



Canadian Food
Inspection Agency

Agence canadienne
d'inspection des aliments

Overview on a federal livestock identification and traceability regulatory proposal

Second round of consultation

Consultation paper

2015-05-13

Canada



BACKGROUND

In 2006, federal, provincial and territorial ministers of agriculture announced the need for mandatory livestock identification and traceability system, starting with bovine, ovine, porcine and poultry. They also encouraged the traceability system to be cost-effective and sustainable and for it to be implemented in collaboration with industry.

Livestock traceability refers to the ability to follow an animal or group of animals during all stages of its life. There are three main pillars to livestock identification and traceability systems: the identification of livestock; the identification of sites where livestock have been kept, assembled or disposed; and events related to livestock, e.g., receipt of animals from another site.

The main anticipated outcomes of an effective livestock traceability system are that (a) risks to the Canadian animal resource base are mitigated; (b) risks to Canadians from the transmission of animal diseases to humans are minimized, and; (c) international markets are accessible to Canadian food, animals, plants and their products.

The federal, provincial and territorial governments have identified performance criteria for livestock traceability systems, namely the type of information needed to effectively manage a sanitary issue (e.g. disease outbreak) or a natural disaster, and how rapidly such information should be provided. The traceability performance criteria are as follows:

“Within 48 hours of the relevant Chief Veterinary Officer or Competent Authority being notified of a sanitary issue or natural disaster or the prevention or preparedness of such issue, it must be possible to...

- 1. Establish the locations(s) where a specified animal has been kept during its life.*
- 2. Establish the location(s) from where animals at a given site were received.*
- 3. Establish a listing of all animals that have been kept on the same location as the specified animal at any stage during those animals' lives.*
- 4. Determine the current location of all animals that have been kept on the same site as the specified animal at any time during those animals' lives.*
- 5. Determine the identification number and movement history of all conveyances used to transport animal to and from a given location.*
- 6. Establish the location of a specified animal immediately prior to importation into Canada or the location of a specified animal immediately subsequent to exportation from Canada.*
- 7. Establish the location and date at which deceased animal were sent, transported, received and disposed of (both on- and off-site), and a listing of those animals if identified individually.”*



The purpose for which livestock identification and traceability data may be used covers activities such as the management of disease outbreaks, vaccination programmes, zoning and compartmentalisation, disease surveillance, early response and notification systems, animal movement controls, and compliance verification inspections.

FIRST ROUND OF CONSULTATION

The current state of livestock identification and traceability systems in Canada was summarized in the consultation document entitled: "Options for livestock identification and traceability regulations"¹ that was presented during the first round of consultations, which took place in November and December 2013.

The consultation document identified miscellaneous issues and the following four main gaps that would need to be addressed in order to meet the performance criteria and enhance the efficiency of the current livestock identification and traceability systems:

1. livestock species that share diseases are not all subject to traceability requirements;
2. the time period provided to report an event to a responsible administrator is too long to support an efficient response to disease outbreaks or natural disasters;
3. the geographical precision of the traceability information is poor, and;
4. information on the domestic movements of livestock is not known or readily available.

A consultation reference document² provided in the first round of consultation further presented the CFIA's recommendations to address the gaps and summarized the policy analysis supporting the recommendations. The following guiding principles were considered in the development of proposed regulatory options:

- Building on efforts that have already been made;
- Building on existing positions and perspectives from national industry groups and provincial/territorial governments;
- Meeting the national performance criteria for livestock traceability systems (developed by the federal, provincial and territorial governments);
- Considering resources available to verify regulatory compliance;
- Addressing gaps in the current regulatory framework; and
- Harmonizing, where possible, regulatory requirements among species to support compliance and facilitate compliance verification.

¹ Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2013. Options for livestock identification and traceability regulations: consultation document. Final draft. 2013/11/05. RDIMS #4049526.

² Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2013. Options for livestock identification and traceability regulations: reference consultation document. Final draft. 2013/11/05. RDIMS #2974093.



Stakeholders were invited to comment on the recommendations outlined in the consultation document. A detailed summary of the comments received under the first round of consultations is provided in the Annex of this document.

CURRENT CONSULTATION

Based on the comments received from the first round of consultations, the CFIA concludes that there is a general consensus among industry and governments to address above-mentioned gaps #1, 2 and 3. However, there is some but not full consensus among and between governments and industry to address gap #4, i.e. information on the domestic movements of livestock is not known or readily available.

The purpose of this document is to seek comments from stakeholders on regulatory requirements that would address the four above-mentioned gaps and other miscellaneous issues identified in the consultation reference document circulated under the first phase of consultation (which has now been revised³ for this second round of consultation).

HOW TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS

You are invited to submit comments on the regulatory proposal described hereunder and to provide your perspective to the questions raised.

Please send your comments to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency at the following address before **26 June 2015**:

Eric Aubin, National Manager
Livestock Identification and Traceability Program
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
1400 Merivale Road. Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Email: trace@inspection.gc.ca

³ Canadian Food Inspection Agency. 2014. Livestock identification and traceability regulatory proposal: reference consultation document for the second round of consultations. Final draft. 2014/12/02. RDIMS #6078099.



PROPOSED NEXT STEPS AND ANTICIPATED TIMELINES

13 May 2015:	release of documents for the second round of consultations
26 June 2015:	end of the second round of consultation
Summer 2015:	comments are reviewed; summary of comments received is released; regulatory proposal summary is released
Fall 2015-16:	regulations are drafted; cost-benefit analysis is revised based on regulatory drafting instructions and comments made on the preliminary analysis
Winter 2015-16:	documents accompanying regulatory proposal are finalized
Spring 2016:	proposed regulations are published in part I of the Canada Gazette followed by comment period; regulations are published in part II of the Canada Gazette



Glossary

Animal (*animal*): a bison, bovine, caprine, cervid, ovine or pig.

Animal Traceability (*traçabilité animale*): the ability to follow an animal or group of animals during all stages of its life (OIE).

Bison (*bison*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the subspecies *Bison bison bison*, *Bison bison athabascae* or *Bison bison bonasus*.

Bovine (*bovin*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the species *Bos taurus* or *Bos indicus*.

Caprine (*caprin*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the genus *Capra*.

Cervid (*cervidé*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the family *Cervidae*.

Conveyance (*véhicule*): means any aircraft, carriage, motor vehicle, trailer, railway car, vessel, cargo container or other contrivance used to move persons, animals or things. *Under the proposed regulations, the license plate of the trailer and not of the motorized vehicle needs to be reported.*

Event (*événement*): a significant occurrence or happening related to an animal or an indicator associated with an animal. *The receipt of an animal is an example of an Event.*

Farm (*ferme*): land, and all buildings and other structures on that land, that is used under one management for breeding or raising animals but does not include an artificial insemination unit.

Farm of origin (*ferme d'origine*): farm on which an animal is born or, if an animal is not born on a farm, the first farm to which it is moved after its birth.

Feedlot (*parc d'engraissement*): an operation that feeds animals and is operated in whole or in part for the purposes of growing or finishing animals by means other than grazing, but does not include (i) an overwintering site where cattle are fed and sheltered, or (ii) a site for breeding animals and their offspring⁴.

Herd mark (*numéro de troupeau*): the identification number of a site from which a large number of animals departs from or is kept together.

⁴ Modification from definition under Alberta statute



Indicator (*identificateur*): means of identification for animals. *An ear tag is an example of an indicator. The word “indicator” is used hereunder to reflect that means of identification other than ear tags could be approved under the TRACE program.*

Indicator, activation (*activation d'un identificateur*): reporting that an approved indicator has been applied to an animal and its identification number.

Indicator, approved (*identificateur approuvé*): means of identification approved by the Minister [of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada] under subsection 173(1) of the *Health of Animals Regulations* and listed on the [Canadian Food Inspection] Agency's web site as an approved indicator.

Indicator, secondary (*identificateur secondaire*): indicator applied jointly with an approved indicator and bearing the same identification number.

Ovine (*ovin*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the genus *Ovis*.

Party (*partie*): an individual, a group, or a body having a role in a business function. Party has a legal connotation in a business transaction.

Performance criteria (*critère de performance*): specifications for performance of a programme and are usually expressed in quantitative terms, such as “all animals can be traced to the establishment of birth within 48 hours of an enquiry” (OIE).

Pig (*porc*): an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the genus *Sus*.

Responsible administrator (*administrateur responsable*): a person who is authorized by the Minister [of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada] to receive information in relation to animals or things to which the [Health of Animals] Act or these Regulations apply, is listed on the [Canadian Food Inspection] Agency's web site as an administrator and administers a national identification program in relation to certain animals of all or part of one or more genera, species or subspecies that are located in one or more provinces.

Site (*installation*): place where animals or dead stock are kept or collected but does not include a conveyance. *Synonyms of “site” are “premises” and “establishments” (terminology used under the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code).*

Site, intermediate (*installation intermédiaire*): means auctions, assembly yards, buying stations, community pastures, competitive events, fairs, feedlots, training and education facilities, rest stations, feed and watering stations, exhibits, reproduction centres, quarantine stations, rodeos, test stations, veterinary clinics and sites managed by dealers and order buyers. *This definition does not include farms.*



Site, terminal (*installation terminale*): a location where animals are slaughtered or dead stock is being disposed off-site; terminal sites include abattoirs (inspection by federal or provincial governments, mobile abattoirs), rendering facilities, dead stock collection centres.



REGULATORY PROPOSAL TO ADDRESS GAPS AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Elements of a proposal to amend Part XV of the federal *Health of Animals Regulations* (hereafter referred to the “Regulations”) are as follows:

1. *Elements to address that livestock species that share diseases are not all subject to traceability requirements;*
2. *Elements to address that the time period provided to report an event to a responsible administrator is too long to support an efficient response to disease outbreaks or natural disasters;*
3. *Elements to address that the geographical precision of the traceability information is poor;*
4. *Elements to address that information on the domestic movements of livestock is not known or readily available;*
5. *Elements to address other miscellaneous issues covered under the consultation reference document.*

The elements of the regulatory proposal hereunder have been numbered to facilitate your reading and review. The numbering system used hereafter does not relate to provisions used under the Regulations.

1. Elements to address that livestock species that share diseases are not all subject to traceability requirements

- 1.1. Identification and traceability requirements for caprine would be introduced in the Regulations. Caprine would be defined as “an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the genus *Capra*”.

Note: the Canadian National Goat Federation requested federal identification and traceability requirements for caprine

- 1.2. Identification and traceability requirements for farmed cervids would be introduced in the Regulations. Cervids would be defined as “an animal, other than an embryo or a fertilized egg, of the family *Cervidae*”.

Note 1: the Canadian Cervid Alliance requested federal identification and traceability requirements for cervids

Note 2: the species of the family Cervidae that are commercially important in Canada include white-tailed deer, mule deer, fallow deer, red deer, reindeer, elk and moose.



Note 3: feral cervid animals would not be subject to requirements described hereunder.

- 1.3. Animals that are a result of a crossbreeding between species subject to Part XV requirements would also be subject to Part XV requirements.

Rationale: those animals share the same diseases as those that have not been crossbred with other species.

- 1.4. It should be explored whether pet animals should be excluded from Part XV requirements.

Rationale: there is recognition that pet animals may pose health risks to farmed animals. However, there is a need to prioritize the compliance verification effort.

Question: what could be a cost-effective compliance verification strategy for pet animals?

Note 1: pet pigs will be subject to Part XV requirements on 1 July 2015.

Note 2: different technologies (e.g. implants) would need to be approved under the TRACE program for the identification of pet animals.

Note 3: in the event pet animals would be exempted from Part XV requirements, there would be a need to define "pet animals" in the Regulations which could lead to interpretation challenges.

Note 4: not exempting pet animals from Part XV requirements would lead to inspections conducted at new sites, e.g. pet shops, zoos, which may require additional inspection resources.

- 1.5. The proposed Regulations would not include identification and traceability requirements for birds.

Rationale: in 2011, Canada's livestock traceability Industry-Government Advisory Committee (IGAC) recommended that the Regulations not include identification and traceability requirements for birds. It is felt that the poultry industry associations already capture enough information to support effective and rapid trace-ins and trace-outs, with the exception of information from non-commercial operations where birds are kept. This gap could be addressed through the identification of sites where birds are kept, an initiative led by provincial and territorial governments.

- 1.6. The proposed Regulations would not include identification and traceability requirements for equines.

Rationale: three reasons support this recommendation: (a) the lack of consensus among horse owners and equine associations with regards to what should be horse identification



and traceability regulatory requirements, and who should lead this discussion from the industry perspective; (b) equines share a relatively low number of reportable diseases with the species subject or expected to be subject to identification and traceability requirements (see section 9.1 of the consultation reference document), and; (c) significant inspection resources would be required to verify compliance for this sector.

- 1.7. The proposed Regulations would not include identification and traceability requirements of food from animal origin.

Rationale: requirements in keeping records of inter-provincial movement of food would be the subject of separate consultations under the Safe Food for Canadians Regulations.

2. Elements to address that the time period provided to report an event to a responsible administrator is too long to support an efficient response to disease outbreaks or natural disasters

- 2.1. All events required to be reported to the responsible administrator under the Regulations would need to be reported within seven (7) days of the event occurring (e.g. the date at which an animal was imported).

Exception: information on the sale (issuance) and distribution of approved tags which would still need to be reported to the responsible administrator within 24 hours.

Rationale: the current time period to report an event under the Regulations is generally 30 days for bison, bovine and ovine. The 30-day time period does not support the ability to complete a trace-in or trace-out investigation within the performance criterion of 48 hours. Industry associations have indicated that a requirement to report an event within 48 hours would be too difficult for the industry to implement; a requirement to report within 7 days could be attainable.

Note 1: in order to support compliance for this proposed requirement, all sites where animals are loaded or unloaded from a conveyance should be identified before the regulatory proposal come into force.

Note 2: the prescribed time period to report an event is based on calendar days; i.e. includes statutory holidays and week end.

Note 3: this proposed requirement would harmonize the time period to report with the current requirements for pigs.

Note 4: in the event of a disease outbreak, regulated parties would be invited to rapidly report to the administrator livestock traceability information which has been recorded but not yet reported. As a result, inspectors and veterinarians involved in the disease outbreak response would have access to more timely and complete information.



- 2.2. All of the information required to be reported to the responsible administrator under the Regulations would be kept in records (electronic or paper) and retained on-site for a minimum of five (5) years by the person who reported the information.

Rationale: requirements to keep records under the Regulations already apply for most operators. The objective of keeping records is support compliance verification activities.

Note 1: the retention period for Part XV data recorded on-site is currently either two or five years.

Note 2: the retention period for Part XV data collected in the information system (database) of responsible administrators would be maintained to 10 years, after which time the data may be archived but not destroyed.

- 2.3. Persons required to record and report information to the responsible administrator would be required to take necessary measures in ensuring the accuracy of information recorded and reported.

Rationale: the efficiency of the livestock identification and traceability system is largely influenced by the accuracy of data required to be reported and recorded under Part XV.

- 2.4. The distributors and dealers of approved indicators would be subject to a five-year record-keeping requirement of all the information required to be reported to the responsible administrator.

Rationale: currently, distributors and dealers of approved indicators are only subject to report tag transaction information. Keeping records of this information would support compliance verification and enable to establish tag inventories.

3. Elements to address that the geographical precision of the traceability information is poor

- 3.1. When required to report the location of the site when animals were loaded and/or unloaded from a conveyance, the party would report the identification number of that site (premises).

Rationale: this proposed requirement would build on the efforts made by provincial and territorial governments in the identification and characterization of agriculture and agri-food premises. The CFIA would have access to site data collected by provincial and territorial governments through data sharing agreements with those governments. Only the site identification and characterization information validated by provincial and territorial governments would be accepted under the Regulations.



Note 1: as a consequence from this proposed requirement, all sites where animal are loaded or unloaded from a conveyance would need to be identified and characterized.

Note 2: in some provinces and territories, only the sites where the main office (headquarter) of agri-food operations are located have been identified and characterized. Further site identification and characterization effort would be needed to cover all sites where animals are loaded or unloaded from a conveyance.

Note 3: with this proposed requirement, livestock movement events would no longer be cross-referenced to the identification number of a party under the information system (database) of a responsible administrator but rather to the identification number of a site.

- 3.2. Four site characterization data fields, associated with each site identification number, would be required to be reported to the responsible administrator: (a) the physical location of the site (legal land description or, in its absence, geo-referenced coordinates); (b) the type of operation(s) at that site (e.g. abattoir); (c) the animal species kept at that site, and; (d) the contact name and contact coordinates for that site.

Rationale: this requirement would build on the on the national traceability standards. Parties would not be required to re-submit the above-mentioned information if it is already collected and validated by provincial and territorial governments.

Note: in addition to the four above-mentioned data fields, some provincial governments also require information on the maximum number of animals (and their species) which may be kept in buildings located on that site. This information would support disease control and surveillance activities in, for example, providing an estimate on the number of vaccines needed, on the number of animals to be tested, etc. The collection of information on building capacity through provincial regulatory measures or voluntarily (with proper consent to disclose the information) should be encouraged.



Question #1. With the proposed requirements, all events would be associated with the identification number of a site and no longer to a party. This new approach would provide more geographically-precise livestock traceability information. However, the identity of a person who would be in violation of a requirement may be difficult to establish if multiple parties are associated with a single site identification number.

Example: a farm and an assembly yard are located on the same site (land parcel) and have been provided the same site identification number. Animals received from this site at an abattoir are not identified with an approved tag. The inspector needs to determine whether the animals were transported from the farm or from the assembly yard.

In order to address this situation, do you feel that the identification number of a site should only be associated with only one regulated party? In this example in particular, should separate sub-premises identification numbers be allocated to the auction and to the assembly yard? Otherwise, how should we address the above-mentioned example?

- 3.3. Approved indicators would be issued to the identification number of the site where the indicators are applied to animals.

Rationale: currently, approved indicators are issued to the mailing address of the person who purchased the approved indicators. The tag issuance information should be cross-referenced to a physical, and not mailing, address in order to provide better geographical information on the location of animals.

Note 1: if deemed difficult to associate a site identification number with a single regulated party (see question #1), approved indicators would continue being issued to the identification number of the party in the administrator's database. However, physical location information would also need to be associated with the regulated party (currently, only mailing address is associated with the party's identification number).

Note 2: it should be explored whether approved tags could be issued to the "headquarter" site (premises) of the regulated party. When purchasing approved indicators, the regulated party may not be able to determine the site where the indicators will be applied to the animals.

- 3.4. The foreign location to where animals are immediately exported (first destination site) and from where animals are immediately imported (last departure site) would be reported to the responsible administrator. The level of geographical precision would be at the sub-country level (e.g. North Dakota).



4. Elements to address that information on the domestic movements of livestock is not known or readily available.

The proposed requirements under this section are drawn from an epidemiological evaluation of program design options (Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2015a).

Note: the proposed requirements would not amend the existing pig movement recording and reporting requirements unless specified otherwise

- 4.1. There would still be no requirement to report the movement of animals within a farm, regardless of the distance between the departure and destination sites within the farm, whether those sites are contiguous or located on both sides of a provincial or territorial border.

Exception 1: the current recording and reporting requirements for the movements of pigs within a farm would not be amended, i.e. all movements of pigs within a farm to a non-contiguous site must be reported. Movements of pigs moved within the farm and within the same site (same land parcel), or within the farm and to a contiguous site do not need to be reported or recorded.

Exception 2: to support Canada's ability to zone, all movements of animals across the Ontario-Manitoba border would need to be reported, even if the movement is within the same farm.

Note 1: under Quebec regulations, the movement of animals within a farm for a distance over 10 km shall be reported. Otherwise, animal movements within a farm are not reported.

Note 2: the exemption of not reporting movement of animals within a farm has been requested by industry to avoid additional costs. However, this exemption has been identified as a significant gap by our trading partners.

Note 3: according to the Livestock Movement Study, 3.0 million or 15% of beef cattle movements are to pasture.

- 4.2. The confirmation that an approved indicator has been applied to an animal (activation event) would be reported to the responsible administrator before the identified animal departs the farm of origin.

The information reported through the activation of an approved indicator would be: (a) the date at which the approved indicator was applied to the animal; (b) the identification number of the approved indicator, and; (c) the identification number of the site where the approved indicator was applied to the animal.



Rationale: This event would support determining birth and feed cohorts and narrow the scope of trace-in and trace-out investigations.

Note 1: the activation event should ideally be reported soon after birth of the animals to optimize benefits.

Note 2: The tag activation event and “move-out” event proposed for cervids could be reported simultaneously.

Note 3: in the event, bison and bovines are transported to a tagging site, the activation of the approved tag would be reported by the operator of the tagging site before the animal departs from the tagging site.

Note 4: under Quebec regulations, indicators must be activated within 45 days following birth or the day after the bovine, ovine or cervid leaves the farm, whichever comes first. In the event the animal is born in pasture, the indicator must be activated in the five months following birth or the day after leaving the pasture, whichever comes first.

Note 5: there are illegal cases where approved indicators are distributed among producers without being reported. As a result, there could be an error in determining the farm of origin of the animals which bear those indicators. Tag activation would confirm the farm of origin.

Question #2. The proposed requirement to report that a given approved tag has been applied to an animal could be verified through on-site inspections; an approach which could be labour-intensive. Another approach would be to verify in the database of the responsible administrator which indicators have been reported as read and received (through the proposed “move-in requirement”) but not reported as “activated”.

How do you believe the compliance for this proposed requirement should be verified?

- 4.3. Animals or dead stock being transported would be required to be accompanied with movement information in a form (electronic or paper such as a manifest) that can be immediately read by an inspector. A copy of the information on the form would need to be retained for a minimum of two (2) years by the operator of the departure site, the operator of the destination site and the carrier.

The type of information captured on the form would be: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the destination site, (b) the date and time that the conveyance carrying the animals left the departure site, (c) the quantity and species of animals loaded onto the conveyance, and (d) the



licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Exception: the document would not be required with the movement of animals or dead stock within a farm.

Note 1: the requirement for information accompanying animals and dead stock already applies for the transportation of pig dead stock and the transportation of non-bred pigs between parts of a farm that are not contiguous or between farms.

Note 2: under the current pig traceability requirements, the "location" and not the "identification number" of the departure site and of the destination site must be recorded.

Note 3: the usage of a livestock manifest is required by the governments of the four Western provinces and Quebec, but not in the rest of Canada⁵. Only the government of Quebec requires the inclusion of individual animal identification numbers and premises identification numbers on manifests.

Note 4: similar requirements already apply for inter-provincial and international movements of livestock under section 151 of the Regulations. The retention period for records collected under section 151 is two (2) years.

Note 5: departure time of the vehicle would provide chronological information in the usage of the vehicle on a given day.

- 4.4. If cervids are transported from a farm to a site, the operator of the farm, within seven days after the departure of the cervids, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the site where the farm is located and the identification number of the destination site; (b) the date and time that the conveyance left the farm; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the cervids; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note 1: such information is already required to be recorded under CFIA form 1642 (cervid movement permit)

Note 2: such information is already required to be reported under Quebec regulations

Note 3: the vast majority of domestic movement of cervids are from a farm (Serecon, 2015)

⁵ AAFC. 2014. Provincial Livestock Manifest Requirements and National Livestock Traceability Standards. RDIMS #6527273.



- 4.5. If ovines are transported from a site to a farm, the operator of the farm, within seven days after the arrival of the ovines, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the farm is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the farm; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the ovines; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note 1: similar information is already required to be recorded for ovines 18 months of age or older under subsection 175.1(3) of the Regulations.

Note 2: such information is already required to be reported under Quebec regulations

Note 3: approximately 10% of domestic movements of sheep are to a farm (Serecon, 2015)

Note 4: information on the departure (removal) of ovines 18 months or older from a site, with the exception of movements to an abattoir, is currently required to be recorded under subsection 175.1(1) of the Regulations. This requirement would be repealed under the proposed regulations as information on the receipt of ovines would be required to be reported and recorded by the operator of the destination site.

- 4.6. If caprines are transported from a site to a farm, the operator of the farm, within seven days after the arrival of the caprines, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the farm is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the farm; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the caprines; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note 1: such information is not required to be recorded or reported under any jurisdiction in Canada

Note 2: approximately half of domestic movements of caprine are to a farm (Serecon, 2015)

- 4.7. If bison or bovines are transported from a site to a farm, the operator of the farm, within seven days after the arrival of the bison or bovines, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the farm is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the farm; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the bison or bovines; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.



Note 1: this proposed requirement is an element of the Cattle Implementation Plan

Note 2: such information is already required to be reported under Quebec regulations

Note 3: approximately one-third of domestic movements of beef cattle are to a farm (Serecon, 2015)

Note 4: approximately 44% of domestic movements of dairy cattle are to a farm (Serecon, 2015)

Note 5: approximately one-quarter of domestic movements of bison are to a farm (Serecon, 2015)

- 4.8. If animals are transported from a site to an intermediate site with the exception of an auction, an assembly yard, a buying station or a community pasture⁶, the operator of the intermediate site, within seven days after the receipt of the animals would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the intermediate site is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the intermediate site; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the animals, and; (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note 1: under Alberta regulations, operators of feedlots which handle more than 1,000 cattle are subject to similar requirements; they would need to also report the source location of the animals received. Approximately 10,000 additional feedlots and backgrounders would be impacted by this proposed regulatory requirement (Boecker, 2014).

Note 2: such information is already required to be reported under Quebec regulations.

⁶ This requirement would therefore apply to fairs, feedlots, backgrounders, training and education facilities, rest stations, feed and watering stations, exhibits, reproduction centres, quarantine stations, rodeos, test stations, and veterinary clinics.



Question #3. The notion of “passive reading” was introduced under the first round of consultations. Under this principle, the operator of a site would be required to install or cause to be installed equipment that is designed to obtain animal identification information; ensure the equipment is functional and is properly maintained, and; ensure that the information that is obtained from reading the approved indicators is reported to responsible administrator within the required time period.

Hence, the operator of the site would not be in violation for not reporting the identification number of an approved tag that could not be read for reasons such as the indicator is defective or the animals bearing the indicators moved too rapidly in front of the reader.

Do you feel that the passive reading principle should be incorporated under the proposed regulations?

- 4.9. If animals are transported from a site to a destination site being an auction, an assembly yard, a buying station or a community pasture, the operator of the destination site, within seven days after the receipt of the animals would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator for each group of animals unloaded at their site: (a) the identification number of the departure site and of the destination site; (b) the date and time that the conveyance left the site of departure site and the date and time the conveyance arrived at the destination site; (c) the quantity of animals and their species, and; (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note 1: under section 94 of the Regulations, “every person conducting a public sale, auction or market of livestock, Camelidae, Cervidae, chickens, turkeys or game birds shall already keep and make available for inspection by an inspector a record showing, with respect to each animal sold or received at the sale, auction or market, the complete, legal names and addresses of the consignor of every animal received and the purchaser of every animal sold at the sale, auction or market”.

Note 2: such requirement was suggested under the Cattle Implementation Plan

Note 3: through this proposed requirement, “auction”, “assembly yard”, “buying station” and “community pasture” would need to be defined.

- 4.10. Clauses 4.8 and 4.9 described hereunder would be repealed and replaced by the following provision at a later coming into force date:**

If animals are transported from a site to an intermediate site, the operator of the intermediate site, within seven days after the reception of the animals, would be



required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the intermediate site is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the intermediate site; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the animals; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Note: under clause 4.10, operators of auctions, assembly yards, buying stations and community pastures would be subject to the same requirements as operators of other types of intermediates sites, such as feedlots, fairs, test stations.

Question #4. For operators of auction, an assembly yard, a buying station or a community pasture:

Can you specify the impediments you see to individual animal reporting?

What improvements/changes in technology/infrastructure would be of assistance to achieve the reporting of individual animal identification numbers?

When would this technology be available (timeframe)?

When do you believe the above-mentioned clause 4.10 should come into force? A time period between the time clause 4.10 and the rest of the proposed requirements would come into force need to be specified in the regulations. Typically, all requirements under a regulatory initiative come into force within 2 years of each other.

- 4.11. The exemption for operators of abattoirs to report the identification number on foreign indicators would be repealed.

Rationale: under subsection 189(3) of the Regulations, operators of abattoirs are not required to report the identification number of foreign indicators applied to bovine, bison and ovine imported for immediate slaughter, nor to report enough information about the animal to allow the origin to be traced.

Note 1: There are approximately 23,000 ovine imported each year for immediate slaughter (annual average from 2011 to 2013) and a negligible number of bovine and bison.

Note 2: Operators of abattoirs and managers of the responsible administrators' databases should comment their ability to read, report and collect the identification number of a foreign indicators that does not follow the same data format than Canadian approved indicators.



- 4.12. If animals are transported from a site to an abattoir, the operator of the abattoir, within seven days after the reception of the animals, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the abattoir is located; (b) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the abattoir; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the animals; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Exemption: current requirements under subsection 175.2(4) for pigs would not be amended.

Rationale: regulatory-making authorities under the Safe Food for Canadians Act could require operators of abattoirs and meat processing facilities to keep records on the source location of animals transported from a different province or territory to their site. The proposed requirement hereunder would meet and surpass this objective.

Note 1: operators of abattoirs in Quebec are already subject to similar regulatory requirements

Note 2: operators of abattoirs should comment the difficulties of reporting the identification number of indicators applied at a location on the animal other than the ear, e.g. the tail web of a caprine.

Note 3: section 186 requires the slaughter or death of bison and bovine at an abattoir to be reported whereas subsection 175.2(4) requires the receipt of pigs at an abattoir being reported. On rare occasions, live animals may leave an abattoir for another destination. To broaden the scope of the requirement, section 186 would be redrafted in-line with subsection 175.2(4). With this proposed requirement, the "Tag Retirement Event" for bison and bovine would no longer be reported to the responsible administrator; it would be replaced by a Move-in (Reception) Event.

Question #5. Under the proposed requirements, the operator of a site would be required, among other things, to report the identification number of the site where animals were loaded into a conveyance before arriving at their site. To support compliance for this requirement, loading site information would need to be recorded on a document and accompanying the animals. However, for a given consignment, animals may have been loaded from different sites. Hence, it could be difficult for the operator of the destination site to determine which animals came from which site.

What are your thoughts on how a high level of compliance could be achieved for this proposed requirement?



- 4.13. The operator of an abattoir would be required to record and report the following information to the responsible administrator about animals received at their site and not bearing an approved indicator for each group of animals unloaded at the abattoir: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the site where the abattoir is located; (b) the quantity of animals and their species of animals received at the abattoir and not bearing an approved indicator; (c) the date and time that the conveyance arrived at the abattoir, and; (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Rationale: a significant number of animals not bearing approved indicators are received at abattoirs.

Note: currently, operators of abattoirs are only required to record and report information on animals that lost their approved tags on their way to the abattoir.

Question #6. Animals are received illegally at sites not bearing an approved indicator, either because the indicator was lost during transportation or that the animal was not identified when loaded into the conveyance. It is proposed under the regulations that animals and dead stock when being transported to be accompanied with a document that contains departure and destination information. This information may not suffice in providing the history of these animals. In Australia, animals for which history may not be determined are identified with a "replacement tag" of a specific colour. Those animals are devaluated and products from these animals may not be exported.

In Canada, the consequence of an unidentified food animal being presented for slaughter would be for the animal to be treated as a suspect animal with respect to veterinary drugs withdrawal times and it would be subject to enhanced inspection. This may also render the carcass ineligible for certain Export markets. With a modernized slaughter system, such an animal could not be slaughtered under a shared inspection system (i.e. "high line speed" model) but would have to be slaughtered at a location where full "traditional" inspection is available.

Should animals that lost their approved tag or were received not bearing an approved tag be identified with visually distinct, approved tag?



- 4.14. If animals are transported from an abattoir to a site, the operator of the abattoir, within seven days after the departure of the animals, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the where the abattoir is located and the identification number of the destination site; (b) the date and time that the conveyance left the abattoir; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the animals; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Rationale: as the receipt and no longer the slaughter of animals at abattoirs would be required to be reported, there is a need to confirm whether live animals leave an abattoir.

- 4.15. The death or slaughter at any site of an animal identified with an approved indicator would be reported to the responsible administrator within seven (7) days of death or slaughter.

The information reported to the responsible administrator would be: (a) the date of the death or slaughter; (b) the identification number of the site where the animal has died or has been slaughtered, and; (c) the identification number on the approved tags applied to the animal.

Rationale: this information would facilitate and/or narrow down the scope of trace-in and trace-out investigations by confirming which animals are dead.

Note: currently under subsection 186(3), the operator of a site where an animal dies is only required to record, not to report, the slaughter or death of the animal and the identification number on its tag.

- 4.16. The requirement that all bison, bovine and ovine dead stock being transported shall be identified with an approved indicator would be maintained and now also apply to caprine and cervid dead stock.

- 4.17. If dead stock of an animal is transported from one site to another, the operator of the destination site, within seven days after the reception of the dead stock or the part, would be required to report the following information to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site and the identification number of the destination site; (b) the date that the conveyance arrived at the destination site; (c) the identification numbers on the approved tags applied to the animals; and (d) the licence plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance.

Exemption: current requirements under subsection 175.2(5) for pigs would not be amended. They are similar to those proposed for the other species.



Rationale: subsection 187(2) requires the off-site disposal of bison, bovine and ovine dead stock to be reported whereas subsection 175.2(5) requires the receipt of pig dead stock being reported. The former requirement would be redrafted in-line with subsection 175.2(5).

Note: with proposals hereunder, the "Tag Retirement Event" for bison and bovine would no longer be reported to the responsible administrator; it would be replaced by a Move-in (Reception) Event.

- 4.18. The process by which livestock export data is recorded and reported should be streamlined.

Background: *As part of its Animal Health and TRACE programs, the CFIA collects, shares, and uses information related to the import and export of livestock animals under authority of the Health of Animals Act. This information is used by the CFIA to track the movement and location of livestock animals in support of its responsibilities for animal health in Canada.*

There are currently two ways by which livestock export information is reported and collected in Canada: (a) under s.188 of the Regulations, the export of cattle and bison must be reported to the responsible administrator within 30 days of leaving Canada; and the export of pigs within 7 days of leaving Canada; (b) under s.69 of the Regulations, no person shall export livestock, poultry, animal embryos or animal semen without an animal health certificate being issued.

Animal health certificates are issued by accredited veterinarians in Canada for animals that are eligible to be exported from Canada. Accredited veterinarians are not CFIA staff, and any cost associated with their services is borne by the exporter.

All animal health certificates must be approved by a CFIA veterinary inspector with a wet signature before the animals can be exported from Canada. CFIA veterinary inspectors verify that the information contained in health certificates is correct and identify any potential problems or discrepancies with the certificate.

All animals included in the health certificate are eligible to be exported from Canada within 30 days of the animal health certificate being certified by the CFIA. However, animals are generally exported from within a few days of the health certificate being certified by the CFIA.

Animal health certificates are required by the importing country. As the recognized competent legal authority for animal health in Canada, the CFIA is responsible for approving animal health certificates in Canada. This authority cannot be delegated.

Challenges: *As animal health certificates are issued for animals "eligible to be exported", and are valid for up to 30 days after the health certificate has been certified, not all the animals included on the animal health certificate will necessarily be exported. For example, some animals may become unfit for transport between the time the health certificate is*



issued and when animals are prepared to be exported, or a decision on what animals will be included for export may be made a later date. Additionally, animals included on the health certificate may be sent to different destinations as part of separate shipments. Ultimately, this scenario potentially creates challenges for traceability efforts to locate animals.

Potential Opportunities: *In order to address this challenge, some potential changes have been proposed for discussion.*

- 1. Animal health certificates will be issued only for those animals are being exported;*
- 2. Animal identification numbers for animals to be exported will be included in all animal health certificates;*
- 3. Animal health certificates will be issued for each lot of animals as part of an individual shipment with a single destination; and*
- 4. Animal health certificates will be valid for a period of 24 hours.*

Question #7. In reference to clause 4.18:

- Would changes to the validation period of health certificate have impacts for Canadian livestock producers intended to export their animals?
- Would moving to an electronic platform for certifying health certificates provide assistance in facilitating the above changes?
- What benefits are associated with the current approach that would not be borne under the proposed changes?

5. Elements to address other miscellaneous issues covered under the consultation reference document

Note that those miscellaneous issues covered hereafter were described under the consultation reference document provided for the first round of consultation. Those issues are covered under the revised reference document provided for the second round of consultation (Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2015b).

Definitions

- 5.1. The definition of “carcass” under the Regulations would be replaced or amended to harmonize terminology in other parts of the Regulations.

Rationale: the current definition causes confusion. “Carcass” is sometimes referred to the part of a dead animal approved for human consumption; sometimes to a dead animal.

Note: the term “dead stock” is used instead of “carcass” hereunder.



- 5.2. Identification requirements for dead stock need to be clarified.

Rationale: it is currently indicated by policy that a decapitated dead stock transported off-site does not need to be identified with an approved tag. CFIA is seeing stakeholders' perspective on what the identification requirements of a severed animal head or parts of a decapitated dead stock being transported off-site should be.

- 5.3. The term "site used exclusively for the purpose of collecting animals before they are transported to an abattoir" currently used in the Regulations should be clarified.

Rationale: this term is used specifically for pig traceability requirements to designate assembly yards. However, the term leads to confusion among inspectors and regulated parties.

- 5.4. The definition of "farm" under the Regulations (see glossary) should be clarified.

Rationale: there are regulatory interpretation questions on whether experimental farms, teaching establishments, residences, on-farm slaughter facility fall under the definition of "farm".

Note: the definition of "farm" was significantly narrowed through the regulatory amendment that came into force on 1 July 2014. It is now close to the definition found in the dictionary.

General identification requirements

- 5.5. As a consideration in the approval of an indicator by the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, the Regulations would be amended to when the identification number on an approved indicator may be unique to a site or unique to an animal.

Rationale: under paragraph 173(2)(a), it is specified that the indicator must bear a unique identification number; without specifying if such number should be unique to an animal and/or a site.

- 5.6. The Regulations indicate the circumstances when an approved indicator needs to be applied. However, it does not specify if the identification number on the indicator needs to be unique to an animal or a site. It is proposed that the Regulations would be amended to make such distinction.

- 5.7. The high-level criteria being considered for the approval of indicators under the Regulations would be modified to allow for the approval of indicators other than ear tags.



Rationale: as an example, the approval of tags applied to the tail web of caprine could be explored. The approval of a new identification methodology under the program is subject to guidelines provided under the animal indicator approval and revocation framework.

- 5.8. The Regulations makes reference to a “logo” applied to approved indicators while not providing more detail on the nature of this logo. Clarifications would be made that logo appearing on approved indicators shall be recognized by the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

Note: there are on-going discussions on the usage of a national, multi-species trademark that could be used instead the administrators’ logos. This would support the traceability branding initiative. Approved tags with a logo of an administrator would be grand-fathered.

- 5.9. Requirements on the placement of approved indicators would be more adapted to all species subject to the Regulations.

Rationale: currently, an approved tag is required to be applied to an animal’s ear with the logo and number facing forward. While this practice is suitable for bovines and ovines, the identification number printed on an approved tag applied to pig is more legible when facing backward due to pig ear morphology. Moreover, approved indicators would not necessarily be applied to an ear, e.g. caprine.

Note: there would still be no requirement on which ear approved tags must be applied. This has been an issue for those who use fixed tag readers (at e.g. at abattoirs, automated feeding devices).

Question #8. The identification of bovine, ovine and cervid with a primary approved indicator and a secondary, non-approved indicator is required under Quebec government regulations. It is proposed under this regulatory proposal that double-tagging requirements apply to cervids across Canada. Both approved and secondary indicators bear the same identification number. Under the regulatory proposal, the approved or secondary indicator must be replaced if lost.

Should there be a violation if animals transported to a terminal site and required to bear an approved and secondary indicator, bears only one of the two indicators? By including an exemption under the Regulations, is there a risk that custodians of those animals would purposely identify their animals with only one indicator and apply the other indicator to another animal, claiming that both animals lost their second tags?

- 5.10. The Regulations would permit the removal of an approved indicator from an animal if it were not approved for the species of that animal.



Note 1: subsections 175(1.1) and section 179 of the Regulations are silent on whether approved indicators applied to the wrong species may be removed. A 2007 CFIA policy states that it is lawful to remove an approved indicator from an animal if such indicator was not approved for the species of that animal. The policy should be reflected in the Regulations.

Note 2: under Quebec regulations, no one can keep an animal identified with an approved tag which is intended for identification of a species to which the animal does not belong.

- 5.11. The Regulations would maintain the general requirement to replace lost approved indicators and to report the identification number of both the former (if known) and new approved indicators and would apply to all species subject to the Regulations.
- 5.12. Every person who applies, or causes the application of, a new approved indicator to an animal or dead stock that does not already bears an approved indicator would be required to report the identification number of the new approved indicator as well as the identification number of the previously applied indicator (if known) to the responsible administrator.

Note: such requirement exists only for animals and dead stock that already bears an approved tag or an approved tag that has been revoked

- 5.13. An inspector could require every person who owns or has the possession, care or control of an animal to apply an approved indicator to an animal or dead stock that has not left the farm of origin and that has been subject of a disease control or surveillance activity.

Rationale: In the course of a disease surveillance and control activity, a Health of Animals (H of A) tag may be applied by a CFIA inspector to an animal or dead stock (H of A tags are not approved under the TRACE program). The identification number of the H of A tag will be cross-referenced to the animal tissue or blood sample sent to a laboratory for testing; and to the test result. If this animal or dead stock leaves the farm of origin, it will be also identified with an approved indicator. Custodianship, location and movement information associated with an approved tag is not linked with the animal health information linked with the H of A tag.

Note: each year, approximately 9,000 animal health test results are generated but only associated with the identification number of a Health of Animals tag.

- 5.14. It is currently prohibited to apply an approved tag to an animal or the dead stock of an animal that is not on the site in respect of which the approved tag was issued. It is recommended to maintain this prohibition.

Rationale: without such prohibition, there would also be a risk that approved tags are issued to the wrong site which could lead to significant legal or even economic consequences.



Tagging sites

Note: under the current Regulations, a bison or a bovine may be transported from its farm of origin without having an approved tag applied to it to a site for the purpose of having an approved tag applied to it at that site if:

(a) the name and address of the site is on the list that sets out tagging sites approved by the responsible administrator and is published on that administrator's web site; and

(b) an approved tag issued to the farm of origin will be supplied, along with the bison or bovine, by the operator of the farm of origin or, through a prior arrangement with the manager of the tagging site, will be issued and applied to the bison or bovine at the tagging site.

Under the regulatory proposal, tagging sites will continue to only apply to bison and bovine.

- 5.15. The Regulations would clarify that only intermediate sites may qualify as a tagging site.

Rationale: such eligibility criterion is currently only set by policy.

- 5.16. The operator of a tagging site would be required to report to the responsible administrator information on the application of approved indicators⁷ within seven days of the application.

Rationale: currently, operators of a tagging site are only required to maintain (keep a record of) information to enable the origin of the bison and bovine to be traced.

Species-specific identification requirements

- 5.17. Caprine aged 12 months or less and ovine aged 12 months or less, and that are sent directly from the farm of origin to an abattoir (without transiting through another site), *could* be identified with a non-electronic indicator bearing an identification number (herd mark) unique to a site or an indicator bearing an identification number unique to the animal.

Rationale: the identification of each ovine and caprine slaughtered at a young age with an identification number unique to each animal may be cost-prohibitive (support policy of small business lens for proposed regulations).

Note 1: sites (and to some respect, buildings) where pigs are held were provided a unique identification number (herd mark) made of five alpha-characters by the administrator responsible for pigs (Canadian Pork Council and members). This herd mark may be used on

⁷ As per paragraph 183(2)(c) of the Regulations



approved slap tattoos and approved ear tags applied to pigs. The decision was made not to use premises identification numbers as a group identifier for pigs as it is made of seven characters, i.e. too long for a tattoo to be applied on a pig; and that not all premises where pigs are kept were identified when the pig traceability regulations came into force on 1 July 2014.

Note 2: in the event herd marks are used under the ovine and caprine components of the TRACE program, we would need to ensure that each herd mark is unique in Canada. The usage of premises identification numbers as a group identifier on approved indicators should also be explored.

Note 3: verifying compliance that caprine and ovine are less than 12 months of age and sent directly from the farm of origin to an abattoir could be difficult to perform. Your comments on how to verify compliance for this proposed requirement is sought.

- 5.18. Each farmed cervid would be identified with a primary approved indicator as well as a secondary, non-electronic indicator before leaving their farm of origin. The identification number on the primary and secondary indicators would match, thereby maintaining the history of the animal in the event the primary or secondary indicator is lost.

Note 1: the proposed double-identification requirement was a request from the Canadian Cervid Alliance.

Note 2: under Quebec regulations, white-tailed deer need to be identified with only one approved tag. The Canadian cervid industry associations should comment whether such exemption should apply across the country.

Note 3: where there is a requirement for indicators to bear an identification number unique to an animal under the TRACE program, the CFIA requires such number to meet the ISO standard 11784 standard⁸.

- 5.19. The Canadian cervid industry associations need to confirm when farmed cervids would need to be identified.

Note 1: under Quebec regulations, cervids need to be identified “before the end of each calendar year or before leaving the farm of origin whichever comes first”. The Canadian cervid industry associations should comment whether such requirement should apply across the country.

Note 2: clarification should be made on whether cervids moved to a game farm would need to be identified with a primary approved indicator as well as a secondary, non-electronic indicator. Hunters may not want trophies bearing an indicator.

⁸ Numbers meeting the ISO 11784 standard are made of 15 digits, the first three being a country code (“124” is the code for Canada under the ISO 3166 standard)



- 5.20. Dairy bovine associations requested that dairy bovines be required under the Regulations to be identified with an additional secondary indicator. This request could not be met as distinguishing bovines raised for meat versus those raised for milk production may be difficult to establish under the Regulations. However, the dairy bovine associations could continue to encourage their members in applying a secondary non-approved indicator to dairy bovines.

Note: most of the dairy bovines already bear an approved and secondary tag when leaving their farm of origin.

Prohibitions

- 5.21. The prohibition under the Regulations to receive or cause the reception of animals not bearing an approved indicator would be repealed.

Rationale: the operator of a site is not necessarily in a position to verify whether or not an animal bears an approved indicator prior to its arrival at the site.

- 5.22. The prohibition under the Regulations to transport animals not bearing approved indicators would be amended to reflect that compliance for this requirement may be difficult to achieve.

Rationale: carriers may not be able to determine that all animals loaded in the conveyance bear an approved indicator as: some of the approved indicators are small, button ear tags; animals are loaded rapidly into the conveyance, or; animals are loaded under dark conditions.

Note: the prohibition could be replaced with a requirement for carriers to demonstrate controls are in place to ensure animals are identified with an approved indicator before being loaded into the conveyance.



Question #9. All indicators approved for bison and bovines are electronic ear tags. With the exception of the proposed herd mark ear tag that would be used on ovine aged 12 months or less, and that are sent directly from the farm of origin to an abattoir, it is expected that all indicators approved for ovine will be electronic ear tags before the proposed regulations come into force. Under the regulatory proposal, operators of abattoirs would report the identification number of approved indicators borne by bison, bovine, ovine, caprine and cervid.

Would operators of abattoirs agree to read and report 15-digit identification numbers of both electronic and non-electronic indicators? Should all approved indicators bearing an identification number unique to an animal (i.e. 15-digit) be electronic?

- 5.23. The Regulations should clarify that the sale or distribution of approved indicators by persons other than approved distributors and dealers is prohibited.

Rationale: the non-reported transfer of approved indicators could lead to regulated parties being wrongly identified as non-compliant, and wrong herds being the subject of disease control, or even depopulation, activities.

- 5.24. The Regulations should clarify whether the removal of defective approved indicators is prohibited.

Rationale: events associated with a defective approved indicator may have been reported to the responsible administrator. The removal of a defective approved indicator from an animal would not enable the history of the animal being known if the identification number of the new approved indicator is not cross-referenced with the identification number of the former, defective indicator.

Note: the compliance level of the requirement to cross-reference the identification numbers of a new and former indicator seems to be relatively low.

Question: should the removal of a defective indicator be permitted under specific circumstances, e.g. the indicator being replaced under the supervision of an inspector, and requiring that both identification numbers being cross-referenced?

- 5.25. The Regulations should clarify that reusing and recycling approved tags, and applying the reused or recycled tag to an animal is prohibited.

Rationale: there is a risk that different animals will bear the same ISO 11784 identification number.



Import

- 5.26. In addition to what is stated under clause 4.4 hereunder, every person who imports an animal would be required to report to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the destination (import) site; (b) the date the animals were imported; (c) the identification number on the animal's approved indicator⁹, and; (d) the license plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance by which the animal was imported.

Rationale: currently, importers are only required to report the identification number of animals being imported. The proposed amendment described under this clause would harmonize with the reporting requirements for those who import pigs.

- 5.27. The possibility to apply Canadian approved indicators to animals before their importation to Canada would be repealed.

Rationale: there is a risk that foreign animals be falsely identified as being borne in Canada, which could lead to a non-justified trade embargo if this animal becomes diseased. In consideration, only animals borne in the United States of America may bear an indicator issued by the U.S. Animal Plant Health inspection Services (APHIS). Lastly, with the growing recognition of foreign indicators, fewer animals need to be re-identified with Canadian approved indicators when imported to Canada.

- 5.28. Bison, bovines and ovines are currently exempted from being identified with an approved indicator when imported into Canada for immediate slaughter. This exemption would also apply to caprine and cervid. Pig would still not be exempted from this requirement.

- 5.29. An amendment would be made to correct an error in the Regulations; subsection 178(2) should refer to subsection 174(3) instead of 174(2).

Export

- 5.30. In addition to what is stated under clause 4.4 hereunder, every person who exports an animal would be required to report to the responsible administrator: (a) the identification number of the departure site; (b) the date the animals were exported; (c) the identification number on the animal's approved indicator, and; (d) the license plate number or, if there is no licence plate, other identification of the conveyance by which the animal was exported.

⁹ This would include the identification number on foreign indicators considered equivalent under the TRACE program.



Rationale: currently, exporters are only required to report the identification number of animals being exported. The proposed amendment described under this clause would harmonize with the reporting requirements for those who export pigs.

- 5.31. It would be clarified that there are domestic identification requirements for pigs being exported.

Rationale: subsection 175.01(7) states that “every person who exports a pig shall ensure that, before its export, it has applied to it an indicator approved by the importing country...”. There should be some minimum identification requirements for pigs being exported to reassure our trading partners in our ability to conduct a traceability investigation for the exported animal.

- 5.32. It would be clarified under the Regulations that pigs do not need to be re-identified before being exported if they already bear an approved tag with an identification number corresponding to the farm of origin (and not to the last site where they were kept before being exported).

Rationale: under paragraph 188(2)(d), it is required that the identification number on indicators approved by an importing country and applied to pigs meant to be exported must identify the last sites where pigs were kept before they were exported.

Disposal of dead stock on-site (without being transported)

- 5.33. There would still be no requirement to identify animal dead stock with an approved indicator if it is not being transported or tested (see clause 5.13).
- 5.34. The exemption to report the on-site disposal of bison, bovine, and ovine dead stock that is *not* identified with an approved tag would be maintained. The exemption would apply to caprine and cervid dead stock.

Note 1: this exemption has been identified as a gap by our trading partners, and does not fully support performance criterion #7.

Note 2: this exemption has been requested by industry.

Note 3: verifying compliance that on-site disposal of animals not bearing an approved indicator has been reported to the responsible administrator would be difficult to perform.



Question #10. The current requirement is for all dead stock to bear an approved indicator when leaving a site. Views have been made that indicators applied to dead stock should not necessarily be electronic due to the relatively low value of the dead stock.

However, the operator of the site where the dead stock will be disposed is required to read and report the identification number of approved indicators applied to dead stock received at their site.

Would operators of rendering facilities, dead stock collection and disposal centres agree to read and report 15-digit identification numbers borne on non-electronic indicators applied to dead stock? Would this requirement create an occupational health hazard or other issues?

- 5.35. The requirement that every person who disposes the dead stock of bison, bovine and ovine bearing an approved indicator shall report the disposal of the dead stock to the responsible administrator would be maintained and now also apply to caprine and cervid dead stock.

The information reported to the responsible administrator would be: (a) the date of the disposal; (b) the identification number of the site where the animal has been disposed, and; (c) the identification number on the approved tags applied to the dead stock.

Note: compliance verification for this requirement has been difficult to perform.

6. Costs and benefits

- 6.1. The Government of Canada instituted a policy that a cost-benefit analysis must be carried out for all significant regulatory proposals to assess their potential impacts on the environment, workers, businesses, consumers, and other sectors of society. Regulatory authorities, such as the CFIA, must make a convincing case that the regulatory approach recommended is superior to non-regulatory alternatives.
- 6.2. The 2007 Cabinet Directive on Streamlining Regulation requires that departments and agencies assess regulatory and non-regulatory options to maximize net benefits to society as a whole. Hence, all regulatory departments and agencies are expected to show that the recommended option maximizes the net economic, environmental, and social benefits to Canadians, business, and government over time more than



- any other type of regulatory or non-regulatory action. Instrument choice (e.g. regulation, voluntary adoption) is thus essential to the regulatory process.
- 6.3. Departments and agencies are also expected to show how the costs and benefits are distributed across the various affected parties, sectors of the economy, and regions of Canada. A Guide has been prepared by the Treasury Board of Canada to help agencies develop cost-benefit analyses.¹⁰
- 6.4. Since 2011, Regulations are also subject to the One-for-One Rule¹¹ and Small Business Lens. The Small Business Lens ensures that regulators are sensitive to the needs of small businesses when they design regulations. When designing regulations, regulators now must demonstrate to ministers that they have done what they can to minimize the impact on small business. Lastly, it is required for regulators to validate assumptions made in the cost-benefit analysis with those that would be impacted by the regulations.
- 6.5. Limiting the economic impacts for small businesses from the implementation of the proposed regulations has been considered in the development of the program design described hereunder. Examples of those considerations include:
- Providing the option of identifying ovine and caprine 12 months of age or less to be identified with a non-electronic indicator bearing a herd mark instead of an identification number unique to an animal;
 - Allowing that the document accompanying animals and dead stock be a paper, not necessarily electronic;
 - Not requiring the electronic transmission of information to responsible administrators; information may be reported by phone, fax.
- 6.6. The Cabinet Directive on Streamlining Regulation requirement is for the cost-benefit analysis to cover incremental costs and benefits derived from the proposed regulations, and not to cover the costs and benefits of the entire program.
- 6.7. A preliminary cost-benefit analysis was presented to stakeholders on 17 October 2014. The preliminary cost-benefit analysis was based on regulatory options presented during the first round of consultations late 2013. One of objectives for the development of the preliminary cost-benefit analysis was to seek feedback from stakeholders on assumptions, e.g. time required to identify an animal, time required to read and report the identification number of an approved tag, number of tag readers required based on type and size of operation. Another objective of the

¹⁰ www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rtrap-parfa/analys/analystb-eng.asp

¹¹ www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rtrap-parfa/fof-upu-eng.asp



preliminary cost-benefit analysis was to indicate the type of benefits which will be captured in the final analysis, which will accompany the regulations.

- 6.8. A cost-benefit analysis that meets the Cabinet Directive on Streamlining Regulation will be prepared for the proposed regulations. It will be based on the proposed regulatory requirements and feedback received on the assumptions made under the preliminary cost-benefit analysis.



References

BOECKER, A. 2014: Amendments to the Health of Animals Regulations introducing livestock traceability: a preliminary cost-benefit analysis for consultation purposes.

CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY, 2015a: Evaluation of Three Livestock Movement Reporting Options Applied at Intermediate Sites to support tracing investigations following a Sanitary Issue in Canada. V46. Animal Health Risk Assessment, Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Non-published report.

CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY, 2015b: Livestock identification and traceability regulatory proposal. Reference document for second round of consultations.

SERECOM INC, 2015: Domestic Livestock Movement Demographic Study. Prepared in cooperation with the Canadian Animal Health Coalition. 72 p.



ANNEX: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM FIRST ROUND OF CONSULTATIONS

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) received considerable comments during the first phase of consultations which took place in November and December 2013. During consultations the CFIA presented a discussion paper that proposed options for livestock traceability regulations.

Face-to-face consultations took place with Industry Government Advisory Committee (IGAC), Dairy Farmers of Canada (DFC), Canadian Bison Association; Canadian Sheep Federation; Sheep Value Chain Roundtable, Canadian Cattle Identification Agency, Canadian National Goat Federation, National Cattle Feeders Association and Canadian Cervid Alliance.

Consultations via teleconference took place with Union des producteurs agricoles (UPA) and Agri-Traçabilité Québec (ATQ), Livestock Identification Services (LIS) and Cargill.

Written comments were received from the following organizations: British Columbia Cattlemen's Association, Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Alberta Beef Producers, Manitoba Livestock Marketing Association, Canadian Cattle Identification Agency, Ontario Beef, Canadian Bison Association, ATQ, Fédération des producteurs de bovins du Québec - Maison de l'UPA, Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development, Alberta Auction Markets' Association, Canadian Sheep Federation, Canadian National Goat Federation, Dairy Farmers of Canada, Canadian Bison Association and the Sheep Value Round Table.

The following are the key messages and themes that we heard.

General comments from the cattle industry associations were consistent, emphasizing that it is very important to ensure that any costs associated with additional traceability requirements are assessed against a measurable value of real benefit to the industry. Traceability must be implemented in a way that does not impede the speed of commerce and does not negatively affect market neutrality. They are asking both the federal and provincial governments to outline their commitments to offsetting costs incurred by the industry in order to accomplish new traceability objectives.

A detailed cost-benefit analysis for the recommendations is requested. The costs associated with new traceability requirements, as well as, who will be responsible for those costs are extremely important considerations for beef producers; this information must be communicated to the beef industry before further consultations and implementation can take place.



The movement option favoured by the CFIA is not the same as that proposed by industry under the Cattle Implementation Plan. A number of provincial cattlemen's associations submitted the following comments:

- Producers should be able to use a single premises identification number which should be accessible to all levels of government in the event of an emergency or disease outbreak;
- Any traceability measures must be implemented in a way that does not impede producers' ability to market their product;
- National Cattle Movement Documents should be utilized (such as current manifest using paper or electronic method) to track cattle movement between premises;
- Origin and destination premises identification numbers should be recorded on the manifest;
- Specific individual RFID tag numbers should not be required in the national cattle movement document; and
- Federal and provincial governments should be responsible for offsetting costs incurred by producers for regulatory requirements.

Auctions marts also commented that the increasing costs of regulatory creep have had a negative impact on their operations.

Stakeholders from the dairy industry indicate that they are willing to adapt to new requirements as long as other options or choices are put forward and discussed before making any final decisions on amended regulations.

Representatives of the goat industry indicated that goats have much lower value relative to other species and the costs of traceability to goat producers could materially affect their businesses. This in turn, will impact the long term sustainability of the goat industry in Canada. The goat industry must approach traceability with great emphasis on cost consciousness, in order to provide viable identification and traceability options for producers across the country. Secondly, the goat industry does not have a mandatory goat identification program in Canada and there are no identifiers approved for goats under the current identifier framework. Steps taken to include goats in national mandatory movement reporting are premature without having a mandatory animal identification program in place.

Representatives from the goat industry acknowledge the need to be a responsible player in the agriculture community and the need for disease management; however, at this time it is premature for industry to commit to full traceability when the appropriate framework for a cost-effective national mandatory identification program is not in place.

Stakeholders in the sheep industry support traceability but states that the CFIA proposal includes a series of gaps. In particular, some feel the CFIA is being too passive towards auction



marts and other intermediate sites. An alternative option to those provided by the CFIA in the consultation document was provided.

Representatives of the cervid industry indicated that it is very close to having full traceability, and wants the CFIA to be an active participant in the national traceability system. Streamlining with provincial requirements is important so that information is not required to be reported twice. Specifically, they would like to know if the information contained on the Cervid Movement Permits, issued under the *Health of Animals Regulations*, could be used for animal identification and traceability purposes as well.

ATQ suggests that CFIA is being too lenient with proposed regulations. Stronger regulations should be imposed on movements within farms over 10 km, auction markets in general (outside of Quebec), sheep and goat movement reporting, tag activation, and age verification.

Gap 1 - Scope: Livestock species that share disease are not all subject to traceability requirements

The cattle industry generally supports movement toward consistency among appropriate livestock species (species that share diseases) in traceability requirements, while following the principles that traceability requirements must support industry standards for commerce and must not adversely affect the competitive positions of an industry. There is support for moving forward with harmonizing the regulations for cattle, bison, sheep, goats and cervids.

The goat industry indicated it is not prepared with the groundwork to implement national traceability in the near term. The goat industry does not have an established mandatory national identification program that appropriately addresses the degree of cost control required by industry. At this time they feel that the goat industry needs to focus on developing a cost-effective mandatory national identification program as the first step.

The sheep industry would support traceability regulations that include sheep, cattle, bison, goats and cervid, knowing that pig will be subject to full traceability under their own act.

Gap - 2: The time period between an event and the time when traceability data is report to a database does not support an effective emergency response.

The cattle industry agreed that the current reporting requirement of 30 days should be reviewed. Reporting within 48 hours of movement would be difficult, costly and impractical for the industry to implement. Most might support a reporting requirement change to 7 days, depending on the details of the plan.

The goat industry indicates that a timeframe of reporting movement within 7 days is sufficient and does not pose great risk to an effective emergency response. Any requirement less than 7 days is too onerous for producers. The use of livestock manifests, as used in the western



provinces, would simplify the reporting process and make reporting within 7 days more attainable for producers.

Gap - 3: The geographical precision of the traceability information gathered does not support an effective response to a disease outbreak or natural disaster

Before movement reporting can be effective, the issue of premises identification number must be dealt with on a national level. Location is one of the three pillars of national traceability. Representatives of the sheep industry support a manifest (paper or electronic) that would accompany animals in transit and include the premises identification number or physical address of the departure site, the identification numbers on the approved indicators, the number of animals or dead stock being transported, the date the animals or dead stock were loaded onto the conveyance and license plate number of the conveyance or other conveyance identification.

Intermediate sites would be required to report the receipt of animals including the identification numbers on the approved indicators, the date and time of the animals arrival, the physical location or premises identification number of the intermediate site, and the license plate of their conveyance (Scenario 2 from The Evaluation of Different Livestock Traceability Options to Manage a Sanitary Issue in Canada (V46)) within 7 days of receiving animals. The shortcoming of this scenario was identified in the evaluation as not providing the source of the animals in an investigation, and is overcome by the CSF's recommendation that a manifest that provides the information required (including PID information) to carry out a disease response in a time and place to ensure an effective emergency response. The operators of abattoirs, rendering facilities and dead stock collection centres (all referred to as 'terminal sites') would continue to report the identification number of slaughtered animals and of dead stock received. This requirement would apply to the five species. Movement manifests already suggested would support this process.

The goat industry believes that premises identification number needs to be mandated across the country. As Location is one of the three pillars of the traceability system, effective national traceability is not reasonable without mandatory PID. Without nationally mandated PID, we feel these proposed regulations are premature. It is up to the federal agencies to work with the provinces to resolve this issue. It is not an issue for industry to solve. It is unreasonable and premature to move forward with mandatory animal identification and mandatory animal movement reporting, without first having a solution for mandatory premises identification. The identification number of a site (also known as a premises) should be required to be reported, but only if all provinces have cohesive and mandatory PID schemes.

Gap - 4: Domestic movement of livestock through high-risk locations, such as commingling sites, is not reported



The CFIA has identified three options for regulatory requirements of movement reporting. It is the opinion of the cattle industry that only Option 1 falls within the guidelines of the Cattle Implementation Plan (CIP) program. Stakeholders from the cattle industry continue to support the CIP as the roadmap for enhanced traceability adoption in Canada and urge CFIA to embrace this industry-developed plan. Though it has been stated numerous times in the past, the beef cattle industry feels strongly that reasonable and sustainable funding by government is required to ensure the CIP is fully implemented.

Of the current options offered most of the cattle industry indicated they could support only Option #1 and strongly requested that Option 2 (sighting) and Option 3 (lot movement and passive read-in) be removed from future consultation documents. Option 2 (sighting) and option 3 (lot movement and passive read-in) would impose significant costs on the industry with little or no identifiable return on this investment. It is their view that both of these options have the potential to significantly impede the speed of commerce at intermediate sites like auction marts.

Stakeholders from the Cattle industry generally support the development of a nationally consistent movement reporting document. A voluntary standardized shipping manifest which includes the minimum data set is recommended by the CIP.

They do not support requirements for sighting or passive reading of animal identification numbers at intermediate sites such as auction markets or assembly yards. Other co-mingling sites such as community pastures can be linked to the primary premises of the operators and would not require any movement reporting.

Stakeholders from the cattle industry emphasized that they did not agree to the reading and recording of individual RFID numbers at intermediate sites such as auction markets and assembly yards. The National Auction Market Research project clearly showed that this would impede commerce.

They note that the industry has made considerable progress towards the development of provincial cattle manifests that are consistent across Canada. These new manifests are ready to be delivered in some provinces (e.g., Manitoba). The new manifests, developed in co-operation between industry, provincial governments and the Government of Canada, will meet the requirements outlined for movement reporting by lot, including, for example, the premises identification number.

The new manifests are being introduced to producers and industry in a manner that will help minimize business disruption and costs. Some suggest that any new national regulations should support this initiative and not shift movement reporting down a different path. Industry associations recommend utilizing a cost-effective manifest system (whether a paper or electronic system) that contains the relevant tracking information to manage animal lot movement and minimizes significant business disruption.



Members of cattle associations agreed to work with the CIP group and other industry stakeholders to develop a system to report group movements arriving at auction markets, buying stations and assembly yards. The industry agreed to this proposal at the Saskatoon summit with the understanding that individual animal reads and reporting was off the table until such time as technology was able to produce a low cost, highly accurate system that could meet the needs of both industry and government without impeding the speed of commerce and creating undue hardship to industry. Industry will not move forward without a clear understanding of the costs, responsibilities and future liabilities associated with traceability and movement reporting. The expectations of the cattle industry by government must be very clearly communicated prior to any regulatory changes.

Dairy farmers indicate conditional support for the requirement for intermediate sites to passively read and report approved indicators (instead of lot reporting) provided that a risk assessment demonstrating an epidemiological basis for doing so can be produced and that this approach complies with EU exporting requirements.

Representatives of the goat industry indicate that allowing primary producers to report by lot movement for all classes of goats would provide adequate risk management without burdening primary producers with excessive reporting costs. A reasonable proposal would be an option for non-RFID herd marks for all goats "intended for slaughter at less than 12 months" with lot movement reporting from the herd of origin and with operators of terminal sites reporting the origin of animals by lot movement, without any requirement to read and report individual identification.

Lot movement reporting must be a reporting option for all classes of goats to limit reporting costs to producers. A livestock manifest is a tool many producers are familiar with and would be an appropriate method of reporting lot movement.

For any species that require intermediate reporting, intermediate sites should not be treated equally. There should be different classes of intermediate sites with different requirements based on their level of risk.

Representatives of the sheep industry indicated that they will not support the requirement to report the movement of sheep off the farm of origin. They believe that the intermediate sites should be responsible for reporting that information. They propose that farm operators would continue the current practice where they report the acquisition of official animal identifiers to the administrator's database upon purchase (currently in practice and enforced), and would report the receipt of animals from other sites within 7 days of the animal being received on-farm. A manifest would accompany animals during transit and would include the premises identification number or physical address of the departure site, the identification numbers on the approved indicators, the number of animals or dead stock being transported, the date that the animals or dead stock were loaded onto the conveyance and the license plate number of



the conveyance or other conveyance identification. Producers would not be required to report the manifest information to the administrator's database.