



CAZA/AZAC Accredited Members

May 28, 2014

British Columbia

British Columbia Wildlife Park
Greater Vancouver Zoo
Kicking Horse Grizzly Bear Refuge.
Shaw Ocean Discovery Centre
Vancouver Aquarium
Marine Science Centre

Mr. John Tracogna
Chief Executive Officer
Toronto Zoo
361A Old Finch Ave.
Toronto, ON M1B5K7

Yukon

Yukon Wildlife Preserve

Dear Mr. Tracogna

Re. Comparison of Zoo Animal Care Standards

Alberta

Calgary Zoo, Botanical Garden & Prehistoric Park
Marine Life Department, West Edmonton Mall
Valley Zoo & John Janzen Nature Centre

I am writing in response to your letter of January 23, 2014 requesting CAZA's assistance in completing the assessment requested in the following motion adopted by Toronto City Council:

City Council request the Chief Executive Officer, Toronto Zoo to apply for admission to the Canadian Association of Zoos (CAZA) and the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) once both of these organizations demonstrate that their standards of care meet or exceed the standards of care adopted by the Global Federation of Animal Sanctuaries (GFAS) and both CAZA and AZA enforce their own guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Toronto Zoo Board.

Saskatchewan

Saskatoon Forestry Farm Park and Zoo

Manitoba

Assiniboine Park Zoo

Ontario

African Lion Safari
Bowmanville Zoological Park
Indian River Reptile Zoo
Jungle Cat World Inc.
Little Ray's Reptile Zoo, Ottawa
Marine Land of Canada
Riverview Park and Zoo
Safari Niagara
Toronto Zoo
Wye Marsh Wildlife Centre

CAZA is always pleased to have the opportunity to compare and contrast its accreditation program with those of other accrediting bodies and is particularly pleased with the opportunity to highlight for the Toronto Zoo Board of Management some of the unique characteristics of the CAZA program.

The comparison of the two programs was challenging since they are designed to accredit very different types of organizations with different missions. Although both organizations have the wellbeing of the animals in their care as a core concern, the environment and context in which they operate is different and their standard reflects this.

Québec

Aquarium du Québec
Biodôme de Montréal
Ecomuseum Zoo
Parc Safari (2002) Inc.
Société Zoologique de Granby Inc.
Zoo Sauvage de St. Félixien

In the report appended to this letter we compared the key areas that affect the quality of animal care. The request was to have CAZA demonstrate that its standards are equal or superior to those of GFAS. We believe that once you have reviewed this comparison you will agree that while the GFAS standards have merit, since the CAZA standards are designed for zoos and aquariums they are

New Brunswick

Cherry Brook Zoo Inc.
Magnetic Hill Zoo

better adapted to the context of the Toronto Zoo and therefore are superior in many key areas.

We also have taken the opportunity to explain how our accreditation program works and highlight some of the unique features that have helped to make it one of the leading zoo and aquarium accreditation programs in the world today.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Bergamini', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Massimo Bergamini
Executive Director
Canada's Accredited Zoos and Aquariums

Canada's Accredited Zoos and Aquariums

Canada's Accredited Zoos and Aquariums (CAZA) was formed in 1976. CAZA's accreditation program is at the heart of its mission. Developed over more than 30 years, the standards outlined in the accreditation program are among the most demanding in the world. They ensure CAZA members provide the best care and enrichment for the animals they are entrusted with, and that the more than 11 million yearly visitors to CAZA-accredited facilities benefit from quality learning experiences about animals and nature.

CAZA's accreditation program makes animal care the first priority and is becoming increasingly recognized as the industry standard. As governments at all levels move to encourage non-accredited zoos to conform to these standards, it is critical that the process for assessing accreditation applications is objective and transparent. To this end, CAZA has recently revised many of its standards and established a numerical assessment system that ensures that all decisions are consistent and objective.

Global Federation of Animal Sanctuaries

The Global Federation of Animal Sanctuaries (GFAS) was incorporated in 2007. It has the stated mission of **"Helping Sanctuaries Help Animals"**. In carrying out this mission, GFAS:

- promotes and validates excellence in sanctuary management and humane and responsible care of animals through international accreditation, collaboration, mentoring;
- promotes the development of greater recognition and resources for sanctuaries;
- seeks to eliminate the causes of displaced animals.

GFAS carries out this mission through:

- Providing worldwide standards
- Carrying out a global accreditation program
- Convening
- Educating
- Speaking up for sanctuaries
- Creating funding streams for responsible disbursement

All GFAS organizations must adhere to certain policies as set out in their standards, including but not limited to:

- no commercial trade in animals or animal parts;
- no animals removed from enclosures for exhibition;

- no direct contact between the public and animals (with some allowable exceptions, such as for some equines, and under carefully supervised circumstances);
- measures in place to prevent breeding, either through segregation of sex or through a program of humane contraception, unless the animals are part of a bona fide release program;
- open to the public only by way of a structured visitor program in which tours are guided and where there is a bona fide educational component to the visiting program.

Comparison of Animal Care Standards

A direct comparison of the two sets of standards as requested in the Council motion is difficult since they have been developed to provide guidance in the operation of very different types of organizations.

Due to the application of the CAZA standards across the broad range of species which are found in modern zoos and aquariums they are qualitative in nature. They are outcome based rather than focusing on specific dimensions of enclosures. Their focus is on whether the enclosures meet the physical, social and psychological wellbeing of the animals housed in them as opposed to how large the enclosures may be. Although there are no species specific requirements included in the accreditation standards, the applicants and the inspectors are directed, if there is any question of the habitat meeting the needs of their occupants, to refer to specific husbandry manuals such as those published by the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) and other professional bodies.

GFAS standards are contained in a series of 24 documents targeted on the combinations of species that tend to be found in sanctuaries. The standards tend to be a combination of qualitative and quantitative standards. In almost all cases the qualitative standards are the same for all of the documents provided. In most cases there is some attempt to become prescriptive in areas such as enclosure sizes etc. The challenge that arises in attempting to define specific sizes of enclosures in each set of standards is the wide variety of species included. The Felid manual for example is to be applied to 36 species ranging in size from a Canadian Lynx to a Siberian Tiger. The standards are also to be applied to animals such as the tiger and the lion. Two large cat species with totally different social structures. GFAS recognizes the challenges of applying quantitative standards by incorporating the following type of language in their documents:

Many factors influence the minimum space required for a group or pair of felids, including, but not limited to: group size, group composition, and enclosure complexity. The following guidelines are minimum recommendations.

Since the quantitative standards are not applicable in assessing many situations this comparison will focus on similarities and differences in the qualitative standards that are utilized in both the CAZA and GFAS processes. The comparison is further challenged by the difference in layout of the documents. In this comparison functional areas of similarity within the broad context of “Animal Care Standards” will be used as the basis for the comparison.

Staffing

A key element of an institution’s successful operation is maintaining a staff sufficient in qualification and number. Effective communication, working relationship, and training are also important. Both programs place a high priority on staff and generally look for the same elements. Due to the larger size and greater complexity of most CAZA member institutions there is a greater emphasis on assessing the organization structure, how effective communication processes are and the level of training provided to staff. Given the diverse nature of most zoo and aquarium collections and the fact that public are on the grounds of CAZA members institutions, emergency training is given a greater focus.

Veterinary Care

Both organizations require that the institution’s animal health care program must be under the direction of a licensed veterinarian and while it is recommended that a full time veterinarian be on staff it is recognized that for smaller organizations, veterinary care can be provided on a contract basis. In both standards there must be an emphasis on preventative care, there must be routine inspections and there must be an appropriate number of trained staff to effectively manage the medical care of the collection. Both standards also require necropsies to be performed on animals that die of unknown causes.

Since CAZA members have animals arriving and leaving their collections on a more frequent basis there is a greater emphasis on issues of quarantine in their standards. In addition, due to the size and mobility of zoo and aquarium collections a greater emphasis is placed on life history and medical records. The ability to readily access data about each animal, in what in many cases are very large and diverse collections, is a key component of solid preventative medical care programs.

Nutrition

Both organizations have elements dealing with nutrition. Since the GFAS standards are usually for a narrower grouping of animals their standards tend to be more prescriptive than are the CAZA standards. The key areas of food handling, storage and preservation are very similar. Due to the wider range of diets involved in CAZA facilities there is a requirement for an active role for either or both veterinary and nutritionist involvement in the formulation and evaluation of diets for the collection.

Physical Facilities and Housing

Both sets of standards have similar requirements for on-going facility maintenance programs. There are also similar expectations regarding the capital planning and development processes.

Since the GFAS standards are targeted on a much narrower range of species in each set of documents, they are more prescriptive in many areas than are the CAZA standards. The direction given focuses much more on function than on form. One of the primary goals of a modern zoo or aquarium is to build a positive bond between the animals in the collection and the visitor. They also attempt to give the visitor an intuitive sense of the animal's habitat and natural behavior. These processes occur at least partially due to the enclosures in which the animals are housed. Therefore the CAZA standards consider both the form and the function of the exhibits. To effectively impart the key messages about the animals, issues such as appropriate social groupings, extensive and well documented environmental enrichment programs and natural habitats are critical components of the assessments undertaken by the CAZA inspectors. While these areas are touched on in the GFAS standards for obvious reasons the requirements are more demanding in the CAZA standards.

Given the wide range of species usually found in zoos and aquariums there is a greater emphasis in the CAZA standards related to life support systems than is found in most of the GFAS documents. This becomes particularly critical in assessing water quality parameters in aquarium exhibits, again not a priority in the GFAS system.

One of the key areas of assessment in the CAZA system is an assessment of off-exhibit and winter holding areas for the animal collection. This is necessary to ensure that the areas that the animals are housed in during the time that the facility is not open to the public provide the same quality of care as the main exhibit areas do. In most GFAS facilities the animals have a single holding facility with both indoor and outdoor housing and their standards are designed to reflect that situation.

Both sets of standards address the physical security of the facility and the need to have appropriate perimeter fencing and systems in place to secure enclosures to both protect staff and to ensure animals do not escape. One of the most significant differences between a GFAS accredited sanctuary and a CAZA accredited zoo or aquarium is that the CAZA facility is open to the public. This necessitates a significant focus on protecting the visitors from the animals and the animals from the visitors. This includes barriers to prevent the public from approaching dangerous animals too closely, the provision of appropriate public health and service facilities such as first aid, washroom and food service areas.

Animal Welfare

CAZA defines Animal Welfare as an animal's collective physical, mental, and emotional states over a period of time, and is measured on a continuum from good to poor.

CAZA believes that an animal typically experiences good welfare when healthy, comfortable, well-nourished, safe, able to develop and express species-typical relationships, behaviors, and cognitive abilities, and not suffering from unpleasant states such as pain, fear, or distress. Because physical, mental, and emotional states may be dependent on one another and can vary from day to day, it is important to consider these states in combination with one another over time to provide an assessment of an animal's overall welfare status.

Both organizations accreditation programs make the welfare of the animals a high priority. This concern for the animals' resident in each organizations accredited facilities are embedded in different elements of their standards. As the CAZA definition of welfare illustrates, good animal welfare is the end result of a series of operational practices all designed and applied with the wellbeing of the animals being cared for.

Non-animal Care Standards

Both of the organizations also have standards for elements of the operation that do not relate directly to animal care and welfare. The difference in the following standards reflects the different mandates of the facilities that they accredit.

Conservation

In the accredited zoo and aquarium community, species and operational conservation is a critical component of their reason for being and is carefully assessed during the inspection process. The scope of the institution's participation in conservation programs is important. Among the things considered are:

- The number of staff dedicated to conservation programming
- Whether the facility is contributing sufficiently to conservation programs based upon budget and/or staff size
- Whether there are any Studbooks published by the institution
- Participation in field conservation programs
- Efforts undertaken for energy and natural resource conservation (i.e. recycling, water conservation initiatives, etc.)
- Level of participation in conservation programs with colleges and universities
- Whether animal food, especially seafood products, are purchased from sustainable or well managed sources.

Sanctuaries on the other hand do not have a conservation mandate. Their accreditation requires that they not breed animals and while they are encouraged to practice operational conservation there is no requirement to do so.

Education

Similar to the conservation mandate CAZA accredited zoos and aquariums have major education requirements. Education must be a significant element in the mission statement of the institution, and the institution must have a written education plan that matches current industry standards. Among the elements considered are:

- The number of staff dedicated to education programming
- That one paid staff member is dedicated to education on (at least) a part-time basis
- How the education message is conveyed to the casual visitor
- Publications, brochures, or other printed material
- Classrooms and teaching areas
- The availability of funds allocated for education programs
- Whether exhibit signage contains appropriate information including a call to action in the area of conservation
- The level of education department contact with local schools, colleges, and other academia
- The volunteer, docent, and outreach programs
- The level of outreach programming and whether animals are being used appropriately.
- How graphics are developed and designed

GFAS also encourages, although does not require, it's accredited facilities to raise public awareness of the species and specimens in their collections and what led the specific animals to be in the sanctuary and the conservation issues facing them in the wild.

The most significant difference between the two sets of standards relates to the fact that education is considered a primary function in CAZA accreditation and a secondary one for GFAS sanctuaries. Since the CAZA facilities are open to the public there is a greater focus on education activities conducted on-site.

Research and Scientific Study

This is an area of increasing priority for zoos and aquariums. Working with the animals in their collections, facilities are able to contribute to a greater knowledge of the physiology of the animals. In addition programs developed to aid in maintaining genetically viable populations zoos and aquariums have direct applications to wildlife officers charged with managing free ranging populations of the same species. In assessing an applicant's level of contribution to this area, consideration is given to the size of the organizations, it's overall budget, and other areas impacting these programs. Among areas assessed are:

- The protocol for evaluating potential projects
- How projects are coordinated
- Whether the resulting information is published in appropriate journals
- The level of involvement with local and regional academia

GFAS does not allow research to be conducted with the animals in their facilities as a result there are no standards for comparison.

Governing Authority

Both organizations have standards for governance and again their differences reflect the facilities they accredit.

CAZA has a very diverse membership base including public (municipal), privately owned and not for profit organizations. Some of the key elements of the CAZA assessment of this area focus on the need for the governing authority to abide by the CAZA Code of Ethics, Acquisition & Disposition Policy, Accreditation Standards, and Constitution & Bylaws, and must recognize and support the institution's goals and objectives. There is also a need to ensure that the role of the governing body not interfere with the effective operation of the facility.

GFAS has a much more homogenous membership. One key requirement of membership is that the organization be a registered charity. Other than that there are similar expectations that the governing authority not interfere with the effective operation of the facility.

Accreditation Program Management

The creation of standards to be used to guide members and to judge the compliance of applicants to the standards is only the first step in the creation of a meaningful accreditation program. Equally important is how the program is administered.

CAZA's program is under the direction of the Accreditation Commission. This body functions independently of the Board of Directors of the Association. The accreditation program has been a cornerstone of CAZA since it became mandatory for all institutional members to achieve and maintain accredited status. The accreditation program and the standards on which it is based have gone through numerous changes as knowledge of animal care and the technology available to manage the program have changed. The Commission is guided by the following concepts:

Accreditation Commission Mission Statement

To establish, maintain and raise standards of operation in the accredited Canadian zoo and aquarium community through a process of self-evaluation, on-site inspections and peer review.

Goals

- Establish standards for CAZA zoos and aquariums.
- To create standards that will be a living document of currently acceptable practices for zoos and aquariums in Canada. To maintain an ongoing review process that will include policy development, review and revision.
- Achieve recognition of CAZA accreditation as representing the national industry standard for zoos and aquariums.
- Encourage and assist member institutions to develop superior facilities and enhanced programs.
- To ensure that member institutions continuously strive for superior facilities and enhanced programs.
- Work with non-accredited institutions to communicate the importance of CAZA accreditation and encourage participation by providing whatever professional assistance is available.

Principles of Accreditation

- Institutions are accredited based on what exists at the time of the inspection and review.
- The accreditation process provides a format for the applicant institution to undertake a rigorous self-examination.
- Accreditation certifies that an institution is currently meeting professional standards of CAZA.
- Accreditation is based upon the informed collective judgment of experienced individuals within the profession.
- The accreditation program is a confidential process.
- Accreditation and membership processing may occur simultaneously, but accreditation must be achieved before membership services are initiated.
- The granting of accreditation is for five years, and expires at the end of that period. Institutions must successfully complete the full process again before the end of the five-year period.
- An accredited institution may be reviewed or inspected at any time within the five-year accreditation period, at the discretion of the Accreditation Commission or the CAZA Board of Directors.

CAZA Accreditation Scoring Philosophy

CAZA has recently moved to a quantitative assessment process. Accreditation inspectors evaluate how an institution rates against written accreditation standards. Scores are awarded as follows:

Score	Assessment against standard
3	Exceptional – exceeds standard
2	Meets the standard
1	Does not achieve standard <u>and</u> it appears deficiency can be rectified within 6 months
0	Does not meet standard and is considered a major issue

Total scores from each accreditation inspection will be evaluated by the Accreditation Commission against an “acceptable” range. This range is established based on criteria provided by the CAZA/AZAC Board of Directors.

The decision to accredit and the decision to add any conditions are guided as follows:

Total Score Result	Adjudication
Falls below acceptable range	Not accredited
Falls within acceptable range	Accredited and will require one interim inspection during the 5 year accreditation cycle
Exceeds acceptable range	Accredited for 5 years

**Please note that all first time accreditation applicants will automatically be subject to an interim inspection regardless of total score against acceptable range.*

The scoring process is a tool for the Commission. If there are determined to be significant shortcomings in one or several areas, the commission may deny accreditation regardless of the scoring.

Inspection and Decision Making Process

One of the critical components of the accreditation process is the inspection team. The size of the team will vary from two to four members depending upon the size and complexity of the facility to be inspected. In all cases a veterinarian will be one of the team members. The remainder of the team must be made up of individuals with a minimum of five years of experience in the zoo and aquarium field.

Following the inspection, the Visiting Committee, prepares a detailed written report for the Commission. The report provides insight regarding the Visiting Committee's impression of the facility, its operations, and the care provided the animal collection.

The Commission may take one of the following actions:

Grant Accreditation: The Commission will grant accreditation when it is satisfied that the applicant institution meets the requirements of an accredited institution. The Commission may, however, request progress reports on any items it wishes the institution to address, require an interim or special inspection, and revisit the decision as often as necessary to assure itself that the institution continues to meet all conditions and requirements of accreditation during the five-year accreditation period.

Table Accreditation: The Commission may table an institution's materials if it determines that certain conditions must be met or additional information submitted before the institution can be considered as meeting accreditation standards. The Commission must believe that the institution is capable of addressing all of the identified issues within one year.

Deny Accreditation: The Commission will deny accreditation when an institution does not meet the requirements needed to be recognized as an accredited institution at the present time and, in its opinion, would require in excess of one year to successfully do so. Institutions denied accreditation may reapply one year *after the date of denial*.

Appeals: A request for appeal may be made in writing to the CAZA President within forty five (45) days of the date of the written notification of denial. The CAZA President must decide whether to grant an appeal hearing. If the CAZA President grants an appeal hearing, it will be conducted by the CAZA Accreditation Appeal Panel. The determination of this group is final.

As the accreditation standards have become more demanding and complex CAZA discovered that first time applicants were having an increasing amount of difficulty in achieving success. To combat that problem CAZA has introduced a mentoring program. Mentoring is defined as short term support for institutional applicants. The mentor is a professional coach in the industry who can guide the institution with regard to preparing for a CAZA accreditation inspection. Prior to the introduction of the mentoring program, there was an almost fifty percent failure rate for first time applicants. Since that step was taken four of the last five new applicants have been successful.

Disciplinary Processes

In the event that concerns are raised, either internally or externally, regarding an accredited member the Association has a written complaint resolution process. If the

Accreditation Commission determines that a violation of the standards has occurred, the following options shall be considered:

- Place institutions accreditation status under review for a specified period of time for up to a maximum of one year. While under review an institutions accreditation remains in place. Notice will be given by the accreditation commission listing deficiencies and improvements/corrections that are required to be made by a specified date. The commission will follow up in an appropriate manner to ensure all required actions have been taken.
- Suspension of accreditation for a defined period of time.
- Expulsion from CAZA membership.

Given the rigorous process involved in achieving accreditation there have historically not been a large number of complaints received. In most cases the Commission, working with the institution in question, is able to resolve the issue to everyone's satisfaction.

In a recent situation there were a series of complaints levelled against a member relating to water quality management and other husbandry related issues. The commission dispatched a three person inspection team within days of the concerns being raised in the media. Two of the members of the team were veterinarians. There was a thorough inspection conducted, a report generated for the commission and, based on that report, a full engineering study of the members water management systems was required. During the period that the engineering study was underway, a CAZA inspector conducted an on-going series of unannounced inspections to ensure that the welfare of the animals in the facility was not compromised.

In spite of all best efforts, there have also been times when members have lost their accredited status. As an example, a facility in British Columbia had a number of concerns raised by current and ex-staff members regarding the husbandry practices of the organization. These concerns related to issues of housing, veterinary care and nutrition. The facility was inspected by CAZA's National Director and in discussions with the Accreditation Commission the decision was made to remove the institution's membership. In this case the member institution resigned prior to having their membership officially removed.

Summary

As mentioned earlier, attempting to compare the accreditation programs of CAZA and GFAS is challenging since the two programs have been created to establish direction to different types of organizations. CAZA recognizes and appreciates the valuable contribution that GFAS has made and will continue to make in the operation of animal sanctuaries around the world. From CAZA's perspective, our accreditation program is seen as a continuous improvement program. There have been many positive changes in the past and there will be more in the future as the expectations of all CAZA members continue to increase.