifically AAFC, CFIA, DFAIT, and IC) was also suggested, echoing comments made during the discussion on regulatory issues.

Animal health and the need for a **national animal and plant health strategy** was raised in the context of international trade. One participant commented that Canada should participate in the development of international standards and work to reduce Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) barriers to trade.

Several **attributes were suggested for differentiating Canadian products** both at home and in international marketplaces: animal care and welfare; conservation, environmental stewardship and environmental standards; traceability systems; health benefits; carbon sequestration; production systems; and water quality. Many of these issues are of growing concern to consumers, and Canada has an opportunity to respond proactively.

It was also suggested that money be spent on a **marketing campaign** to educate consumers about high food safety and environmental standards in Canada. It was also suggested that the scientific community could assist in branding Canada as a leader in science and innovation

## Capacity to Adapt and Succeed

- Helping farmers put in place management plans to develop and adapt their businesses
- Enhancing farmers' knowledge and skills

**Farm succession** and farm asset transfer were raised as issues, particularly the need for succession-friendly policies, and policies that help attract young people to agriculture, such as start-up incentives, tax relief, access to affordable capital, and skills development.

It was also suggested that **farmers and the family farm** should receive greater attention under Growing Forward, and that ensuring sufficient farm returns is the only mechanism to attract young farmers to the sector.

Both skilled and unskilled **labour and human capital** all along the value chain were also raised as issues. It was suggested that Growing Forward should contain a labour strategy component, and that it could be used as a basis to seek support from other government departments.

Several participants expressed concern that farmers may not be able to capture opportunities where there is a high cost involved. From this point of view, one element of adaptation is **ensuring farmers are financially able to implement change**. A multitude of different services are needed in order to offer producers the right services to meet their circumstances.

Governments were encouraged to look beyond business plans and consider **collective, community-based** organizations and activity to help farm businesses succeed.

Governments were asked to consider **adaptation and training for the processing sector**, not just primary producers. In particular, small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) were identified as a core group needing support for adaptation (such as access to affordable capital) and training, particularly for SMEs looking at entering international markets.

## What We Heard – A Sector that Contributes to Society's Priorities

---

Several participants commented that Society's Priorities should be viewed as extending beyond Food Safety and Environment, and it was suggested that greater support be provided to understand consumer and citizen expectations. Health, wellness, and energy were suggested as areas where the agricultural sector could play a role. Animal care and welfare were also identified as a social priority.

### Food Safety

---

- Science to advance food safety
- Science for on-farm food safety
- Support for post-farm food safety

More than one participant felt that **on-farm food safety** needs to continue to be in the hands of farmers, industry leadership and farm organizations in order to keep food safety farmer-friendly, and that governments should recognize producer efforts in this area.

Several participants commented that **farmers cannot bear all of the costs of implementing food safety systems**, and cannot recover the costs by demanding a premium from the market. To this end, society should help pay the cost of food safety measures and government funding should be available when measures are implemented. Some participants felt that the \$750 payments for on-farm implementation are insufficient for this purpose. Funding should be provided to industry groups to complete technical reviews and to make the required changes to manuals.

It was suggested that FPT governments and industry should work together to **review the overall food safety strategy**, following the implementation of several different initiatives in the last decade. Governments should extend their focus to include assistance to firms, particularly SMEs. The point was also raised that there are already many industry-led initiatives in different sectors that governments can build on.

**Animal health** was raised again in the context of food safety, particularly with respect to the level of inspection required provincially and federally, and the differences between domestic and international standards.

### Improving Environmental Performance

---

- Targeted support for improved environmental performance
- Improved research capacity to support environmental performance
- Enhanced environmental performance policy

While Environmental Farm Plans (EFPs) were identified as an excellent tool, many participants requested that **an Ecological Goods and Services (EG&S)** component be added to Growing Forward.

There was widespread support for incentive-based measures to improve environmental performance. Several participants expressed support for the **Alternative Land Use Services (ALUS)** model. Stewardship programs were also suggested.

One participant commented that non-regulatory, incentive-based approaches are preferable because they do not increase the regulatory burden on the sector.

Generally, participants felt that producers should be compensated for providing the public good of environmental benefits and/or the **cost of environmental stewardship should be borne by society** as a whole, rather than by the sector.

Several specific suggestions were made that link environmental performance to regulations:

- Government regulations help to improve public confidence, and thereby ensure that genetically modified crops (for example, crops that use less water and pesticides) are viewed as advanced and sustainable, providing a positive benefit to the environment and farmers.
- Governments should consider programs to reduce pesticide load on the environment.
- Regulations should support feeds with lower phosphates.
- Greenhouse gas emissions are another area for action, although it is not the role of government to impose a cap and trade system.

While it was noted that family farms complement the environment, the point was also raised that the agricultural sector is a huge user of energy and water, and creates a great deal of waste. There are opportunities to process this waste in innovative ways, reducing the environmental impact.

# What We Heard – A Sector that is Proactive in Managing Risks

---

## Preventing and Preparing for Problems

---

- Broad strategies to mitigate risks
- Implementing systems to reduce risks
- Science support

Participants raised several points about a **national traceability system**:

- Industry should lead or co-lead advances in traceability systems.
- AAFC should provide accompaniment, and this should be **flexible**, viable for many species, and adapted to the problems facing producers.
- The goal should be a **national program** with national administration.
- There are existing examples of good systems that can be built on. However, what works for one region, sector or commodity won't necessarily work for another. Efforts should concentrate on internationally recognized and existing infrastructure and knowledge.
- Funding should be directed to an enhanced system for all commodities.
- Risk-mitigation should have a risk-based, rather than zero-tolerance approach. The current recall system is a good model.
- The system put into place should not impede competitiveness.
- Financial support for producers to address traceability should be ongoing, and support should be provided for infrastructure.
- Disease surveillance should be included.
- There are concerns with the use of an Internet-based portal system.

Participants suggested **other risk-mitigating strategies**:

- The role of wetlands in the global carbon cycle needs to be considered when developing risk management strategies for climate change.
- An emergency response mechanism is needed to re-establish and normalize trade after trade interruptions.
- CFIA's inspection capacity should be increased, including point-of-origin inspections.
- Primary research and extension is needed, particularly integrated pest management to control problems with insects and non-native species.
- Program development for risk mitigation should recognize the differential risk between different parts of the agricultural sector.
- Market-driven risk management programs should require a level of accountability.
- Food safety should be seen as a risk mitigation strategy and risk mitigation should be recognized as a key reason for undertaking food safety measures.

## Business Risk Management

---

Several participants had comments on the impact of program changes under the new suite of **Business Risk Management** programs. In particular, participants had concerns regarding:

- Participant fees for AgriStability;
- Margins and cap on matching funds under AgriInvest;
- Deadlines for annual payments under CAIS;
- How the suite will work for supply managed commodities;
- Communication about how AgriRecovery will work;
- Whether or not the new program suite will resolve problems experienced with CAIS; and
- Whether or not the suite will include an “AgriFlex” component.

The comment was also made that the new program suite would be a difficult **adjustment for some in the short-run, but beneficial in the long-run.**

Participants in several sectors (including eggs, dairy and horticulture) commented on perceived gaps in the BRM suite, most notably that industry-specific issues and potential disasters are not covered. The inclusion of regional-specific BRM programming was also suggested. The point was also noted that governments may need to make an effort to ensure producer uptake of the BRM suite, due to dissatisfaction with CAIS.

The **definition of a disaster** was also raised, and what it means for individual producers, businesses, and entire regions. It was suggested that individual businesses must be covered by a disaster relief program.

## What We Heard – Program Delivery Approach

---

### **Integrated program suites to facilitate better access to programs and initiatives**

---

Participants had several comments on the **structure of integrated program suites**:

- The challenge will be to ensure that there is truly a one-stop shop for information that meets different needs. In particular, not all users will be Internet-savvy or open to discussing the private details of their business.
- Make sure that a single-window is open every business day of the year and remains open regardless of funding changes and other issues.
- There are many ways that the sector can learn about programs. Community and commodity groups can also be a channel for information.
- Program suites and expert counsel should be offered as geographically close as possible to producers and producer associations.
- Need to allow the flexibility required to successfully address the different needs in different regions.
- The system should be run at a regional level with third-party delivery. Many of the people who can successfully deliver programs were present at the consultation.
- Industry can work with governments to make sure that the delivery system is flexible, effective, and industry-friendly.

- Confidentiality is an issue with respect to EFPs, BMPs and food safety. Clients will need to feel assured of their confidentiality.
- A conscious effort is required to address program delivery issues related to groups other than producers.
- Funding commitments should be for a period of 3-5 years.

Participants also had questions about the integrated program suites approach:

- Would the suites apply to farmers with very small numbers of livestock?
- Will an integrated approach mean that producers seeking, for example, BRM funding will be required to take some sort of action in another area?

## What We Heard – General Comments

---

### Other comments offered by participants included the following:

There is an expectation that Growing Forward will be an **agri-food industry strategy**, not just an agricultural strategy. Industry would like to be very involved in both the development of policy and programs and the ongoing delivery of programs:

- The resources of industry and governments should be combined in the creation and delivery of services. Where this is not possible, industry should be consulted frequently for input, and governments should talk to industry about mechanics, not just broad policy.
- Value chains should be industry-led.

Governments should take a **supply-chain approach** and provide support along the entire value chain, not just for primary producers.

There is a need for governments to measure and **increase farmers' income from the marketplace**. The importance of farmers getting a fair price for their products needs to be recognized.

Growing Forward should **build on the Agricultural Policy Framework** (APF) particularly with respect to harmonization, national standards, and food safety.

Animal Health and Welfare should be a separate program area and/or a greater focus of Growing Forward, and should receive more funding.

**Looking to the future**, governments and industry should consider the impacts of risks to industry due to climate change, rising fuel prices, peak oil prices, potential water shortages, and the rising cost of imports when developing long-term policy.

**Governments should work to reduce the administrative burden of programs.** AAFC needs to be more flexible in the way it works with organizations. There is also a significant paper burden, particularly as a result of new Treasury Board guidelines, combined with the high degree of reporting required by AAFC.

Participants made several comments with respect to **specific programs and initiatives**:

- Governments should actively support supply management, rather than just defining it as a business risk management tool.
- The Matching Investment Initiative should also fund private sector research that is aimed at solving issues in the public sphere.
- The Ontario Advanced Agricultural Leadership Program was suggested as a model that could be implemented as an FPT program.
- How will existing extension services work with professional advisory services under Growing Forward?
- AgrilInvest should help farmers to build up financial resources to improve existing production systems or diversify in emerging markets.
- Governments should implement the Cooperative Investment Plan proposed by CFA.

## Concluding Remarks

---

The February 13, 2008 national consultation meeting allowed stakeholders to provide governments with their input and ideas on proposed Growing Forward programs and initiatives designed to position the sector to respond to new challenges and to seize new market opportunities. Input from this session will be used to brief Ministers and inform FPT governments as they move forward to finalize Growing Forward program details and initiatives.

It is anticipated that further federal-provincial-territorial stakeholder engagement sessions will be held and that they will focus on specific Growing Forward program details with a view to implementation. More information on these sessions will be available in the coming months.

For more information on Growing Forward please:

- Visit our website at:  
**[www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward](http://www.agr.gc.ca/growingforward)**
- E-mail: **[growingforward@agr.gc.ca](mailto:growingforward@agr.gc.ca)**
- For general inquiries you can also contact our Public Information Request Services by mail, telephone or e-mail:

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada  
Sir John Carling Building  
930 Carling Ave  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0C7

Telephone: 613-759-1000 /  
Fax: 613-759-7977

For the hearing and speech impaired  
(TDD/TTY): 613-759-7470

E-mail: **[info@agr.gc.ca](mailto:info@agr.gc.ca)**

- Contact any FPT agriculture office

We would like to extend our thanks to everyone who has participated in the consultation process to date. Your commitment to providing governments with constructive feedback has resulted in numerous ideas being put forward and your continued engagement will help inform discussion in the final stages of Growing Forward program development.

## Annex A: List of Participant Organizations at the February 13, 2008 Meeting on Growing Forward

---

Agricultural Alliance of New Brunswick	Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition
Agricultural Institute of Canada	Canadian Turkey Marketing Agency
Animal Nutrition Association of Canada	Canadian Veterinary Medicine Association
BIOTECanada	Canadian Young Farmers Forum
British Columbia Agriculture Council	Canola Council of Canada
Canada Beef Export Federation	Chicken Farmers of Canada
Canada Pork International	Credit Union Central of Canada
Canadian 4-H Council	CropLife Canada
Canadian Agri-Food Policy Institute	Dairy Farmers of Canada
Canadian Association of Fairs and Exhibitions	Dairy Processors Association of Canada
Canadian Bison Association	Ducks Unlimited Canada
Canadian Canola Growers Association	Flowers Canada
Canadian Cattlemen's Association	Food and Consumer Products of Canada
Canadian Co-operative Association	Food Processors Alliance of Canada
Canadian Egg Marketing Agency	Food Processors of Canada
Canadian Faculties of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine	George Morris Centre
Canadian Federation of Agriculture	Grain Growers of Canada
Canadian Federation of Independent Business	Institute of Agri-Food Policy Innovation
Canadian Fertilizer Institute	Keystone Agricultural Producers
Canadian Hatching Egg Producers	La Coop Fédérée
Canadian Horticultural Council	National Farm Animal Care Council*
Canadian Institutes of Health Research	National Farmers Union
Canadian Livestock Genetics Association	Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Agriculture
Canadian Meat Council	Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture
Canadian National Goat Federation	Ontario Federation of Agriculture
Canadian Pork Council	Prince Edward Island Federation of Agriculture
Canadian Seed Growers Association	Pulse Canada
Canadian Seed Trade Association	Soil Conservation Council of Canada
Canadian Sheep Federation*	Union des producteurs agricoles du Québec
Canadian Soybean Council	Western Barley Growers Association
	Wild Rose Agricultural Producers

\* Indicates organizations that were unable to attend but sent written comments.