

**REGIONAL MEETING AND MAIL OUT RESPONSES**

**A - POLICY DEVELOPMENT AS PART OF ABP'S MANDATE**

1. Should ABP be involved in policy development?

150	YES	50. – Yes to a “revised” ABP (counted as a yes)
20	NO	
7	UNCERTAIN	

2. Should ABP advise government on behalf of producers?

155	YES	
18	NO	50. – “not currently” (counted as a no)
4	UNCERTAIN	

3. Should ABP lobby government on behalf of producers?

155	YES	
18	NO	50. – “not currently” (counted as a no)
4	UNCERTAIN	

63. If you mean individual producers “no”.

4. If ABP is not involved in policy development and lobbying and advising the government, who would do this on behalf of Alberta beef producers?

1. We need a definition of “producers” – is it the cow/calf or feedlot or any other member of ABP.
10. Individual sector organizations – more specific to the individual issue. I.e.: WSGA – land use, ACFA – production efficiencies.
11. There is nobody as familiar with cattle issues as ABP.
14. ABP should work on behalf of the beef industry.
15. ACFA
16. A federation of association. ABP should then be limited to research and promotion only.
17. Other lobbying groups would take over in a minute but they may be just lobbying for their group, not the industry.
18. People that do not represent a large cross section of the industry must not be given a voice.
19. I agree with John and Len. It should be on behalf of industry as a whole, not just producers. Everyone in industry must realize that ABP is the voice of the entire industry.
23. If structure remains as is every organization will lobby governments e.g.: ACFA, Stockgrowers, Grazing Association.
35. These shoes would be filled in a heartbeat by proactive beef industry leaders positive or negative would not matter as ABP has missed the target many times themselves.
39. ABP – should direct all funds to develop markets in the Asia Circle and European.
42. Each sector or lobby group.
44. Other farm groups.
45. What producers are lobbying for.

50. Group of producer organizations including newly structured ABP.
52. Splinter Groups with no direction.
53. Landowner groups, cow-calf groups.
59. ABP has a better chance to influence government on policy. Producers do not have time and may have limited expertise on this action. We cannot afford to hire a group to negotiate on our part.
71. Wild Rose Ag Producers.
73. Should target more on the people in town and cities.
74. ABP is the best option for the producer at the present time.
81. Good question – not BIG.
- 87 The rate of producer's quitting – bankrupt and burn out's there may not be any producers let to lobby for
- 90 Western Stock Growers, ACFA, etc. – scary thought
- 101 In an ideal world groups like the NFU or BIG-C would better represent producers – give them the levy \$'s!
- 106 I think ABP is likely only united voice for industry all other do no represents most ag groups
- 107 There are producer groups who do this on a voluntary basis. (i.e. WSGA, Wild Rose, ACFA)
- 113 It would be a void other than special interest groups
- 114 I have no idea who would do this on our behalf
- 115 That's why producers elect us
- 116 Most cow/calf producer do not have time or expertise to advise government on their own. An individual does not have as loud a voice as an umbrella organization would either.
- 122 Individual producers have a responsibility to lobby their MLA's and MP's and ensure their position is known to politicians
- 124 Cow/calf producers should move away from ABP and start up a cow/calf association
- 135 More producer directions
- 138 The urban people
- 139 ABP must ensure that they are bringing concerns of the rank and file producers to government. ABP appears to ignore many suggestions and resolutions our industry in crisis
- 141 Whatever group that will listen to the actual producer and not just the packing plants
- 143 You got other associations could sit with ABP and talk it over and decide together then the ABP goes to the government of Alberta. Not all different groups go to the government like that it shows we are not together. In Federal government ABP and other provinces sit together talk it over and one group goes to the Federal government in CCA
- 148 Dismantle the paid positions and start from square one with producer focus groups
- 155 Alberta Beef Producers merely parrots the P.C. line now. Just ask the P.C. party what the ABP position is
- 165 There is not enough room to expand on this loaded question here.
- 167 There are many groups which could come together when required i.e. Milk, Feeders, Forage, Barley Growers, WSGA, BIG, etc. Must come as equals → a group that comes together naturally.
- 170 Alberta cow/calf producers should have producer organization that works for the cow/calf producer and stop this 3 ring circus where everyone makes money off this calf except the producer that raises it
- 171 The ABP took over \$50 million out of the cattle industry in 5 years. So where did it all og if you weren't doing the above three.
- 172 this should be done on an individual producer basis
- 174 We have to have more power to do a reasonable job in to cattle industry. Producers have to be heard. Government involvement has been always badly politically involved & poorly managed. Anything they are involved is downwards & destructive in anything that's good unless it's destructive & sexual
- 176 Some other responsible organization
- 179 Probably no one
- 181 ABP cannot lobby the government on behalf of producer because they also represent other stakeholders.
185. I'll do it myself.

Comments:

1. If ABP is not involved in policy then all the other groups that make up ABP would either individually or as groups represent their own best interest (policies) and forward them to government or government agencies. Not enough money spent on marketing – (not nearly enough) Research?
3. ABP has been a strong voice for the cattle industry. Communicating what is being done could be done better. At times the industry waits until something happens instead of being proactive.
4. ABP is the province's most recognized producer organization and should be the organization to most closely work with the government.
6. 2 and 3 should be on behalf of "industry", not "producers". Should be pro-active not reactive to policy. Industry issues need to be dealt with timely. I.e.: currently a non-competitive industry in all segments of the industry need to be actively involved with all sectors of the industry even outside of the boardroom.
7. All three points are a yes as long as the word "producer" is taken out and "industry" put in.
8. The cattle industry needs a united voice of all sectors of the industry to come forward to governments, not a bunch of splinter groups.
9. Define "producers". While CCA should lead lobby efforts of the Feds, ABP has a role, on behalf of the Alberta cattle industry, to ensure the federal government understands the industries' interest in policy development. More importantly ABP must take a leadership role in this effort within the Province of Alberta.
10. Go back to the original mandate of ABP. Marketing and production become very focused, and very good, at only a select group of issues. Move away from being "producer" driven to "industry" driven.
12. There are several industry organizations like those listed on the back page that ABP can collaborate with to get an industry perspective.
13. How will producers/industry be aware of what ABP is advising/lobbying? Will there be more meetings? Better communication to producers/industry. And at what costs \$? This questions should have maybe been left to the end of the meeting.
14. Need to lobby on behalf of industry. Various producer interests can be handled within ABP. Need a vision for competitiveness.
15. Give more than lip service to other beef organizations or make a real effort to amalgamate.
17. Work as a united industry not as individual fractions. Focus on a goal that would help every aspect of the industry, not just one or two.
18. Define the meaning of producer. The industry should be the object of our efforts. Dealing with producers lends to an environment (on a case by case) basis leads to trying to be all things to all people.
20. In 2 and 3, it should be "industry" instead of "producers". Government will listen to a strong unified voice.
21. I agree with the term industry instead of producer. But who gets to decide what is best for industry?
22. The main focus should be the industry as a whole and not individual parts of the industry.
24. Yes ABP should be there to develop industry to advise government. They should be involved in all programs with government because they know what is best for industry.
25. 1, 2, & 3 should be on behalf of the beef industry. As a producer I expect ABP to be a leader and a dominant voice in policy development, lobbying and be a reliable, current advisory voice for the beef industry. Ideally, the role would be proactive rather than reactive. Promotion – ABP – BIC – CBEF. Yes with accountability. Research – Clearly focused for industry benefits – focus on industry objective and (national?) focus.
26. I feel policy at the present should reflect the financial square being felt at all levels in the beef industry. Major emphasis should be on profit enhancement, all other concerns should be related to a more minor role.
27. Need to ensure that each industry sector is represented equally and fairly and that differences in sectors can be recognized. A compromise amongst sectors is not always best.

28. ABP needs to develop policies based upon what our whole industry needs to remain competitive. Industry should be driving our research. Feedlot, cow-calf focus groups could be used to see what projects need to be done.
29. ABP may need to re-evaluate the definition of "producers" and look towards a more industry type outlook.
30. Be more inclusive. Other industry groups have a lot to offer.
31. For #2 and 3 "producers" should be "industry". Policy must be based on industry and economics.
35. In 2, 3 and 4 "producers" should be "industry". Policy focused on industry. Be proactive not reactive. Industry needs to be visionary and create opportunities for all sectors to create positive commerce. We need a vision for our industry. We as an industry are mostly reactionary and are price takers and are too careful of what they say as not to piss off the government of the day. What are our core values? Really we need to act on our core values.
36. All the information is out there. People don't access it. Don't let special interest groups have too much say. They need a voice, not control. Delegates need to look at the whole industry, not just their zone.
37. ABP's mandate of policy development should continue as is. It is an organization whose membership and delegation represent all aspects of the beef industry. Each sub-committee and council has equal representation of cow/calf, feedlot and related operations.
38. At no time that I am aware of, has ABP (ACC) ever developed policy or lobbied government that hasn't been beneficial to the industry in the long term.
44. I feel that the CFIA is a bureaucracy out of control. We need the ABP to lobby government to get at least 1 or 2 plants with all animals BSE inspected. The Federal government should pay for or help pay for trade disputes.
46. It is important that there is one strong voice for producers.
49. Main reason for ABP to exist is for policy development.
52. Beef is only part of agriculture. Without one voice as strong as possible, will get no government input or understanding of our problems.
53. ABP – needs only to be involved in policies to do with market access, financial support and sales (issues?).
54. This is number one for ABP.
57. Focus on trade, promotion of the products both internally and externally within AB and Canada. Marketing research is important. Greater promotion of meetings, go to areas where producers are.
58. Need to focus on policy that creates environment for sustained global competitiveness e.g.: KVD in grain, animal health product approval, etc., regulatory framework.
61. Alberta Beef Producers are our elected representatives and are open for anyone to participate; therefore, they should be developing policy for our industry, not small special interest groups.
63. I feel there has been a policy drift within the organization in recent years. I felt with the arrival of Tim Highmoor there a chance to return to a time of more decisive policy development at a time when the industry is threatened to a degree rarely seen by antagonistic politicians, bureaucrats and other lobby groups opposed to our industry (environmental animal rights).
65. Very important to be involved in government policy – all effects costs in the chain from primary producers to consumer.
67. We need policy which facilitates trade and reduces regulations.
69. The policy needs to be created in a fair method for all sectors of the cow-calf, feedlot, etc. when lobbying government. This will create fairness for all producers and they will trust ABP as its producer organization.
70. Policies is important to the producers. We have to communicate with producers and the government. If the Research money is put in the right way toward the benefit of the beef producers.
72. We need one uniform voice to speak for all areas of the beef industry.
74. Input on specific issues should be vigorously garnered from individual producers i.e. polling or producers.

75. Policy should be developed at grass roots. In previous years, policy that were developed on the farm got watered down or changed dramatically by the time they were ever put to government.
76. Promotion has to be catchy – we (consumer) don't notice signs in store or commercials unless it is great. Put a person in a store and watch consumer's buy product – but how will the uplift of product filter back to the producers who paid the bill. A deal has to be made with Retail and Packers because the producers see the benefit last.
77. (Lobbying?) on behalf of Producers to control regulations put on by government has to be one of ABP's biggest mandates at this time but must also not forget other things such as Policy and Advisory roles.
78. More expert staff to follow up on government policy and lobbying. Work on behalf of ranchers not expect ranchers or delegates to do this.
79. Lobbying on our behalf is critical. Provincial, Federal and Foreign Governments want to control our products and inputs more and more However, we would like more transparency regarding lobbying efforts, failures and successes.
81. Promotion needs to target non-producers more. TV promotion – “Where's the Beef” was very catchy. How about BEEF (see diagram, page 1). Packers should contribute to promotion as well. Lobbying is extremely important to producers. And we need to keep advising government.
84. ABP needs a strong voice at the federal level to voice our concerns regarding animal health, exports, etc.
85. Alberta Beef is just more than beef cows it also involved beef from the dairy sector, which Alberta Beef has not recognized.
87. when a government gives millions of \$ of tax payer (i.e.) beef producers money to the “cartels” and then gives them a “pope” like blessing to steal our beef etc in spite of any policy, why bother
88. Government is provincial and federal. Federal is mostly through CCA but ABP can also provide direct input
91. I think that is the point of paying \$3.00/head. We expect you to set policy and lobby the government
92. they should be doing all of the above but keeping in mind that the cow/calf producer is the grass roots and without them (it's heading that way); there will be no Beef industry.
95. ABP, should hire professional lobbyist, ABP also needs to be clear on what they ask for
96. The ABP needs to realize that fact without cow/calf producers there is no feeding industry and no slaughter industry
97. Other industry groups in beef sector would have to assume this role on individual basis
98. ABP “should” be advising and lobbying but they are not representing the view of the average producer
101. This is the role of ABP. Now the organization needs to start listening to producers views
104. It would be irresponsible of ABP to allow policy development to occur without ABP involvement. The delegates will determine what direction and philosophical connection that involvement would take
107. Only if ABP had a voluntary membership then and only then should they be allowed to lobby government on policy issues
109. Perhaps ABP's mandate is too broad. ABP should do two things – (1) Promote Beef producers (2) lobby government on behalf of beef industry image
111. ABP delegates are elected by producers; so they should be part of government making policy
112. Policy development based on input from producers through annual zone meetings, special zone meetings and the ABP annual meeting is one the two primary functions of ABP. The second of course is to support marketing activities
115. As a elected delegate I feel my job is to make decisions and set policy that is for the good of the industry as a whole. However having said that as a organization we tend to focus on them that make the most noise and are the best organizes rather than the grass roots producers who make up 95% of producers in Alberta are the poorest organized and need our leadership the most

- 116 Most cow/calf operations do not have employees to allow them the time off to research and be adequately informed to have valuable input on lobby issues or the time to lobby successfully
- 117 ABP should be involved in development of policies and advising and lobbying government but all policy development must be developed to help the whole industry not just individual sectors. The board must be clear that a producer is from the cow/calf producer up to the packer & everyone in between. Promotion & research – let the other organization handle promotion focus more on research. Re-juggle the funds
- 118 Effective work with government is the most important service ABP can offer small scattered producers
- 119 As a producer this is an area that ABP could have the most financial impact for me
- 123 I think that ABP has had a really good working relationship in the past with the Alberta government. They have worked well with Shirley McCellan & Doug Horner and were able to put programs into place for the beef producers of Alberta. One united front that works for the industry works the best. The latest Ag Minister is no good hopefully the election takes care of this problem
- 124 ABP has successfully lobbied for the feeder association and forgotten money goes up the chain not down. Without the cow/calf producer there is no bee industry in Alberta. To survive the cow/calf producer must be represented by an association that understands the implication of eliminating the basis of the industry as a whole
- 130 the major reason for ABP to exist is to advise and lobby government policy
- 133 I answered yes but only if they would finally truly represent the average common producer. This would be a major change in policy (re: BSE testing). Policy of fall meetings at busiest time of year is terrible
- 135 I have filled these out in the past and not much changed the old boys club but this time there had better by some changes
- 136 I can't see ABP lobbying has had much effect to date
- 138 The Alberta Cattle Commission lobbied government years ago for policy and policy change. The Alberta Beef Producers have no balls to get tough!
- 140 Uncertain (I counted producer as uncertain for 1-3)
- 146 Who does ABP represent? Feeders? Packers? Incredibly ABP has no cow/calf delegates
- 147 It seems to me that the system has been working, check off pays ABP to develop policy, advise government, and lobby government on our behalf we can't always do that ourselves that the purpose of ABP and the check-off
- 148 The most likely people to run for these positions seem to be people who no longer expect to earn a living producing beef. How many of our delegates sole income is beef cattle? Are they in touch with markets, procedures and risks facing the grass roots producer?
- 150 Would this ever be done
- 153 It is absolutely essential for ABP to make policy and lobby the government with the provision that the policy made & the advice given to government reflects the best interest of all livestock producers & is indicative of what producers want not just ideas put forth by a select few or the Board of Directors themselves. It seems now that the ABP directors have often lost touch with the wishes of producers
- 154 I can't see a reason that would be worth my check-off dollars if a person didn't answer "yes" to all of the above
- 161 Whoever lobbies needs to be producer driven?
- 162 Agriculture in Alberta is going very fast down into the ground. Oil is king in Alberta, Corporate profit is not far behind. In agriculture we need a profit to, also some return on investment. With no profit we cannot survive. Record fuel, land, machine cost should also mean record price for food. Food is way too cheap in ALBERTA!
- 165 The Board members should take the wishes (Resolutions) of the grassroots membership as the basis of policy development and should definitely lobby on those resolutions. They should not defeat resolutions on critical issues for any reason. They are elected to carry out our resolutions – not theirs & they are elected and are paid to do so. They were NOT elected to think for us or decide what is best for us. Because they have chosen to go their own way they should NOT be in a position to develop policy.
- 166 Whatever there is to be done; somebody's got to do it. Let's keep the number involved to the minimum required; not empire build!

- 167 Should be part of any input when asked – should be from producer’s point of view, not ABP. Alliances can be formed “naturally” when there is a common interest
- 168 If ABP keeps on operating and will not implement any of Beef Initiative’s proposals given to ABP Nov 14.07 it is not worth filling this form out. I have been feeding for years up to ten million \$ per and have not seen any money coming out to the money we have contributed to ABP
- 171 This organization should not be called beef producers it should be called Alberta Beef Parasites (ABP). It’s become a big bureaucracy that is lining a few pockets and influenced by packers, feedlot owners & auction marts
- 172 ABP would become a filter through which individual comments and views would come through. If ABP misreads the feeling of producers it takes effort to re load and change direction
- 175 As I am not really very knowledgeable about this organization or its various councils, associations etc. I don’t really feel qualified to say how it should be run as I don’t know what the various members do but I will write at the back how I feel at present.
- 177 ABP should be immediately dissolved. It doesn’t seem to matter how big or how many voices producers have if no one is listening. Producers need the \$3/hd in their own pocket
- 181 Producers representation is substantially diluted by having ABP representing many industry stakeholders. The name ABP has producers in it for a reason. It should only represent the true producer of beef and no other groups in the beef industry. The true producers are ranchers.
- 183 Having received this review plan Feb 28.08 and having a deadline of Feb 29/08 I am disappointed with the short turnaround time. My hope is that ABP could get resolutions acted on this fast.
- 184 We have an organization; government does want feedback from the industry. Why re-invent the wheel
- 185 I want my democratic right back. I don’t want to contribute to ABP and I wish it would just disappear but I also believe that those who want this organization have the right to join so just make the check-off refundable and we’ll see how long you last!

## **B - STRUCTURE OF ABP**

### **B1 - Delegate Representation**

1. Should the role of ABP delegates as the representatives of producers continue as it currently exists?
 

104	YES
46	NO
22	UNCERTAIN
  
2. Should the role delegates play in the structure of ABP change in the future?
 

75	YES
48	NO
42	UNCERTAIN
  
3. If yes, how?
  1. There should be more defined sub districts to make delegates accessible/local to an area, they should bring forward resolutions from their sub district and then “report” back to the members after the annual meeting on its and other resolution status.

6. Some delegates, I feel, do not have the knowledge of the complete industry, only speculations. All delegates are held to task by ABP policy
9. Feedback delegation.
10. Move to a board of directors represented by the various industry associations and run ABP like a company. In other words, use the LIS structure as a functional model.
11. Should become more focused.
12. Reduce number of delegates.
14. A larger body to deliberate on issues on a semi-annual basis is important.
15. Shrink the number of delegates in half and require accountability (pay them to do a good job).
16. Best people should be delegates not necessarily from set zones, but would fill certain needed aspects on a board.
18. In an effort to better communication from the upper levels of the organization down to producer level.
19. Less committee work, more general direction, staff should carry out objectives.
22. Less delegates.
23. Too many delegates. Too cumbersome, unworkable.
25. Possibly more industry sector representation from zones. Zone director should be elected at zone meetings.
26. Shrink number.
30. This system is not efficient or responsive.
31. Too many too little talent.
32. We should have delegates from each zone and not from various 'councils'.
35. Mission drive, accountability and measurable. Set goals and work towards those goals. The purpose is to have zone representation each year the composition of delegates change by personalities. Sometimes strong, sometimes weak.
38. Delegates are required but as a conduit and advisory liaison.
41. More Zone Delegates set up meetings with MP and MLAs to lobby at grass roots level.
44. We need a better multi-national marketing strategy.
45. I like the idea of cow-calf council if it is effective.
51. Need representative across industry. (Down?) size board to 12 to 14 more than that is more (functional?). Need to get the best people.
53. Producer delegates only to elect directors, no special interest groups.
57. Improper meeting format – small table discussions better than open forum, the loudest voice is the one heard under current format.
58. More accountability, face of ABP (vs. staff), more zone responsibility.
63. I think the delegate body needs to be the communication face wherever possible of the organizations. While I believe the staff has done an excellent job, I believe the organization's credibility is enhanced in dealing with the media or lobbying politicians.
65. Direct election of executive (especially chairman).
70. Listen to the producers and bring these ideas to the AGM and push hard to the other delegates.
71. Delegates need to be PAID "more" and paid when working in their region.
72. If the need arises, some changes may need to be made. The Delegates are there to speak on our behalf.
81. Producer eligible to be a delegate needs to be better defined.
83. Delegates need to be able to represent the producer.
85. The province is basically split in 5 zones on most issue and Alberta Beef should be reduced to 5 zones and 5 delegates/zone
86. The delegates should be the voice of the producers in their area (large & small) even if it means more meetings to collect their views when changes need to be made (i.e. BSE, drought, imports, etc)
88. some delegates are appointed – most elected. All should be elected directly through ABP zones
89. Delegates should be fewer but those elected should have time to dedicate to more issues & committees so they truly are effective & informative voice for producers.
91. Fewer delegates. Fewer meetings. Some of the cost could be cut if you used the conferencing.

92 It should be structured with at least one or more cow/calf producer in each zone.  
 96 The delegates need to play a more active role in dragging the produces in  
 97 Delegates represent the industry participants and are elected  
 102 Unsure  
 106 Uncertain as some delegates perform better than others but I guess same in all facets of  
 life  
 107 Delegates should be advisors on policy and less involved in day to day operations.  
 Delegate representation is confusing to me. And the meeting voting structure the “grass  
 roots” to me does not really have any say – they can be over rode at meetings (producer)  
 by delegates or Board of Directors and they voice is not heard – currently this is  
 happening more and more does this not tell ABP Board of Directors and those “in power”  
 there are issues out there?  
 109 More accountability less numbers  
 111 Should be involved in making agri policy federally and provincially  
 112 The current system works but we should always be vigilant in finding more effective ways  
 to reflect the needs of producers  
 114 We need to continue to make sure that the delegate's main income and living is in the  
 cattle business. We are getting many delegates with off farm income  
 115 ABP works well the way it is the work load would be too much with less delegates  
 116 More delegate support from head office level when it come to resolution advise and  
 administrative assistance: (1) establish timelines and professional support for resolution  
 process i.e. submit draft to consult 1 month prior to fall meeting and receive feedback on  
 proper wording and structure to improve passing at fall meeting. (2) There should be  
 some definition of what the role of a delegate is within ABP policy and support available  
 at all levels if needed & requested.  
 118 Delegates are the primary contact for producer. Volunteer delegates need more  
 resources (staff field reps?) to be effective  
 124 Delegates should be elected from a cow/calf association with no feeder interference  
 125 Delegates should be representing cow/calf producers only  
 126 Delegates should be eliminated  
 129 Must have more zone meetings & invite producers to discuss issues  
 137 Do more to promote Canadian beef overseas to obtain our own markets  
 139 there should be no change in the number of zones  
 141 Let my check off money go to the group I decide  
 148 Elected delegates need to promote the wishes of their zones – not vote the party line or  
 senior council – or be swayed by them  
 154 ABP should be wound down as they provide no productive function  
 157 Secret ballot when voting on policy changes  
 158 Everyone has a council within ABP that addresses issues which pertain to their interests  
 except the cow/calf producer  
 165 The zone representative should have to carry the resolutions forward and vote  
 accordingly and be accountable for their stand especially if they do NOT vote according  
 to their producer's wishes.  
 166 reduce zones – don't see they contribute much – some needed  
 167 don't like the word delegate – we must choose the best representatives from the industry  
 168 With input from producers  
 172 there is a need for fewer delegates with emphasis on whole industry  
 174 More united with producers  
 181 The should focus all representation to benefit primary producers only

4. Should the role producers have within ABP be expanded?

63 YES  
 52 NO  
 45 UNCERTAIN

5. If yes, how?

1. Should report on status of resolutions.

6. Uncertain how. Based on knowledge or producer advisory groups.
9. Not sure if you can force people to participate.
12. Producers should be able to address AGM and Semi-Annual, instead of going through delegates.
14. Direct feedback via surveys on internet and local meetings.
16. Limited to research and promotion.
17. Have the producers communicate more to the delegates.
18. Depends upon final structure.
23. Less delegates, stronger delegates.
32. There needs to be grassroots involvement.
35. Yes if producers want a ground swell they should be able and individuals should be able. Easily have a mechanism to bring issues forward.
39. Move towards before communication.
42. To receive greater feedback and ability to influence delegates on issues.
44. Local delegates should have more contact with producers.
45. Who is the producer?
49. Numbers make it prohibitive to include producers in the annual meeting, but producers often feel alienated from the process.
50. Plebiscites.
53. Producer only directors.
58. Yes if they can be engaged.
65. Producers/delegates need to be involved in policy and use full/contact people to do a lot of the ground work.
70. Should have some more updates meetings during the year. Producers will come if they are interested.
71. Through e-mail, newsletters and (encouraging?) discussion and comments from producers.
74. Perhaps more local access to resource people.
77. Producers input on some things would be good maybe by internet and fall meetings.
83. ABP needs to listen to grass roots producers.
87. Stop throwing their resolutions in the waste basket
89. More surveys like this one that invites input from all producers much more efficiently than fall producers meetings.
95. as many of us have off farm jobs going to meetings is out of question. Mail out questionnaire on issues from time to time.
96. The delegates need to actively bring the concerns of the producers forward by utilizing farm visits
101. Producers must be allowed greater input. The current system does not work for producers.
103. Producers should be provided with the opportunity to dialogue with their delegates more often than a yearly meeting with its time constraints. The meetings that preceded this survey are an example
104. More direct election process. Improved communication through developing technologies
106. Are not delegates elected producers?
107. Producers should be able to elect directors and participate in the annual meeting. Any resolution that is passed at producer meetings should be presented by that producer. As no resolution is presented exactly the same by ABP at the AGM as the producer presents it.
109. Voting at producer meetings on Board
111. They need to know more of what is going on in the industry
112. It seems to me producers could have more direct access to ABP on policy issues using internet and electronic communication opportunities
113. Direction should be given through resolution format
114. It depends on their qualifications and experience they have collected in the industry and know what they are doing
116. Don't feel we are effectively utilized for financial contribution made – deciding how might be better made from inside ABP
117. As long as the delegates & directors follow what the industry wants

- 118 ABP does not effectively involve producers. Unless this changes ABP will not endure if I pay \$3/head I need to feel you earn it or I don't want to pay it
- 119 With better communication producers could have more involvement under the current system
- 121 30% of the board should be elected @ zone meetings
- 122 As fuel costs rise, zone meetings must be localized more
- 124 Only cow/calf producer who do not feed cattle for slaughter should represent the cow/calf producer
- 125 More emphasis on cow/calf representation. There are too many other groups being represented. We need to focus on the heart of the industry. No cow/calf producers => NO BEEF
- 129 Should be trained to discuss issues with government and have the power to get things done
- 130 Producers need to be more directly involved with ABP policy development. Most have access to the internet. Use this tool to develop a direct link with producers
- 131 Elect some directors directly onto Board
- 132 They should have more input in matter that arise
- 136 More meetings with producers
- 138 Grass roots producers should have more input – information – provide direction to their elected delegate
- 139 Producers feel they have no input or contact from ABP other than at zone meetings. ABP must have more in person communications
- 140 It has been 10 or more years since any producer meetings have been held locally and allowed producer involvement
- 142 need to listen to producers ideas
- 143 Sometime this does not work but we should have more meeting with producers or if a producer wants to go to a delegate meeting here a right to say something but lot prepare don't like meeting
- 145 Must have cow/calf representatives to have any validity
- 148 Reduce – ABP is already spread too thin to be effective. Inexperience delegates cannot make informed decisions on such a wide range of topics
- 153 The advice and wishes of the producers must be paramount. Delegates must listen more closely to what producers want instead of promoting their own agendas
- 157 Greater voice in policy changes
- 158 Perhaps more zone meetings should take place explaining the many issues affecting our industry
- 159 There must be more consultation firstly. Secondly zone meetings should be set so as producers wanting to attend could do so. Any structural changes should be voted on by all producers
- 160 More consultation – minutes of Board meetings should be made available, zone meetings set so producer who wanted to attend could do so. Structural changes should be voted on by all producers
- 163 More producer input from cow/calf operators as they are bottom of the chain with no say in most matters
- 165 I (and many others) believe that one meeting a year is inadequate – veritably reduced to an information session (telling us what you did last year) and elections
- 167 Perhaps producers can align with organizations that best represent them (including ABP) and then a “Fed of Associations”
- 174 Get united
- 179 more input
- 181 The organization should be directly accountable to producers. This includes performance and fiscal grading
- 184 If producers elect delegates (they do) and the delegates represent producers (they should) then what's the problem

6. Should producers be able to directly elect the members of the ABP Board of Directors?

- 65 YES  
66 NO

7. If yes, what directors could be elected directly by producers?
- 6. Through delegates? Can this be done?
  - 8. Producers could possibly elect the zone directors.
  - 9. Zone director.
  - 11. Zone directors.
  - 12. All directors of a smaller board.
  - 14. All directors should be directly elected.
  - 16. All.
  - 18. Zone directors.
  - 19. The zone director would be elected at zone meetings by all producers in attendance.
  - 20. Each zone's producers elect a zone director - plan change.
  - 21. All of them.
  - 24. Ones well associated with the issues.
  - 25. Zone, the other positions should remain as they are.
  - 26. The ordinary producer would have difficulty in assessing whether a director is capable. Delegates would have more access to a directors strengths and weaknesses.
  - 27. All.
  - 29. All.
  - 30. All including chairman.
  - 31. Anyone with ability and talent.
  - 35. Sometimes the best director would not get the popular vote. I would be unsure how this would take place. Sometimes we rotate people too often on 2 year term but be able to get the weaker ones out. Voting – producers should have the right to call a vote on any large issues that they can rally enough support.
  - 36. Look at hired staff/good staff/producer direction. Hire more staff like Rich Smith or Tim Highmoor. Work together.
  - 38. Directors at large.
  - 45. We need accountability but more important communication. ABP's biggest problem is effective communication.
  - 50. All including executive.
  - 57. All local board (zone) producers.
  - 59. All delegates are elected at fall meetings by producers. Directors on board are elected by other delegates.
  - 61. Most producers do not realize all the responsibilities that directors are expected to provide.
  - 79. Zone Directors
  - 83. All
  - 85. Have 2 director elected per zone for a total of 10 plus the Chairman elected by the Board of Director for a total of 11 persons
  - 86. All directors should be elected by the members so that there is no doubt as to their "loyalties", qualifications, etc.
  - 87. If possible, all of them
  - 92. Each zone should elect their own directors at their zone level
  - 95. Less representation would not be good, for us as producers
  - 97. People should be elected to positions and state their goals and objectives
  - 100. Zone directors
  - 101. All of them
  - 102. All
  - 104. Zone directors could be elected directly by producers. After all they are supposed to represent their regional producers
  - 106. If they elect delegates to their zone then how would elect group of say 5 to Board be fair?
  - 107. All excluding Cattle Feeder Directors & Industry Council
  - 109. All
  - 112. I think zone directors could be directly elected at fall meetings. This would have the effect of stimulating discussion at meetings and of moving stable directors along
  - 117. All of them

- 121 As above
- 122 Zone directors and Directors at large
- 124 Only cow/calf producers can represent cow/calf producers
- 126 All directors should be elected directly by producers
- 129 Directors that producers feel represent their views
- 139 All the same faces appear on the executive year after year. This for producers to decide
- 140 All directors' producers have lost all contact or input into ABP
- 148 All levels so that oppressive senior officials do not continue to accumulate power
- 150 As producers, we have the opportunity to elect the delegate & they can elect the director
- 153 All directors. There should be one director elected from each zone for a total of 9. That is all that is needed and all zones are equal. As it stands now one zone has 4 directors and two zones have only 1 on the board.
- 157 All of them
- 165 All directors should be elected by producers
- 167 Each producer organization could promote or recommend persons to the "super Board" i.e. Fed of Assoc.
- 173 All directors
- 174 I don't know
- 181 all of them
- 184 Directors are currently chosen by delegates who are chosen by producers. To me this is democratic. To change things so that any producer can be at the table sounds good but would probably be counter productive if someone wants to be members let them run as a delegate

## B2 - Geographical Representation

1. Is there a need for ABP to continue to have 9 zones:

88 YES  
 48 NO  
 32 UNCERTAIN

2. If no, how many zones should there be? \_\_\_\_\_

4. 7  
 7. 4  
 8. 4 (see diagram on comment form)  
 10. 4  
 11. 5  
 12. 4-5  
 14. 5  
 15. 3  
 18. 5  
 19. 4  
 20. 5  
 21. 4  
 22. 4  
 23. 1  
 24. Don't know. Maybe 4 or 5  
 26. 5-7  
 27. 1  
 29. 4-5  
 30. 1 or 4  
 31. 2 or 3  
 35. 4 (1&4), (2&3), (5,6&7), (8&9)  
 38. More than 4

- 39. 1
- 46. 6
- 49. 7
- 50. ?
- 51. 5
- 54. 2
- 83. 6
- 85. 5
- 91. 7
- 92. 5
- 97. 5
- 99. 2 – 4
- 100. 5
- 107. 4 at maximum
- 109. 5
- 110. 4
- 114. Maybe 5-7
- 124. 1
- 125. N/A
- 126. None
- 135. 7
- 136. 5
- 145. 3 north-central-south
- 148. 4 or 6
- 154. 7-9
- 155. 0
- 157. 4
- 174. 1
- 176. 5

3. Should there be fewer than 7 zone delegates per zone:

- 57. YES
- 67. NO
- 37. UNCERTAIN

4. If yes, how many zone delegates does each zone need? \_\_\_\_\_

- 5. Should have at least 40 delegates.
- 7. 4
- 9. 3
- 10. Production volume based, and no more than 4 and no fewer than 2.
- 12. 2
- 14. There should be more. 20.
- 15. 5
- 18. 5
- 19. 5 in 4 zones.
- 20. 5
- 21. 4
- 22. 4
- 23. 1
- 26. 4-6
- 27. (3?) Board of directors of 12 represented from within the industry.
- 30. 3 if 4 zones, 7-9 if 1 zone.
- 31. 25 total.
- 35. 5
- 38. 5 at most.
- 42. (2 – 5?)
- 50. 4 – 5

51. 6  
 52. 6  
 56. 1 ? or someone to represent them that is informed fully.  
 58. 3-4  
 65. no lower than now.  
 76. 5  
 83. 3  
 85. 5  
 89. 4  
 91. 5  
 92. maximum of 5  
 97. 5  
 99. 4  
 102. 5  
 106. Maybe 6  
 107. 4  
 109. 4  
 110. 5  
 111. 5  
 117. 4  
 120. 10  
 124. 1  
 126. None  
 127. 5  
 131. 1-4  
 136. 3  
 139. as is  
 145. 2  
 148. 4 or 5  
 150. 5  
 153. No more than 4  
 155. 0  
 158. 1  
 166. One delegate per zone floating group to expand zone coverage if issue calls for it.  
 172. 4  
 174. 1  
 178. 4 or 5

Comments:

1. There is a “disconnect” between ABP and many many cow/calf producers. You have to have visible, regional representation or the many producers will have as much “connect” with the CCA (which is very little to none). I want my \$3.00 back – if I don’t have influence into how my \$3 is spent.
3. With a large delegate body all sectors of the industry have a chance of being fairly represented.
4. You still have an adequate representation – varied representation to adequately equal every section of the industry and every area of the province.
6. Should have everyone represented but the structure of the board needs to change!
7. If 4 zones still have 7 per zone
8. Let cattle feeders decide their issues.
9. Let the most competent rise to the top – few delegates may promote this.
11. Five zones will reduce number of delegates, reduce directors and allow a more efficient organization to emerge.
12. This would make delegates into directors which would make the board smaller and workable.
14. Need to reduce zones and the number of directors.
16. Need no more than 12 people aboard and enough delegates to gather information and help direct the board members – a smaller board are smaller delegate body.

17. Depending on location, the more delegates the more ways the producers can (**communicate?**) to delegates.
18. Overall downsizing will help overall responsiveness of the organization. ABP must become more responsive and proactive rather than reactive.
19. Let the best people available be voted in.
20. Transportation issues can be addressed. The same communication through technology.
24. Depends how big the zone may be.
25. I think that if there are producers willing to be delegates the option should be there – if consistently there aren't enough people willing then it should be revisited. I think specific options should be explored and presented to the delegate body about fewer zones and delegates. Special interest representation is a concern.
28. If you make the job of a delegate full time you may lose a lot of young producers who are involved with ABP. A lot of older producers still running their own operations wouldn't have time to be involved with ABP.
29. If we have fewer zones we could maintain 7 delegates. Having delegates zoned within each Alberta zone.
31. Way too many uninformed delegates being paid. 12 directors – no delegates – hire committees. Business organization can be run by 12 good directors. No need for delegates.
32. The reduction in the number of delegates should be from reducing the 'council' representation.
35. Run it like a business, not like a social club. Pay the best minds of your industry to represent producers and industry. But they are accountable and fire-able.
37. In order to adequately represent the producers of Alberta, there has to be adequate number of people. There is a great amount of information to process from each committee and council.
38. When reducing the number of zones a real concern will be the fear of areas like the north not being adequately represented because of geography limitations.
39. Reduce to one industry
40. The only reason to reduce the number would be to reduce cost. I don't feel the cost saving would justify the loss of communication to producers.
42. Reduction in delegates creates demand for positions and emphasis of importance of the delegate position.
45. We need not to be so controlled by small segments of the cattle chain dictating policy for larger group. (see diagram)
46. Fewer zones would streamline the organization.
49. Zone 9 has always been an "issue" in that it is costly to bring their delegates to meetings – however, they are part of the industry so I would suggest looking at 6 & 7 or 5 & 4.
52. Then 3 elected each other year. Then as stand 1 delegate for each committee of present system.
54. You need this representation to cover the areas of the zones.
57. Due to regions being large – more delegates are important to talk to more producers. More input (info) can be gathered and then a common ground or direction can be sought to best represent the industry.
58. 3.3 million Albertans – 83 MLAs  
21,000 producers – 63 delegates  
Fewer delegates means more accountability/delegate.
59. Less delegates per zone would make more work for the ones left and the week would not get done. People would play out and do less and nothing would get done.
61. Unless roles change drastically there are too many areas to be covered by any fewer delegates. Areas represented at this time in some zones is huge.
62. Could be less delegates per zone.
63. I do not feel the delegate body should not be reduced. Wherever the industry needs to be represented to the greatest extent possible it should be delegates that should be that face.
65. Most delegates are working for all sectors – survival of cow-calf sector is in trouble and needs to be addressed.
69. Travel already is quite extensive in zone 7. Bigger zones would be hard to represent the zone thoroughly.

70. If the delegates are interested in ABP and works hard for the producer, there is a lot of work for the delegates.
79. Perhaps there should be a minimum (perhaps 5) and a maximum (perhaps 7) delegates per zone and not fill empty seats except with producers who want to be there.
81. Zone by climatic region – cost of production similar, wildlife concerns similar, trucking distances similar, geography similar.
83. The more people who represent us, we lose the direction of the producers.
- 85 the cost of administration is to high
- 87 If the present trend of herd reduction's and sell off's continue, then geographical representation will have to change – 8000 to 10,000 less beef cows in the Rimbey Auction Market trading area, and if so, then less delegates are needed. Hog sell off's and few gophers, so not much livestock to represent.
- 88 All delegate have roles on their own operations. Reducing the number could increase individual delegates workload which could reduce the number of potential delegates and skew delegate representation more than now to producers who have a greater workforce at home.
- 90 Having been a delegate and zone director for 2 years, I saw firsthand people who were just along for the ride. The responsibility assumed by a board member is very significant and needs to be taken seriously. Delegates to need to be genuinely interested and able to contribute and deliver information on a 2 way street.
- 91 Mileage is expensive. Let's cut costs.
- 92 Fewer cattle means fewer dollars for ABP which means fewer zones & fewer delegates
- 93 there needs to be even number of cow/calf producers as feedlot reps
- 96 the delegates need to spend more time gathering information from producers. This will bring the producer out and make them become an active participant. In good times as well as bad times.
- 97 the number currently elected tends to be cumbersome and non functionally. A smaller efficient number would mean more communication and action on matters & issues
- 99 there are too many delegates. The people who run, are either retired, poor managers or have hired men to do chores. So far removed from reality
- 100 Five zones with seven delegates each should be sufficient
- 103 Eliminating zones would make it harder for delegates to represent producers
- 104 Elect equal numbers each year. Reducing the zones to 5 will reduce delegated by 28 plus 4 cattle feeder council delegates. Increasing zone delegates to 8 will still result in a significant reduction
- 106 One less would save some cost and 3 elected each other year would work. If only 5 or 6 committees then 6 would be plenty. 1 on each committee.
- 107 this will have the best people. At present there are many delegates and they are not well known. Their job is to report but, as a producer, I feel this does not happen
- 109 Too, many delegates make meetings onerous not enough delegates have done their homework – committee become too large as well. Too arduous to get anything done i.e how long have we worked on age verification
- 111 5 with something to say sure better than 7 with not much to say
- 113 Too narrow of a scope if only a few producers involved
- 116 I would not want to contribute to an organization that didn't represent me in my part of the province (within reasonable driving distance)
- 117 The zones must remain the same due to different issues in different areas. We could reduce the delegates back to 4 from 7 to reduce expenses but it still would provide good representation for the producers
- 118 ABP covers a large diverse group. Producers need more options than fall meetings to be involved. Once a year I can drive for two hours to a meeting if I have nothing else to do. When and if I get there ABP visitors and delegates want to do the business of the organization. I on the other hand may have a brilliant idea to put forward or maybe just get some frustration off my mind. Fall meetings are not enough to meet my needs. Suggestion to consider: (1) mail in ballots for delegates in addition to voting at fall meets (2) staff field reps to assist delegates with maintaining producer contacts – local meetings; phone calls; drafting resolutions.

- 119 there is more and more work to be done this will need people to help do it. I also believe that, to a point, delegates are great ambassadors for ABP and help get good communication to and from as many producers as possible
- 124 ABP could become an umbrella organization with representatives from all the beef sectors. There is a need for one voice in the industry but too often personal financial situations and greed mean that irreparable damage is done too one sector. In this case the feeders took money for short term gain and killed the cow that producers the calf they feed
- 126 We need to get rid of zones and delegates. Have an annual meeting and elect the best people available to the Board of Directors. Say 12 directors for a 3 year term – elect 4 each year at an annual meeting.
- 127 Our zone covers a big area
- 128 there is only a need for ABP to continue to have 9 zones if we continue to have the same amount of cattle that we have now. If numbers go down, then there may not be a need to have 9 zones
- 129 Zone 9 is too big, not represent. Ranchers don't know about ABP and do not get enough information. Zone 9 should be divided into two zones (9 & 10). The population of ranchers is increasing in Zone 9
- 130 There is not enough contact between delegates and producers. Delegates need to find innovative ways to develop two way communication with grass roots producers. There is a perception that may or may not be fact that the ABP is seen top down instead of bottom up. Reducing delegates would just make the problem worse
- 132 If the numbers of producers declines a large amount then change zones to a smaller number. Alberta is a large province; one delegate cannot know situations in his or her zone completely
- 136 I think it cost too much for as many delegates as ABP now has
- 138 There is too much representation in southern Alberta vs. Northern Alberta. If there has to be change make larger zones in the south. It wouldn't hurt producers to drive 1 ½ hours to meeting like the rest of us.
- 146 ABP is very "top heavy". A \$13 million+ budget = ~ 2500 calves (value) at a time when cow/calf operations are dying (2008 = loss \$200/cow) is extremely excessive. Great need to trim this organization which can be as effective as a longer organization. Cow/calf operators bear full cost of ABP as the "check-off" expense is passed down by feeders and packers. We have received no benefit from age verification from packers.
- 147 Because of the size of some zones to have fewer delegates the areas will not be represented properly. It is good to be able to talk to a local zone delegate without phoning long distance or travelling many miles
- 148 I feel we are groping to elect delegates to fill positions but there is a very small pool of often inexperienced people t chose from. Serious, knowledgeable people avoid running for ABP because it has proven that it is ineffective at making changes that the producers repeated ask for. I.e. market access testing, reduced check-off, CCIA and age verification (financial and data) benefits...
- 150 Alberta has many different areas and needs to have representation from all areas in order t carry on and represent every zone
- 152 Number of delegates should depend on cattle population and area of particular zone
- 153 There is no need to have so many delegates from each zone. In many zones there are 2 delegates from the same location. If you put things into perspective there are 83 MLA's governing a whole province & its numerous areas of responsibility. With ABP 74 zone delegates and 9 Industry Council delegates for a total of 83 delegates "govern" one industry. Isn't that a bit of over kill? No wonder so much of our check-off budget dollars goes to delegate expenses. It could/should be cut in half
- 154 Delegates have to travel to far in a zone – I believe zones should be divided into sub-zones. So each delegate would be responsible for a certain number of producers combined with a factor related to the number of cattle in his/her subzone. The format Alberta Wheat Pool has was manageable
- 158 If more zone meetings were held, one delegate could relay the concerns of the zone back to the parent body. Just think of the monetary savings to producers

- 159 Each of these areas are ecologically different, each with its own unique set of challenges. You cannot expect someone from say Red Deer to really know & gut feel the problems in Milk River.
- 160 Alberta is such a diverse province and each of these zones we currently have are ecologically different with its own unique set of challenges
- 164 Certainly it appears that ABP could benefit from a restructuring – over the past number of years the organization appears to have moved to more of a reactive organization than a proactive one – what was once a fairly efficient, effective organization has grown into a bureaucracy that is now neither efficient nor effective. There is not enough background material in the document to answer the questions in Section “A” any clearer than I have already done so.
- 165 Right now the bureaucracy at the top and it is totally disconnected bureaucracy – is ineffective and unwieldy AND expensive. Because of this, some of us have taken our concerns directly to the Ag Minister either individually or in smaller groups and have had positive results. This present process is one of them. We need to rethink and restructure ABP and CCA
- 166 As above – zone delegates have done little to attract my attention over the years
- 167 Should be the “best” irrespective of geographies
- 172 Less delegates means more input for delegates that are left, and you would require less committees to give everyone jobs
- 176 Delegates to be elected by mail ballot
- 183 Fewer zone delegates would not compromise effective representation
- 184 Maybe the numbers could be tweaked a little, but the idea of zones is good since different areas may have different views that need to be brought to the table. To decrease the number of delegates dramatically would limit the opportunity for concerned producers to be involved. I think we are in the ballpark right now.

### **B3 - Industry Sector Representation**

#### Cattle Feeder Council

1. Should cattle feeder council delegates continue to be elected from the zones?

100 YES  
 35 NO  
 26 UNCERTAIN

8. Let Cattle Feeders elect their own  
 10 Let ACFA play this role  
 50. CFC members should come from elected delegates.  
 70. one per zone.

2. Do the zones for the election of cattle feeder council delegates need to be the same as the zones for electing zone delegates?

62 YES  
 57 NO  
 38 UNCERTAIN

58. 3 Broad zones?

3. Are there other options for electing cattle feeder council delegates?

55 YES  
 45 NO  
 4 UNCERTAIN

4. If yes, what?

1. I don't believe there should be a cattle council, in fact, there feeders should not be a part of ABP.
4. The Cattle Feeders Councils and the Feeder Association should be one body.
5. Let them elect or appoint their own delegates.
6. Disconnect - some zones have delegates in CFC that are not in the extensive livestock feeding industry.
8. Let them decide their own delegates.
9. Let cattle feeders elect their own.
10. Let ACFA run through ABP, with matching funding from ABP and cattle feeder members.
11. There are other options. (Direct?) province wide from delegates or other methods. Are they better?
12. Elect them similar to a delegate at large. (I think this person meant "director")
15. 4 elected from zones, 4 brought in from ACFA.
16. Needs to be a Federation of beef industry associations with ABP limited to research and promotion.
17. Elect from the cattle feeder industry. Get the people in the business in the right position.
18. ACFA
21. Elect the best member's from wherever.
23. Best people regardless.
25. Let the feeders decide for themselves. Whatever they choose is fine.
27. Election of best persons from industry with no regard to zones.
28. Let cattle feeders elect their own delegates.
30. (ACFA) Let cattle feeders send their reps to the board.
35. Cattle feeder council and Alberta cattle feeder send show will represent them based on industry (Stall?).
37. There should be one zone regarding CFC. Elect the best and brightest.
38. Representation of cattle feeders has to be a-political. All cannot come from ACFA because they don't represent all cattle feeders.
41. Alignment with ACFA.
42. Appointments or nominations from the ACFA plus elected reps.
44. Maybe they need to be elected from areas that feed more cattle.
50. No special interest groups. All delegates should be elected.
51. Have Alta Cattle Feed appoint delegates to the Board.
52. The way it is the most (democratic?).
53. Feeders have the same rights as other producers.
58. 3 broad feeder zones?
65. Council rep could be taken from total zone reps.
67. ACFA could provide delegates for each zone.
75. They could run as delegates same as everyone else.
79. from within Cattle Feeder groups.
85. Elect 1 member to the cattle feeders council from each zone and this is fair to every zone
87. Not sure
88. Council members are already ABP members and have historically had good representation on ABP delegates & BOD. Don't need feeder council
90. NE AB – 1 delegate; NW AB – 1 delegate; SW AB – 1 delegate; SE AB – 1 delegate
92. Cattle Feeder delegates should be elected NOT appointed and there should be only 1 in each zone otherwise they overload it.
96. Any producer that background or finishes should be part of this process
104. There are a number of different options. But are they an improvement on what we have now? If yes, go for it.
106. Likely more cattle feeders in southern half of province but not sure any change would be fair
107. Select from ACFA by feeders
112. I do not agree with having directors appointed or elected from within other industry organizations. These directors must be accountable to producers and not to some other organization

119 There could be a system of electing more from zones with higher numbers of feeders  
 122 Equal representation for each zone  
 124 If ABP becomes an umbrella association the feeders would have the same  
 representation as other stakeholders  
 125 CFC should not sit on ABP  
 126 If directors are elected as I propose there is no need to have cattle feeder council  
 members  
 147 Do we need a Cattle Feeder Council delegate from every zone, maybe only zones that  
 have feeder cattle?  
 148 Let the cattle feeder council send 2 delegates of their choice to meetings at their own  
 expense  
 155 Don't elect  
 164 Cattle Feeder Council seems to be able to effectively provide input to ABP for their sector  
 – there needs to be similar representation from each industry sector to ABP and election  
 protocols should be developed to allow for that.  
 165 I think, as feeders, we should elect council members for the ACFA to sit on the ABP  
 166 Cattle Feeders have their own association  
 174 Sound thinking big & producer are listened to  
 181 They should not be represented in ABP. There should be no election  
 184 I'm sure there are lots of options like letting the feeding industry appoint the council. But I  
 wouldn't agree to that

5. Is 13 the right number of cattle feeder council delegates?

26 YES  
 53 NO  
 67 UNCERTAIN

6. If no, what is the right number:

10. 7ish should suffice.  
 11. 9  
 12. 2  
 14. 6-7  
 15. 8  
 16. Needs to be a Federation of beef industry associations with ABP limited to research and  
 promotion.  
 17. 8-10  
 18. 8  
 20. 5  
 22. 5  
 23. 4 C/C, 4 Feeder Council, CIC 1 delegate.  
 30. 3-5 directly to board of directors.  
 34. 9 – 1 from each zone.  
 39. 1  
 42. 7  
 45. less – perhaps 9  
 50. 0  
 51. use 12 – 14 that are on the Alta Cattle Feeders.  
 53. 1  
 61. It would be hard to fill in more seats within zones not heavily involved in feeding.  
 65. balance to rest of delegate numbers.  
 70. 7  
 75. 3  
 82. 19  
 85. 5 member; 1 from each zone  
 87. 7  
 88. 0  
 90. 4

92 9 - 1 per zone  
 96 18  
 99 2  
 102 9-10  
 104 8  
 109 smaller – 8  
 110 7  
 111 1 per zone  
 114 1 per zone  
 122 9  
 124 1  
 125 0  
 133 5  
 135 7  
 136 8-10  
 138 9  
 139 0  
 140 9  
 143 12-14 (13 is unlucky number)  
 146 3  
 148 2  
 155 0  
 157 6  
 158 3  
 160 0  
 164 ?  
 174 Maybe 3 don't want to be too top heavy  
 181 0  
 183 8

7. Who should elect the cattle feeder council delegates?

55 by all producers or  
80 only by producers identified/registered as cattle feeders

45. What constitutes a cattle feeder?  
 58. Hard to identify.  
 167 Cattle Feeders, as an Association can determine this

8. Should Cattle Feeder Council continue to be a Council specifically identified in the Plan Regulation or should it become a standing committee of the Board?

54 remain as a Council  
38 become a standing committee  
36 Uncertain

160 downsize

Comments:

- 3. It is hard to comment on Cattle Feeder Council when the large cattle feeders are uncertain what organization to belong to.
- 6. Need more cattle feeder to articulate to ABP industry pressures and issues. Need more cattle feeders on the board of directors.
- 10. Let ACFA play this role.
- 13. Cattle feeders should appoint/elect a delegate to represent their industry.
- 16. Needs to be a Federation of beef industry associations with ABP limited to research and promotion.
- 17. Let the cattle feeders represent themselves. Put the people in the know on a committee.

18. If you want a sector's opinion ask it and hear it and act on it. These folks can be more valuable as a committee than a council.
19. Response form is square holes and I have round pegs.
23. 4 C/C, 4 Feeder Council, CIC 1 delegate
25. Let the feeders decide. Make the feeder council a line budget item.
26. The cattle feeders should be allowed to control their own destiny.
30. Let ACFA represent cattle feeders at their board. Do away with cattle feeder council they will send reps to ABP board.
31. Get rid of CFC and leave it up to ACFA and hand them some money.
32. There should not be 'industry sector' representation separate from election of zone delegates.
35. Restructure and have equal representation that the sectors reflect. Let cattle feeders elect who they want. Let cattle feeder council and let Alberta cattle feeders dialog and tell ABP who and what they want. Let the feeders elect their best to represent them. What does cattle feeders want? They want ABP to be more responsive to issues on a timely manner. We all need ABP to become shakers and movers.
36. Figure it out with cattle feeders.
38. We need a group of cattle feeders that are representative of industry and not just the ACFA.
50. No special interests councils with voting power.
51. Use Alta Cattle Feeders with positions on the board.
53. It should be gone (Cattle Feeder Council).
58. If the check off issue can be addressed otherwise stay as council.
61. Zones could be different for CFC delegates as long as all feeders are eligible to run for election.
62. Why do we need a feeder council?
63. I feel the cattle industry has suffered from the addition of cattle industry councils and feeder councils. Even if undeserved they give the perception of sectoral division. Either all councils or no council.
70. Cattle Feeder, where's the cow-calf. We are Alberta Beef Producers.
72. It needs to remain a Council to keep ACFA happy. Need their support!
81. Why special status?
86. Although an important part of the process they are still on "step" which without all of the other "steps" cannot stand alone so they should be equal to but not more important than the other groups.
88. already made
91. Feeder Association delegates should not be setting policy
96. I believe that the CFC has more power in the ABP than primary producers
103. No more delegates than cow/calf producers
104. Probably best for political and conceptual reason to leave CFC as a council
106. both have merit not sure change is necessary unless Feeder Council would prefer. I think it is work fairly well.
115. I believe the cattle feeders have every opportunity to get the people they want into position on ABP. Let's not lose sight of the fact cattle feeders are a very split organization (Free enterprise on one hand Disgruntled!! Happy Contract feeder on the other hand)
116. All input groups should be equal with equal power if cow/calf input is from committee level maybe other producer sectors should have same status either all committees or all councils
118. My poor understanding of ABP history is that a deal was made to maintain feeder involvement. If you make a deal you honour it.
123. It is hard now to get a representative from the feeders for every zone. Should make the zones for feeders match where the feedlots are by # of feedlots. Down south could have 2 zones where elsewhere could be expanded into larger zones. Feeder groups are also able to be a regular ABP delegate if they really want to be
124. CFC The cattle feeders have too much power within ABP and through lack of understanding of the industry and greed have killed the cow/calf industry
125. CFC should not be involved in deciding policy

- 138 All zones' should be equal  
 139 Cattle Feeder Council interested differ from cow/calf producers. ABP has lost sight of the cow/calf producers too much emphasis on feeder council  
 140 Plan regulation is not explained or identified  
 147 If there is not a lot of feeder cattle fed in a zone I don't think every zone needs a feeder council zone rep  
 148 Let the council send 2 reps to the ABP to state their position when it is relevant. Actually they would accomplish more appealing direct to government  
 153 The Cattle Feeder Council should be of equal status to a cow/calf group representation. If the CFC is a specific council then the cow/calf producers should be represented by a specific council; otherwise they should both become standing committees only  
 157 We do not need more bureaucracy  
 158 If we don't address the issue of the self off of our cow herd we won't need a CFC  
 159 There should be no cattle feeder council – period – they make their living off the primary producer and we pay their check-off indirectly. Consultation – yes. They are already represented as producers by a zone delegates if they are paying a check-off per head  
 160 ABP has spread itself too thin and is not able to effectively represent all interests equally. The primary producer pays all check-offs directly and indirectly. Why should they have any more say than any other producer? Consultation outside of ABP – yes – not within. Downsize this out.  
 165 The following suggestion is probably impossible but in restructuring the ABP I think some thought should be given to considering a more unified voice under the common “umbrella” of producers – or I hardly see the point of ABP or CCA at all  
 174 too many is to political  
 181 They should be removed from the ABP organization. This would be in the best interest of the primary producers.  
 184 If the cow/calf part of the sector doesn't need to be a separate council, then why does the feeder sector? If the feeder industry feels better keeping it a council, then fine by me.

### Cattle Industry Council

1. Should the members of Cattle Industry Council be restricted to “stakeholders” invited to participate by the ABP Board of Directors?

98 YES  
 23 NO  
 28 UNCERTAIN

50. Again, CIC should come from elected delegates.  
 51. From ACFA.  
 167 Should not be forced to exist

2. If no, how should members be put on Cattle Industry Council?

11. I don't care!  
 12. Elect by stakeholders  
 13. No change.  
 14. Vote or appointed by stakeholders within industry.  
 16. Needs to be a Federation of associations.  
 39. Elected by all check off.  
 40. They should be elected the same way as zone delegates.  
 45. Proposal representation.  
 58. List of invitees and some at large elected by producers.  
 61. If it is open to everyone, we will have more PETA's, etc. than we need to contend with and nothing will be achieved!  
 75. one.  
 78. not sure.  
 81. Not sure CIC needs to be there (as voting members). For advice, yes.  
 86 Any interested groups should request a place and a vote should be held

- 104 Anybody who derives his/her income from the cattle industry and expresses a willingness to contribute and directly or indirectly contributes should be welcome
- 107 By application and approved by Cattle Industry Council
- 112 It is my view these members need to be selected from organizations invited by ABP executive to send representatives
- 121 Elected
- 122 From cow/calf as well as cattle feeder council
- 124 Participation to date has not been beneficial to the industry
- 133 elections
- 139 elected by producers
- 146 elected
- 148 2 reps from CIC to present their needs & views to ABP
- 153 It should include any interested party wishing to work for the betterment of ABP. There are many retired producers who are interested in ABP who have wonderful expertise and who now have time to work for the organization. CIC members could elect their delegates.
- 160 there should not be a Cattle Industry Council or even a standing committee
- 165 Because the ABP directors as a whole body is out of touch with the grassroots producers, CIC members such as WSGA must have a strong guiding voice.
- 173 Member can be approved by any ABP approved members
- 181 The cattle industry council should not be able to participate in ABP
- 184 If this is our organization, then we should control it. The current framework for CIC is good. Certainly new members could be propose dto the Directors by others, and the directors can decide

3. Should cattle industry stakeholders continue to be restricted to “persons, other than individuals, that provide services to the cattle industry”?

- 81 YES
- 14 NO
- 32 UNCERTAIN

4. If no, how should the definition of cattle industry stakeholder be expanded?

- 11. Whatever
- 14. Any key players
- 16. Needs to be a Federation of associations.
- 41. The most qualified are need not restricted to services provided.
- 56. Someone that has retired from the active industry, maybe they have more time.
- 58. Add elected reps from delegates.
- 61. “Stakeholders” with industry involvement and interest for its survival should be considered.
- 62. Don’t need Cattle Industry Council.
- 86 Perhaps the wholesale marketing should be explored to try and narrow the gap from the producer to the retail market price
- 91 No one should be able to set policy of they don’t have a gut issue – stake – in the business
- 95 If you’re not a vegetarian you qualify.
- 97 Participants should be appointed as required for current issues. Any party who is valuable should be utilized. If issues are completed then representatives no longer needed
- 101 To include representatives on Feeder council and cow/calf committee
- 104 Interpret “provide services” in its broadest sense
- 106 Not sure all CIC groups fit category now. E.g. Are not WSGA really producers some cattle feeders
- 113 We need not lose track of who we represent
- 146 Cattle industry “stakeholders” should not be part of ABP
- 148 Restricted to services directly connected to the production of beef. Exclude extreme animal welfare groups and meat retailers

- 153 See comments about. Former ABP members who have retired should be allowed membership
- 159 It shouldn't be expanded
- 160 No expansion – downsize them out
- 163 Cattle people only to make decisions
- 165 If they are to have influential voting powers or even a swaying influence, they should have a direct stake in the industry
- 174 They have no experience in production
- 181 The only cattle industry stakeholders ABP should be concerned with is the primary producers. Focus → concentrate. Not expand → diluting
- 184 I'm not aware of where the definition has been a problem

5. Is 10 the right number of cattle industry council delegates?

- 33 YES
- 39 NO
- 66 UNCERTAIN

- 153 Probably could be reduced
- 184 Unless another important group is identified that cannot fit under the current umbrella

6. How many cattle industry council delegates should there be?

- 10. Dependant on the number of service providers.
- 11. 5
- 12. 2
- 14. 20
- 16. Needs to be a Federation of associations.
- 18. 5-7
- 20. 5
- 33. 5
- 39. 1
- 40. few
- 46. 7
- 53. 1
- 58. 12
- 62. none.
- 68. 5
- 69. 10 is a good number.
- 70. 7
- 75. 10
- 82. 3
- 85. 5
- 87. 5
- 90. 4
- 91. 7
- 92. 1 per zone
- 95. should be odd numbers
- 96. 36
- 97. 3
- 99. 2
- 100. 5
- 102. 8
- 109. 5
- 110. 7
- 111. 5
- 113. # could be determined
- 114. 5
- 124. 1?

131	9
136	6
140	9
146	less – see above
148	2
153	4-6
155	0
158	3
159	0
160	0
164	Limited to a number to allow the council to be efficient and effective
165	?
174	Depend what kind are elected about 3 or 4 I think
181	0
183	5

7. Should Cattle Industry Council continue to be a Council specifically identified in the Plan Regulation or should it become a standing committee of the Board?

65 remain as a "Council"  
28 become a standing committee  
37 Uncertain

Comments:

- 6. Need CIC on the board of directors.
- 18. CIC is valuable and warrants committee standing.
- 25. Let cattle industry members decide on the right number.
- 35. Industry can tell us what they want. Industry not to exceed 10 delegates.
- 36. All looks good.
- 42. WSG – 2, FAA – 2, AMA – 2, CIC – 4
- 46. Council should be large but they should choose 7 the same as a zone.
- 58. If standing committee does not impact funding.
- 61. Cattle Industry Council delegates have been invited to become through identification through other members of the Council – as of yet, there are not any been denied by the board – to my knowledge.
- 63. I feel the councils are an attempt to bypass the delegate body to the hard table.
- 65. Standing committees can be made or deleted as needed – if industry council (or other committees) are needed or not needed they can be added or deleted.
- 70. This should be a committee that would bring these ideas to the board.
- 85. The workings of Alberta Beef is to confusing and need to be simplified
- 88. ABP is funded by check-off. Only those who pay the check-off should have a vote on decision making. Most of the CIC members probably pay check-off and are eligible to run as delegates at zone meetings – that is how they should be on the board. As an ABP delegate(s) on there various boards and involved in their decision making
- 91. Don't know
- 96. CIC should be the voice that brings all concerns down to the producer level. The CIC should also include the voice of the multi-national and the localized companies
- 100. The Western Stock Growers is an association of producers. Allowing them to appoint producer members of that association to the CIC, then gives WSGA producers double representation on ABP and is therefore undemocratic and should be ended
- 104. Again, for political reasons leave it alone. Committee or Council whatever. The question is does it contribute!
- 115. I believe it has worked very well so far. Industry brought good information and another point of view to the table
- 124. ABP seems to be stocked with individuals who do not understand that without calves there is no cattle industry in Alberta
- 125. CIC should not have a vote on board
- 138. These people run no risk in making their living so why do they need input?

- 148 Let CIC send their concerns via 2 delegates from CIC at their expense to make their needs know to the ABP at any meetings
- 153 the same goes for the CIC and CFC and cow/calf committee. They must all be on par – all councils of equal standing or all standing committees
- 159 There should be no cattle industry council – period. They do not pay a check-off but instead charge producers for a service. Consultation – yes – if any of their members are producers they are represented already by zone delegates
- 160 There should be no cattle industry council. If they are a cattle producer they would be already represented by a zone delegate. They do not pay a check-off but instead charge producers for a service. Consultation outside of ABP – yes – not within.
- 167 this may be replaced by a Fed of Assoc
- 174 I need sound decision makers that are with producers
- 176 same as cow/calf
- 181 The CIC should be removed from all ABP events
- 184 In general this CIC is a good idea

### Cow-calf committee

1. Should the cow-calf committee be a “Council” similar to Cattle Feeder Council or should it be a standing committee of the Board?

52 Set up as a Council  
49 be a standing committee  
28 Uncertain

50. No need if other councils are gone.
- 90 Question – why is it a cow/calf committee? When all the rest of individualized groups are councils?
- 111 What the Hell
- 114 We do not need a cow/calf committee
- 148 Do not create
- 167 this committee need to exist. There are cow/calf org (including ABP) which exist now as stand alone

2. Should the members of the cow-calf committee/council be elected by producers or appointed by the Board?

87 Elected by producers  
24 Appointed by the Board  
27 Uncertain  
1 Appointed and elected producers  
1 Elected by producers or elected by board

- 148 We do not need another committee. All members should be elected by producers

3. If elected, how should producers be elected to the cow-calf committee/council?

9. By zone.
10. Appointed by the various industry associations.
14. Direct elections.
16. Federation of association – ABP restricted to research and promotion.
20. Are we sure we need this?
23. By cow-calf council only.
25. Same as feeder council.
29. Vote.
33. From delegate body.
37. Elections at fall producer meetings.
39. Election not by Zone but by the total Province.
40. Same as zone delegates.

44. At annual meetings, the same as ABP directors.  
46. Delegates could identify themselves for election.  
52. From elected delegates.  
54. by delegates.  
56. Interview, their interests are important.  
57. from the zone delegates.  
58. elected from delegate body.  
65. same as feeder.  
69. Elected as normal zone delegates.  
70. Elected by a cow-calf producers.  
75. elected by directors.  
78. one from each zone.  
79. from the delegate body at AGM.  
81. why elected?  
87 Same way, same time, as delegates  
89 At fall meeting they can run  
90 1 per zone  
91 5  
92 Elected at zone meetings  
95 by zones and mail out ballots  
97 5  
100 The CFC has established the pattern – carry on  
101 At Fall producer meetings – the same as current delegates  
106 a member of elect delegate would be on committee  
107 Producers at zone meetings  
109 fall meetings  
114 at fall meetings  
115 Elected at zone level from elected delegates  
117 this is the current delegates & directors that represent ABP  
119 At fall meetings or by the delegate’s body at the AGM  
121 At zone meetings  
122 At the annual producers meetings  
123 Only cow/calf producers for a cow/calf association  
125 By the zone delegates  
129 Same way delegates are elected  
131 Producers should be elected to CCC by registered producers  
136 At zone meetings  
139 nominated by zone producers & elected by ballot  
140 By producers  
143 same as delegates  
144 The fall producer meetings  
146 Put a ballot in your newsletter to avoid other costs  
148 No cow/calf committee  
150 At producer meetings  
153 By cow/calf producers only  
154 Similar to how delegates are elected now  
157 Same as other committee  
158 At the zone level  
160 by producers at fall meetings  
161 Mail in ballots from cow/calf producers  
163 By owning a cow/calf operation  
164 Members should be elected by cow/calf producers (sector) to represent their interest in the organization  
165 At general meetings which we would hope are at least twice a year.  
166 You answer your own question (producer underlined “how should producers be”)  
172 elected by delegates  
173 voted by Board  
176 by mail in ballot  
177 cow/calf committee

181 through ballot system  
184 Probably at zone meetings, then further narrowed down by election at AGM

4. If elected, who should elect the cow-calf committee/council delegates?

41 by all producers or  
47 by producers identified/registered as cow-calf producers

153 as cow/calf producers only

Comments:

1. The cow/calf should be the main backbone of ABP. We need not ... (It looks like the writer did not finish comment)
4. More information is needed by the producer to make a proper decision.
5. Have a committee for the cow/calf operators.
6. Should be less represented but equal with other sectors of the industry.
10. By industry associations and zones.
11. Should forget about this idea.
13. N/A – Is a producer not already represented?
14. Good idea to have a cow-calf council in place.
19. Do we really need one?
21. Cow-calf council or committee is not necessary.
23. 4 cow-calf director to board from cow-calf council.
25. I think this needs to be reviewed once the zone numbers and delegate numbers are determined.
27. Why?
34. If there is a cow-calf committee it definitely should be elected by identified cow-calf producers.
35. By producers who are identified as cow/calf producers. Isn't ABP already representing the cow/calf producer. Change for the better may be the best strategy.
38. We do not need a cow/calf council. We would be distributing funding (to) the different councils without an overall approach to industry issues!
43. When I was involved in ABP, I could have answered with more certainty. I feel sitting delegates are more in tune with what is needed.
46. They should be elected by the whole delegate body.
52. If cattle feeder council is elected by producers the cow-calf should be the same.
61. I do not see the purpose of a cow-calf committee or council as producers have the opportunity to bring forward issues through resolutions at fall meetings and public affairs. Government Affairs deal with cow-calf issues at every meeting. The board deals with cow-calf issues at every meeting. As a standing committee it can be disband it at anytime. They have the opportunity to be elected like any other producer.
62. Shouldn't have separate councils.
81. Other committee members not elected. If committee – one from each zone just like the other committees.
85. Their has to be more people involved and member being picked by a delegate body is not fair to producers who are paying the bills.
86. They are the foundation (whether large or small producers) without them there wouldn't be any other groups
88. too may divisive committees. However if other industry committee stay in place then need a cow/calf committee. I expect delegate costs from the other committees are funded by their organizations. Who will pay for cow/calf – ABP?
90. Every zone has heavy cow/calf population. Producers should be best ones to decide.
104. I really don't see why a CC committee is necessary. Keep it small. 5 zones 5 members. Allow the zone delegates to elect them. It is proves to be of no value the Board has the mandate to terminate all or any committee
106. A member of elected delegates would be select to sit on cow/calf committee same as all other committees. Likely 85 – 95% of elected delegates are cow/calf producers

- 111 ABP delegates are mostly cow/calf producers. If they aren't working for the cow/calf producer they should not be delegates
- 113 Standing committee – elect chair from Board
- 114 this seems to be very unnecessary we have a good representation of cow/calf delegates now. It makes me think that the past two year cow/calf delegates were not doing their jobs. We have some new delegates that are trying to split the organization and not supporting ABP
- 115 Each zone should put one person on cow/calf committee from there elected delegates the same as they do for other committees
- 116 Process should be the same for all sector representation
- 117 Currently we have delegates. I would ask who they currently represent; perhaps they aren't doing their job
- 118 Cow/calf operators are mostly small with owners 100% committed in running their operation. They don't have the resources to be heavily involved in ABP although many want to. This is a problem. Deal with it.
- 119 I think this should start as a committee and move to a council if needed
- 123 To sit on the committee you must be a cow/calf producer
- 124 The formulation of a cow/calf committee is too little too late. The cow/calf producer is moving to extinction in Alberta
- 125 ABP was originally set up by cow/calf producers for cow/calf producers. The focus must return to that direction
- 129 Cow/calf producers don't feel that they are being represented – need more information
- 138 How would you define cow/calf or cattle feeder. May be I will get 2 votes
- 139 This is LONG overdue – no cross over members. E.g. cow/calf & feedlot operators! Restrict to cow/calf producers
- 146 Do they really have “non-delegates” as stated in your newsletter?
- 147 Do we need another Council? If you think about it there probably are more cow/calf producers on the ABP boards all ready why do we need another group? It seems to me that all government run or funded. The idea is to divide and conquer we need to work together, cow/calf needs feedlots and feeder as much as they need the packing plants we are all in the beef industry.
- 148 Cow/calf sector provides calves to an industry response to demand dictated by feeder expectations. No committee will affect that so save the effort and expense
- 151 Should be appointed the same as any other committee
- 153 Election for CCC as well as CFC, CIC should be by those registered/identified as such. If a producer could be registered in more than one group they must be registered where they have the greatest number of cattle
- 155 Let the check-off be voluntary and let those that wish to contribute to ABP represent it
- 158 Producers often times know who the cow/calf producers are as well or better than the delegate body
- 159 this committee/council should be treated the same way as other but according to AGM resolutions this is to be a committee. This would not have been needed if ABP had not drawn lines that clearly show the divisions and created councils for some
- 160 I have checked Council as I believe as long as you keep the other “councils” this too should be one. All elections within “councils” should be by “all producers.”
- 163 to get good representation it has to only be a cow/calf operator
- 165 This would depend on how the board represents. These definitions mean nothing to the producer. Which is most effective? What does this mean to the producer?
- 174 We need real people with real jobs producing real pay
- 184 If we start to hear different sectors having representation separately (i.e. CFC) then all sectors probably need their own committees/council. Whether the CCC is a council or committee should probably be based upon with one involves the least bureaucracy.

Overall Comments:

3. This was new information for me and I can't really comment on it.
6. Set up a board of directors that have equal representation on the board. (?) Then make a cow/calf council to go with feeder council, industry council.
14. Need clear set of councils to make sure ABP works for the whole interest.

16. There needs to be a fundamental change in ABP – actually back to what ACC started within the beginning – ACC at the time was limited to research and promotion, with other industry associations doing industry policy.
18. Looking at the current structure of the board I am not certain that a cow-calf council or committee is necessary. The bulk of the delegate body are cow-calf producers.
19. Unnecessary unless there are wholesale changes as per Brent Carey's comments.
26. I feel that there is a limit to the number of councils. I am not sure that there is any need to have a council.
28. The committee is an excellent idea to bring cow-calf issues to the board.
34. As a cow-calf primary producer I believe the ABP organization should remain the same with less representation from the cattle feeder council.
35. This could go to a vote of the entire industry. Cattle feeder, cow/calf and cattle industry – would require good forward thinking strategic planning. Change name: Alberta beef industry.
37. This process need to be streamlined. CFC, CIC and the proposed CCC should have equal representation at the board of directors.
40. The whole "Council" issue is just a means of circumventing the delegate process to get to the board.
43. Just don't tear apart ABP; make it stronger.
44. The ABP needs to be more involved in selling beef. The need to move meat to markets outside of North America.
52. What would be cow-calf council purpose are most delegates not cow-calf producers.
56. Sorry, this is my first meeting. This is a little confusing to me all at once because I don't understand all the details. Very good meeting!
57. Each council would recognize the special interests of the respective stakeholders and bring them together for the common goal of the beef industry in this province.
63. Whatever you decide to do the sectors need to be treated equally.
70. This group should be all committees only. Mixed thoughts? We are all Beef Producers, don't matter what we produce or sell.
86. All sectors should have 1 representative per zone on council – each sector needs each other regardless of the concentration of producers per area i.e. "feedlot alley" is no more important than the Zone 1 feedlots.
87. Being a producer – cow/calf – and as most that I know, I am tired of working for the sake of work, and for absolutely no financial regard and more cartel and government sanction'd debts. The parasites in government agencies don't give a damn about the producers plight
91. Too many questions. This scares the average farmer
93. Cow/calf producers need equal representation / same as feeding reps
96. Until the delegates gain input from the producer, and work at bringing the producers in the whole system will be ineffective
101. There certainly needs to be better representation of all sectors within the industry. The cow/calf committee is a small step in the right direction
103. Cow/calf producers are the foundation of the cattle segment of agriculture. Their influence in ABP has overshadowed by other players
104. Sector perspectives are beneficial. It should always be the Board that analyze sector issues or desires against the welfare of the whole industry
106. I think over all ABP is functioning not too bad but all of the industry is in trouble. A lot of major changes is the best solution
107. My question remains the same why is it a committee and not a council like the other "councils". In my opinion there seems to be a influence by one sector of our industry over others if we had equal representation from each "council" it may seem more equal
115. I personally don't believe this committee is needed. I believe the board needs to become more focus on the life blood of the system. Feed yards, plants Auction barns, dealers will become irrelevant without the cow/calf producer
116. Most cow/calf operations are ma & pa operations and both operators are needed at farm level particularly at key times – haying, calving, feeding. Finding the right time to be away from ranch to meetings is a concern.
117. Prior to BSE I think the public at large thought of the ABP to be the voice of the cow/calf producer. Since BSE the entire industry has changed significantly and if we want it to

survive we must unite as one from cow/calf to slaughter. In order for ABP to do this they must include all sectors of the industry & if this means to make a total change, we must do this if we want the industry to survive

124 Alberta lost 15% of the cow herd in 2006 and forecasts are for a further reduction of 40% in 2007. Our personal goal is to reduce our herd by 60% over 2008 & 2009. Our neighbours are moving to 100% herd reduction over the next five years. The land is going to acreages for people working in the oil and gas industry. Now calf prices and lack of support mean that cow/calf producers in the 50-80 age bracket cannot keep youth in the business.

125 The margin players should not be involved in the policy development for cow/calf producers

138 In the good old days of the Alberta Cattle Commission the cow/calf producers had presence. Not now with influence from all the areas of the business

140 ABP has lost all contact with the grass roots producer (primary producer). It has gone beyond its original mandates. I agree it must be updated but only with more input from grass root producers. Areas of this province has not had fair representation or respect from ABP

146 the cow/calf producer bears all the costs of ABP. Other sectors view their "check-off" as an expense and can pass it down by paying less for calves. Cow/calf producers cannot pass any expenses

148 The entire ABP is plagued by bullying from the top down and inexperience at the base. The average successful forward thinking individual does not bother to beat his head against the wall trying to affect change in a self serving stagnant, protective situation like we see with the check-off

153 In order for ABP to regain some credibility of working for the interest of the cow/calf producers, it is absolutely essential that they value the input of this sector of the industry. To ensure that this happens the CCC must be treated/represented equally to the CFC and CIC. Not only that, but cow/calf producers certainly out-number CIC members and quite likely CFC. It makes a lot of cow/calf producers to fill a 10,000 feedlot

154 Being a former Alberta Wheat Pool delegates – I believe its structure was better for producer representation. AWP had to many delegates (72). Remember even if organizational you may be a but cumbersome – democracy has a cost

157 the cow/calf producers needs are not being met with the present system

158 The cattle feeder – feedlot operators will be downsizing operations if our cow herd continues to be sold off. The cow/calf producer provides the product for the feeders. The strength of the cow/calf producer affects everyone above him and in most cases they pay for their 'safety nets' that benefit everyone but him

159 In this whole review – as an 'in house review' you never once asked an upfront question on this: Do you want Industry Council; Do you want Cattle Feeder Council; ABP cannot effectively represent all sectors of the industry fairly. ABP has lost its focal point and spread itself too thin. Ultimately the cow/calf producer bears the cost as they have nobody to pass it down to or up to as they are price takers

160 downsize all councils out. All producers are represented by zone delegates. WE must not allow ourselves to become "just another bureaucracy"

164 Using "Councils" representing each sector of the beef industry that are elected by their peers could make the need for delegates redundant – and this may be a more efficient effective way to serve the industry as a whole

165 Not every delegate should be "tarred with the same brush". We know many delegates are as frustrated with the bureaucracy and agendas of the ABP and CCA but if a delegate can't make it work for the producers I would think he or she should quit. Return to the zone and convey this message. No apology is necessary. At this point it is too late to expect ABP to turn around and with the war for us. Find a group that speaks for you not against you.

184 I questioned the need for the CFC when it was proposed, since producers who are feeders can run as delegates (as can cow/calf guys) therefore why the need for special consideration. However, the feeders seem happy and I don't think it has hurt the ABP to have the CFC. I do htink we need toasty together as ABP and not fracture too much into separate entities. Distinct councils or committees within ABP are good so long as the

industry continues to have one face and one voice and government, the public (customers), trading partners.

### Producer Associations

1. Should Alberta Milk and Feeders Associations of Alberta continue to be producer associations under the plan and appoint producer association delegates to ABP?

65 YES  
56 NO  
24 UNCERTAIN

58. Feeder Assoc (Yes).  
81. Alberta Milk – Yes, because they produce beef. Feeders Associations of Alberta – No, why do we need a lender at the board?  
115 Milk Yes; Feeder Association No  
123 Alberta Milk and Feeders circled – Feeders has “no” beside circle  
166 Not in the business  
184 **Marked both “Yes” and “Uncertain” I counted as “Uncertain”**

2. If no, should Alberta Milk and Feeder Associations of Alberta have the option of becoming stakeholders on Cattle Industry Council?

43 YES  
21 NO  
19 UNCERTAIN  
  
115 Feeder Association Yes

### Comments:

9. Join CIC  
11. Milk producers market cattle. Double representation. Feeder associations. Why not Royal Bank? They both finance cattle.  
12. Producer delegates should have option of one delegate being on CIC and one delegate being on another committee instead of both on CIC or both on other committees.  
13. If you are paying you should have representation on ABP.  
16. Milk producers and Feeders Association would become part of a federation of associations, along with WSGA, ACFA, etc.  
18. Not sure what a supply managed commodity can bring to our table or a quasi lending institution.  
35. We would encourage them to move to industry council.  
38. All members of AMP and Feeder Associations have access to ABP.  
65. Milk producers have cattle.  
68. **(checked off “yes” and “no”)** Feeder Association is a bank and **(is?)** not a stakeholder and should not be able to appoint delegates.  
87. We are all in the same tank, sink or swim, or as present drowning in debt.  
88. Up to them if they want to join CIC. All in these organizations pay check-off and are eligible to run as delegates.  
97. all cattle groups should be included  
100. Again this would undermine the democracy of the ABP and give some producers unequal input  
104. All Alberta Milk producers sell spent cows and calves. Those animals become part of the beef industry. They should not enjoy double representation. Feeder Associations are lenders. Invite the Royal Bank. They would be more useful than an obsolete ending agency protected by government  
106. Good to have some input from other groups related to agriculture maybe expand to packers etc. Instead of some splint producer groups. Not certain

- 115 Every dairy animal becomes product eventually. Feeder Associations are financial and should be part of Industry Council
- 124 The cattle industry needs to stick together. We cannot lobby for support to groups that can take their losses from another sector. If the cattle feeders are hurting, channel the money they need to the cow/calf producers as that is where they have historically taken their losses from. There is a real need to address the cattle identification costs dumped on cow/calf producers.
- 125 We require input for other associations for information purposes only. Policy should be set by cow/calf producers only
- 138 Why should those type producers be represented twice and have more say
- 147 A percentage of dairy calves go into the beef market so the Milk and Feeder Associations of Alberta should have some say or representation on ABP
- 148 Dairy cattle and Feeder Associations do infuse beef into the system so they are stakeholders and can promote their ideas by the representatives they send to ABP meetings. These 2 reps should be advised of and invited to all ABP meetings
- 153 Either way is okay
- 157 they have a strong voice for a small group
- 158 Why operate more bureaucracy this is already happening
- 159 their members are already paying a check-off when they sell cattle. As producers they should not have more say or special status than other producers
- 160 Their members are already paying a check-off when they sell cattle. As producers they should not have any more say or special status than any other producer
- 163 Milk people have their own organization on their behalf: also they appear to be making money
- 164 Their role needs to be evaluated if representation is necessary and not duplicated somewhere else then representation should be provided where deemed appropriate. Likely on CIC
- 165 Since a good portion of service industry beef comes from the dairy sector I think they need to make this decision and then bring it to the membership as a AMFA decision
- 167 Are org in their own right. Should be part of an "umbrella" Fed of Assoc must be an equal at the table
- 172 Alberta Milk can elect delegates to delegate body. Feeder Associations are lenders and get no preference over banks or other lending institutes
- 181 Alberta Milk and Feeder Associations of Alberta should be removed from all aspects of ABP
- 184 these groups can already be represented through running as delegates, but there is a need to have their ideas at the table through some way.

## B4 - Election of the Board of Directors

### Board size

1. Are 19-20 Directors too many for the ABP Board of Directors?

92 YES  
 34 NO  
 35 UNCERTAIN

45. Uncertain who represents who.  
 139 Depends on whether they have the opportunity to be heard on all issues  
 147 Maybe the existing Board should decide  
 153 One from each zone  
 166 the volume of work should dictate how many

If yes, what would be an appropriate number? \_\_\_\_\_

1. 11-13
4. 11-13
5. 10-15
6. 9, 11, 13
8. 10
9. Less than 10
10. 8 or 12
12. 9-12
13. 10-12
14. 7-9 max
15. 11
16. under 12
18. 10-14
19. 8-12
20. 12
21. 13
22. 11
27. 12
28. 10
29. 10-12
32. 12: 1 from each zone and 3 at large.
35. 12
36. See diagram on back of page 5.
37. 15
39. 3
40. 14
43. 12 – 15
46. 17
49. 12 – 15
50. ?
51. 14
52. 15
53. 9
56. 15?
58. 12
61. Reaching upper limit though!
65. (checked off "yes" and "no") Large boards are difficult to handle – if well chaired can be productive.
76. 17
81. 12
83. 13
87. 13
92. 1 per zone
95. 13 or 15
97. 11
99. 8, too many member to be able to make quick, timely decisions
100. 15
102. 15-16
107. 10
108. 12
109. 10-12
110. 14
111. 10
116. 15
118. 12-15 – involve committees and council's where 12 – 15 does not have enough knowledge of a particular problem
122. 14
123. 13
124. 10?

126 12  
 127 17  
 130 15  
 131 9  
 135 12  
 136 12  
 138 15-17  
 146 6  
 148 7-10  
 149 3  
 154 9-12  
 156 10  
 157 10  
 158 9  
 164 9-12  
 172 10  
 174 3  
 177 12  
 183 11

Zone Directors

1. Should the zone directors continue to be elected by the zone delegates?

92 YES 50. – sure (I counted this as a yes)  
 57 NO  
 14 UNCERTAIN

2. If no, should the zone directors be elected by the producers attending the fall producer meetings?

61 YES  
 16 NO  
 10 UNCERTAIN

61. How would it work without results of delegate election?  
 72. Not a bad idea.

3. If elected directly by producers, does the nominee for zone director need to be a zone delegate or cattle feeder council delegate in order to be eligible for election?

64 YES  
 36 NO  
 16 UNCERTAIN

35. Let the zone delegates do it as they know their workload better than the average producers.

Comments:

- 1. A director, regardless, should come from the zone.
- 5. Could have a CEO
- 8. At the fall meetings they could run as delegate and director
- 11. If elected, he/she becomes a delegate.
- 12. Delegates should be eliminated. Elect directors directly.
- 13. Each sector should vote for their own representation.
- 16. The best person for the job must be on the board. We need to develop a new election structure that allows the best industry people to be elected to the board.
- 18. As a producer my responsibility is to promote and elect the best person to the desired position.

21. Elect the best person available.
23. 4 cow-calf, 4 feedlot, 1 CIC. Paid positions. Change terms.
25. With a smaller delegate body and fewer delegates I think balanced representation should be on the board. More important than meeting a specific number of directors. It is very difficult to determine these numbers until we know if zones and delegates are going to be different.
27. Direct election of the 12 best people at election meetings or federation of associations.
35. Directors know best who can serve and who will serve the best.
46. The board could shrink by the relocation of the zones.
53. Zone delegate only.
61. For sitting and elected delegates to be eligible you need the election results unless it is a weighted ballot of some sort.
70. Zone delegate only.
90. Producers would be more involved from the grass roots and insider delegate pettiness would not be a factor
91. Sometime the fall producer meetings get heated
96. the chairmen should appoint, but he should be elected by producers
100. Give each producer one vote for zone director, choosing from those who are running for delegate positions
104. It could be a sitting delegate or a new candidate. Acclaimed or elected whatever. Allow producers a direct voice on what their direction will be. Eliminate the petty zone delegate politics
106. Likely the most democratic system
114. Some of the zones do not properly elect the zone director. You should put in one 2 yr term. Some become zone chairmen by appointment after only 1 year as a delegate or first year by past zone chairmen. Some chairmen are elected underhandedly
115. It is a large commitment and many times once people find out how much time it takes they realize they don't have time to spare
117. The Board has to be held accountable and they need to have a mission statement and set goals
124. There is a real need to separate cow/calf producers from cattle feeders. While they both fact he same or similar costs the feeder does not producer or manufacture the calf and has alternatives to recoup their costs
126. Directors should be elected from producers at large at the annual meeting
130. Directors need to be accountable to delegates. Delegates need to be accountable to the producers
131. If producers had to be "registered" it would create more accountability of producer input
138. be careful not to stack the board
139. Should be producer elected producers
140. Zone director should be a zone delegate not appoint council delegate
148. All positions should be elected by producers so no directors can climb the ladder without strong backing of his people he represents
153. If the number of zone delegates is reduced, the zone directors could be elected directly by producers at fall meetings
154. If the producers within a zone can find a person who can contribute greatly was is outside of the delegate body – they should be eligible to run as a director (as long as they are a cattle producer, live in the zone, etc)
155. Zone meetings are poorly attended unless there is a free meal. Elections are becoming mainly by acclamation
157. zone delegates
158. All that is necessary is one delegate per zone who is an automatic director
160. Regions are too diverse to downsize any zone representative out
164. If ABP moves to sector council's zone delegates are redundant
165. Until the producers have faith again in the ABP, the membership should be electing the zone directors. I would think someone with delegate experience would be a better choice for director but there could be exceptions and producers should decide that.
166. the people attending presumably are most involved and informed. They should decide and not be restricted

- 167 Should be "the best". The grassroots whoever they are, should decide who represents them
- 172 20 member board is too big and unworkable, and too large for frank exchange of ideas
- 184 I think that zone delegates choosing their director is the most effective way to choose the director. The delegates will be able to discuss who should be director in a way that may be difficult for producers at large

Directors at Large

4. Is 5 the right number of directors at large?

- 55 YES
- 51 NO
- 45 UNCERTAIN

- 45. Who are they?
- 50. No comment.

If no, what would be an appropriate number?

- 7. 1
- 8. 2
- 9. 0
- 10. 2
- 11. 6
- 12. 0
- 14. 0
- 15. 3
- 18. 3
- 19. 2
- 22. 0
- 25. The number will be determined to give balanced representation.
- 30. 0
- 32. 3
- 37. 3
- 39. 0
- 52. 3
- 53. 0
- 58. 3 is plenty.
- 65. okay
- 76. 3
- 79. 3
- 83. 3
- 85. none
- 92. Directors at large are NOT needed
- 93. 0
- 101. 2
- 102. 3
- 103. 3
- 104. 6
- 106. 3
- 107. 0-3
- 108. 3
- 109. 2
- 111. If you have 5 zones
- 116. Maybe fewer
- 118. 3
- 122. 3
- 124. 0

126 all  
 129 3  
 130 3 or less  
 131 0  
 133 3  
 145 0  
 146 0  
 153 None  
 154 4  
 156 2  
 172 1  
 177 0  
 183 2

5. Should non-delegates be eligible to run for a director at large position?

40 YES  
 76 NO  
 27 UNCERTAIN

6. Who should elect the directors at large?

88 the delegates  
50 the producers  
1 delegates and producers (#23)

Comments:

- 13. Let each industry elect the best person to represent them, i.e.: producer/feeder/cattle industry.
- 16. You may have a combination of both zones (director from a zone) and directors at large or you may have ALL directors at large, essentially the best person for the job on the board.
- 18. Fewer at large is in theme with downsizing.
- 35. Under new structure directors at large would not be necessary.
- 49. Delegates who are producers anyway.
- 61. Delegates are the elected body therefore should elect Directors at Large.
- 65. Special circumstances can take place i.e. CCA president possibility.
- 87. Most producer's are not actively involved so as to elect people they don't know. The most activity we have is paying for the questionable process
- 88. Might not need directors at large but if other industry representation is not reduced then need directors at large.
- 96. should be appointed
- 97. this allows the use of most valuable industry people to assist the Board.
- 99. too many people involved
- 104. 6 directors at large will give a better balance. Neutralize regional politics. My experience is that delegates are pretty good in electing directors at large. Where they fail is in electing zone directors.
- 106. Either would work as long as elected directors at large are a producer of cattle feeder. Direct animal owner
- 107. If this is a producer organization the producers should have more say. It seems that people are letting others who have agendas take over – and do not listen to the “grass roots”
- 124. We need to get back to the grass roots. There are too any feeders that call themselves cow/calf when they are feeding 1500 head and calving 500 calves. Their interest lies in the feedlot
- 130. Same comment as above. Directors can't really be accountable to producers
- 131. There should be 5 elected Board members (elected by registered producers) and 4 appointed – one each from CIC, CFC, CCC, Processing, Market Council

- 143 If we have so many election that why we need different meeting went have problems we can say something. Don't have election sometime they can override each etc
- 148 No one should hold a position without full producer endorsement
- 153 I'm not sure there is a need for directors at large. It may just be a redundant way to support "the good old boys club". If it remains, the directors at large should be elected by producers
- 154 I would prefer the "Board" bring names forward for consideration to the delegates. Example: if ABP could put the past president/CEO of a major multinational food chain into a director's position – we would be much better off
- 155 this organization has become bloated with too many staff and no real direction
- 158 Is there any real need for directors at large
- 159 If you're worried about size of ABP Board of Directors these are the ones to let go provided all councils are downsized out
- 160 If you're worried about the size of ABP board of directors these are the ones to go provided all councils are downsized out
- 174 covers the whole as producers
- 179 These are the ones being represented

#### Cattle Feeder Council Directors

50. **Crossed out directors and put "elected from all producers" with an arrow to Cattle Industry Council.**
7. If the number of zone directors is reduced, should the number of cattle feeder council directors be reduced proportionally?
- 114 YES
- 15 NO
- 4 UNCERTAIN
- 153 Absolutely
- 167 Should be coming from independent groups i.e. Feeder Assoc, Cattle Feeders, the packers etc
8. If no, is 3 the right number of cattle feeder council directors?
- 23 YES
- 18 NO
- 30 UNCERTAIN
- If no, what would be an appropriate number?
6. 4
8. 2
12. 1
14. 1
15. 2
37. 1
39. 1
51. Depends on size of board.
58. 2 – 3
75. 1
83. 3
103. 1
124. 1?
130. 1
131. 1
135. 4
148. 2

159 0  
160 0  
172 1  
181 0

9. Should feeders who are not cattle feeder council delegates be eligible to run for a cattle feeder council director position?

34 YES  
67 NO  
28 UNCERTAIN

10. Should the cattle feeder council directors be elected by CFC or by a vote of registered cattle feeders or in some other manner and, if so, how?

7. Let the cattle feeders figure out what will work for them.  
9. Elected by CFC.  
11. Remain as is.  
12. Elected by ACFA  
14. Vote of registered cattle feeders.  
16. You may have a combination of both zones (director from a zone) and directors at large or you may have ALL directors at large essentially the best person for the job on the Board.  
18. ACFA  
19. Don't know.  
25. Let the feeders decide.  
27. Feeder council should be proportionately represented. Board should be equally divided among sectors.  
28. By a vote of registered cattle feeders.  
29. Cattle feeders  
34. Don't care.  
37. CFC directors should be elected within CFC.  
41. ?  
42. By everyone with appointments from ACFA.  
46. Should be elected by all delegates.  
51. Take them from Alta Cattle Feeders.  
52. By CFC  
54. Yes  
56. CFC  
57. CFC as they are the ones interested in the volunteer aspect of industry.  
58. CFC  
61. CFC should elect their directors as they are the feeders willing to put their names on a ballot.  
62. Yes  
65. (circled CFC)  
68. CFC  
69. By a vote of registered cattle feeders.  
72. By CFC.  
78. not sure.  
86. Cattle feeders should be registered, but a minimum # of head should be required in order to represent the whole group.  
90. By CFC  
92. Voted in by registered Cattle Feeders  
97. by cattle feeder organizations  
100. Elected by CFC  
101. By registered Cattle Feeders  
102. "by a vote of registered cattle feeders" (phrase circled)  
104. I really don't care how they are elected as long as it is accepted or fair. If anybody can develop an acceptable and fair way of electing delegates that's fine

- 106 Likely as is now I think it is work but do no first hand knowledge  
 107 By ACFA – how their group would like to see director put in place  
 112 These directors should be nominated from among registered cattle feeders but should be elected by ABP delegates at the AGM  
 113 No  
 114 they can be elected at fall meetings  
 116 should be same for all sectors  
 118 Elected in same manner as other council directors  
 119 CFC  
 122 vote of registered feeders  
 123 Elected by CFC  
 124 Personally I feel that industry representation need to be actively involved to be good representatives  
 125 NO  
 130 the director should be elected by and be accountable to the CFC  
 133 Other – all producers  
 138 who is a cattle feeder and who is not  
 140 What are these council delegates? Why aren't feeders represented by zone delegates elected by producers?  
 144 Elected by CFC  
 148 2 sent by CFC to present their views  
 152 CFC  
 153 Producer circled "or by vote of registered cattle feeders"  
 154 Yes – they should determine themselves how they wish to be proportionally represented  
 157 Registered Cattle feeders  
 160 By all producers the same as zone delegates – Democracy  
 161 By vote of registered cattle feeders  
 164 All directors should be elected by their respective councils  
 165 Directors should be elected by regular cattle feeders at their ACFA meetings along with their delegates  
 174 They should be a subsidiary of ABP  
 179 Registered cattle feeders  
 184 By CFC

Comments:

10. Let the "sector" association represent this body.  
 11. Fewer zones, fewer CFC delegates.  
 16. Federation of Associations for policy and ABP for research and promotion.  
 23. Redo feeder council – 4 to board and elected by cattle feeders.  
 25. Let the board of directors decide on #7 above.  
 26. I feel as a cow-calf producer that this should be a feeder concern.  
 35. Cattle feeders responsibility.  
 40. I don't think the extra "Councils" are necessary at all!  
 52. It is the most democratic system.  
 58. May cause ripples with election from CFC only.  
 61. Larger zones is not doable in some areas. Zones 2-3 are smaller.  
 Need to keep an odd number board whether it be through even zones (8) i.e. or Director at Large increased??  
 63. I don't feel there should be a feeder council.  
 87. If possible, all the voting by producers could be done on a single ballot form  
 124. Cow/calf producer's voices get lost because there are not enough pure producers to advise ABP. When this happens you lose the unheard voice  
 126. I don't believe any directors should be elected by delegates  
 130. One director should be able to bring the consensus of the CFC to the Board  
 148. these represent the CFC at ABP meetings but at their own expense  
 151. Council directors should be elected by CFC  
 159. If there was no council these directors would be gone, shrinking the ABP Board of Directors

- 160 No council – Board of Directors also shrinks
- 181 CFC should not have any representation in ABP
- 184 Since feeders can run as delegates I wonder why they require “extra” representation in the first place. Again if it is working then maybe it’s ok

Cattle Industry Council Directors

- 50. ~~Crossed out Directors and put “elected from all producers”~~ with an arrow to Cattle Feeder Council.
- 11. If the number of zone directors is reduced, should the number of cattle industry council directors be reduced proportionally?

- 104 YES
- 23 NO
- 4 UNCERTAIN

- 51. Depends on size of Board.
- 116 Need to represent all sectors for valuable input
- 118 Maybe but need enough for effective cross-pollination of ideas

- 12. If no, is 2 the right number of cattle industry council directors?

- 28 YES
- 19 NO
- 22 UNCERTAIN

- 29. Equal with CFC
- 184 ~~Producer answered second part of question. I count at “No” vote.~~

If no, what would be an appropriate number?

- 11. 1
- 12. 1
- 14. 1
- 20. 1
- 37. 1
- 39. 1
- 81. 0
- 83. 1
- 103 1
- 124 1?
- 130 1
- 131 1
- 159 0
- 172 0
- 181 0
- 184 1 or 2

- 13. Should the cattle industry council directors continue to be elected by the delegates at the AGM?

- 92 YES
- 19 NO
- 7 UNCERTAIN

- 85 Elect these directors from the delegated or by producers (I marked him as a yes)
- 138 Has “uncertain” written behind “no”

- 14. If no, how should they be elected?

- 7. Can't answer until a plan change has been put in place
- 9. By CIC membership/directorship.
- 10. By the CIC
- 14. Direct election
- 16. Federation of Associations for policy and ABP for research and promotion
- 19. Don't know.
- 23. Industry council. 1 to board.
- 25. To be determined once delegates and zones are established. Let the council decide if the CIC directors should continue to be elected by the delegates at the AGM.
- 35. Cattle industry responsibility.
- 37. 1
- 45. As long as there is representation from each zone.
- 52. It is the most democratic system.
- 58. within the council.
- 61. With two directors you normally will have one that can attend meetings.
- 81. no vote – as advisors only.
- 96 They should be appointed by chairman. This group should be large
- 97 AGM – is not currently efficient with large numbers of delegates – if reduced then maybe better – but key factor is finding the best people to represent industry
- 100 They should be elected by members of CIC
- 104 CIC delegates or if acceptable by the CIC anybody who has the interest of CIC foremost in mind. A non-industry director may be good for policy development
- 106 Likely the most democratic
- 107 By CIC members
- 124 Cow/calf needs a bigger voice so that the feeders realize that when they go out of business so does everyone else
- 130 the director should be elected by the Cattle industry council as that is who they represent on the board.
- 133 General producers
- 139 By producers at zone meetings or by mail in ballot
- 140 Please specify what cattle industry council does. What good are they? When and where did they come from and what for?
- 148 Sent by CIC and elected by them to represent the views of CIC
- 153 By any members/stakeholders of the cattle industry council
- 154 by their own group, same as CFC directors
- 155 should not be any
- 158 Why do we need so many councils when possibly one could cover all the bases and cut way back on the money spent?
- 159 No CIC – these directors would be gone
- 160 As above for Cattle Feeder Council
- 164 Directors should be elected from their respective “councils”
- 174 Elections should be done by all producers (by votes) or voting
- 181 They should not be elected. The CIC should have no involvement in ABP
- 184 Maybe the CIC directors should be chosen by the CIC

Cow-calf directors

- 15. If set up as a “Council”, should a cow-calf Council have the ability to elect cow-calf directors to the Board of Directors?

- 83 YES
- 28 NO
- 15 UNCERTAIN

- 116 should be same for all sectors, #'s should be industry appropriate
- 165 For now the producers should also elect the c/c directors

16. If yes, how many cow-calf directors should be elected? \_\_\_\_\_

- 4. 4-6
- 6. 4
- 10. 4
- 14. 1
- 24. 4
- 25. Don't know.
- 28. 5
- 29. Same as CFC and CIC
- 34. ½ number of total directors.
- 37. 1
- 39. 1
- 44. 1 for each zone.
- 45. Not sure, depends on makeup of board.
- 46. 0
- 48. 1
- 54. 2
- 56. 1 or 2
- 57. As representatives like other councils.
- 58. 6
- 65. same as feeder council.
- 67. 3
- 68. 2/3 of Board?
- 69. Same as Cattle Feeder Council.
- 70. Have a committee.
- 78. 0
- 79. Same as Cattle Feeders
- 81. same as feeder council.
- 83. 2
- 85. 5
- 87. 13
- 88. same as feeders
- 90. 4
- 92. 1 per zone
- 97. 3
- 100. 2
- 101. 3
- 102. Same as feeder council
- 103. 1
- 104. None
- 106. 0
- 108. 5
- 109. 2
- 112. some at cattle feeder council
- 114. 2
- 119. 3
- 122. 2
- 123. Same as other groups
- 124. 1?
- 127. 9
- 128. 9
- 130. 1
- 131. 1
- 132. 2
- 133. 5
- 136. 4
- 138. 3 x cattle feeder council (looks like a "2" was turned to a "3")
- 140. 9

142 9  
 144 3  
 145 4  
 146 majority  
 148 0  
 150 7  
 153 equal to CFC  
 154 I would prefer 51%  
 156 2  
 157 Proportional representation  
 159 7  
 160 7  
 161 2  
 164 proportionate #'s to other councils  
 166 1  
 172 0  
 173 ?  
 174 try 5  
 176 Same as Cattle Feeder Council  
 181 9  
 183 1  
 184 3

17. Would their election be similar to Cattle Feeder Council or Cattle Industry Council or is there another option?

4. Same  
 7. Let cow/calf sector decide.  
 10. Elected by zones.  
 14. Yes  
 16. Federation of Associations for policy and ABP for research and promotion  
 19. If there are wholesale changes, yes. Otherwise no.  
 25. To be determined once zones and delegates are established.  
 26. I don't believe this should be a cow-calf council.  
 28. Similar to cattle feeder council  
 29. Yes.  
 34. Yes.  
 40. Run through their Zone as all delegates do!  
 42. ABP is a cow-calf council.  
 44. Yes.  
 45. Yes.  
 46. If they are a council they could elect 2 but the delegates still decide by election.  
 54. Yes  
 57. Yes  
 58. Yes  
 65. Yes.  
 69. It would be similar to CFC.  
 74. Cow-calf Committees.  
 75. Cow-calf producers can have rep same as everyone else.  
 78. no committee only.  
 79. Same as Cattle Feeders.  
 85. Elect this board from the delegates.  
 86. Should be decided by an agreement between the producers involved  
 88. Zone meetings or out of delegates elected at zone meetings cow calf producers (most of them business) and have delegates elect – funding would come from ABP as not organization funding it.  
 90. Yes  
 92. Similar  
 93. It should be the same

- 96 Chairman should appoint. The chairman should be a leader with vision and his vision should be elected
- 97 similar
- 100 Elected by members of CCC
- 101 Similar to CFC and CIC
- 102 "be similar to Cattle Feeder Council" (phrase circled)
- 104 Don't create another Council. ABP would do exactly what is being proposed by opponents of ABP. Going for CCC has wide implications
- 106 Cow/calf should be a committee not a council
- 108 Same as Cattle Industry Council
- 114 The same to make it equal. This will have less cow/calf representation due to their idiocy
- 115 This committee is not needed already around the table sits mostly cow/calf producers
- 119 Yes
- 122 Similar
- 123 Yes
- 124 Pure cow/calf producers should be the only members of such a committee
- 125 Yes
- 130 Yes they should be elected similar. The majority of cattle producers are cow/calf producers
- 135 Yes, try it and see
- 136 Elected by cow/calf producers
- 138 They should be treated equal
- 139 elected by producers after an appropriate nomination process
- 140 Elected as zone delegates
- 143 I just want everything fair so one does not ride over the other one
- 144 Similar to CFC or CIC
- 147 Don't think we need another council
- 150 Yes
- 151 Treated the same as other councils
- 152 similar
- 153 Producer circled "be similar to"
- 154 Yes
- 158 the cow/calf producer is the backbone of the whole industry. How many people realize this?
- 159 If you are set on having all these council/committee's they must all be treated the same regarding elections. Elections by all producers
- 160 Elected by all producers
- 161 Same as
- 162 Yes
- 164 Yes
- 165 The comments represent a consensus of a number of grassroots producers meeting separately and they are all indicative of a lack of faith and trust in the bureaucratic machinery that runs the ABP and CCA. It has become an industry of its own thriving on a mandatory check-off and unaccountable to anyone keeping the producers at bay with platitudes and the fear factor
- 171 Isn't it funny that the heart of this industry was least represented. Without the cow/calf producer there would be no beef industry, we wouldn't need the ABP, Auction Marts, truckers, buyers, feedlots, packers, industries and suppliers. Yet the cow/calf producer takes most beating when something happens or changes and the least represented or helped out. Make sure everybody else makes a profit except the cow/calf man.
- 174 There should be another option
- 177 similar
- 179 Shouldn't each "branch" be the same if all are on the production side of things?
- 184 Similar

Other Comments:

11. Forget about it.
- 87 keep it simple

91 Other: We should lobby government for a \$3.00/head refund on calves that have been  
 age verified on the computer system. I'm willing to buy tags but I'm not willing to go  
 online and spend time entering information if I'm not getting \$ first

97 the Directors role is to represent industry. Keep the Boards small and efficient to  
 promote and facilitate action in the marketplace

103 At its inception ACC stood as a "grassroots" organization. It has strayed from that  
 concept

111 they are on the Board

117 the Board of Directors must handle their affairs the same as if this was someone's  
 business. We need to make decisions in the best interest of the whole industry not just  
 one sector because if we don't have all sectors involved the industry will collapse

124 the cow/calf committee is too late to save the cow/calf industry in Alberta. It is on  
 industry which has died due to neglect. Those of us in the 50 to 80 year age bracket will  
 not be returning to production at any price and can keep our land out of the industry for  
 the next 30 years

130 there has to be direct accountability for directors. I current 3 type system I think should  
 work best. Delegates accountable to producers. Directors accountable to delegates.  
 Management accountable to directors

136 The number has to come down as to much of budget is used for large group meetings

147 Too many already hard to get things done. Fewer more to the topics at hand and get  
 things done

148 Cow/calf must inevitably producer what the market is looking for. Returned data from  
 slaughter via CCIA tags will help immensely

152 Directors should be elected by the delegate body from the delegate body

154 If ABP mandate is to be a "umbrella" organization I suppose the WSGA could have more  
 representation if they have more members. You need a variety of directors, connected to  
 each segment of this industry – proportionally to their importance

174 All councillors, directors & presidents should be elected by members and all those  
 running should let their interests be known

177 Cattle Feeder Council and cow/calf council same number

184 cow/calf producers are represented on ABP and there are lots of cow/calf delegates but  
 the cow/calf sector should not be marginalized through the process of having other  
 sectors receive special consideration and not the cow/calf sector. I am still not sure that  
 the feeders needed separate representation but if that is the direction, the cow/calf  
 should probably be treated equally

#### Federation of Associations Concept

1. Should the concept of a "federation of associations" be considered as an alternative means of electing and/or appointing members to the ABP Board of Directors?

30 YES  
 56 NO  
 31 UNCERTAIN

2. If no, why not?

10. Seem to be looking at a hybrid between the two though patterns.

11. The end of ABP.

25. It's an unclear confusing concept at this point and shouldn't be discussed until the new foundations of the organization are established.

34. Fine the way it is.

40. Was Uniform successful!

41. I don't understand the "Federation of Associations" concept.

42. Erodes the (impetus?) of the organization.

46. Too difficult to manage. Far too divisive and would create more friction.

48. Why fix something that isn't broke!

52. More splinter groups without any direction.

58. Too many associations with disparaging views. Impossible to manage a common voice.

61. The process now works – if it is not broken don't fix it!
67. Should continue delegate selection.
69. It is not responsive enough – would be too cumbersome. Who would take the lead on important issues?
74. Why have more associations that will have trouble getting producer participation.
75. We need to keep the focus from grass roots.
79. Too easy for splinter groups and special interest groups to interfere with and distract attention from critical problems.
88. We have, for the most part, a democratic powers for selecting individuals to represent the industry
89. Delegates should select who they think will do the best job.
92. they should come from each zone directly
100. It would cease to be a producer organization, but would become an amalgamation of lobby groups
104. It would be the end of a provincial and national voice of the cattle industry. Sectoral interest will inevitably emerge.
106. what would be federation of association really be 6 or 7 splint groups? Doesn't appear to be democratic or addressing the industry concerns.
109. What is a "federation of associations"?
112. Let's not get any further removed from grass roots producers than we are now
113. We are the producers
115. anyone who wants to be part of ABP already have avenues to do so
116. for cow/calf sector current structure works best (more grass roots level now)
118. If it ain't broke don't fix it or Don't throw it away and get a new on if it still works – ABP works – lots of room to improve – but it works.
119. this would allow very "narrow issues" directors to have a strong voice on the board. The current system allows every producer the same voice and vote
120. Unworkable
125. We will lose our focus and the purpose of the ABP is diluted. Too many other groups involved
130. Because it would not have people grass root association. I think it would be topdown
135. too much over lapping all ready
139. Too cumbersome
140. Please clarify the federation of associations concept. How does it work?
145. It would change total focus of the organization – rather than representing producers it would be representing sectors of the industry
147. Leave it the way it is
148. More opportunity to appoint positions in a political patronage way
152. ABP should remain a grass roots organization answering to its members
154. I personally which ABP was more cow/calf focused – however there is a lot of dissention out there. We need everyone in the industry to participate to make it truly work – Don't know if it is possible
155. Make the check-off voluntary and let those who wish to contribute make this decision
159. Not democratic appointments. ABP is not listening to producers – they have lost touch. The primary producer is paying the check-off directly or indirectly. The more you broaden the scope the less effective you become for the primary producer and the more dollars you would need causing the primary producer to fund it
160. You are creating a bureaucracy that out of control! Appointments are not democratic so I wouldn't even consider that angle
161. Let's get things ironed out instead changing the whole framework
167. the Fed of Assoc should be the voluntary coming together of "equals" i.e. associations
168. Only delegates should elect directors
173. Too many ideas resulting in no real solutions
174. Maybe too much friends member vote
181. Less is better. Focus on concentration, not dilution of representation
183. Elected directors by the members provide more transparency
184. I may not know all the ins and outs here but it seems to me 1 organization sends a more united message to government, public, trading, partners

3. If yes, why?

- 9. Look to NCBA.
- 12. You would be getting engaged producers from all segments of industry.
- 16. Policy still needs to come from a federation of association – at times it may be unanimous, and at times it may produce a (franeuted?) policy – that is ok.
- 20. Possibly an easier template to deal with.
- 27. We need proper sectoral representation.
- 28. The best people would rise to the top.
- 29. All 9 are on the board.
- 44. To get a larger and stronger voice to lobby government, to get all animal inspection paid for by the federal government.
- 83. Possibly more accountability.
- 86. World is constantly changing & this could allow an avenue for a new group to be represented
- 87. Would it be much more simple and less costly?
- 90. Puts them all in one spot
- 96. the primary producer must be involved in the broader issues
- 97. the cattle industry is a sector or group one. A Board with representatives from each groups is more efficient
- 99. may be a good idea. ABP as it exists today is IRRELEVANT
- 101. It would allow additional producer groups and their members' better representation
- 103. Alberta lacks a strong broad-based farm organization
- 114. If the cow/calf goes to a council they should be treated equally they won't like it but it serves them right
- 122. Too many members becomes unwieldy
- 124. Equal representation would mean a more balanced approach to industry problems
- 131. Better representation from all segments
- 153. If there is equal representation for the federated associations/councils they could each elect members to the board
- 154. You have the "core" groups already – some may have to be expanded
- 156. Better opinions wider scope
- 158. Only if the grassroots people are well represented
- 172. Each association could concentrate on their specific speciality a or BR my position to the whole body

4. If yes, who would decide what association could become members of the "federation"?

- 9. Existing councils and board of directors.
- 16. MAPA is a problem – if there is a check-off some of which may go to the federation – members, then do they have to be a commission under the act? Do you then do a barley commission and barley growers association to make it MAPA correct, but everyone know the money (check-off) still ends up in the same hands.
- 28. ABP, CFC, CIC
- 29. All are on the federation.
- 42. A weak alternative.
- 44. Most farmer organizations.
- 86. The membership at large (if they feel that a representative would benefit the industry as a whole)
- 87. producers
- 90. Producers at fall meetings
- 96. The chairman
- 97. have a committee draft rules
- 101. A producer plebiscite. Not the ABP and not the Alberta Government
- 114. The delegate body
- 122. Producers at AGM
- 140. Why decide what association can't ABP be a member if not why? If they can't why use the above concept of the federation?
- 153. the ABP policy

- 156 producers
- 167 Up to the Assoc
- 172 delegates
- 174 Producer members. We all too top heavy with the politicians etc.

Overall Comments:

- 6. Umbrella
- 7. In order to answer the questions reasonably we need to have the changes in the review.
- 35. Need more information.
- 43. As a producer, I feel more confident in letting the delegates I vote for making many of these decisions. Do not tear this organization apart. Build it up. Make it stronger.
- 46. A Federation would allow small org. with little or no membership.
- 49. Delegates often cause some of their own problems in that they aren't as knowledgeable about issues as they might be. My biggest concern is accountability, not that ABP is not doing their job, but not telling the world what they're doing. If ABP can "fix" the communication problem with producers they will be the only group to do that.
- 52. If it not really broke, then do not throw it away.
- 61. Special interest groups that are cattle producers already have a means – sign a nomination form.
- 100 this would destroy the objective and spirit of the Organization as it was founded
- 106 Cannot see any benefits to this idea
- 115 It seems to be that anybody who does not agree with the person representing them as a association or council wants to find a new avenue to the table (that's wrong)
- 121 the ABP should be a Board of Directors to manage staff & plan strategically. Under the BOD would be various councils that look after the day to day business
- 124 Many of these special interest groups will be leaving the industry along with cow/calf producers
- 126 If the directors are elected form all producers; then the beef people will be elected and they will represent all areas of the industry or they the rest of the sentence is missing
- 138 Spending too much time trying to reinvent the wheel
- 147 to confusing leave it alone if not broke don't try and fix
- 148 Even more good old boys club. Overtones possible
- 167 ABP should not be the umbrella group! The Fed of Assoc should be ABP could be one of the Assoc which come together as equals

**B5 – Committees**

- 1. Do you agree that the Board of Directors should review the current standing committees as part of this Plan Review?
  - 122 YES
  - 7 NO
  - 10 UNCERTAIN
  
- 2. Do you agree with the creation of ad hoc "issued-based" committees as opposed to permanent standing committees?
  - 84 YES
  - 20 NO
  - 30 UNCERTAIN
  
- 3. Should the current prescriptive regulatory drafting style be changed to an objective or out-come based regulation drafting style to establish sector committees or councils for the cattle feeding, cattle industry and cow-calf sectors of the beef cattle industry?

47 YES  
16 NO  
44 UNCERTAIN

Comments:

9. Mixture of ad hoc committees and issue-based (limited-life) committees.  
16. Issue based, but only in research and promotion.  
35. Government does not always represent us fairly.  
46. Let the committees decide which issues need to be dealt with.  
49. Committees can be like “cul de sacs” go around and around with no results – many committees are stale so “issue-based” makes more sense not every delegate needs to be on a committee.  
58. Ad hoc committees would be good for specific and timely items i.e. BSE  
61. Ad hoc committees can be created to deal with specific issues now i.e. task forces. Committee should be reviewed and national issues should be shifted to National Body i.e. Technical – CCA.  
63. I believe ad hoc committees are appropriate to have as need arises.  
78. Ad-hoc committees (task forces). Make sure committees have rules that they cannot be always the same people. Do not want “good old boys”.  
87. the cost of having meeting’s because its been traditional to do so, may not be necessary with most homes having the communication gadgetry to communicate with.  
96. the whole system is flawed  
98. I do not know enough about ABP to take part in full question section. But I also think there are too many committees. Should consolidate some of them. Looks like a government operation one overlapping the other and not much gained any place.  
100. Ad hoc committees would create continuity issues with organizations and people we deal with. However current committees should be reviewed with regard to overlap, duplication and need.  
104. Committees have to be tasked. If not they become lethargic and non-effective. Create at most 3 or 4 broad-based groups with a pool of delegates in each one. Particular issues can then be assigned. Once resolved the committee is dissolved  
106. United we win divided we fall. Most problem can be worked out face to face as need cooperation between sectors to function  
114. the more sector the more arguments and disrespect will happen among them. This in no way will bring industry together do one sector is more important “united we stand divided we fall”  
116. Possibly should be changed so that it is the same for all sectors of industry  
119. The use of ad hoc committees for issues is good in conjunction with a set of standing committees  
123. I think we need to keep committees but maybe have ad hoc committees as issues arise. The ad hoc committee is only for short periods of time until the committee is no longer necessary  
124. We do not think that reorganization of ABP will save the cow/calf producer. There is a need for a BIG voice to ensure that other sectors don’t forget who produces the product they need to make their industry profitable  
130. Committees should be flexible to address current issues. There is no point in having a committee for the sake of having a committee  
138. We do not want to divide the cattle industry any more than it already is  
139. Perhaps appoint producers to these standing committees  
143. I think I understand this question. All I want is if we have these committees only ABP goes to government not all this different committees  
146. #3 sorry wording not clear (has underlined “prescriptive regulatory drafting style” and “objective or out-come based”)  
148. The fear is that the ABP will exchange 2 regulated councils for a rash of expensive fruitless divisions instead of flexibility of being able to react quickly (not thoughtlessly) to a sudden need.  
153. I think we could reduce the committees to 2: 1-Producer Liaison; 2-Government Liaison

- 158 I want you to understand where I'm coming from: without the calves nobody else has need for an organization. Look after the grassroots people who are the cow/calf operators
- 159 this should be reviewed but not along the lines ABP is suggesting here. All producers are represented by zone delegates. There is no need for all these councils/committees. Surely under the committee's you have now any "issue based" item could fit there. Don't create more bureaucracy. This leads to slower response time
- 160 Surely any "issue based" item could fit into committee's already structured
- 165 All these "committees" are a part of what the problem is. Too top heavy. Too diverse, too segmented. Proof of that is that you felt you needed a "Producer Liaison Committee". It is ineffective obviously anyway.
- 167 Ad hoc committee could come together from the different associations – not all assoc world necessarily be on all committees. Ad hoc issues bring together interested group "naturally". Sometimes, even, including other groups i.e. forestry, oil & gas, etc can partner with agriculture
- 174 In my operation I don't see why the regulations. I use pasture grasses & legumes & hays.
- 179 Everything hangs on outcomes
- 184 I wish I understood all of the ramifications here. I hope you make the right choice

## C - THE SERVICE CHARGE

### C1 - Non-Refundable vs. Refundable Service Charge

- Should the service charge continue to be non-refundable:

105 YES  
61 NO

123 Absolutely 100%  
171 No! NO! A million time NO!

- If no, should the service charge be fully refundable or partially refundable:

31 Fully refundable  
24 Partially refundable

51. Minimum of 50%  
123 Has written NO 100% in each option  
146 Reasonable charge would be \$1 check-off at slaughter  
165 and/or redirectable  
171 Million times yes  
185 All

- If the service charge was fully or partially refundable, what services or activities that ABP currently provides or funds would you reduce or eliminate?

- It is all about accountability and choice. I believe my check-off should go to the organization of my choice.
- It would be impossible to budget for anything.
- Promotion, but note that this may not mean less dollars collected. National funded (promotion) should be enough.
- "Focus"!! Build a clear vision and mandate and stay the course. Do fewer things and do them much better.
- Reduce size of board and delegates.

13. Manage revenues more efficiently. Refund as much as possible while still being effective to the beef industry.
14. Make the check-off directional
15. Any duplication (**between or?**) with other industry groups.
16. Promotion and research only.
23. None.
29. If the jobs are done, I believe this money would not be asked for as refundable.
30. Keep national check-off dollar.
31. Service charge be directional.
33. Feeder council and industry council.
35. Pay a shaker and mover accountable board of directors. Pay board for their work. We needs funds to move our extreme beef makeover and market to where it needs to be.
40. Most activities would come to an end because a relatively few producers speak for most of the cattle traded. Effectively the Board would become small with the "Big Players" dictating the Policy.
45. There should be a maximum amount of \$500 per producer in order that the feeder council doesn't withdraw and bankrupt ABP.
49. Absolutely no way should it be refundable! ABP needs a constant flow of monies in order to employ staff and fund national programs.
51. Rather have direction check off so we still maintain funding for the whole industry with direction from individual producers.
55. Put a for sale sign up if it's refundable.
56. I think ABP is very accountable on the money spent.
57. Should not be refundable or you lose valuable \$ to the ABP.
58. Reduce CCA funding. Reduce promo of "Alberta Beef"
87. Costly meetings
89. None. Alberta Beef provides great services and protection to all produces without ABP the borders would still be closed.
92. Fewer zones means fewer representatives and that would few up money to be spent for the betterment of cattle industry
93. BIC
98. The big feed lots would be collecting referral and the cattlemen would be paying for what is left
99. Reduce size of delegates
101. A major cut in staff would be a starting point
103. Uncertain re: question C1
106. If refundable would eliminate united front. A lot of service now used would have to be eliminated and not reproducer anywhere else
114. The ABP would end as well as the rest of the activities and organization
119. None
122. Could be run more efficiently
124. The cow/calf producers need to keep control of the service charge so that it can be withheld when their interests are being ignored
126. Research, promotion, all other areas other than government policy
130. Wrong questions. Producers should be able to redirect part of the service charge
132. Service charges should be charged when the animal goes to slaughter
135. Streamline like the rest of us have had to do the last 4 years
136. ABP know what is not paying for itself with the funding it requires at this time
138. the board has to be more proactive to issues facing producers. If we are not getting a service why should we pay?
139. attendance at conference outside of Alberta – get all our house in order first – cut back on glossy publications
140. ABP were more accountable probably wouldn't worry about funding. We don't even get any meeting local in our zone much less representation on issues in today's trying times
146. The beef industry activity is determined by supply and demand. ABP organization money have some difference but perhaps much less than realized
147. If it is refundable or partial refundable the ABP would have a hard time to budget because they would never know how much money they would have to work with for the year

148 reduce or eliminate “studies”, chose smaller centres to reduce cost of meetings. Either  
 provide suppers at all producer meetings or zone. Unequal treatment. The US courts  
 deemed mandatory check-off unconstitutional. HEADS UP

153 The service charge should be partially refundable with the producer having the option of  
 delegating a portion to the committee/association of their choice

154 Possibly ABP needs to be more focused – “outcome oriented”. There has to be  
 accountability – partial refundable check-off would be a good accountability meter

155 Communications; Controller; Legal Counsel; Advertising & promotion; Animal Health &  
 Welfare; government lobbying; directors; staff remaining

157 That would be for ABP to decide

158 If the delegate body were reduced and the whole organization restructured would there  
 be a need for all this check-off money

159 When that time comes that decision will be made. You’re putting the cart before the  
 horse and fear mongering

160 when that time comes those decisions will be made

163 ABP in my opinion does an alright job of promoting beef

165 BINGO! FEAR TALK EXAMPLE. If you do a good job, producers who are efficient  
 business people would NOT request a refund. Those that do either see a need for  
 accountability or are just hobbyists and we can’t rely on them anyway.

167 If the check-off is refundable or directional then individual associations would come  
 together and “pool” resources for consensus expenditures: be it research, task forces,  
 staff etc.

171 You run this organization with the amount of voluntary money you get and I know it  
 wouldn’t be in the millions

172 Stop pretending to market beef (we own no beef to market) cut back promotion

173 Some advertising costs

176 Too many to mention

177 The service charge should be discontinued and the board dissolved. Thanks for trying  
 but you are trying to drive a car with no tires, steering wheel or destination

180 Most

181 All services or activities deemed not essential

183 CCA check off remittance fee. BIC

Comments:

4. Changes may be needed, however, it still takes the money from the check-off to address  
 problems in the industry and meet the producers concerns.
6. Depends on how we structure the board. i.e.: keep good staff here, experts in  
 marketing, business, etc. If changes are made leave it non-refundable.
11. Too big a difference between large feeders and cow-calf sector. Money will talk.
13. Current \$3.00 feels like a grab given market conditions and what results are seen.
14. Allow money to be directed to objectives: research; marketing; policy.
16. By the Alberta government, through MAPA, allowing ABP the ability to tax, then ABP is  
 closely tied to government. This government link is very strong and needs to be if not  
 severed, at least mostly severed. A previous Ag Minister said “I liked APB, because I  
 could tell them what to do”. The people in the Ag industry must be in charge of making  
 policy – bottom up, NOT top down. Throughout the past 5 years during past BSE, this  
 top down government approach has brought the beef industry to its knees.
19. There would be no way to budget if we had a refundable check-off. This is ridiculous.
28. With a refundable check-off ABP would lose its ability to fight trade challenges.
30. Makes the board more accountable.
35. We need the funds to be powerful and visionary and to make hard decisions.
41. The service charge should only be charged 1 or 2 times per animal in its lifetime. I know  
 this is unpractical at this point of time.
43. Huge value in non-refundable. Dollars and political clout. Give it up and you will never  
 get it back.
44. We need results from marketing or selling beef to make sense of the check off dollars.
46. Needs to stay non-refundable to allow for consistent funding.

49. ABP does a good job and is our body to represent our industry. My only concern is that sometimes ABP becomes "tunnel visioned" and forgets to communicate back to grass roots. I would like to disband all committees and have board develop policy.
50. Directional Levy – Industry needs money but many feel ABP has not properly represented producers, therefore direction of money should be an option. Choice – just like the Wheatboard.
53. I believe that there should be a third option; make the check off directional.
54. We have to leave it as is. ABP would not know what direction go in.
58. Refundable should be a long term goal (every producer should want to pay). Any refund request should be in writing.
61. ABP is very conscious of check off dollars. Refundable would have put us in a debatable position – legal fees for court cases do to R. Calf – BSE.
65. Refundable would put the board in a position to follow demand of larger check off feedlots.
72. Make it higher. We can do more with a larger budget for ABP.
78. Smallest part of our budget.
85. By cutting back as the size of the board and their activities you could afford to at best refund some of the monies – least 25/hd
87. As a retiring producer my concerns are probably different than those who may believe they have a career in raising animals (i.e.) farming. Most of what we do, we treat the symptoms not the cause of our problems.
88. Can't have refundable and create great uncertainty to funds available to operate
92. Maybe ABP should be moved to a more central (such as Red Deer or a smaller centre) location. This would reduce office costs etc. Possibly cut back in administration should be looked at. FEWER CATTLE MEANS LESS MONEY FOR ABP
93. Cow/calf producers are not fairly represented by ABP. This organization is overrun by the feeding industry. I would like a partial refund from the check-off so I could contribute to WSGA who rep cattlemen!
98. When I go to the Auction mart with my calves or watch the neighbours. Does not look like any one is look out for pre-closes. ABP Alberta Agriculture or any one else. Hopefully I'm missing something
101. Until ABP learns to listen to producers wishes and concerns producers should have the option to divert their levy money to organizations that do represent their producers' wishes
106. Refundable would really weaken the whole industry and do nothing to improve any thing
107. Have \$1.00 remain re: national portion. Have \$2.00 refundable this would be a compromise
107. If check-off remains non-refundable I would like to see ABP out of policy development
108. I would reduce the budget by 25%. If a refund was available this would make ABP more accountable. One should have the option of contributing and also getting it back if it is taken off
112. A non-refundable check-off is fundamental to the success of the organization. Any refundable option would all into question the integrity of policy decisions due to the real possibility of pressure from individuals or groups who control large chunks of check-off
113. To effectively work for the producer we must have stable funding
114. I am becoming very sad about the way things are going if it was up to Stock Growers and now the cow/calf committee they want to divide ABP and then we will be of no help to any sector in the industry
115. the strength of being represented by an organization (elected) would be lost along without national organization CCA & BIC CBEF
116. Otherwise there would be too much uncertainty around budgets for organization to be effective and adequately represent rate payers
117. If we are going to have an industry we need to get together as an industry and there are issues we need to deal with that require money if we allow producers to claim it back we will have no money to fund the needs of the industry
118. Providing that ABP involves the producer who pays and that there is consensus they are getting their money's worth
119. A refundable service charge would allow large operators to overpower smaller ones

- 123 We do not want to go with refundable, partially refundable or directional. We need one association to deal with industry issues. Start splitting money up and you lose the effectiveness of dollars. One united voice to do what is good for industry as a whole instead of all of these smaller ineffective organizations that just want a piece of the pie. Who says similar groups will spend the money better. You need big bucks to compete in the world today
- 124 The cow/calf producers should only pay when their interests are being addressed. There is no need for them to support BIC which supports packers and feedlot sales and could reduce beef breeds to not necessarily the best four.
- 130 For example producers should be able to direct part of the charge to WSGA of AB Cattle Feeders Association. Both these organizations have a voluntary membership and contribution which really doesn't work
- 136 The money that is on travel and board in the budget seem far out of hand
- 138 the board needs to get tough with both provincial and federal governments on issues that cost us money. If we took care of small things we could focus on larger problems. E.g. talk about elk in haystacks doesn't fix the problem we need immediate action
- 146 Not being closely involved with ABP makes it difficult to judge their impact. Their activities are not well spelled out.
- 148 I expressed when the \$3.00 check-off was shoved down our throat. The ABP could not spend within its budget at \$2.00 why give them \$3.00. I sell my calves privately when I can because I do not feel the \$ is used wisely
- 152 How can any organization function if part of its funding has to be returned to its members?
- 154 I would gladly pay more if I could see results – in particular marketing offshore, regulation costs transferred back to the public etc. We haven't seen this in the last 4 years since BSE
- 160 Accountability
- 163 In the beef industry along with the grain industry there is way too much corporate profit. Too many parasites making absurd amounts of money controlling farmers in general. Chemical, oil companies, agri machine company's post record profits while farms go under
- 164 C2 would probably help eliminate the issues around non-refundable and refundable check-off
- 165 Please stop patronizing our grassroots producers. Those of you, who have been silenced or out voted or both, due to heavy handed pressure or good orators with an agenda or misguided mission – remember who voted for you and what they asked you to take forward.
- 172 Promotion is important if you have product to market. Alberta beef is owned by large American plants who have product to sell
- 184 I hate paying the check-off as much as anyone but we need it. The people who can't see this have not looked at the issues nor what has been accomplished with these funds. I hope we always try and run a tight ship and get the most value for our \$. To make check-off refundable accomplishes nothing. It would only hurt us
- 185 Those who want to be in the ABP can do what ever they want. I don't want to be a member. I don't want you stealing my money and using it against me. You are my biggest enemy as a cow-calf producer.

## **C2 - Trigger for Payment of the Service Charge**

1. ABP should look into the feasibility of imposing a one-time service charge when cattle are slaughtered or transported out of Alberta.

65 YES

49 NO

29 UNCERTAIN

167 LIS could be contracted to do this

Comments:

10. LIS to collect the check-off – stop the present leakage.
11. Present system is inefficient and costly.
16. Not sure of how the service charge should be collected but current system does not work well.
18. All check-off or the biggest part is contributed by one sector.
20. Fairer for everyone. One-time fee.
29. Producers – ALL producer sectors. Cow/calf – backgrounder – feeder.
30. First point of sale.
33. Leakage – risk that animals would escape check-off would increase with higher/animal check-off.
40. It doesn't matter how it is collected as long as it doesn't change the bottom line.
45. As long as it doesn't become a trade (irritant?) of an excuse for reprisals.
46. This could simplify and reduce friction in the industry.
51. What value? Can't answer question too open ended?
52. Maybe 1 final check off at end of animals' termination or as leave province.
56. It may be pretty high cost to one person.
58. Caution as we are already at a cost disadvantage e.g. SRM disposal.
61. With all the kill going south it puts finances very variable.
63. The reason they had multiple point check offs was so everyone felt involved.
65. Loss of contact to all producers.
68. This has merit because it does not unfairly penalize those who choose to market cattle sooner.
70. \$3.00 is fair for all.
74. Check off should be collected on exported cattle.
81. Check off on exported cattle.
83. Would it streamline things?
86. Would this provide a stable "consistent" source of funds for which the ABP could operate a budget or would it be a more stable source of funds?
88. A concern – how will memberships be determined? May be hard to identify those not slaughtering or exporting – what about abattoir or mobile kill?
90. Would balance costs between cow/calf producers who bear the sale cost of CCIA and feeders who reap the rewards of identification.
91. Too many fees already
96. Only if the check-off goes to marketing Alberta beef
100. Each owner can take some responsibility for dealing with industry issues
106. Maybe would be a good idea likely best when animal leave country or at slaughter but would have be worked in gradually not to hurt any one part of the industry
107. Why would we do this?
112. We have often considered this but as far as I know have never done a real analysis of the impact
116. the feasibility of this concept should definitely be explored and presented for further discussion
117. Who would keep track of this, this would be a bookkeeping nightmare
118. this is not a vote for beef direction to look into. With present information my vote would be for status quo
119. I think this a good to look at it
123. Will maybe help to keep the value chain here in Alberta
124. It would cost more to police than it would generate in revenue. Would ABP be collecting fees on show cattle going to inter-provincial shows and returning to Alberta?
125. Packing plant or exporter should pay this
130. I just don't think it would work. The current system isn't really fair and the proposed system wouldn't be any better
138. Why should just the cow calf sector pay they are already paying all of the other extra costs
139. How many more dollars do you think the industry can spare

- 140 Probably this cost would be passed down to the cow/calf producers which carries the greatest burden of tax cost etc. In the industry as they have no one to pass these extra cost too.
- 146 this charge and repeated charges are all passed to the cow/calf producer by feedlots and packers. ABP is a cow/calf expense
- 147 Would this replace the check-off or would this be over and above. More income
- 148 The ABP would raise the \$ amount to an unmanageable amount to suit their needs and the packer would reduce the price to compensate
- 150 The cattle all gone from ABP jurisdiction totally
- 151 Merit in considering. Would remove the service charge from the producers face
- 152 Who would pay the onetime charge? E.g. producer, backgrounder, feedlot or packing plant
- 154 May be a option worth looking at, however you would then know every \$ would be passed on down to the producer i.e. cow/calf (for e.g. If it was \$12.00)
- 155 If you have the support of producers you should be willing to operated on voluntary contributions
- 159 Trade would be impeded. ABP should consider working to keep all live cattle here and only go out in a box or as a carcass
- 160 Trade would be impeded. ABP should consider working to keep all live cattle here and only go out in a box or as a carcass
- 163 We live in a user pay society. End user should pay (i.e. packing plants)
- 164 Could simplify the check-off administration and eliminate the argument that some are paying too much or not enough
- 166 If you need a new source of income yes, if not – no
- 167 Should be collected when animal “moved” in the cycle (i.e. auction, moved to feedlot, moved to slaughter) or transported out of province for slaughter
- 171 this is the only thing that should of bee in place. Not charging the same animal 2-3-4 times.
- 177 No more service charges
- 179 Question would be how high a rate?
- 181 Absolutely not
- 184 I'm afraid this just creates more bureaucracy (I know there is already bureaucracy in the current system) the current system at least ensures everyone pays something sometimes. Something different may be hard to merge to everyone's satisfaction
- 185 Quit stealing my money

## D - REGULATION MAKING POWERS

1. Should producers be required to register their names and addresses with ABP?

90 YES  
 38 NO  
 19 UNCERTAIN

167 Voluntary – do not ask for phone no → you are in violation of privacy  
 171 Why? Don't you know who is giving you money

2. If yes, should the use of the producer names and addresses be restricted to ABP mailing lists, voter's lists and collection of the service charge.

89 YES  
 2 NO  
 10 UNCERTAIN

148 FOIP

Comments:

10. Inform at the time of data collection, what this information could be used for, i.e.: FADE, email notification for various industry issues, etc.
14. Disease control.
18. Other lists are available but the organization appears adverse to obtaining them . . . this (above) is an alternative but not a first choice.
19. Producers share responsibility.
35. We must have a current accurate voting list. Keep this current on an annual basis.
50. Would this make ABP a member organization?
54. This would be the same as when you make out a manifest to sell your livestock.
55. We say we can track every cow but we cannot track every producer.
58. Communicate with individuals asking if they wish for further communication e.g. Research summaries.
74. I have no problem with registration but how much time and effort would be expended on having every producer register.
- 98 P.S. I'm senior citizen with small cow herd. Supposedly to supplement retirement income. So my dollars or ideas will have little import
- 102 Their choice, if you want a say then register
- 106 What is major problem of list of producers name & address be available to necessary agents like premise ID etc.
- 107 This is a point that should remain private. As a producer our farm name was given out by ABP. I know this because of the way the address and the name was written only ABP has ever communicated with us in this way. When another organization has the name stated like this you know where it came from – please control giving out personal information
- 109 We desperately need an up-to-date mailing list! That is a prerequisite of any business or organization
- 112 Some may consider the reduction of mailing problems to be a reason to require this but in my view the attack on individual rights is not worth the gain
- 124 the government already has too much info on the number of cattle and producers. Currently no one is making sure that those attending ABP meetings are even producers
- 126 with my course you would have to register to vote
- 130 There is too damn much regulation in the business now
- 136 Collection of service charge name is submitted by selling agent so why should I have to register (producer has crossed off “and collection of the service charge”)
- 138 Soon ABP will want a membership fee
- 146 No space to comment re judgement – opportunity for future markets during BSE (i.e. BSE testing of all cattle) sadly mismanaged by ABP/government. First effort must always be to “please the customer” or he won't be there
- 147 They already have it how else would we get this information
- 148 this is a greedy out of control dictatorship – one I am not proud to support. My efforts to change at the producer level have failed
- 152 Just adds to the growing list of costs to be incurred
- 164 FOIP rules apply in today's world
- 165 If producers wish not to register that should be their right. We as Canadians are supposed to be free. We need to reduce powers not increase powers of regulation bookies. ABP is NOT the spokes association for the producers at this time – if that changes producer will support it again
- 166 I think you already get it
- 167 Assoc can collect names/addresses etc voluntarily → have to make it clear what info it would use and under what circumstances. Most would give info if make clear what/and where it is used.
- 171 This is a good idea and I wonder how many producers wouldn't register so they wouldn't have to pay check-off
- 174 I don't like B.S. coverage
- 183 In the Grass Routes Erik Butters says we need regulation burden not more. I agree
- 184 I really can't see a reason why anyone should be alarmed at having ABP know who they are.

## Survey Questions

1. Town/City nearest to you:	50.	6
	51.	5
	52.	Blank
	53.	Blank
2. Zone:	54.	Blank
1. 1	55.	Blank
2. Blank	56.	Blank
3. 1	57.	8
4. 1	58.	Blank
5. 1	59.	Blank
6. 2	60.	6
7. 2	61.	4
8. 4	62.	Blank
9. 2	63.	8
10. Blank	64.	Blank
11. 2	65.	7
12. Blank	66.	7
13. 1	67.	7
14. 2	68.	7
15. 2	69.	7
16. 2	70.	7
17. Blank	71.	Blank
18. 2	72.	7
19. 2	73.	Blank
20. 2	74.	9
21. Blank	75.	9
22. 2	76.	9
23. 2	77.	9
24. 2	78.	9
25. 2	79.	9
26. 1	80.	9
27. 2	81.	9
28. 1	82.	9
29. Blank	83.	Blank
30. 2	84.	Blank
31. Blank	85.	2
32. 1	86.	1
33. 1	87.	6
34. 1	88.	7
35. 2	89.	3
36. 1	90.	4
37. Blank	91.	7
38. Blank	92.	7
39. 5	93.	2
40. 1	94.	1
41. 5	95.	8
42. 5	96.	6
43. 5	97.	X
44. 3	98.	9
45. 5	99.	8
46. 5	100.	8
47. Blank	101.	6
48. 3	102.	8
49. Blank	103.	7

104	X	145	X
105	X	146	9
106	3	147	9
107	1	148	5
108	3	149	8
109	2	150	7
110	4	151	8
111	5	152	9
112	1	153	5
113	4	154	1
114	5	155	7
115	7	156	6
116	9	157	8
117	3	158	X
118	9	159	8
119	5	160	7
120	2	161	5
121	2	162	8
122	8	163	7
123	5	164	3
124	8	165	5
125	7	166	6
126	3	167	X
127	7	168	X
128	9	169	4
129	9	170	X
130	4	171	X
131	2	172	1
132	6	173	2
133	1	174	8
134	4	175	1
135	2	176	X
136	5	177	X
137	8	178	5
138	9	179	9
139	6	180	X
140	9	181	X
141	X	182	X
142	2	183	9
143	2	184	2
144	7	185	6

3. Type of business:

**142 cow-calf**

1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78 (backgrounding), 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 – grass backgrounder, 89, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96 – background, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 183, 184, 185

**44 feedlot**

3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 23, 27, 28, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 48, 50, 51, 57, 67, 70, 72, 75, 76, 79, 83, 84, 95 – only our own cattle, 99, 108, 120, 121, 126, 138, 140 – background, 143, 155, 157, 165, 167, 169

6 dealer

7, 29, 30, 42, 50, 133

20 other

8, 9, 10 (Custom feeder), 13 (auction market), 16, 30, 50, 54 (Purebred Breeder), 77 (stocker), 79, 85, 90 – purebred, 91, 103 – Dairy, 117, 133, 140, 154 – backgrounder, 156, 172

**OTHER COMMENTS:**

16. We need to dig down deep and really take a serious look at change. Anything less is just another band aid. The beef industry is bleeding from a serious wound, and another band aid put on every 5 years at plan review is not acceptable. The industry has moved on, ABP needs to change to what the industry is now. Stop turf protecting and start representing the new beef industry.
25. This process becomes very confusing when it's uncertain if there will be a significant structural change with regards to zone boundaries and delegate numbers. I think that needs to be established then options should be presented to handle a changed structure.

57. Change meeting format:

- have tables of 6-8 people instead of open forums. The open forum format encourages arguments and animosity. The loud dominate the conversation.
- I do not feel comfortable in this type of meeting development.

Make survey shorter and put on Internet. Too many questions that require a presentation to understand.

Meeting too long.

To make meetings (zone) with more individuals in attendance – must have a contentious issue as a topic.

66. Because of Media and Government talk? Consumer Perception: Question are teachers wages as subsidy? Farmer's subsidy? Nurses' wages? Educate public "Media". Government will follow. E.g. Newspaper with actual dollar figures to producers Administration.

On radio I heard "Farmers have more money in the pockets than ever". Lumped in with Grain Producers.

Who lobbies other countries of our safe beef effectively (not as effective as USA). Can other commodities be used as bargaining tools. More effort should be placed on education of general public. E.g. Government cheques flowing to beef producers written in Western producer. Public feels we got a lot of tax dollars. Did it go to administration? Not a great feeling when our Agriculture Minister says "one time bail out, you figure it out next year". Their policy's Ethanol Expansion directly hurt us. These Media and Government misrepresentations need to be responded to and corrected.

Does the Grain Producer know if the Ethanol Industry fails when the government stops subsidizing it during the next (recession?) where there grain will go.

The Government letting our industry fall will let all agriculture fall. It all starts education the public. E.g. Is it good for the environment eating beef from the Brazilian Rain Forest "it's cheaper". The new Ag stability program who can put money in "Grain Producers" they don't need the support at this time, we do. The Government should use common sense. Who tells them this? If our Agriculture Minister feels age verification will give us (?) \$100/head, (?) \$5 per head if it will be our saviour.

- 98 ABP keep up the good work and Thank you

- 105 Your organization will never be taken seriously, until you quit entertaining such ridiculous resolutions as those on the back of your news letter. It makes me sick that the check-off money that I am forced to give you is controlled by wackos who come up with such idiotic notions like "let's stop importing beef", and let's get the government to make sure we get \$1000/calf. What are you R-CALF north?  
Having 19 directors insures nothing will ever change with this organization. Giving the same single vote to a producer who raises 1 pail bunter calf and sells him at the auction as to a producer who buys and sells 100,000 head further insures nothing will change. As far as beef industry issues who do you think has more at stake?  
Get rid of the zones, put 7 directors on your board, make all of their votes public record, give producers votes corresponding to the # of head marketed, and allow them to apply votes towards the directors who they feel represent them. As it is now 10% of the producers do 90% of the funding and get no say because they are cattle feeders and the cow-calf sector votes them down every time.  
The cow-calf producer is holding our industry back. They fought CCIA tags, they fought BVD vaccinations, they are fighting traceability, and they run your organization.  
Just so you know we run 300 cows as well as a small feedlot.
- If you refuse to make your organization accountable then please refund my check-off and carry on, but without my money.
- 116 There should be choices for producer to vote rather than just at fall meetings. Not everyone can attend but would still like opportunity for input
- 139 In making my comments throughout the consultation it may appear that I am overly critical. I want to preface these comments by saying the following:  
I faithfully attend Zone meetings each year, listen to the speeches and base my voting decisions on the information contained therein.  
I have attended the Beef Industry Conference in Red Deer annually, with the exception of this current year. I make these comments to advise that I do make myself aware of the working of our organizations, and don't just sit back and complain.  
Over the years it appears to me that ABP has developed into an organization controlled by a few ranchers that has lost sight of the issues facing the 35,000 cow/calf producers across Alberta.  
I see the same names heading the same committees of ABP regularly, even though each year a new crop of delegates are elected, many of them with excellent qualifications and involvement in the cow/calf industry.  
I am in full support of the Cow/calf committee/council, with the membership being selected by all producers by way of an appropriate nominations process and voting taking place with some form of ballot.  
During the Provincial election campaign, ABP should be front and centre lobbying every party leader to ensure they recognize the crisis in the industry. I personally have spoken to the Premier about his issue and our local PC candidate is hosting a luncheon make up of solely agricultural producers to learn firsthand the issues facing them and their families.  
ABP needs to do away with the hat and shiny boots persona, and become an organization that advocates loud and long for the cow/calf producers, if we do not see some relief in this devastation the industry is in we will lose not only the cow/calf but feeding industry in our province.  
In closing, I wish to say that I have ultimate respect for Rich Smith, and feel that the responsibility for making significant changes with ABP rests with the Board of Directors.
- 143 My writing and spelling not very good I hope you can read this. I believe in ABP very much it is very powerful we just go to make it one to service organize on we depend
- 148 I painfully read and answered this survey. The questions were complicated and off track. Questions should reflect: Do we as producers feel we are getting fair value for our \$3 check-off – Answer No; Is the money spent on too many people doing too many things that don't matter. Yes. Cattle producers are pared to bare bones. The ABP should be too and the wages they are paid should be in line with the industry
- 165 Inane questionnaire – irrelevant and not addressing real problems
- 171 Oh! Sorry I forgot we sold our cows last year because we got fed-up being screwed by this organization and the rest of this industry

- 172 AS part of review I need to point out several other important subjects.
1. WE as ABP, appear unable to modify our positions. We are quoting the same arguments in the same language as we did five years ago even if our preaching has accomplished little (example anti BSE testing)
  2. While our beef business is undergoing a very difficult time our director appear to be prospering, using government programs that they help plan and implement. ABP is being used as a vehicle to launch political careers, finance new research facilities, and establish directors as prime channels to export cattle.
  3. Too much loyalty to individuals over what might be good for the beef business. (example: if the Chairman of CCA were lobbying for things that hindered the beef business it appears no one would step up to contradict him.)
- I don't raise these points lightly I waited a long while to make these points as I am very dismayed to observe the effects they have on the whole organization. I look forward to discussing any of these subjects at a future date.
- 175 I feel since this is a beef organization the only real reason it exists is because of cattle. The people who produce the product are the cow/calf people ranchers and cattle farmers as some call them. So without them there would be no cattle. So I feel they are the people who should have the top voice in the organization. Next in line are the market people who hopefully help market the beef at a price so the producers can make some money and stay in business. The feedlot people and milk people need a voice too. Somewhere down the line. As for the check-off I think \$2.00 should be enough one time only for everyone. Everybody the same. Something else what I wonder is why is all this money collected and each year the cattle drop lower. So what good is it to the producer? You might say well we can't control the price of cattle! Maybe not. I fail to see what benefit our organization to cattle producers if they are forced out of business
- 177 Almost out of business. Thank God.

The End