



**Report on the Multi-Stakeholder Workshop on Food  
Irradiation: Ottawa, Canada, March 29, 2005**

**A report by Ellis Westwood and Marc Saner, March 31, 2005**

## Acknowledgements

This workshop was funded by the Bureau of Food Regulatory, International and Interagency Affairs at Health Canada, under contract 4500090067. We thank this office for its support and, in particular, we would like to thank Paul Mayers, Claudette Dalpé, Dean Peters and Kernaghan Webb for their thoughtful presentations at the event.



The Institute On Governance (IOG) is a Canadian, non-profit think tank founded in 1990 to promote responsive and responsible governance both in Canada and abroad. We define governance as the process whereby power is exercised, decisions are made, citizens or stakeholders are given voice, and account is rendered on important issues.

We explore what good governance means in different contexts. We undertake policy-relevant research, and publish the results in policy briefs and research papers.

We help public organizations of all kinds, including governments, public agencies and corporations, the voluntary sector, and communities to improve their governance.

We bring people together in a variety of settings, events and professional development activities to promote learning and dialogue on governance issues.

The IOG's current interests include work related to Aboriginal governance; technology and governance; board governance; values, ethics and risk; building policy capacity; democratic reform and citizen engagement; voluntary sector governance; health and governance; accountability and performance measurement; and environmental governance.

© Copyright, 2005, Institute On Governance

For further information, please contact:

Marc Saner  
Institute On Governance  
122 Clarence Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1N 5P6  
tel: +1 (613) 562-0090  
fax: +1 (613) 562-0097  
info@iog.ca  
[www.iog.ca](http://www.iog.ca)

[IOG 2005-8031]



## Table of Contents

<b>1. Discussion of Workshop Content</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Introduction (Marc Saner, Facilitator).....	1
<b>A) Responses To <i>Canada Gazette</i>, Part I, As They Relate To The Labelling Requirements For Irradiated Foods Served In Food Service And Restaurant Establishments</b> .....	<b>1</b>
A.1) Opening remarks (Paul Mayers, Acting Director General, Food Directorate, Health Canada) ...	1
A.2) Consultations and Consumer Concerns on Labelling in Food Service Establishments (Claudette Dalpé, Associate Director, Food Regulatory Program, Food Directorate, Health Canada) .....	2
<b>B) Lessons Learned From Voluntary Approaches</b> .....	<b>4</b>
B.1) Presentation on International Dairy Queen’s Approach to Irradiation (Dean Peters, Director of Communications, International Dairy Queen).....	4
B.2) Presentation on Voluntary Approaches (Kernaghan Webb, Senior Legal Advisor, Industry Canada).....	6
<b>C) Addressing Consumer Concerns – <u>Open Forum</u></b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Some Observations and Ideas for Next Steps</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>2.1 Observations on Workshop Presentations</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Health Canada and the Status of the Food Irradiation File .....	10
Case Study: Dairy Queen and Voluntary Labelling of Irradiated Beef .....	10
Voluntary Approaches to the Issue .....	11
<b>2.2 Observations on Discussion Themes</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Annex 1: Workshop Agenda</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 2: List of Invitees</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex 3: List of Participants</b> .....	<b>24</b>

# 1. Discussion of Workshop Content

## Introduction (Marc Saner, Facilitator)

Mr. Saner opened the workshop by thanking participants for attending and by thanking staff at Health Canada for recognizing the need for, and leading, a workshop to discuss voluntary approaches to irradiated foods served in food service and restaurant establishments. He specifically thanked Paul Mayers, Claudette Dalpé and Sonia Roussel for this leadership.

Mr. Saner also referred participants to the objectives for the workshop, reiterating that discussions on food irradiation as a general food safety technique were welcome but that the focus of the workshop was on voluntary approaches to identifying irradiated foods served in restaurant settings. He explained that an attention on voluntary methods was important because there is no provision in the *Food and Drug Regulations* to require the declaration of irradiated foods in the food service and restaurant industry.

He also referred to the rules of dialogue that were sent to participants as part of the invitation letter – in particular to the point that “what if” scenarios should be considered. In other words, we do have to discuss the information needs in restaurant and food service establishments if the use of food irradiation were to be extended to ground beef, chicken, shrimp, prawns and mangoes.

Mr. Saner confirmed that a full list of participants at the workshop, whilst not available at the event, would be distributed along with the final report. An agenda including objectives is attached as Annex 1, a full list of invitees is appended as Annex 2, and a list of those who participated is also included, as Annex 3.

## **A) Responses To Canada Gazette, Part I, As They Relate To The Labelling Requirements For Irradiated Foods Served In Food Service And Restaurant Establishments**

### A.1) Opening remarks (Paul Mayers, Acting Director General, Food Directorate, Health Canada)

Mr. Mayers started the information-sharing section of the workshop by welcoming participants and noting that the event was a valuable part of a continuing consultation process on the proposed amendments that were published in *Canada Gazette, Part I*, in November 2002. He commented that these consultations had been substantive and the 2-year duration of the process had mirrored the high-levels of public interest and responses received on the issue.

Mr. Mayers explained that the need for the current event sprang from these consultations and the Government of Canada saw it as an important next step in sharing some of the results of the consultation process and as an opportunity to hear the concerns and ideas of stakeholders.



Invitations had been extended to all government, industry and civil society organizations that had shown an interest or responded to the proposed amendments. As a result, the diversity of participants provided the chance for a rich exchange of ideas.

Mr. Mayers looked forward to a number of outputs from the workshop: a discussion that would reaffirm different points of view and allow Health Canada to better respond to comments received to-date; and, a chance for the Department to listen to and understand options for the continuation of the dialogue on the use of food irradiation and its identification in particular establishments.

## A.2) Consultations and Consumer Concerns on Labelling in Food Service Establishments (Claudette Dalpé, Associate Director, Food Regulatory Program, Food Directorate, Health Canada)

Ms. Dalpé's presentation covered various components of the food irradiation file and Health Canada's involvement: a history of food irradiation regulations, details of the recent proposed regulatory amendments to extend the use of food irradiation to ground beef, chicken, shrimp, prawns and mangoes, results of the public consultations on these proposals, and the current status and future of the food irradiation file within the government. A copy of her deck will accompany this report as an email attachment.

She reminded participants that food irradiation technology has been permitted since the 1960s, when food items so treated were first approved for sale in Canada. Currently, onions, potatoes, flour, wheat flour and dried spices can undergo irradiation treatment. Prepackaged foods that have been irradiated must be labelled. Furthermore, if an irradiated food is used as an ingredient of another food, it must be declared as such if it constitutes 10% or more of the final food.

Ms. Dalpé also reminded attendees that in restaurant environments, regulations do not require that information on food ingredients, treatments or composition to be provided to consumers, including allergen and nutrition labelling, as well as labelling of irradiated foods.

Ms. Dalpé continued to discuss the consultation process associated with the proposed regulatory amendments published in *Canada Gazette*, Part I, in 2002. She started by informing participants that Health Canada had conducted focus group sessions prior to the national consultations, in order to ascertain what existing knowledge members of the public had on food irradiation. The results indicated that the public wanted more information on the process. Scientists and other technical staff participated in consultation events to answer questions on the irradiation process.

In the subsequent national series of consultations, most of the responses received were from individual citizens, although organizations also responded by way of written submissions. Ms. Dalpé's presentation categorized citizen comments into eight issues – she noted each and added specific issues of concern that we have placed in parentheses accordingly.

### 1. Labelling

2. Consumer Choice – Labelling
3. Enforcement and Compliance with Regulations (*How can the Government ensure compliance? With a code of practice? Rules and inspections?*)
4. Food Safety Practices (*Comments suggested that food irradiation would be used by industry to hide negligent food handling practices and other safety issues*)
5. Regulatory Process
6. Scientific Considerations Underlying the Safety of Food Irradiation (nutritional quality, toxicological data, alkylcyclobutanones)
7. Transparency
8. Safety of the Nuclear Industry (*Concerns on equipment and safety measures*)

Ms. Dalpé updated participants on the current status of the food irradiation file: summaries of the evaluation process for each food item in the current proposal, copies of presentations provided at consultation events, details on the proposed amendments, a code of practice and Q&As are currently available on Health Canada's website at [http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/food-aliment/fpi-ipa/e\\_irradiation\\_index.html](http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/food-aliment/fpi-ipa/e_irradiation_index.html)

She indicated that the Department was also working to release a report on information sessions as well as a summary of comments and responses to the 2002-3 consultation series in the near future. Her division is working to present recommendations on a policy option to senior management and the Minister of Health.

In a prolonged question period, a number of important matters were raised by participants. An initial respondent thanked Health Canada for organizing the workshop, and said it was useful, but added that the process of food irradiation was still unsafe. The participant acknowledged that the focus of the workshop was on voluntary approaches to identify irradiated foods in restaurants, but he was concerned that this discussion assumed that everyone could agree on food irradiation's safety and appropriateness; a point on which he disagreed with Health Canada. In response, the facilitator stated that comments on food irradiation were welcome and would be noted, but time constraints meant that the bulk of discussion would be on voluntary approaches.

Another questioner asked why other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) or "developed" countries, such as Switzerland and Sweden had not approved the use of food irradiation, although they had access to similar scientific evidence as Canada.

Further questions were raised on the governance of the approval process for irradiation use under the current proposed amendments. A participant asked where Health Canada acquires scientific information for assessing safety, and whether organizations who petition for approved use of irradiation on specific food items also provide data to the government to help it make a decision.

Ms. Dalpé responded that although petitioners did submit information supporting their case, Health Canada used all available data, such as published scientific studies, to decide on safety. A further participant commented that these studies might not be entirely reliable since they can be funded by industrial groups, which in turn may affect the validity of results.

A legal question was raised by a participant who asked whether there were any legal or constitutional issues that would result in labelling requirements becoming mandatory in restaurant establishments – and if not, whether the government could create such a law. Ms. Dalpé responded that although no such law exists, the government could consider it, although doing so would create complications under the *Food and Drugs Act*.

A contributor asked Ms. Dalpé for clarification on the reference to an allergy labelling initiative during her presentation: specifically, whether the *Gazette* process could require these labels and if Health Canada’s mandate extended to the requirement of allergen labels. Ms. Dalpé responded that she used the example simply to demonstrate that other information required on labels for prepackaged foods are not required in restaurant settings.

The question session ended with a discussion on trade implications for approval of further use of irradiation. A respondent asked where foods are irradiated and if treatment occurs in other countries, how Canada can ensure adequate safety standards during the process. Ms. Dalpé replied that irradiation is performed on food products where they are produced, which may be domestic or foreign in source. Mr. Mayers added that, under the mandate of CFIA, imports are subject to the same safety requirements as domestically irradiated products and that there exists a “suite of measures” (certifications in-field, regular process of Canadian Border Services inspection, laboratory testing) which apply to both. A respondent, though, voiced a concern that CFIA simply does not have the capacity to monitor and enforce existing standards abroad.

A final discussion over the safety of food irradiation identified a guide from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) document that provides a global map showing approval by country. This document is available at <http://www.iaea.org/programmes/nafa/d5/public/foodirradiation.pdf>

## **B) Lessons Learned From Voluntary Approaches**

### **B.1) Presentation on International Dairy Queen’s Approach to Irradiation (Dean Peters, Director of Communications, International Dairy Queen)**

Mr. Peters’ presentation provided participants with operational information and lessons learned from Dairy Queen’s test of food irradiation for beef ingredients from 2002-4; an experience which has lessons and implications for possible voluntary labelling programs in Canada.

For Mr. Peters, Dairy Queen’s decision to irradiate beef ingredients dates back to *E.coli* outbreaks at *Jack in the Box* restaurants in 1993, which resulted in the deaths of four children and made hundreds ill. Dairy Queen felt that they needed additional levels of food safety and partnered with a company called *SureBeam* to irradiate beef patties. The company accepted the safety of irradiation after seeing its World Health Organization (WHO), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and American Medical Association (AMA) approvals. According to Mr. Peters, the chain tested the process in two restaurants in Minneapolis in 2002, eventually increasing the rollout to 130 stores, in Minnesota,

New York and New Mexico. *SureBeam* used a process of electronic irradiation and did not use the radioactive sources associated with nuclear irradiation.

Participation in the program was voluntary for franchisees, who were provided with information and technical support by Dairy Queen head office and *Surebeam*. Employees were also given detailed training and assistance to allow them to provide accurate information to customers. Mr. Peters emphasized that Dairy Queen's approach was transparent, honest and done in an effort to provide consumers with adequate information to make an informed decision on consumption. The company used posters, information leaflets and other materials to educate consumers on the process and benefits of irradiation.

Mr. Peters reported that Dairy Queen's surveys on the products had indicated that almost half of consumers would be willing to pay more for burgers that had been irradiated and that 95% of respondents would either maintain or increase visits to restaurants after irradiation had been introduced.

He concluded that the company had learned some important lessons through the initiative:

1. Consumers will accept irradiated hamburgers
2. Education is very important (acceptance increases with knowledge of the irradiation process).
3. Staff training is critical for success (so that they can provide accurate information to consumers).

The Dairy Queen test of food irradiation ended when *SureBeam* went bankrupt in January 2004. Mr. Peters' presentation is included with this report as an email attachment.

In the following question period, a number of clarifications and suggestions were made to Mr. Peters. One participant commended Dairy Queen for adopting a transparent process to informing consumers, but proposed that information on potential risks and hazards associated with the use of food irradiation should have also been made available.

Mr. Peters responded that, under US law, Dairy Queen was not required to label or identify irradiated foods, but chose to do so to provide information to consumers. However, he did clarify that restaurants did not serve both irradiated and non-irradiated burgers: consumers who chose not to consume the treated products needed to go elsewhere.

On a personal note, Mr. Peters added that he favours the additional safety provided by food irradiation but acknowledged that the company no longer uses the technology due to competing priorities.

A representative from the industrial sector asked if a requirement to post the Radura on materials would have impacted Dairy Queen's decision to use irradiation. Mr. Peters responded that if it had been required, they would still have used the process. He did, though, admit that some franchisees were reluctant to use the term 'radiation' because of negative perceptions, but that they had been committed to use the appropriate term and not try to sway public opinion.

Finally, a participant asked why Dairy Queen used the test and how it could claim success in educating its consumers when its own polling showed that, despite the information available during the opening of the test period, most (59%) customers did not in fact know that they had been consuming irradiated product. The participant also asked how many burgers the company sold during the survey period, as 4470 respondents seemed low.

Mr. Peters replied that, unfortunately, sales information is proprietary and that he did not have it available. He continued to state that low awareness figures told them that they did not publicize the use of irradiation enough, and that the survey period had only lasted for 30 days. Finally, he remarked that the purpose of the test itself was to see if irradiated beef burgers were viable for both consumer acceptance and sales.

## B.2) Presentation on Voluntary Approaches (Kernaghan Webb, Senior Legal Advisor, Industry Canada)

Dr. Webb presented on how voluntary approaches could potentially be applied to the issue of food irradiation in the restaurant/fast food sector. For the purposes of his discussion, voluntary approaches (codes) were defined as “non-legislatively required commitments agreed to by one or more party, designed to influence or control behaviour, to be applied in a consistent manner or to reach a consistent outcome.”

He discussed the strengths / weaknesses of both conventional regulatory instruments and voluntary codes, noting that both types of instruments had unique positive characteristics and limitations. He provided some examples of successful codes and offered some questions for consideration in developing a voluntary approach on the food irradiation file, focusing on identifying what is the problem or mischief which the instrument might address, what are the strengths and weaknesses of that instrument, and what sort of scope and process for development would likely be effective.

In discussing voluntary approaches, Dr. Webb identified a number of advantages in contrast to legal methods. He noted the slow and expensive regulatory development process, and how conventional regulatory approaches are constrained by constitutional and legislative aspects which do not apply to voluntary approaches. Voluntary approaches can have significant incentives to maintain good behaviour, such as the desire of businesses to attract or maintain their customer base by demonstrating that they are responsive to customer needs. The failure to meet commitments contained in voluntary codes can leave firms vulnerable to legal actions for deceptive marketing practices. In this way, the potential for liability can act as an enforcement mechanism to ensure that organizations that have committed to voluntary programs adhere to the terms of those programs. Voluntary codes can operate across jurisdictions without constraint by constitutional requirements applying to legislative approaches. Voluntary codes can also evolve to become law, as has recently happened when a voluntary standard pertaining to protection of personal information became the basis for a federal privacy law.

As an example of a voluntary approach which has worked well, he referred to the sustainable forestry management standards developed by the *Forest Stewardship Council*



(<http://www.fsc.org/en/>), which has led to millions of acres of certified "sustainable" forested lands. The FSC is a voluntary membership-based organization spearheaded by non-governmental organizations and since adopted by major retailers and forestry companies. It shows how NGOs can develop and enforce a voluntary program with successful outcomes. Business has also developed voluntary programs that act as useful adjuncts to regulatory programs, such as the Responsible Care program of the Canadian Chemical Producer's Association. This program sparked the development of similar programs in more than 40 other jurisdictions, and showed how industry associations can evolve from an exclusive lobbying role to one involving self-policing elements, with community, NGO and academic involvement.

However, Dr. Webb identified a number of limitations for voluntary programs: although not necessarily the case, they can result in lowest common denominator outcomes; come with free-rider problems where those outside the program can benefit; and governance problems where authority and decision-making can involve difficult and complex processes.

In conclusion, he outlined several important questions for the food irradiation file, including whom the parties and champions would be, how a program would be developed and implemented and who will pay for it.

Participants put a number of questions to Dr. Webb after his presentation. One asked whether the courts draw on voluntary codes in their decisions, and whether judges have a good understanding of what these instruments are and how they work. He responded that courts rely on legal counsel to bring issues and instruments to their attention, and that courts have used voluntarily approaches in determining what constitutes reasonable care, and also have made it a term of sentence that convicted companies comply with the terms of voluntary standards (e.g., that polluters comply with ISO 14001 environmental management systems standards).

Another participant asked how associations enter voluntary programs, who they need to notify and how they can withdraw. Dr. Webb replied that in Canada there is currently no set way for organizations to opt in or out of such codes. Instead, members determine membership, disclosure and implementation in a self-driven process. But, the standards in self-driven programs must be high enough to be reasonable; in the US, a voluntary standard that was not kept up to date, and was relied on by others, led to liability against the standard developer when it was found to be deficient.

### ***C) Addressing Consumer Concerns – Open Forum.***

Participants in the workshop were divided into pre-designed small discussion groups. In order to allow for all viewpoints to be represented, listen to and considered, we ensured that government, civil society and industry were present in each group.

Each group was given around one hour to discuss a number of questions:

1. What is your individual take on food irradiation?



2. What do you think should be done on the food irradiation file in the future?
3. What ideas are there for non-mandatory measures?
4. What would be the conditions for continuing the dialogue (environment, format and participants)?

A number of important issues emerged from small group discussions. These views were expressed by individuals and do not represent a form of consensus. On questions 1-3, some salient points were:

- There is a need for information to be provided to consumers on food irradiation, but who should go first in supplying it? In the case of Dairy Queen, industry volunteered to lead the process and in doing so absorbed some of the costs.
- The restaurant and food service industry is a consumer-driven market. So, the impetus for changes in labelling or ingredient identification must come from the consumer. However, there are limits to this – restaurants cannot provide information on all customer requests. Capacity does not, and cannot, exist for satisfying all demands.
- The use of food irradiation can create a false sense of security in food safety. For example, the widespread use of vinyl gloves in food preparation diverts attention away from actual cleanliness and general food handling practices.
- Labelling in smaller, independent restaurants can be a challenge regardless of whether they cover nutrition or irradiation information – such establishments have individual preparation processes and limited resources that make labelling difficult. Logistics in small and medium-sized enterprises is a significant challenge. So, a voluntary approach to food irradiation labelling may only help the larger chain restaurants, which have standardized production processes and fixed menus.
- But, in response to comments that labelling would be more difficult in smaller establishments, another point was made that all restaurant managers know what they are serving, since suppliers are required to label products.
- All stakeholders know the public wants to be informed but the issue is how they should be informed, using what language and what kind of information.
- There are numerous options for providing information to consumers on irradiated foods using different language.
  - Radura
  - Ionization
  - Electronic irradiation
  - Cold pasteurization
  - Irradiation
  - Nuclear irradiation

- The language of public information can be powerful enough to affect the outcome: in France, irradiated foods are instead called “ionized” products which sounds more acceptable. This coincides with a high use and low public resistance in France
- There is also a difficult trade-off between information for consumers and disguising the message.
- One participant wondered how we could evaluate long-term safety without labels. In response, another participant stated that there is no need for a long-term safety study, and based on this there is no justification for any kind of labels.
- Who is doing the communication to consumers and who *should* be doing it?
- One particular group was evenly divided in favour of mandatory labels. One side thought that voluntary approaches were “teethless”, whereas the other considered mandatory labels to be too onerous for small and medium-sized restaurant businesses.
- Mandatory requirements would also place significant enforcement burdens on municipal authorities.
- Food irradiation can create a false sense of security about food preparation hygiene practices. For example, statistics indicate that most illnesses from food-borne bacteria are caused by contamination of the food during preparation in restaurant settings. Irradiating supplied foods will not prevent these.
- Questions still exist on food item-specific approvals. Concerns over beef irradiation are separate from those over treatment of onions.
- There is a need for a “massive” consumer education program from the government. Health Canada’s nutrition label initiative is a plausible model.

On question 4, on a *continuation of the dialogue*, several important issues were raised:

- The current workshop is a beginning and we must continue the dialogue.
  - Is the process of food irradiation valuable?
  - Why have other countries accepted / rejected the technology?
- Perhaps it is time for a cross-country consultation on labelling for food irradiation.
- But, we also need to focus on the issue of voluntary labelling / identification instead of broad public debate on food irradiation. Concrete options for consideration would be helpful for future events.
- There is a need for provincial governments to participate in other events, as they are also involved in the issue.



## 2. Some Observations and Ideas for Next Steps

### 2.1 Observations on Workshop Presentations

#### *Health Canada and the Status of the Food Irradiation File*

We noticed a number of important ideas in Mr. Mayers' remarks provided in opening the workshop that are worth repeating here:

- Consultations on the proposed regulations are ongoing and will continue.
- Health Canada is listening to comments from stakeholders.
- The government would like to continue a productive dialogue with its partners on the file.
- The Department is still considering various options as to whether and how it might introduce the use of food irradiation while balancing this with efforts to allow consumers to make informed choices on food purchases in restaurant establishments.

The presentation by Claudette Dalpé and the character of the following question period suggests to us that significant concerns exist in the general public and in civil society on all aspects of the food irradiation file – on science, the approval process, consultations, safety and transparency. The willingness of Health Canada to continue the discussion in a multi-stakeholder forum is a positive step towards addressing these issues.

#### *Case Study: Dairy Queen and Voluntary Labelling of Irradiated Beef*

We found that there were a number of important conclusions that can be drawn from Dairy Queen's experience, which are relevant to the current food irradiation discussion in Canada. Perhaps most importantly, the case study showed that it is possible for industry to design and lead a voluntary labelling program that ensures safety as well as image and sales. Indeed, firms like Dairy Queen have managed to combine the use of food irradiation with a commitment to corporate social responsibility. We also suggest that labelling programs work best when communications are honest and transparent to develop trust between consumer and business.

However, the case also demonstrated the challenge for voluntary programs to provide sufficiently accessible information to consumers to allow for an educated choice. Labelling may need to be accompanied by an extensive information campaign about the science and trade-offs of food irradiation treatment.

We feel it was also significant that Dairy Queen used electronic irradiation. This is a substantively different treatment process from technologies using radioactive sources and has very different implications for stakeholders and for the profile of real and perceived risks. In fact, we heard participants who were sceptical about the safety of nuclear food irradiation support the electronic method. Consideration of food irradiation from nuclear sources introduces

concern and opposition on issues pertaining to nuclear safety that need not be part of discussions on electronic irradiation.

### *Voluntary Approaches to the Issue*

An analysis of voluntary issues shows us that they can have significant power to enforce their requirements, through litigation or the risk of voluntary measures becoming mandatory legal requirements. This means that, in numerous cases, they have worked effectively to curb behaviour seen as irresponsible from the perspective of the general public. Simply put, if designed and implemented effectively, they can work. In other words, mandatory approaches are not automatically stronger in practice.

Voluntary programs also allow industry / NGOs to play a much more active role in the policy process, from a results or outcomes perspective. They can work to create a program that protects their interests and reducing the role for the state as a significant actor on the issue. However, crafting a viable program can be difficult and requires resources.

## **2.2 Observations on Discussion Themes**

A number of common themes emerged from the discussions that will have important implications for the future development of the food irradiation file.

- **Science of food irradiation.**

Although the workshop welcomed points-of-view about the general technique of food irradiation, it also asked participants to consider “what if” scenarios: what if food irradiation was permitted on the new list of food products? This is difficult for groups that categorically oppose the process. More importantly, though, it produces a fundamental point of disagreement between stakeholders that makes it difficult to work cooperatively towards a voluntary program for identification.

One significant disagreement is over the need for long-term studies – does the consumption of irradiated foods pose a risk to the consumer in the long-run? If such a risk was plausible then it would support the need for labels.

The fact that OECD countries vary in their acceptance of food irradiation, and on the list of food items upon which it may be performed, when they have similar evidence available to them, suggests that decisions may not be based entirely on science but on other factors. They may be based on popular opinion or may start from an assumption about the general utility of technology in protecting human health in the food production sector.

The decisions of other jurisdictions and countries on the issue of food irradiation, and the process by which these decisions were made, are important. (Both questions concern governance, which the Institute describes as the procedures whereby *societies or*

*organizations make important decisions, determine whom they involve and how they render account.)*

- **Information for Consumers**

There were some shared opinions that consumers need information about food products in order to make informed decisions on consumption. Other labels, for allergens and nutrition information are seen as valuable and necessary by many stakeholders. However, within the food irradiation discussion, there is disagreement about *what* information to provide and *how*. This position may form the basis for agreement on voluntary labelling: the point of debate may not be on whether so much as on operational issues.

Who should provide the information to consumers?

What kind of information should it be?

How can we balance accuracy of information with clarity and layperson accessibility?

It may be possible to get answers to these questions from comparative studies (either comparing other food label issues or other jurisdictions). Also, public opinion research could be revisited.

- **Impact on small and medium-sized enterprises**

Adopting a position against the use of labelling does not mean being “pro-business”. For some, an obligation to label menu items and educate consumers on food irradiation has different affects upon, and implications for, businesses of two distinct sizes: large restaurant chains on one hand and small and medium-sized businesses on the other. It may be possible to address these concerns empirically.

- **Food irradiation and other food hygiene practices**

Workshop participants generally agreed that the use of food irradiation techniques should not replace existing standard safe food handling and preparation practices. Possible voluntary approaches to identification could affirm a commitment to use irradiation to support and strengthen existing good practices in food safety.

- **Need for continued dialogue**

Participant believed that there is a need for stakeholders to continue to be involved in the food irradiation decision-making process. Other events should follow-up on the opinions shared at the current workshop. They should target a wide group of interested parties.

## **Annex 1: Workshop Agenda**



# ***Multi-Stakeholder Workshop on Food Irradiation***

## ***Agenda***

**Date:** March 29, 2005 (10 am to 3 pm)

**Location:** Volunteer Canada – Volunteer and Trustees’ Lounge  
330 Gilmour Street, Downtown Ottawa

### **Objectives:**

- To provide information on the comments pertaining to the labelling of irradiated foods served in food service and restaurant establishments following prepublication in the Canada Gazette, Part I, on proposed amendments.
- To initiate the discussion on avenues to address these comments.

10:00-10:10 Workshop Objectives (facilitator)

**(A)            **RESPONSES TO *CANADA GAZETTE, PART I*, AS THEY RELATE TO THE LABELLING REQUIREMENTS FOR IRRADIATED FOODS SERVED IN FOOD SERVICE AND RESTAURANT ESTABLISHMENTS****

10:10-10:15 Opening Remarks by Paul Mayers (Acting Director General, Food Directorate, Health Canada)

10:15-10:35 Presentation on Consultations and Consumer Concerns on Labelling in Food Service Establishments by Claudette Dalpé (Associate Director, Food Regulatory Program, Food Directorate, Health Canada)

10:35-10:50 Q&A

10:50-11:05 **Break**

**(B) LESSONS LEARNED FROM VOLUNTARY APPROACHES**

11:05-11:10 Introduction (facilitator)

11:10-11:30 Presentation on International Dairy Queen's Approach to Irradiation (Dean Peters, Director of Communications, International Dairy Queen)

11:30-11:45 Q&A

11:45-12:05 Presentation on Voluntary Approaches (Kernaghan Webb, Senior Legal Advisor, Industry Canada)

12:05-12:20 Q&A

12:20-13:00 **Lunch**

**(C) ADDRESSING CONSUMER CONCERNS – Open Forum**

13:00-13:05 Introduction (facilitator)

13:05-14:00 Roundtable Discussions

14:00-14:50 Plenary Discussion (facilitator)

**(D) WRAP-UP**

14:50-14:55 Closing Remarks by Health Canada

14:55-15:00 Closing Comments (facilitator)

## ***Annex 2: List of Invitees***

**Food Irradiation Workshop: March 29, 2005**

### **Presenters**

1. Paul Mayers  
A/Director General, Food Directorate  
Health Products and Food Branch  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
  
2. Claudette Dalpé  
Associate Director  
Bureau of Food Regulatory, International and Interagency Affairs  
Health Products and Food Branch  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2
  
3. Dean Peters  
Director of Communications  
International Dairy Queen  
7505 Metro Blvd.  
Minneapolis, MN 55439
  
4. Kernaghan Webb  
Senior Legal Policy Advisor  
Industry Canada  
Consumer Policy  
255 Albert Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0H5

### **Governments (FPTCFSP)**

5. Mr. Kevin McLeod  
Senior Team Leader  
Environmental Health  
Alberta Health and Wellness  
10025 Jasper Avenue  
23rd Floor,



Box 1360  
Edmonton, Alberta  
T5J 2N3

6. Darryl Johnson  
Environmental Health Analyst  
Disease Control Division  
Medical Services Branch  
Department of Health and  
Community Services  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, West Block,  
Confederation Building  
P.O. Box 8700  
St. John's, Newfoundland, A1B 4J6

7. Joseph Bradley  
Manager of Environmental Health  
Dept of Health and Social Services  
P.O. Box 2000,  
161 St.Peters Road  
Charlottetown, PEI  
C1A 7N8

8. Mark Durkee  
Agri-Food Safety Analyst  
Legislation & Compliance Services - Quality Evaluation  
Department of Agriculture & Fisheries  
99 High Street  
Bridgewater, Nova Scotia  
B4V 1V8

9. Mark C. Allen  
Project Manager  
Office of the Chief Medical Officer of Health  
Department of Health and Wellness  
PO Box 5100  
Fredericton, NB  
E3B 5G8

10. Lucile Giguère  
Conseillère en inspection des aliments  
Direction générale de l'alimentation  
Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec  
200, chemin Ste-Foy, 11 étage  
Québec (Québec)  
G1R 4X6



11. Dr. Gwen Zellen  
Director,  
Food Safety Policy Branch  
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food  
1 Stone Road West  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor NW  
Guelph, Ontario  
N1G 4Y2

12. Fred Ruf  
A/Coordinator,  
Environmental Health and Toxicology Unit; and  
Coordinator, Food Safety/Safe Water Unit, Public Health Branch, Ministry of Health and Long-  
Term Care,  
5700 Yonge Street, 8th Floor,  
Toronto, Ontario M2M 4K5

13. Mr. Bruce Fortin  
Association of Supervisors of Public Health Inspectors of Ontario  
Sudbury and District Health Unit  
1300 Paris St.  
Sudbury, Ontario  
P3E 3A3

14. Mr. James Drew  
Director, Food Protection  
Public Health Branch  
Manitoba Health  
4080 - 300 Carlton Street  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3B 3M9

15. Peter Parys  
Association of Environmental Health Directors of Urban Centres in Western Canada,  
Community Services Department  
City of Winnipeg  
33 Warnock St.  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3E 3L6

16. Mr. Louis Corkery  
Director, Disease Prevention and Health Protection Unit  
Population Health Branch  
Saskatchewan Health  
3475 Albert Street



Regina, Saskatchewan  
S4S 6X6

17. Mr. Larry Copeland  
Director, Food Protection Services  
BC Centre for Disease Control  
655 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. W. 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Vancouver, B.C.  
V5Z 4R4

18. Mr. Duane Fleming  
Chief Environmental Health Officer  
Department of Health & Social Services  
Centre Square Tower, 6th Floor  
5022 - 49<sup>th</sup> Street  
P.O. Box 1320  
Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
X1A 2L9

19. Eric Bergsma  
Environmental Health Officer  
#2 Hospital Road  
Whitehorse, Yukon  
Y1A 3H8

20. Paul Sockett  
Director, Division of Enteric, Foodborne and Waterborne Diseases  
Centre for Infectious Disease Prevention and Control  
Population and Public Health Branch  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0L2

21. Anne-Marie St-Laurent  
Associate Director, Interagency Program  
Bureau of Food Regulatory  
International and Interagency Affairs  
Health Products and Food Branch  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture (0702C1)  
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0L2

22. Patricia Lemay  
Director, Public Health Bureau  
Workplace Health and Public Safety Programme



Healthy Environment and Consumer Safety Branch  
Health Canada  
9th Floor, Vanguard Building  
171 Slater Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0L3

23. Greg Orriss  
Director, Bureau of Food Safety and  
Consumer Protection  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
Camelot Court  
59 Camelot Drive  
Nepean, Ontario  
K1A 0Y9

### **Consumers' Organizations**

24. Bruce Cran  
President  
Consumers' Association of Canada  
c/o National Office  
436 Gilmour Street, 3rd Floor  
Ottawa, ON  
K2P 0R8

25. Maxime Laplante  
President  
Region: Chaudière-Appalaches  
Union Paysanne  
453 Principale  
St-Germain-de-Kamouraska, Québec  
G0L 3G0

26. Louise Rozon  
Directrice  
Option Consommateurs  
2120, rue Sherbrooke Est, bur. 604  
Montréal (Québec)  
H2K 1C3



### Environmental Organizations

27. Elizabeth May,  
Executive Director  
Sierra Club of Canada  
412-1 Nicholas Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 7B7

28. Tony Clarke  
Director  
Polaris Institute  
312 Cooper Street  
Ottawa ON  
K2P 0G7

### **Health Organizations**

29. Elinor Wilson  
Chief Executive Officer  
Canadian Public Health Association  
400 - 1565 Carling Avenue  
Ottawa ON  
K1Z 8R1

30. Marsha Sharp  
CEO  
Dietitians of Canada  
480 University Avenue, Suite 604  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5G 1V2

31. H  l  ne Tremblay  
Pr  sidente  
Association des di  t  tistes au Qu  bec  
11, rue Charlevoix  
Bureau A-106  
Montr  al, Qu  bec  
H3J 2V9

### **Public Interest Organizations**

32. John Urquhart  
Executive Director



The Council of Canadians  
700-170 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa, ON  
K1P 5V5

33. Joan Claybrook  
President  
Public Citizen  
1615 Broadway, 9th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612

### **Women's Organizations**

34. Catharine Laidlaw-Sly  
President  
National Council of Women of Canada  
205-251 Bank St  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2P 1X3

### **Industry Organizations**

35. Nancy Croitoru  
President & CEO  
Food and Consumer Products of Canada  
885 Don Mills Road, Suite 301  
Toronto, Ontario  
M3C 1V9

36. Douglas Needham  
President  
Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association  
316 Bloor Street West  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5S 1W5

37. Nick Jennery  
President  
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors  
1 Concorde Gate, Suite 604  
Don Mills, Ontario  
M3C 3N6

38. Albert Chambers  
Secretary  
Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition  
19 Elm Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1R 6M9

39. Kathy Keeler  
Executive Director  
Beef Information Centre  
310- 6715, 8th Street NE  
Calgary, AB  
T2E 7H7

40. Stan Eby  
President  
Canadian Cattlemen's Association  
#310, 6715 - 8th St. NE  
Calgary, AB  
T2E 7H7

41. Jim Laws  
Executive Director  
Canadian Meat Council  
955 Green Valley Crescent, Suite 305  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2C 3V4

42. Danny Dempster  
Canadian Produce Marketing Association  
9 Corvus Court  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada  
K2E 7Z4

### **Health Canada Specific Invitees**

43. Jeff Farber  
Director  
Bureau of Microbial Hazards  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0K9

44. Bruce H. Lauer  
Head, Food Additives and Contaminants Section  
Bureau of Chemical Safety  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9

45. Nathalie Robert  
Regulatory Officer  
Food Policy Integration  
Health Canada  
Tunney's Pasture  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9



### ***Annex 3: List of Participants***

1. Anna Shapiro (Health Canada)
2. Bruce H. Lauer (Bureau of Chemical Safety, Health Canada)
3. Carla Abbatemarco (Canadian Meat Council)
4. Hélène Tremblay (Association des diététistes au Québec)
5. Jeff Farber (Bureau of Microbial Hazards, Health Canada)
6. Joyce Reynolds (Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association)
7. Maria Neil (National Council of Women of Canada)
8. Lucy Sharratt (Polaris Institute)
9. Nathalie Robert (Bureau of Food Policy Integration, Health Canada)
10. Paul de Bané (Union Paysanne)
11. Paul Sockett (Centre for Infectious Disease Prevention and Control, Health Canada)
12. Angela Rickman (Sierra Club of Canada)
  
13. Paul Mayers (Food Directorate, Health Canada)
14. Claudette Dalpé (Bureau of Food Regulatory, International and Interagency Affairs, Health Canada)
15. Sonia Roussel (Bureau of Food Regulatory, International and Interagency Affairs, Health Canada)
16. Dean Peters (International Dairy Queen)
17. Kernaghan Webb (Industry Canada)
18. Marc Saner (Institute On Governance)
19. Ellis Westwood (Institute On Governance)

