



Canadian Food
Inspection Agency

Agence canadienne
d'inspection des aliments

Public opinion research with consumers 2025-2026

Final Report

Prepared for the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)

Supplier Name: Nanos Research

Contract Number: CW2430872

Contract Value: \$112,069.12 (including HST)

Award Date: 2025-12-04

Delivery Date: 2026-03-24

Registration Number: POR-066-25

For more information on this report, please contact the CFIA at: Information@inspection.gc.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Copyright

This report presents the results of research conducted by Nanos Research on behalf of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. This study consisted of qualitative (focus groups) and quantitative (survey) research with consumers.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : **Recherche sur l'opinion publique auprès des consommateurs 2025-2026**

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. For more information on this report, please contact the Canadian Food Inspection Agency at: Information@inspection.gc.ca or at:

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency
1400 Merivale Road
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9

Catalogue Number: A104-208/1-2026E-PDF
International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-99349-2

Related publications:
Catalogue Number: A104-208/1-2026F-PDF (final report in French)
International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-99350-8

© His Majesty the King in Right of Canada, as represented by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2026

Table of Contents

Executive summary	2
A. Research Purpose and objectives.....	2
B. Methodology	4
C. Contract value	5
D. Key findings by theme	6
E. Political neutrality statement and contact information	14
Detailed Results	15
Quantitative Research Findings.....	15
A. Food purchasing decision-making.....	15
B. CFIA Key Performance Indicators	18
C. Enforcement Actions.....	43
D. Food fraud	44
E. MIS and DIS information affecting decision-making	47
F. Assessing CFIA brand attributes and messages	49
G. Awareness of Pistachio product recall in Canada	59
H. Lifestyle and activities related to food and food safety	62
Qualitative Research Findings	67
A. Overall views on food and relationship with food	67
B. Views on food safety regulations	67
C. Understanding of CFIA's mandate and impressions of CFIA	72
D. Views on plant health and invasive plant pests	74
E. Views on animal health and safety	75
F. Testing the agency look and field.....	77
Appendix A: Methodology	81
Appendix B: Survey questionnaire	89
Appendix C: Qualitative Research Instruments	105

Executive summary

A. Research Purpose and objectives

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) has a mandate to safeguard food, animals and plants, thereby enhancing the health and well-being of Canada's people, environment and economy. A top priority for the CFIA is to mitigate risks to food safety, and the health and safety of Canadians is a key factor in terms of the design and development of CFIA programs.

The CFIA, in collaboration and partnership with industry, consumers, and federal, provincial and municipal organizations, is continuing to work towards protecting Canadians from preventable health risks related to food and zoonotic diseases.

As the current and future economic prosperity of the Canadian agriculture and forestry sectors relies on a healthy and sustainable animal and plant resource base, the CFIA is continually improving its program design and delivery in the animal health and plant resource areas in order to minimize and manage risks. The CFIA also performs extensive work related to the protection of environmental biodiversity in an effort to protect the natural environment from invasive animal and plant diseases and pests.

A key factor in the ability of the CFIA to deliver on its mandate is its reputation and credibility among Canadian consumers, and these variables are a key part of the CFIA's values and drive its actions, internally and externally.

The CFIA retained the services of Nanos Research to conduct a public opinion research study to gather the views of Canadian consumers, focusing on reputation, trust, messaging and other brand attributes that allowed the CFIA to manage and develop the CFIA brand. It also sought to identify the best ways to communicate with stakeholders, as well as the impact and origins of disinformation or misinformation.

The specific research objectives were as follows:

- Identify updated measures for key Agency performance indicators
- Track trust and reputation in the CFIA, scientists and other institutions
- Gather data on other brand attributes that allows the Agency to manage and develop the CFIA brand across all business lines
- Measure the percentage of Canadians who agree that CFIA's activities help ensure food sold in Canada is safe
- Conduct key driver analysis to understand the role awareness, trust and confidence have on overall performance
- Assess consumer familiarity of the CFIA and its mandate, particularly the Agency's role in food safety as well as protecting plant and animal health. The goal being how to improve awareness of all the Agency's responsibilities (including management of Potato Wart)
- Test key messages and brand attributes
- Identify reachable segments of the population
- Assess understanding of existing communication tools and tactics
- Assess preferred methods of communication for each segment
- Collect demographics to allow for examination of the results with a Gender Based Analysis+ lens

- Explore the trust of consumers in messages from CFIA, especially in comparison to other spokespeople or institutions

The quantitative portion of the engagement included tracking questions to measure changes in the key indicators of awareness, understanding, trust, confidence, and other brand attributes that influence perception of overall performance.

Notes for the Reader:

This report begins with an executive summary outlining key findings and conclusions, followed by a detailed analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative results. A detailed set of “banner tables” is provided under separate cover; this presents results for all online survey questions by key segments such as region, age and gender.

The quantitative results are expressed as percentages unless otherwise noted.

The target sample was Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older. Throughout the report, including the key findings, respondents are referred to as “consumers.”

Detailed findings are presented in the sections that follow. Overall results are presented in the main portion of the narrative and are typically supported by graphic or tabular presentation of results. Results for the proportion of respondents in the sample who either said “don’t know” or did not provide a response may not be indicated in the graphic representation of the results in all cases, particularly where they are not sizable (for example, 10% or less). Net results cited in the text may not exactly match individual results shown in the charts due to rounding.

Key demographic patterns of interest are described throughout the report, in the following order: gender, age, province/territory, income, grocery shopping responsibility and proximity to food allergies. Only demographic differences that are significantly different based on the margin of error of plus or minus 2.0 percentage points (95% confidence interval) are presented. It is important to note that the results for subgroups have a larger margin of sampling error than for the overall sample because of their smaller sample sizes.

Details of the methodology and sample characteristics can be found in Appendix A. The final survey instrument can be found in Appendix B.

B. Methodology

Quantitative Methodology

The survey is comprised of 2500 Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older.

The survey sample was drawn from the Nanos Probability Panel, which contains about 52,000 Canadians who were randomly recruited to join the panel by land and cell lines with live agents.

The resulting sample contains individuals who were all randomly recruited by telephone, thus allowing a margin of error to be associated with the research. All respondents self-administered the survey online.

The online survey was conducted between January 31 and February 23, 2026, in English and in French. The survey programming was tested extensively online in both languages.

The margin of error for a random survey of 2,500 Canadians consumers is plus or minus 2.0 percentage points, 19 times out of 20 (95% confidence interval).

Qualitative Methodology

The qualitative component of this research program featured online focus groups among Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older.

Focus groups were conducted among consumers in the following regions/provinces:

- Quebec (two groups)
- Ontario (one group)
- Atlantic Canada (one group)
- Prairies (one group)
- British Columbia (one group)

The two (2) Quebec groups were conducted in French and the remainder were in English. Each session was up to 90 minutes in length.

Each group had between 7 and 9 participants, with 10 being recruited per group to achieve this target. A total of 49 participants attended the focus groups out of a total of 60 individuals recruited.

Readers should note that qualitative research is designed to reveal a rich range of opinions and interpretations rather than to measure what percentage of the target population holds a given opinion. These results must not be used to estimate the numeric proportion or number of individuals in the population who hold a particular opinion because they are not statistically projectable. The focus group research will allow the CFIA to gauge the views and gather in-depth insights from specific regions.

For a detailed methodology, including the profile of participants, please see Appendix A.

C. Contract value

The total contract value was \$112,069.12 (including HST)

Supplier Name: Nanos Research

Contract Number: CW2430872

Registration Number: POR-066-25

For more information on this report, please contact the CFIA at: cfia.enquiriesarchive-archivedemandederenseignements.acia@inspection.gc.ca

D. Key findings by theme

Unaided and aided awareness of CFIA

Consumers most often mention CFIA unprompted (25%, consistent with 22% in 2025, up from 16% in 2024), along with Health Canada (21%, consistent with 19% in 2025; up from 11% in 2024) when asked which organizations come to mind when they thinking of ones dedicated to food safety in Canada. Additionally, over one in ten mention CFIA unprompted (16%, up from 10% in 2025; 3% in previous waves) when it comes to organizations dedicated to animal health, along with Health Canada (11%, 10% in 2025) and the SPCA (10%, also 10% in 2025). Consumers most often mention the CFIA unprompted (17%, 13% in 2025, up from 5% in 2024) along with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (17%, consistent with 15% in 2025, up from 6% in 2024) in terms of organizations dedicated to plant health.

Among focus group participants, CFIA is top of mind for many participants, as an organization in Canada dedicated to food safety. Other organizations included Health Canada, and in Quebec, participants were more familiar with MAPAQ, which they believe is responsible for inspections in restaurants and grocery stores and ensuring the safety of food sold in Quebec as well as certifying people working in the food industry.

In terms of organizations that come to mind when thinking of those that are responsible for safeguarding the nation's supply of food, animals, and plants, results are consistent when compared to 2025 (86%, 85% in 2025), with more than eight in ten consumers indicating awareness of the CFIA when prompted. This had previously been trending down over the years, from 71% in 2021 to 61% in 2024. A majority of consumers continue to have generally consistent aided awareness of Health Canada (67% for both the 2026 and 2025 waves) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (64%, 67% in 2025), as well as provincial food safety regulators (provincial or Territorial governments) (59% for both the 2026 and 2025 waves).

Familiarity with CFIA activities

Familiarity with the activities of the CFIA among consumers remains similar to previous years, with about one in five (21%) who report some familiarity (score of 5-7). Previous years ranged from 16% in 2022 to 22% in 2024.

Specifically, focus group participants mentioned a number of activities they think CFIA does in terms of food, plant and animal health and safety, such as: approving calorie counts on menus and products, certifying food as safe to consume, conducting food inspections, conducting fishing vessel and farm inspections, handling complaints related to undeclared ingredients in food, regulating ostrich farms, inspecting processing plants, and ensuring restaurants are following health codes.

Awareness that the CFIA plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases has gone up noticeably (71%; up from 57% in 2025). Around one in four are aware CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer (26%; 23% in 2025) or the Spotted Lanternfly (21%, 17% in 2025). Around one in ten are aware CFIA helps establish new markets for Canada's food, animal and plant businesses (13%; same in 2025).

Engaging with CFIA

Consumers most often report they have seen, heard or read about the CFIA in traditional media (57%; consistent with 56% in the 2025 wave, but an increase from previous years which ranged from 26% in 2022 to 35% in 2023 and 2021), followed by the Internet (39%; consistent with 38% in the 2025 wave, up relative to the waves conducted from 2021 to 2023) and word of mouth (16%; consistent with 16% in the 2025 wave, decreasing slightly from 20% in 2022). Consistent with previous years, about one in ten report hearing, seeing or reading about the CFIA through social media (12%).

Similar to the findings from 2025, eight in ten consumers report they have not had contact or engagement with the CFIA (79%, 80% in 2025, 79% in 2024). About one in ten report they have visited the CFIA website (13%, consistent with 11% in 2025 but up from 7% in 2024). One in twenty (5%; also 5% in the 2025 wave) report having had an in-person interaction with a CFIA employee. Consistent with 2025, less than one in twenty report subscribing to CFIA food recall notices (4% for both waves), having a friend or family member who works at CFIA (3% for both waves), contacting CFIA by email or through the website (2%, 3% in 2025), submitting a food safety or labelling concern or following the CFIA on social media (2% each for both waves).

Among those with an opinion who reported submitted a food safety or labelling concern, seven in ten say they were satisfied (score of 7-10) with CFIA's handling of the concern (70%), while one in five were not satisfied (21%, score of 0-3). Of note, due to the small sample size the differences between 2026 and previous years are within the margin of error.

In terms of satisfaction with the timeliness of CFIA recall notices, seven in ten of those who report subscribing to the notices say they are satisfied (71%), while one in five say they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (22%) and under one in ten are not satisfied (7%). Satisfaction is consistent with 2025 (71%) but remains marginally lower than in 2023 (79%) and is significantly lower than in 2022 (92% satisfied).

Timelines for accessing the CFIA's website are consistent with 2025 given the margin of error for the smaller sample size. In fact, among consumers who report having visited the CFIA's website or contacting the CFIA via its website, more than four in ten report they last visited the site more than six months ago (43%, 36% in 2025), while four in ten consumers (43%) who visited the site report they last did so within the last six months, with one in ten (10%) having done so within the last month or last week. CFIA website visitors most often said it was very or somewhat easy to find the information they were looking for on the CFIA website (59%, 53% in 2025), while more than seven in ten say it was very or somewhat easy to understand the information on the site (71%, 63% in 2025).

Views on safety of food in Canada

A majority of Canadians with an opinion say they are confident that food sold in Canada is safe (88% give it a score of 5-7 of 7), which is consistent with results seen in 2025 (87%), a slight increase from 2024 (82%) and remains higher than 2021, 2022 and 2023 (confidence ranging from 77% to 78%).

Overall, focus groups participants have high trust in the safety of food sold in Canada and relate their high trust that Canada's food system is working to them not seeing many issues in the news and themselves not often encountering issues with food (such as food recalls, food poisoning, major disease outbreaks, etc.). Some

mention they don't think about food safety when buying or eating food, which means this is not an issue that is top of mind for them.

Trust in CFIA

Trust in the CFIA is at the highest since tracking began with close to eight in ten consumers with an opinion (79%, previous high of 76% in 2025, low of 66% in 2021) saying they trust the CFIA to some extent (score of 5-7 out of 7) to do what is right to help ensure food is safe in Canada. An increasing proportion also trust the CFIA to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity (75% gave a score of 5-7 out of 7, previous high of 71% in 2022, low of 68% in 2024 and 2021).

Consumers rank CFIA Inspectors (30%) ahead of scientists, whether academic (21%; down from 28% in 2024) or government (13%; down from 22% in 2025) first in terms of the types of professionals they trust the most as sources of information on food safety. It is important to note that testing on trust in CFIA inspectors is new this wave and therefore no tracking data is available. Canadian farmers (12%; 18% in 2025) and government experts (6%, down from 14% in 2025) also saw a decrease in trust.

In terms of CFIA enforcement actions, close to six in ten consumers report being aware that the CFIA uses a variety of enforcement actions including monetary penalties, suspensions, cancellations, charges laid, prosecution bulletins, food safety investigations and reports (57%; compared to 36% not aware). Consumers have mixed views on whether these actions are sufficient to encourage businesses to comply with CFIA regulations. About one in two believe that these actions are sufficient or somewhat sufficient to encourage compliance (51%), while one in four believe they aren't sufficient or are somewhat not sufficient (25%). An additional one in four (24%) are unsure.

CFIA Message Evaluation

Perceptions of the CFIA's performance in aspects of its mandate continue to improve as there has been an increase in the proportion of consumers with an opinion who rate the CFIA as doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe (84%, marginally up from 80% in 2025 and up from 74% in 2024). The CFIA also scores highly when it comes to how well consumers believe it is doing safeguarding animal health (78%, consistent with 76% in 2025 but higher than 71% in 2023). Over six in ten Canadians say they CFIA is doing well at safeguarding plant health (72%, marginally up from 68% in 2025 and is an increase from 38% in 2024).

All statements tested saw a marginal increase in levels of agreement. Consumers have the highest intensity of agreement with the statement "I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall" (85%, mean of 8.6 out of 10; 80%, mean of 8.4 out of 10 in 2025), followed by "the CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada" (76%, mean of 7.8 out of 10; 70%, mean of 7.5 out of 10 in 2025), "I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science" (73%, mean of 7.7 out of 10; 68%, mean of 7.5 out of 10 in 2025) and "the CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations" (69%, mean of 7.7; 64%, mean of 7.4 in 2025). Much like in 2025, there was a relatively lower intensity of agreement for the statements "CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada" (61%, mean of 7.3; 56%, mean of 7.0 in 2025) and "the CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada" (60%, mean of 7.1; 55%, mean of 7.0 in 2025), although both showed a marginal increase in agreement.

The highest intensity of agreement continues to be with the statements “by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians” (90% of those with an opinion agree, 88% in 2025) and “as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement” (87% of those with an opinion agree; also 87% in 2025).

Receiving a positive but comparatively lower intensity of agreement were the statements “CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely” (71%; 66% in 2025), “CFIA helps to facilitate international trade” (68%; same in 2025), and “CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations” (60%; 58% in 2025). This is consistent with results from the 2025 wave of research.

Drivers of views on CFIA’s performance fulfilling its mandate – Pearson Derived Importance

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at safeguarding animal health, plant health or in ensuring food sold in Canada is safe to agreement with various statements about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and –1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Drivers of opinion – CFIA doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe

In terms of CFIA brand attributes, agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (+0.73, +0.71 in 2025) and that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (+0.70, +0.66 in 2025) are most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at ensuring food sold in Canada is safe, while the CFIA helping to ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (+0.62, +0.59 in 2025) is comparatively less likely to drive impressions of this. This is consistent with results from 2025.

For CFIA’s key messages, agreement that by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (+0.66, +0.61 in 2025, and that as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (+0.66, +0.60 in 2025) are more likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at verifying food sold in Canada is safe, while the CFIA enforcement activities being strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.51, +0.53 in 2025) is less likely to drive impressions. This is consistent with results from 2025.

Drivers of opinion – CFIA doing well at safeguarding plant health

Regarding brand attributes, agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding plant health (+0.64, +0.69 in 2025), while trusting the CFIA when it issues a food recall (+0.50, +0.44) is a noticeable but less intense driver of impressions. This is consistent with results from 2025.

For CFIA’s key messages, agreement that CFIA is enforcing regulations that help ensure Canada’s plant resources are protected is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding plant health (+0.63, +0.64 in 2025), while the statement that CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.48, which is down from +0.55 in 2025) is less likely to drive impressions. The CFIA contributing to the economy by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants saw an increase in driving positive opinions of the CFIA doing well as safeguarding plant health (+0.57, up from +0.49 in 2025).

Drivers of opinion – CFIA doing well at safeguarding animal health

Among brand attributes, agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding animal health (+0.72, +0.68 in 2025), while trusting the CFIA when it issues a food recall (+0.58, +0.52 in 2025) and the CFIA helping to ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (+0.59, +0.58 in 2025) are less likely to drive impressions. Trusting the CFIA makes decisions based on science (+0.71) is now more likely to be a driver of positive opinions that the CFIA is doing well at safeguarding animal health compared to the previous wave (+0.62 in 2025).

For CFIA's key messages, agreement that protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (+0.67, up from +0.59 in 2025), that as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (+0.66, up from +0.59 in 2025) and that by protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy (+0.65, up from +0.57 in 2025) are now the most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases. The statement that CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.47, +0.52 in 2025) remains the least likely to drive impressions.

Recalls and food safety concerns

Marginally up from 2025, just over half of consumers report they have changed their food buying habits because of a recall or food safety issue (54%, 51% in 2025), while just under four in ten report they have not (37%, 41% in 2025). Among those who have changed their food buying habits, the top two most often reported changes are the same as in 2025 that they are no longer buying or avoiding certain brands or products (66%, 62% in 2025) or switching brands, stores or products (12%, 19% in 2025). About one in five each report these changes lasted one to six months or a few months (20%, consistent with 22% in 2025), until the recall was lifted or the media report the issue was resolved (18%, consistent with 19% in 2025) or that the changes are still in effect/ongoing (18%, up from 12% in 2025).

Focus group participants associate the CFIA, Health Canada, and private companies with issuing food recalls but they aren't certain who exactly is responsible for issuing them. In Quebec, MAPAQ is also mentioned as an organization they believe is responsible for issuing food recalls. Participants agree that they believe the food safety system responds quickly enough when there is a problem, and this opinion is driven by the transparency and extensive dissemination of the information (on social media, news feeds, alerts, etc.) in a timely manner. Additionally, participants mentioned the variety of different sources of dissemination of information (for example, on social media, through traditional news, on the CFIA website, etc.) is positive and maximizes the reach to a majority of the population. Overall, participants agree that recalls indicate the system is working fine as they don't realistically expect the food system to never have problems.

Consumers most often ranked meat products (32%, up from 28% in 2025) first as the type of food they are most concerned about for foodborne illnesses, followed by fish and seafood (21%, 24% in 2025) and fresh produce (19%, 21% in 2025). Another one in five ranked imported foods first (16%, 17% in 2025). Focus group participants mentioned their concerns on food safety are related to transportation and ensuring the storage requirements are consistent throughout the transportation of the food. Cross-contamination was also

mentioned, with the example given of contamination when processing different types of meats. Additionally, they were concerned that fillers, additives and dyes that are added in processed foods made them unsafe for consumption.

Food fraud

The proportion of consumers rating food fraud as personally important to them continues to grow (79%, gave a score of 6-7 out of 7; 75% in 2025 and up from 49% in 2022), while 18% say this has some importance to them (score of 3-5 out of 7) (19% in 2025, down from 34% in 2022) and two percent say it has little to no importance (score of 1-2 out of 7) (3% in 2025, down from 9% in 2022).

Nearly all consumers say that CFIA should publish the names of companies that have been found to misrepresent food (97%, consistent with 98% in 2025 but a slight increase from 93% in 2022). Consumers most often say they would either report the issue (60%; 63% in 2025 and up from 33% in 2022) or throw the product away (47%; consistent with 49% in 2025 but down from 57% in 2022) if they thought a food product they had purchased was fraudulent or misrepresented. Close to one in twenty say they would probably not take any action (6%), which has declined since 2022 (17%).

When asked who they would report the food fraud issue to, consumers most often selected the CFIA (53%, consistent with 54% in 2025, 53% in 2022), followed by the retailer (44%, consistent with 44% in 2025 but up from 35% in 2022). There has been a decline in the proportion who would go to their local/regional public health authority (25%, down from 31% in 2025, but up slightly from 19% in 2022) or the Better Business Bureau (12%, marginal decrease from 15% in 2025, 18% in 2022).

Misinformation and disinformation

Food safety

Concern about misleading information on food safety and plant and animal health is high among consumers. About two in three report being concerned (score of 5-7 out of 7) about misleading information on environmental impact issues (68%), misleading information on food safety (66%), misleading information on animal health and safety (65%) and misleading information on plant health (64%).

Consumers rely on media reports (29%), source credibility checks (9%), government/CFIA alerts (7%) and reviewing labels and product claims (6%). Over one in ten believe there is no reliable way to check when information on food, animal and plant safety is untrustworthy or misleading (14%).

In the focus groups, concerns were raised on misleading information on food issues such as the nutritional value of ingredients, weight loss properties of food, sugar substitutes, conspiracy theories and vitamin C claims, but no one could recall hearing or seeing information online about food safety that later turned out to be wrong. Overall, focus group participants mention that they do not fully trust what they see on social media and are likely to verify the information they see with more reputable sources and turn to the manufacturers or retailers of the food items, government websites and the Health Canada website, government websites of other countries and major news outlets as sources of information they trust.

Maple washing

Few participants in the focus groups report having heard of the term “Maple washing” in the English groups or its French equivalent “Érablanchiment” in the French groups. Participants associate the term with products being labelled as made in Canada or product of Canada, without it being true, along with using Canadian branding to make products seem more appealing. In Quebec, they associated the term with maple syrup, maple leaf and tree and also associated the term with money laundering. When these ideas were brought up, participants did not like this concept, believed it is done for marketing and to deceive customers, found it upsetting, frustrating and had overall negative reactions.

Current issues of concern

Pistachio recalls

Over half of consumers (53%) report they have seen, read or heard something about pistachios, and pistachio products being recalled in Canada, while 42% report they have not and 5% are unsure. Just under half of consumers are concerned about pistachio recalls (48% rate their concern a 7-10 out of 10; mean score of 6.0 out of 10). About one quarter each are neutral on the issue (24%) or are not concerned (25%). On the other hand, six in ten consumers (60%) are confident that the Government of Canada is taking the right actions to protect consumers from the issues related to the pistachio recalls.

Pistachio recalls were also mentioned unprompted by focus groups participants as examples of recent recalls they had heard of or seen. They also mentioned hearing about Dubai chocolate and other types of chocolates containing pistachios being recalled. These pistachio recalls were heard about through a variety of sources including traditional news, social media and through word of mouth from friends and family.

Spotted Lanternfly and avian flu

Although focus group participants did not mention having heard of the Spotted Lanternfly prior to the focus group, they are concerned it will be a problem for the grape and wine industry, and that they are concerned that it also might impact the tourism industry that is linked to wineries.

Additionally, when prompted, focus group participants mentioned concerns related to the potential impact of avian influenza on food prices, specifically chicken, and that a wider spread outbreak could cause damage to the industry and cause a major price increase. Also mentioned were concerns about the illness being transmitted to humans or other mammals and livestock and how this could lead to wider impacts on the food and meat industry outside of poultry.

Food purchasing decision-making and relationships

About half of consumers each report they share responsibility for grocery shopping for their family and/or household (50%, consistent with 49% in 2025 but an increase from 40% in 2023 and 2022) or they are solely responsible (46%, consistent with 46% in 2025 but a decline from 54% in 2023). Four per cent report someone else is responsible for this (on par with previous waves).

In terms of key important factors when choosing food to buy, consumers continue to most often select price (70%, down from 82% in 2025) and freshness (54%, down from 67% in 2025) as the most important. However, the product being a “Product of Canada” is the third most important factor when choosing food to buy (50%), but it is important to note that this response option was new in the 2026 wave of research and therefore no reportable tracking data is available on this factor. Other important factors when purchasing food include nutritional value (47%, down from 56% in 2025) and taste (30%, down from 43% in 2025). Focus group participants mentioned price, quality, and freshness as the most important factors. Also mentioned was buying local products and avoiding products from the United States. Some participants also mentioned that they look at flyers and plan their meals based on what is on sale for that week or look for the best deals available.

Consistent with the profile of consumers from 2025 and 2024, about two in three report neither they nor someone they make food purchasing decisions for have any food allergies or sensitivities (65%, 64% in 2025, 67% in 2024), while close to one in five each report they do themselves (21%, 22% in 2025, 21% in 2024) or someone they make food purchasing decisions for does (16%, 17% in 2025, 12% in 2024).

Similar to the 2025 results, consumers were more likely to agree (score of 7-10) than disagree (score of 0-3) with the statement “I make a point to be informed about recall notices or other food safety notices” (38% agree and 27% disagree, compared to 42% agree and 26% disagree in 2025). Levels of agreement continue to be the lowest for the statements “I usually throw out food just because the best before date has passed” (24% agree, 24% in 2025) and “a best before date means the same thing as an expiry date” (12% agree, 14% in 2025).

Information Sources

The top four information sources for consumers on the topic of food, plant and animal health and safety are consistent with the previous wave of research. Consumers most often selected media (57%, up from 51% in 2025), the Internet/a website (51%, 50% in 2025), a Google search (46%, 50% in 2025), and family/friends or a neighbour (30%, 32% in 2025). The proportion who say the CFIA website is among their top sources of information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety or food product ingredients is also consistent with 2025 (28%, 27% in 2025). Eight per cent report they do not look for information about this which is also consistent with 2025 (10%).

Among those who said social media is a top source (17%, comparable to 15% in 2025), the top four channels are the same as in 2025 and include Facebook (59%, 58% in 2025), followed by YouTube (39%, same in 2025), Instagram (33%, 29% in 2025) and Reddit (17%, 20% in 2025).

E. Political neutrality statement and contact information

This certification is to be submitted with the final report submitted to the Project Authority.

I hereby certify, as a Representative of Nanos Research, that the deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Government of Canada's Policy on Communications and Federal Identity and Directive on the Management of Communications. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, party standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.



Nik Nanos
Chief Data Scientist and President
Nanos Research
nik@nanos.co
613-234-4666, extension 237

Detailed Results

Quantitative Research Findings

A. Food purchasing decision-making

About half of consumers report they share responsibility for grocery shopping for their family and/or household (50%; consistent with 49% in the 2025 wave and an increase from 40% in 2023 and 2022) or they are solely responsible (46%; consistent with 46% in the 2025 wave and a decline from 54% in 2023 and 53% in 2022). Four per cent report someone else is responsible for this.

In terms of key important factors when choosing food to buy, consumers most often selected price (70%; 82% in 2025), followed by freshness (54%; 67% in 2025), product of Canada (50%), nutritional value (47%; 56% in 2025) and taste (30%; 43% in 2025). Less than one in five each selected meeting their dietary needs (12%; 15% in 2025), convenience (9%; 16% in 2025), environmental impact (7%).

Consistent with the profile of consumers from 2024 and 2025, about two in three report neither they nor someone they make food purchasing decisions for have any food allergies or sensitivities (65%), while about one in five report that they have allergies themselves (21%) and 16 per cent report someone they make food purchasing decisions for does.

Table 1. Role and responsibility in terms of food shopping

Base: All respondents (n=2489)

Role	2021 (n=2502)	2022 (n=3001)	2023 (n=3003)	2025 (n=2276)	2026 (n=2489)
I share in this responsibility	42%	40%	40%	49%	50%
I am solely responsible	53%	53%	54%	46%	46%
Somebody else in my family or household looks after grocery shopping	5%	5%	4%	6%	4%
Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%	<1%	<1%

Q4 – Which of the following statements best describes your role and responsibility when it comes to grocery shopping for your family or household? [SELECT ONE]

Table 2. Key factors when choosing food to buy

Base: All respondents (n=2490), based on multiple selections.

Factors	2025 (n=2281)	2026 (n=2490)
Price	81.8%	70.1%
Freshness	67.2%	54.5%
Product of Canada*	N/A	50.3%
Nutritional value	56.1%	47.1%
Taste	42.5%	30.3%
Meets my dietary needs (i.e. gluten free)	14.9%	11.8%
Convenience	15.5%	8.6%
Environmental impact*	N/A	7.5%
Allergy safe	3.5%	2.7%
Country of origin/Canadian products/local	2.8%	-
Other	2.9%	-
None of the above	<1%	<1%

**New response option added in 2026.*

Q5 – What factors are most important to you when choosing food to buy? (Select up to three) [RANDOMIZE]

Table 3. Making decisions for someone with food allergies or sensitivities

Base: All respondents (n=2489)

Food allergies in household	2024 (n=1502)	2025 (n=2278)	2026 (n=2489)
Yes, myself	21%	22%	21%
Yes, somebody I make food purchasing decisions for	12%	17%	16%
No	67%	64%	65%
Unsure	2%	1%	<1%

Q6 – Do you or does anyone you make food purchasing decisions for have any food allergies or sensitivities?
[SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

NOTE: In 2024 the question was “Do you have any food allergies or sensitivities?” and the responses were: “Yes, myself”; “Yes, somebody in my household”; “No”; and “Don’t know/prefer not to say.” “Prefer not to say” was removed in the 2026 wave.

B. CFIA Key Performance Indicators

Unaided awareness of the CFIA

Mentions of the CFIA unprompted (25%) as an organization dedicated to food safety continue to have an upward trajectory from the 2025. Health Canada numbers are generally steady (21%; 19% in 2025) when asked which organizations come to mind when they thinking of ones dedicated to food safety in Canada but are up from 2024. Of note, sixteen percent, a continued increase from previous waves, mention CFIA unprompted when it comes to organizations dedicated to animal health, along with Health Canada (11%; 10% in 2025), SPCA (10%; same in 2025) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (10%; 9% in 2025). Consumers most often mentioned the CFIA (17%; upward trend continues from 13% in 2025) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (17%; 15% in 2025) in terms of organizations dedicated to plant health.

Table 4a. Unprompted awareness of organizations in Canada dedicated to food safety

Base: All respondents (n=2152)*Contains up to three mentions in 2024, up to five in 2025 and 2026.

Organizations – Top Mentions	2024 (n=1503)*	2025 (n=2282)*	2026 (n=2152)*
Canadian Food Inspection Agency/CFIA/ACIA	16%	22%	25.3%
Health Canada	11%	19%	21.4%
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)	3%	6%	5.6%
Provincial government/department	-	4%	4.8%
Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec (MAPAQ)	6%	5%	4.7%
Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)	3%	3%	3.1%
Municipal/local health units and inspectors	-	2%	2.7%
Food and Drug Administration (FDA)	6%	3%	2.6%
Canadian Food and Safety/Food Safety	-	-	2.1%
Food/product/producer associations (Dairy, Beef, Poultry, Produce, etc.)	-	-	1.9%
Canadian government	-	-	1.9%
Health department/health inspectors/food inspectors (unspecified)	-	2%	1.7%
Government (not specified)			1.5%
Canadian Food Agency/Food and Health Agency	-	2%	1.4%
Other mentions (Less than 2% each)	16%	15%	15.4%
None / Nothing	<1%	2%	2.6%
DK / Prefer not to say/no answer	53%	13%	2.8%

Q7 – When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to food safety, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

Table 4b. Unprompted awareness CFIA as organization dedicated to food safety - tracking

Base: All respondents (n=2152).

Year	% who mentioned CFIA
2026	25%
2025	22%
2024	16%
2023	11%
2022	10%
2021	10%

Q7 – When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to food safety, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers in Quebec (17%) were less likely to mention the CFIA unprompted than other regions in Canada (ranging from 26% to 34%). Those from Quebec (21%) were more likely to mention ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec (MAPAQ) than the CFIA.

Table 5a. Unprompted awareness of organizations in Canada dedicated to animal health

Base: All respondents (n=2073) *Contains up to five mentions.

Organizations – Top Mentions	2025 (n=2282)*	2026 (n=2073)
Canadian Food Inspection Agency/CFIA/ACIA	10%	15.6%
Health Canada	10%	10.6%
SPCA (national or provincial)	10%	10.1%
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)	9%	9.9%
Provincial government/department	4%	4.0%
Animal Health Canada (AHC)	4%	3.4%
Humane Societies	3%	3.4%
Animal/producer associations (Dairy, Beef, Poultry, Produce, etc.)	2%	2.9%
PETA	3%	2.3%
Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation du Québec (MAPAQ)	2%	1.5%
Canadian Veterinarian Association	2%	1.1%
Other mentions (Less than 2% each)	24%	29.2%
Nothing/Don't know/NA	18%	5.9%

Q8 – When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to safeguarding animal health and protecting against animal diseases, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

Table 5b. Unprompted awareness CFIA as organization in Canada dedicated to animal health

Base: All respondents (n=2073).

Year	% who mentioned CFIA
2026	16%
2025	10%
2023	3%
2022	2%
2021	3%

Q8 – When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to safeguarding animal health and protecting against animal diseases, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers from Atlantic Canada (21%) and British Columbia (20%) are more than two times as likely to mention the CFIA as an organization that is dedicated to safeguarding animal health and protecting against animal diseases than those from Quebec (8%). Consumers from Atlantic Canada (13%) and Ontario (12%) also mention Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) as an organization that is dedicated to safeguarding animal health and protecting against animal diseases at a rate higher than consumers from Quebec (7%).

Table 6a. Unprompted awareness of organizations in Canada dedicated to plant health

Base: All respondents (n=1904)*Contains up to three mentions in 2024, up to five in 2025 and 2026.

Organizations – Top Mentions	2024 (n=1026)*	2025 (n=2282)	2026 (n=1904)
CFIA/Canadian Food Inspection Agency	5%	13%	17.2%
Agriculture Canada/Department of Agriculture	6%	15%	16.8%
Health Canada	-	7%	10.4%
Provincial government/department	-	4%	5.7%
Environment and Climate Change Canada	6%	4%	5.3%
Farms/farmers	-	2%	<1%
Other mentions (Less than 2% each)	22%	27%	33.9%
Nothing/Don't know/NA	56%	29%	10.7%

Table 6b. Unprompted awareness CFIA as organization in Canada dedicated to plant health

Base: All respondents (n=1904).

Year	% who mentioned CFIA
2026	17%
2025	13%
2024	5%
2023	4%
2022	4%
2021	4%

Q9 – When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to safeguarding and protecting plant health which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers from Atlantic Canada (26%) are twice as likely to mention the CFIA as those from Quebec (13%).

- Consumers aged 18 to 24 are significantly more likely to mention Environment and Climate Change Canada (15%) than other age group (7% for those 25 to 44; 4% for those 45 to 64; 2% for those 65 plus).

Aided awareness of CFIA

When asked which organizations that come to mind when thinking of organizations that are responsible for safeguarding the nation's supply of food, animals, and plants, the CFIA benefits from aided awareness, with more than eight in ten consumers (86%; 85% in 2025) indicating awareness of the CFIA when prompted with awareness, over three times more than the 25% in the unprompted awareness. The CFIA continues its strong awareness after declines in previous years, from 71% in 2021 to 61% in 2024. Other organizations a majority of consumers had aided awareness of were Health Canada (67%; same as 2025) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (64%; 67% in 2025), as well as provincial food safety regulators (provincial or Territorial governments) (59%; same as 2025).

Table 7a. Aided awareness of organizations responsible for safeguarding the supply of food, animals and plants

Base: All respondents (n=2492)

Organizations	2025 (n=2276)	2026 (n=2492)
The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)	85.2%	85.5%
Health Canada	66.7%	67.2%
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	67.4%	64.2%
Provincial food safety regulators (Provincial or Territorial governments)	59.1%	58.6%
Public Health Agency of Canada	53.1%	50.3%
Municipal inspectors (for example, public health inspectors)	50.3%	47.3%
Businesses	16.5%	12.4%
None of the above	2.6%	2.3%

Q10 – When thinking of organizations that are responsible for safeguarding the nation's supply of food, animals, and plants, which of the following come to mind? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY] [RANDOMIZE]

Table 7b. Aided awareness of CFIA as organization responsible for safeguarding the supply of food, animals and plants

Base: All respondents (n=2492)

Year	% who selected CFIA
2026	86%
2025	85%
2024	61%
2023	63%
2022	68%
2021	71%

Q10 – When thinking of organizations that are responsible for safeguarding the nation’s supply of food, animals, and plants, which of the following come to mind? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY] [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Aided awareness of the CFIA is lower among consumers from Quebec (78%) than those in other regions of the country (ranging from 87%-88%).
- While having increased from previous waves, younger consumers (78%; 64% in 2025) still have a lower aided awareness of the CFIA than those 25 to 44 years of age (82%; 84% in 2025), 45 to 64 (91%; 89% in 2025) or 65 plus (85%; 91% in 2025).

Familiarity with the CFIA

Familiarity with the activities of the CFIA among consumers remains consistent with previous years, with about one in five (21%) reporting some familiarity (score of 5-7). Previous years ranged from 16% in 2022 to 22% in 2024.

Consumers most often report they have seen, heard or read about the CFIA in traditional media (57%; consistent with 56% in the 2025 wave, but an increase from previous years which ranged from 26% in 2022 to 35% in 2023 and 2021), followed by the Internet (39%; consistent with 38% in the 2025 wave, up relative to the waves conducted from 2021 to 2023) and word of mouth (16%; consistent with 16% in the 2025 wave, decreasing slightly from 20% in 2022). Similar to previous waves, about one in ten report hearing, seeing or reading about the CFIA through social media (12%).

Consistent with previous waves, around eight in ten consumers report they have not had contact or engagement with the CFIA (79%). About one in ten report they have visited the CFIA website (13%; 11% in 2025). Other interactions include having had an in-person interaction with a CFIA employee (5%; same as 2025), subscribing to CFIA food recall notices (4%; same as 2025) having a friend or family member who works at CFIA (3%; same as 2025), submitting a food safety or labelling concern or following the CFIA on social media (2%; same as 2025).

Among those who reported submitted a food safety or labelling concern, seven in ten say they were satisfied (score of 7-10) with CFIA's handling of the concern (70%; 63% in 2025), while one in five were not satisfied (21%; 22% in 2025)(score of 0-3). Of note, due to the small sample size the differences between 2025 and previous years are within the margin of error.

When it came to satisfaction with the timeliness of CFIA recall notices, close to seven in ten of those who report subscribing to the notices say they are satisfied 71%; 71% in 2025), while one in five say they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (22%; 21% in 2025) and under one in ten are not satisfied (7%; 8% in 2025). Satisfaction is steady with the previous wave but lower than it was in 2023 (79%) and remains significantly lower than in 2022 (92% satisfied).

Among consumers who report having visited the CFIA's website or contacting the CFIA via its website, two in five report they last visited the site more than six months ago (43%; 36% in 2025). Just under a quarter have visited in the past 3 months (13% in the past 3 months; 6% in the past month; 4% in the past week). Fourteen percent do not recall or are unsure of the last time they visited the website.

Table 8a. Familiarity with the activities of the CFIA

Base: All respondents (n=2495)

Familiarity	2025 (n=2280)	2026 (n=2495)
1 – Not familiar at all	28.5%	23.4%
2	20.4%	19.8%
3	16.5%	16.5%
4	15.6%	17.8%
5	10.6%	13.0%
6	4.0%	4.8%
7 – Very familiar	3.3%	3.7%
NET Familiar (5-7)	17.9%	21.5%
Unsure	1.1%	0.9%

Table 8b. Familiarity with the activities of the CFIA – NET Tracking

Base: All respondents (n=2495)

Year	NET Familiar (5-7)
2026	21%
2025	18%
2024	22%
2023	21%
2022	16%
2021	19%

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) is dedicated to safeguarding food, animals and plants, which enhances the health and well-being of Canada's people, environment and economy. Reducing risks to food safety, plant health and animal health are CFIA priorities, and the health and safety of Canadians are key forces behind the design and development of CFIA programs.

Q11 – How familiar would you say you are with the activities of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)? Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'very familiar'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not familiar at all'.

Demographic differences of note

- Quebec consumers are more likely to say they are not familiar at all (30%; 36% in 2025) than those in Atlantic Canada (19%; 23% in 2025), Ontario (23%; 27% in 2025) and the Prairies (21%; 25% in 2025).
- Consumers between 18 to 24 years of age are more likely to consider themselves not familiar at all (36%; 42% in 2025) compared to those 25 to 44 (23%; 30% in 2025), 45 to 64 (20%; 24% in 2025) and 65 plus (23%; 27% in 2025). Showing a decrease in those who are not at all familiar with the CFIA in all age groups.

Table 9. Sources of information or awareness of CFIA

Base: All respondents (n=2491) *Contains multiple mentions

Source	2021 (n=2502)*	2022 (n=3001)*	2023 (n=3003)*	2025 (n=2272)*	2026 (n=2491)
Traditional media (newspapers, TV, radio)	35%	26%	35%	56%	57%
Internet (includes online news sites but not social media)	24%	17%	21%	38%	39%
Word of mouth (friends, family, etc.)	17%	13%	20%	16%	16%
Social media (not including CFIA social media)	10%	8%	12%	9%	12%
Direct contact from the CFIA (includes CFIA social media and visiting the CFIA website)	5%	4%	4%	9%	8%
Podcasts	-	2%	3%	2%	3%
A digital assistant (for example, Alexa, Siri, Google Home)	3%	2%	3%	1%	2%
Not applicable: have not seen, heard or read anything about the CFIA	37%	51%	35%	25%	23%

*Q12 – Where have you seen, heard, or read about the CFIA? Select all that apply [RANDOMIZE]***Demographic differences of note**

- Consumers over the age of 24 are more likely to report they have seen, heard or read about the CFIA through traditional media (51% for those 25 to 44; 66% for those 45 to 64; 63% for those 65 plus) than those 18 to 24 (36%). Consumers 18 to 24 were more likely to report they have not seen, heard or read anything (33%; 40% in 2025).
- Consumers who self-identify as not belonging to a visible minority group were more likely to report they have seen, heard or read about the CFIA through traditional media (59%; 58% in 2025) than those who do identify as a visible minority (50%; 47% in 2025).

- French only speakers (26%) were less likely to report having seen, heard, or read about the CFIA through the Internet (including online news sites, but not social media) relative to English only speakers (42%). They were also more likely to have not seen, heard or read anything about the CFIA (32%) than English only speakers (19%).
- Atlantic Canadians are twice as likely to see, read or heard about the CFIA through word of mouth (35%) than any other region in Canada (range from 11% to 17%).

Table 10. Engagement with the CFIA

Base: All respondents (n=2475) *Contains multiple mentions

Contact or engagement with the CFIA	2024 (n=1503)*	2025 (n=2223)*	2026 (n=2475)*
I have visited the CFIA website	7%	11%	13%
I have had an in-person interaction with a CFIA employee	3%	5%	5%
I subscribe to CFIA food recall notices	3%	4%	4%
I have a friend or family member who works at the CFIA	2%	3%	3%
I have contacted the CFIA by email or through the website	2%	3%	2%
I follow the CFIA on a social media platform	4%	2%	2%
I submitted a food safety or labelling concern	3%	2%	2%
I have contacted the CFIA by phone	2%	2%	1%
None of the above	79%	80%	79%

*Q13 – Select all the following that apply to you: [RANDOMIZE]***Demographic differences of note**

- Consumers who make food purchasing decisions and have food allergies and sensitivities (18%) are more likely to visit the CFIA website than those who do not (11%).

Table 11. Satisfaction with CFIA handling food safety or labelling concern

Base: Respondents who submitted a food safety or labelling concern (n=45)[DECIDED ONLY]

Satisfaction	2022 (n=137)	2023 (n=105)	2025 (n=39)	2026 (n=45)
Mean	-	-	6.4	7.0
Not satisfied (0-3)	5%	8%	22%	21%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4-6)	20%	20%	15%	9%
Satisfied (7-10)	75%	73%	63%	70%

Q14 – [IF REPORTED FOOD CONCERN] How satisfied are you with the CFIA handling of the food safety or labelling concern you reported? Use a scale of 0-10 where 0 is “not at all satisfied” and 10 is “very satisfied”.

Table 12. Satisfaction with timeliness of CFIA recall notices

Base: Respondents who subscribe to CFIA recall notices (n=92)[DECIDED ONLY]

Satisfaction	2022 (n=137)	2023 (n=141)	2025 (n=91)	2026 (n=92)
Mean	-	-	7.5	7.3
Not satisfied (0-3)	3%	3%	8%	7%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4-6)	6%	18%	21%	22%
Satisfied (7-10)	92%	79%	71%	71%

Q15 – [IF SUBSCRIBES TO RECALL NOTICES] How satisfied are you that the CFIA issues food recall notices in a timely manner? Use a scale of 0-10 where 0 is “not at all satisfied” and 10 is “very satisfied”.

Table 13. Accessing CFIA’s website

Base: Respondents who have visited the CFIA’s website or contacted the CFIA via website (n=341)

Last visited CFIA’s website...	2025 (n=335)	2026 (n=341)
Within the last week	6.9%	3.9%
Within the last month	12.6%	5.9%
Within the last 3 months	12.6%	13.4%
Within the last 6 months	17.8%	20.3%
More than 6 months ago	36.2%	42.9%
Don’t recall/unsure	13.9%	13.7%

Q16 – [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE/CONTACTED CFIA THROUGH THE WEBSITE] When did you last visit the CFIA website?

Table 14. Accessing CFIA's website

Base: Respondents who have visited the CFIA's website or follow the CFIA on a social media platform (n=340)

Type of information respondents were searching for on CFIA's website/social media	2026 (n=340)
Food recall	68.3%
Labelling requirements (including a labelling complaint)	22.4%
Invasive species or plant pests	16.5%
Animal diseases	13.3%
Information of returning to Canada with food items	11.5%
Allergens	8.0%
Travelling with pets	7.9%
Other information (please specify)	11.4%

Q17 - [NEW][IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE – Q13 = 4 OR 6] What type of information were you looking for?
[RANDOMIZE] (Select all that apply)

Table 15. Level of ease of difficulty in finding or understanding information on CFIA website

Base: Respondents who have visited the CFIA's website or contacted the CFIA via website (n=340)

	Finding information		Understanding information	
Level of difficulty	2025 (n=335)	2026 (n=340)	2025 (n=336)	2026 (n=332)
Very easy	13.3%	20.8%	23.4%	28.6%
Somewhat easy	40.0%	38.0%	39.8%	42.2%
Neither difficult nor easy	19.0%	21.3%	17.0%	17.0%
Somewhat difficult	10.8%	5.8%	6.5%	3.4%
Very difficult	1.2%	2.2%	1.0%	1.3%
NET Easy	53.3%	58.8%	63.2%	70.9%
Don't recall/unsure	15.6%	11.9%	12.3%	7.5%

Q18 – [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE/CONTACTED CFIA THROUGH THE WEBSITE] How easy or difficult was it to find the information you were looking for on the CFIA website?

Q19 – [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE/CONTACTED CFIA THROUGH THE WEBSITE] How easy or difficult was it to understand the information on the CFIA website?

Food buying habits and concerns due to recalls or food safety issues

Just over half of consumers report they have changed their food buying habits because of a recall or food safety issue (54%), while thirty-seven percent report they have not. Among those who have changed their food buying habits, they most often reported making changes by way of no longer buying or avoiding certain brands of products (66%; 62% in 2025) or switching brands, stores or products (12%; 19% in 2025).

One in five each report these changes lasted one to six months or a few months (20%; 22% in 2025), until the recall was lifted or the media report the issue was resolved (18%; 19% in 2025) or it is still ongoing (18%; 12% in 2025).

Table 16. Change in food buying habits due to recalls or food safety

Base: All respondents (n=2496)

Change in habits	2025 (n=2281)	2026 (n=2496)
Yes	51.4%	54.2%
No	41.3%	37.2%
Not sure/rather not say	7.3%	8.5%

Q20 – Have you ever changed your food buying habits because of a recall or food safety issue?

Demographic differences of note

- Similar to last years wave, consumers in British Columbia (59%; 57% in 2025), Ontario (58%; 59% in 2025), and Atlantic Canada (55%; 57% in 2025) are more likely to report they have changed their habits than those in Quebec (47%; 38% in 2025).
- Three in five women (63%; 57% in 2025) report they have changed their food buying habits, comparatively, less than half of men say their food buying habits have changed (45%; 46% in 2025).
- Consumers with a bachelor's degree or higher (58%) are more likely to report having changed their food buying habits due to a recall or food safety issue than those with an education of high school or less (41%).

Table 17. Specific changes made to food buying habits

Base: Respondents who reported changing habits due to food recalls (n=1320)

Change(s) in habits – Top mentions	2025 (n=1180)	2026 (n=1320)
Stopped buying/avoided certain brands or products	61.6%	65.8%
Switched brands/stores/products	18.5%	12.0%
Avoided foods from certain countries/areas	3.7%	4.3%
Awareness/Became more cautious	4.1%	3.9%
Checked dates/labels	2.9%	3.2%
Yes/Changed buying/eating habits	1.4%	2.4%
Returned/Discarded items	2.1%	2.2%
Checked recall notices	3.2%	1.3%
Checked if I had purchased the product	<1%	1.3%
No/None	<1%	0.5%
Other	1.9%	3.1%

Q21 – [IF HAS MADE CHANGES TO HABITS] How did your food buying habits change? [OPEN]

Table 18. Duration of changes

Base: Respondents who reported changing habits due to food recalls (n=1293)

Length of changes	2025 (n=1166)	2026 (n=1293)
One to six months/A few months	22.2%	19.9%
Until the recall was lifted/Until media reported the issue was resolved/Until safe	18.6%	18.4%
Still in effect/Ongoing/To date	12.4%	18.4%
Permanently/ Forever	16.2%	13.2%
Six months to a year	8.6%	7.4%
More than a year/multiple years	4.7%	7.0%
Less than a month/a few weeks or days	8.7%	5.9%
Depends on the product/Depends on the safety issue	3.3%	3.3%
Not long/Short term (not specified)	2.0%	2.0%
A long time (not specified)	1.0%	1.5%
Other	0.8%	0.5%
Unsure	1.4%	2.0%

Q22 – [IF HAS MADE CHANGES TO HABITS] How long did this change last? [OPEN]

Table 19. Ranking foods with most food borne illness concerns

Consumers most often ranked meat products (32% cumulatively; 20% fresh, 12% ready-to-eat; 28% in 2025) first as the type of food they are most concerned about for foodborne illnesses, followed by fish and seafood (21%; 24% in 2025) and fresh produce (19%; 21% in 2025). Close to one in five ranked imported foods first (16%; 17% in 2025).

Base: All respondents (n=2479)

Type of food	Rank 1		Rank 2		Rank 3	
	2025 (n=2234)	2026 (n=2479)	2025 (n=2155)	2026 (n=2393)	2025 (n=1963)	2026 (n=2170)
Fish and Seafood (including shellfish)	23.6%	20.9%	27.5%	24.3%	22.1%	19.8%
Fresh produce (fruits and vegetables)	20.6%	19.3%	19.6%	14.4%	23.4%	15.6%
Imported foods	17.1%	16.3%	11.6%	10.6%	17.5%	13.6%
Manufactured food products (Packaged snacks, ready-to-eat meals, juice, and baked goods)	7.6%	8.1%	10.8%	8.6%	15.4%	12.0%
Meat products (fresh or ready-to-eat e.g. deli meat)*	28.4%	32.2%	30.1%	41.7%	20.7%	38.6%
<i>Meat products (fresh)*</i>	N/A	19.8%	N/A	21.9%	N/A	18.4%
<i>Ready-to-eat meat products (e.g. deli meat)*</i>	N/A	12.4%	N/A	19.9%	N/A	20.2%
Other	0.8%	1.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Unsure	2.0%	2.0%	-	-	-	-

* Meat products (fresh or ready-to-eat e.g. deli meat) was one category in 2025 but split into two categories in 2026 (Meat products (fresh), and Ready-to-eat meat products (e.g. deli meat)).

Q23 – Please rank the following types of foods, where 1 is the type you are the most concerned about in terms of foodborne illness, 2 the second most concerned about, etc. [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- A quarter of consumers in Quebec (26%, compared to 20% of consumers overall) were more likely to rank fresh meat products as type of food that concerns them the most in terms of foodborne illness and less likely to feel concern about fresh produce (11%) than the Canadian average of 19%. Comparatively, consumers from Atlantic Canada are more likely to feel rank fresh produce (27%) as their top food type concern for foodborne illness while ranking fish and seafood (12%) at a rate lower than the Canadian average of 21 percent.

Trust in CFIA

Just under four in five consumers (79%; an increase from 76% in 2025 and 70% in 2024) say they trust the CFIA to some extent (score of 5-7) to do what is right to help ensure food is safe in Canada. A majority of consumers also trust the CFIA to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity (75%; 70% gave a score of 5-7 in 2025), a slight increase from previous years of tracking.

Table 20a. Trust in CFIA to ensure food is safe

Base: All respondents (n=2320) [DECIDED ONLY]

Level of trust	2025 Level of trust in CFIA to do what is right to help ensure food is safe in Canada (n=2091)	2026 Level of trust in CFIA to do what is right to help ensure food is safe in Canada (n=2320)
Mean	5.3	5.4
1 – Do not trust at all	2.7%	3.2%
2	3.5%	2.8%
3	5.9%	4.6%
4	11.9%	10.7%
5	23.5%	22.3%
6	33.2%	36.0%
7 – Trust completely	19.3%	20.4%
NET Trust (5-7)	76.0%	78.8%

Q24. Please indicate how much you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to do what is right to help ensure that food is safe in Canada? Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.

Table 20b. Trust in CFIA to inspect labels

Base: All respondents (n=2290) [DECIDED ONLY]

Level of trust	2025 Level of trust in CFIA to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity (n=2072)	2026 Level of trust in CFIA to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity (n=2290)
Mean	5.1	5.2
1 – Do not trust at all	2.9%	2.7%
2	4.2%	2.7%
3	7.4%	7.2%
4	15.2%	12.5%
5	24.9%	25.5%
6	29.9%	32.8%
7 – Trust completely	15.4%	16.6%
NET Trust (5-7)	70.3%	74.9%

Q25. How much do you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity? Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.

Table 20c. Trust in CFIA to ensure food is safe and inspect labels – NET tracking

Base: All respondents (n=2290)[DECIDED ONLY]

NET Trust (5-7)	Level of trust in CFIA to do what is right to help ensure food is safe in Canada	Level of trust in CFIA to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity
2026 (n=2290)	79%	75%
2025 (n=2091)	76%	70%
2024 (n=1503)	70%	68%
2023 (n=3003)	71%	70%
2022 (n=3001)	69%	71%
2021 (n=2502)	66%	68%

Q24. Please indicate how much you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to do what is right to help ensure that food is safe in Canada? Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.

Q25. How much do you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity? Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.

Demographic differences of note

- Around four out of five consumers aged 25 to 44 (78%), 45 to 64 (82%), and 65 plus (79%) trust the CFIA (gave scores of 5-7) to do what is right to ensure food is safe in Canada, comparatively to 69 percent of those aged 18 to 24 gave trust scores of five or higher out of seven.
- Consumers from Quebec (23%) and Ontario (21%) are more likely to trust the CFIA completely to do what is right to help ensure that food is safe in Canada than those from British Columbia (12%).

Trust in various types of professionals

Consumers rank CFIA Inspectors (30%) ahead of scientists, whether academic (21%; 28% in 2024) or government (13%; 22% in 2025) first in terms of the types of professionals they trust the most as sources of information on food safety, followed by Canadian farmers (12%; 18% in 2025).

Table 21. Trust in professionals

Base: All respondents (n=2486)

	Rank 1		Rank 2		Rank 3	
Type of professional	2025 (n=2245)	2026 (n=2486)	2025 (n=2096)	2026 (n=2279)	2025 (n=1931)	2026 (n=2114)
CFIA Inspectors*	-	30.3%	-	15.4%	-	14.9%
Academic scientists	28.0%	20.6%	18.2%	14.7%	16.3%	13.9%
Government scientists	22.0%	13.3%	28.6%	23.0%	15.7%	17.3%
Canadian farmers	17.5%	11.7%	9.6%	8.9%	10.2%	9.2%
Government experts	13.9%	5.8%	14.3%	13.0%	21.0%	14.0%
Veterinarians* (Unspecified)**	-	3.1%	-	7.0%	-	7.7%
Private sector scientists	4.0%	2.8%	8.7%	5.6%	10.6%	7.1%
Freelance journalists	1.7%	2.2%	4.7%	3.4%	6.1%	3.8%
Canadian food manufacturers	3.0%	1.5%	8.4%	4.4%	8.1%	5.4%
Mainstream media journalists	2.2%	1.4%	3.6%	2.6%	7.0%	3.8%
Social media influencers	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%
Bloggers	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%
Farmers from outside Canada	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	0.9%	2.5%	1.7%
Unsure	2.4%	2.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
Do not trust any of them	4.4%	3.7%	0.7%	-	0.4%	-

*New response options in the 2026 wave of research.

**The response "Veterinarians" shown to respondent did not specify if referring to CFIA, government or private veterinarians.

Q26 – [TWEAKED] Please rank your level of trust in the following types of professionals as sources of information on food, animal and plant safety, where 1 is the most trusted, 2 the second most trusted, 3 the third most trusted and so on [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers aged 18 to 24 (37%) were twice as likely to rank academic scientists as their top trusted source of information on food, animal and plant safety than older Canadians (16% of those 45 to 64; 14% of those 65 plus). Inversely, Older Canadians (36% of those 45 to 64; 35% of those 65 plus) are twice as likely to rank CFIA inspectors as their top trusted source of information than those aged 18 to 24 (17%).
- A quarter (26%) of consumers that attained a bachelor's degree or higher listed academic scientists as their topmost source of information, twice the rate of those that attained College/Trades/CEGEP (13%) or high school or less education (12%). Those who attained an education of high school or less (20%) reported that Canadian farmers were one of their top trusted sources of information about food, animal and plant safety, higher than the percentage of bachelor's degree holders who have the same view (8%).

Confidence in safety of food in Canada

A strong majority of Canadians say they are confident that food sold in Canada is safe (88% give it a score of 5-7 out of 7), which is consistent with 87% in 2025 and remains higher than 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024 (confidence ranging from 77% to 82%).

Table 22. Level of confidence that food sold in Canada is safe

Base: All respondents (n=2483) [DECIDED ONLY]

Confidence	2021 (n=2502)	2022 (n=3001)	2023 (n=3003)	2024 (n=1503)	2025 (n=2269)	2026 (n=2483)
Mean	-	-	-	-	5.6	5.7
1 – Not at all confident	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%
2	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
3	5%	4%	5%	2%	3%	3%
4	15%	16%	15%	11%	7%	7%
5	26%	27%	25%	26%	23%	20%
6	31%	30%	34%	36%	43%	42%
7 – Very confident	21%	20%	18%	20%	21%	26%
NET Confidence (5-7)	78%	77%	77%	82%	87%	88%

Q27 – Please rate your level of confidence that food sold in Canada is safe. Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'very confident'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all confident'.

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers aged 45 to 64 (91% gave a score of 5-7) are more likely to say that they are confident that the food sold in Canada is safe than those aged 18 to 24 (77% gave a score of 5-7).
- Consumers who do not have food allergies or sensitivities nor make food purchasing decisions for those with food allergies or sensitivities were more likely to say they are very confident that food sold in

Canada is safe (27%; 22% in 2025) than those who report having food allergies or sensitivities (21%; 15% in 2025).

Evaluating the CFIA's performance

When examining perceptions of CFIA's performance as aspects of its mandate, it can be observed that a majority of consumers rate the CFIA as doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe (84%; a slight increase from previous years) as well as safeguarding animal health (78%; consistent with previous years). Seven in ten Canadians say they CFIA is doing well at safeguarding plant health (72%; 68% in 2025), continuing its upward trajectory from 2024 (38%) but remains consistent with findings from 2021, 2022 and 2023 (which ranged from 69% to 70%).

Table 23a. Views on CFIA verifying food sold in Canada is safe

Base: All respondents (n=2306) [DECIDED ONLY]

How well CFIA is doing	2025 CFIA verifying food sold in Canada is safe (n=2113)	2026 CFIA verifying food sold in Canada is safe (n=2306)
Mean	5.4	5.5
1 – Not doing well	2.1%	2.4%
2	2.1%	2.0%
3	5.1%	3.3%
4	10.9%	8.2%
5	25.5%	22.6%
6	34.9%	39.4%
7 – Doing well	19.4%	22.1%
NET Doing well (5-7)	79.8%	84.0%

Table 23b. Views on CFIA safeguarding plant health

Base: All respondents (n=2102) [DECIDED ONLY]

How well CFIA is doing	2025 CFIA safeguarding plant health (n=1915)	2026 CFIA safeguarding plant health (n=2102)
Mean	4.9	5.1
1 – Not doing well	3.7%	3.4%
2	4.0%	3.2%
3	8.0%	6.4%
4	16.4%	15.4%
5	29.3%	28.4%
6	25.1%	27.9%
7 – Doing well	13.3%	15.3%
NET Doing well (5-7)	67.8%	71.6%

Table 23c. Views on CFIA safeguarding animal health

Base: All respondents (n=2233) [DECIDED ONLY]

How well CFIA is doing	2025 CFIA safeguarding animal health (n=1995)	2026 CFIA safeguarding animal health (n=2233)
Mean	5.3	5.3
1 – Not doing well	2.4%	3.9%
2	3.0%	2.6%
3	5.1%	4.0%
4	13.5%	11.4%
5	27.0%	24.5%
6	30.3%	32.7%
7 – Doing well	18.8%	21.0%
NET Doing well (5-7)	76.1%	78.2%

Table 23d. Views on CFIA's performance at fulfilling its mandate – NET tracking

Base: All respondents (n=2306) [DECIDED ONLY]

NET Doing well (5-7)	CFIA verifying food sold in Canada is safe	CFIA safeguarding plant health	CFIA safeguarding animal health
2026 (n=2306)	84%	72%	78%
2025 (n=1995)	80%	68%	76%
2024 (n=1502)	74%	38%	-
2023 (n=3003)	75%	69%	71%
2022 (n=3001)	76%	70%	69%
2021 (n=2502)	76%	68%	71%

[RANDOMIZE ORDER OF Q28 TO Q30]

Q28 - When it comes to verifying that food sold in Canada is safe, how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.

Q29 – When it comes to safeguarding plant health (regulating invasive species such as insects, seeds, plants, snails and slugs that can cause serious damage to Canada's environment and economy), how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.

Q30 – When it comes to safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases, how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers 45 to 64 (75%) and 65 and older (72%) were more likely to rate the CFIA as doing well (score of 5-7 out of ten) when it comes to safeguarding animal health than those 18 to 24 and 25 to 44 (65% respectively).
- Consumers from Quebec (75%) are more likely to say the CFIA is doing well safeguarding plant health (score of 5-7 out of ten) than those from Ontario (69% gave a score of 5-7 out of ten).

C. Enforcement Actions

Table 24. Awareness of CFIA's enforcement actions

Base: All respondents (n=2496)

Awareness	CFIA enforcement actions (n=2496)
Yes, I was aware	57%
No, I was not aware	36%
Not sure	8%

Q31 - [NEW] Were you aware the CFIA uses a variety of enforcement actions including monetary penalties, suspensions, cancellations, charges laid, prosecution bulletins, food safety investigations and reports?

Table 25. CFIA's enforcement actions as sufficient to encourage compliance

Base: All respondents (n=2498)

	CFIA enforcement actions as sufficient (n=2498)
Sufficient	14%
Somewhat sufficient	37%
Somewhat not sufficient	16%
Not sufficient	8%
Not sure	24%

Q32 - [New] In your opinion, are the enforcement actions sufficient, somewhat sufficient, somewhat not sufficient or not sufficient to encourage businesses to comply with the CFIA regulations?

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers from British Columbia (70%) and the Prairies (63%) were more aware of the variety of enforcement actions such as monetary penalties, suspensions, cancellations, charges laid, prosecution bulletins, food safety investigations and reports used by CFIA than those from Quebec (45%).
- Consumers from Quebec (8%) were the least likely among all regions in Canada to report that the enforcement actions taken by the CFIA were sufficient enough to encourage businesses to comply with the CFIA regulations.

D. Food fraud

Exploring the issue of 'food fraud'

The proportion of consumers rating food fraud as personally important to them continues to grow (79%, gave a score of 6-7; 75% in 2025 and up from 49% in 2022), while 18% say this has some importance to them (19% in 2025, 34% in 2022) and two percent say it has little to no importance.

Nearly all consumers say that CFIA should publish the names of companies that have been found to misrepresent food (97%; consistent with 98% in 2025 but a marginal increase from 93% in 2022). Consumers most often say they would either report the issue (60%, marginal decline from 63% in 2025 but up from 33% in 2022) or throw the product away (47%, downward trend continues from 49% in 2025 and 57% in 2022) if they thought a food product they had purchased was fraudulent or misrepresented. Close to one in twenty say they would probably not take any action (6%), which stayed static from last tracking but has declined since 2022 (17%).

When asked who they would report the food fraud issue to, consumers most often selected the CFIA (53%; 54% in 2025), followed by the retailer (44%; same as 2025), the provincial public health priority (28%; same as 2025) or the local or regional public health priority (25%; 31% in 2025).

Table 26. Personal importance of 'food fraud'

Base: All respondents (n=2457)

Importance	2022 (n=1000)	2025 (n=2281)	2026 (n=2457)
Mean	-	6.1	6.3
Important (6-7)	49%	75%	79%
Some importance (3-5)	34%	19%	18%
Little to no importance (1-2)	9%	3%	2%
Unsure	8%	3%	< 1%

Q33 – How important is the issue of food fraud to you when buying food? On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is very important. Food fraud is when food is misrepresented. It can include things like substituting a product with something different than advertised, mixing in other ingredients and not including them on the label, making false claims or misleading statements (saying something is preservative free when it isn't) or mislabelling a product as something it is not (labelling farmed salmon as wild salmon).

Demographic differences of note

- Women (67%, mean score of 6.4 out of ten) were more likely than men (58%, mean score of 6.1 out of ten) to say food fraud is very important to them.

- Consumers and 45 to 64 (68%, mean score of 6.5) were more likely to say this is very important to them than those 65 plus (61%, mean score of 6.2), 25 to 55 (60%, mean score of 6.2) or 18 to 24 (59%, mean score of 6.0).
- Consumers who report they have food allergies or sensitivities (71%; 67% in 2025) were more likely to say this is very important than those who report neither having food allergies or sensitivities nor making purchasing decisions for others with them (60%; 55% in 2025).

Table 27. CFIA publishing names of companies committing ‘food fraud’

Base: All respondents (n=2495)

CFIA publishing names of companies	2022 (n=1000)	2025 (n=2280)	2026 (n=2495)
Yes	93%	98%	97%
No	4%	1%	1%
Don't know	4%	1%	2%

Q34 – Do you think CFIA should publish the names of companies that have been found to have misrepresented food?

Table 28. Action taken if purchased a fraudulent or misrepresented product

Base: All respondents (n=2497) *Contains multiple mentions.

Action	2022 (n=1000)*	2025 (n=2280)*	2026 (n=2497)
Report the issue	33%	63%	60%
Throw the product away	57%	49%	47%
Stop purchasing said product from store	3%	4%	5%
Return product to store/ask for a refund	4%	5%	5%
Contact store/ management/company	1%	1%	1%
None of the above. I probably would not take any action	17%	6%	6%
Other	1%	4%	4%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	11%	4%	5%

Q35 – What action(s) would you take if you thought that a food product you purchased was fraudulent or misrepresented? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers aged 18 to 24 are almost just as likely to throw away a product (57%) as they are to report the issue (58%).

- Those who self-identify as belonging to a visible minority group were also more likely to say they would throw the product away (53; 57% in 2025) than those who do not identify as a visible minority (45%; 48% in 2025).

Table 29. Reporting instances of ‘food fraud’

Base: All respondents (n=2494) *Contains multiple mentions.

Report the issue to...	2022 (n=1000)*	2025 (n=2281)*	2026 (n=2494)
Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)	53%	54%	53%
Retailer	35%	44%	44%
Provincial public health authority	21%	28%	28%
Local/regional public health authority	19%	31%	25%
Manufacturer	21%	21%	20%
Better Business Bureau	18%	15%	12%
A Government of Canada department other than the CFIA	17%	10%	9%
Police	3%	3%	3%
Other	1%	2%	4%
Would not report the issue	10%	7%	7%
Don't know/Prefer not to say	12%	8%	7%

Q36 – Who would you report the food fraud issue to? SELECT ALL THAT APPLY [RANDOMIZE]

E. MIS and DIS information affecting decision-making

Table 30. Concern for false and misleading information affecting decision-making

Base: All respondents (n=2489)

Concern for false or misleading information	Misleading information on food safety (n=2489)	Misleading information on animal health and safety (n=2462)	Misleading information on plant health (n=2476)	Misleading information on environmental impact issues (n=2487)
Mean	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.2
1 – Not at all concerned	2.9%	4.1%	3.9%	5.4%
2	6.6%	5.9%	5.3%	5.2%
3	8.0%	7.9%	7.7%	6.8%
4	15.2%	14.0%	14.0%	12.0%
5	20.0%	18.4%	19.2%	17.8%
6	18.9%	18.3%	17.0%	20.3%
7 – Very Concerned	27.1%	28.5%	27.6%	29.7%
Don't know/prefer not to say	1.2%	2.9%	5.2%	2.8%
NET Concerned (5-7)	66.0%	65.2%	63.8%	67.8%

Q37 - [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on food safety?

Q38 - [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on animal health and safety?

Q39 - [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on the impact of non-native invasive species on plant health?

Q40 - [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on environmental impact issues?

Table 31. How to know when information is untrustworthy or misleading*Base: All respondents (n=1718)*

	Total (n=1718)
Media reports as main signal	28.6%
No reliable way to tell	14.1%
Source credibility check	8.9%
Government or CFIA alerts are trusted	6.6%
Label review and product claims	6.1%
Instinct and common-sense suspicion	5.4%
Cross-verification across multiple sources	4.7%
Researching evidence and science	4.6%
Other	2.4%
Not sure	6.0%

Q41 - [NEW] How do you know when information on food, animal and plant safety is untrustworthy or misleading? [OPEN]

Demographic differences of note

- Women are more likely to express being very concerned with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on environmental impact issues (34%) and decision-making on animal health and safety (33%) than men (25% and 24%, respectively).
- Older consumers (32% of those 65 plus, 33% of those 45 to 64) report feeling very concerned with false and misleading information affecting their decision making on the impact of non-native invasive species on plant health at higher rates than younger consumers (21% of those 18 to 24 and 25 to 44 respectively).
- Consumers from Quebec (45%) are much more likely than other regions (range from 20% to 26%) to trust media reports when it comes to their judgement on whether information on food, animal and plant safety is untrustworthy.
- Consumers aged 65 plus (38%) and 45 to 64 (31%) are more likely to trust media reports when it comes to their judgement on whether information on food, animal and plant safety is untrustworthy than younger consumers (22% of those 25 to 44; 15% of those 18 to 24).

F. Assessing CFIA brand attributes and messages

Agreement with CFIA brand attributes

Consumers have the highest intensity of agreement with the statement “I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall” (85%, mean of 8.6 out of 10; 80%, mean of 8.4 out of 10 in 2025), followed by “the CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada” (76%, mean of 7.8 out of 10; 70%, mean of 7.5 out of 10 in 2025), “I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science” (73%, mean of 7.7 out of 10; 68%, mean of 7.5 out of 10 in 2025) and “the CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations” (69%, mean of 7.7; 64%, mean of 7.4 in 2025). There was a relatively lower intensity of importance for the statements “CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada” (61%, mean of 7.3; 56%, mean of 7.0 in 2025) and “the CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada” (60%, mean of 7.1; 55%, mean of 7.0 in 2025), and both had a higher percentage of those who were unsure (15% and 13% respectively).

Table 32. Agreement with statements about the CFIA

Base: All respondents (n=2498)

Statement about CFIA	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	Agree (7-10)	Neither agree nor disagree (4-6)	Disagree (0-3)	Unsure
I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall (n=2498)	8.4	8.6	84.6%	8.3%	3.6%	3.5%
The CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (n=2498)	7.5	7.8	76.4%	12.9%	5.4%	5.4%
I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (n=2498)	7.5	7.7	73.1%	12.9%	7.6%	6.5%
The CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (n=2496)	7.4	7.7	68.6%	16.2%	5.2%	10.0%
The CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada (n=2498)	7.0	7.3	60.9%	18.3%	5.9%	14.9%
The CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada (n=2494)	7.0	7.1	60.4%	17.7%	8.6%	13.3%

Q42-47 – On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you completely disagree and 10 means you completely agree, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the CFIA [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers in 65 plus (77%), 45 to 64 (81%) and 25 to 44 (75%) were more likely to agree (score of 7-10 out of ten) with the statement “the CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada” than 18 to 24 year olds (66%), as well as the statement “I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science” (18-24: 63%; 25-44: 70%; 45-64: 77%; 65 plus: 76%).

Derived Importance Analysis - Key Brand Drivers - Belief that CFIA is doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at ensuring the safety of food being sold in Canada to agreement with various statements about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and -1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 32 – Drivers of CFIA Verifying Safety of Food in Canada – Brand Attributes:

Statement about CFIA	2025 Mean (0-10)	2026 Mean (0-10)	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
The CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (n=2498)	7.5	7.8	+0.71	+0.73
I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (n=2498)	7.5	7.7	+0.66	+0.70
The CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada (n=2494)	7.0	7.1	+0.64	+0.66
The CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada (n=2498)	7.0	7.3	+0.65	+0.65
I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall (n=2498)	8.4	8.6	+0.54	+0.64
The CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (n=2496)	7.4	7.7	+0.59	+0.62

The variables have scores between +0.62 and +0.73. These scores indicate that agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (+0.73; +0.71 in 2025) is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at ensuring food sold in Canada is safe, while the CFIA helping to ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (+0.62; +0.59) is comparatively less likely to drive impressions.

Derived Importance Analysis - Key Brand Drivers - Belief that CFIA is doing well at safeguarding plant health

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at safeguarding plant health in Canada to agreement with various statements about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and –1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 33 – Drivers of CFIA Safeguarding Plant Health - Brand Attributes:

Statement about CFIA	2025 Mean (0-10)	2026 Mean (0-10)	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
The CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada (n=2498)	7.0	7.3	+0.69	+0.64
The CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada (n=2494)	7.0	7.1	+0.62	+0.60
The CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (n=2498)	7.5	7.8	+0.59	+0.60
I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (n=2498)	7.5	7.7	+0.56	+0.58
The CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (n=2496)	7.4	7.7	+0.54	+0.53
I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall (n=2498)	8.4	8.6	+0.44	+0.50

The variables have scores between +0.50 and +0.64. These scores indicate that agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of plants (+0.64; +0.69 in 2025), animals (+0.60; +0.62 in 2025) and the health and safety of food (+0.60; +0.59 in 2025) in Canada is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding plant health, while, the CFIA helping to ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (+0.53; +0.54 in 2025) and trusting the CFIA when it issues a food recall (+0.50; +0.44 in 2025) are less likely to drive impressions.

Derived Importance Analysis - Key Brand Drivers - Belief that CFIA is doing well at safeguarding animal health

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at safeguarding animal health in Canada to agreement with various statements about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and –1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 34 – Drivers of CFIA Safeguarding Animal Health - Brand Attributes:

Statement about CFIA	2025 Mean (0-10)	2026 Mean (0-10)	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
The CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada (n=2494)	7.0	7.1	+0.68	+0.72
I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (n=2498)	7.5	7.7	+0.62	+0.71
The CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada (n=2498)	7.5	7.8	+0.64	+0.68
The CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada (n=2498)	7.0	7.3	+0.65	+0.65
The CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (n=2496)	7.4	7.7	+0.58	+0.59
I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall (n=2498)	8.4	8.6	+0.52	+0.58

The variables have scores between +0.58 and +0.72. These scores indicate that agreement that CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada (+0.72; +0.68 in 2025) and trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science (+0.71; +0.62 in 2025) are comparatively most likely to drive positive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding animal health, while the CFIA helping to ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations (+0.59; +0.58 in 2025) and trusting the CFIA when it issues a food recall (+0.58; +0.52 in 2025) are not as strong at driving positive impressions.

CFIA message evaluation

The highest intensity of agreement was given to the statements “by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians” (90% agree; 88% on 2025) and “as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement” (87% agree; same in 2025). This was followed by “by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment” (83% agree; same in 2025), “by protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the economy” (80% agree; 81% in 2025) and “the CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner” (80% agree; 78% in 2025).

Receiving strong but comparatively lower intensity of agreement were the statements “CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely” (71%; 66% in 2025), “CFIA helps to facilitate international trade” (68%; same in 2025), and “CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations” (60%; 58% in 2025).

Table 35a. Agreement with messaging about the CFIA

Base: All respondents (n=2344)[DECIDED ONLY]

CFIA message	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	Agree (5-7)	Neutral (4)	Disagree (1-3)
By protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians (n=776)*	6.0	6.1	90.1%	5.1%	4.8%
As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (n=2344)	5.9	5.9	86.7%	5.9%	7.4%
By protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (n=774)*	5.6	5.6	82.5%	7.5%	10.0%
By protecting Canada’s food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy (n=719)*	5.6	5.6	80.5%	8.6%	10.9%
The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner (n=1982)	5.4	5.5	80.5%	10.6%	8.9%
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada’s plant resources are protected (n=1954)	5.2	5.4	79.1%	11.2%	9.8%
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely (n=1810)	4.9	5.0	70.5%	14.6%	14.9%
CFIA helps to facilitate international trade (n=1464)	5.0	5.0	68.3%	14.9%	16.8%
CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (n=1927)	4.5	4.6	59.9%	16.7%	23.4%

Q48-54 – Below are some statements to describe the activities of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is disagree completely and 7 is agree completely, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? [RANDOMIZE]

**Split sample*

Table 35b. Agreement with messaging about the CFIA – NET Tracking

Base: All respondents (n=2344)[DECIDED ONLY]

CFIA message – NET Agree (5-7)	2021 (n=2502)	2022 (n=3001)	2023 (n=3003)	2025 (n=2027)	2026 (n=2344)
As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement	-	70%	70%	87%	87%
The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner	73%	69%	68%	78%	80%
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected	-	68%	67%	75%	79%
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely	67%	64%	63%	66%	71%
CFIA helps to facilitate international trade	-	61%	59%	68%	68%
CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations	-	65%	63%	58%	60%

Q48-54 – Below are some statements to describe the activities of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is disagree completely and 7 is agree completely, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers aged 65 and over (26%) are almost three times as likely to completely agree with the statement “CFIA helps to facilitate international trade” than those aged 18 to 24 (9%). Almost eight out of ten (78%) respondents 65 plus agreed (gave a score of five or higher out of seven) compared to just over 50 percent of consumers aged 18 to 24 (53%).
- Quebec consumers were more likely to completely agree with a number of statements about the CFIA, than consumers in Ontario, BC and the Prairies, including “As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement”, “CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner”, “CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations”, “The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely” and “CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected”.
- Consumers 45 to 64 were more likely to completely agree with the statement “As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement” (43%) than those 18 to 24 (32%).

Derived importance of CFIA messaging versus belief that CFIA is doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on the CFIA doing well at verifying food sold in Canada is safe to agreement with various messages about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and -1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 36 – Drivers of CFIA Verifying Food Sold in Canada is Safe – CFIA Messaging

CFIA message	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (n=869)*	5.6	5.6	+0.61	+0.66
As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (n=2493)	5.9	5.9	+0.60	+0.66
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected (n=2490)	5.2	5.4	+0.61	+0.61
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy (n=801)*	5.6	5.6	+0.57	+0.61
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians (n=823)*	6.0	6.1	+0.55	+0.60
The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner (n=2495)	5.4	5.5	+0.62	+0.59
CFIA helps to facilitate international trade (n=2496)	5.0	5.0	+0.53	+0.54
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely (n=2496)	4.9	5.0	+0.52	+0.53
CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (n=2492)	4.5	4.6	+0.53	+0.51

The variables have scores between +0.51 and +0.66. These scores indicate that agreement that by protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (+0.66; +0.61 in 2025) and as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (+0.66; +0.60 in 2025) are more likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at verifying food sold in Canada is safe, while the CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.51; +0.53 in 2025) is not as strong at driving positive impressions.

Derived importance of CFIA messaging versus belief that CFIA is doing well at safeguarding plant health in Canada

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at safeguarding plant health to agreement with various messages about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and -1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 37 – Drivers of CFIA Safeguarding Plant Health – CFIA Messaging

CFIA message	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected (n=2490)	5.2	5.4	+0.64	+0.63
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (n=869)*	5.6	5.6	+0.57	+0.59
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy (n=801)*	5.6	5.6	+0.49	+0.57
As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (n=2493)	5.9	5.9	+0.50	+0.55
The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner (n=2495)	5.4	5.5	+0.54	+0.53
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely (n=2496)	4.9	5.0	+0.54	+0.53
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians (n=823)*	6.0	6.1	+0.47	+0.52
CFIA helps to facilitate international trade (n=2496)	5.0	5.0	+0.48	+0.51
CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (n=2492)	4.5	4.6	+0.55	+0.48

The variables have scores between +0.48 and +0.63. These scores indicate that agreement that CFIA enforcing regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected is most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding plant health (+0.63; +0.64 in 2025), while CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.48; +0.55 in 2025) is not as strong at driving positive impressions. The statement that by protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy saw an increase in driving impressions, rising from +0.49 in 2025 to +0.57.

Derived importance of CFIA messaging versus belief that CFIA is doing well at safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases

The Pearson Correlation score indicates the relationship between views on how well the CFIA is doing at safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases to agreement with various messages about CFIA. A value of +1 is a total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and -1 is a total negative linear correlation.

Table 38 – Drivers of CFIA Safeguarding Animal Health – CFIA Messaging

CFIA message	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	2025 Pearson Score	2026 Pearson Score
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment (n=869)*	5.6	5.6	+0.59	+0.67
As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement (n=2493)	5.9	5.9	+0.59	+0.66
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy (n=801)*	5.6	5.6	+0.57	+0.65
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected (n=2490)	5.2	5.4	+0.61	+0.61
By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of Canadians (n=823)*	6.0	6.1	+0.55	+0.61
The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely (n=2496)	4.9	5.0	+0.60	+0.57
CFIA helps to facilitate international trade (n=2496)	5.0	5.0	+0.53	+0.56
The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner (n=2495)	5.4	5.5	+0.59	+0.54
CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (n=2492)	4.5	4.6	+0.52	+0.47

*split sample

The variables have scores between +0.47 and +0.67. These scores indicate that the statements “by protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the health and well-being of the environment” (+0.67; +0.59 in 2025), “as a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement” (+0.66; +0.59 in 2025) and “by protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to the economy” (+0.65; +0.57 in 2025) are most likely to drive impressions of the performance of CFIA at safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases. The statement that CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations (+0.47; +0.52 in 2025) is comparatively less likely to drive impressions.

Awareness of CFIA responsibilities

Consumers have the highest level of awareness that CFIA plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases (71%; up from 57% in 2025), while one in four are aware CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer (26%; 23% in 2025). One in five are aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as Spotted Lantern Fly (21%; 17% in 2025). Around one in ten are aware CFIA helps establish new markets for Canada's food, animal and plant businesses (13%; same in 2025).

Table 39a. Awareness of CFIA responsibilities

Base: All respondents (n=2491)

CFIA responsibility	2025 Yes	2026 Yes	2025 No	2026 No	2025 Unsure	2026 Unsure
Plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Spotted Lantern Fly (n=1277)*	17.3%	21.5%	76.9%	65.7%	5.8%	12.8%
Plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer (n=1216)*	22.7%	25.8%	71.9%	60.7%	5.4%	13.5%
Plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases such as Avian Influenza (bird flu) (n=2491)	57.4%	70.5%	36.0%	23.3%	6.6%	6.1%
Helps establish new markets for Canada's food, animal and plant businesses (n=2470)	13.3%	12.8%	79.8%	76.3%	7.0%	10.9%

**Split sample*

[SPLIT SAMPLE for Q55 and Q56] Q55 – Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Spotted Lantern Fly?

[SPLIT SAMPLE for Q55 and Q56] Q56 – Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer?

Q57 – Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases such as Avian Influenza (bird flu)?

Q58 – Were you aware that the CFIA helps establish new markets for Canada's food, animal and plant businesses?

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers in Atlantic Canada (79%) and BC (83%) were more likely to say they were aware that the CFIA plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases such as Avian Influenza (bird flu) than those in Quebec (60%).
- Older consumers (65 plus: 73%, 61% in 2025; 45 to 64: 77%, 63% in 2025) were more likely to be aware of CFIA playing a role in detecting and addressing animal diseases than those 25 to 44 (67%, 53% in 2025) or 18 to 24 (56%, 47% in 2025).

- English only speakers (74%) were slightly more likely than French only speakers (62%) to be aware of the CFIA playing a role in detecting and addressing animal diseases.

Table 39b. Awareness of CFIA playing important role in preventing spread of pests

Base: All respondents (n=1216)

CFIA responsibility	Yes
2026	26%
2025	23%
2022	24%

[SPLIT SAMPLE for Q55 and Q56] 56 – Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer?

NOTE: 2022 Question wording was: Were you aware (before this survey) that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as Japanese beetle in Vancouver and emerald ash borer in eastern Canada?

G. Awareness of Pistachio product recall in Canada

There have recently been a series of recalls involving Salmonella in Pistachio Nuts. Recalls involve both the nuts themselves as well as products made containing nuts.

Table 40. Awareness of pistachio product recall in Canada

Base: All respondents (n=2484)

Awareness of pistachio product recall	Total (n=2484)
Yes	53.0%
No	42.1%
Not sure	4.8%

Q59 - [NEW] Have you read, heard or seen anything recently about pistachios, and pistachio products being recalled in Canada?

Demographic differences of note

- Older Canadians (57 percent of 65 plus and 59 percent of 45 to 64) were more likely to have seen, heard or read about pistachios and pistachio products being recalled than younger Canadians (48 percent of 25 to 44 and 40 percent of 18 to 24). Respondents in Quebec (61%) were also more likely than the national average (53%) to report having seen, heard or read about pistachios and pistachio products being recalled.

Table 41. Concern for pistachio product recall in Canada

Base: All respondents (n=2495)

Concern for pistachio recall	Total (n=2495)
Mean	6.0
Concerned (7-10)	47.7%
Neutral (4-6)	24.2%
Not concerned (1-3)	24.9%
Unsure	3.2%

Q60 - [NEW] How concerned are you about the pistachio recalls on a scale of 1-10 where 1 is not at all concerned and 10 is very concerned.

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers aged 65 plus (56%) and 45 to 64 (52%) are more likely to report being concerned (score of seven or higher out of ten) than consumers aged 18 to 24 (38%) and 25 to 44 (40%) about pistachio recalls.
- Women (53%) were more likely to report being concerned (score of seven or higher out of ten) about the pistachio recalls than men (42%).
- Older Canadians (56 percent of those aged 65 and over and 52 percent of those aged 45 to 64) are more likely than younger Canadians (38 percent of those aged 18 to 24 and 40 percent of those aged 25 to 44) to report being concerned about pistachio recalls.

Table 42. Reason for level of concern for pistachio product recall in Canada

Base: All respondents (n=2154)

Reason for concern	Total (n=2154)
No personal exposure due to non-consumption	22.8%
Low personal relevance due to rare purchase	18.4%
Personal consumption drives concern	12.4%
Serious illness risk from salmonella	7.8%
Poor recall awareness and communication	6.7%
Avoiding pistachios after the recall	6.1%
Trust in the recall system	4.4%
Protecting family or other vulnerable people	3.0%
Other	6.2%

Q61 - [NEW] Why do you rate your concern as [insert recalled number]? Please be as specific as possible. [OPEN]

Table 43. Confidence in the Government of Canada to take the right actions to protect consumers from issues related to the pistachio recalls

Base: All respondents (n=2494)

Confidence in the Government of Canada taking the right actions	Confidence
Mean	7.2
Confident (7-10)	60.1%
Neutral (4-6)	15.9%
Not confident (1-3)	8.7%
Unsure	15.3%

Q62 - [NEW] How confident are you that the Government of Canada is taking the right actions to protect consumers from the issues related to the pistachio recalls? Use a scale of 1-10 where 1 is not at all confident and 10 is very confident.

Demographic differences of note

- Almost three quarters of consumers from Quebec (73%) reported being confident (score of seven or higher out of ten) that the Government of Canada is taking the right actions to protect consumers from the issues related to the pistachio recalls. Canadians aged 45 to 64 (65% gave a score of seven or higher out of ten) are more likely to feel confident than Canadians aged 18 to 24 (50% gave a score of seven or higher out of ten).
- French only speakers (75%) were more likely than English only speakers (55%) to report being confident (score of seven or higher out of ten) that the Government of Canada is taking the right actions to protect consumers from the issues related to pistachio recalls.

H. Lifestyle and activities related to food and food safety

Lifestyle descriptions

Consumers most often identify with the descriptors of somebody concerned about the environment (63%), climate change (57%) or with food safety (53%; 54% in 2025), animal lover (47%; 48% in 2025), pet-owner (45%; 48% in 2025) and nature enthusiast (43%; same in 2025).

Table 44. Personal descriptions

Base: All respondents (n=2495)

Descriptor	2025 (n=2280)	2026 (n=2495)
Someone who is concerned about the environment*	N/A	62.7%
Someone who is concerned about climate change*	N/A	56.6%
Somebody concerned with food safety	53.7%	52.6%
Animal lover	47.8%	46.6%
Pet owner	48.0%	44.6%
Nature enthusiast	42.9%	43.0%
Gardener	38.7%	38.6%
Foodie (someone who is actively looking to try new food experiences)	37.9%	36.3%
Someone with health issues	25.4%	28.4%
Hiker	30.5%	27.0%
Camper	21.6%	20.8%
Bird enthusiast	17.2%	18.7%
Someone with food allergies*	N/A	13.8%
Cottager	14.7%	13.5%
Hobby farmer	6.4%	4.5%
None of them	4.2%	3.4%

*New response option in 2026.

Q63 – Which of the following descriptions would you say describe you at least somewhat? [RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Relationship with food and food safety

Consumers were more likely to agree (score of 7-10) than disagree (score of 0-3) with the statement “I make a point to be informed about recall notices or other food safety notices” (38% agree, 27% disagree; 42% agree, 26% disagree in 2025). They were more likely to disagree with the statements “I usually throw out food just because the best before date has passed” (56% disagree, 24% agree; same in 2025) and “a best before date means the same thing as an expiry date” (76% disagree, 12% agree; 73% disagree, 14% agree in 2025).

Table 45. Agreement with statements about food and food safety

Base: All respondents (n=2500)

Statement about food and food safety	2025 Mean	2026 Mean	Agree (7-10)	Neither agree nor disagree (4-6)	Disagree (0-3)	Unsure
I make a point to be informed about recall notices or other food safety notices (n=2497)	5.6	5.4	38.2%	32.6%	27.4%	1.8%
I carefully read labels when purchasing food due to my or someone else’s food allergies or sensitivities (n=2498)	5.0	5.1	41.9%	17.4%	38.4%	2.2%
I usually throw out food just because the best before date has passed (n=2500)	3.6	3.6	23.8%	19.8%	55.8%	0.6%
A best before date means the same thing as an expiry date (n=2499)	2.3	2.0	11.8%	10.1%	75.8%	2.3%

Q64-67 – On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is completely disagree and 10 is completely agree, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [RANDOMIZE]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers 45 to 64 and 65 plus were more likely to agree that they make a point to be informed about recall and other food safety notices (43 percent and 47 percent respectively) than those 18-24 (22%) and 25 to 44 (32%).
- Women were more likely to completely agree that they carefully read labels when purchasing food (46%) than men (38%).
- Consumers from Ontario (46%) were more likely to agree that they carefully read labels when purchasing food than consumers from Quebec (35%).

Sources of information on food, plant and animal health and safety

Consumers most often selected media, including TV, newspapers, or magazines (57%; 51% in 2025), the Internet/a website (51%; 50% in 2025), a Google search (46%; 50% in 2025), family/friends or a neighbour (30%; 32% in 2025) and the CFIA website (28%; 27% in 2025) as their top sources of information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety or food product ingredients. Under one in ten consumers (8%; 10% in 2025) report they do not look for information about this.

Among those who said social media is a top source (17%; 15% in 2025), they most often report Facebook (59%; 58% in 2025) is the channel they go to most often for information on this. This was followed by YouTube (39%; same as 2025), Instagram (33%; 29% in 2025) and Reddit (17%; 20% in 2025).

Table 48. Top sources of information

Base: All respondents (n=2478)*Contains multiple responses

Source	2025 (n=2280)*	2026 (n=2478)
Media (TV, newspaper, magazine)	50.9%	57.2%
Internet/website	49.6%	50.6%
Google search	50.0%	46.0%
Family/friends/neighbours	32.0%	30.0%
Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) website	27.0%	28.0%
Other Government of Canada website	24.8%	23.2%
Provincial government website	24.4%	22.7%
Social media	15.4%	17.3%
Industry association	5.8%	6.1%
Podcasts	3.3%	3.8%
Social media influencers	2.7%	2.1%
Other	1.6%	-
None/I don't look for information about this	9.8%	8.4%

Q68 – What are the top five sources of information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety or food product ingredients (including product labels) you go to most often? Select up to five.

[RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Demographic differences of note

- Consumers 65 and over (66%) were more likely to report that Media (TV, newspaper, magazine) were in their top five sources of information than younger Canadians (52 percent for those aged 25 to 44; 50 percent for those aged 18 to 24). Conversely, younger Canadians (25 percent for those aged 18 to 24; 21 percent for those aged 25 to 44) were more likely to use social media as a source of information than their older counterparts (11 percent for those aged 65 and older).
- Consumers in Atlantic Canada (40%) were almost twice as likely to report that the CFIA website was in their top five most used information sources as consumers in Quebec (21%) when it comes to information about plant and animal health, travelling with pets, and food safety or food product ingredients.
- Consumers who report they have food allergies or sensitivities were more likely to say the CFIA website is a top information source (33%; same in 2025) than those who neither have food allergies/sensitivities nor make purchasing decisions for those with allergies/sensitivities (26%; 25% in 2025).

Table 49. Go-to social media channels for information on food, plant and animal health and safety

Base: Respondents who report social media as one of their top five sources of information about food, plant and animal health and safety (n=409)

Social media channel	2025 (n=334)	2026 (n=409)
Facebook	57.8%	58.8%
YouTube	38.6%	38.6%
Instagram	29.2%	33.5%
Reddit	19.9%	16.8%
X (formerly Twitter)	15.8%	16.2%
TikTok	15.5%	10.3%
Threads	4.1%	5.4%
Bluesky	7.1%	3.3%
Pinterest	5.1%	2.8%
Other social media	8.7%	16.3%
Unsure	7.2%	5.0%

Q69 – [IF SELECTS SOCIAL MEDIA AS TOP SOURCE] What social media channels do you go to most often for information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety, or food product ingredients (including product labels)? [RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Demographic differences of note

- Facebook remains the top choice across all demographics and regions for those who say social media channels are where they go to most often for information. With YouTube and Instagram being the other top choices. There is a gender divide in usage between the two platforms with men (47%) being more likely than women (30%) to use YouTube, while women (39%) are more likely than men (28%) to report using Instagram as one of their top choices for social media channels.
- Consumers in Quebec (71%) who say social media channels are a top source for them were more likely to specifically select Facebook as a top social media channel information source than those in British Columbia (44%).
- Canadians aged 45 to 64 (6%) and 65 and over (4%) who say social media channels are a top source of information were less likely to report using Reddit than Canadians aged 18 to 24 (39%) and those aged 25 to 44 (22%).

Qualitative Research Findings

A. Overall views on food and relationship with food

Q - Thinking of different factors when making food purchasing decisions, what factors are most important to you?

When it comes to food purchasing decisions, participants mentioned price, quality, freshness as the most important factors. Also mentioned was buying local products and avoiding products from the United-States. A couple participants also mentioned that they look at flyers and plan their meals based on what is on sale for that week. A few mentioned avoiding preservatives and processed food, focusing on healthy food and nutrition. One participant mentioned prioritizing local non-grocery chain stores for produce. One participant mentioned using an app to scan barcodes which provides them with an idea of the healthiness of the product.

Q - How would you rate the safety of the food you buy right now? Are you relatively confident food sold in Canada is safe and accurately represented or do you have any concerns?

Overall, participants are confident that food sold in Canada is safe for consumption. Some participants reported that this confidence came from comparing to the food industry in other countries which they aren't as confident in as they've gotten sick while travelling to these countries but rarely get sick from food in Canada. The few concerns were regarding the labelling of food and how food is represented on the packaging, undeclared allergens or ingredients and the FDA reducing its regulatory oversight. Also mentioned as concerns were diseases spreading among chicken and pork.

Q - What type of food are you most afraid of getting sick from? Why?

Although participants weren't particularly concerned about getting sick from food in Canada, when prompted on which food they are most afraid of getting sick, meat was mentioned most frequently as it can be undercooked, and some believe they can also contain microplastics. Other foods included jalapeno poppers as their partner got sick after eating them, romaine lettuce and produce contaminated with salmonella, and seafood. Also mentioned were the cutbacks in the FDA regulatory oversight in the United-States and how that could impact food imported from the US and sold in Canada.

B. Views on food safety regulations

Q - When you think about the safety of food in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others? [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations come to mind, if any?

Participants mentioned that they believe Canada has high standards when it comes to the safety of food in Canada, and are confident that if there is a problem, it will be taken care of. One participant mentioned that they think of large capitalist systems and that regulations are positive as they keep people safe. Other things that came to the mind of participants when thinking of the safety of food in Canada included the job of food inspectors, best before dates on packaging, and the handling of food by workers in grocery stores or in restaurants.

When asked which regulations come to mind, participants mentioned provincial certifications needed to work in the food service industry (FOODSAFE in BC, MAPAQ in Quebec), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United-States that does testing on food, the CFIA tracing all steps in the food chain and also developing methodologies for testing and ensuring food is safe for human consumption.

Q - When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to food safety, which organizations come to mind? Q - What do you think these organizations do to assure the safety of food in Canada?

Asked which organizations in Canada that are dedicated to food safety come to mind, CFIA is top of mind for many participants, which participants believe is responsible for handling imports, farm and slaughterhouse inspections. Others included Health Canada, and in Quebec, participants were more familiar with MAPAQ, which they believe is responsible for inspections in restaurants and grocery stores and ensuring the safety of food sold in Quebec as well as certifying people working in the food industry. One participant also mentioned they thought of inspectors from private companies (such as inspectors working for a chain of restaurants inspecting each individual restaurant), which from experience believed was even more stringent than government inspectors.

Q - What do you think makes a food “unsafe”?

When it comes to what they believe makes a food unsafe, participants mention improper storage which can lead to bacterial growth and also concerns about transportation and ensuring the storage requirements are consistent throughout the transportation of the food. Cross-contamination was also mentioned, with the example given of contamination when processing different types of meats. Another added they felt fillers, additives and dyes that are added in processed foods made them unsafe for consumption. One participant mentioned animal welfare, and ensuring they are healthy prior to slaughtering and processing them as if they weren't it could make the meat unsafe.

Q - What makes you trust that Canada's food system is working?

Overall, focus groups participants relate their high trust that Canada's food system is working to them because they are not seeing many issues in the news and themselves not often encountering issues with food (such as food recalls, food poisoning, major disease outbreaks, etc.). Some mention they don't think about food safety when buying or eating food, which means this is not an issue that is top of mind for them. Those that have heard of recalls are satisfied with the way companies communicate recalls with the public and deal with them (of note, Costco was often mentioned as a company that they felt provided good and timely information on recalls). Additionally, recalls bring a sense of feeling that the governing bodies (such as the CFIA) are protecting the public in a proactive way. A few also compared the Canadian food system to other countries and believe the Canadian food system is safer. One participant mentioned that they have complained about a grocery store in the past but that the problem was dealt with adequately and with good communication which increased his confidence in the system. Finally, some participants mentioned feeling confident in the system because of the inspections and regulations that are occurring in our food system, while one mentioned that the environment in grocery stores is usually clean which leads them to feel that the food is safe.

Q - What would make you lose confidence in it?

Large systemic issues such as an increase in the number of incidents of people getting sick or an increase in the number of recalls would make many participants lose confidence in the food system in Canada. Additionally, one participant mentioned that if they saw rotting food in grocery stores it would make them lose trust, while another participant mentioned that if a foodborne illness was not reported and “covered up” in the news, it would make them lose confidence. Relaxing the regulations without scientific backing or to increase trade is also something that one participant mentioned would make them lose confidence in the food system while another

mentioned poor communication would make them lose confidence. Finally, a decrease in the number of inspectors would make one participant not confident that the CFIA would be able to protect the public.

*Q - When you hear the term “food recall,” what comes to mind? Q - Who do you think is responsible for issuing food recalls? Q - What organization, if any, do you associate with food recalls? Q - Have you personally seen or heard about a food recall recently? [IF YES] Where did you see or hear about it? Was it something you buy or eat regularly? *If social media is mentioned ask which influencers or individuals do they follow?*

When asked specifically about food recalls, participants associate the CFIA, Health Canada, and private companies with issuing food recalls but they aren’t certain who exactly is responsible for issuing them. In Quebec, MAPAQ is also mentioned as an organization they believe is responsible for issuing food recalls. Things that came to mind when they heard the term “Food recall” included milk, pistachios, the belief that recalls happen in “batches”, undeclared allergens, salads, and issues with labelling. Additionally, some participants associated “food recalls” with someone getting very sick from a food, losing trust in the product temporarily and also a social responsibility to share the recall with others. Finally, some participants see food recalls as positives as it shows the system is working in terms of tests, but also that the safety of the population comes before profit.

Specific food recalls participants have seen or heard of recently included salads from Costco (heard about through a recall from Costco), pistachios and chocolate containing pistachios such as Dubai chocolate (heard about through a recall in the news, on social media and through friends), Pizza Pops (heard about the recall from Costco), carrot juice (heard about this recall in the news) and drinkable yogurts (heard about this recall in the news).

Q - Thinking more broadly... What do you think a food recall says about the food safety system? What do they suggest about how the system works? Q - When there is a problem, do you think the system responds quickly enough? Probe: Do recalls make you feel reassured, concerned, or both?

Participants agree that they believe the food safety system responds quickly enough when there is a problem, and this opinion is driven by the transparency and extensive dissemination of the information (either through social media, news feeds, alerts, etc.) in a timely manner. Additionally, participants mentioned the variety of different sources of dissemination of information (for example, on social media, through traditional news, on the CFIA website, etc.) is positive and maximizes the reach to a majority of the population. On the other hand, some participants mentioned that they believe a food recall indicates that an inspection found something that was non-conforming, or that somebody got sick or made a complaint, but that overall, this indicates the system is working fine as they don’t realistically expect the food system to never have problems.

Some participants were unsure as to whether the system is responding quickly enough as they are unaware of how much time it takes between a problem being raised and the recall being issued, or how many people have been affected. Some participants mentioned they believe the system is currently working well but that if there was an increase in food recalls, this would be cause for concern, while the belief that some recalls are too broad, which causes the population to throw away too much food, was also mentioned. Some participants reported that recalls made them feel anxiety as it made them question whether or not they had consumed or have in their possession the food item concerned, but they feel confident that they are being told the truth and can then act on it.

Q - What helps you decide whether a recall applies to you or not? Probe: Product name, brand, lot code, risk level, where you bought it. Q - When you hear about a food recall, what do you usually do? Probe: Does it matter where the information comes from (for example, social media, news, store notices, or government sources)? Q - Are you more likely to act depending on the source? Q - Do you ever verify the information before taking action? If so, how?

In terms of deciding if food recalls apply to them and what actions they take, participants would check if they owned the affected product, read the recall and see if it only applies to one brand or is broader, check the lot numbers and expiration dates on their products, and see how severe the recall is in terms of effects on health. Some participants mentioned that if they don't have the product, they wouldn't pay too much attention to the recall, while others mentioned they would share the information with friends and family. Some participants mentioned having thrown away a product that was recalled before as they didn't want to wait in line to return a product worth a few dollars. Also mentioned was a recall for a product of a specific brand causing concern that other products from that same brand might not be safe.

Participants report turning to Health Canada, social media, grocery stores, and food manufacturers' websites to verify recall information. Those that rely on social media mentioned that they usually check the information seen on social media on more reputable websites and scientific sources.

Q - Do you feel that food recalls are happening more often than they used to, less often, or about the same? Why do you feel that way? Q - Where do you think that impression comes from (for example, news coverage, social media, personal experience, store notices, etc.)?

Overall, most participants believe that food recalls are happening about as frequently as before, minimal sight of food recalls being issued was also mentioned in support of believing that food recalls are happening less often.

Q - Who do you think is more transparent when something goes wrong – government or companies?

Participants had mixed views on who they believed to be more transparent when something in the food industry goes wrong but overall seemed to favour governments slightly more than private companies. On one hand, those who believe government is more transparent mention that this is the government's job, they are mandated to do so and it's in their interest and their responsibility to protect the public and keep people alive and healthy. Some participants don't trust that private companies would be as transparent because it could hurt their reputation and profits or could lead to legal recourse against them.

On the flip side, those who trust companies more believe companies have an incentive to be transparent as they have a reputation to uphold and it will be more beneficial for them to be honest upfront rather than hide recalls. Also mentioned was the belief that companies would only know if something was wrong if a customer complained as opposed to the government who is more likely to hear of health issues through the health system, along with the belief that companies are more likely to hear about the issue first from direct customer complaints and therefore have an incentive to act quickly to contain the issue and protect their reputation.

Q - If a food recall applied to something you regularly buy, where would you most want to hear about it? What would make you notice and pay attention right away? Is there anything that would make food recalls more helpful or easier to act on for you?

Participants want to hear about food recalls from a variety of sources depending on their level of trust in each news source. Some would like to hear about them on the news (for those who don't trust social media) or on social media for those who use it on a regular basis and regularly share information with others through this mean.

Things that would make them pay attention and act right away include press conferences or class action lawsuits and direct phone notifications (like amber alerts).

Q - Have you ever seen information online about food safety that you later learned was wrong? Are you concerned by the amount of misinformation online? Who do you trust? How do you decide what to believe?

Overall, participants do not recall hearing or seeing information online about food safety that later turned out to be wrong, although many mention they have seen misinformation online related to food that turned out to be false such as the quality of food, weight loss properties of fruits, Chuck-e cheese conspiracy theories, sugar substitutes, Vitamin C, etc. Participants mention that they do not fully trust what they see on social media and are likely to verify the information they see with more reputable sources, with it being mentioned that it can be tiresome to have to verify all the information seen on social media.

In terms of trust, participants would turn to the manufacturers or retailers of the food items, government websites and the Health Canada website, government websites of other countries and major news outlets. Some participants mentioned they would trust social media to verify information, either through the community chats and notes, by asking the AI offered by specific social media companies such as Grok or by watching videos on platforms such as YouTube.

Made in Canada branding

Q - Have you heard of the term “maple washing”? What comes to mind when you hear that term?

Few participants report having heard of the term “Maple washing” in the English groups or its French equivalent “Érablanchiment” in the French groups. Participants associate the term with products being labelled as made in Canada or product of Canada, without it being true, along with using Canadian branding to make products seem more appealing. In Quebec, they associated the term with maple syrup, maple leaf and tree and also associated the term with money laundering. When these ideas were brought up, participants did not like this concept, believed it is done for marketing and to deceive customers, found it upsetting, frustrating and had overall negative reactions.

Q - How important is it to know whether the product you are buying is Canadian, in terms of ingredients and labour, or made in Canada with imported ingredients?

Participants overall find it important for them to know if a product is Canadian, partly because of the current tension with the United States regarding trade and tariffs and their desire to buy Canadian-made products, but also because of the differences in quality control and regulation in other countries. Some participants recognize

that it can be hard to find products that are 100 per cent Canadian and would like to see more transparency in terms of where ingredients are from, what percentage of the product is made with Canadian ingredients, where the product is manufactured, etc. It was also mentioned that the practice in Australia is to show the proportion, by ingoing weight, of the food's Australian ingredients on food labels.

Q - What should the percentage of Canadian ingredients be if the food is labelled as "Product of Canada"? Probe: Do you know what it is for food products? It's 98%, thoughts on this?

Participants are comfortable with a food being labelled as "Product of Canada" if the percentage of Canadian ingredients in the food is at a minimum between 50% to 70%. They recognize that it can be hard to source ingredients strictly from Canada given our winters and restricted growing season.

When informed that the threshold is 98% for food products, most were surprised and found that to be high. Comfort with a product not being made 100% from Canadian ingredients if it supports local jobs in Canada was also mentioned.

C. Understanding of CFIA's mandate and impressions of CFIA

Q - Had you previously heard of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency – The CFIA? What specific activities do you think the CFIA does in terms of safeguarding food safety? Any others?

Participants associate a variety of different activities they believe the CFIA is responsible for, including:

- Approval process of calorie counts on menus and products
- Certifying food as safe to consume
- Food inspections
- Fishing vessel and farm inspections
- Handling complaints related to undeclared ingredients in food
- Regulating ostrich farms
- Inspecting processing plants
- Ensuring restaurants are following health codes

Q - Do you think food safety oversight today relies mostly on physical inspections, or more on data, technology, and science? Does that increase or decrease your confidence?

Participants have mixed views on whether food safety oversight today relies on physical inspections or data and technology but see the value in both approaches. Participants mentioned that they believe it is likely a combination of the two but see data as playing a larger role because of the volume of food and products that need to be regulated, as well as a shortage of inspectors to conduct the physical inspections. Some believe that the process would start with a physical inspection which would record data, while others believe data plays a larger role and that physical inspections are more sporadic or random.

Data driven inspections increase participants' confidence as they believe it is necessary to be able to cover the entire food system which they do not believe can be done with just physical inspections, and it is convenient as oversight can be managed without needing an inspector to physically be in the food manufacturing plant. Also mentioned was the belief that data driven oversight would increase confidence given the perceived potential for

technology to be able to detect and alert to issues that a human would not necessarily catch. Some see AI playing a larger role and are confident in its use.

Q - Do you think companies are held accountable strongly enough when they break food safety rules? Why or why not?

Some participants mentioned they are not confident that companies are held accountable strongly enough when they break food safety rules, with some mentioning that they just get a “slap on the wrist” or that penalties aren’t large enough to make a difference. Some weren’t sure what the actual penalties could be for companies who break food safety rules and are hoping that the government has strong enough legislations and regulations in place to hold them accountable. On the other hand, some believe they are only held accountable once the media start reporting on the issue, if not they might try to keep the issues concealed. Participants could not recall an instance where a company was sued for breaking food safety rules and they believe companies should be held more accountable for this. Though not a prevailing opinion, it was mentioned that companies are held accountable strongly enough when they break food safety rules and believed the penalties were high enough.

Q - Do you think Canada’s food safety standards are higher, lower, or about the same as other countries? Q - Does it matter to you whether other countries trust Canada’s system?

Overall, participants reported believing Canada’s food safety standard are among the highest in the world and often compared them to standards seen in the United States and Europe. There was some agreement that when directly comparing to the United States, they believed Canadian standards are higher, especially for items including GMOs and pesticides, and that Canadian food standards are lower when comparing to those in Europe. Participants noted high levels of trust in the Canadian system and also mentioned having less trust in the safety of food when travelling abroad compared to the trust they have in the safety of food sold in Canada.

In terms of caring whether other countries trust the Canadian food system, participants reported believing it is important that other countries trust our system to keep trade strong and positively impact our economy. They mentioned it is important that other countries have confidence so they want to do business with Canada and that we can continue to export food products. A couple participants also mentioned that it’s important to them for Canadians to have pride in our products and the quality of the products we produce and export.

Belief that it only matters if a country trusts Canada’s system if that country’s standards are at least as high as Canadian standards, was also mentioned, coupled with the belief that it wouldn’t matter how a country viewed Canada’s system if that country had lower standards. Finally, some mentioned believing it’s more important to them that Canadians trust the food system in Canada than what other countries think of it, unless it is for export purposes.

D. Views on plant health and invasive plant pests

Q - When you think about plant health in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others?

Participants mention that when they think about plant health in Canada, the things that come to mind include:

- organic farming;
- chemicals and pesticides used for farming;
- GMOs;
- crops and grains;
- nutrition;
- invasive crops like the Japanese beetle;
- native plants of Canada and their protection;
- bacteria; and,
- spruce budworm.

Q - Do you know what the CFIA does to protect plant health?

Among participants who reported knowing what the CFIA does to protect plant health, familiarity with the experimental farm in Ottawa, with testing conducted on seeds and crops and belief that this is work done by the CFIA to preserve the way plants naturally grow were mentioned. Also mentioned was recollection of the CFIA managing and stopping the spread of the potato wart in PEI.

Participants mentioned that they understand the term “invasive” to mean pests that take over and kill plants, that it could be worms, birds, insects, something that decreases the productivity of crops, and species that outcompete other species.

In terms of invasive pests, they are aware of and their impact, participants mentioned the Japanese beetles, the potato wart, the Emerald ash borer, and a plant species from Japan taking over the shores of the St. Lawrence river (mentioned with no recall of the exact name). The perceived impacts include negative impacts on ecosystems, increase in prices of food impacted by the invasive species, detrimental impacts on the health of animals that feed on the affected plants, health hazards for humans, and a negative financial impact on farmers.

Q - [PROMPT IF Spotted Lanternfly is not mentioned] Have you heard anything about Spotted Lanternfly recently? What about in the last year or two? Q - What do you think the issues with Spotted Lanternfly are? Q - How concerned are you about the potential economic impact of Spotted Lanternfly. Q - Probe: What do you think the economic risk is?

Focus group participants reported not having heard of the Spotted Lanternfly. When presented with the information about the Spotted Lanternfly, participants were concerned about the potential impact on farmers, on the wine industry and the price of wine increasing as a result, and how that could impact the tourism industry in Canada that is closely linked with wineries and the wine industry, with specific mention of detrimental impacts on wineries and tourism in Nova Scotia being mentioned in the Atlantic group.

Q - [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations related to plant health come to mind when you think about plant health in Canada, if any?

Asked what regulations come to mind related to plant health, participants mentioned regulations on the import of plants coming in on boats, regulations for Canadians coming back from vacation as it relates to food and plants they are bringing back into Canada, and regulations as it relates to interprovincial transportation of foods. Additionally, though not a prevailing opinion among focus group participants, unawareness of any regulations related to plant health was raised, which was coupled with a preference for prioritizing the health of humans over plants and belief that regulations related to plant health are not beneficial due to a perceived increase in costs to the consumer as a result of the regulations.

E. Views on animal health and safety

Q - When you think about animal health in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others?

In terms of things that come to the mind of participants when they think of animal health in Canada, participants mentioned:

- Farm and livestock inspections;
- Food preparation and animal slaughter regulations;
- Environmental regulations such as which chemicals can be used around animals;
- Animal feed and ensuring it is of good quality;
- High quality animal products to keep our export commerce strong;
- Chronic diseases in livestock that are a threat to animals and to the prices of food at grocery stores;
- Concerns over large chicken farms and the spread of diseases in them;
- Ethical concerns over slaughter and how animals are treated on farms;
- Zoonoses such as Lyme disease or rabies; and,
- Animals in forests and wild animals acting as vectors for the transmission of diseases.

Q - [PROMPT IF Avian Influenza is not mentioned] Have you heard anything about Avian Influenza or “Bird Flu” recently? What about in the last year or two? Q - How concerned are you about the potential economic impact of Avian influenza? Q - Probe: What do you think the economic risk is? Q - How concerned are you about the potential health impacts of Avian Influenza on humans?

Focus group participants reported being familiar with the avian flu and having heard of it before, although some mentioned having not heard about it recently. They associated it with regular testing in farms, entire herds of animals being killed if one animal tests positive and seeing misinformation online about the topic. Some participants also thought of other birds such as crows, magpies and the northern gannet, being affected by the virus.

Asked about the economic impact, participants mentioned being worried about the price of food increasing, particularly chicken, if farmers have to kill all their chickens when avian flu is detected at their farm. Concern regarding the impact this could have on the farmers that are forced to kill all their chickens was also mentioned, along with recollection of an incident with a farm in British Columbia that had to kill ostriches having a significant negative impact on the farm. Also mentioned was concern about international trade being impacted if we don't abide by the strict regulations and end up being banned from exporting to other countries because of it.

Q - [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations related to animal health come to mind when you think about animal health in Canada, if any?

In terms of regulations related to animal health, focus group participants mention regulations as to how the animals are kept and in what conditions they live.

Q - Are you aware of any regulations around travelling internationally with dogs or other pets? What are they? Q - What organization do you think is involved in this? Q - What specific activities do you think the CFIA does in terms of safeguarding animal health? Any others?

When it comes to regulations around travelling internationally, participants recall signage at borders, including signage along the border between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with messaging along the lines of: “Don’t bring honeybees with you”. Also mentioned were the thought of dogs having to go into quarantine when coming back from outside of Canada and passing a rabies test, along with personal experience of bringing pets to Canada from abroad and the belief that standards for quarantine and control were really low when compared to New Zealand. Participants mentioned believing the CFIA is responsible for enforcing these regulations.

When asked about which specific activity they think the CFIA does in terms of safeguarding animal health, belief farms have a limit on the number of chickens they can have on a farm was mentioned, which helps limit the impact of the avian flu and they believe it has helped contain the avian flu, in contrast to the United-States which has bigger farms and where the impact of the avian flu was larger.

F. Testing the agency look and feel

Q - If the organization responsible for food safety in Canada were a person, how would you describe them? Q - What qualities should they have?

Focus group participants describe the way they want the organization responsible for food and safety in Canada to be as:

- Thorough and diligent;
- Honest and ethical;
- Pays attention to detail, stringent and by the book;
- Teacher's pet and nerd;
- Educated and knowledgeable;
- Well-spoken;
- Caring;
- Curious and investigator-like;
- Someone that takes pride in their work and has a deep sense of responsibility;
- Common sense, rational;
- Analytical, smart, scientific basis for decisions;
- Non-partisan and unbiased;
- Trustworthy; and,
- Quick.

Q - What qualities would concern you?

Focus group participants say the following qualities would concern them if they were found in a person representing the organization responsible for food and safety in Canada:

- A pushover;
- Biased; and,
- Easily influenced.

Though not prevailing opinions, belief that the CFIA should not exist and disagreement with the concept of personifying the organization, coupled with a belief the organization should have a neutral sense and not apply human characteristics to a set of rules were also mentioned.

Next, we want to get your impressions of some potential visual that will represent the Agency. We aren't looking to get you feedback on which specific visual you prefer, but rather the concept overall. Q - Which concept best speaks to the mandate of the Agency? Q - Which concept was your favourite? [R, M OR B]? Q - Why? What about the tag lines? Q - Which concept was your least favourite? [R, M OR B]? Q - Why? What about the tag lines?



Figure 1 - Concept R

Overall, concept R is the least favourite among participants. However, those who did prefer it mentioned they like the clean look of it, the directness of the message, that it gives more of an impression that they are enforcing and administering policies, that they like the tag line “Enabling prosperity” as they believe it is important for Canada to be strong food producers and have abundant food, and they liked how big the Canada logo was on the patch. On the other hand, participants found the taglines in concept R to sound more like a business pitch, too capitalist and too political. Additionally, they find the patch on the arm reminds them of police and is authoritarian, which they did not like as much.

A few participants thought the three taglines were too vague and could apply to many things such as investing in a company as much as the CFIA mandate and didn't clearly explain the activities of the CFIA therefore it didn't represent the CFIA mandate as well as the other concepts. The thought of this concept being more appropriate for the Canada Border Services Agency than the CFIA was also mentioned due to a difficulty in seeing the connection to food in the concept.



Figure 2 - Concept M

Concept M is a favourite for many participants. Those who prefer it mention that they believe it speaks well to the mandate of the CFIA, that they like the visuals in the background as they represent a range of topics that are all linked together, or that they remind them of concepts found in the Canadian Food Guide. The hexagonal shapes being reminiscent of science was also mentioned positively. On the other hand, the hexagons being too reminiscent of the Desjardins bank logo was mentioned in the Quebec group. Among participants who preferred this concept, it was mentioned that this concept would be the most well understood by the general public because it provides a brief overview of the CFIA's mandate. Concept M's background was preferred by many as they mentioned that they like the colours of the background. Conversely it was suggested that the concept employ more of the colour green as opposed to blue, with the colour blue being associated to the police and law enforcement, with the feeling that food was better represented with the colour green.

However, many mentioned they weren't sure about the use of the text "for generations to come" as they didn't find it effective and also contradicted their belief that it is also important to protect Canadians now, not just future generations. Reasoning for liking the tagline "for generations to come" included finding it important to make sure Canada has enough food for its children. The word "securing" was viewed in a positive light among participants who likened it to keeping things safe. However, some participants thought the use of the word "securing" reminded them of border patrols and stopping unauthorized food from getting into Canada.

Of note, in the French groups, the term used in the concept M "Préserver" was preferred over the term "Protéger" found in concept B as they thought "Protéger" implied that there is a threat on health and food safety.



Figure 3 - Concept B

Many participants preferred concept B over the other ones as they thought it was focused and specific to food, animals and safety which they thought represented the CFIA mandate well, and also future focused. They also liked the logos and how they are presented as interconnected, which shows not just the end product in food production but also all the steps that come before. It was also mentioned that the logos are reminiscent of how Canada does provincial signage in parks and national parks, which is viewed as being easily recognized by Canadians. Participants found concept B to be easy to read and not as distracting as R or M which both have logos in their background.

They thought the tagline was forward-thinking, and many preferred the use of the word “safeguarding” as opposed to “securing” which is found on concept M. They thought it grabbed their attention well and what they first see when looking at the concept. Conversely, though not a majority view, it was also mentioned that the logos were too generic, being reminiscent of generic logos found in Microsoft Office images.

Appendix A: Methodology

Nanos conducted a mixed-sample random digit dialing (RDD) dual frame (land and cell lines) hybrid random online survey of 2500 Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older, between January 31 and February 23, 2026.

Participants were randomly recruited by telephone using live agents and administered a survey online. The results were statistically checked and weighted by age and gender using the latest Census information and the sample is geographically stratified to be representative of Canada.

With over 52,000 panelists, the Nanos Online Probability Panel consists of individuals randomly recruited by land and cell lines using live agents. As panelists are randomly recruited, this ensures the panel is representative of Canadians.

This research project is compliant with the terms of the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research. All research conducted complies with the Standards for the Conduct of Government of Canada Public Opinion Research – Online Surveys.

All Nanos surveys are registered in the CRIC Research Verification Service and contain a Research Verification Service (RVS) number. This registration number can be used to check the legitimacy of the research and provide feedback on the research.

Nanos Research monitors ten percent of all fieldwork for quality control and assurance in accordance with the standards of CRIC, European Society for Opinion and Marketing Research and American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Sample characteristics

The following table outlines the sample composition for the survey. Please note this includes the weighted sample. The questions asked to obtain the sample characteristics are contained in the final survey instrument in Appendix B.

Demographic	Total Unweighted	Total Weighted
Age		
18 to 24	189	252
25 to 44	718	825
45 to 64	887	831
65 plus	706	590
Gender		
Male	1318	1218
Female	1182	1280
Other/Prefer not to answer	-	-
Region		
Atlantic	200	168
Quebec	563	575
Ontario	908	968

Demographic	Total Unweighted	Total Weighted
Prairies	463	439
British Columbia	366	348
Education		
High School or less	256	258
College/some university	804	787
Bachelor's Degree or more	1390	1395
Prefer not to answer	50	57
Total household income		
Under \$40,000	197	197
Between \$40,000 and \$100,000	933	903
\$100,000 or above	1099	1126
Prefer not to answer	271	272

Screening

Once invited, participants were administered a set of screening questions to filter out anyone who was not eligible to participate in the study. For the purposes of this study the following screening criteria were applied:

- The first set of screening criteria that were applied are industry standard screening criteria. This involves several components, the first of which is age – in this case, all respondents confirmed they are 18 years of age or older at the time they are taking the survey. Any respondent who indicated they are under 18 years of age or refused to answer the question was not allowed to proceed through the survey.
- Respondents were also screened on their employment situation and the employment situation of their immediate family members/household members. The industry standards required that any respondents who indicated they are employed, or have family members employed, in the market research, advertising and/or media sectors were not allowed to proceed through the survey.

As noted, respondents who fell into any of the above categories were immediately terminated from the research/prevented from proceeding any further and they were no longer eligible to participate in the study.

Fieldwork dates

Fieldwork was conducted between January 31 and February 23, 2026.

Margin of error

The margin of error for the random sample of 2500 Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older, is 2.0 percentage points, plus or minus, nineteen times out of twenty.

Questionnaire design

The CFIA provided Nanos with previous tracking questions, as well as desired topic areas for new questions and draft questions in line with the research objectives. Nanos Research then designed a questionnaire and advised on best practices in question design. Upon approval of the English questionnaire, Nanos translated the questionnaire into French which was then reviewed by the CFIA.

Nanos programmed the questionnaire into our online system, then thoroughly tested the programming in English and French to ensure accuracy ahead of the pre-test and rollout. This procedure ensured that the survey logic accurately reflected the questionnaire and data was collected properly. The final survey questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Interview duration

The average interview length was 17 minutes and ranged from 9 to 26 minutes.

Weighting procedures

Our sampling methodology stratified the population along three key variables which allowed triangulation of the weighting approach and yielded robust, geographic and demographic representation across the country.

The sample was stratified along three axis – by region/province, by sex and by age. Fixed completion quotas, which were anchored by the respective population distribution relative to the national total, were assigned to each province, and regionally in the Territories due to their relative size.

In order to ensure balanced representation within each province/region, the sample was further stratified by sub-regions. This prevented over/under-sampling of geographies (for example, City of Toronto), within the provincial total.

Within each province soft gender/sex quotas were then set which approximate that area's sex distribution. The data collection allowed for a variance of plus or minus five per cent for sex within each region, again preventing over representation by either men or women. The third stratification axis was by age category. The age categories were used to group respondents and for weighting purposes.

Each of the age categories were weighted, within their sex and their province/region, the outcome of which yielded a dataset which accurately reflects the demographic composition of the population at large.

Quality controls

Prior to launching the survey, a pre-test was conducted with 20 individuals (10 English, 10 French). The purpose of the pre-test was to ensure that the content of the questionnaire was understandable, that the duration of the interview fit the target, to ensure comparability between the French and the English, and to ensure that the logic of the survey flowed smoothly. The pre-test was completed on January 20th, 2025.

Upon completion of the pre-test, Nanos and CFIA reviewed the findings and determined no modifications were needed and the survey was deployed to the full sample.

Pre-field procedures – Online

- projects are staffed with employees best suited for the nature and subject matter of the project
- the Survey Field Manager
 - analyzes the general project summary, questionnaires, sample requirements, quota requirements and any special instructions
 - contacts the Client to clarify any grey areas
 - meticulously programs the questionnaire, incorporating all questionnaire logic and project requirements
 - extensively tests the programming to ensure that all possible scenarios are properly programmed
 - forwards the structure of the data file to the Client for approval prior to commencement of the fieldwork
 - if necessary, performs a duplication control check on the sample lists according to the Client's specifications
 - reviews or prepares the survey invitation; gets final approval from client
 - if a pre-test (or "soft launch") is requested, guides the session and provide immediate feedback on questionnaire logic, average duration, sample issues, incidence, etc. to the Client
 - documents all modifications made during the initial project stage and pre-test to support later inquiries on project specifications (questionnaire, sample and quotas)
 - if required, arranges for translation of the questionnaire in the language(s) needed. For verification of translation accuracy, send the translated version(s) to the Client for their review and approval. Also, if requested, arrange a back-translation by separate translators to ensure accurate translation.

Fieldwork procedures – Online

- Before invitation emails are sent, unique PIN numbers are tagged onto the survey links in order to identify and track survey attempts from individual respondents. With a unique PIN, each respondent can only complete the survey once.
- Project Managers oversee the validation and correction of erroneous email addresses. Log records are maintained for each email sent.
- When approximately 10% of the quota target is completed, the Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) questionnaire is checked to ensure question wording, response codes and questionnaire logic are correctly programmed. Actual survey data is used to verify the programming.
- If there are errors or omissions due to questionnaire logic or CAWI programming, data collection is temporarily suspended while the programming is immediately corrected and re-tested.
- Data is also tested for respondent consistency, scanned for patterns (either general or within a specific case). If any record shows an illogical response or a peculiar pattern, it will be investigated, and if it is determined to be unsound, it will be removed from the completed interviews.
- Project Managers regularly check the project connection logs within the online survey system to review the connect time of all respondents who have completed a survey for each project. The connect time (duration) is monitored to find any record that may be questionable (e.g. a survey with a much lower than average duration). If such a record is found, the data for that case will be reviewed and tested, and

if it is determined not to be a valid complete, it will be removed from the completed count and cumulative data

- To reduce non-response error for a web survey, a few techniques are employed.
 - Reminder emails are sent, again containing the survey link
 - Project Managers regularly check on the completion status of web questionnaires. If a partially completed web questionnaire remains uncompleted for over three (or five) days, a reminder email is sent

Call dispositions

The following table outlines the contact disposition for the fieldwork.

Online Survey Contact Disposition	
Total Invitations (a)	23535
Total Completes (b)	2502
Qualified Break-offs (c)	288
Disqualified (d)	15
No response (e)	20730
Contact Rate (b+c+d)/a	11.9%

Response rate

The response rate for this survey was 12%. This was calculated using the Canadian Research Insights Council (CRIC) formula, which has been approved by the Government of Canada (Response Rate = $R/[U + IS + R]$).

Non-response bias

First, there is potential non-response bias based on the profile of the responding sample. Based on our experience, using the RDD dual frame land and cell-line sample represents the optimal and most reliable form of research that requires the least amount of post fieldwork statistical weighting. From a research perspective, the less weighting the better since the data remains random and in its raw form as shared with Nanos.

There was potential for under-coverage among individuals who may not even have access to a land or cell-line to be included in the sample. Nanos managed the non-response bias by statistically checking the demographics of the participating sample group with the Canadian population. Where a valid variance occurred, the dataset was weighted to be consistent with the profile of Canadians 18 years and older, including those, for example, of a lower socio-economic status.

Second, there is the potential non-response bias based on the answers themselves. Although the demographic profile of the sample reflects the Canadian population, hypothetically, the non-responding participants may have different opinions. Although this is a hypothetical possibility, the Nanos track record with respect to both economic and political sentiment which very accurately captures opinion and closely correlates to a number of external measures intended to be examined, suggests that there is little non-response bias in the Nanos methodology.

Also, of note, the positive reputation of Nanos as Canada's most trusted research organization has a material impact on both response rates and, in our opinion, non-response bias.

There are a number of ways to estimate any non-response bias to a data set which could be used as a data check. First the key line results of the 'early completers' could be compared against the responses of those who only completed the survey later in the data collection process/after reminder message(s) had been sent.

As those who complete research late in the field window can share characteristics of non-responders, any variations in the initial vs later responses could be indicative of any non-response bias in the data set.

Qualitative

The focus groups conducted online included Canadian consumers, 18 years of age and older in the following regions:

- Quebec (two groups),
- Ontario (one groups)
- Prairies (one group)
- Atlantic Canada (one group)
- British Columbia (one group)

The two (2) Quebec groups were conducted in French and the remainder were in English. Each session was up to 90 minutes in length.

The sessions were distributed as follows:

Date and time	Region
March 3 rd at 5:30PM ET	Ontario
March 3 rd at 7:30PM ET	Prairies
March 4 th at 5:30PM ET	Atlantic Canada
March 4 th at 7:30PM ET	British Columbia
March 5 th at 5:00PM ET	Quebec
March 5 th at 7:00PM ET	Quebec

Each group had between 7 to 9 participants (target of 8-10), with 10 being recruited per group to achieve this target. A total of 49 participants attended the focus groups out of a total of 60 individuals recruited.

Recruitment

Nanos Research developed the recruitment screener and provided it to CFIA for review prior to finalizing. Participants were screened to ensure they met the target age (18+) and that they had the needed technology to participate.

Participants were also screened to ensure the groups included a mix of gender, education, age and that they would be comfortable voicing their opinions in front of others. Normal focus group exclusions were in place (marketing research, media and employment in the federal government and recent related focus group attendance). All participants received \$125 in appreciation of their time.

Participants were recruited online from the Nanos Probability Panel and were administered the recruiting screener online (See Appendix C). Only those who qualified were invited to participate in the group discussions. Across all groups, 60 participants were recruited and 49 attended.

All groups were video and audio recorded for use in subsequent analysis by the research team. During the recruitment process, participants provided consent to such recording and were given assurances of anonymity.

Moderation

Nik Nanos, Senior Research, moderated the groups on March 3rd. Alexandra Apalavoa, Senior Researcher, moderated the focus group session on March 4th and 5th, 2026.

All qualitative research work was conducted in accordance with professional standards and applicable government legislation (e.g. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act [PIPEDA]).

Participant Profile

Profile	Number of Participants
Gender	Count
Male	25
Female	23
Other	1
Age	Count
18 to 34 years	12
35 to 44 years	7
45 to 54 years	9
55 to 64 years	10
65 plus	11
Income	Count
Less than \$20K	1
\$20K to just under \$40K	2
\$40K to just under \$60K	5
\$60k to just under \$80K	6
\$80K to just under \$100K	7
\$100K to just under \$120K	9
\$120K to just under \$150K	7
More than \$150K	12
Prefer not to say	-
Region/Province	Count
Quebec	16
Ontario	9
Prairies	8
Atlantic Canada	8
British Columbia	8
Territories	-
Total	49

Appendix B: Survey questionnaire

Thank you for your interest in participating in this 13-15 minute research survey conducted on behalf of the Government of Canada. This is entirely voluntary and all the views and information you share with Nanos Research will be confidential and protected in accordance with Canada's privacy laws. Thank you, in advance, for sharing your time.

Si vous préférez répondre au sondage en français, veuillez cliquer sur « français » dans le coin supérieur droit de l'écran.

This research project is registered with the CRIC Research Verification Service that allows you to verify its legitimacy and share your feedback. If you have feedback on this research, you can share it by going to <https://canadianresearchinsightscouncil.ca/rvs> and using the RVS code: XYZ.

Contact: If you have any questions or require more information about the study itself, or for technical support with the survey, accessibility requirements, or to request to complete the survey over the phone you can contact ebossard@nanosresearch.com. If you have any questions regarding the administration of this study, you may contact the Senior Researcher, Nik Nanos at nik@nanos.co.

A. Are you 18 years of age or older?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No (*Terminate – not qualified*)

B. Do you or does anyone in your immediate family, work in any of the following occupations?

- ☐ Market research firm (*Terminate – not qualified*)
☐ TV, radio or news media (*Terminate – not qualified*)
☐ Advertising company (*Terminate – not qualified*)

•
 The objective of this research is to help the Government of Canada understand the perceptions that Canadians have regarding the safety of food and the protection of plant and animal health in Canada.

ASK ALL

1. In what year were you born? **[DROP DOWN BOX 1900-2025] → IF 2008-2025, TERMINATE**
 Prefer not to answer99

IF RESPONDENT SELECTS "PREFER NOT TO ANSWER" AT

Q1, ASK Q2:

2. Would you be willing to indicate in which of the following age categories you belong?

- Younger than 18 years old **TERMINATE**..... 1
 18 to 24..... 2
 25 to 34..... 3
 35 to 44..... 4
 45 to 54..... 5
 55 to 64..... 6
 65 or older 7
 Prefer not to answer 99 [TERMINATE]

3. In which province or territory do you live?

British Columbia	1
Alberta	2
Saskatchewan	3
Manitoba	4
Ontario	5
Quebec	6
New Brunswick	7
Prince Edward Island	8
Nova Scotia	9
Newfoundland and Labrador.....	10
Yukon.....	11
Northwest Territories	12
Nunavut.....	13
Outside Canada	14 [TERMINATE]
Prefer not to answer	99 [TERMINATE]

ASK ALL

4. **[TRACKING]** Which of the following statements best describes your role and responsibility when it comes to grocery shopping for your family or household?[SELECT ONE]
- | | |
|--|----|
| I am solely responsible | 1 |
| I share in this responsibility..... | 2 |
| Somebody else in my family or household looks after grocery shopping | 3 |
| Prefer not to say | 99 |
5. **[TRACKING – TWEAKED]** What factors are most important to you when choosing food to buy? (Select up to three)
[RANDOMIZE]
- | | |
|---|----------------|
| Price..... | 1 |
| Nutritional value..... | 2 |
| Taste | 3 |
| Convenience | 4 |
| Allergy safe | 5 |
| Meets my dietary needs (i.e. gluten free) | 6 |
| Freshness..... | 7 |
| [New] Environmental impact | 8 |
| [New] Product of Canada | 9 |
| Other (Specify)..... | 20 |
| None of the above | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |
6. **[TRACKING]** Do you or does anyone you make food purchasing decisions for have any food allergies or sensitivities?
[SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
- | | |
|--|----------------|
| Yes, myself..... | 1 |
| Yes, somebody I make food purchasing decisions for | 2 |
| No | 3 [EXCLUSIVE] |
| Unsure | 77 [EXCLUSIVE] |

MAIN SURVEY**SECTION A – CFIA KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

ASK ALL – DO NOT SHOW HEADERS Rotate start

UNAIDED AWARENESS

7. [TRACKING] When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to **food safety**, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

PROVIDE 5 BOXES. RECORD THE ORDER THAT THE BRANDS ARE MENTIONED.

UNAIDED AWARENESS

8. [TRACKING] When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to safeguarding **animal health and protecting against animal diseases**, which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

PROVIDE 5 BOXES. RECORD THE ORDER THAT THE BRANDS ARE MENTIONED.

UNAIDED AWARENESS

9. [TRACKING] When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to safeguarding and protecting **plant health** which organizations come to mind? Please type one organization per box for as many organizations as you can think of. [OPEN]

PROVIDE 5 BOXES. RECORD THE ORDER THAT THE BRANDS ARE MENTIONED.

AIDED AWARENESS

10. **[TRACKING REQUIREMENT A1[M]:]** When thinking of organizations that are responsible for **safeguarding the nation's supply of food, animals, and plants**, which of the following come to mind? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY] **RANDOMIZE**
- | | |
|---|----------------|
| The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) | 1 |
| Municipal inspectors (for example, public health inspectors) | 2 |
| Provincial food safety regulators (Provincial or Territorial governments) | 3 |
| Health Canada | 4 |
| Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada | 5 |
| Public Health Agency of Canada | 6 |
| Businesses | 7 |
| None of the above | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |

FAMILIARITY WITH THE CFIA

The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) is dedicated to safeguarding food, animals and plants, which enhances the health and well-being of Canada's people, environment and economy. Reducing risks to food safety, plant health and animal health are CFIA priorities, and the health and safety of Canadians are key forces behind the design and development of CFIA programs.

ASK ALL

11. **[TRACKING]** How familiar would you say you are with the activities of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)?
Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'very familiar'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not familiar at all'.

1 (Not familiar at all).....	1
2.....	2
3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7 (Very familiar)	7
Unsure	77

ASK ALL

12. **A3: [TRACKING]** Where have you seen, heard, or read about the CFIA? Select all that apply [RANDOMIZE]
- | | |
|--|----------------|
| Word of mouth (friends, family, etc.)..... | 1 |
| Social media (not including CFIA social media) | 2 |
| Podcasts..... | 3 |
| A digital assistant (for example, Alexa, Siri, Google Home)..... | 4 |
| Traditional media (newspapers, TV, radio) | 5 |
| Internet (includes online news sites but not social media) | 6 |
| Direct contact from the CFIA (includes CFIA social media and visiting the CFIA website) | 7 |
| Not applicable: have not seen, heard or read anything about the CFIA | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |
13. **[TRACKING]** Select all the following that apply to you: [RANDOMIZE]
- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| I subscribe to CFIA food recall notices..... | 1 [ASK Q15 (A3Ai)] |
| I submitted a food safety or labelling concern | 2 [ASK Q14 (A3Aii)] |
| I follow the CFIA on a social media platform..... | 3 |
| I have visited the CFIA website | 4 [Ask Q16] |
| I have contacted the CFIA by phone..... | 5 |
| I have contacted the CFIA by email or through the website | 6 [ASK Q16] |
| I have had an in-person interaction with a CFIA employee | 7 |
| I have a friend or family member who works at the CFIA | 8 |
| None of the above | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |
14. **[IF REPORTED FOOD CONCERN – Q13 = 2][TRACKING]** A3Aii: How satisfied are you with the CFIA handling of the food safety or labelling concern you reported? Use a scale of 0-10 where 0 is "not at all satisfied" and 10 is "very satisfied".
- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 0 (Not at all satisfied) | 0 |
| 1..... | 1 |
| 2..... | 2 |

3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7.....	7
8.....	8
9.....	9
10 (Very satisfied).....	10
Unsure	77

15. [IF SUBSCRIBES TO RECALL NOTICES – Q13 = 1][TRACKING] A3Ai: How satisfied are you that the CFIA issues food recall notices in a timely manner? Use a scale of 0-10 where 0 is “not at all satisfied” and 10 is “very satisfied”.

0 (Not at all satisfied)	0
1.....	1
2.....	2
3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7.....	7
8.....	8
9.....	9
10 (Very satisfied).....	10
Unsure	77

[Ask web visitors only]

16. [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE – Q13 = 4 OR 6] [TRACKING] When did you last visit the CFIA website?

Within the last week.....	1
Within the last month	2
Within the last 3 months	3
Within the last 6 months	4
More than 6 months ago	5
Don't recall/unsure.....	77

17. [NEW][IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE – Q13 = 4 OR 6] What type of information were you looking for? [RANDOMIZE] (Select all that apply)

Food recall	1	
Travelling with pets	2	
Information of returning to Canada with food items	3	
Allergens.....	4	
Invasive species or plant pests	5	
Animal diseases	6	
Labelling requirements (including a labelling complaint)	7	

Other information (please specify) _____ 20

18. [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE – Q13 = 4 OR 6] [TRACKING] How easy or difficult was it to find the information you were looking for on the CFIA website?
- Very easy1
 Somewhat easy2
 Neither difficult nor easy3
 Somewhat difficult4
 Very difficult5
 Don't recall/unsure.....77
19. [IF VISITED CFIA WEBSITE – Q13 = 4 OR 6] [TRACKING] How easy or difficult was it to understand the information on the CFIA website?
- Very easy1
 Somewhat easy2
 Neither difficult nor easy3
 Somewhat difficult4
 Very difficult5
 Don't recall/unsure.....77
20. [TRACKING] Have you ever changed your food buying habits because of a recall or food safety issue?
- Yes1 [GO TO Q21]
 No2 [SKIP TO Q23]
 Not sure/rather not say.....77 [SKIP TO Q23]
21. [IF YES TO Q20] [TRACKING] How did your food buying habits change? [OPEN]
22. [IF YES TO Q20] [TRACKING] How long did this change last? [OPEN]
23. [TRACKING] Please rank the following types of foods, where 1 is the type you are the most concerned about in terms of foodborne illness, 2 the second most concerned about, etc. [RANDOMIZE]
- Imported foods.....
 [TWEAKED – SPLIT] Meat products (fresh).....
 Fresh produce (fruits and vegetables).....
 Fish and Seafood (including shellfish)
 Manufactured food products (Packaged snacks, ready-to-eat meals, juice, and baked goods).....
 [NEW] Ready-to-eat meat products (e.g. deli meat).....
 Other (please specify).....
 Unsure

ASK ALL - TRUST

24. [TRACKING] **TRACKING REQUIREMENT A5:** Please indicate how much you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to do what is right to help ensure that food is safe in Canada? *Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.*
- 1 (Do not trust at all)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66

7 (Trust completely)7
 Unsure77

ASK ALL

25. **[TRACKING]** How much do you trust the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to inspect that food product labels have indications regarding ingredients that may cause allergy/food sensitivity? *Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'trust completely'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all'.*

1 (Do not trust at all)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 7 (Trust completely)7
 Unsure77

26. **[TRACKING - TWEAKED]** Please rank your level of trust in the following types of professionals as sources of information on food, animal and plant safety, where 1 is the most trusted, 2 the second most trusted, 3 the third most trusted and so on **[RANDOMIZE]**

Government scientists.....
 Canadian farmers
 Farmers from outside Canada
 Mainstream media journalists.....
 Canadian food manufacturers.....
 Private sector scientists.....
 Academic scientists
 Government experts.....
 Social media influencers.....
 Bloggers
 Freelance journalists
 [NEW] Veterinarians.....
 [NEW] CFIA Inspectors.....
 Unsure
 Do not trust any of them [EXCLUSIVE]

ASK ALL

27. **[TRACKING] Tracking Requirement A7:** Please rate your level of confidence that food sold in Canada is safe. *–Please use the 7-point scale below for your response. A rating of 7 indicates 'very confident'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not at all confident'.*

1 (Not at all confident)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 7 (Very confident).....7
 Unsure77

ASK ALL

[RANDOMIZE ORDER OF Q28 TO Q30]

28. [TRACKING] A7a: When it comes to verifying that food sold in Canada is safe, how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? *Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.*
- 1 (Not doing well)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 7 (Doing well)7
 Unsure77
29. [TRACKING] A7b: When it comes to safeguarding plant health (regulating invasive species such as insects, seeds, plants, snails and slugs that can cause serious damage to Canada's environment and economy), how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? *Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.*
- 1 (Not doing well)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 7 (Doing well)7
 Unsure77
30. [TRACKING] A7c: When it comes to safeguarding animal health and preventing the spread of animal diseases, how well do you believe the Canadian Food Inspection Agency is doing? *Please use the 7-point scale below for your responses. A rating of 7 indicates 'doing well'. A rating of 1 indicates 'not doing well'.*
- 1 (Not doing well)1
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 7 (Doing well)7
 Unsure77
31. [NEW] Were you aware the CFIA uses a variety of enforcement actions including monetary penalties, suspensions, cancellations, charges laid, prosecution bulletins, food safety investigations and reports?
- Yes, I was aware1
 No, I was not aware2
 Not sure99
32. [New] In your opinion, are the enforcement actions sufficient, somewhat sufficient, somewhat not sufficient or not sufficient to encourage businesses to comply with the CFIA regulations?
- Sufficient1
 Somewhat sufficient2
 Somewhat not sufficient3

Not sufficient4
 Not sure99

33. [TRACKING] How important is the issue of food fraud to you when buying food? On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is very important. Food fraud is when food is misrepresented. It can include things like substituting a product with something different than advertised, mixing in other ingredients and not including them on the label, making false claims or misleading statements (saying something is preservative free when it isn't) or mislabeling a product as something it is not (labelling farmed salmon as wild salmon).
- 1 (Not at all important).....1
 2.....2
 3.....3
 4.....4
 5.....5
 6.....6
 7 (Very important)7
 Don't know/prefer not to say77
34. [TRACKING] Do you think CFIA should publish the names of companies that have been found to have misrepresented food?
- Yes1
 No2
 Don't know77
35. [TRACKING] What action(s) would you take if you thought that a food product you purchased was fraudulent or misrepresented? *SELECT ALL THAT APPLY [RANDOMIZE]*
- Throw the product away1
 Report the issue.....2
 Other (please specify):.....20
 None of the above. I probably would not take any action3 [EXCLUSIVE]
 Don't know/Prefer not to say77 [EXCLUSIVE]
36. [TRACKING] Who would you report the food fraud issue to? *SELECT ALL THAT APPLY [RANDOMIZE]*
- Manufacturer1
 Retailer2
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)3
 A Government of Canada department other than the CFIA4
 Provincial public health authority5
 Local/regional public health authority6
 Police7
 Better Business Bureau8
 Other (please specify):20
 Would not report the issue9 [EXCLUSIVE]
 Don't know/Prefer not to say77 [EXCLUSIVE]

[NEW] MIS and DIS INFORMATION

37. [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on food safety?
- 1 (Not at all concerned)1
 2.....2
 3.....3
 4.....4

- 5.....5
 6.....6
 7 (Very concerned)7
 Don't know/prefer not to say77

38. [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on animal health and safety?

- 1 (Not at all concerned)1
 2.....2
 3.....3
 4.....4
 5.....5
 6.....6
 7 (Very concerned)7
 Don't know/prefer not to say77

39. [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on the impact of non-native invasive species on plant health?

- 1 (Not at all concerned)1
 2.....2
 3.....3
 4.....4
 5.....5
 6.....6
 7 (Very concerned)7
 Don't know/prefer not to say77

40. [NEW] How concerned are you with false or misleading information affecting your decision-making on environmental impact issues?

- 1 (Not at all concerned)1
 2.....2
 3.....3
 4.....4
 5.....5
 6.....6
 7 (Very concerned)7
 Don't know/prefer not to say77

41. [NEW] How do you know when information on food, animal and plant safety is untrustworthy or misleading? [OPEN]

CFIA BRAND ATTRIBUTES ASSESSMENT (DO NOT SHOW HEADER)[DRIVER ANALYSIS]

[TRACKING] On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means you completely disagree and 10 means you completely agree, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the CFIA [**RANDOMIZE**]

42. The CFIA protects the health and safety of food in Canada
 43. The CFIA protects the health and safety of animals in Canada
 44. The CFIA protects the health and safety of plants in Canada
 45. I trust that the CFIA makes decisions based on science
 46. The CFIA helps ensure the safety of people with food allergies and sensitivities through food label regulations
 47. I trust the CFIA when they issue a food recall
 0 (Completely disagree).....0

1.....	1
2.....	2
3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7	7
8.....	8
9.....	9
10 (Completely agree)	10
Unsure/not applicable	77

SECTION B – CFIA MESSAGE EVALUATION [DRIVER ANALYSIS]

B1: [TRACKING] Below are some statements to describe the activities of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is disagree completely and 7 is agree completely, how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? [RANDOMIZE]

48. [SPLIT SAMPLE] By protecting Canada's food, animals and plants, the CFIA is contributing to [ROTATE – SPLIT SAMPLE] the health and well-being of Canadians OR the health and well-being of the environment OR the economy
49. As a science-based regulator, the CFIA is believable when it issues a statement
50. The CFIA issues food recall warnings in a timely manner
51. The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure animals are transported humanely
52. The CFIA enforces regulations that help ensure Canada's plant resources are protected
53. CFIA enforcement activities are strong enough to encourage companies to comply with the regulations
54. CFIA helps to facilitate international trade

1 (Disagree completely).....	1
2.....	2
3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7 (Agree completely)	7
Unsure/not applicable	77

SPLIT SAMPLE for Q55 and Q56.

55. B8A. [TRACKING] Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Spotted Lantern Fly?

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure	77
56. B8B. [TRACKING] Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in preventing the spread of pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer?

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure	77
57. [TRACKING] Were you aware that the CFIA plays an important role in detecting and addressing animal diseases such as Avian Influenza (bird flu)?

Yes	1
No	2

Not sure77

58. [TRACKING] Were you aware that the CFIA helps establish new markets for Canada's food, animal and plant businesses?

Yes1

No2

Not sure77

59. [NEW] Have you read, heard or seen anything recently about pistachios, and pistachio products being recalled in Canada?

Yes1

No2

Not sure77

There have recently been a series of recalls involving Salmonella in Pistachio Nuts. Recalls involve both the nuts themselves as well as products made containing nuts.

60. [NEW] How concerned are you about the pistachio recalls on a scale of 1-10 where 1 is not at all concerned and 10 is very concerned.

1 (not at all concerned)1

22

33

44

55

66

77

88

99

10 (very concerned)10

Unsure77

61. [NEW] Why do you rate your concern as [insert recalled number]? Please be as specific as possible. [OPEN]

62. [NEW] How confident are you that the Government of Canada is taking the right actions to protect consumers from the issues related to the pistachio recalls? Use a scale of 1-10 where 1 is not at all confident and 10 is very confident.

1 (not at all confident)1

22

33

44

55

66

77

88

99

10 (very confident)10

Unsure77

LIFESTYLE / ACTIVITIES

63. [TRACKING - TWEAKED] Which of the following descriptions would you say describe you at least somewhat?
[RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Foodie (someone who is actively looking to try new food experiences) 1

Camper	2
Cottager	3
Hobby farmer	4
Bird enthusiast.....	5
Gardener.....	6
Nature enthusiast.....	7
Hiker	8
Pet owner	9
Animal lover	10
Somebody concerned with food safety.....	11
Someone with health issues.....	12
[NEW] Someone with food allergies.....	13
[NEW] Someone who is concerned about climate change	14
[NEW] Someone who is concerned about the environment.....	15
None of them	16 [EXCLUSIVE]

[TRACKING][RELATIONSHIP WITH FOOD SAFETY] On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is completely disagree and 10 is completely agree, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [RANDOMIZE]

64. I make a point to be informed about recall notices or other food safety notices
 65. I carefully read labels when purchasing food due to my or someone else's food allergies or sensitivities
 66. I usually throw out food just because the best before date has passed
 67. A best before date means the same thing as an expiry date

0 (completely disagree)	0
1.....	1
2.....	2
3.....	3
4.....	4
5.....	5
6.....	6
7.....	7
8.....	8
9.....	9
10 (completely agree).....	10
Unsure	77

68. [TRACKING] What are the top five sources of information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety or food product ingredients (including product labels) you go to most often? Select up to five.

[RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Internet/website	1
Google search	2
Social media	3 [ASK Q69]
Media (TV, newspaper, magazine)	4
Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) website	5
Other Government of Canada website	6
Provincial government website	7
Industry association.....	8
Family/Friends/neighbours	9
Podcasts.....	10
Social media influencers.....	11
Other, please specify ____	20

None/I don't look for information about this 99 [EXCLUSIVE]

69. [TRACKING] **[ASK ONLY IF Q68=03]** What social media channels do you go to most often for information about plant health, animal health, travelling with pets, food safety, or food product ingredients (including product labels)?

[RANDOMIZE][SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

Facebook1
 Instagram2
 X (formerly Twitter)3
 TikTok4
 YouTube5
 Reddit6
 Pinterest7
 Threads8
 Bluesky9
 Other social media20
 Unsure77 [EXCLUSIVE]

70. [NEW] Please rate your level of trust that the information on [rotate Facebook, Instagram, X, YouTube] is accurate where 0 is not at all accurate and 10 is very accurate.

0 (not at all accurate)0
 11
 22
 33
 44
 55
 66
 77
 88
 99
 10 (very accurate)10
 Unsure77

DEMOGRAPHICS – ALL TRACKING QS

The following information is collected for classification purposes only.

ASK ALL

71. [TWEAKED] What is your gender?

Man 1
 Woman2
 Other - Please specify 20
 Prefer not to answer99

ASK ALL

72. What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

Less than a high school diploma or equivalent1
 High school diploma or equivalent2

Registered apprenticeship or other trades certificate or diploma	3
College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma.....	4
University certificate or diploma below bachelor's level	5
Bachelor's degree	6
Graduate degree above bachelor's level	7
Prefer not to answer	99

ASK ALL

73. What language do you speak most often at home? Select all that apply
- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| English | 1 |
| French..... | 2 |
| Other (Specify) | 20 |
| Prefer not to answer | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |

ASK ALL

74. Which of the following best describes your total household income last year, before taxes, from all sources for all household members?
- | | |
|---|----|
| Under \$20,000..... | 1 |
| \$20,000 to just under \$40,000 | 2 |
| \$40,000 to just under \$60,000 | 3 |
| \$60,000 to just under \$80,000 | 4 |
| \$80,000 to just under \$100,000 | 5 |
| \$100,000 to just under \$150,000 | 6 |
| \$150,000 and above | 7 |
| Prefer not to answer | 99 |

ASK ALL

75. Are you an Indigenous person? *An Indigenous person is a member of a First Nation, a Métis or an Inuk (Inuit). First Nations (North American Indians) include Status and Non-Status Indians.*
- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Yes | 1 [GO TO Q76] |
| No | 2 [SKIP TO Q77] |
| Prefer not to answer | 99 [SKIP TO Q77] |
76. You indicated that you are an Indigenous person. If you wish to provide further details, please specify the group to which you belong. [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]
- | | |
|---|----------------|
| First Nations (North American Indian) | 1 |
| Métis..... | 2 |
| Inuk (Inuit) | 3 |
| Other (Specify) | 20 |
| Prefer not to answer | 99 [EXCLUSIVE] |

ASK ALL

77. Are you a member of a visible minority group? *A member of a visible minority in Canada may be defined as someone (other than an Aboriginal person) who is non-white in colour or race, regardless of place of birth. For example: Black, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South Asian or East Indian, Southeast Asian, non-white West Asian, North African or Arab, non-white Latin American, person of mixed origin (with one parent in one of the visible minority groups in this list), or other visible minority group.*

Yes1 [GO TO Q78]
 No2 [SKIP TO Q79]
 Prefer not to answer99 [SKIP TO Q79]

78. [IF R1 IN Q77] You indicated that you are a member of a visible minority group. If you wish to provide further details, please select the box(es) that apply to you. (Mark all that apply.)

Black1
 Chinese2
 Filipino3
 Japanese4
 Korean5
 South Asian/East Indian (including: Indian from India; Bangladeshi;
 Pakistani; East Indian from Guyana, Trinidad, East Africa; etc.)6
 Southeast Asian (including: Burmese; Cambodian;
 Laotian; Thai; Vietnamese; etc.)7
 Non-White West Asian, North African or Arab (including: Egyptian;
 Libyan; Lebanese; Iranian; etc.)8
 Non-White Latin American (including: indigenous persons from Central
 and South America, etc.)9
 Person of mixed origin (with one parent in one of the visible minority groups)10
 Other visible minority group (specify)20
 Prefer not to answer99 [EXCLUSIVE]

ASK ALL

79. Please enter the first three digits of your postal code. [Code as rural and urban] **[ALLOW 3 DIGITS FOR ENTRY]**
 Prefer not to answer99

Thank you very much for your time.

Appendix C: Qualitative Research Instruments

C.1 Recruiting Screener

We are recruiting Canadians to take place in online focus group discussions on behalf of Nanos Research, a Canadian public opinion research company. We are organizing a series of virtual discussion groups for the Government of Canada to explore various issues of importance to the country. Results from this research will help the Government of Canada gauge the views of Canadians and gather in-depth insights from specific regions. The format is a discussion with up to ten people. The group will take place in the evening, and it will last no more than 90 minutes. People who take part will receive an honorarium to thank them for their time. If you are interested in participating, please answer the following questions to ensure we have a good mix of people. This would take about five minutes of your time. Your participation is completely voluntary and confidential.

Participation is voluntary and your decision to participate will not affect any dealings you may have with the Government of Canada. We are interested in hearing your opinions; no attempt will be made to sell you anything or change your point of view. The format is a “round table” discussion lead by a research professional from Nanos Research. All opinions expressed will remain anonymous and views will be grouped together to ensure no particular individual can be identified in accordance with laws designed to protect your privacy. The focus groups will take place between March 3rd and 5th, 2026.

1. Do you have a tablet or computer on which you can make a video call?

Yes

[] - **Qualified**

No

[] – **Not qualified**

2. Would you say you are comfortable, somewhat comfortable, somewhat uncomfortable or uncomfortable in using the following?

a. Computer

b. Tablet

Comfortable1

Somewhat comfortable2

Somewhat uncomfortable3 – **Not qualified**

Uncomfortable4 – **Not qualified**

3. Would you say you are comfortable, somewhat comfortable, somewhat uncomfortable or uncomfortable in using the Zoom virtual meeting platform?

Comfortable1

Somewhat comfortable2

Somewhat uncomfortable3 – **Not qualified**

Uncomfortable4 – **Not qualified**

TERMINATE IF NOT QUALIFIED IN Q1, 2 OR 3.

4. What is your gender? [OPEN] [AIM FOR ABOUT 50/50 GENDER MIX]

5a. Have you ever attended a focus group discussion or an interview which was arranged in advance and for which you received a sum of money?

Yes ☐ - **Max ½ of total recruits**

No ☐ – **Min ½ of total recruits**

NOTE: If “no” go to Q5d

5b. When did you last attend a focus group or an interview? ____ **Terminate if in the past 6 months**

5c. What topics have you discussed? _____ - **Terminate if food, plant or animal safety topics related**

5d. Have you been invited to attend a focus group or interview in the near future?

Yes ☐ – **Terminate**

No ☐

6a. Have you ever worked in any of the following industries?
Terminate if “Yes” to any in 6a or 6b.

	<u>6a</u>		<u>6b</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Market Research	☐	☐	☐	☐
Advertising.....	☐	☐	☐	☐
Any media (Radio, TV, Print).....	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public relations	☐	☐	☐	☐

6b. Do any members of your family currently work for...**REPEAT ABOVE LIST**

7. What year were you born in? _____ - 18 years and older only – **Ensure mix**

8. For verification purposes only, what is your postal code? _____

9. Which of the following categories best describes your household income, that is the income from all people living at your residence [read list] – **Ensure mix**
- Under \$20,000 []
- \$20,000 to just under \$40,000 []
- \$40,000 to just under \$60,000 []
- \$60,000 to just under \$80,000 []
- \$80,000 to just under \$100,000 []
- \$100,000 to just under \$120,000 []
- \$120,000 to just under \$150,000 []
- \$150,000 and above []
- Prefer not to answer [] – **Prompt**
10. Which of the following is the highest level of education you have achieved?
- Some high school 1
- Completed high school..... 2
- Some college or university 3
- Completed college..... 4
- Completed university 5
- Completed graduate studies 6
- Refuse/No Answer 99
11. Participants in group discussions are asked to voice their opinions and thoughts and sometimes even asked to explain their feelings to others in the group. How comfortable are you in voicing your opinions in front of others?
- Are you...
- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Very Comfortable | [] |
| Comfortable | [] |
| Fairly Comfortable | [] - TERMINATE |
| Not Very Comfortable | [] - TERMINATE |
| Very Uncomfortable | [] - TERMINATE |
12. You may be asked to open a link and complete a short online poll, read a document or view visuals on the screen during the online focus group session. Do you have any concerns or would you need any accommodations to facilitate your participation in the group? [OPEN]

13. These sessions will be offered in both official languages. Which is your preferred language to use when participating in an online focus group discussion? Please note that whichever language you select cannot be changed later on. [NOTE IF PARTICIPANT REQUESTS TO PARTICIPATE IN NON-MAJORITY LANGUAGE OF PROVINCE WE WILL ALLOW THEM TO PARTICIPATE IN A GROUP WITH THEIR PREFERRED LANGUAGE]

English1
 French.....2

NOTE: ALL PARTICIPANTS MUST BE VERY ARTICULATE, VERY OUTGOING, AND WILLING TO EXPRESS THEIR THOUGHTS EASILY AND OPENLY.

14. In what province or territory do you live?

Newfoundland and Labrador..... 1 [ATLANTIC]
 Prince Edward Island 2 [ATLANTIC]
 Nova Scotia 3 [ATLANTIC]
 New Brunswick 4 [ATLANTIC]
 Québec 5 [QUEBEC]
 Ontario 6 [ONTARIO/NU]
 Manitoba 7 [PRAIRIES]
 Saskatchewan 8 [PRAIRIES]
 Alberta 9 [PRAIRIES]
 British Columbia 10 [BC]
 Yukon..... 11 [BC]
 Northwest Territories 12 [BC]
 Nunavut..... 13 [ONTARIO/NU]
 Prefer not to answer **[TERMINATE]**.....99

15. [IF OPTIONS 1-4 IN Q14 - ATLANTIC] Are you available on March 4th at 6:30pm AT?

Yes1 [SKIP TO END TEXT]
 No3 [THANK AND TERMINATE]

16. [IF OPTION 5 IN Q14 - QUEBEC] Are you available on March 5th at either of the following times?

5pm ET1 [SKIP TO END TEXT]
 7pm ET2 [SKIP TO END TEXT]
 No3 [THANK AND TERMINATE]

17. [IF OPTION 6 IN Q14 – ONTARIO/NU] Are you available on March 3rd at 5:30pm ET?

Yes1 [SKIP TO END TEXT]
 No3 [THANK AND TERMINATE]

18. [IF OPTIONS 7-9 IN Q14 - PRAIRIES] Are you available on March 3rd at 5:30pm MT/6:30pm CT?

Yes1 [SKIP TO END TEXT]
 No3 [THANK AND TERMINATE]

19. [IF OPTIONS 10-13 IN Q14 – BC/NWT/YK] Are you available on March 4th at 4:30pm PT?

Yes1 [SKIP TO END TEXT]

No3 [THANK AND TERMINATE]

Thank you for your interest in participating in the focus groups. You will be contacted within 24 to 48 hours to confirm your participation. Please note participation will be confirmed on a first come, first served basis and you may be added to a waitlist if the group is already full.

The online focus group will be facilitated by an experienced professional moderator and will last approximately 90 minutes. You will receive \$125 for your time. Only those who show up for the focus group discussion at the scheduled time will receive the \$125 incentive.

Please provide us with your name, email address and telephone number so that we can provide you with the details to join the group.

First name: _____

Last name: _____

Email: _____

Confirm Email: _____

Telephone: _____

If for any reason you need to cancel, please notify us by emailing ebossard@nanosresearch.com as soon as possible so that we can invite someone else to fill your spot.

C.2 Discussion Guide

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
Introduction Moderator introduces self/firm and defines his/her role, the discussion timeframe (90 mins), encourages all participants to speak up. • Thank you for attending/value your being here. • My name is X, and I work for Nanos, an independent marketing research company. My job is to facilitate the discussion, keeping us on topic and on time. I have no special interest or knowledge of the content being discussed. • Tonight, we're conducting research on behalf of the Government of Canada. • The purpose of tonight's research is to get your impressions on Canada's food supply, as well as animal and plant health and food safety in Canada. This will help the Government of Canada better understand how Canadians understand safe food and their trust that Canada's food supply is indeed safe. • The discussion will last 90 minutes Audio/video recording announcement (and the presence of observers). The meeting will be recorded for research purposes only and all your feedback will remain anonymous. • Comments treated in confidence. ○ Anything you say during these groups will be held in confidence. ○ Our report summarizes the findings but does not mention anyone by name. ○ We encourage you to not provide any identifiable information about yourself. • There are people from the Government of Canada involved in this project who will be observing tonight's session online. ○ Purpose: oversee the research process and see your reactions first-hand. They know only your first names. Offensive comments/views. racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. - are not acceptable, otherwise, there are no right or wrong answers. I'm interested in your ideas as individuals. Any questions?	To make participants feel at ease by clearly explaining the process.	3 min
Quick self-introduction – Let's go around the group and introduce ourselves with our first name and our favourite food. Participants introduce themselves to the group (e.g. first name and favourite food, any allergies). Go through software functionality ("Raise hand" and "Vote" button). Ask participants a yes or no question to test the vote functionality. (E.g. Do they drink coffee in the morning?)	Respondent warm-up and group bonding. Make ice-breaker relevant to topic.	5 min

I want to be respectful of your time and ensure the discussion is no longer than 90 minutes, so you might see me move things forward and ask a question to only one or two of you before moving on to the next question. I encourage everyone to use the raise hand function if they would like to add to the discussion. This way I can ensure I don't miss anyone and you have the opportunity to share your views.	Moderator Note: If the topic of Ostriches comes up you can reply with the following statement. <i>The Agency takes its responsibilities related to animal health and regulatory compliance very seriously and addresses each situation based on science, legislation, and established protocols. However, today's focus group is dedicated to gathering your input on other topics and we want to make sure we respect everyone's time and stay focused on that objective.</i>	
--	--	--

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE A: OVERALL VIEWS ON FOOD</u> First we are going to discuss food and decisions you make when purchasing food. Thinking of different factors when making food purchasing decisions, what factors are most important to you? [Probes if not mentioned] - Price - Nutritional value - Taste - Convenience - Allergy-safe - Meets my dietary needs (i.e. gluten free) - Freshness - Origin How would you rate the safety of the food you buy right now? Are you relatively confident food sold in Canada is safe and accurately represented or do you have any concerns? What type of food are you most afraid of getting sick from? Why? [IF NOT MENTIONED] What concerns do you have, if any, related to the safety of food in Canada?	To get a sense of how they view food and their relationship to food, including when making purchasing decisions.	10 min

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE B: VIEWS ON FOOD SAFETY</u> Now let's talk more about the safety of food in Canada. A reminder that we do not expect you to be experts on this topic and we are just looking to understand how you think about food safety. When you think about the safety of food in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others? [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations come to mind, if any? When you think of organizations in Canada that are dedicated to food safety, which organizations come to mind? What do you think these organizations do to assure the safety of food in Canada? What do you think makes a food "unsafe"? What makes you trust that Canada's food system is working? What would make you lose confidence in it? Let's talk about food recalls for a moment. When you hear the term "<i>food recall</i>," what comes to mind? Who do you think is responsible for issuing food recalls? What organization, if any, do you associate with food recalls? <i>Moderator note: Do not correct or validate responses at this stage. Let participants describe their understanding in their own words.</i> Have you personally seen or heard about a food recall recently? [IF YES] Where did you see or hear about it? Was it something you buy or eat regularly? [Probe if needed]: Social media, news, store notices, word of mouth, apps, etc. *If social media is mentioned ask which influencers or individuals do they follow? Thinking more broadly... What do you think a food recall says about the food safety system? What do they suggest about how the system works? When there is a problem, do you think the system responds quickly enough? Probe: Do recalls make you feel reassured, concerned, or both?	To gather views on food safety is managed in Canada, as well as impressions of safety. Also to gauge unaided awareness of CFIA on this topic.	30 Min

What helps you decide whether a recall applies to you or not? Probe: Product name, brand, lot code, risk level, where you bought it. When you hear about a food recall, what do you usually do? Probe: Does it matter where the information comes from (for example, social media, news, store notices, or government sources)? Are you more likely to act depending on the source? Do you ever verify the information before taking action? If so, how? Do you feel that food recalls are happening more often than they used to, less often, or about the same? Why do you feel that way? Where do you think that impression comes from (for example, news coverage, social media, personal experience, store notices, etc.)? Who do you think is more transparent when something goes wrong – government or companies? [PROMPT IF participants say “more often”] What do you think is driving that? Do you think recalls are actually happening more often, or are you hearing about them more? Why? <i>Moderator note: Do not prompt CFIA or government unless participants raise it themselves.</i> If a food recall applied to something you regularly buy, where would you most want to hear about it? What would make you notice and pay attention right away? Is there anything that would make food recalls more helpful or easier to act on for you? Have you ever seen information online about food safety that you later learned was wrong? Are you concerned by the amount of misinformation online? Who do you trust? How do you decide what to believe? Have you heard of the term “maple washing”? What comes to mind when you hear that term? How important is it to know whether the product you are buying is Canadian, in terms of ingredients and labour, or made in Canada with imported ingredients? Have you undertaken research to clarify the meaning of the various origin and content claims displayed on Canadian product labels? Do you prioritize buying Canadian food when grocery shopping?		
--	--	--

Does the cost of a food influence your decision to choose Canadian food products over imported food products? What should the percentage of Canadian ingredients be if the food is labelled as “Product of Canada”? Probe: Do you know what it is for food products? • It’s 98%, thoughts on this? PROBE: Would they accept lowering the threshold knowing that many ingredients cannot be sourced in Canada but still contain substantial Canadian ingredients.		
--	--	--

DISCUSSION	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
MODULE C: UNDERSTANDING OF CFIA'S MANDATE AND IMPRESSIONS OF CFIA Had you previously heard of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency – The CFIA? What specific activities do you think the CFIA does in terms of safeguarding food safety? Any others? Do you think food safety oversight today relies mostly on physical inspections, or more on data, technology, and science? Does that increase or decrease your confidence? Part of CFIA's role is inspecting food businesses to make sure they are following the rules. What do you think some of the outcomes are if they find a company was not following the rules? What actions do think CFIA can take when it finds that rules are not being followed? Do you think companies are held accountable strongly enough when they break food safety rules? Why or why not? Where would you expect to hear about these enforcement activities? Do you think the CFIA generally makes decisions based on data and science? Are their decisions transparent? What do you think an inspection of a food manufacturing plant/facility involves? [Open] Do you think Canada's food safety standards are higher, lower, or about the same as other countries? Does it matter to you whether other countries trust Canada's system? Does knowing that inspections are conducted at food manufacturing plants/facilities make you think food is safer? Why or why not?	To gather aided awareness of CFIA and gauge understanding of its mandate and impressions overall. <i>Moderator's note: Enforcement actions can include warnings administrative penalties, product removal, licence suspensions or licence cancellations.</i>	15 min

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE D: VIEWS ON PLANT HEALTH AND INVASIVE PLANT PESTS</u> Next we will talk about the protection and health of plants in Canada. When you think about plant health in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others? Do you know what the CFIA does to protect plant health? Prompt – what about plant pests including invasive plant pests? Do you understand the term invasive? What kind of invasive pests are you aware of? What is the impact of these pests? [PROMPT IF Spotted Lanternfly is not mentioned] Have you heard anything about Spotted Lanternfly recently? What about in the last year or two? What do you think the issues with Spotted Lanternfly are? How concerned are you about the potential economic impact of Spotted Lanternfly. Probe: What do you think the economic risk is? [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations related to plant health come to mind when you think about plant health in Canada, if any?	To gather views on plant health and awareness of regulations. Also to gauge unaided awareness of CFIA on this topic. Plant pests, invasive species, import, export, trade, fertilizers, soil, soil-related matter, grains, field crops, seeds, cannabis, forestry and horticulture. The spotted lanternfly is an insect native to Asia. It is not yet established in Canada. It is predicted to have a significant negative impact on the Canadian grape and wine industry. It may also have an impact on the fruit tree, nursery and forest sectors but the grape industry is most at risk.	10 min

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE E: VIEWS ANIMAL HEALTH AND SAFETY</u> Next we will talk about the health of animals in Canada. When you think about animal health in Canada, what types of things come to mind for you? Any others? [PROMPT IF Avian Influenza is not mentioned] Have you heard anything about Avian Influenza or “Bird Flu” recently? What about in the last year or two? How concerned are you about the potential economic impact of Avian influenza? Probe: What do you think the economic risk is? How concerned are you about the potential health impacts of Avian Influenza on humans? [PROMPT IF REGULATIONS NOT MENTIONED] What regulations related to animal health come to mind when you think about animal health in Canada, if any? Are you aware of any regulations around travelling internationally with dogs or other pets? What are they? What organization do you think is involved in this? What specific activities do you think the CFIA does in terms of safeguarding animal health? Any others?	To gather views animal health and awareness of regulations. Also to gauge unaided awareness of CFIA on this topic. MODERATOR NOTE: Avian influenza (AI), often called "bird flu," is caused by the Type "A" influenza virus. This virus can affect several species of food-producing birds (chickens, turkeys, quails, guinea fowl, etc.), as well as pet and wild birds.	10 min

Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE F: TESTING THE AGENCY LOOK AND FEEL</u> If the organization responsible for food safety in Canada were a person, how would you describe them? What qualities should they have? What qualities would concern you? Next, we want to get your impressions of some potential visual that will represent the Agency. We aren't looking to get you feedback on which specific visual you prefer, but rather the concept overall. [SHARE SCREEN – SHOW VISUAL – ONE CONCEPT AT A TIME] Which concept best speaks to the mandate of the Agency? Which concept was your favourite? [R, M OR B]? Why? What about the tag lines? Which concept was your least favourite? [R, M OR B]? Why? What about the tag lines? Concept R 	To test impressions on proposed creative concepts. Current Mandate – read time permitting Mitigating risks to food safety is the CFIA's highest priority, and the health and safety of Canadians is the driving force behind the design and development of CFIA programs. The CFIA, in collaboration and partnership with industry, consumers, and federal, provincial and municipal organizations, continues to work towards protecting Canadians from preventable health risks related to food and zoonotic diseases. The current and future economic prosperity of the Canadian agriculture and forestry sectors relies on a healthy and sustainable animal and plant resource base. As such, the CFIA is continually improving its program design and delivery in the animal health and plant resource areas in order to minimize and manage risks. In an effort to protect the natural environment from invasive animal and plant diseases and plant pests, the CFIA also performs extensive work related to the protection of environmental biodiversity.	10 min

Concept B



Concept M



Discussion	Moderator Notes & Objectives	Time
<u>MODULE G: WRAP UP</u> <u>Check in with observers to see if there are any follow-up items or clarification needed.</u> Follow up questions for participants, if needed. Thank everyone. Explain and direct to incentives.	To establish that objectives have been reached.	2 min