

**CONTROL ID:** 2067692

**TITLE:** What Consumers Expect

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** Every organization operates with some level of “social license” -- the privilege of operating with minimal formalized restrictions based on maintaining public trust. Social license is granted when you operate in a way that is consistent with the ethics, values and expectations of customers, employees, the local community, regulators, legislators and the media.

Once lost, through a single event or a series of events that erode public trust, social license is replaced with social control -- regulation, legislation, litigation or restrictive market action. Operating with social license is flexible and low cost. Social control increases costs, reduces operational flexibility and increases bureaucratic compliance.

What can be done to maintain public trust that grants social license? You begin by recognizing that transparency is no longer optional. Anyone with a cell phone is an on-the-scene reporter. Research in recent years clearly indicates that consumers increasingly go online to look for information to answer their questions about food. Growing skepticism about food safety and the use of technology fuel online communities that are raising issues and making their voices heard with increasing volume and frequency.

When CFI asked consumers what it takes for them to be more trusting of food, they said they don't believe that today's food system is transparent. They also believe that large companies are likely to put profit ahead of public interest. To overcome this bias, the food system must dramatically increase the commitment to transparency.

CFI's consumer trust research has identified seven elements of transparency that can make a significant contribution to building trust. The research shows these elements had the most positive impact on those who tend to be most skeptical about the food system -- women and early adopters. All of our research has shown that early adopters, those who are better educated, have higher incomes and broader social circles, and women tend to be significantly more skeptical than men and later adopters when it comes to food issues.

As we increase both the distance most consumers have from farming, food processing and the level of technology we implement in food production, we must dramatically improve our ability and commitment to build trust with stakeholders who grant social license. To be successful we have to build and communicate an ethical foundation for our activity and demonstrate our commitment to practices that are ethically grounded, scientifically verified, and economically viable.

**Speaker Biography (300 words):** Charlie Arnot is recognized as a thought leader in food and agriculture. He is highly regarded as both a writer and sought-after speaker who engages audiences across the globe. Charlie has more than 25 years of experience working in communications, public relations and issues management within the food system. He is the founder and president of CMA, an employee-owned consulting firm with offices in Missouri, Iowa and Ohio. He also serves as CEO of the Center for Food Integrity, a national non-profit organization dedicated to building consumer trust and confidence in today's food system.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** C. Arnot, Center for Food Integrity, Gladstone, Missouri, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2069974

**TITLE:** Meaningful Conversations

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** Abstract available in the Meeting App.

Speaker Biography (300 words): available in the Meeting App.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** R. Krotz, US Farmers and Ranchers Alliance, Chesterfield, Missouri, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2067305

**TITLE:** Animal Feed vs. Human Food

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** The global population is predicted to rise to over nine billion by the year 2050. As resources for food production will decline over this time, how we should ensure that our children and grandchildren have the same access to food that we currently enjoy? Groups opposed to animal agriculture contend that we should adopt a vegetarian or vegan diet in order to “save the planet”, however, continuous improvements in efficiency have allowed U.S. livestock producers to considerably reduce environmental impact. Compared to 1944, U.S. dairy producers use 77% less feed, 90% less land, 65% less water and have achieved a 63% reduction in the carbon footprint per gallon of milk. Similarly, the modern U.S. beef industry uses 19% less feed, 12% less water, 33% less land and has a 16% lower carbon footprint than production systems characteristic of the 1970’s. Moreover, the U.S. EPA reports that meat production contributes 2.1% of national GHG emissions. If all of the USA’s 314 million inhabitants removed meat from their diet for one day per week, the annual reduction in national GHG emissions would only be equal to 0.30%. Reduced meat consumption would also necessitate new sources for the many by-products from animal agriculture, including leather, fertilizer, fats, fibers and pharmaceuticals. Another popular argument for reducing meat consumption is that human nutrient requirements could be met by shifting grain use from livestock feed to human food. Corn only accounts for 7% of the total feed used to produce a unit of U.S. beef, and globally, over 7 billion acres of pastureland are used to raise livestock. Only a small fraction of these are suitable for food crop production due to terrain, water or nutrient restrictions, and they also maintain habitats for many bird, animal and insect species that would be lost if converted to cropland. By-products from the food and fiber industries also play significant roles in feeding livestock. Approximately 37 lb of livestock feed is produced from every 100 lb of plants grown for human food – what would be the environmental consequences of instead diverting these human-inedible by-products to landfill? Furthermore, as 30% of all food purchased in the USA is discarded by the consumer, making a concerted effort to reduce food waste could significantly reduce environmental impacts. To maintain food availability for future generations, it is essential to continue the tradition of continuous improvement within animal agriculture that has reduced environmental impact over time, and to consider the additional areas where considerable reductions can be made.

Speaker Biography (300 words): JUDE L. CAPPER, Ph.D. undertook her BSc in Agriculture with Animal Science and her PhD in Ruminant Nutrition and Behavior at Harper Adams University College in Shropshire, United Kingdom. She held a postdoctoral position in Ruminant Nutrition and Environmental Impact in the Department of Animal Science at Cornell University, followed by an Assistant Professor position in the Department of Animal

Sciences at Washington State University.

Jude is currently an independent Livestock Sustainability Consultant based in Bozeman, MT; and holds adjunct professor and affiliate positions at Washington State University and Montana State University, respectively.

Jude's current research focuses on modeling the environmental impact of livestock production systems, specifically dairy and beef. Current research projects include the effect of specific management practices and technology use upon environmental impact. Her principal professional goal is to communicate the importance of livestock industry sustainability and the factors affecting sustainability to enhance the knowledge and understanding of stakeholders within food production from the rancher and farmer through to the retailer, policy-maker and consumer.

She has an active social media presence and spends a considerable amount of time de-bunking some of the more commonly-heard myths relating to resource use and the environmental impact of livestock production.

Jude maintains websites relating to her work at: <http://wsu.academia.edu/JudeCapper/Talks> and <http://bovidiva.com/> and has the Twitter handle of @Bovidiva. She can be contacted via email at [jude@livestocksustainability.com](mailto:jude@livestocksustainability.com).

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** J. Capper, Livestock Sustainability Consultant, Bozeman, Montana, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2069975

**TITLE:** Antibiotic Stewardship as a Driver of Legislative, Regulatory, and Consumer Agendas that will Shape the Future of Antibiotic Use in Agriculture.

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** The interface of antimicrobial use in food animals and the potential for selection of resistant organisms which could affect human health lies within a wide variety of food animal production systems. These systems are comprised of unique combinations of scale, physiological and disease challenges, technological inputs, and management intensity. Innovations in efficiency bring rewards in an economic system where commodity prices tend to approach the cost of production; early adopters of new efficiency technology obtain a competitive advantage in the period prior to the uniform adoption across the industry. Antimicrobial use in livestock production will continue to evolve due to pressures from regulatory, legislative, and supply chain entities. The supply chain perspective may include evaluation of available data, but also involves marketing pressures driven by the latest trends on Twitter, Facebook, and the blogosphere; all of which we might agree pull us away from rational assessment of issues at least to some extent. Come to think of it, maybe the same argument could be made for legislative and regulatory pressures also. Regardless, the supply chain is the most likely to drive immediate and substantial changes in food animal antimicrobial use.

If we attempt to use data to drive decisions about antibiotic use in agriculture, our challenge becomes that of defining risks and benefits of antimicrobial use in different production scenarios and then evaluating these outcomes based on our collective values. As these values will seldom reach consensus, it is reasonable to assume that views of risks and benefits (and in fact the morality) of the use of antibiotics in food animals will seldom reach consensus.

The issues of food chain transfer, or direct transfer, of resistant bacteria such as *Salmonella*, *E.*

*coli*, and *Campylobacter* from food animals to humans at least lend themselves to metrics which can help us evaluate the risk of certain practices within a food system. We may disagree about the probabilities associated with each node along a quantitative risk assessment, or about the acceptability of the overall calculated risk distribution, but at least we can find some points on which to focus. In contrast, the concept of the “reservoir of resistance” defies assessment of the system as a whole due to the nebulous nature of the concept, and paints us in the corner of deciding whether or not to invoke the precautionary principle.

Speaker Biography (300 words): Dr. Mike Apley is a veterinary clinical pharmacologist who works with food animal producers and veterinarians in the areas of drug use in food animals, antimicrobial resistance, and drug residues. His practice background includes general practice in central Kansas and a feedlot consulting/contract research practice based out of Greeley, CO. Prior to joining Kansas State University, he was on the faculty at Iowa State University.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** M. Apley, College of Veterinary Medicine, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2069978

**TITLE:** Animal Welfare Landscape: Current Scientific and Consumer Challenges

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** Farm animal welfare remains a highly contentious topic in the US. Continuous confinement housing and behavioral restriction of animals continue to be primary areas of concern. However, a number of issues exist that are at least as significant in regard to potential infringement on animal well-being, but which have received comparatively less public attention. These include inappropriate animal handling and other poor quality human-animal interactions on farms. Handling of non-ambulatory animals continues to present a challenge for many farms, and painful practices, performed without analgesia, such as castration, tail docking and dehorning remain problematic. On-farm euthanasia methods and the timeliness of euthanasia decisions also warrant attention, along with the distress, injury and mortality that can occur during loading and transport of animals.

While scientists, veterinarians, farmers and food animal industry organizations have invested significantly in addressing farm animal welfare, and consequently perceive themselves to be the go-to experts on the subject, a recent Purdue University study suggests that consumers do not necessarily look to these particular groups for information on animal welfare. An online survey of 798 US households examined relationships between key household characteristics (demographics, geographic location and experiences), reported levels of concern about animal welfare, and sources of information people use to inform themselves on the topic. Because of the level of media attention dedicated to recent undercover videos of swine care practices on farms, specific questions pertaining to modern pork production were posed.

Over half of those surveyed (56%) could not identify a specific source for animal welfare information. Those who did have a source most commonly reported using information provided by the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). Respondents were most concerned about confinement housing of sows, identifying gestation and farrowing stalls as even more troubling than castration, teeth clipping or tail docking of piglets. Additionally, respondents reported acting on these concerns, with 14% subsequently decreasing their pork consumption by as much as 56%.

It is increasingly critical for the scientific and veterinary communities to be well versed in current scientific advancements and challenges relative to farm animal welfare as well as the nature and reasons for public concerns. The latter is particularly important to facilitate

improved communication, trust and perceived competence relative to current and emerging farm animal welfare issues.

Speaker Biography (300 words): Dr. Candace Croney is Director of Purdue University's Center for Animal Welfare Science and associate professor of animal behavior and well-being in the departments of Comparative Pathobiology and Animal Sciences. Her research focuses on understanding the relationship between animal cognition and well-being, the effects of rearing environments and enrichment on animal behavior and welfare, bioethical implications of animal care and use decisions, and public perceptions of animal agriculture. She serves as scientific advisor on animal welfare to several groups, including American Humane Association, Bob Evans Farms, McDonald's, the National Pork Board, P & G Inc., and Target.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** C. Croney, Center for Animal Welfare Science, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2067691

**TITLE:** Trends in Food Safety: Public Perception vs. Reality

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** This talk will address recent trends in food safety and media coverage of outbreaks, such as the recent Foster Farms associated Salmonella outbreak, that tend to cause mistrust with the food industry in consumers' minds. The issue of the use of antibiotics in animals raised for food, and what, if any, risk this practice poses to human health thru the development of antibiotic use will also be discussed. Also discussed will be the use of technologies to increase production output and efficiency in an effort to feed a growing population with an increasing income. Finally, a discussion of where consumers are getting their information about agriculture and food production, and why that needs to change.

Speaker Biography (300 words): Dr. Raymond was a rural Family Physician in O'Neill, NE, for 17 years and then established and Directed Clarkson Hospital's Family Practice Residency Program in Omaha for 10 years. During this time he also served as the President of the Nebraska Medical Association.

In January, 1999, Dr. Raymond was appointed by Governor Mike Johanns to be Nebraska's Chief Medical Officer. Dr. Raymond directed a large number of public health programs including investigations of food borne illness outbreaks and building public health preparedness. He also served as President of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials.

In July, 2005, Dr. Richard Raymond moved to Washington, D.C., when President George Bush appointed him Undersecretary for Food Safety at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In this position, Dr. Raymond was responsible for overseeing the policies and programs of the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) which regulated the meat and poultry food industry and once again was a direct report to Mike Johanns, at that time the Secretary of the USDA.

Dr. Raymond now consults and writes on food safety and public health issues from his home in Windsor, Colorado, and speaks on the same subjects both domestically and internationally.

Dr. Raymond is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Co-WY Chapter of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, the Business Advisory Board of Identigen, the Food Safety Solutions Advisory Board for Elanco/Eli Lilly, the Christie Club Property Owners Board of Directors and Tyson Food's Animal Well Being Advisory Board.

He writes two food safety blogs monthly for Meatingplace.com and Feedstuffs Food Link

Dr. Raymond has an ongoing working relationship with Eli Lilly/Elanco, consulting on food safety and public health issues, and an ongoing working relationship with Merck Animal Health regarding messaging as it relates to antibiotic use in animals raised for food.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** R. Raymond, Food Safety/Public Health Consultant, Windsor, Colorado, UNITED STATES;

**AWARDS:**

**Trainee Letter:**

**CONTROL ID:** 2069645

**TITLE:** The New Consumer Value Proposition

**ABSTRACT BODY:**

**Narrative (400 words):** Strongly held beliefs about environmental issues, the ethical treatment of food animals, and the way a food item is produced are becoming more pronounced variables in the consciousness of the American consumer. These emotionally charged concerns - along with food safety considerations - are increasingly factoring into U.S. shopper's decisions about where they shop, the products they purchase and the brands they support. Additionally, consumers are expecting their food retailer to be engaged in these value considerations and in some instances, active advocates acting on behalf of the customer's views for improvements. Sharing research about what builds customer trust, trends regarding shopper values and emerging consumer attitudes about food safety and animal welfare considerations, we will explore the expanding role of the food retailer in addressing customer values.

The new value proposition of consumers extends beyond economics and encompasses more esoteric concerns and belief systems. It is making exploration of these value-driven issues up and down the value chain a necessary conversation, requiring deeper dialogue, better information exchange and more intimate engagement between retailers and producers.

**Speaker Biography (300 words):** David Fikes is Vice President, Consumer/Community Affairs and Communications for Food Marketing Institute, the trade association for supermarkets, grocery stores and all venues of food retail. His areas of responsibility - which embrace consumer research, animal welfare issues, the challenges of communication and the many ways food retailers interact with their local community - all feed his fascination with people. Prior to his position with FMI, Fikes served as the Director of Communication for the American Frozen Food Institute. Before entering the world of food trade associations, Fikes worked for 20 years as an Episcopal priest, serving parishes in Georgia, Tennessee and Texas.

He and his wife Lisa are the proud parents of three and half year old Harper Fikes, who maintains an active consumer interest in Dragon movies, sidewalk art and soap bubbles.

**CURRENT CATEGORY/DISCIPLINE:** Plenary

**AUTHORS/INSTITUTIONS:** D. Fikes, Food Marketing Institute, Arlington, Virginia, UNITED STATES;

