



**ONTARIO PORK**

---

# Response to Resolutions

2009



January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Dear Councillors, Alternates, Presidents, and Secretaries,

On behalf of the Resolutions Committee I thank all of the delegates to the Annual General Meeting for participating in the resolution process. This booklet contains responses to the resolutions received by Ontario Pork both at the Annual Meeting and as interim resolutions over the year.

I encourage each of you to read and consider the responses given. Further questions pertaining to the issues outlined in these resolutions can be directed to the Board through your local Board Director or directly to the staff at the office.

Sincerely,

Beth Clark  
Chair,  
Resolutions Committee

2009/2010 Committee Members

Beth Clark  
Ben Dekker  
John DeVries  
Rod de Wolde  
John Lammers  
Barb Zettler



## **INDEX OF RESOLUTION GROUPINGS**

<b>SAFETY NETS</b>	
Resolution 1	1
Resolution 2	3
<b>SAFETY NETS – RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY</b>	
Resolution 6	4
Resolution 7	5
<b>MARKETING STRUCTURE</b>	
Resolution 9	6
Resolution 10	8
<b>ELECTORAL STRUCTURE</b>	
Resolution 14	9
<b>STRATEGIC PLANNING</b>	
Resolution 17	10
<b>INTERIM RESOLUTION RESPONSES 2009</b>	11
<b>COMPETITION/TRADE</b>	
Resolution A	11
Resolution B	11
Resolution C	12
Resolution D	13
<b>FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING COMMISSION</b>	
Resolution E	14
<b>HYDRO</b>	
Resolution F	14
<b>LOBBYING</b>	
Resolution G	15
Resolution H	16
Resolution I	17
Resolution J	18
<b>PRODUCTION INSURANCE</b>	
Resolution K	19
<b>PROMOTION</b>	
Resolution L	19
Resolution M	20
Resolution N	21
Resolution O	21
<b>RECOVERY PLAN</b>	
Resolution P	22
Resolution Q	23
<b>SLAUGHTER</b>	
Resolution R	24
<b>TAXES</b>	
Resolution S	24
<b>TRANSIT</b>	
Resolution T	25
Resolution U	25
<b>APPENDIX ONE - November 2009 Policy Day Summary</b>	26
<b>APPENDIX TWO – Strategic Plan Overview</b>	33



# SAFETY NETS

## Resolution 1 - Response

Ontario Pork has been clear in efforts to ensure fairness in any additional program payments. This is a big part of the reason that Ontario Pork supported the Canadian Pork Council position that governments should make a payment to hog producers based on each hog shipped in 2008. The Pork Council's requested loan program would be targeted at existing production.

The original ask of a Federal \$30/head payment was rejected by the Federal Government due to probable trade issues.

Since that time, the Federal Loan Program and Transition Program have been announced and applications to both programs came online in October.

In late May of 2009, Ontario Pork presented a comprehensive ask, giving extensive data on the importance of the hog/pork sector to the Ontario economy as well as a clear indication that reducing Ontario production to under 90,000 hogs/week would lead to the loss of a processor and the ensuing fall out.

The Minister was categorically opposed to the idea of providing any further type of ad hoc funding to the sector. There was interest in providing dollars for innovation to the sector. Ontario Pork has also been told that our industry has become too divided on several issues for the government to be able to discern what is really being requested of them.

At the September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 Special Meeting there was an endorsement by councillors of the **Ontario Pork Focus - Six Key Provincial Strategies:**

1. Help to producers exiting the industry.
2. Help to producers who are remaining - investments in farm upgrading, safety and bio security measures, fairer business risk management programs.
3. Initiatives to grow Ontario consumer market – capitalize on consumer and food service demand for local product.
4. Initiatives to renew industry through new products and value, address market evolution on issues related to animal welfare e.g. loose housing.
5. Establish an improved industry forum to accelerate industry adaptation and evolution across supply chain.
6. Investigate and pursue unfair trade practices – including but not limited to ASRA – develop a coalition with partners.

Also, at this meeting the three top areas for immediate focus identified by the councillor body were:

1. Level the playing field within Canada and between Canada and the U.S. Specifically, Ontario Pork was asked to challenge the Quebec ASRA program.
2. Develop the domestic Ontario market. This would include promotion, consumer education, and an "Ontario brand" strategy. A roundtable made up of producers, processors, retailers and government would facilitate the development of the domestic market and would promote profit sharing through the value chain.
3. Lobby for short-term funding for producers.

Resources and energy have been and will continue to be focused on the direction given.

The November 2009 Policy Day provided an opportunity to update councillors on our activities related to these areas. A summary from the November 2009 Policy Day is attached in the addendum. **See appendix one.**

### **Resolution 1**

#### ***For Debate***

**Whereas** the Provincial OCHHP payment used 2000-2004 based figures provided by the Federal Government from the Cost of Production payment, which then were used by the Federal KickStart-AgriInvest program, and;

**Whereas** these old numbers do not reflect 2007-2008 actual losses suffered by pork producers, and;

**Whereas** Minister Dombrowsky has stated that the OCHHP payment does not relate to the 2007 and 2008 production years, and;

**Whereas** Producers suffered large losses due to fluctuation in the dollar and feed grain prices and low market hog prices in 2007 and 2008 years,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork ask both levels of government for a direct payment program for producers who actually were in business in 2007-2008.

**Submitted by:** *Oxford County*

**Amendment:** the payment be based on 2008 production numbers

Voted on amendment - Total Votes 120 Total Yes – 109 Total No – 11 PASSED

## **Resolution 2 - Response**

Ontario Pork did ask the Provincial Minister of Agriculture for a payment to offset the shortfalls of the Ontario Cattle, Hog and Horticulture Payment (OCHHP). However, the Provincial Minister was clear that there would be no subsequent payments related to the program. It was clear that continuing to ask for this type of help would be detrimental to any efforts to receive further support from the provincial government.

Ontario Pork has been very fair in its support of the Beginning Farmer group when they first formed in early 2008, to challenge their treatment in the OCHHP. Ontario Pork made extensive efforts to lobby the government on this issue. We hosted a forum to coordinate the group, and supplied a consultant and technical resources to formalize an official ask to the provincial government. These requests were subsequently denied.

Ontario Pork has since requested the Beginning Farmer group join the efforts of the larger industry. It has been made abundantly clear to Ontario Pork that further actions by the Beginning Farmer group would be detrimental to all producers. Ontario Pork has determined that for the good of the entire industry (including Beginning Farmer group members) more can be achieved by moving on from the issue. This message has been communicated to the Beginning Farmer group.

Ontario Pork continues to focus on short and long-term activities to support the entire industry.

## **Resolution 2**

**Whereas** many beginning and expanding farmers were left out, or treated unfairly by the OCHHP payment,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork lobby for future payment programs that address these inadequacies and level the playing field for all ACTIVE pork producers.

**Submitted by:** *Oxford County*

# SAFETY NETS – RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

## **Resolution 6 - Response**

Significant work has been done in this area. The November 2009 Policy Day contained an extensive discussion of the Business Risk Management (BRM) topic. A presentation was made by Ken McEwan, Professor of Production Economics & Agribusiness University of Guelph, Ridgetown College to provide information followed by group discussion. For notes from Policy Day **see appendix one.**

Ontario continues to strategize and work within the Ontario Agriculture Sustainability Coalition (OSAC) which is comprised of The Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA); Ontario Cattlemen's Association, Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Ontario Pork, Ontario Veal, Ontario Sheep Marketing Association and is supported by the Grain Growers of Ontario. The key objectives of this Coalition are to lobby for a level playing field in Agriculture and to assist in developing provincial strategies for achieving this. The latest planned activity is a cross-commodity lobby of MPPs and MPs coordinated by OASC leader OFA with participation by local producers.

## **Resolution 6**

**Whereas** the Risk Management Program (RMP) has been developed for Grains and Oilseeds producers, and has been supported by the provincial government, and;

**Whereas** the AgriStability Program (CAIS) does not effectively work for all hog farmers,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork fund a study for a Cost of Production Program (similar to RMP) for the Hog Industry, encompassing a new vision for safety nets with multiple options and an open minded approach to sustainable hog production in Ontario.

**Submitted by:** *Durham Region*

## **Resolution 7 - Response**

The primary role of Business Risk Management (BRM) programs should be to create a sustainable agricultural industry through income stabilization and (when necessary) income support. A level playing field between provinces is essential to avoid major distortions in the market place.

### **Ontario Pork's recommendations for AgriStability are the following:**

1. With the introduction of the AgriInvest Program to replace the top tier of CAIS, that producers be given the better of AgriStability Tier 1 or AgriInvest.
2. That AgriStability reference margins be adjusted to include BSE payments, circovirus proxy payments and other program payments for 2007 and 2008.
3. That for the purpose of calculating the AgriStability reference margin, that producers be given the better of the Olympic average or previous three years average.
4. Since a significant number of producers will be eliminated from the AgriStability program due negative margins and the viability test, that the AgriStability program be amended to remove the viability test for negative margin coverage.
5. That negative margin coverage in the AgriStability program be increased from 60% to 70%.
6. While not a program amendment, that government continues the current practice of waiving structural change in the AgriStability program when industry conditions warrant.

### **Ontario Agriculture Sustainability Coalition (OASC)**

The OASC is comprised of The Ontario Federation of Agriculture; Ontario Cattlemen's Association, Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Ontario Pork, Ontario Veal, Ontario Sheep Marketing Association and supported by the Grain Growers of Ontario. The key objectives of this Coalition are to lobby for a level playing field in Agriculture and to assist in developing provincial strategies for achieving this.

### **Key Messages:**

- Ontario is losing its farming sector and its ability to produce local food.
- Governments need to take immediate action to preserve local food production.
- Farmers have developed affordable plans that will help them grow the economy.
- Investing in agriculture pays dividends – it will grow our rural and urban economies.
- Canada needs to partner with the provinces for business risk management programming.
- Ad hoc payments come too little too late.
- Agriculture needs the federal government to come to the table with their 60 per cent share.

In the fall of 2009, Ontario Pork participated in an OMAFRA led program evaluation of the Risk Management Program. Ontario Pork's comments to OMAFRA highlighted that *"with 24% of program participants identified as livestock producers and with swine producers representing a large share of this group, it is essential that the Risk Management Program be made effective for livestock producers if it is going to continue."*

Ontario Pork's submission also stated that *"In order to be effective in stabilizing the incomes of livestock farmers who grow crops the linkage to AgriStability should be removed or changed so that the RMP program is treated similar to production insurance for the purpose of calculating provincial payments."*

### **Resolution 7**

**Whereas** the Risk Management Program (RMP) has been developed to offset losses in the Grains and Oilseeds sector, and;

**Whereas** RMP payments were clawed back from AgriStability (CAIS) payments,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork lobby the government to decouple Risk Management from AgriStability (CAIS).

**Submitted by:** Durham Region

## **MARKETING STRUCTURE**

### **Resolution 9 - Response**

As the hog marketing environment may potentially be changing, the need for a financial protection program to cover loss of revenue in the event of a default in payment when hogs are sold in Ontario is being investigated.

A committee was formed in the fall of 2008 with members representing the sector through Ontario Pork directors, producers, marketers and federally inspected processors. Members have been examining the need for a financial protection program for the swine industry, similar to the Ontario Beef Financial Protection Program. A proposed program could initially be implemented for market hogs and other swine classes could be added at a later date.

An actuarial study, commissioned by Ontario Pork, and follow up analysis was completed in June 2009. This will drive early decisions around the program structure for market hogs. Most importantly the setting of the premium level/hog will be determined. Background information on the FPP topic as well as key findings of the Actuarial Study were shared with councillors in the White Papers developed for the November 2009 Policy Day. These papers are available on the OP website under the heading Producers – Presentations and Updates.

Councillor feedback during Policy Day provided guidance on the Financial Protection Plan. A producer consultation is being offered during January County Meetings to present the results of the actuarial study and engage you in meaningful discussions on the proposed program elements.

### **Resolution 9**

**Whereas** the Farm Products Marketing Commission is stripping back the powers of Ontario Pork, and;

**Whereas** Ontario Pork is severing off the marketing and sales department and therefore no longer able to use its reserve funds for financial protection, and;

**Whereas** the Ontario Pork industry will have no financial protection plan in place in the event of a processor becoming insolvent, and;

**Whereas** pork producers cannot bear any financial losses due to processor insolvency, which American producers have protection against,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork assist in developing a financial protection plan and solicit the Ontario government to agree to administer and provide the funds for such a plan before the implementation of the Farm Product Marketing Commission's decision.

**Submitted by:** *Wellington County*

### **Resolution 10 - Response**

It was the recommendation of the Resolutions Committee to the Board that this resolution be used as evidence during the Farm Products Appeal Tribunal. This recommendation was passed by the Board at the June 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 Board meeting:

**It was duly moved and seconded that at the appropriate time in the Tribunal hearing process, the Board will submit Resolution 10 and the results as evidence. MOTION CARRIED**

The Farm Products Marketing Commission ruling was heard by the Tribunal during the months of November and December 2009. A ruling is expected by the end of January 2010 to provide clarity on the directions and marketing options for producers.

### **Resolution 10**

**Whereas** Farm Products Marketing Commission has brought down a decision to change our marketing system, and;

**Whereas** the decision is being imposed upon producers in a very aggressive time frame,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork lobby for much more direct producer input into developing the final plan.

**Submitted by:** *Grey-Bruce County*

# ELECTORAL STRUCTURE

## **Resolution 14 – Response**

The October 6th Order of the Farm Products Marketing Commission directed Ontario Pork “to align its governance model with the current industry size and structure”. As the proposed governance structure is being appealed to the Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs Appeal Tribunal, direction from the Tribunal is required prior to action being taken on this resolution.

The November 2009 Policy Day provided an opportunity to update councillors on our activities related to these areas and gather feedback. A summary from the November 2009 Policy Day is attached in the addendum. **See appendix one.**

Further consultations are now being organized. The working group was recently expanded to include councillors from each zone and a meeting with county presidents and secretaries was held on December 22<sup>nd</sup> to review and discuss items related to the electoral reform process (elections, alternates, constitutions, grants, etc.).

## **Resolution 14**

**Whereas** the new governance proposal calls for 80 Councillors to be elected at the district level rather than the county level, and;

**Whereas** it appeared that the Councillor body at Policy Day preferred Councillor by county, and;

**Whereas** the role of the Councillor is to focus on policy creation, and;

**Whereas** policy creation should benefit and reflect the opinions and needs of all producers, and;

**Whereas** there are areas, particularly in the districts of the proposed Zone Three east of Toronto where the number of producers are significantly less and distributed over a very large geographical area, possibly impacting the cohesiveness and policy participation efforts of the districts,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork change its position on governance structure so that in areas where producer representation is geographically challenged, Councillor Representation be determined by county instead of Councillor by district.

**Submitted by:** *Durham Region*

# STRATEGIC PLANNING

## **Resolution 17 - Response**

The Ontario Pork Board of Directors announced the appointment of Ken Ovington as the General Manager for the organization effective November 4, 2009.

For over 10 years Mr. Ovington has been focused on business development, strategic planning, production expertise, and business operations which have prepared him well for this challenging role. He has served on various provincial and national committees, executing numerous projects and initiatives.

## **Resolution 17**

**Whereas** Ontario Pork has been without a CEO since April, and;

**Whereas** without having a CEO is perceived as being a weak link,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork get on with having a CEO from within or outside the organization.

**Submitted by:** *Simcoe County*

---

# Interim Resolutions Response 2009

## COMPETITION/TRADE

### **Resolution A - Response – Competition Bureau**

This resolution will be taken to the Board for further consideration and direction.

### **Resolution A - Competition Bureau**

**Whereas** the Competition Bureau has the right to investigate unfair competition in the market place, and;

**Whereas** pork meat in our large grocery store chains seem to undercut our locally priced meat by a substantial margin,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork look into getting the Competition Bureau to investigate the possibility of unfair competition in the market place.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

### **Resolution B - Response - Unfair Competition**

This resolution will be taken to the Board for further consideration and direction and to be formally passed on to the Canadian Pork Council.

### **Resolution B - Unfair Competition**

**Whereas** it is fairly evident that the United States and Quebec have been "dumping" pork into Ontario at below their cost of production, and;

**Whereas** this is against International Trade rules under the W.T.O. and NAFTA,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork request the Canadian Pork Council to get the Competition Bureau to investigate the possibility of unfair competition in the market place.

**Submitted by:** *Wellington County – September 2009*

### **Resolution C - Response - Ontario-Quebec Trade and Co-operation Agreement**

Ontario Pork has joined the Ontario Agriculture Sustainability Coalition (OASC). We are represented at the OASC by the Ontario Pork Board Chair, the Chair of the Safety Net Committee and appropriate staff .The OASC is comprised of The Ontario Federation of Agriculture; Ontario Cattlemen's Association, Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Ontario Pork, Ontario Veal, Ontario Sheep Marketing Association and supported by the Grain Growers of Ontario. The key objectives of this Coalition are to lobby for a level playing field in Agriculture and to assist in developing provincial strategies for achieving this.

Ontario Pork, along with the federally inspected processors has sent correspondence to the Provincial Minister of Agriculture asking her to utilize the "forum" within the Agreement to discuss this issue with Quebec.

### **Resolution C - Ontario-Quebec Trade and Co-operation Agreement**

**Whereas** the Pork industry in Ontario is facing increasing pork imports coming from the US and increasingly from Quebec, and:

**Whereas** Quebec pork producers benefit from a safety-net program known as ASRA that provides support to cover their cost-of-production, and:

**Whereas** the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec signed a trade and Cooperation Agreement on September 11, 2009, and:

**Whereas** this will give the Quebec pork industry open access to the Ontario market for pork, and;

**Whereas** this agreement gives an unfair advantage to Quebec pork producers and allows subsidized pork into the Ontario market, and:

**Whereas** by signing this agreement with Quebec, the Ontario Government has a duty on behalf of the Ontario pork industry to provide a similar business structure for Ontario pork producers,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork demand an equivalent financial support to ASRA here in Ontario from the province of Ontario to create a harmonized trading environment between Ontario and Quebec and to do so immediately.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – October 2009*

## **Resolution D - Response - Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling**

Ontario Pork is supportive of voluntary labeling. Ontario Pork as a member of the Canadian Pork Council is supportive of the World Trade Organization challenge currently underway against United States mandatory Country of Origin Labeling as it violates WTO rules. At this time, to pursue mandatory labeling at home would be contradictory to efforts to have it removed in the U.S.

Ontario Pork promotes country of origin identifiers through Pork Marketing Canada to identify Canadian pork products.



**Logo:** Look for the red and white Canadian Pork label in the meat case.

The "Choose Canadian" program provides consumers with an opportunity to choose pork in the meat case that has been clearly labeled with a Canadian Pork sticker; this is a voluntary program that retailers can participate in.

### **Resolution D - Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling**

**Whereas** imported meat continues to come into our domestic market with improper labels which consumers cannot identify the county of origin, and;

**Whereas** there is a growing concern from consumers to buy local, and;

**Whereas** the Product of Canada and Made in Canada labels are too confusing for the consumer to identify which is which,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork push both levels of government to force a mandatory Country of Origin label on all products no matter where they come from.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

# FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING COMMISSION

## **Resolution E - Response - Farm Products Marketing Commission**

Ontario Pork sent in their submission to the Tribunal with regards to the upcoming appeals hearing that was due on November 5th, 2009. The submission was based upon Ontario Pork's Strategic Plan which was sent to councillors and presented at the November 2009 Policy Day Conference. The Appeal Tribunal hearings are now finished and the decision is pending.

## **Resolution E - Farm Products Marketing Commission**

**Whereas** Ontario Pork is required by the tribunal to clarify its position about Marketing, and;

**Whereas** directors of Ontario Pork have indicated that they would support the original decision of the Farm Products Marketing Commission, and;

**Whereas** Grey/Bruce pork producers feel that this oversteps the mandate given at the June 11, 2008 special meeting of the councillors,

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork directors support and put forward the strategic direction plan supported by the councillor body.

**Submitted by:** *Grey-Bruce County – August 2009*

# HYDRO

## **Resolution F - Response - Hydro Rate Increases**

This resolution refers to a general farm organization issue and will be forwarded to the Provincial General Farm Organizations.

Producers are reminded that they can approach their General Farm Organizations at a County level when situations or issues affect multiple commodities as well.

## **Resolution F - Hydro Rate Increases**

**Whereas** Hydro One is applying for rate increases;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario pork send a letter to the energy board opposing the increases and encourage other commodity groups and individual producers to do the same.

**Submitted by:** *Elgin County – September 2009*

# LOBBYING

## **Resolution G - Response - Lobby Government (swine flu)**

Ontario Pork in cooperation with the Canadian Pork Council approached the Federal Government to address this issue. The following is a press release sent out by government requesting the use of the proper term of Pandemic H1N1 be used.

### ***Call the Flu H1N1 Because the Swine Are Fine***

*By Gerry Ritz  
Federal Minister of Agriculture*

**OTTAWA, Ontario, June 24, 2009** –When Canadian families go to the grocery store they can be confident about putting Canadian pork in their shopping carts because they know it is safe.

Unfortunately, the challenges facing our farm families in the pork industry are being compounded because some Canadian media outlets continue to use inaccurate and unclear terminology when reporting on the H1N1 influenza virus.

Clarity and accuracy are the hallmarks of good journalism so it is frustrating for Canadian hog farmers to see reporters continue to use the incorrect and inaccurate term "swine flu."

Canadians know and understand the term H1N1 influenza. International scientific authorities, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), refer to this virus as H1N1 influenza and have clearly stated that properly cooked pork is safe. When Canadians are talking about it around the water cooler they refer to the virus as H1N1. This virus is called H1N1 influenza because that is its name.

Canadian hog farmers already have enough problems on their plate with international market instability and volatile currency exchange rates. The last thing they need is completely unnecessary misconceptions created by unclear and inaccurate media reports. I have one simple request for responsible reporters across Canada: when you are reporting on H1N1 influenza, please use the proper name. Canadians will appreciate the clarity and accuracy and so will Canadian hog farmers.

## **Resolution G - Lobby Government (swine flu)**

That Ontario Pork encourage the Ministers of Agriculture, Ministers of Health (federal and provincial) and heads of both federal and provincial governments to encourage and require all media in the province of Ontario and Canada to refrain from using the term "Swine Flu" and to call it by its proper name, "Novel H1N1 Flu."

(This is a similar request made by USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack to the Media outlets in the U.S.)

***Submitted by: Middlesex County – September 2009***

## **Resolution H - Response - Lobby Government (short term support)**

Ontario Pork is asking for interim payments on risk management programs.

The Ontario Agricultural Sustainability Coalition (OASC) has been formed to address such issues. The OASC is comprised of The Ontario Federation of Agriculture; Ontario Cattlemen's Association, Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association, Ontario Pork, Ontario Veal, Ontario Sheep Marketing Association and supported by the Grain Growers of Ontario.

### **Key Messages of the Coalition are:**

- Ontario is losing its farming sector and its ability to produce local food.
- Governments need to take immediate action to preserve local food production.
- Farmers have developed affordable plans that will help them grow the economy.
- Investing in agriculture pays dividends – it will grow our rural and urban economies.
- Canada needs to partner with the provinces for business risk management programming.
- Ad hoc payments come too little too late.
- Agriculture needs the federal government to come to the table with their 60 per cent share.

### **Background:**

Ontario agriculture has a long and proud history. Our province was built on a progressive and productive farming and food processing industry. A strong and diverse agriculture sector can sustain our rural communities, provide healthy locally produced food for Ontarians, contribute to an improved environment, reduce the environmental footprint of the food we eat and accelerate our whole economy to help make Ontario a stronger and more vibrant province.

Without immediate action our respective sectors will face irreparable harm that will snowball to significant and long term impacts on our rural economy and communities. Farm gate prices have not kept pace with cost increases for labour, fertilizer, fuel and other farm inputs. The wild and unpredictable fluctuation in the dollar has stifled export sales. Current government Business Risk Management (BRM) programs like the AgriStability program are not enough to help farmers cope with today's market conditions. We need immediate adjustments to the AgriStability program and to the calculation of reference margins to account for low to negative margins.

We also need the federal government's commitment to provide funding to the provinces to address BRM programming gaps.

We cannot wait three years for the next Growing Forward framework for changes to be made to the current government BRM programs.

### **Ontario Agricultural Industry Snapshot:**

- Primary agriculture – 57,000 farms, 43,700 hired full time equivalents,
- \$10 billion in farm cash receipts
- Agri-food industry – 740,000 employed, \$28 billion industry
- Agriculture is second largest economic contributor and the third largest employer in Ontario.

### **Resolution H - Lobby Government (short term support)**

**Whereas** Pork producers are experiencing unprecedented hardship and turmoil due to the current market price situation, and;

**Whereas** Pork Producers look to and expect Ontario Pork to be the industry leader and the collective voice of all producers, and;

**Whereas** Pork Producers need both long and short term direction and support from the Ontario Pork Producers Marketing Board (OPPMB), and;

**Whereas** there is a growing feeling that Ontario Pork is not providing short term leadership and communication for producers;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork needs to become more assertive/aggressive with both the provincial and federal governments to achieve more short term support for our industry, on behalf of ALL pork producers.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

### **Resolution I - Response - Lobby Government (Agricultural Policy)**

This is ongoing as part of Ontario Pork's government relations process. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture is working on a National Food Strategy and Ontario Pork has been and will continue to participate in these discussions.

### **Resolution I - Lobby Government (Agricultural Policy)**

**Whereas** our country does not have an agricultural policy which would support our farmers, and;

**Whereas** most countries that have a healthy agriculture industry have an agricultural policy which protects and supports their farmers, and;

**Whereas** a healthy agriculture industry gives that country a safe food supply which they have control over;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork lobby both levels of government to develop food policy that will protect our food source.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

## **Resolution J - Response - Provincial Government Lobbying**

This resolution has been taken as direction for the organization. Please see Ontario Pork's Strategic Direction Plan overview attached as **appendix two**.

### **Resolution J - Provincial Government Lobbying**

**Whereas** the Ontario Pork Industry contributes more than \$4.7 billion and 33,000 jobs from the farm gate to the consumer, and;

**Whereas** the current financial stress on the Ontario pork industry will only get worse in the next 5 to 6 months according to the futures, and;

**Whereas** all other major hog producing provinces received support from their provincial governments during the last 12 months, and;

**Whereas** Ontario's provincial government has not given Ontario's producers a level playing field with Quebec and the US;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork increase the lobby effort on behalf of all producers here in Ontario to our provincial government for an immediate investment as well as the longer term ideas currently being discussed to help keep our pork industry here in Ontario.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

# PRODUCTION INSURANCE

## Resolution K - Response - Death Losses

Production insurance has the potential to address catastrophic losses and producers are encouraged to examine their insurance policies to confirm what is covered.

The Board has been provided direction by their partners in the In-Transit Loss Account (processors and truckers) that they are not interested in resurrecting the program and a preliminary review of the costs to producers of a producer-only funded program make it prohibitive in this current economic climate. Also, what constitutes “special extreme losses” would need to be defined and minimum/maximum numbers, specific circumstances and ideas of who should fund the coverage and to what level all need to be considered.

## Resolution K - Death Losses

**Whereas** some producers sometimes can suffer heavy death losses in special cases;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork look at establishing a system to cover special extreme losses.

**Submitted by:** Elgin County – September 2009

# PROMOTION

## Resolution L - Response - Retail food stores

Ontario Pork works with Pork Marketing Canada (PMC) on these types of initiatives. Ontario Pork staff has approached all major retail stores and encouraged them to identify their Canadian pork products with a “Choose Canadian” label.



There is only one retailer that buys **exclusively** US fresh pork and that is Costco.

Costco claims that the Canadian processors cannot meet their demands – in quantity, price and quality.

All of the other Canadian retailers would prefer to buy only Canadian, but the US pricing is so low that they will not, at times, pass it up. They assure us that regular pork is Canadian and that for all features (the front page flyer ads for their individual stores), they send a request out to the 3 large Canadian processors to get pricing. Rarely is a Canadian processor however able to meet the pricing that the US processors give them. Unfortunately, the vast majority of consumers are very price conscious, particularly during these hard times. That is why you often see cheap meat on the front page of the flyer – it drives people into the store and then they often do all of their shopping in that store.

If we could produce a differentiated product and convince consumers that it is worth paying more for, then the Canadian farmers would win. This of course will take time, but something that Ontario Pork is actively pursuing.

#### **Resolution L - Retail food stores**

That Ontario Pork approach large retail food stores to encourage them to obtain, feature and sell Canadian/Ontario pork in their stores. If they refrain from the request, determine the reason why.

**Submitted by:** *Middlesex County – September 2009*

#### **Resolution M - Response - Develop Pork Products**

This resolution has been taken as direction for the organization. Please see Ontario Pork's Strategic Direction Plan overview attached as **appendix two**.

#### **Resolution M - Develop Pork Products**

**Whereas** our Pork industry needs to gain a bigger share of the domestic market, and:

**Whereas** Pork products in our grocery stores and fast food outlets lack consumer friendly products compared to chicken products, and:

**Whereas** there are companies that are in the business of creating new consumer friendly food products;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork investigate the possibility of developing more user friendly consumer pork products.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

### **Resolution N - Response - Promoting Hellmann's Video**

As the accuracy of the Hellman's video and the information it provides cannot be verified and has been questioned by many in the industry it is not felt that Ontario Pork can confidently promote it. However, the video does draw the conclusion that consumers should try and source locally grown products when available and Ontario Pork strongly supports and promotes this message.

### **Resolution N - Promoting Hellmann's Video**

**Whereas** the majority of consumers have lost touch with where their food supply comes from, and;

**Whereas** most consumers prefer to have locally grown food instead of imported food because of food safety and food sovereignty reasons, and;

**Whereas** Hellmann's have created a video that does an excellent job of telling consumers what is going on with our food supply over the last number of years;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork investigates the possibility of promoting this video by which ever means it can (get other commodities involved and maybe both levels of government) to as many consumers as possible.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

### **Resolution O - Response - Local Pork Promotion**

This resolution has been taken as direction for the organization; it is part of Ontario Pork's Strategic Direction Plan.

Included in the Strategic Direction Plan is the following strategy:

"Drive innovative product development" includes initiatives such as research, consumer relations and value chain coordination. Measures of success regarding Ontario Pork's efforts to drive innovative product development include independent research and research by master's students regarding pork consumption. Ontario Pork may also commission pork usage studies and consumer awareness and attitude studies. Lastly, the number of partnerships between Ontario Pork and various companies, "Foodies", and other industry organizations will help to measure the success of the initiatives that support Ontario Pork's effort to drive innovative product development.

Ontario Pork has also developed a Local Food Promotion Plan for 2010:

The purpose of the plan is to continue to build awareness of Ontario pork products and to promote the benefits of pork to an expanded consumer market. As well, this project will foster increased awareness of the contributions of Ontario Pork and pork producers in the province.

By developing consumer marketing materials and communications that showcase the Ontario Pork logo and its relationship with Ontario pork producers and locally-raised pork products, the consumer will be able to not only better identify our product, but feel confident that purchasing pork within the province strengthens the economy, reduces the carbon footprint on our environment, and recognizes the contribution our pork producers make to the community.

The consumer awareness project will hit consumers multiple ways through radio, internet, print, and visually at urban transit centres.

- Transit signage
- Video recipes
- Radio spots
- Television cooking demonstrations

### **Resolution O - Local Pork Promotion**

**Whereas** there seems to be a movement by consumers to purchase more locally grown and raised food, and;

**Whereas** many grocery stores do not properly identify most of the meat in their counters thus leaving consumers unable to recognize our Ontario raised pork;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork place more effort in domestic promotion and labeling of Ontario raised pork and solicit our governments to assist with some funding.

**Submitted by:** *Wellington County – October 2009*

## **RECOVERY PLAN**

### **Resolution P - Response - Recovery Plan**

The Ontario Pork Safety Net Committee met with members of the Grassroots Campaign to present their recovery plan for the industry. There was good discussion and open exchange of ideas among the group. Ontario Pork outlined the current initiative that is underway with the Ontario Ministry of Food and Rural Affairs. Ken McEwan Professor of Production Economics & Agribusiness University of Guelph, Ridgetown College was also on hand to provide information and insight on topics discussed, such as the prospect of developing a risk management plan, ASRA, creating a level playing field, and political strategy. Many of the comments put forth by the Grassroots Campaign have been incorporated into Ontario Pork's long term plan.

### **Resolution P - Recovery Plan**

**Whereas** Pork producers have been told that we need to develop a long term plan for the survival of the industry, and;

**Whereas** this plan must be developed before any short term funding can be asked for from the province, and;

**Whereas** there does not seem to be any other alternative plan being presented;

**Therefore be it resolved that** this recovery plan be presented to the Ontario Pork Producers Marketing Board (OPPMB), before the next board meeting, as the basis for going forward with the development of a complete and comprehensive plan for the future of the pork industry in Ontario.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – October 2009*

### **Resolution Q - Response - Recovery Plan 2**

The Ontario Pork Safety Net Committee met with members of the Grassroots Campaign to present their recovery plan for the industry. There was good discussion and open exchange of ideas among the group. Ontario Pork outlined the current initiative that is underway with the Ontario Ministry of Food and Rural Affairs. Ken McEwan Professor of Production Economics & Agribusiness University of Guelph, Ridgetown College was also on hand provide information and insight on topics discussed, such as the prospect of developing a risk management plan., ASRA, creating a level playing field, and political strategy. Many of the comments put forth by the Grassroots Campaign have been incorporated into Ontario Pork's long term plan.

### **Resolution Q - Recovery Plan 2**

**Whereas** Ontario Pork needs more ideas on moving forward in developing a sustainable industry for the long and short term;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Wellington County Pork Producers support "The Plan" which includes two options, one being the ASRA style program for the Ontario industry and the other being the on going general direction of the Recovery Plan.

**Submitted by:** *Wellington County – October 2009*

## SLAUGHTER

### Resolution R -Response - Slaughter Capacity

Current financial situations in the province have limited the volume of hogs available. Current volumes as of December 2009 are reaching slaughter equilibrium and are below processing capacity. The federal plan is to reduce hog volumes in Canada through the transition plan. Previous and current sow and hog reduction programs have also reduced production volumes.

### Resolution R - Slaughter Capacity

**Whereas** Country of Origin Labeling in the US, and the constant threat of trade action on live hogs by the US, and;

**Whereas** processed pork moves easier across international borders, and:

**Whereas** Canada only has a slaughter capacity of 70% of live hogs and feeder pigs produced for the purpose of slaughter;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork and the CPC lobby the federal and provincial governments to help bring Canada to self-sufficiency in slaughter capacity for pork.

**Submitted by:** *Perth County – September 2009*

## TAXES

### Resolution S - Response - Municipal Tax Increases

This resolution was posted on the Ontario Pork website to assist in keeping producers informed.

### Resolution S - Municipal Tax Increases

**Whereas** municipal taxes are increasing and hog barn values are severely decreased;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork advise producers to appeal their tax assessment and argue that their buildings are worth substantially less.

**Submitted by:** *Elgin County – September 2009*

## TRANSIT

### **Resolution T - Response - Trucking Pick Up Fees**

Trucking fee charges as calculated from the data on receipts/producer statements in cases where Ontario Pork makes deductions on behalf of transporters;

FROM Jul 1, 2009 – Dec 31, 2009  
Min Trucker Fee = 0.00/hog  
Max Trucker Fee = 13.00/hog  
Weighted Avg Fee = 1.03/hog

The rates are diverse and fair comparison difficult as each producer has specific needs. Pick-up dates, volume of hogs shipped and location of farm relative to processing and plant location are all factors.

### **Resolution T -Trucking Pick Up Fees**

**Whereas** there is large differences between trucking charges for one producer compared to another and no fair way of comparing rates;

**Therefore be it resolved that** Ontario Pork publish high, low and average pickup fees.

**Submitted by:** *Elgin County – September 2009*

### **Resolution U - Response – In-Transit Loss Account**

The Board has been provided direction by their partners in the In-Transit Loss Account (processors and truckers) that they are not interested in resurrecting the program and producers are encouraged to examine their insurance policies to confirm what is covered on farm and to verify the details of your cargo insurance, or that of your trucker.

A preliminary review conducted in July of 2007 to create a new producer-funded program estimated the cost at 12 to 32 cents/hog depending on coverage, losses, price and volumes. The Board is not supportive of any initiative that brings unnecessary added cost to producers at this time. Since the ITLA was ended, there has been little demand or need demonstrated for this type of program, in large part due to the diligence of producers and their industry partners in adjusting loading and transport times to better support the welfare of their animals.

### **Resolution U - In-Transit Loss Account**

That Ontario Pork look into the possibility of re-establishing the In transit Loss Insurance Program during “high risk” weather conditions (summer months) to be funded by producers.

**Submitted by:** *Middlesex County – September 2009*

# APPENDIX ONE

## Ontario Pork Policy Day Meeting November 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Summary

### November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Welcome and Introductory Remarks – Wilma Jeffray

Update on Work Done since September 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting on Key Strategies 1-5 – Mary-Ann Hendrikk

- Overview of points of focus for 1<sup>st</sup> five key strategies, noting that county consultations, etc have been factored into these plans
- Review of September 22<sup>nd</sup> vote to focus on these issues
- OMAFRA involvement – meetings that have taken place, dollars being accessed
- Help to exiting and remaining producers: Planning for the Future Workshops, EI benefits
- Help for farm upgrading, safety and biosecurity and traceability measures: traceability funding for pilots and on-farm tools
- Initiatives to grow our domestic market: Foodland Ontario, Canadian Label marketing program, consumer education, alternatives to seasoned pork, niche markets
- Initiatives to renew our industry through new product development and address market preferences: facilitate sow slaughter facility in Ontario, ground pork product, consumer demand for pulled pork, marbled pork project, explore consumer signals for nitrate free and natural processed pork alternatives
- Establish an improved industry value chain forum: improve competitive position, save costs and share information, sounding board to address consumer issues with chain partners, OPIC will continue to perform an important role

Questions for discussion:

- 1) All aspects of the industry should be our focus – including food service and end consumers.
- 2) What elements of the plan are most important for you?
- 3) What other elements should Ontario Pork look at?

Summary of Group Discussion on Key Strategies 1-5

The following issues were common among the tables:

- Value Chain Coordination is essential
  - o Involvement from processors, producers, retailers, government
  - o Topics: Product innovation – meal solutions
- More advertising/consumer education/promotions of Ontario pork is needed
- Require an aggressive campaign to get the domestic market back
  - o Labeling of Ontario/Canadian product
  - o Ensure there are Regulations that prevent imported pork from entering Ontario unless it is raised to the standards of Ontario production

- National coordination of research would be more cost-effective
- Some support to develop an Ontario-based price
- Some support for a swine Risk Management Program

Update on Work Done Since September 22<sup>nd</sup> on Key Strategy 6 – Steve Illick, Ken McEwan

- Timeline of events since September 22<sup>nd</sup>: federal program details, meetings with Perth County Pork Producers Political Action Committee and Grassroots pork producers, investigated options to restrict imports from out-of-country and out-of-province, meeting with OFA to develop coalition of commodity groups to demand level playing field with Quebec
- Aim to discuss pros and cons on RMP today
- Provincial Ask: Government wants us to speak with one voice
- List of RMP Considerations, such as government receptivity, producer resolutions

Ken McEwan

- Overview: background, RMP for Grains and Oilseeds, ASRA program, Ontario program for pork producers, pros and cons
- Review of Canadian hog exports and interprovincial movement of slaughter hogs
- Ontario production versus Ontario slaughter figures
- Overview of Grains and Oilseeds RMP: in place three years, cost of production based, Ontario funding but no Federal funding
- ASRA program
- RMP examples for Ontario hogs
- Government concerns for RMP: cost, eligibility, economic impact to economy, trade implications [commodity specific, injury to U.S. market, trickle through to pork?], production versus slaughter/consumption
- Pros: economic spinoff to economy, payment cap limits government cost, industry income more stable, guaranteed supply of Ontario product, producer commitment thru premiums, program easier to understand, less criticism from diversified farms (AgriStability)
- Cons: cost to government, risk of trade challenge, additional cost (producer premiums), likely need to further downsize industry, if industry grows – government cap, time lag – increases to COP, less pressure on suppliers to reduce input prices
- What is acceptable level of risk?

Questions for Discussion:

- 1) RMP brings consideration of 2 key matters:
  - a. The need for some sort of production discipline
  - b. Heightened risk of trade action on live hogs and to a lesser extent pork
- 2) “I am interested in pursuing RMP for the Ontario hog industry IF...” (discuss any conditions)
- 3) “I am not in favour of pursuing RMP for the Ontario hog industry”

### Summary of Group Discussion on Key Strategy 6

- Three tables were unanimously in favour of a government swine risk management program with some qualifications, nine tables had mixed support/could not reach a consensus on the RMP issue.
- Some producers were concerned about the potential for WTO or trade action retaliation. Others were concerned that an RMP program would lead to a 'slow death' of the industry.
- Producers also expressed concern over the impact of the initiative on processor viability or concentration.
- In order for an RMP program to be effective, many producers felt that Ontario production would need to shrink to match processing capacity. This would reduce exports to the U.S. and thereby reduce the threat of a trade action.
- Producers indicated that the program should be created at equal benefit levels to ASRA in order to level the playing field between Ontario and Quebec.
- Some producers worried about the time to get a government agreement and indicated that dollars are needed now due to the time that would be needed to create an RMP program.
- Producers suggested that a cap be placed on how much one producer can access from an RMP program.

### **November 11<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

#### Welcome and Introductory Remarks – Wilma Jeffray

- OFA coalition – level playing field needs to be defined by the commodity groups
- Introduction of Tom McLaren, government relations lobbyist for Ontario Pork and summary of yesterday

#### Review of Outcomes from Previous Day

- Basic agreement on the overall direction of 5 points – 'own the Ontario market', 'push Ontario label aggressively'
- Pursue funding for more aggressive promotion, labeling and advertising
- Work with chain partners including retail and food service to develop new products base on the solid understanding of consumers
- Work to ensure producer gets a larger share of the consumer purchase value
- Agreement regarding consumer issues with seasoned pork and more natural alternatives to processed pork additives and nitrates
- Pursue CQA and traceability funding, but find ways to level the playing field with other jurisdictions to meet Ontario standards so that it is not just an increased cost of Ontario producers
- Consider new consumer education initiatives
- Most tables had no consensus or questioning support regarding RMP
- Benefit levels have to be higher to secure producer support given structural risks to the industry
- Premium levels versus benefit and CAIS impact concerns

- Producers want greater federal involvement – RMP needs to mirror levels of ASRA
- Issues of concern: Impact on processors, processor concentration, retaining export option for some producers, details of production limits required and how to manage issues like new entrants and time to get government agreement
- Recommendation: work with coalition to get government going in right direction and then work on terms that are beneficial to producers including a ‘kick start’ advance or retroactive payment

---

#### Financial Protection Plan – Charles Lalonde

- Concept of swine financial protection program
- Why now: industry priority, market uncertainty, default history, other ag sectors benefit from similar programs
- Work to date: defines benefits, proposes program structure options and clarifies costs
- Benefits: licensing standards for markets and processors (financial responsibility), regulates a firm timeline for payment to producers, provides timely payment in event of a processor or marketer default
- Actuarial study considered various implementation and cost options (completed in June 2009)
- Packers & Stockyards: same objective to ensure producer payment for livestock, U.S. government regularly monitor registered packers and dealers trust accounts, compliance rate in 2008 at 80%, recoveries on defaults not high
- Industry statistics overview: 2,800 producers marketing over 4 million hogs, 40% of producers market less than 500 hogs per year, daily marketings 15 – 20,000 hogs, one day’s transaction value \$2-3 million
- Actuarial study results: initial fund investment of \$3 million, grow fund to sustainable level of \$5 million, premiums in range of 3-7.5 cents per hog, coverage at 100%, licensing requirements, 5 day payment cycle
- Proposed program principles: every producer pays the same premium, competitive advantage to Ontario, processor/marketer applicant pays cost of license (\$100 to \$250), must not be cost prohibitive
- Administration costs: *OMAFRA* covers financial responsibility assessment, investigative and legal costs at licensing and claim adjudication, formal MOU established with commodity org., *Licensee* pays for license application costs, compliance cost associated with financial responsibility, *Producers* pay for licensing administration, fund administration, estimate of 2-3 cents per hog and included in premium estimates in the actuarial study
- Program class recommendations: market hogs first, each new class will require an order-in-council recommended by the Minister
- Pre-loading the fund: leads to lower premiums, actuary study provided scenarios, keeping premiums low yet achieve sustainability

- Licensing: process must be efficient, robust and cost effective, all processors and marketers require licensing, custom slaughter processors are excluded by the definition of a 'sale', application process managed by OMAFRA
- Application requirement: self declaration of business activity, banker's confirmation of business activity, submission of financial information to have financial responsibility assessed, pay license fee based on cost of issuing a license, licensor may require the assignment of financial security as a condition of licensing, need to talk to small processors on their mandatory participation in the program
- Timeline: payment timelines average 5 days with some much higher, 92% of producers receive payments through electronic fund transfers to their bank accounts
- How it works: all market hog producers are included, all processors and marketers are licensed on the basis of financial responsibility, producer pays a premium on a 'per hog sold' basis and receive coverage at a pre-determined level, processor collects premiums and remits to the fund, a financial production board manage the fund
- Example of default
- Next steps: consult with producers and obtain endorsement, OP Board engage Ministry in discussions of a need for a plan, continue discussions with large and small processors, continue discussions with other livestock representative groups, finalize an OP recommended plan

Questions for Consideration:

- 1) Are you supportive of the development of a swine financial protection program?
- 2) Do you agree with a phased-in approach – e.g. Developing market hog plan first and then feeder pigs, breeding stock and sows?
- 3) What would you support as a premium per hog for this program with the range being 3 to 7.5 cents/market hog?

Summary of County Roundtable Presentations on a Financial Protection Plan

- 11 districts supported the development of a swine financial protection program. 1 district did not reach a consensus on this issue. This district indicated they liked the system as it is now but would support an FPP if it was a broad program covering all hogs.
- 10 districts supported a phased-in approach for an FPP. 1 district disagreed with the phased-in approach and 1 district could not reach a consensus on this issue.
- Districts were mixed on their support for premium levels. 1 district supported a 10 cent per hog premium (with processors and producers contributing), 1 district supported a 5 cent per hog premium, 4 districts supported a 3 cent per hog premium, and 2 districts suggested there should be no premium. 4 districts could not reach a consensus or did not respond on premium levels.
- Some districts suggested that there should be producer choice in enrollment of an FPP. For example, it was noted that Conestoga producers do not need this plan.
- Districts indicated that government support is essential for the fund.

- Pre-loading the fund was considered to be important. It was suggested that Ontario Pork put in \$3 million to pre-load the fund.
  - It was suggested that a high premium be put in place initially and then reduced when the fund reaches a higher level.
- 

#### Electoral Reform – Beth Clark

- Overview of the proposed model, based on feedback from AGM
- Presentation of table with new breakdown of councillors
- Next steps: new election protocols established, amend Ontario Pork by-laws, County Grant policy, County amalgamation policy, all counties need to review their constitutions

#### Questions for Consideration:

- 1) Do you support a county model permitting a minimum of 1 delegate per county?
- 2) Do you support a county model with 4 zones with board representation as outlined (zone 1 & 2 – each 3 Directors, zone 3 – 2 directors, and zone 4 – 1 director)?
- 3) If so, do you prefer a county model based on 80 or 100 delegates (using 2008 producer and hog statistic would result in 89 or 108 delegates respectively)?
- 4) Do you support county elections every year or every 3<sup>rd</sup> year?
- 5) Do you support each producer being entitled to a second vote?

#### Summary of County Roundtable Presentations on Electoral Structure

- 11 districts supported 1 delegate per county. 1 district did not support 1 delegate per county and expressed concerns that representation would be decreased.
- 11 districts supported 4 zones. 1 district could not reach a consensus on this issue.
- 3 districts supported a model based on 80 delegates and 7 districts supported a model based on 100 delegates. 1 district did not agree on a reduction in delegates and 1 district did not reach a consensus.
- 5 districts supported elections every third year. 6 districts also supported elections every year. 1 district did not provide a response on this issue.
- 4 districts supported each producer being entitled to a second vote. 2 districts disagreed with each producer being entitled to a second vote. 3 districts were neutral on the concept of a second vote and 3 districts did not reach a consensus.
- There was some concern that producer representation would be decreased.
- It was noted that if there are no pigs in a certain county, that county should not have a delegate.
- Many producers want to ensure there are enough alternates.
- It was suggested that directors from one zone should not all be from the same county.

---

Ontario Pork Strategic Plan – Wilma Jeffray

- Overview of vision and mission
- Review of four strategies that are the foundation of the Strategic Plan: information, forum, innovation, advocacy
  - o Overview of initiatives and tactics that support these strategies

Questions for Discussion:

- 1) Are you supportive of the above proposed direction?
- 2) Do you believe that this suggested strategy has all the elements it needs – are there any important omissions or changes needed? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed policy? Are there any groups of producers that have been left out or need special consideration under the policy?
- 3) What implementation conditions or limitations, if any, would you want to impose on this policy as it is being implemented?

Summary of County Roundtable Presentations on Strategic Plan

- There was general consensus on the Strategic Plan as presented.
- Some districts encouraged Ontario Pork to move ahead with the Plan noting that there is the potential to talk about the issues at length without making significant progress.
- It was suggested that work on taking back the domestic market be a priority.
- There was some concern over a shift to F.O.B. pricing.

---

Update on Federal Transition Program – Curtiss Littlejohn

- Review of Press Release that was sent out
- Overview of process and how bids were put forward
- Second tender delayed until December 9<sup>th</sup> to accommodate the volume of bids

# APPENDIX TWO

## Strategic Plan Overview

### Our Mission

To foster a healthy business environment for industry partners, innovation, and development.

### Our Vision

Distinction and Excellence in Pork.

### Ontario Pork Strategies

Four specific strategies have been defined to help Ontario Pork fulfill its mission. The strategies are as follows:

- 1) Be the preferred supplier of services that provide knowledge and opportunities to allow producers to be economically sustainable.
- 2) Provide an on-going industry forum to encourage, leverage, and enhance sustainable industry development.
- 3) Provide an advocacy function to improve the business environment.
- 4) Drive innovative product development.

### Key Initiatives

The following initiatives will support the identified strategies:

- Member relations
- Business intelligence/benchmarking
- Governance
- National partnerships
- Provincial partnerships
- Crisis management
- Food service
- Retail
- Pork Marketing Canada
- Risk mitigation
- Consumer relations
- Value chain coordination
- Research - production and industry development
- Government relations
- Stakeholder relations
- Trade advocacy

## **Activity Centers**

Four activity centers within Ontario Pork will be responsible for delivering industry services.

These are:

- Administration
- Industry/Member Services
- Communications
- Consumer Marketing

## **Performance Indicators**

Ontario Pork routinely evaluates its service offerings, ensuring producer members continue to receive services that provide benefits for their business. Ontario Pork will evaluate internal targets for initiatives as well as producer and industry stakeholder feedback to determine whether initiatives are meeting the needs of producers and industry stakeholders.

## **Ontario Pork's Values Statement**

Ontario Pork's values statement acts as an ethical framework within which the organization will function. The following values statement has been developed for the organization:

Ontario Pork values and supports an ongoing commitment to:

- *Excellence in service and performance;*
- *Leadership within the industry;*
- *Accountability for our actions,*
- *Working in partnership with producers and stakeholders within the industry;*
- *Open communications with producers, government, stakeholders, and staff; and*
- *Integrity, Trust, Respect, and Honesty in all we do.*