
Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum Conference Report

*Albert at Bay Suites Hotel
Ottawa, Ontario
November 28 & 29, 2006*

January 2007

“Take Aways”

Key Points from the CFPF

Purpose

- The Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum (CFPF) was created to foster discussion among all interested parties in the fertilizer sector, with the CFIA registration backlog acting as the primary impetus for its creation. The Forum’s mandate is:
- *“The purpose is to work to build a national consensus between regulatory agencies and stakeholders, on mutually beneficial processes that protect the public and the environment, while promoting a regulatory milieu that encourages innovation, economic stability and international leadership for Canada in the field of fertilizers and supplements.”*

Participants were asked what they would most like to achieve during the forum; and stated:

1. CFIA/CFPF collaboration: goal-setting, processes, standards
2. To help streamline and improve regulatory and other decision-making processes
3. Improving effectiveness in regulation in the areas of regulatory burden, environmental protection, innovation and technology integration
4. Better understanding between and amongst stakeholders, in particular the Forum and links to the decision-making process
5. Approach / process for working together and path forward
6. Networking and improved working relations

CFIA Action Plan

- The Executive Vice President of CFIA welcomed the creation of the Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum (CFPF). It provides an excellent opportunity for government, consumers, agricultural producers and industry to discuss common goals as the move to modernize the Fertilizer Program is made.
- He promised that the CFIA is committed to helping achieve these goals by providing a regulatory framework that is understood and supported by consumers and producers, a framework that is transparent and open, and one that ensures effectively and properly labeled products.
- CFIA staff provided an update on the Fertilizer Program Modernization Initiative and introduced the Fertilizer Section Strategic Action Plan (SAP).
- In broad terms, Forum participants had enthusiasm for the CFIA’s Strategic Action Plan to update the fertilizer regulations, policies, guidelines etc. However, there was skepticism that the promise would be fulfilled. Regular communication and progress will be necessary. Participants identified the following changes needed to make progress in the sector:

1. Improved regulatory efficiency, such as revised standards and improving communication processes, is critical.
2. The Strategic Action Plan (SAP) must add value for farmers.
3. CFIA needs to adhere to their proposed service standards. Continuing openness and dialogue, exemplified by the Forum exchanges to date.
4. Better/more efficient and effective methods of risk management for new product introduction are found and allowed to emerge.
5. Regulatory time is better spent on safety instead of efficacy.
6. Efficacy requirements are far too onerous.
7. Better use of public domain information/science, don't waste time on field trials where not warranted.
8. Improved transparency, communication/reporting of status of applications.
9. Process of registration and application timeframes need to be clearer.

Key Issues

- It became evident that improving efficacy regulation is one of the top priorities of the Forum. There was general agreement to create a Task Force solely focused on the issue and to focus on the immediate steps that can be taken to improve efficacy regulation so it does not continue to be a deterrent to new products. This issue and the creation of a Biosolids Work Group were referred to the Executive.
- For the most part, people thought issues identified were correct. The need to focus on biosolids and efficacy was stressed.
- The expectations for rapid change – especially regarding regulatory overhauls, may be overly ambitious. CFIA needs to consider the resource implications for delivery on their items. Expectations are high, as is the appetite for changes. Industry needs to work too and there is a certain skepticism it can be addressed. A range of other items were also identified:
- No federal oversight for aspects of biosolids sector and a number of provincial regulations. There is a disconnect between when a product is regulated if it is applied to land but not sold for cash.
- Need more focus on level playing field through better enforcement of unregistered products. Possibly create web link on end label so consumers can verify products are registered.
- Need more communication from CFIA. There is urgency to the 6 month deliverables. Need to solidify cooperative efforts to attain short term/urgent goals.

Conclusions

- Most were quite impressed by the considerable effort work groups had put in. "From what I hear and see, the work groups seem to be working well," said one participant.
- CFIA's involvement is necessary and highly cooperative. There is great appreciation for the work CFIA has done on this project and their willingness to come to the table. A proactive role by CFIA is needed: they have the resources and knowledge and CFPF needs to tap into this. CFIA are very useful in

identifying limitations imposed by regulatory structure; ie what actually can and can't be done, as well as resource issues.

- The group considered their satisfaction with the process and work completed to date, by rating on a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being very satisfied, and 1 being not satisfied). Participants indicated a high level of satisfaction with the process and work of CFPF to date – with no responses recorded below a number “7”, and the majority of responses ranking an “8” or “9”.
- There is broad based consensus that the CFIA Strategic Action Plan and Work Group plans are sound but the ‘proof is in the pudding’. It is important that work get accomplished and progress is made. The goal is to have concrete items to report on and review (possibly approve) at the next Forum meeting.

Annual General Meeting

The membership of the Executive Committee will be reviewed at the CFPF Conference in the fall of 2007. Confirmed membership is as follows:

Volunteer	Organization
Craig Rickard (Chair of CFPF)	Agrium
Catherine Jefferson	Canadian Water and Wastewater Association
Jereleen Bryden	Wolf Trax Inc.
Darrin Qualman	National Farmers Union (shares a seat with Mike Leslie)
Mike Leslie	Grain Growers of Canada/Alberta Barley Commission (shares a seat with Darrin Qualman)
Paul Lefebvre	OABA Lawn & Garden Committee
Peter McCann	Plant Inoculants Canada
Susan Antler	Composting Council of Canada
Wendy Omvlee	Canadian Federation of Agriculture

Clyde Graham of the Canadian Fertilizer Institute was appointed as the Executive Director of CFPF. Carla Ventin is the project manager.

**Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum Conference Report
Albert at Bay Suites Hotel
Ottawa, Ontario
November 28 & 29, 2006**

Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

Delivered by Craig Rickard, CFPF Chair

The Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum (CFPF) was created to foster discussion among all interested parties in the fertilizer sector, with the CFIA registration backlog acting as the impetus for its creation.

Craig also spoke to the Canadian Fertilizer Industry's ability to feed agriculture and gardens while ensuring safety. He explained that even while maintaining safety standards, a regulatory system for fertilizer and supplements can be improved upon to support the introduction of new products into the marketplace. Craig called for a system that is more responsive and that utilizes public and industry resources in an efficient manner.

"The purpose is to work to build a national consensus between regulatory agencies and stakeholders, on mutually beneficial processes that protect the public and the environment, while promoting a regulatory milieu that encourages innovation, economic stability and international leadership for Canada in the field of fertilizers and supplements."

Craig encouraged the participants (representatives from every sector, from compost to mineral fertilizer; and from farmers to environmental organizations) to come together and focus on those areas of consensus in order to create improvements for all.

Participants were asked what they would most like to achieve during the forum.

Responses were tabulated as follows with these items reflecting 80% of the total votes:

1. CFIA/CFPF collaboration: goal-setting, processes, standards
2. To help streamline and improve regulatory and other decision-making processes
3. Improving effectiveness in regulation in the areas of regulatory burden, environmental protection, innovation and technology integration
4. Better understanding between and amongst stakeholders, in particular the Forum and links to the decision-making process
5. Approach / process for working together and path forward
6. Networking and improved working relations

Other mentioned items include:

1. Better understanding of and increased knowledge of products, science, policy and regulatory processes
2. Collaborative problem-solving
3. Create momentum for positive change
4. Enhanced product effectiveness
5. Protection of the environment and safety
6. Raise the profile of organic fertilizers

7. Raise awareness around biosolids

The CFIA and the CFPF

Delivered by Dr. André Gravel, Executive Vice-President, CFIA

The Executive Vice President of CFIA welcomed the creation of the Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum (CFPF). It provides an excellent opportunity for government, consumers, agricultural producers and industry to discuss common goals as the move to modernize the Fertilizer Program is made.

He promised that the CFIA is committed to helping achieve these goals by providing a regulatory framework that is understood and supported by consumers and producers, a framework that is transparent and open, and one that ensures effectively and properly labeled products. Dr. Gravel reported that the CFIA has established a new Fertilizer Safety Office and more staff has been hired.

CFIA – Strategic Goals and Workplan Update

Delivered by Glyn Chancey, Director, Plant Products Division, CFIA and Ewa Madey, Fertilizer Section

CFIA staff provided an update on the Fertilizer Program Modernization Initiative and introduced the Fertilizer Section Strategic Action Plan (SAP). Glyn explained how and why the CFPF was formed and detailed common issues and challenges facing the diversity of the fertilizer and supplement industries. Glyn also emphasized the CFIA's commitment to working with stakeholders and constituents and he encouraged the active participation of all in the fertilization program modernization initiative.

Ewa Madey then reviewed the details of the activities planned under the Strategic Action Plan. That document is available in its entirety.

Glyn and Ewa took a number of questions regarding their presentation. It was raised by CFPF members that they were eager to see progress on the items as quickly as possible. Ewa indicated the precise timing for some items would be determined over the next 6 months.

Another conference participant asked when an enhanced feed ban would be implemented. Glyn responded that regulations pertaining to the ban were published last July but a monitoring method has not yet been established. A communications document (presently being prepared) will soon be published to explain what the requirements are, and what roles and responsibilities are attached to them. This item was prioritized by CFIA in the short term.

Panel Presentation - “Future Industry Direction”

Panelists:

Bob Friesen, *President, Canadian Federation of Agriculture, Wawanessa, MB*

Al Mussel, *Senior Research Associate, George Morris Centre, Guelph, ON*

Craig Rickard, *Industry Representative, Agrium, Calgary, AB*

Canadian Producers: Challenges and Opportunities

Bob Friesen, *President, Canadian Federation of Agriculture*

Since 1999, Bob has represented farmers from every province and commodity sector as President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA). He regularly meets with federal and provincial cabinet ministers, opposition critics and parliamentarians. Bob chairs the National Safety Nets Advisory Committee, which directly advises the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food. Bob lives in Wawanessa, Manitoba and along with his brother Gerry, he owns and operates a family farm, raising hogs and turkeys.

Friesen noted the current farm debt situation which sat at \$51.0 Billion in 2005. He explained that the realized net income of farmers in the last 4 years is the worst in Canadian History, and that because of this, farmers are increasingly leveraging their farms to survive. In 2005 alone, Canadian producers spent \$2.6 billion on fertilizer and lime.

Friesen suggested that growers need a Canadian Farm Bill that would integrate Canada’s economic, environmental and social objectives, understand the international competition, take a holistic view of the industry, and strive for a Canada-first industry.

Friesen noted that business risk management programs must be strategic in how they provide stability to primary producers and must address markets that are distorted by international subsidies, be flexible to address regional and commodity needs, and be predictable and bankable for producers

Friesen outlined some key factors ensuring competitiveness regarding the fertilizer sector:

- Fertilizers are important to agriculture
- Need for an efficient and timely regulatory system
- Access to new and innovative products
- Science based regulations
- Need for further Research and Development (regional and commodity specific)

Critical Factors in Canadian Agricultural Competitiveness

Al Mussel, *Senior Research Associate, George Morris Centre, Guelph, Ontario*

Mussel’s research expertise includes: farm management, agricultural marketing and farm income policies. He also teaches finance and marketing in the George Morris Centre’s executive management courses. Mussel has also worked as an economist in the milk procurement division of Land O’Lakes Inc. in Minnesota, and holds Bachelor and Masters degrees in agricultural economics from the University of Guelph, and a Doctorate in agricultural economics from the University of Minnesota, where he was a Fulbright Scholar.

Mussel explained that the future of the fertilizer industry would be determined by the competitive prospects of farm customers including: trade liberalization and export growth, the improved ability to differentiate product, an increased investment in HR and management training, and a rationalization of the regulatory system. Mussel suggested that the Canadian agri-food sector needs to be export-oriented and that, in relationship to its actual land mass, Canada has tremendous agricultural capacity relative to its domestic population.

He predicted that growth in product volumes will be in developing countries – and will mainly be protein, fats and vegetables. Domestically (and elsewhere) growth will be in segmented demand for attributes. Responding to that demand will require feedback, control, segregation, traceability as well as innovative price mechanisms and a regulatory system that supports differentiation and that is tough but fast.

Mussel suggested that it is imperative that management and HR skills be improved. Current HR investment is insufficient and points to the evidence that Canadian farmers are not well-trained managers. A poor job is being done at vertical coordination.

Farmers are hamstrung by regulations, he emphasized and therefore a reform of the regulatory system is needed. Various components need to be reviewed, including inputs, regulated marketing, and environment issues.

Future Issues for Fertilizer

Craig Rickard, *Government Relations and Regulations* joined Agrium's Corporate Relations group in 2004. Prior to this, Craig worked as an Agriculture Consultant in Winnipeg and as a Senior Policy Advisor to two successive Federal Ministers of Agriculture in Ottawa. He also has experience as a Commercial Agriculture Account Manager for TD Canada Trust and on his family farm in Southern Ontario. Craig graduated from the University of Guelph with a Commerce Degree in Agriculture.

Rickard discussed both the past and future of the fertilizer industry, considering all three areas of sustainability: environmental, economic, and social.

He also discussed “the right rate, time and place” otherwise known as BMPs (Beneficial Management Practices) in conjunction with the desired approach of the balance of the environmental, economic and social goals of Agrium's stakeholders.

He pointed out those industry factors that would enable “Step Change”

- High energy prices = high fertilizer prices
- Fertilizer is farms' largest input cost
- Environmental pressures
- Hyper-competitive farm marketplace
- Continued pressure on land base to produce more with less (protein & fuel)
- Fit for Enhanced Efficiency Fertilizers

Canada is the world leader in fertilizer, Rickard continued, with 12% of the world's production capacity. It is the world's 2nd largest exporter of NPKS and leaders in slow release technology, which is a large, growing and changing marketplace.

The delivery of crop nutrients must meet multiple demands placed on the agriculture sector. Agrium has a bullish outlook for agriculture and believes that Canada is well positioned to continue to lead the world in the crop nutrient business, much of which will come from unconventional nutrient technologies. Rickard believes that regulatory and policy environment is key to delivering such a system.

The system must be capable of:

1. effectiveness,
2. flexibility,
3. simplicity,
4. ease of implementation and adjustment, and
5. the facilitation of continuous improvement (measurable).

Interactive Forum Discussion

In broad terms, Forum participants had enthusiasm for the CFIA's Strategic Action Plan to update the fertilizer regulations. However, there was skepticism that the promise would be fulfilled. Regular communication and progress will be necessary. In Participants identified the following changes needed to make progress in the sectors:

1. SAP looks good at first glance, though participants would have liked to have it in advance.
2. Improved regulatory efficiency, such as revised standards and improving communication processes, is critical.
3. The Strategic Action Plan (SAP) must add value for farmers.
4. CFIA needs to adhere to their proposed service standards. Continuing openness and dialogue, as exemplified by the Forum exchanges to date.
5. Better/more efficient and effective methods of risk management for new product introduction are found and allowed to emerge.
6. Regulatory time is better spent on safety instead of efficacy.
7. Efficacy requirements are far too onerous.
8. Better use of public domain information/science, don't waste time on field trials where not warranted.
9. Improved transparency, communication/reporting of status of applications.
10. Process of registration and application timeframes need to be clearer.
11. Biosolids – no regulated driver to regulate these products.
12. Need a regulatory driver to produce class A compost products.
13. All jurisdictions of regulators needed to be focused on BMPs, sound science, and consistent/uniform rules.
14. Develop some acceptance of "overseas" data.
15. Better use of public sources of data.
16. Level the playing field between regulated products and those that are not complying. Enforcement must be better.
17. Industry is currently silo-ed through the sub-sectors (eg. Macronutrients, micronutrients, inoculants, etc). The SAP will/should help to build cohesion across the full industry to gain some quick wins.

In large group discussion, participants further considered what is needed most from fertilizer regulations to serve the needs of this sector. Highlights included the following:

1. Continued innovation, efficacy and efficiency.

2. The CFIA needs to implement responsive, innovative and transparent regulation.
3. Part of the onus lies on the farmers' to use BMPs (Beneficial Management Practice) and the industry must ensure that there is confidence in those products that are available.
4. The key to inoculants' success is the removal of obstacles such as those regulatory constraints in the industry deemed as "old fashioned regulations".

Panel Presentation and Interactive Discussion - "Regulatory Context Overview"

Delivered by:

Joe Slater, Manager, Fertilizer /Ag Lime Control Service, University of Missouri-Columbia

Luc Mougeot, Acting National Manager, Fertilizer Section, CFIA

Kate Billingsley, Acting National Manager, Fertilizer Safety Section, CFIA

Fertilizer Regulation in the US & AAPFCO (Association of American Plant Food Control Officials)

Joseph Slater, Manager, Fertilizer /Ag Lime Control Service at the University of Missouri-Columbia. is a graduate of the University with a BS (1984) and MS (1988) in Horticulture. He joined the department in 1987 as Assistant Manager, and became Manager in 1991 with the responsibility for the administration of the Missouri Fertilizer and Ag Liming Materials Laws and Rules. He is Missouri's voting representative to the Association of American Plant Food Control Officials (AAPFCO). He joined the Board of Directors 1998 and was elected President in August 2001 and Secretary in 2004. He is active on several committees and is the Vice Chair of agricultural liming materials on Uniform Bills, is the Publications investigator, and as Secretary has responsibility for editing the Official Publication.

Slater recounted the history and origin of the AAPFCO and detailed its structures and standards, pointing out that one of its successes lay in the fact that there was no Federal Fertilizer Law therefore the organization helps to create uniformity in fertilizer law through participant consensus.

He explained the purpose and objectives of AAPFCO citing:

- a) Promote uniform and effective legislation, definitions, rulings and enforcement practices
- b) Encourage and sponsor the adoption of the most effective and adequate analytical methods for fertilizer by all member agencies
- c) Develop high standards of fertilizer inspection techniques and procedures
- d) Promote adequate labeling and safe use of fertilizers
- e) Provide facilities and opportunities for the free exchange of information, discussion and cooperative study of problems confronting members of the Association
- f) Cooperate with members of industry in order to promote the usefulness and effectiveness of fertilizer products and the protection of soil and water resources

Regulation of Fertilizers and Supplements in Canada

Luc Mougeot is Acting National Manager, Fertilizer Section, CFIA. A graduate of the University of Waterloo with a BS in Biology (1991), he joined the Plant Production in 1991 and has held positions in all Sections of the Division (Fertilizer, Seed and Plant Breeder's Rights). Luc returned to the Division in February 2006 as the Acting National Manager, following various positions in the CFIA President's Office over the last four years.

Kate Billingsley, Acting National Manager, Fertilizer Safety Office, CFIA
Kate has worked in the Fertilizer Section of the CFIA for 5 years, in roles ranging from safety evaluator to National Manager. After receiving a PhD in environmental biology, Kate worked for a private bioremediation/environmental technology company that focused on oil refinery and municipal biosolids waste treatment.

Mougeot briefly presented CFIA's origin and explained who they are, what their role is and what the CFIA is responsible for. He further explained the definition of Regulation and Registration as they are applied to fertilizers and supplements sold or imported into Canada as per the Fertilizers Act.

Billingsley detailed the process to follow in regards to Safety and Efficacy Assessments and explained the steps of Submission Review Procedures. She emphasized the CFIA's focus on safety to plants, animals, humans and the environment. She also referenced the need for supporting data that is applicable to the Canadian situation as back-up for efficacy in registration submissions.

Discussion

In response to a question, panelists noted that as regulators, they view the most important things as quality control and safety, adding that new products that are well-categorized and fully prepared are the ones that will move forward in the registration process.

In reply to a comment, Slater noted that no formal national efficacy testing is done in the U.S., however there are definitions for products which must be met, and consumers are getting what they are promised. Efficacy rules vary by state. Slater further clarified that AAPFCO is not a regulatory body, but makes recommendations to the State and also acts as a resource for everyone to come together to get info. He noted that as individual states in the U.S. move to update fertilizer rules they are encouraged to use the AAPFCO model/bill. No official regulatory authority exists but instead all members are regulators.

Panelists noted that Canada's harmonization and working relationship with the U.S. is based on working with organizations such as AAPFCO (of which Canada is a member) and also by its participation in various committees and working groups. Canada will take into account safety assessments from the US, but accepting their published studies automatically as ours won't happen yet as our standards are a little different.

Panel Presentation and Interactive Discussion - "Role of Regulatory Agencies"

Delivered by:

Mark Wilcox, Manager, Food, Plant & Animal Programs, Canada Border Services Agency, Ottawa, ON

Peter MacLeod, Executive Director, Crop Protection Chemistry, CropLife Canada

John Blakney, Competition Lawyer, Fraser Milner Casgrain

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division, Health Canada, Ottawa, ON

Canada Border Services Agency

Mark Wilcox, Manager of Food, Plant and Animal Programs with Canada Border Services Agency was born and raised on a mixed farm in Saskatchewan and received a Bachelor of Science and Agriculture from University of Saskatchewan.

Mark worked with Farm Credit Corporation, then with private industry in the Horticulture sector, before joining Agriculture Canada in 1984. After 10 years in the field he moved to Ottawa, holding various positions, most recently the national manager of import programs for the CFIA and a year in the Deputy Minister's office.

Wilcox explained the integration of the functions previously spread out between Canada Customs, Citizenship and Immigration Canada and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency into one border management system. He then detailed CBSA's responsibilities and subsequent OGD (Other Government Department) Programs that were created as a result of this integration. Wilcox showed the relationship between CBSA and CFIA by highlighting a list of each of the agency's functions.

He further expanded on the OGD Single Window Initiative and also detailed its Next Steps, which includes a working group reporting to a DG-level Steering Committee in January 2007, to evaluate proposals and ensure the level of engagement.

Regulatory Learning's from the Pest Control Products Sector

Peter J. MacLeod is the Executive Director of Crop Protection Chemistry at CropLife Canada. Peter has spent his career in the field of scientific research and regulatory affairs. He was involved in the research, development and registration of two of the reduced risk pest control technologies that were awarded the prestigious United States Presidential Green Chemistry Award. An active member of Pesticide Management Advisory Committee to the Minister of Health he has served on many panels on pesticides and risk management. He graduated in 1987 with a B.Sc. (Agr.) Hon. from Dalhousie University and has additional Environmental Science training from the University of Maryland and the University of Kansas for Toxicology.

MacLeod provided an overview of CropLife Canada and the pest control products sector. He listed a variety of issues of importance to both CropLife and CFPF – improve/modernize regulatory system, timeliness of evaluation process, regulation's impact on innovation, divergent product ranges, and scrutiny of food/health/environmental safety multiple regulators.

He reviewed the work CropLife did on changes to the Pest Control Products Act and the consequences of regulation. "Canada needs to be an Attractive Market for Business – The Regulator has a Key Role in innovation, investment and competitiveness".

Fertilizers Act /Competition Act Interface

John Blakney, Competition Lawyer, Fraser Milner Casgrain has a practice which focuses on administrative law and federal regulation of business conduct including pricing, marketing practices, product approval, design, and safety, competition, and international trade, with a particular emphasis on the communications, food and drug sectors. John received his BA (Hons) in Economics, a Masters of Urban and Regional Planning, and his LLB from Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario. He is a regular contributor to the Canadian Competition Record and has been past Seminar Leader, Bar Admission Course, Public Law Curriculum.

Blakney examined the relationship of the CFIA (under the Fertilizers Act) and the Competition Bureau (under the Competition Act) with respect to fertilizer claims at present and in the event that the CFIA exits efficacy regulation. In particular he delved into Sections 3, 4, 5 7 and 11 in the Fertilizer Act and provided his legal observations pertaining to them. Blakney noted that the Fertilizers Act has no specific prohibitions against false or misleading advertising, although there is a requirement to be efficacious for the purposes presented. He outlined the mandate and operations of the Competition Bureau and its role related to claims of efficacy. The complexity of making changes was noted. Blakney stated that even if there was no Fertilizer Act, there would still be efficacy requirements that companies would have to prove because this is a requirement of the Competition Act.

Federal Regulatory Role: Pest Control Products

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division, first joined Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency in 2002. She has previously held a number of positions within Environment Canada with a focus on policy, regulatory and international affairs. With an MSc in environmental biology, her career began as a scientist, first with Agriculture Canada, then with Environment Canada.

Health Canada's Legislative Context was explained and its purpose is to manage Acts designed to protect public health. MacQuarrie then elaborated on the regulatory context of pest control products and the new Pest Control Products Act, which has a mandate to prevent unacceptable risks. Pest Control Product registration and its process were explained. MacQuarrie concluded with information on the working relationship between the PMRA and the CFIA.

Discussion

In reply to a question asking how regulators can increase their understanding of the impact regulations have on business, MacQuarrie noted that PMRA is engaged in ongoing learning. Also, whenever policy is being developed or documented, suggestions for improvements should be made in a holistic manner. She added that a special review can be launched and regulatory changes made based on that review.

In terms of registration, she added that a re-evaluation program was launched to review all products registered pre-1987. Products are registered, and are then reviewed every 5 years and the re-evaluation looks at the complete data package. In reply to a follow-up question from a participant concerned about the frequency of fertilizer registration reviews, MacQuarrie noted that if the requirement to review products was increased to

every 2-3 rather than 5 years, it would not be possible to meet the requirements with existing resources.

A participant inquired whether a removal of efficacy would be legal or if the description of the efficacy data could be changed. Mougeot noted that the Fertilizers Act provides for efficacy testing but the details of how it is done can be more flexible.

In response to a question, Billingsley noted that the tiered review structure is geared to get the easiest and most clear submissions approved in order to free up the path for those that are more complicated.

In response to comments and questions about products that might be exempted from registration, it was suggested that Schedule 2 could possibly be expanded but potentially another approach could be considered for these products.

CFPF Working Group Updates

New Products Working Group (NPWG):

On behalf of the Chair of the New Products Working group, who was unable to attend the meeting due to a storm problem, Robynne Anderson provided an overview of the work to date. There are presently 10 industry professionals and 2 members of the CFIA in the Working Group and that the group has identified and identified the following priority items:

- Review processes to register new products with the CFIA
- Establish priorities for new products
- Examine Canada's place in international competitiveness

As a relatively "new" working group, one meeting has been held to date, where discussion included the definition of a new product, need for efficacy, and understanding the current CFIA processes. Anderson noted that the group has a lot of work to do and outlined its draft work plan through March 2008, including resolution of issues such as:

- How can efficacy be modified or eliminated (legislative vs. policy)
- What changes can be made to modify efficacy? (greenhouse trials rather than small plot replicated)
- Is a two tier registration system possible?
- Immediate registration for New products if no claims are made
- Efficacy requirements only if claims are made
- Consumer confidence
- Efficacy regulations
- Definition of New Products in relationship to Schedule 2.

Communications and Operating Environment Working Group (COEWG):

Susan Antler, Chair of the Communications and Operating Environment Working Group provided an overview of the work to date, indicating that six volunteers are presently on

the team, with two representatives from the CFIA, and one meeting has been held to date. The working group believes its role is to connect all members and all working groups of the CFPF, in terms of information and communication needs and flows. She noted that the group will be working to develop a CFPF website, materials and information for both CFPF members and external audiences, and connecting the working groups to communicate information to members. She noted that the workplan of the COEWG will be built on the input of members.

Conference participants were asked what their preferred method of communication from CFPF would be – email, print or web? By show of hands, participants preferred email communication, closely followed by web, and no preference for print communication. Comments indicated that based on the importance of the information, it could go to everyone via e-mail, with a link to the web for those who wanted additional information.

Regulatory Efficiency Working Group (REWG):

Peter McCann, Chair of the Regulatory Efficiency Working Group, provided an overview of the work to date, indicating that ten volunteers and one representative of the CFIA have been involved in the work to date, and that two meetings have been held so far.

Peter noted that the REWG is a technical group that requires its members to have a high level of understanding of the Act & Regulations and their impact on the economic success of the industry, and will work with the CFIA Fertilizer Program on all issues that affect the smooth & efficient operation of the regulatory process. The REWG also works with other WG's e.g. New Products WG, on issues of common interest, to avoid overlap & duplication.

The working group has identified the following priority items to be addressed:

- Streamlined approach to Research Authorizations (T-4-103)
- Development of a list of products exempt [partially exempt] from efficacy data requirements and/or registration
- Extending the registration period beyond 2 years
- Scope/nature of efficacy data requirements for specific product types (initial focus on micronutrients etc)
- Service delivery standards
- Tiered approach to file queuing
- Recommendations re: content of a registration guidebook

Peter emphasized that members of the working group feel that the CFIA is listening to members & is very positive in its responses, and that the Regulatory process for fertilizers and supplements is becoming more efficient. Peter noted that a good start has been made but there is still a lot of work ahead of Canadian Fertilizer Products Forum, the REWG and CFIA Fertilizers Program.

Marketplace Monitoring & Labelling Working Group (MMLWG):

Paul Lefebvre, Chair of the Marketplace Monitoring and Labelling Working Group provided an update on the work to date, noting that the group has met three times so far. Paul noted that the group has gone through a process of identifying priority issues for consideration, and outlined an ambitious draft workplan.

Items to be addressed include:

- Draft principles of an industry-operated accredited marketplace monitoring system
- Establish sub-work groups on sector specific quality assurance protocols
- Receive reports and develop communications on CFIA enforcement changes
- Sector specific quality assurance protocols developed
- Consultation on feed ban implementation between CFIA and work group
- Upgrade Schedule 2a and define key words (eg. organic, natural, waste)
- Discuss market research on label clarity and gather existing research
- Possibly commission and conduct market research on labelling
- Create plan and conduct negotiations with CFIA on accreditation for marketplace monitoring
- Prepare marketplace monitoring report including sector specific standards for next Forum
- Work with CFIA on regulatory and policy changes regarding labelling stemming from work group. Prepare documents for review/endorsement at Forum
- Create a report on market research and an “options paper” for discussion at next Forum

Interactive Discussion

At their tables, participants discussed the following questions:

- *Reactions to the work to date – is there anything that needs to be considered that CFIA or CFPF has not addressed so far?*
- *Structure of working groups – any changes? Any additions or amendments?*
- *Comments on CFIA’s role on working groups?*

Participant responses are recorded below. The larger group also considered their satisfaction with the process and work completed to date, by rating on a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being very satisfied, and 1 being not satisfied). Participants indicated a high level of satisfaction with the process and work of CFPF to date – with no responses recorded below a number “7”, and the majority of responses ranking an “8” or “9”.

Reactions to the work to date – is there anything that needs to be considered that CFIA or CFPF has not addressed so far?

For the most part, people thought issues identified were correct. The need to focus on biosolids and efficacy was stressed. The expectations for rapid change – especially regarding regulatory overhauls, may be overly ambitious. CFIA needs to consider the resource implications for delivery on their items. Expectations are high, as is the appetite for changes. Industry needs to work too and there is a certain skepticism it can be addressed. A range of other items were also identified:

- No federal oversight for biosolids and a number of provincial regulations. There is a disconnect between when a product is regulated if it is applied to land but not sold for cash.
- Beneficial Management Practices
- Efficacy Standards

- Broader economic impact study
- Tracking system for applications
- Electronic submissions
- Conditional registrations
- Consider reduced requirements for registration of products that have been registered or marketed without incidence in other OECD countries, especially the U.S.
- Need more focus on level playing field through better enforcement of, unregistered products. Possibly create web link on end label so consumers can verify products are registered.
- Border issues and import compliance is another enforcement issue.
- CFQAP should be priority.
- More issues will arise as the CFPF work proceeds. Deal with currently identified issues first.
- The Regulatory Efficiency Work group has an excellent list to prioritize and this was stated several times.
- Need more communication from CFIA. There is urgency to the 6 month deliverables. Need to solidify cooperative efforts to attain short term/urgent goals.
- It is a large undertaking that is very big and will affect the industry at large. Should be ongoing, never ending need to improve and streamline.
- One way or another I think it has been covered!
- Combination of technologies (ex. Biopesticides and supplements)
- Biologicals and synthetics in relation to integrated management systems
- Timelines – workgroups to date have set good mandates, but what do we intend to accomplish in 2 yrs? The time will speed quickly away. It's important to deliver.
- The CFIA has a 5yr plan – how flexible are they on taking CFPF suggestions, and making them strategic priorities?
- *“It is my first meeting and I’m new in the CFIA process. I think a lot of work has been done and a lot of work is to be done. I have good faith that the cooperation between CFIA and CFPF will end with good result due to the implication of CFIA’s agents into different working groups.”*
- *“This is the first forum meeting that I have attended but was impressed by how the regulatory efficiencies WG dug right in and started working. I am also impressed that the CFIA, Fertilizer Group, as a government organization is so open to industry opinion.”*

Structure of working groups: Any changes? Any additions? Any amendments?

Most were quite impressed by the considerable effort work groups had put in. “From what I hear and see, the work groups seem to be working well,” said one participant. Ultimately it was decided to create an efficacy task force as will be discussed later.

1. Working Group structure should reflect make-up of full CFPF as much as possible. It is important that group results and proposals are well communicated within the whole CFPF to ensure consensus.
2. The groups need to be cross-country and cross all segments and at the same time not too big, as large groups seem to be less definitive.
3. Working group structure is good. As a current snapshot, would like an overview chart that identifies both the committee structure and the committee participants (helpful for recent participants).

- New Products should concern itself with the new product types/concepts re regulatory foresight.
- No need for a separate new products and regulatory group; in the end it's all about the regulatory process.
- Creation of efficacy task force and decisions as to remaining duties of new products working group.
- The role of facilitators is key to ensuring the groups are focused and get things done. Proactive facilitation is appreciated.
- Identify common issues from "working groups". This is a next step for "steering committee" to sort out way to reduce overlap.
- Labelling and Market monitoring should be split. New Products and Efficacy requirement have many things in common, fail to see the relevance of 2 working groups.
- Regulatory efficiency is a big group with big topics and will need subcommittees and management.
- Need to disseminate information in a timely manner.
- Group focused on efficacy.
- Regular reporting requirements same for each group.
- Accountability of the communications group, re budget.
- A strong and provocative (also courageous!) facilitator is needed to assist the chairperson in ensuring everyone contributes to discussion and procedures.
- Work plans are living documents.
- Need to be sure that the different working groups don't work on the same task.
- New, in this process. I would suggest more inclusion of different people in the groups. There is a trend to have few leaders and a lot of a follower's. In the end, I think the structure is good.

Comments on CFIA's role on working groups?

CFIA's involvement is necessary and highly cooperative. There is great appreciation for the work CFIA has done on this project and their willingness to come to the table. A proactive role by CFIA is needed: they have the resources and knowledge and CFPP needs to tap into this. CFIA are very useful in identifying limitations imposed by regulatory structure; ie what actually can and can't be done, as well as resource issues.

- They are making a conscious effort to make sure that someone from CFIA is involved (included) in the steering committee meetings, working groups, etc. That is appreciated.
- Very positive; proactive; hearing us; excellent but may be overstretched!
- It would be good to see the openness to change occurring in day-to-day activities right away rather than in 6 months, where it has been agreed that the change needs to happen.
- CFIA needs to be continually involved in order to clarify the progress that CFIA is making in certain areas, eg, if an issue has been resolved internally by CFIA (ie. Literature review completed), the working groups need to be aware of that.
- Critical that they be here and be informed.
- CFIA appears well represented and should continue to be represented on each WG as observers as well as experts who can contribute to problem solving.

- Consultation and explanation of potential implications of options is important.
- Leadership of CFIA is required but continuing to have a very open mind and appreciation of industry input will facilitate their efforts.
- Can not see the process going forward unless CFIA is involved and part of the solutions.
- They should be full participants (though not an excessive or unbalanced weight) since we need to be open and transparent in our goals and needs. Cooperation trumps adversarial any day.
- It's given a "face" to the CFIA. They have rules /regs that HAVE to be followed – how can we work with them? It's created a partnership /community atmosphere.
- CFIA will need patience in dealing with industry reaction which may be based on previous frustrations and conflict of opinions on regulatory matters.
- *"Very positive, open to ideas, not defensive but constructive – better than I expected."*
- *"CFIA has been extremely open to all comments and rarely goes into a defensive mode. This is a tremendous credit to their willingness to try to improve. Well done."*

Separate Working Group Meetings were held. An additional meeting of participants interested in discussing biosolids was held.

Working Groups Report to Plenary Marketplace Monitoring & Labelling Working Group Meeting Report:

The group reviewed the Terms of Reference, and adopted them as presented.

The group listened to a presentation by Jim McCullagh of the Canadian Seed Institute. McCullagh reviewed the circumstances that led to the creation of the Canadian Seed Institute and the learning garnered from it. McCullagh provided the following information:

- What CSI does:
 - Develops standards
 - Maintains standards
 - Delivers program on basis of quality assurance
- Labelling says what a seed lot is
- Certification says a 3rd party verifies that a company said the truth on the label
- Benefits to the consumer:
 - Confidence in information
 - Knowledge that seed meets standards
 - Better ability to enforce
- Benefits to industry:
 - Provide a single standard
 - Marketplace discipline
 - Cost effective
 - Regulatory compliance high
 - Industry-run system
 - Direct control of costs

- Mark of conformity is under control
- Backbone to other programs (i.e. organic, ISO for branding activities)
- Impetus for Change
 - Regulatory review 1992
 - Cost recovery 1994
 - International delegation of EU authority to accreditation systems and adoption of ISO standards
- Key elements of new system:
 - Due diligence done inside company – “Quality Control had to run start to finish inside a company”
 - Industry body - CSI is a verification body
 - CSI is authorized by CFIA; it required regulatory change.
 - Conducts audits of work by companies
- Getting started took:
 - Personnel recruitment
 - Auditor training
 - CFIA audit of CSI (and continues to)
 - CSI audits clients every 2 years
 - After 2 audits good performers can move to every 4 year audit cycle.

The group received a presentation by Susan Antler of the Compost Council on Composting Quality Alliance. Susan reviewed the new Composting Quality Alliance System which is providing standards in the compost section and may be officially recognized by CFIA. Susan provided the following information:

- Trying to develop the rules for an industry that didn't exist 20 years ago
- Diverse groups are involved in everything from businesses to municipalities (who are focused on waste diversion rather than product management)
- Goal: To further composting and compost use, to respect the regulations, and to add further value
- Important components:
 - Product standards
 - Regulatory support
 - Category marketing program
- “We could never pay for the advertising and promotion we get from our friends such as key garden organizations.”
- “We have to protect the reputation of the industry.”
- Want to market Compost Quality Alliance like a ‘Good Housekeeping Seal’
- Multi-jurisdiction responsibility for compost is a challenge
- Rules covered in the program are focused on environmental health and safety.
 - Items such as trace elements, foreign materials, maturity, pathogens
- Industry wants to include agronomic information
- Key Elements:
 - Voluntary individual quality program for compost
 - Standardized sampling
 - Appropriate testing
 - Appropriate product attributes and usage guidelines
- Benefits to Consumer: Ability to select right product for right use
- Benefits to Industry
 - Supports regulatory compliance
 - Enhances compost market development

- Builds industry reputation
- How it works
 - Open to all producers
 - Focused on product vs. process
 - Prescribed sampling frequency
 - Annual business arrangements to use CQA logo
 - Managed by industry
 - Parallels US program (CAP)
 - Testing reports go to company and Composting Council
 - Have selected testing methods
 - If product fails testing can be reworked and retested
 - Fee: \$700-\$1,000 per year
- Audits
 - Peer audits; members will audit companies for compliance
 - Proofing program

The following points were made in Questions & Answers with Presenters:

- CFIA was credited with being open to working on quality assurance programs.
- CFIA may be able to cut back on inspection levels creating more resources for enforcement.
- Definition of sale may need to be expanded to make it clear it is not just defined as an exchange of \$'s but also include transfer of material. A sale is defined in the Act so it may be complex to fix. Legal opinions tend to a narrower definition of "sale"
- Logo use is tied to selling into right stream rather than a "specific grade"
- CQA program applies to all composts regardless of feedstock (i.e. composting from manure or potato peels)
- CQA - Feedstock and trace elements need to be disclosed, but not necessarily shown on labels
- Quality assurance systems must at a minimum include CFIA rules
- CQA will accredit the labs based on using correct testing protocols
- It was noted that compost is more about soil amendments than fertilizer
- CFIA will focus its enforcement efforts on non-CQA members
- Conformity verification bodies like the CQA and CSI are not the regulatory bodies so non-conformance reports and complaints still go to CFIA
- CFIA recognizes conformity verification systems, as such they audit CSI and CQA as bodies rather than the labs or members in their programs.
- CFQAP did not succeed at creating marketing and branding value
- A quality assurance system needs to create consumer value
- CFIA received praise for helping get the CQA perfected
- CQA and CSI systems are quality management systems – fully documented with audit trail/traceability and sampling is part of these overall systems
- Scope of CSI program is more vast than the fertilizer sector. Retail sales have less stringent requirements than bulk samplers.

In general discussion, the group raised the following points:

- CFQAP
 - Fertilizer (NPKS) already have a program on quality
 - Addresses blending at retail
 - Has drifted and needs attention

- CFIA has issues with CFQAP:
 - Participation rate
 - Compliance rate
- CFIA noted that the failure to develop a logo and promote it has diminished value
- Consumers have moved on. Quality as defined in CFQAP is only a tiny portion of quality (i.e. consistency of blend – may help to explain to customer that blends have some variability of consistency)
- Role of Marketplace Monitoring
 - Reach of these groups was discussed – micronutrients, biosolids, supplements, compost/manure, inoculants, ag retail, lawn & garden, and pest/fertilizer
- CFIA noted that they have no formal expectations of the group but they applaud programs like CQA to find new ways to tackle these challenges. CFIA is happy to provide input on standards and performance indicators.
- CFIA willing to vary standards by segment (i.e. micronutrients, inoculants)
- Micronutrients are ISO approved companies, and most companies have a QA program of some sort.
- Fertilizer differs from seed – it is just really verifying an analytical standard
- Industry wants to be in compliance
- In U.S. they have to have a license for blending

Labelling Subgroup Meeting Report

Participants discussed current definitions of labeling and raised the following points:

- To work on labels we need proper definitions. The current definitions under Schedule IIA are 20-30 years old.
- AAPFCO update their definitions annually
- There is an opportunity to move the schedule out of regulations and into a departmental directive
- Suggest a regular (perhaps 5 year) review process

Action Items:

- It was agreed to create a document that has a side-by-side comparison of CFIA and AAPFCO definitions in a chart. It will be colour-coded to indicate areas of difference.

Participants discussed Harmonization and raised the following points:

- The goal of harmonizing all or most definitions with U.S. was discussed. It was agreed that this was desirable; CFIA noted total harmonization may not be possible but it could move that way.

With reference to Organic Definitions, the following points were made:

- Need to obtain draft of Canadian Organic standard definitions in an effort to harmonize with it and keep domestic definitions consistent
- The bottom line is the consumer – so “organic” needs to be aligned with the standard of production for organic.

Micronutrients key point:

- AAPFCO list contains them and the New Products work group would like to see them listed.

Inoculants key point:

- New Products work group talked about adding in.

Supplements key points:

- May also need fleshing out and identification
- It was suggested by CFIA that there be a trade-memo of definitions for use in regulations and guidelines. Schedule IIA would then be the exempt list. The concern is schedule IIA is more than a list of definitions.
- It was suggested the Steering Committee refer the full list of compiled definitions to send to New Products to review items for Schedule IIA inclusion.

Market Research key points:

- Possibility of conducting market research with customers was raised.
- There are two totally different audiences for issues such as lawn and garden (general consumer) and the professional side (golf courses, municipalities, lawn care and farmers).
- Feeling was the need to test a single core label option with multiple audiences rather than testing concept of multiple labels for multiple audiences
- Good labelling for consumers should include education to ensure safety, environmental protection, and proper use.
- First priority for testing is on end consumer products.
- Subgroup will gather existing labels and think up options for mock ups of changes.
 - What do they need for information?
 - Do they understand it?
- There are elements of the label that are prescribed and other may be best practices.

Action Items:

- Issues Ink to call for labels and “sanitized” version of any existing market research that companies are ready to share to collect information on the needs of the audience.

Regulatory Efficiency Working Group Meeting Report

The group reviewed the REWG Mandate and Terms of Reference and adopted them as presented.

The group identified a number of overlaps with New Products Working Group, noting that coordination will be the key to avoiding redundancy.

The group reviewed the T4-103 proposed revisions and provided the following feedback:

- Why are maps required for field trails? – They are required as per the precautionary principle to deal with any unintended outcomes.
- Why are maps required with 14 days? To be able to engage the Inspectors within a reasonable timeframe.

- Discussion on mapping issue – deferred to an ad hoc technical committee that will meet within one month (if possible) to provide detailed feedback on the CFIA proposed approach to mapping requirements.
- Could you please put an example map in the instruction package? - Yes
- What about the industry making other suggestions for regulatory refinements / improvements? They are welcome. Proposal should frame the issue, describing why it is a concern, the nature of its impacts, what change is proposed, how adequate protection measured would be retained and the rationale.
- Service Standards within s.6.2: Are the timelines outlined within the proposed changes reasonable? Deferred to an ad hoc technical committee that will meet within one month (if possible) to provide detailed feedback on the CFIA proposed approach to application timeline requirements.
- Would CFIA need to issue an authorization for a supplement? – Probably not.

The group made the following comments on the CFIA short-term Strategic Action Plan issues:

- Efficacy (item #6 within the SAP) is the highest priority. The REWG will strike a task team to deal with this issue on an urgent basis.

ACTION:

- Nominees for this Task Team should be sent to Richard by 15 December 2006.
- Anthony to send Richard a profile of the skills needs to effectively contribute to this Task Team. (Note: Please distribute directly using the attached list)

A prioritization exercise was undertaken where each participant was asked to identify what their priorities are within the SAP. Each participants was given three “sticky notes” and, after a line-by-line review of the CFIA SAP, were asked to identify three CFIA action items and quantify if their priorities should be achieved within year one or year two of the plan

It should be noted that the combination of company / industry representatives who were present for this session (see attached distribution list) had a direct impact on the outcome.

YEAR ONE		YEAR TWO	
Section	Votes	Section	Votes
5.1	3	5.2	1
6.1.3	2	6.1.2	1
6.1.5 and 6.2.5	4	6.4	1
6.2	2	10.1.3	3
13.3 and 13.4	13		
6.4	1		
15.2	2	15.2	2
35.5	1	18.1.11	1
37.2	1	37.1	1
39.2	1	44.1.4	1
44.1.2	1		

REWG Work Plan

It was agreed that, outside the CFIA SAP, there was additional work needed to help advance regulatory efficiency. The group brain-stormed a list of possible initiatives and then voted to determine the overall priority. Results are listed below:

Action Item	Votes
Develop efficacy standards	94
Process for tracking status of applications	85
Baseline study of economic impacts of current regulatory framework	78
Events / training on regulation	75
Develop standards for acceptability of industry research	75
Improve consistency (national) of CFIA responses	71
DACO Table – submission requirements	65
Non-traditional products / combinations	62
Conditional registration, similar to PMRA	50
24% NPK rule review	31

Communications and Operating Environment Working Group Meeting Report

The group discussed the role and mandate of COEWG and determined that it was to serve as an information and consultation link with both external (the general public, groups, departments and organizations outside of CFPF mandate or membership) and internal stakeholders (CFPF members).

Carla Ventin, CFPF Project Manager, provided an overview of some of the communications initiatives outlined in the grant application, including:

- Website
- Brochures and other publications (one pagers, newsletters, what is CFPF etc)
- Media relations (matt stories, Q&A's, backgrounders etc)
- CFPF brand and logo
- Electronic and printed publications related to working group reports

Participants discussed further and identified the following items, grouped by audience type:

External Audience	Internal Audience
Brochures	Member updates – quarterly
Website	Discussion board – website
Press release	Intranet - Minutes, agendas, calendar of meetings and events
Inclusive Database	Email / web contact as preferred choice
Key messages	24 hour notice for important or pressing issues that emerge
Articles in trade publications	Structure and format for minutes / agendas so they have a common look and feel and so members know where to look to determine if they need to provide input or respond

	Need a consultation plan to determine the type, frequency and format of communication with members, and the timing and type of information needed from them
	Review of working group reports from a communication perspective
	Need media spokesperson(s) from the Executive Committee identified, able to speak both languages

Further discussion included the need to fully consider:

- Ongoing sustainability of the organization – what happens at the end of the granting period? How is momentum maintained?
- Cost of website / logo / branding etc – measure and carefully consider expenditure of funds on member priorities, and be as cost effective as possible
- Need a clear distinction between the Canadian Fertilizer Institute and the CFPF – for transparency and accountability

The group identified the following items for **Immediate Priority (next 3 months):**

- Develop CFPF Key Messages
- Define Audiences and Audience Needs
- Identify and implement vehicles for communication:
- Websites (internal and external)
- Member Updates
- Calendar of Events
- Determine CFPF Contact information distinct from CFI to ensure transparency and accountability
- Identify CFPF Spokesperson(s)
- Create format for minutes / member updates to ensure clarity, consistency
- Develop procedure for getting input and sharing information – between Executive Committee, Working Groups, Members
- Develop a schedule/calendar of events and meetings

Short term priority (up to 6 months):

- Provide input/direction into consultation and communication plan
- Provide input/direction into development of strategic plan
- Review Working Group reports

Conclusion of Session

It became evident that improving efficacy regulation is one of the top priorities of the Forum. There was general agreement to create a Task Force solely focused on the issue and to focus on the immediate steps that can be taken to improve efficacy regulation so it does not continue to be a deterrent to new products. This issue and the creation of a Biosolids Work Group were referred to the Executive.

There is broad based consensus that the CFIA Strategic Action Plan and Work Group plans are sound but the ‘proof is in the pudding’. It is important that work get accomplished and progress is made. The goal is to have concrete items to report on and review (possibly approve) at the next Forum meeting.

CFIA indicated they would also be holding further consultations on their plan. The successful application for a grant from ACAA by the Interim Steering Committee was lauded. The Forum concluded on a positive tone and moved into its Annual General Meeting.

CFPF Annual General Meeting

Stephani Roy McCallum, Conference Co-Facilitator, reminded participants of the process used to select the interim Steering Committee last March. A number of volunteers offered to put the time and energy into creating the organization and applying for funding. Membership on the formal CFPF Executive Committee was to be decided at the present meeting.

Interim Steering Committee members included:

Volunteer	Organization
Craig Rickard (Acting Chair of CFPF)	Agrium
Catherine Jefferson	Canadian Water and Wastewater Association
Collin Gyles / Jereleen Bryden	Wolf Trax Inc.
Darrin Qualman	National Farmers Union
Mike Leslie	Grain Growers of Canada/Alberta Barley Commission
Paul Lefebvre	OABA Lawn & Garden Committee
Peter McCann	Plant Inoculants Canada
Susan Antler	Composting Council of Canada
Wendy Omvlee	Canadian Federation of Agriculture

The Interim Steering Committee members created the CFPF Terms of Reference which were distributed to all FPF members for comment in April 2006, and confirmed by the Interim Steering Committee in May 2006. Roy McCallum called for comments, questions or amendments to the Terms of Reference. No comments, questions or amendments were offered.

The Terms of Reference were formally adopted by the CFPF membership.

Roy McCallum indicated that a number of the existing volunteers have confirmed their interest and availability in continuing to serve on the Executive Committee. Nine voting positions are available (as outlined in the Terms of Reference). Roy McCallum noted those volunteers who are willing to serve again and then made a further call for volunteers or nominations from the floor. When none were forthcoming, members were asked to approve the Executive Committee membership. Members concurred. Roy McCallum indicated that there were also ex-officio members on the Executive Committee.

The membership of the Executive Committee will be reviewed at the CFPF Conference in the fall of 2007. Confirmed membership is as follows:

Volunteer	Organization
Craig Rickard (Chair of CFPF)	Agrium
Catherine Jefferson	Canadian Water and Wastewater Association
Jereleen Bryden	Wolf Trax Inc.
Darrin Qualman	National Farmers Union (shares a seat with Mike Leslie)
Mike Leslie	Grain Growers of Canada/Alberta Barley Commission (shares a seat with Darrin Qualman)
Paul Lefebvre	OABA Lawn & Garden Committee
Peter McCann	Plant Inoculants Canada
Susan Antler	Composting Council of Canada
Wendy Omvlee	Canadian Federation of Agriculture

Clyde Graham of the Canadian Fertilizer Institute was appointed as the Executive Director of CFPF. Carla Ventin is the project manager.

Appendix

Forum participants' evaluation:

Overall, comments about the Forum were very positive. It created constructive interaction between disparate parts of the industry. It also built a more constructive relationship with CFIA. CFIA's participation was praised. The primary point for improvement is increased availability of advance materials and to engage more environmental and consumer growth.

1. Overall, what parts of this forum had particular value for you? What did you enjoy most?

- Learning about CFIA and current issues in the fertilizer sector.
- Having everything brought together. Big picture.
- Very positive experience. Much progress made.
- Work Group discussions, especially on efficacy. To witness first hand the openness of the CFIA to change.
- Open discussion with stakeholders in a comfortable setting. Also CFIA interactions and availability to answer and comment on specifics.
- In my case, this was a learning experience. Particularly enjoyed CFIA's involvement.
- Meeting face to face with regulators.
- The chance to interact with members of the CFIA.
- Work Groups. Relationship building with CFIA.
- I enjoyed the discussions with industry and CFIA and the ideas for improvements generated. The facilitators were also really good.
- Presentations from the various panels
- Was first meeting – just understanding better what role of CFPF is. Enjoyed most: New Product Working Group & interaction with CFIA
- Working Group Discussions – Plenary where CFPF Stakeholders identify common issues: resulted in task force creation. Constructive discussions with regulators.
- The interaction with the group, the open discussions of “burning issues” and the willingness to make changes to the existing system
- Working Group Discussions. Networking.
- Efficacy Data Requirements
- Day 1 morning panels: - Future Industry - Regulatory Context. Joe Slater Excellent! More speakers from outside government
- Working Group on Regulatory Efficiency

2. Overall, what parts of this forum would you improve? How would you make improvements?

- Provide handouts in advance. Provide copies of presentations to take notes during presentations.
- Better pre-announcements, wider circulation.
- Use a process to “force” attendees to mix better, eg, different tables Am & PM.
- A more organized reception in a larger venue to allow for easier movement. It seemed a bit too crowded.
- The global review of regulations starting with why.
- This part is good to excellent. Keep it up!

- Clearer objectives for working groups. Clearer participation guidelines for working groups eg, sitting through T-103 revision when not involved in novel supplement industry.
- Making sure enough of all stakeholders are represented and we get their input. “Team building” exercises.
- More focus on action that has “demonstrated” changes in the existing system.
- Workgroup discussions if possible, don’t schedule them simultaneously. Stagger discussions.
- Use of good facilitators in working groups.
- More speakers from outside Ontario addressing regional issues better as there are issues efficacy and regulatory in different provinces. Clarification of efficacy versus new products.
- More discussion of Fertilizer Act and regulation improvement.

3. Who else do you think should be involved in discussion on these issues but wasn’t in attendance?

- CFIA inspectors.
- More groups from civil society.
- Consumer group.
- Maybe some technical investigators from CFIA.
- Are all major fertilizer companies represented now? If not, invite reps from companies not in attendance.
- I think most of the people were in attendance and contributed their part.
- Not certain.
- Outside Canada – “more Joe Slater’s.”
- PMRA

4. Did the process, facilitation, timing, location and set-up of the discussions have value for you? If so, what in particular did you enjoy?

- Excellent facilitation.
- Very useful to have all stakeholders in one place.
- Hotel worked well. Good space. Food good. Prices reasonable. Meeting organization/facilitation was great.
- Well done.
- Facilities were great. Location was great. Conference flow was also very good.
- The facilitation was very helpful in moving the process forward and added a lot of value to the whole experience. It also helped to generate ideas. Excellent location.... Good hotel, nice rooms, etc.
- Yes.
- Yes, the facilitation helped to keep the meeting on track.
- Maybe schedule things a little different – last afternoon a bit of a light agenda so people booked early flights.
- Yes. Excellent location and schedule of events.
- Ottawa is a good location; it’s central and close to CFIA and CFI for organizing reasons.
- Yes, the exercises were helpful and the mediators were well organized in keeping discussions on track and pleasant.

- Process – on track. Facilitation – excellent. Timing – excellent. Location – good. All had value and were important to the success of the forum. I enjoyed the networking opportunity.
- Yes, the plenary session question/comment periods.
- The facilitation at plenary could be CFIA staff?
- Extreme value. Networking provided highest value.

5. Are there improvements you would make to the process, facilitation, timing, location and set-up of the discussions? Please tell us what you would change.

- All OK. (5 people said no changes or improvements needed)
- Had difficulty finding background information prior to the meeting. Had to ask for minutes of March 06 meeting – should have been available on CFIA website.
- Having meetings after 8:00am may help with attendance at workgroup meetings.
- Nothing, but be prepared for future growth as I think many more would like to participate.
- Facilitation good. Location good. Different rooms for workgroups.
- Continue at this level for now. Can be reviewed again at a later meeting.
- Fewer “random” questions.
- If possible – don’t schedule workgroups simultaneously.
- Use of good facilitators in working groups.
- Might be useful to include discussion on compost regs/ biosolids issues particularly issues in Ontario to educate us/them and potentially influence at this forum.

6. Are there issues you would like to discuss at the next meeting that weren’t considered or addressed at this time? Please tell us what they are.

- Optimal use of fertilizers. Best management practices.
- Encourage participants from industry to raise issues that directly affect their business.
- Will ponder this and e-mail.
- Yes we need to find a way to keep the CFIA listening to our concerns now and in the future.
- Internet advertising? Open this up for a “small” discussion as that CFPF and CFIA can start addressing this issue – excellent playing field – unregistered product.
- Sampling requirements.
- The global review of regulations starting with why.
- Interdepartmental (CFIA – PMRA) cooperation – potential future technology combinations.
- Working group on “file” movement through the system should be initiated and that should’ve been pursued further.
- Biosolids tie in – illuminates issue of provincial differences – how to address this eg, hurdles in Ontario
- Product crossing the border not regulated or registered in Canada.

7. *Do you have any other comments that you'd like to share?*

- Lack of documentation on forum content prior to meeting. *Lack of list of delegates as part of documentation packages.
- I think the collaboration between CFIA and industry will help address shortcomings. Many other government agencies would benefit from a similar collaboration.
- Should include a dinner to keep people together in the evening and improve teamwork.
- Next time – double sided photocopying please. Second meeting that double sided photocopying has not been done. (2 comments)
- Breakfast and lunch provided, encouraged discussion. Please repeat this.
- Participation of CFIA excellent, of much value and greatly appreciated.
- Great work so far!! Results will determine future success.
- Excellent job!