



CANADIAN SHEEP FEDERATION

DETAILED COMPARISON

2013 Code of Practice for the Care and Handling of Sheep
versus the August 2026 Draft Updated Code

BOARD DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

Bottom line

The proposed update is not simply additive. It materially increases written planning, training, recordkeeping, transport, euthanasia, and slaughter obligations, while also removing, downgrading, or making less prescriptive several safeguards found in the 2013 Code. Member Board review should test both the new burden and the consequences of the omissions.

Prepared for: Canadian Sheep Federation Board of Directors and Member Boards

Date: September 3, 2026

1. Executive assessment

Purpose. This report compares the published 2013 Sheep Code with the August 2026 draft at the level of chapter structure, Requirements, Recommended Practices, and material explanatory guidance. It leads with the draft wording and then shows how it differs from the current Code.

Method. Purely editorial changes and updated citations are omitted unless they affect meaning. The labels such as "strengthened," "relaxed," and "drafting gap" are analytical classifications for Board discussion; they are not labels used by NFACC. Page references are the printed page numbers in the documents, not the PDF counter.

Overall assessment. The draft raises the governance and documentation baseline substantially. It also improves transport planning, post-transport handling, euthanasia verification, emergency preparedness, predation management, and on-farm slaughter safeguards. However, the draft is not uniformly more stringent. Several 2013 requirements are downgraded, narrowed, or removed, most notably in breeding, castration and tail docking, handling, salt/mineral formulation, equipment maintenance, and some task-specific competency provisions.

Strategic priority - neonatal manual blunt force trauma (mBFT). Although the core neonatal age/weight allowance remains, the draft narrows mBFT to situations where no other neonatal euthanasia option is available and explicitly encourages producers using it to seek alternatives. Producer representatives fought to retain this option during the current Code update. The wording therefore signals a material future-retention risk, and positive producer comment is important now if the industry wants mBFT preserved as a practical neonatal euthanasia option in this and future Code cycles.

Net effect by implementation lens

LENS	NET EFFECT	KEY OBSERVATION
Governance and documentation	Material increase	New welfare policy and emergency plan; more explicit records, SOPs, contingency planning, and plan content.
Veterinary dependency	Increase	More reliance on veterinarian-developed pain protocols, flock plans, secondary euthanasia steps, products, and difficult-lambing escalation.
Operational specificity	Mixed	More specific for transport, fencing, deadstock, and euthanasia; less specific for heat mitigation, minerals, breeding, and castration/docking minimums.
Animal-welfare safeguards	Mixed but generally stronger	Strong gains in emergency planning, transport, euthanasia verification, and slaughter; potential regressions or ambiguities in some husbandry provisions.
Auditability and fairness	Mixed	New written requirements improve evidence, but internal inconsistencies and broad wording could create uneven interpretation.

2. High-priority changes for member Board discussion

The following are the issues most likely to affect producer cost, feasibility, animal-welfare outcomes, assurance-program interpretation, or national consistency.

PRIORITY	CHANGE	WHY IT MATTERS	QUESTION FOR MEMBER BOARDS
High	Written governance requirements	New welfare policy and all-hazards emergency plan; expanded flock-health, euthanasia, transport-contingency, and slaughter-SOP expectations.	What templates, transition period, and evidence of implementation will producers need?
High	Castration and tail docking	Veterinary pain-control protocols are mandatory, but the 2013 method/age/pain table is removed; several explicit anesthesia/analgesia thresholds disappear.	Does the draft establish a clear, science-based minimum, or create variable standards by farm/veterinarian?
High	Manual blunt force trauma (neonatal euthanasia)	The draft retains mBFT for neonatal lambs, but adds a 'no other neonatal option available' condition and explicitly encourages producers to seek alternatives. Retention was contested during Code development, so this is a strategic future-retention issue even though the core age/weight eligibility remains.	Is continued support for mBFT important?
High	Colostrum timing	One draft requirement says six hours; another says no later than 12 hours. The 2013 Code used six hours.	The final Code needs one unambiguous deadline.
High	Sheep-specific minerals	The mandatory sheep-specific, region-appropriate salt/mineral formulation requirement is absent.	Is this change consequential to producers?
High	Transport accountability	The draft assigns clearer duties to planners, shippers, handlers, transporters, and receivers, including contingency planning and euthanasia before unloading downers.	Does this add another layer to transporter requirements or is it covered in humane transport regulations?
High	On-farm slaughter	A completely new chapter requires stunning, restricts acceptable methods, and requires an SOP linked to the euthanasia plan.	How will this interact with differing provincial laws and farms without employees?
High	Emergency preparedness	Every farm must maintain a detailed written plan with maps, contacts, evacuation arrangements, passwords, and designated actions.	Is the required content scalable for small/extensive farms, and what support is needed?
High	Facilities and electric fencing	New containment/electric-fence requirements are paired with removal of broad general equipment inspection/maintenance wording.	Are the new containment and fencing requirements reasonable?

PRIORITY	CHANGE	WHY IT MATTERS	QUESTION FOR MEMBER BOARDS
High	Handling safeguards	The prohibited body-part list is narrowed; electro-immobilization prohibition is removed; dog rules are less strict.	Have an important handling safety elements lost with these changes?
High	Breeding obligations	Three 2013 requirements on dystocia-risk matching, genetic disorders, and readiness for accelerated lambing become recommendations.	Will these changes impact mating decisions?
Moderate	Heat-stress requirements	The draft applies nationally but moves specific mitigation actions from the Requirements box into guidance.	Would a producer or auditor know the minimum required actions?
Moderate	Predation and deadstock	New proactive planning, wildlife-law, deadstock-removal, and guardian-animal duties substantially expand the section.	Are the requirements practical across regions with very different predator pressures and disposal options?
Moderate	Daily monitoring and records	Daily monitoring is centralized and treatment/mortality records become minimum mandatory records.	What constitutes adequate records and how long must they be retained?
Moderate	Euthanasia confirmation and secondary steps	Death confirmation, secondary-step selection, equipment controls, and the five-minute confirmation threshold are more prescriptive than in 2013.	What equipment, training, and veterinary protocol support will producers need to apply these requirements consistently?
High	Draft quality control	The draft contains a floor-space conversion error, inconsistent policy/plan wording, a colostrum conflict, and mandatory wording inside a Recommended Practices table.	These should be corrected before the text is used for assurance or enforcement.

PUBLIC COMMENT PRIORITY - MANUAL BLUNT FORCE TRAUMA (mBFT)

Why this needs attention now. The 2026 draft still permits mBFT for neonatal lambs under five days of age or 9 kg, but only when no other neonatal euthanasia option is available. It also states that producers currently using mBFT should be actively seeking alternatives. This is therefore a retained method with a clear transition-away signal, not a simple status-quo provision.

Strategic context. Producer groups fought to keep mBFT available in this Code update. The current draft provides an opportunity for farmers to create a clear consultation record that the option remains important. Without positive producer evidence of need, the case for retaining it in the next Code review will be materially weaker.

What farmers should comment on. Farmers who believe mBFT remains important should be encouraged to submit positive comments supporting its continued inclusion and explaining their actual on-farm circumstances. Useful comments can address competency and training, the need to act immediately when neonatal euthanasia is required, availability and practicality of alternative methods during lambing, and whether the new 'only when no other option is available' condition is workable.

Core message. Retaining manual blunt force trauma as a permissible neonatal euthanasia option, within strict age/weight, competency, correct-technique, and secondary-step safeguards, depends on the support from producers through the comment period.

3. Detailed section-by-section comparison

Reading key. The first column always states what is new or changed in the 2026 draft. "Requirement" and "Recommended Practice" refer to how the provision is presented in the source document. "Guidance" refers to explanatory text outside those boxes.

Overarching structure and scope

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
STRUCTURE - The draft is reorganized into 10 chapters and expressly identifies three new chapters: Personnel, Training, and Responsibilities; Emergency Preparedness and Management; and On-farm Slaughter. Transport is also substantially restructured and expanded.	The 2013 Code has seven main sections. Personnel competencies were spread across stockmanship and procedure-specific sections; emergency content was dispersed; and there was no on-farm slaughter chapter.	This is more than a formatting update. It creates new stand-alone governance obligations and makes transport, euthanasia, and slaughter easier to audit against discrete requirements.	NEW / RESTRUCTURED Draft Intro, pp. 5-6; TOC, pp. 2-4 2013 TOC, pp. 1-2
SCOPE - The draft expressly lists pasture-only systems, feedlots, dairies, lifestyle properties, petting farms, zoos, and sanctuary or rescue sites, and states that minimum standards apply regardless of location or production type.	The 2013 Code applied to all sheep on farms in Canada and listed common commercial production systems, but did not expressly name several non-commercial or public-facing settings.	The practical reach is clearer and broader. Provincial organizations may hear from small flock, sanctuary, agritourism, and institutional operators who did not previously see themselves explicitly named.	CLARIFIED / EXPANDED Draft Intro, p. 5 2013 Intro, pp. 5-6
GUIDANCE - The draft introduces explicit positive-welfare framing, noting that sheep experience positive and negative states and that well-cared-for sheep are more productive and profitable.	The 2013 introduction emphasized meeting needs, avoiding discomfort and distress, and promoting good welfare, but was less explicit about positive welfare experiences.	This changes the narrative lens rather than creating a direct requirement. It may influence how future assurance programs interpret continuous improvement and outcome-based evidence.	NEW GUIDANCE Draft Intro, p. 5 2013 Intro, pp. 5-6
IMPLEMENTATION AIDS - The draft table of contents does not include a glossary, a general explanation of how Requirements and Recommended Practices are to be interpreted, or a consolidated summary of all requirements.	The 2013 Code includes a glossary, formal definitions of Requirements and Recommended Practices, and Appendix N summarizing Code requirements.	Unless these elements are added before publication, implementation will be harder and interpretation risk will increase. A consolidated requirement index is particularly important for producer education and assurance-program alignment.	REMOVED / DRAFT GAP Draft TOC, pp. 2-4 2013 Preface/Glossary, pp. 3-9; App. N, p. 90

Chapter 1 - Personnel, training, and responsibilities

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Every producer must develop an animal welfare policy demonstrating commitment to good welfare and responsible care.	No animal welfare policy was required. The 2013 Code required access to the Code, knowledge of its basics, competent stockpeople, and staff training.	This creates a new governance obligation for every operation, regardless of size. The draft provides a sample policy, but the minimum acceptable content and whether the policy must be written require clarification.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft Ch. 1, p. 7 2013 s. 4.2, p. 25
REQUIREMENT - Producers must ensure personnel are trained, supervised, and provided with the resources needed to carry out their responsibilities under the Code.	Producers were responsible for ensuring stockpeople were trained, but supervision and provision of resources were not stated as separate obligations.	The accountability standard is broader and more management-focused. Operations using family labour, seasonal workers, contractors, or relief staff will need a defensible training and supervision approach.	STRENGTHENED Draft Ch. 1, p. 7 2013 s. 4.2, pp. 25-26
REQUIREMENT - All personnel must be competent for assigned duties or directly supervised, and must recognize sheep behaviour, basic needs, and indicators of health and welfare and respond in a timely manner.	Comparable knowledge and competence duties applied to stockpeople, including knowledge of normal behaviour, illness and injury, and body condition scoring.	Substantively similar core expectations are consolidated and applied more clearly to all personnel. The explicit body-condition-scoring competency is no longer stated in this chapter.	CONSOLIDATED / CLARIFIED Draft Ch. 1, p. 7 2013 s. 4.2, pp. 25-26
REQUIREMENT - Personnel performing higher-risk tasks, including lambing assistance, docking, castration, and euthanasia, must have demonstrated competency in technique and equipment use, maintenance, and sanitation, or work under direct supervision.	Competency requirements existed, but were distributed across procedure-specific sections and did not use the same overarching 'demonstrated competency' standard.	This is a stronger, audit-ready umbrella requirement. It also partly replaces procedure-specific wording that has been removed elsewhere, so training evidence may become more important than before.	STRENGTHENED / CONSOLIDATED Draft Ch. 1, p. 7 2013 ss. 4.2, 5.4-5.7, 7.2
OMISSION - The draft no longer expressly requires every person working with sheep to have access to a copy of the Code.	All people working with sheep had to have access to a copy of the Code.	Digital availability may make the former wording less necessary, but removing it weakens the direct link between training obligations and access to the source standard.	REMOVED Draft Ch. 1, p. 7 2013 s. 4.2, p. 25

Chapter 2 - Emergency preparedness and management

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Every farm must have an accessible written emergency preparedness plan containing, at minimum, identified risks, emergency contacts, a site map, evacuation arrangements and a destination, critical-system passwords, and documented actions with designated people.	The 2013 Code required a contingency plan for extreme weather and contained scattered recommendations on fire, evacuation, alarms, facility exits, and emergency planning. It did not require a comprehensive written all-hazards plan on every farm.	This is one of the largest new compliance burdens. It will require templates, producer education, periodic updates, and practical accommodation for small and extensive operations.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft Ch. 2, pp. 8-9 2013 ss. 1.1, 2.1, pp. 10, 15-18
REQUIREMENT - All employees and family members must know where the emergency plan is located.	No equivalent stand-alone requirement.	This converts the plan from a paper exercise into an accessibility and communication obligation. Operations should consider both physical and off-site copies.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft Ch. 2, p. 9 2013 - no direct equivalent
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Review emergency procedures annually with stockpeople and family members, and consider evacuation, alarms, and emergency lighting when designing or renovating facilities.	Facility emergency design, alarms, exits, and on-farm emergency planning were recommended, but annual review with family and staff was not specified.	The new recommendation creates a recurring training expectation and better integrates emergency planning with facility design.	EXPANDED RECOMMENDATION Draft Ch. 2, p. 9 2013 s. 2.1, pp. 15-18

Chapter 3 - Environmental conditions

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - All sheep must have access to a well-drained or elevated lying area; constantly standing in wet conditions is unacceptable.	A well-drained lying area was required under Facilities, and the wording referred to constantly standing in mud.	The obligation is elevated into the environmental chapter and broadened from mud to wet conditions. This may have implications for wintering sites, sacrifice areas, and extensive systems.	STRENGTHENED / RELOCATED Draft s. 3.1, pp. 10-11 2013 s. 2.1, p. 15

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Producers must plan for elevated heat conditions and mitigate heat stress in all geographical and topographical areas.	The 2013 requirement listed six specific mandatory actions: frequent monitoring, shade, water, avoiding handling in peak heat, rest, and an appropriate shearing season.	The geographic scope is broader, but the formal requirement is less prescriptive. The six actions remain as guidance rather than individual requirements, which reduces audit clarity and may weaken the minimum standard unless the final wording is tightened.	BROADER BUT LESS PRESCRIPTIVE Draft s. 3.1.1, pp. 11-12 2013 s. 1.1.1, p. 11
RECOMMENDED PRACTICE - Establish a veterinary treatment protocol for hyperthermia and include it in the flock health and welfare plan.	The 2013 Code contained a comparable recommendation for hypothermia, but not hyperthermia.	This is a useful new heat-response planning measure, particularly where extreme heat events are becoming more frequent.	NEW RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 3.1.1, p. 12 2013 s. 1.1.1
REQUIREMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS - Cold, wet, and windy weather requirements are largely retained. The feeding response is reframed from 'more feed (energy)' to 'a more energy-dense feed'; signs of cold stress in guidance are updated.	Required shelter, lambing-period planning, monitoring, relocation, more feed, bedding, and shearing timing; recommended hypothermia protocol, postponing shearing, and cover comb use.	No material policy shift, but the new feed wording is more technically specific. Member feedback should confirm it is practical across forage-based systems.	LARGELY UNCHANGED / CLARIFIED Draft s. 3.1.2, pp. 12-13 2013 s. 1.1.2, pp. 11-12

Chapter 4 - Facilities

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Equipment and fencing/penning must be suitable for the type of sheep.	The 2013 Code separately required barriers and structures to be maintained and cleaned, all listed equipment and services to be inspected and cleaned regularly and kept in working order, feeding equipment to be safe, and equipment to be maintained in good repair.	The draft is materially less prescriptive at the general-facility level. Some maintenance duties reappear in specific sections, but the broad inspection, cleaning, and serviceability requirement is no longer explicit.	CONDENSED / POTENTIAL RELAXATION Draft s. 4.1, p. 16 2013 s. 2.1, p. 15
REQUIREMENT - All limit-fed sheep must be able to access feed at the same time.	The narrative discussed sufficient feed space and competition, but there was no explicit simultaneous-access requirement.	This could require feeder or pen redesign on limit-fed operations and is a clear new infrastructure/management obligation.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 4.1, p. 16 2013 s. 2.1, pp. 13-15

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Corrective action is mandatory when competition limits access to feed, even in free-access systems.	Competition was discussed in narrative, but corrective action was not expressly required.	This creates an outcome-based duty that may be demonstrated through body condition, intake, growth, or behavioural evidence.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 4.1, p. 16 2013 s. 2.1, pp. 13-15
REQUIREMENT - Housed sheep must have a clean and dry lying area.	The 2013 wording required a dry lying area; cleanliness was addressed elsewhere through bedding requirements.	This is a modest but meaningful strengthening and makes cleanliness an explicit outcome for housed sheep.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 4.1, p. 16 2013 s. 2.1, p. 15
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - The draft retains layout, biosecurity, exits, movement pathways, cleanable surfaces, and emergency-planning recommendations, but drops recommendations to slope or mound yards for drainage and to allow space for hospital pens during design.	Both drainage design and dedicated hospital-pen space were expressly recommended.	These omissions are difficult to reconcile with the stronger wet-lying-area and hospital-pen outcomes. They may be inadvertent and should be tested with producers.	RECOMMENDATIONS REMOVED Draft s. 4.1, p. 16 2013 s. 2.1, p. 16
REQUIREMENT - Social contact may be with another compatible animal, and temporary separation is allowed where advantageous for treatment or disease control.	Sheep were required to have visual contact with other sheep, without an express treatment/disease exception.	This is more practical for small flocks, guardian companions, and hospital isolation while preserving the social-contact principle.	CLARIFIED / MORE FLEXIBLE Draft s. 4.1.1, p. 17 2013 s. 2.1.2, p. 17
NEW SECTION/REQUIREMENTS - Outdoor containment must keep sheep safe; fencing and pasture must not have injurious sharp edges or protrusions.	There was no dedicated outdoor-facilities or fencing section. General structure-safety requirements applied.	Outdoor containment becomes a direct Code obligation rather than an inferred facility duty. This is relevant to temporary, range, rented, and non-fenced grazing systems.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 4.1.2, pp. 17-18 2013 s. 2.1
NEW REQUIREMENTS - Electric fences must follow manufacturer specifications, use power units designed to prevent short circuits/stray voltage, be tested for voltage and grounding, and have scrub/weeds cleared from electrified strands.	No electric-fence-specific requirements.	This is a substantial new maintenance and verification obligation. The practical frequency and documentation expected for testing are not specified.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 4.1.2, p. 17 2013 - no direct equivalent
REQUIREMENT - Corrective action is required if ammonia is detected by smell or exceeds 25 ppm.	Action above 25 ppm was mandatory, while action when ammonia was detectable by people was only recommended.	The sensory trigger is promoted to a requirement, making the standard easier to apply without monitoring equipment but also more subjective.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 4.1.3, pp. 18-19 2013 s. 2.1.1, p. 17

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Shelter must ensure adequate airflow and protection from prevailing winds.	Producers had to consider prevailing winds when constructing shelter to achieve adequate airflow and protection.	The draft shifts from a design-process duty to an outcome duty, so it can apply to existing and temporary structures as well as new construction.	OUTCOME-BASED / STRENGTHENED Draft s. 4.1.3, p. 19 2013 s. 2.1.1, p. 17
RELOCATION - The requirement for extra bedding when lambing indoors in cold conditions is moved from Bedding and Manure to Pregnancy, Lambing, and Neonatal Care.	The same obligation appeared in the bedding section.	No substantive change, but cross-references must be clear so producers do not overlook it when using the facilities chapter.	RELOCATED Draft ss. 4.1.4 and 7.10, pp. 19-20, 45 2013 s. 2.1.4, p. 19
RECOMMENDED PRACTICE - Housed sheep should receive six hours of continuous darkness in each 24-hour period.	The 2013 recommendation called for six hours of darkness but did not specify that it be continuous.	A useful clarification, though the recommendation is labelled 'b.' in the draft with no 'a.', indicating an editing error.	CLARIFIED / EDITING ISSUE Draft s. 4.1.5, p. 20 2013 s. 2.1.3, p. 18
TABLE 4.1 - The hard-surfaced feedlot allowance for ewes/rams is printed as 1.4 m2 (1.6 ft2).	The 2013 table states 1.4 m2 (16 ft2). The metric value was carried forward, but the imperial conversion lost a digit.	This is a material drafting error: 1.6 ft2 would be radically below the intended allowance. It must be corrected before publication and before any assurance-program use.	CRITICAL TYPO Draft Table 4.1, p. 15 2013 Table 2.1, p. 14

Chapter 5 - Feed and water

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Producers must know regional micronutrient deficiencies or excesses and address them accordingly.	This was a recommended practice, not a requirement.	The expectation is strengthened, but 'address accordingly' is broad. Producers may need access to regional guidance, feed testing, or professional advice to demonstrate compliance.	PROMOTED TO REQUIREMENT Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 22
REQUIREMENT - Sheep must receive sufficient amounts of a balanced ration to meet nutritional requirements.	The 2013 requirement was more detailed and expressly included salt and minerals, feed quality and quantity, physiological needs, well-being and vigour, and production/weather factors.	The shorter wording is outcome-based but less explicit. It may be easier to read, while providing fewer concrete criteria for education and verification.	CONDENSED / LESS PRESCRIPTIVE Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
OMISSION - The draft does not retain the specific requirement that supplemented salt and mineral be formulated for sheep and suited to the geographic region.	A sheep-specific, region-appropriate salt/mineral formulation was mandatory.	This is a significant safety omission, particularly given sheep sensitivity to mineral imbalances such as copper. The new micronutrient requirement does not clearly replace the product-formulation safeguard.	REQUIREMENT REMOVED Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21
REQUIREMENT - All sheep must have access to roughage.	All sheep except feedlot lambs had to have access to forage.	The feedlot-lamb exception is removed and 'roughage' replaces 'forage.' This may be a meaningful ration-design obligation for intensive finishing systems.	STRENGTHENED / TERMINOLOGY CHANGE Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21
REQUIREMENT - Corrective action is required when any individual sheep has a body condition score below 2/5.	The threshold was below 2/5 for meat breeds and below 1.5/5 for dairy/prolific breeds.	This is stricter for dairy and prolific sheep and removes breed-type differentiation. It may require earlier intervention in dairy systems.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21
OMISSION - The draft no longer expressly requires ongoing monitoring of performance, behaviour, flock-average body condition against stage-of-production targets, and corresponding feeding-program adjustment.	Those flock-level monitoring and adjustment steps were mandatory and linked to Table 3.1 targets.	Regular individual body-condition monitoring remains, but the management-system requirement is less explicit. This may reduce focus on flock-level trend management.	LESS PRESCRIPTIVE Draft s. 5.1, pp. 21-22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21
REQUIREMENT - Toxic-feed language expressly adds mycotoxins. The draft examples no longer expressly mention antifreeze or feed with injurious physical qualities such as awns.	The 2013 requirement included toxic weeds, batteries, fertilizer, treated seed, antifreeze, nitrates, and physical feed hazards such as awns.	Mycotoxins are a useful addition, but removing physical hazards and antifreeze from the express wording may narrow producer attention unless they are captured by general toxin language.	UPDATED BUT NARROWER EXAMPLES Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 21
RECOMMENDED PRACTICE - 'Work with a nutritionist' is added as a stand-alone recommendation; feed testing and spoilage management remain.	Nutritionist consultation was embedded within the feed-testing recommendation rather than stated separately.	This elevates professional nutrition support, but availability and cost may be a concern for small or remote operations.	STRENGTHENED RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 5.1, p. 22 2013 s. 3.1, p. 22
REQUIREMENTS - Artificially reared lambs must receive milk replacer free-choice or at appropriate intervals, and must have access to roughage before weaning in addition to water and solid feed.	Adequate milk-replacer volume and quality were required, but feeding frequency and pre-weaning roughage access were not explicit requirements.	The draft provides clearer feeding expectations and recognizes rumen development. It may require changes in some artificial-rearing systems.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 5.1.2, p. 23 2013 s. 3.1.2, p. 22

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Follow milk-replacer manufacturer instructions; automatic milk feeders are expressly recognized among methods to reduce abomasal bloat.	No manufacturer-instruction recommendation; bloat guidance referred to ad lib cold milk, acidified milk, or other veterinarian/nutritionist-recommended methods.	Useful operational clarification and modernization of artificial-rearing guidance.	NEW / UPDATED RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 5.1.2, p. 23 2013 s. 3.1.2, p. 22
RECOMMENDED PRACTICE - Test water quality annually, at high-risk periods such as drought or spring/fall, and whenever intake problems are observed.	Water quality testing was discussed in narrative, but the only formal recommendation was to provide water at all times, especially during lactation.	This creates a clearer preventive-management benchmark and may require access to affordable testing services.	NEW RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 5.2, p. 25 2013 s. 3.2, pp. 23-24
REQUIREMENTS - Core water obligations, including restrictions on snow as a sole source and daily inspection of watering devices, are materially unchanged.	Contained the same snow-use conditions, backup-water obligation, young-lamb drowning protection, and daily device inspection.	No major policy shift. The principal change is the new formal water-testing recommendation.	UNCHANGED Draft s. 5.2, pp. 24-25 2013 s. 3.2, pp. 23-24

Chapter 6 - Health management

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Sheep must be monitored at least once daily to ensure well-being across all Code sections.	The same minimum daily monitoring expectation appeared under Stockmanship, with frequency adjusted for risk factors.	This is mainly a relocation and clearer central statement, not a wholly new obligation. The explicit risk-based inspection examples are less visible in the draft requirement.	RELOCATED / CLARIFIED Draft s. 6.1, p. 26 2013 s. 4.2, pp. 25-26
REQUIREMENT - Accurate and detailed animal-health records must include, at minimum, treatment and mortality records.	Accurate and detailed health records were required, but minimum record categories were not specified.	This improves auditability and establishes a clear baseline. Producers will need a retention and accessibility approach even though retention periods are not specified.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 6.1, p. 26 2013 s. 4.1, p. 25
REQUIREMENT - Reportable-disease knowledge and immediate consultation with the flock veterinarian are moved into the central health chapter.	The same requirement appeared under Stockmanship Skills.	No substantive change; the relocation improves logical organization.	RELOCATED Draft s. 6.1, p. 26 2013 s. 4.2, p. 26

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Producers must have a valid VCPR with a licensed veterinarian 'to obtain prescription veterinary products.'	All producers were required to have a valid VCPR, without the qualifying purpose statement.	The draft requirement can be read as narrower or conditional, even though surrounding text describes a VCPR as important for advice and products. This should be clarified, especially in areas with limited veterinary access.	POTENTIALLY NARROWER / AMBIGUOUS Draft s. 6.2, pp. 26-28 2013 s. 4.3, p. 26
REQUIREMENT - Veterinary products used for sheep must be safe for use, stored according to label directions, and monitored for expiry dates.	No equivalent stand-alone product-storage and expiry requirement.	A practical new medication-governance obligation. 'Safe for use' should be interpreted consistently with veterinarian-directed extra-label drug use in sheep.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 6.2, p. 28 2013 s. 4.3
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Written flock plans should incorporate best-management-practice SOPs, be updated annually, and keep SOPs and medical records accessible to stockpeople and protected from damage.	A written plan developed with veterinary/technical advice and updated annually was recommended, along with participation in an established flock-health program.	The draft strengthens document control and staff access, but removes the recommendation to participate in an established flock-health program.	EXPANDED WITH ONE REMOVAL Draft s. 6.2, p. 28 2013 s. 4.3, p. 27
REQUIREMENTS - Sick, injured, or diseased sheep must receive prompt treatment and appropriate monitoring or immediate euthanasia; non-responsive animals require veterinary advice or euthanasia; animals must be managed to permit treatment and reduce injury or disease transmission.	The same core duty was spread across several requirements, including express prohibitions on allowing unnecessary suffering, at-least-daily monitoring of affected sheep, and segregation where advantageous.	The draft is more concise, but the explicit minimum daily monitoring and segregation wording is lost. 'Managed to allow treatment' is broader but less specific.	CONSOLIDATED / LESS EXPLICIT Draft s. 6.3, pp. 28-29 2013 s. 4.4, pp. 27-29
RECOMMENDATIONS - Disease knowledge and treatment/culling/mortality records remain. Recommendations for daily observation of confined flocks, more frequent observation from late gestation through early lactation, and pen/yard design for easy visual inspection are removed.	Those monitoring-frequency and facility-visibility recommendations were explicit.	The general daily-monitoring requirement remains, but useful risk-based operational guidance has been lost.	RECOMMENDATIONS REMOVED Draft s. 6.3, p. 29 2013 s. 4.4, p. 29
GUIDANCE - Parasite control now addresses anthelmintic resistance through selective treatment, weight-based dosing, storage, dosing-gun calibration, avoiding long-acting therapies, genetics, grazing, nutrition, fecal egg counts, FAMACHA, and records.	Formal parasite requirements and the flock-plan recommendation were similar, but resistance-management guidance was far less detailed.	This is a major technical update, although most of it sits in guidance rather than the Recommended Practices box. Member Boards may want clarity on which elements are expected versus educational.	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPANDED GUIDANCE Draft s. 6.3.1, pp. 29-30 2013 s. 4.4.2, p. 30

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS - Blowfly-strike obligations are materially unchanged, with updated terminology and examples.	Required prompt treatment, risk assessment, preventive steps, and seasonal monitoring; recommended awareness of control advances and baiting.	No major policy shift. The update is primarily terminology and presentation.	LARGELY UNCHANGED Draft s. 6.3.2, pp. 30-31 2013 s. 4.4.1, pp. 29-30
REQUIREMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS - Lameness recognition, prompt action, veterinary strategy, and disposition of chronically lame sheep remain. The stand-alone requirement to monitor closely is removed, and the wet-condition requirement is replaced by the general well-drained/elevated lying-area standard. Locomotion-scoring guidance now links to a new appendix.	Contained a separate close-monitoring requirement, a requirement to avoid prolonged wet/muddy conditions, and the same locomotion-scoring recommendations without a dedicated training appendix.	The outcome is broadly retained, but monitoring is less explicit. The new scoring appendix improves practical implementation.	CONSOLIDATED / NEW TOOL Draft s. 6.3.3, p. 31; App. M, p. 91 2013 s. 4.4.3, p. 31

Chapter 7 - Husbandry

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS - Procedure planning and the prohibition on mistreatment remain, while handler competency is largely centralized in Chapter 1. The former stand-alone duty to work calmly and quietly at all times is not repeated in the husbandry requirements.	Required competent handlers, calm and quiet handling, minimized restraint, and avoidance of pain, injury, and distress.	The new chapter structure avoids duplication, but removing the explicit calm/quiet requirement from the handling section may reduce clarity for day-to-day practice.	CONSOLIDATED WITH OMISSION Draft ss. 1 and 7.1, pp. 7, 32-33 2013 s. 5.1, pp. 32-34
REQUIREMENT - Sheep must not be grabbed, dragged, or lifted by the fleece, tail, or ears; time held on the side or back must be minimized.	The prohibited list also included legs, neck, and horns, and side/back restraint was limited to no more than a few minutes.	The draft is less prescriptive and narrows the expressly prohibited body parts. Unless intentional, this creates avoidable ambiguity around lifting or dragging by legs, neck, or horns.	POTENTIAL RELAXATION Draft s. 7.1, pp. 32-33 2013 s. 5.1, pp. 32-34
OMISSION - The express prohibition on electro-immobilization is absent.	Electro-immobilization was prohibited.	This should be confirmed as intentional. Silence could be interpreted as removal of a clear welfare safeguard.	REQUIREMENT REMOVED Draft s. 7.1, pp. 32-33 2013 s. 5.1, p. 33

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS - Stock dogs must be controlled and may not nip or bite 'in an aggressive manner.' The prohibition on dogs working without the handler present and the recommendation to limit dog use to necessary situations are removed.	Any nipping or biting was prohibited; dogs could not work sheep without a handler; dog use was recommended only when necessary because it can be stressful.	The new wording is more permissive and subjective. This is likely to generate divergent interpretations across working-dog systems and welfare assessments.	RELAXED / REMOVED Draft s. 7.1, pp. 32-33 2013 s. 5.1, pp. 33-34
REQUIREMENT - Breeding-aged lambs must be managed to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Guidance highlights puberty as early as 12 weeks, separation of intact males and females, and ultrasound of at-risk ewe lambs before shipment.	No equivalent handling requirement.	This is a significant new management duty with implications for grouping, marketing, feedlots, and processor shipments.	NEW REQUIREMENT / GUIDANCE Draft s. 7.1, pp. 32-33 2013 - no direct equivalent
REQUIREMENT - All sheep and lambs leaving the farm of origin must carry an approved national sheep identifier, expressly described as a CSIP tag.	Producers had to meet all identification requirements for sheep leaving the farm; transport also required approved CSIP identification.	The obligation is not fundamentally new, but the draft is more direct and traceability-specific within the identification section.	CLARIFIED / CONSOLIDATED Draft s. 7.2, pp. 33-34 2013 ss. 5.2 and 6.1.3, pp. 34-35, 52
REQUIREMENT - Branding must not be used.	Branding was allowed only when specifically required for export, with freeze branding preferred where allowed, veterinary pain control, a competent operator, and no branding of wet sheep.	This is a clear strengthening and removes the former export exception. Confirm compatibility with any current or prospective export requirements.	STRENGTHENED / PROHIBITED Draft s. 7.2, pp. 33-34 2013 s. 5.2, pp. 34-35
REQUIREMENT - Tagging hygiene is condensed to a general duty to use good hygiene, sharp applicators, and serviceable equipment.	The Code expressly required clean and dry applicators, ears, and hands before permanent identification.	The outcome is retained, but the concrete hygiene steps are less explicit and therefore less useful as a training checklist.	CONDENSED Draft s. 7.2, pp. 33-34 2013 s. 5.2, pp. 34-35
REQUIREMENT - Lethal and non-lethal wildlife actions must comply with provincial and federal wildlife legislation.	No express legal-compliance requirement in the predation section.	This creates a direct bridge between Code compliance and wildlife-law compliance. Provincial variation will matter.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 7.3, pp. 34-36 2013 s. 5.3, p. 35

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS - Producers must implement a proactive, location-appropriate best-management-practice strategy; promptly remove deadstock; and ensure guardian dogs or other guardian animals do not harm or harass sheep.	Producers had to understand local predation risk, implement a strategy, and care for attacked sheep. Deadstock removal and guardian-animal conduct were not direct requirements.	Predation management is materially expanded from loss response to proactive conflict prevention and guardian-animal welfare oversight.	STRENGTHENED / NEW REQUIREMENTS Draft s. 7.3, pp. 34-36 2013 s. 5.3, p. 35
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Add a Sheep-Predator Conflict Prevention Plan, increased human presence at vulnerable times, frequent monitoring/removal of vulnerable sheep, deadstock/afterbirth procedures, photographic documentation, local predator ecology, and research before purchasing guardian animals.	Recommendations were shorter and included a specific safeguard to prevent non-target animals from exposure to traps, restraints, and snares.	The draft provides much more operational guidance, but the non-target trap/snares safeguard is removed. The phrase 'coexisting with nature' may be viewed as value-laden rather than a measurable practice standard.	EXPANDED WITH ONE REMOVAL Draft s. 7.3, pp. 35-36 2013 s. 5.3, p. 35
REQUIREMENT - Ewes in the last month of gestation may be shorn by an experienced shearer or shorn while standing.	They could only be shorn by an experienced shearer; standing shearing was not named as an alternative.	This adds a practical alternative that may reduce restraint risk, but 'shorn while standing' still requires competent execution under Chapter 1.	MORE FLEXIBLE Draft s. 7.4, pp. 36-38 2013 s. 5.4, pp. 35-37
REQUIREMENT/RECOMMENDATION - Feed and water access before shearing must be managed for comfort and safety. A new table recommends minimum and maximum withholding periods by class of sheep.	Only a general recommendation to reduce rumen and bladder fill was provided.	This is a major operational clarification, but the table's use of the mandatory word 'must' for unweaned-lamb separation appears inside a Recommended Practices table and should be corrected or relocated.	NEW REQUIREMENT / DETAILED GUIDANCE Draft s. 7.4 and Table 7.1, pp. 36-38 2013 s. 5.4, pp. 35-37
REQUIREMENTS - The section no longer expressly says shearing must be performed by or directly supervised by a competent shearer. Equipment and clothing moving between farms must be disinfected, but the explicit requirement to clean as well as disinfect is removed.	Required competent shearing and both cleaning and disinfection between flocks, with within-flock disinfection where disease-transfer risk existed.	Chapter 1 likely captures competence, but the sanitation wording is narrower. Disinfection without prior cleaning may be ineffective; the change should be reviewed.	CONSOLIDATED / POTENTIAL GAP Draft s. 7.4, pp. 36-38 2013 s. 5.4, pp. 35-37
REQUIREMENTS - Hooves must be inspected and trimmed as needed; equipment must be clean, maintained, and disinfected between flocks and, where risk exists, between sheep.	Also expressly required competent personnel and the ability to identify footrot and other diseases.	General competence is now covered by Chapter 1, but foot-disease recognition is no longer explicit in the hoof-trimming section.	CONSOLIDATED / LESS EXPLICIT Draft s. 7.5, p. 38 2013 s. 5.5, p. 37

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
OMISSION - Recommendations to avoid trimming immediately before shearing, avoid stressful periods such as late gestation or hot weather, and trim when hooves are soft are removed.	All three were formal Recommended Practices.	These are practical risk-reduction measures. Their removal reduces producer-facing operational guidance without an obvious replacement.	RECOMMENDATIONS REMOVED Draft s. 7.5, p. 38 2013 s. 5.5, p. 37
REQUIREMENT - Castration and tail docking are combined under one welfare risk/benefit requirement, but the basis for the decision is no longer expressly required to be included in the flock health and welfare plan.	The basis for castration and docking decisions was to be documented in the flock plan.	The decision standard remains, but the documentation and accountability mechanism is weakened.	CONSOLIDATED / DOCUMENTATION REMOVED Draft s. 7.6, pp. 38-41 2013 ss. 5.6-5.7, pp. 37-41
REQUIREMENT - Producers must work with a veterinarian to develop and implement practical, safe, and effective pain-control protocols for castration and docking.	Veterinary pain protocols were required for castration, while the Code also prescribed detailed method-, age-, and pain-control minimums in a table and specific anesthesia/analgesia thresholds.	The high-level veterinary governance requirement is stronger, but removal of the prescriptive table makes the minimum acceptable pain control less transparent and potentially variable between farms and veterinarians.	STRONGER PROCESS / LESS PRESCRIPTIVE OUTCOME Draft s. 7.6, pp. 38-40 2013 ss. 5.6-5.7 and Table 5.1, pp. 37-41
REQUIREMENT - Castration or docking over six weeks must be performed by a veterinarian with 'pain mitigation.' Surgical tail docking at any age must be performed by a veterinarian, but the draft does not expressly require anesthesia and analgesia when the lamb is six weeks or younger.	Surgical tail docking at any age required a veterinarian with anesthesia and analgesia. Surgical castration over four weeks and clamp castration over six weeks required anesthesia and analgesia; castration beyond ten weeks required a veterinarian with anesthesia and perioperative analgesia.	The draft is less specific and may be less stringent for surgical castration between four and six weeks and surgical docking at six weeks or younger. 'Pain mitigation' should be defined or replaced with explicit minimums.	POTENTIAL RELAXATION / AMBIGUITY Draft s. 7.6, p. 40 2013 ss. 5.6-5.7, pp. 38-41
REQUIREMENT - Rubber rings may be used up to six weeks of age in all production systems.	The maximum was ten days in confinement/semi-confinement systems and six weeks only in pasture-lambing systems.	This is a material relaxation for confinement systems and should be explicitly justified by the scientific evidence and pain-control protocol.	RELAXED Draft s. 7.6, p. 40 2013 Table 5.1 and s. 5.7, pp. 38-41
REQUIREMENTS - Cosmetic tail docking is expressly prohibited. Tail length must cover the adult vulva/equivalent in rams, supported by a new Dock Smart appendix.	No express cosmetic-purpose prohibition. Tails had to cover the vulva/equivalent and be no shorter than the distal end of the caudal fold.	The cosmetic prohibition is stronger. Removing the caudal-fold anatomical criterion simplifies the wording but may reduce precision; the visual appendix partly compensates.	STRENGTHENED WITH CRITERION CHANGE Draft s. 7.6, p. 40; App. O, p. 94 2013 s. 5.7, pp. 40-41; App. F, p. 71

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Procedures should occur after colostrum intake and between 24 hours and seven days where possible; ewe-flock clostridial vaccination is recommended; combining procedures remains. The separate recommendation to administer pain-relieving drugs whenever possible and the hot-iron recommendation are removed.	Recommended early timing, pain-relieving drugs whenever possible, hot-iron docking, current tetanus vaccination, and combined procedures.	The mandatory pain-protocol language may replace the general pain-drug recommendation, but the actual minimum remains unclear. Removal of hot-iron preference reflects changed evidence in the draft narrative.	UPDATED RECOMMENDATIONS Draft s. 7.6, pp. 39-41 2013 ss. 5.6-5.7, pp. 38-41
REQUIREMENT - Mulesing remains prohibited.	Mulesing was prohibited.	No change.	UNCHANGED Draft s. 7.7, p. 41 2013 s. 5.8, p. 41
OMISSION - The section no longer expressly requires minor horn-tip trimming to be performed by or under a competent stockperson. Veterinary performance with anesthesia and perioperative analgesia remains mandatory for disbudding, dehorning, or substantial trimming.	Contained both the minor-trimming competency requirement and the veterinary requirement for substantial procedures.	General competence may be captured by Chapter 1, but retaining a direct horn-trimming competency statement would improve clarity.	CONSOLIDATED / LESS EXPLICIT Draft s. 7.8, p. 41 2013 s. 5.9, pp. 41-42
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Responsible breed/ram-ewe matching to reduce dystocia, avoidance of propagating genetic disorders, and careful assessment before accelerated lambing are now recommendations.	All three were mandatory requirements.	This is a clear downgrade of three preventive breeding-management obligations. The change is significant because these practices directly affect dystocia, lamb survival, and ewe welfare.	DOWNGRADED TO RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 7.9, pp. 41-43 2013 s. 5.10, pp. 42-43
REQUIREMENTS - When farm personnel cannot correct dystocia, the ewe must promptly receive veterinary attention or be euthanized; prompt care for vaginal/uterine prolapse is required; obstetrical surgeries must be performed by a veterinarian; 'fetotomy' replaces 'embryotomy.'	Required competent recognition/assistance, competence in prolapse management, and that embryotomy only be performed on dead lambs, but did not state the same explicit veterinarian-or-euthanasia endpoint for uncorrectable dystocia.	This is a clearer and stronger escalation pathway, though veterinary availability and response time will be important in remote areas.	STRENGTHENED / CLARIFIED Draft s. 7.10, pp. 43-46 2013 s. 5.11, pp. 44-47

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS - Confinement lambing areas must be clean, dry, and well-bedded, with extra bedding indoors in cold temperatures.	Required a clean, dry lambing area; the cold-weather extra-bedding requirement appeared in Facilities.	The 'well-bedded' outcome is stronger and the related requirements are consolidated into the lambing section.	STRENGTHENED / RELOCATED Draft s. 7.10, p. 45 2013 ss. 2.1.4 and 5.11, pp. 19, 45-46
REQUIREMENT - Non-nursing newborn lambs must receive sufficient colostrum as soon as possible but no later than 12 hours after birth.	The deadline was six hours. The draft's Artificial Rearing section still requires lambs taken from dams to receive colostrum within six hours.	This is both a relaxation and a direct internal conflict between two draft requirements. The final Code must use one clear deadline; the draft's own narrative notes that absorption declines substantially six to eight hours after birth.	CRITICAL INCONSISTENCY Draft ss. 5.1.2 and 7.10, pp. 23, 46 2013 ss. 3.1.2 and 5.11, pp. 22, 46
RECOMMENDED PRACTICE - Involve the flock veterinarian in developing neonatal-care protocols. Formal recommendations on recognizing non-suckling/hypothermic lambs, keeping warming and feeding equipment ready, veterinary advice on supplemental colostrum risks, and navel treatment in confinement are removed or shifted to narrative.	Those preparedness and navel-care measures were expressly recommended.	Veterinary protocol development is useful, but several practical lamb-survival measures become less visible and less actionable.	NEW RECOMMENDATION WITH REMOVALS Draft s. 7.10, pp. 45-46 2013 s. 5.11, pp. 46-47
REQUIREMENT - Dairy milking must follow a regular routine and be frequent enough to avoid unrelieved, distended udders.	Frequency was required to prevent distension and the text stated milking should occur at least daily; following a regular routine was only recommended.	Routine is promoted to a requirement, but the at-least-daily benchmark is removed. The net minimum frequency is therefore less explicit.	MIXED: STRENGTHENED AND LESS SPECIFIC Draft s. 7.11, pp. 46-47 2013 s. 5.12, pp. 47-48
REQUIREMENT - Relief milkers are expressly included in competency obligations; first-lactation ewes must be trained to the system. The separate requirements for calm/quiet handling and patience in training are removed.	Applied competence to stockpeople generally and expressly required calm handling and patient first-lactation training protocols.	Relief-milker coverage is useful, but removal of calm and patient handling language weakens the behavioural standard in the dairy context.	CLARIFIED WITH OMISSIONS Draft s. 7.11, pp. 46-47 2013 s. 5.12, pp. 47-48
REQUIREMENT - Early-weaned dairy lambs must have access to roughage, in addition to consuming adequate water and solid feed before weaning.	Required adequate water and solid feed, but not express roughage access.	A clear strengthening consistent with the broader roughage requirement in Chapter 5.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 7.12, p. 47 2013 s. 5.13, p. 48

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
NEW SECTION/REQUIREMENTS - Deadstock must be promptly removed from housing and pasture and disposed of in accordance with law; recommendations address scavenging, contamination, and loss records.	Deadstock was addressed indirectly through waste, predation, carcass disposal after euthanasia, and mortality records, but there was no dedicated husbandry section.	This consolidates and strengthens deadstock governance. It also overlaps with the new predation requirement, which should be harmonized to avoid duplication.	NEW SECTION / REQUIREMENTS Draft s. 7.13, pp. 47-48 2013 ss. 2.1.4, 5.3, 7.3

Chapter 8 - Preparations for transport

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Everyone who arranges, loads, transports, or unloads sheep must know and comply with applicable federal and provincial transport law.	Producers had to be familiar with transport regulations, and the Code stated that the formal scope ended at the farm gate.	The draft retains the farm-gate scope statement but substantially expands operational expectations for the whole transport chain and expressly allocates responsibility to all participants.	STRENGTHENED / EXPANDED Draft s. 8.1, p. 49 2013 Transport intro and s. 6.1.2, pp. 49, 52
REQUIREMENT - Transport planners must consider journey-related risk factors, including duration, intermediary stops, delays, forecast weather, conveyance, and time without feed, water, and rest.	Fitness had to be assessed for each trip and weather considered, but the risk-factor framework was less detailed.	This creates a more structured planning standard and makes foreseeable delays and multi-stage journeys part of the producer's decision.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 8.2.1, pp. 49-50 2013 ss. 6.1-6.1.1, pp. 49- 52
REQUIREMENT - Planners must assess each sheep's capacity to withstand the journey, animal compatibility and required separation, and whether compromised animals are present.	Required trip-specific fitness assessment, but compatibility and load-planning for compromised animals were not separately framed at the planning stage.	A clearer pre-loading decision framework. It will require earlier sorting and communication rather than relying on decisions at the chute.	STRENGTHENED / NEW ELEMENTS Draft s. 8.2.2, pp. 50-51 2013 s. 6.1.1, pp. 50-52
REQUIREMENT - Producers hauling their own sheep must have a contingency plan for delays and for sheep becoming compromised or unfit during transport.	No explicit transport-contingency-plan requirement.	A significant new duty for producer-haulers. The expected form of the plan is not specified and should be aligned with the general emergency plan.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 8.2.3, p. 51 2013 - no direct equivalent

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Confirm the receiving location is ready, communicate sheep condition and journey details through the chain, agree trailer capacity in advance using journey/weather factors, and verify loading-facility compatibility.	Recommended transporter selection, staff training, paperwork, trailer compatibility, and agreement on animal numbers/types, timing, destination, special needs, and weather protection.	The draft improves chain-of-custody communication and destination readiness, but drops practical transporter-vetting recommendations such as references, relevant experience, and formal driver training.	UPDATED WITH REMOVALS Draft ss. 8.2.1-8.2.3, pp. 49-52 2013 s. 6.1.2, p. 52
REQUIREMENTS - Loading/unloading/transport personnel must understand sheep behaviour and be competent. Prohibited actions are expanded to include beating, striking, whipping, kicking, electric prods, injurious driving devices, dragging, and lifting/pulling by wool.	Required a competent stockperson to oversee loading/unloading, prohibited electric prods and wool-grabbing, and incorporated federal equipment/procedure rules.	This is a clearer and stronger transport-specific handling standard with direct obligations on all involved personnel.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 8.3.1, pp. 52-53 2013 ss. 6.1.2 and 6.2, pp. 52-53
REQUIREMENTS - Loading/unloading facilities must provide secure footing, prevent falls, support safe efficient movement, and minimize injury or escape; ramp slope may not exceed 35 degrees.	Compliance with federal loading/unloading rules was required, with the 35-degree maximum and related ramp criteria in a footnote.	Key requirements are brought into the Code text and become easier to find and audit.	CLARIFIED / ELEVATED Draft s. 8.3.2, p. 53 2013 s. 6.2, p. 53
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Add consistent barn/loading conditions, appropriately sized gates/alleys without sharp turns, and solid-sided ramps, crowd pens, and chutes; lighting guidance is retained and refined.	Recommended uniform or progressively brighter lighting, appropriate group sizes, calm movement, and loading-density consideration.	Facility-flow guidance is materially stronger and more specific, while loading-density advice moves into other planning/loading provisions.	EXPANDED RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 8.3.2, p. 53 2013 s. 6.2, p. 53
REQUIREMENTS - Compromised animals may travel only with prescribed special provisions and directly to the nearest suitable place for care, prompt slaughter, or euthanasia; unfit animals may not be transported except under veterinarian direction for care. Neither may be routed through auction/assembly as prohibited by law.	Contained the same core prohibitions, but described direct movement to a local abattoir and provided less operational detail on isolation, individual loading/unloading, ramps, and feed/water/rest.	The draft is more aligned with current Part XII language and provides a more complete decision pathway.	STRENGTHENED / LEGAL ALIGNMENT Draft s. 8.4.1, pp. 54-56; App. Q, p. 105 2013 s. 6.1.1, pp. 50-52; App. H, p. 81

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS - Ewes may not travel with an engorged udder or if engorgement is likely before final destination; heavily lactating ewes must be dried off before auction/collection unless specified exceptions apply; ewes/ewe lambs sent to slaughter must be unlikely to be pregnant.	Required lactating dairy ewes to be milked immediately before transport, required drying off before auction/collection with similar exceptions, and prohibited transport in the last 10% of gestation.	Udder protection is more outcome-focused. Late-gestation ewes remain captured as 'unfit' in draft guidance, but the new slaughter-pregnancy requirement creates an additional producer screening obligation.	UPDATED / NEW SCREENING DUTY Draft s. 8.4.1, pp. 54-56 2013 ss. 6.1.1 and 6.1.3, pp. 50-52
REQUIREMENTS - Lambs must be healthy with healed, uninfected navels. Lambs eight days or younger may travel only with special provisions and directly to the final destination; non-weaned lambs remain subject to special legal limits.	Unaccompanied neonatal lambs could not leave the farm until the navel healed and they reached seven days; the legal 12-hour limit for young ruminants appeared in a footnote.	The draft aligns more directly with current federal age categories and route restrictions. Producers will need to distinguish eight-days-or-less, nine-days-and-older but not fully weaned, and fully weaned lambs.	LEGAL ALIGNMENT / MORE DETAILED Draft s. 8.4.1, pp. 54-56 2013 s. 6.1.1, pp. 50-52
REQUIREMENTS - Incompatible sheep must not be mixed; loose sheep must not wear ropes or collars. Feed-within-five-hours, water-until-loading, and CSIP identification duties remain.	Did not expressly prohibit mixing incompatible animals or loose transport with ropes/collars. The feed, water, and identification duties were already requirements.	Two clear new loading-preparation safeguards are added; core preparation timelines are retained.	NEW REQUIREMENTS WITH RETAINED BASELINE Draft s. 8.4.2, pp. 56-57 2013 s. 6.1.3, p. 52
REQUIREMENTS - The entire conveyance floor and ramps must be fully bedded; shippers must visually verify that compartments are not overcrowded; divider gates must be used as designed; airflow must prevent moisture buildup and excessive temperatures.	Required the truck to be in good repair, clean, and adequately bedded; loading density was only a recommendation and airflow/divider-gate duties were not express requirements.	This is a substantial strengthening of producer/shipper verification at loading and may require clearer guidance on acceptable bedding coverage and density assessment.	STRENGTHENED / NEW REQUIREMENTS Draft s. 8.4.3, p. 57 2013 s. 6.2, p. 53
REQUIREMENTS - A non-ambulatory sheep must be euthanized before unloading; an unfit ambulatory sheep must be unloaded individually or rendered unconscious/euthanized in the conveyance if safe individual unloading is not possible.	Required evaluation of feed and water after unloading, but did not set out these explicit on-arrival handling and euthanasia rules in the main Code.	This is a major new receiving-farm/feedlot obligation requiring trained personnel, equipment, and authority to act immediately.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft s. 8.4.4, pp. 57-58 2013 s. 6.2, p. 53
RECOMMENDED PRACTICES - Assess sheep during unloading and monitor recently transported sheep for delayed dehydration, injury, or illness, especially after long journeys.	Only required producers to evaluate the need for feed and water after unloading.	Post-transport monitoring is materially expanded and better reflects delayed welfare impacts.	NEW / EXPANDED RECOMMENDATION Draft s. 8.4.4, p. 58 2013 s. 6.2, p. 53

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
APPENDIX/PROCESS - Appendix Q provides updated transport guidance. The former livestock transport consignment form is not retained.	Appendix H provided compromised-sheep guidance and Appendix I provided a consignment form to structure shipper-transporter communication.	The updated guidance is useful, but removing the form reduces a practical implementation tool precisely as communication expectations become more detailed.	UPDATED TOOL / FORM REMOVED Draft App. Q, p. 105 2013 Apps. H-I, pp. 81-83

Chapter 9 - Euthanasia

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - Farms with employees must maintain a written euthanasia plan for each production phase that identifies decision criteria, methods, trained persons, contact information, and timely alternatives for caretakers who are not comfortable performing euthanasia.	A written plan was required for farms with employees, identifying criteria and methods, but not the same personnel/contact and alternative-arrangement details.	The plan becomes more operational and continuity-focused. The employee threshold remains, so solo-operator farms still have no express written-plan requirement.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 9.1, pp. 59-60; App. R, p. 106 2013 s. 7.1, p. 54
REQUIREMENT - All caretakers must be trained on the euthanasia plan.	All stockpeople had to be trained on the euthanasia action plan and associated methods.	Broadly retained, with terminology shifted from stockpeople to caretakers and clearer linkage to the expanded plan.	RETAINED / CLARIFIED Draft s. 9.1, p. 60 2013 s. 7.2, p. 56
REQUIREMENT - Producers unfamiliar or uncomfortable with euthanasia may consult a veterinarian, provincial sheep specialist, or provincial producer organization.	Consultation was limited to a veterinarian.	This improves access to decision support, but technical method selection and drug use still require appropriate veterinary and legal oversight.	MORE FLEXIBLE Draft s. 9.1, p. 60 2013 s. 7.1, p. 54

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
HIGH-PRIORITY REQUIREMENT/RECOMMENDATION - Manual blunt force trauma (mBFT) remains a permissible method for neonatal lambs under five days of age or 9 kg, but only when performed correctly, followed by a secondary step, and when no other neonatal euthanasia option is available. The draft also states that producers currently using mBFT should be actively seeking alternatives.	The 2013 Code permitted blunt force trauma followed by bleeding for neonatal lambs up to five days of age and under 9 kg. The age/weight limit and need for a secondary step are therefore substantially retained. The important new changes are the 'no other option' condition and the explicit policy direction toward alternatives.	HIGH-PRIORITY PUBLIC COMMENT ISSUE. The method has been retained in this draft, but its status is clearly more constrained and the narrative signals movement away from it. Producer representatives report that continued inclusion was actively contested during development. If producers consider mBFT an essential neonatal euthanasia option, positive comments should say so and explain the practical circumstances in which it remains necessary. This consultation record will be important in future Code reviews.	RETAINED BUT RESTRICTED / STRATEGIC FUTURE RISK Draft s. 9.2, pp. 60-63 2013 Table 7.1, p. 55
METHODS - Barbiturates or other approved euthanasia drugs must be administered by a veterinarian. Captive-bolt use requires a secondary step; acceptable secondary steps are expressly limited and must be selected with the flock veterinarian and included in the protocol following training.	Barbiturate overdose was to be administered under veterinarian direction. Captive bolt also required a secondary method, but the Code did not provide the same closed list and protocol/training conditions.	Veterinary control and method standardization are strengthened. Availability of veterinary-administered euthanasia and safe secondary-step training may be operational constraints.	STRENGTHENED / MORE PRESCRIPTIVE Draft Table 9.1, p. 62 2013 Table 7.1, p. 55
REQUIREMENT - Euthanasia equipment must be maintained, stored, and used according to manufacturer instructions.	Only maintenance according to manufacturer instructions was explicit.	Adds storage and use controls, which is important for firearm/captive-bolt reliability and safety.	STRENGTHENED Draft s. 9.2, p. 63 2013 s. 7.2, p. 56
OMISSION - The recommendation to consider veterinarian-guided sedation to reduce fear is removed.	Sedation was a formal Recommended Practice.	May reflect practicality or drug-access concerns, but removes an option for high-stress or difficult restraint situations.	RECOMMENDATION REMOVED Draft s. 9.2, p. 63 2013 s. 7.2, p. 56

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENTS - Assess insensibility immediately using the corneal reflex; reapply the method before a secondary step if a reflex is present. Confirm death using all listed indicators, including heartbeat and breathing cessation within five minutes, fixed/dilated pupils, and absent corneal reflex; repeat if death has not occurred within five minutes.	Required immediate repeat if consciousness returned and confirmation by lack of respiration, lack of heartbeat, and dilated pupils, but did not specify an immediate corneal-reflex test or a five-minute decision point.	This is a major strengthening in procedural verification and will require training, confidence, and clear equipment readiness.	STRENGTHENED / MORE PRESCRIPTIVE Draft s. 9.3, pp. 63-64 2013 s. 7.3, p. 56

Chapter 10 - On-farm slaughter

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
NEW CHAPTER/REQUIREMENT - On-farm slaughter must comply with all applicable municipal, provincial, and federal regulations and guidance, and be carried out by persons with the knowledge, experience, skills, and tools to achieve death rapidly.	No on-farm slaughter chapter or equivalent set of requirements.	This is a new Code domain. Provincial legality varies, so implementation material must clearly distinguish animal-welfare standards from food-safety, inspection, and meat-sale rules.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft Ch. 10, p. 65 2013 - no direct equivalent
REQUIREMENTS - Sheep must be stunned before slaughter. Only captive bolt or firearm followed by bleeding are acceptable on-farm slaughter methods.	No equivalent requirements.	This establishes a mandatory stun standard and a closed method list. It is a significant operational and equipment obligation for farms conducting legal on-farm slaughter.	NEW REQUIREMENT Draft Ch. 10, p. 65 2013 - no direct equivalent
REQUIREMENTS - Restrain only when the operator is ready; monitor loss of consciousness and death; confirm death before dressing; never invert or hang a conscious sheep.	No slaughter-specific equivalent, although euthanasia principles addressed restraint, insensibility, and death confirmation.	Creates clear end-to-end procedural safeguards and links slaughter practice to euthanasia verification standards.	NEW REQUIREMENTS Draft Ch. 10, p. 65 2013 s. 7, pp. 54-56

2026 DRAFT - WHAT IS NEW OR CHANGED	COMPARISON WITH THE 2013 CODE	ASSESSMENT FOR MEMBER BOARD DISCUSSION	CHANGE TYPE / SOURCE
REQUIREMENT - An on-farm slaughter SOP must be included in the farm's euthanasia action plan. Non-stun slaughter may only occur at a licensed abattoir with trained personnel, appropriate systems/equipment, and oversight.	No equivalent.	The SOP requirement creates a drafting gap: Chapter 9 requires a written euthanasia plan only on farms with employees, while Chapter 10 appears to require the slaughter SOP in a plan on any farm conducting on-farm slaughter. The final Code should resolve this explicitly.	NEW REQUIREMENT / DRAFTING GAP Draft Ch. 10, p. 65; s. 9.1, p. 60 2013 - no direct equivalent

4. Drafting and implementation issues requiring clarification

These issues should be corrected or resolved before the draft is finalized or incorporated into any assurance or assessment framework.

ISSUE	DRAFT PROBLEM	RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION
Animal welfare policy	Chapter 1 requires a policy, while the Recommended Practice says to prepare a written policy.	State clearly whether the mandatory policy must be written and identify minimum content.
Floor-space conversion	Table 4.1 prints 1.4 m2 as 1.6 ft2 instead of approximately 15-16 ft2.	Correct the imperial value before publication.
Lighting numbering	The only Recommended Practice in s. 4.1.5 is labelled 'b.'	Correct the numbering.
Colostrum timing	Section 5.1.2 requires colostrum within six hours; s. 7.10 allows up to 12 hours.	Use one science-based requirement throughout.
Shearing table status	A table located under Recommended Practices says unweaned-lamb separation 'must not exceed 24 h.'	Move mandatory wording into Requirements or change it to recommendation language.
Castration/docking pain standard	The mandatory veterinary protocol is not paired with clear method- and age-specific minimum pain control, and 'pain mitigation' is undefined.	Restore explicit minimum anesthesia/analgesia thresholds or define the required protocol outcomes.
VCPR wording	The requirement can be read as applying only when prescription products are sought.	Clarify whether every producer must maintain a VCPR and how access constraints are addressed.
On-farm slaughter plan	The slaughter SOP must be in a euthanasia plan, but a written euthanasia plan is otherwise mandatory only for farms with employees.	State directly whether every farm conducting on-farm slaughter must have a written plan.

ISSUE	DRAFT PROBLEM	RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION
Missing implementation aids	No glossary, general interpretation of Requirements/Recommended Practices, or consolidated requirement summary appears in the draft TOC.	Restore these elements or provide an equivalent compliance index.
Handling omissions	Electro-immobilization is no longer prohibited, and legs/neck/horns are removed from the express no-lift/no-drag list.	Confirm intent and reinstate explicit safeguards if omissions were inadvertent.

5. Appendix and implementation-tool changes

The draft adds useful implementation tools, but also removes some practical aids from the 2013 Code.

AREA	2026 DRAFT	COMPARISON / IMPLICATION
New governance templates	Appendices A-D add a sample welfare policy, shelter/evacuation guidance, emergency telephone list, and mapping guidance; Appendix R adds a sample euthanasia plan.	No comparable package existed in 2013. These tools are central to implementing new written-plan obligations.
Heat-stress tools	Appendices E-G add heat-stress factors, the Livestock Safety Index, and a Panting Index.	The 2013 Code had the Livestock Safety Index only. The Panting Index provides a new observation tool.
Body condition scoring	Appendix H retains BCS guidance and adds supporting visual cross-sections.	The 2013 Appendix B provided BCS guidance; the draft improves visual usability.
Existing clinical/behaviour tools	Veterinary access, signs of illness/pain, individual examination/first aid, sheep behaviour, and lambing/neonatal guidance are retained and renumbered.	Core supporting resources continue with updated placement and content.
New locomotion and docking tools	Appendix M adds locomotion-scoring training; Appendix O adds Dock Smart visual tail-length guidance.	No dedicated locomotion appendix existed; tail docking previously used Appendix F with a different anatomical criterion.
Transport tools	Appendix Q provides updated transport guidance.	It replaces the older compromised-sheep guidance, but the 2013 consignment form is removed.
Euthanasia anatomy	Appendix S adds anatomical landmarks; Appendix J/R reorganize the decision tree and plan.	The 2013 euthanasia appendices were less integrated and did not include the same anatomical landmark appendix.
Removed appendices	The draft does not list the 2013 Participants appendix or the Summary of Code Requirements appendix.	Loss of the requirement summary is an implementation concern; participant acknowledgements may be added at final publication.

6. Suggested questions for producers

1. Which new requirements would create the greatest cost, labour, infrastructure, veterinary-access, or recordkeeping burden in your province?
2. Which draft changes improve animal-welfare outcomes without creating unnecessary prescription, and which are too vague to be consistently implemented?
3. Are the proposed requirements workable in extensive/range, feedlot, dairy, small-flock, remote, and seasonal-labour systems?
4. Where the draft removes or downgrades 2013 requirements, is the change intentional, evidence-based, and adequately replaced elsewhere?
5. Which veterinary-dependent obligations require an access pathway or contingency for regions with limited large-animal veterinary service?
6. What producer templates, training, transition period, and assurance-program changes will be required before implementation?
7. Are any recommendations written so prescriptively that they may be treated as de facto requirements, or any requirements written too broadly to audit fairly?
8. Does industry affirm the continued need for manual blunt force trauma as a neonatal euthanasia option, and what practical evidence or examples should farmers put on the consultation record?

Source documents

National Farm Animal Care Council. Code of Practice for the Care and Handling of Sheep. Published 2013; aligned with Part XII of the Health of Animals Regulations in 2021.

National Farm Animal Care Council. Code of Practice for the Care and Handling of Sheep - Draft Version, August 2026.

This comparison supports policy and implementation discussion. It does not replace the source documents or applicable legislation.