

Evaluation Summary

FUTURE TRENDS IN ANIMAL AGRICULTURE

Addressing International Trade Complexities of Animal Welfare

September 20, 2006

The organizing committee values your comments.
Please take a moment to provide your opinion of this symposium.
Please use the back of this evaluation, or additional paper if
necessary.

Use a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being *Low value*, and 5 being *Extremely High value*.

1. **The symposium provided a good balance of speakers.**

	1	2	3	4	5	
number of						
votes			3	5	4	
average			9	20	20	49/12 = 4.1

Comments: Perhaps not best arena for discussion; use small groups; original thought was the small groups would form naturally; hold this one time a year plus have small group meetings

2. **The information was helpful in understanding the complexity of the issues surrounding costs of trade and food animal welfare.**

	1	2	3	4	5	
number of						
votes		1	1	8	2	
average		2	3	32	10	47/12 = 3.9

Comments: International perspective beneficial to FTAA

Please comment on the following speakers or topics:

3. **Welcome/Introduction**

- * Good except Rich's Preface divisive!
- * Conner was very encouraging and RR his usual fine job. That USDA supports the meeting is great
- * Good—introduced a lot of topics
- * Good
- * Where are the connecting points(?)
- * n/a
- * Excellent

4. **Current Critical Issues in International Trade**

- * Excellent
- * Good overview
- * Perhaps useful for more lay audience
- * Good—needed this background to understand later topics
- * OK
- * Repetitive
- * He was good. Comments were relevant.
- * Good

5. **Canadian Experience: Keys to Successful Cooperation between Diverse Groups**

- * Excellent
- * Interesting industry approach. I was surprised that US industry seemed unaware of Canadian approach.
- * Informative
- * Interesting. It was good to see how a country that the US sees as “fairly neutral” regarding AW, is organizing and advancing their production as it relates to AW.
- * Appreciate the info—for a future topic, discuss How the Codes of Practice are Developed?
- * Good
- * Progressive, hope for US production
- * Good info for industry and welfare groups. Makes me wonder if an industry-only forum would be more helpful in terms of advance on welfare issues, or if US industry would simply stagnate on this issue of welfare without the consumer/animal welfare advocacy push.
- * Excellent
- * Excellent—very interesting and well done
- * Very good perspective on Canadian practices. Would have been nice to have a non-industry representative on their effectiveness!

6. **Panel: Animal Welfare as a Trade Issue**

- * AAA—...—just not very well informed; Michael David—good; HSUS—would have preferred discussion of oie issues
- * Poor
- * Good; Loved Appleby

- * Appreciate the panelists willingness to be open and candid about their view. Audience discussion requires good facilitation to avoid polariazation.
- * It appeared that the panel session didn't really work this year for whatever reason. Too bad, it had potential to be more dynamic.
- * Excellent topic, good, last longer
- * Very illuminating. Some hardline views—import/export presentation was especially good
- * Good, though I say so myself

7. Disease Transfer Potential: Impact on Animal Husbandry and International Trade

- * Not sufficiently [could not read] focused on trade issues. Would have been good to have other perspective.
- * Excellent

- * Good to have this update by Michael David. Concerned that used “excuse” that too many consumer groups opinions essentially keep their voice out of US position. Lorraine Mitchell’s comments were very good and relevant. Economic based information is needed.
- * OK
- * General info in presentation, but handled questions very well—gave more specific information then
- * guarded focus
- * Super—it was great to be able to get him to speak. Terrific.
- * Good

8. Economics and Animal Welfare Implications of Moving Animal Production Outside the USA

- * Very good—even handed—but didn't incorporate explanations of trade policy adequately
- * Great talk—Dr. Stricklin was definitely the most interesting and compelling speaker (despite the fact that I disagreed with part of what he said)
- * Excellent—but the speaker reverted back to US Animal Ag vs. Animal Rights
- * Helpful? More justification on USDA position than anything. That said, did cover major disease concerns.
- * Stricklin was great.
- * Lots of philosophical discussion, but would like to know if this would likely occur (given the disease transfer potential)
- * Very sincere and useful
- * Outstanding. Thoughtful, insightful—
- * Patchy—much good stuff but some off the point

9. How Must or Should the USA Address Trade and Animal Welfare Issues?

- * Industry representative gave P.R. speech—irrelevant; Halverson—very good
- * Fair
- * Great. Wonderful/frightening point that US could lose control over production practices by exporting [hard to read] our production, and not necessarily for the better. We have to find a way to address this issue in the US. Ray always posts questions that should be addressed or at least considered.
- * Greg Doud—commercial for beef industry. Added nothing to our discussion.; Marlene Halverson...
- * Repetitive and didn't offer much of a solution except to come together and talk with both parties.
- * OK
- * Again, appreciate the candid viewpoints
- * Yes, in concert with all parties
- * OK
- * Both Doud and Halverson a little unfocused

10. **Open response, Audience Sign-Up**

- * The bias of some (most) audience participants was very distracting
- * Good idea to have this
- * Good ideas to consider were presented
- * Fewer questions than I would have thought
- * Not enough discussion

11. **Summary**

- * Excellent
- * Good symposium, next time broadcast this more and have two panels for debate at the same time supporting both extremes. State a goal of the meeting.
- * Good
- * Short and sweet!
- * Excellent program
- * Good

12. **Would a follow-up symposium dedicated to specific issues be helpful?**

Yes 9; 1 = ?; No 1 (But I suggest AAA get together with Susan Church, as suggested by M. Appleby.)

If yes, please comment on topics and potential speakers.

- * Each trade and animal welfare organization if possible.
- * Regulation of crowding housing [could not read] on disease transmission concerns; the science/ethics idea is great!
- * Ethical basis of science and animal welfare concerns

- * Ethics and Science: Are They Synergistic or Mutually Exclusive?
- * Significance of the Farm Bill regarding animal welfare and regulation of food animal production and processing
- * Farm Foundation Report: Future of Animal Agriculture, the AW component
- * Include HSUS
- * Presentations on how other countries (Canada, NZ) develop codes of practice—not only a general overview, but let’s hear the developers themselves
- * Maybe posit an idea and go from there...e.g., “The End of Animal Agriculture 2050”
- * Not necessarily just animal welfare, but questions formulated to be positive to all potential participants

13. In light of philosophical polarization regarding animal welfare issues, how do we engage various constituencies in the objective discussion of animal welfare issues and create cooperative efforts to improve the welfare of food animals?

- * The Canadian representative was informative and useful but the American industry representatives were poorly informed and deliveries of P.R. [could not read]. Don’t know how to fix it but would help to have more ...[hard to read] speakers from industry.
- * First, by recognizing that value-free and “objective” science does not truly exist (nor, do I think, would most people want it to)
- * Wish I knew. Industry will never take a position that acknowledges need for better welfare in light of their economic investment. Animal rights groups will continue to be confrontational, inhibiting calm discussion. Perhaps moderate welfare groups and scientists, with industry and animal “extremists” not at the table, although I know this would not be considered “diplomatic”. But industry is already boycotting (unless they’re speaking), so...?
- * Keep everyone at the table, perhaps through more small meetings; misinformation kills progress so keep meetings free of meaningless debate and focus on how the system can be improved without being a threat to animal production; recognize the ultimate goals of some so-called animal welfare groups (if the leadership is ethics-based vegetarian or vegan, the organization’s goals are probably the elimination of animal production even though they say they only care about the welfare of the animals); progress can not be made if the meeting is used as a forum for positional bargaining or manipulation
- * Discuss issue of mutual benefit (elimination of gestation stalls)
- * Set parameters in advance to avoid subjects where there will not be agreement. Ensure discussion remains [hard to read] on focus, and is supported by scientific documentation.
- * Mike voiced my similar thought; these open forum (door) sessions have a place, but I am not seeing them as pushing the envelope towards the change most in animal agriculture wish to see. So yes, workshops to get more done would be nice.
- * Activists, government seem supportive. It is the industry that needs work—
- * Some closed door workshops

14. Additional comments to improve the program.

- * Could have provided more basics on WTO for those who don’t work in this area

- * Perhaps most importantly: get more engaging, enthusiastic, and compelling speakers! Presentations could be much better—many of the Power Point presentations were difficult to read.
- * Be more candid about the fact that this conference is a meeting place to allow animal rightists and animal health officials can debate. I was expecting more information on international trade.
- * Auditorium is not conducive to discussion. It's speaker on stage versus person at the microphone. We need a better, smaller location, breakout discussions, etc. I liked that each topic didn't have to have 3 speakers. There can be too many speakers sometimes. FTAA can't be once a year. There has to be something in between to keep a dialog going. It may not happen on it's own, as per D. Brubaker. Someone, some organization, must facilitate this process.
- * Good job, all around
- * Smaller room (warmer room)! Consider providing lunch to allow attendees to discuss subjects in a more informal mode.
- * So nice to have an economist, especially one that doesn't use exclusionary jargon or appear to have an agenda. A good deal of AW discussions come down to money. Having this included in FTAA is perfect and necessary.
- * Good ideas at day's end—we need to discuss these. Good quality crowd—although they were sparse; RR—outstanding work
- * Good Luck! Signed...