

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-001

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report and Re-create - Employee Food Safety Training Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Acknowledge the Food Employee Food Safety Training Committee report and re-create the committee for the 2016-2018 biennium.

Public Health Significance:

Food employees trained in food safety have the potential to decrease incidents of foodborne illness in foodservice establishments. The existence of many variations of food safety training requirements in many jurisdictions throughout the United States makes it difficult for foodservice establishments that have more than one location to have a consistent food employee food safety training program. Foodservice establishments could more readily and efficiently offer effective food employee training if consistent national food employee training standards were created. Such standards would encourage more food employee training in food safety and could improve public health.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

acknowledging the Employee Food Safety Training Committee report and thanking the committee members for their efforts.

The Conference further recommends re-creating the Employee Food Safety Training Committee to continue the work initiated during the 2014-2016 biennium and to complete the original charges from Issue 2014-II-011; specific committee charges for the 2016-2018 biennium are to:

1. Identify what a food employee should know about food safety, prioritized by risk.
2. Develop a guidance document to include recommendations for appropriate operator, regulator, and/or third-party food safety training program(s); including the criteria for the program and learning objectives.

3. Report Committee findings and recommendations to the 2018 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Ben Chapman
Organization: Employee Food Safety Training Committee
Address: NC State University Campus Box 7606
City/State/Zip: Raleigh, NC 27695
Telephone: 9198093025
E-mail: benjamin_chapman@ncsu.edu

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Chuck Catlin
Organization: Employee Food Safety Training Committee
Address: Food safety Rx2276 E. Clinton Street
City/State/Zip: Phoenix, AZ 85028
Telephone: 602.769.1418
E-mail: chuck.catlin@foodsafetyrx.com

Content Documents:

- "Employee Food Safety Training committee report"

Supporting Attachments:

- "CFP-employee-training-committte-1-8-15"
- "Literature on evaluating food handler training programs:"
- "FDA Risk Factor Study 1998, 2003 and 2008 comparison"
- "Employee Food Safety Training Committee Meeting Minutes"
- "CFP Food Employee Training Committee Training Component Draft"
- "Employee Food Safety Training Topics"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-002

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report- Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Conference for Food Protection (CFP) Demonstration of Knowledge Committee seeks Council II's acknowledgment of the committee's final report.

Public Health Significance:

Demonstration of knowledge is identified as one of the five key public health interventions to protect consumer health. The designated person in charge who is knowledgeable about foodborne disease prevention, Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles, and Code requirements is prepared to recognize conditions that may contribute to foodborne illness or that otherwise fail to comply with Code requirements, and to take appropriate preventive and corrective actions. A dialogue with the person in charge during the inspection process will also reveal whether or not that person is enabled by a clear understanding of the Code and its public health principles to follow sound food safety practices and to produce foods that are safe, wholesome, unadulterated, and accurately represented.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

1. Acknowledgement of the 2014-2016 Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee Report and attachments, and
2. Acknowledgement of the committee members for their participation on the conference calls, surveys and work completed.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Michelle Haynes
Organization: 2014-2016 Demonstration of Knowledge Committee
Address: DBPR, Hotels and Restaurants 1940 N Monroe St.

City/State/Zip: Tallahassee, FL 32399-1011
Telephone: 850.717-1734
E-mail: michelle.haynes@myfloridalicense.com

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Eric Moore, Committee Co-Chair
Organization: 2014-2016 Demonstration of Knowledge Committee
Address: ACME Markets75 Valley Stream Parkway
City/State/Zip: Malvern, PA 19355
Telephone: 267.971.0916
E-mail: eric.moore@acmemarkets.com

Content Documents:

- "2014-2016 DoK Committee Final Report"
- "Attachment I 2014-2016 DoK Roster"
- "Attachment II 2014-2016 DoK Meeting Record"
- "Attachment III 2014-2016 DoK Pro Con Table 2-102.11 Template"
- "Attachment IV 2014-2016 DoK Pro Con Listing 2013 Food Code 2-102.11 (A)"
- "Attachment V 2014-2016 DoK Pro Con Listing 2013 Food Code 2-102.11 (C)"
- "Attachment VI 2014-2016 DoK Alternative Methods of Demonstrating Knowledge"
- "Attachment VII 2014-2016 DoK Final Survey Results"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-003

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Re-create - Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Conference for Food Protection (CFP) Demonstration of Knowledge Committee (DoK) requests that the committee be re-created to continue evaluation of the methods of demonstrating knowledge found in the 2013 FDA Food Code Section 2-102.11.

Public Health Significance:

Demonstration of knowledge is identified as one of the five key public health interventions to protect consumer health. The designated person in charge who is knowledgeable about foodborne disease prevention, Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles, and Code requirements is prepared to recognize conditions that may contribute to foodborne illness or that otherwise fail to comply with Code requirements, and to take appropriate preventive and corrective actions. A dialogue with the person in charge during the inspection process will also reveal whether or not that person is enabled by a clear understanding of the Code and its public health principles to follow sound food safety practices and to produce foods that are safe, wholesome, unadulterated, and accurately represented.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

the Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee be re-created following the 2016 CFP Biennial Meeting to continue work originally assigned in Issue 2014-II-016 with the following charges:

1. Identify and evaluate the pros and cons of *Alternative Methods to Demonstrating Knowledge*, a document created by the 2014-2016 DoK Committee (Attachment VI to the DoK Committee Report). Although not limited to the following areas, the committee will assess the pros and cons of each alternative method in light of the following areas:
 - a) Differentiation between knowledge and application

- b) Emphasis on risk factors
 - c) Ease of uniform assessment by regulators and industry
 - d) Enabling the Person in Charge to demonstrate knowledge even when there is a language barrier
 - e) What corrective action should be taken when there is not a demonstration of knowledge from the Person in Charge
2. Recommend alternative methods of demonstrating knowledge as new or amended Food Code language.
 3. Report back committee outcomes and recommendations to the 2018 CFP Biennial Meeting.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Michelle Haynes
Organization: 2014-2016 Demonstration of Knowledge Committee
Address: DBPR, Hotels and Restaurants 1940 N Monroe St.
City/State/Zip: Tallahassee, FL 32399
Telephone: 850-717-1734
E-mail: michelle.haynes@myfloridalicense.com

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Eric Moore, Committee Co-Chair
Organization: 2014-2016 Demonstration of Knowledge Committee
Address: ACME Markets 75 Valley Stream Parkway
City/State/Zip: Malvern, PA 19355
Telephone: 267.971.0916
E-mail: eric.moore@acmemarkets.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-004

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This issue was submitted for consideration at a previous biennial meeting, see issue: 2014-I-032; new or additional information has been included or attached and the recommended solution has been revised.

Title:

Imminent Health Hazard: Modify Enforcement & PIC Duties

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Modify both the enforcement action and the duties of the Person in Charge in the FDA Food Code relative to "Imminent Health Hazard" so that a facility 1) with a written emergency operating plan that is preapproved by the regulatory authority; and that 2) takes immediate corrective action to eliminate, prevent or control a risk or hazard in accordance with that written and preapproved emergency operating plan; and that 3) informs the regulatory authority of the risk or hazard having occurred and the written preapproved emergency operating plan having been implemented should not have to cease operations.

Public Health Significance:

As stated in CFP's 2014 Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments, "All retail food establishments are vulnerable to a potential emergency or disaster that could impact the safety of the food and products they sell or serve to consumers. Yet, in times of crises, these facilities can also serve the community and provide valuable resources." During crisis, industry and public health are partners with a common purpose; to restore normalcy to the community quickly while protecting the public health in the process. Industry is the expert at feeding people, not emergency management agencies. The sooner food establishments can get operating; the sooner communities can return to normal. Pre-approval of emergency operating plans enables facilities to remain in operation and the regulatory authority to deploy their limited resources more efficiently, starting with establishments that don't have emergency operating plans, because delays in re-opening hurt all stakeholders; customers, employees and first responders.

The proposed language for Food Code Section 2-103.11(P) is modeled after language in the State of Georgia Rules & Regulations Governing Food Service, 511-6-1 effective November 1, 2015, found in a supporting attachment accompanying this Issue.

In the following link, "Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments", CFP 2014, note in particular Localized Emergency or Event #s 2, 3 & 4 located on pages 4-5. Also note planning for Response to an Emergency paragraphs 1, 2 & 3 located on page 7. Also see chart I on page 17; Procedures for Handling Refrigerated TCS Foods during a Power Outage.

<http://www.foodprotect.org/media/guide/Emergency%20Action%20Plan%20for%20Retail%20food%20Est.pdf>

In the following link, "Lessons Learned: Food Safety Preparedness before the Next Natural Disaster" in Food Safety Magazine, August/September 2014, note in particular, authors Kalis & Blake (CDC), Hatch (AL DPH) & Corby (AFDO) on the value of preapproved emergency operating plans. Kalis & Blake add that in a crisis, food service providers with preapproved emergency operating plans become part of the infrastructure that protects public health.

<http://www.foodsafetymagazine.com/magazine-archive1/augustseptember-2014/lessons-learned-food-safety-preparedness-before-the-next-natural-disaster/>

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that the 2013 Food Code be amended by adding new paragraphs to Sections 8-404.11 and 2-103.11 as follows (underline format used for new language):

Section 8-404.11. Ceasing Operations and Reporting.

(A) Except as specified in ¶ (B) and (C) of this section, a PERMIT HOLDER shall immediately discontinue operations and notify the REGULATORY AUTHORITY if an IMMINENT HEALTH HAZARD may exist because of an emergency such as a fire, flood, extended interruption of electrical or water service, SEWAGE backup, misuse of POISONOUS OR TOXIC MATERIALS, onset of an apparent foodborne illness outbreak, gross insanitary occurrence or condition, or other circumstance that may endanger public health.

(B) A PERMIT HOLDER need not discontinue operations in an area of an establishment that is unaffected by the IMMINENT HEALTH HAZARD.

(C) A PERMIT HOLDER need not discontinue operations if the facility has experienced an interruption of water service or an extended interruption of electrical service for two or more hours so long as the facility has a specific written emergency operating plan that has been preapproved by the regulatory authority and if the Person in Charge takes immediate corrective action to eliminate, prevent or control the risk or hazard in accordance with the specific written preapproved emergency operating plan and if the Person in Charge informs the regulatory authority of the specific risk or hazard having occurred and of the specific written preapproved emergency operating plan having been implemented. ^{Pf}

Section 2-103.11. Person in Charge

The Person in Charge shall ensure that:

(P) Imminent Health Hazard. If an imminent health hazard exists because of an emergency such as a fire, flood, interruption of electrical or water service for two or more hours, sewage malfunction, misuse of poisonous or toxic materials, onset of an apparent

foodborne illness outbreak, gross unsanitary occurrence or condition, or other circumstances that may endanger public health, then operations are immediately discontinued and the Health Authority is notified.^P If, however, the Imminent Health Hazard consists of an interruption of water service or an extended interruption of electrical service for two or more hours, the establishment may continue to operate under a specific written emergency operation plan that has been preapproved by the Health Authority prior to the occurrence of the specific emergency event provided the Person in Charge notifies the Health Authority that the specific emergency event has occurred and the preapproved specific written emergency operation plan is being implemented.^{Pf}

Submitter Information:

Name: Mark "Mick" Miklos
Organization: National Restaurant Association
Address: 175 West Jackson Blvd.Suite 1500
City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60604
Telephone: 770-868-7422
E-mail: mmiklos@restaurant.org

Supporting Attachments:

- "Rules & Regulations Governing Food Service for the State of Georgia"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-005

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Demonstration of Knowledge regarding Food Allergen Labeling

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Adding an amendment to the 2013 FDA Food Code section 2-102.11(C)(9) to include describing proper food allergen labeling for products, when applicable, produced by the venue.

Public Health Significance:

Pre-packaged products from bakeries, delis, restaurants, and other venues often are not labeled with allergens that they contain (a violation of the Food Code section 3-602.11(B) (5)), nor the potential allergens that may have been in contact with the products. This poses a serious risk to allergic consumers who may experience anaphylaxis as a result of exposure to the allergens.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that Subparagraph 2-102.11(C)(9) of the 2013 Food Code be amended as follows (new language is underlined):

2-102.11 Demonstration.

(C) Responding correctly to the inspector's questions as they relate to the specific FOOD operation. The areas of knowledge include:

(9) Describing FOODS identified as MAJOR FOOD ALLERGENS and the symptoms that a MAJOR FOOD ALLERGEN could cause in a sensitive individual who has an allergic reaction. Describe proper food allergen labeling for pre-packaged products produced by the establishment.^{Pf}

Submitter Information:

Name: Nona Narvaez
Organization: Anaphylaxis and Food Allergy Association of MN (AFAA)

Address: 2200 Hendon Ave
City/State/Zip: St. Paul, MS 55108
Telephone: 6516445937
E-mail: nona@minnesotafoodallergy.org

*It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name
or a commercial proprietary process.*

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-006

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report – Program Standards Committee (PSC)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Conference for Food Protection (CFP) Program Standards Committee seeks Council II's acknowledgment of the committee's final report.

Public Health Significance:

The Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards) were developed to serve as a guide for regulatory retail food program managers in the design, management, and execution of a retail food program with the public health outcome of reducing foodborne illness risk factors. The Program Standards Committee is a standing committee reporting to the CFP Executive Board. The Committee provides ongoing input to the FDA on issues that arise with the Retail Program Standards. The Committee serves the Conference by indirectly assisting Retail Program Standards enrollees in making progress towards meeting the Retail Program Standards. The Committee continues to work with the FDA internal Program Standards working group and the FDA Clearinghouse Workgroup to clarify and address issues that arise with the Retail Program Standards.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

1. Acknowledgment of the 2014 - 2016 Program Standards Committee Final Report, and
2. Thanking the Committee members for their work and dedication during the 2014 - 2016 biennium.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: David Lawrence, Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee

Address: Fairfax County Health Department 10777 Main Street, Suite 111
City/State/Zip: Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 246-8435
E-mail: David.Lawrence@fairfaxcounty.gov

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Debbie Watts, Co Vice-Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Tulsa Health Department 5051 South 129th East Avenue
City/State/Zip: Tulsa, OK 74134
Telephone: (918) 595-4305
E-mail: Dwatts@tulsa-health.org

Content Documents:

- "2014-2016 Program Standards Committee Final Report"
- "2014-2016 CFP Program Standards Committee Membership Roster"
- "Retail Program Standards - Competency of Inspectors Infographic"

Supporting Attachments:

- "Verification Audit Survey Tool"
- "Industry Support for Standards 2, 4 and 7 Survey Tool"
- "Verification Audit Survey Results"
- "Industry Support for Standards 2, 4 and 7 Survey Results (FMI Summary)"
- "Industry Support for Standards 2, 4 and 7 Survey Results (NRA Summary)"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-007

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

PSC 2 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-003

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Program Standards Committee has completed the charges outlined in Issue 2014 II-003 related to Retail Program Standards 2, 4 and 7. The Committee has proposed recommendations to be sent to the FDA.

Public Health Significance:

The Retail Program Standards offer a systematic approach to, through a continuous improvement process, enhance retail food regulatory programs. They define and provide a framework designed to accommodate both traditional and emerging approaches of a regulatory food safety system. To address Issue 2014 II-003 (*Charge 2: To solicit the support of industry to examine methods to support regulatory efforts to achieve Standard 2, Standard 4, and Standard 7 of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards*), a subcommittee interviewed regulatory agencies enrolled in the Retail Program Standards, mostly those who had achieved Standards 2, 4, and 7 and who conduct direct inspections, to examine and provide methods to support regulatory efforts to achieve Standard 2, Standard 4, and Standard 7.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that they:

1. Develop a Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards) guide or template to help regulatory agencies to enroll in the Retail Program Standards, realize what they are getting involved in prior to enrollment, provide recommendations about where an enrollee should begin, and provide a roadmap to allow management to plan for proper staffing and resources to actually complete and sustain the activities associated with the Retail Program Standards;

2. Reward achievement of the Retail Program Standards by giving extra credit during the application review and scoring process for FDA grants;
3. Establish additional formal networks to complement the existing NACCHO Program Standards Mentorship Program (e.g., workgroups in each state or by FDA region with routinely scheduled webinars, conference calls, etc.) to assist regulatory agencies in their efforts with the Retail Program Standards;
4. Seek the expansion of existing forums (e.g., NACCHO sharing sessions, NEHA AEC Retail Program Standards Workshop, and cooperative agreements with NACCHO and AFDO, etc.) for enrollees to share their success stories with the Retail Program Standards;
5. Engage in a promotion of the FoodSHIELD Program Standards Resource Center when it goes live; and
6. Provide a means to ensure that each of the FDA Regional Retail Food Specialists has a minimum level of knowledge regarding implementation of the Retail Program Standards.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Todd Mers, Competency of Inspectors Subcommittee Co-Lead
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Ohio Department of Agriculture 8995 East Main Street
City/State/Zip: Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
Telephone: (614) 728-6250
E-mail: tmers@agri.ohio.gov

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Caroline Friel, Co Vice-Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Wawa, Inc. 260 West Baltimore Pike
City/State/Zip: Wawa, PA 19063
Telephone: (610) 322-6708
E-mail: caroline.friel@wawa.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-008

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

PSC 4 - Posting of Retail Program Standards Infographic on CFP Website

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Program Standards Committee has completed the charges outlined in Issue 2014 II-003 related to Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards) 2, 4 and 7. The committee has identified the benefits to industry for regulatory authorities to achieve Standard 2, Standard 4, and Standard 7. The committee developed an infographic poster that may serve as a resource for industry and other stakeholders to share those benefits.

Public Health Significance:

The 2011 Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) requires the FDA to partner with state and local food safety regulatory agencies to build a national Integrated Food Safety System (IFSS). The goal of a national IFSS is to develop a seamless partnership and operation of federal, state, and local food safety regulatory agencies to meet the public health mission of achieving a safer food supply. The benefits of having a regulatory authority meeting the Retail Program Standards contributes to an IFSS by improving the confidence in the food safety work being conducted by other agencies, focusing efforts on the reduction of risk factors known to contribute to foodborne illness, and encouraging retail food establishments to implement active managerial control over these risk factors.

Along with being a foundation and system upon which all retail food regulatory programs can build through a continuous improvement process, the Retail Program Standards provide a model of what a quality program should encompass. Standard 2 provides the essential elements of a training program for regulatory staff. Standard 4 pertains to implementing an on-going quality assurance program that evaluates inspection uniformity to ensure inspection quality, inspection frequency and consistency among the regulatory staff. Standard 7 concerns enhancing two-way communication with industry and consumers through forums designed to solicit input to improve the food safety program.

The Retail Program Standards Competency of Inspectors Infographic can be used by both industry, regulators, and other stakeholders to relate the benefits to industry for regulatory authorities to achieve Standards 2, 4 and 7 of the Retail Program Standards.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that the Retail Program Standards Competency of Inspectors Infographic be posted to the CFP website in PDF format as a Conference-developed guidance document.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: David Lawrence, Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Fairfax County Health Department 10777 Main Street, Suite 111
City/State/Zip: Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 246-8435
E-mail: David.Lawrence@fairfaxcounty.gov

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Todd Mers, Competency of Inspectors Subcommittee Co-Lead
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Ohio Department of Agriculture 8995 East Main Street
City/State/Zip: Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
Telephone: (614) 728-6250
E-mail: tmers@agri.ohio.gov

Content Documents:

- "Retail Program Standards - Competency of Inspectors Infographic"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-009

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

PSC 3 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-005

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Program Standards Committee has completed charge 3 of Issue 2014 II-005 to conduct an evaluation of the current verification audit requirement of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards). The Committee has proposed recommendations to be sent to the FDA.

Public Health Significance:

The Program Standards Committee is a standing committee reporting to the CFP Executive Board. The Committee provides ongoing input to the FDA on issues that arise with the Retail Program Standards. The Committee serves the Conference by indirectly assisting Retail Program Standards enrollees in making progress towards meeting the Standards. Issue 2014 II-005 included the charge to *Review the current verification audit requirement and: (a) Identify strengths of the current verification audit requirement; (b) Identify weaknesses of the current verification audit requirement, with emphasis on any barriers that may result from the current requirement; and (c) Determine whether there are potential changes to the requirement, or the administration of the requirement, that could maintain the credibility of the Retail Program Standards while reducing barriers to achievement that may result from the current verification audit requirement.* To address the charge, a subcommittee developed and distributed a survey questionnaire (*see Verification Audit Survey Tool*) to the jurisdictions currently enrolled in the Retail Program Standards to gather information about verification audits.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that they:

1. Work on removing the barriers identified related to conducting a Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standard verification audit by: (1) providing auditor training; (2) creating a mentorship program for auditors; (3) including information on

the online Listing of Enrolled Jurisdictions document indicating which enrollees are willing to serve as verification auditors for other enrollees; and (4) continuing to work to simplify the forms and procedures for the Retail Program Standards in an effort to reduce the amount of time required to complete the required documentation;

2. Expand funding opportunities to help support and sustain the Retail Program Standards-related activities of enrollees; and
3. Better publicize and promote the work that is being done by the FDA Clearinghouse Workgroup as an important resource for Retail Program Standards enrollees.

The Conference also recommends the continuation of charges 1, 2 and 4 from Issue 2014 II-005 to the 2016 - 2018 Program Standards Committee. Those charges are:

1. Identify areas where the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards can be changed or improved to enhance enrollment and implementation; and
2. Work on a project to recognize levels of performance of Program Standards enrollees that will demonstrate the progress of enrollees in a meaningful way and acknowledging the enrollees for taking the necessary incremental steps toward meeting the Program Standards. As part of this project:
 - a. Provide a Cost/Benefit Analysis for recognizing partial achievement of the Retail Program Standards;
 - b. Identify different approaches that could be used to recognize partial achievement of the Retail Program Standards that would not require additional resources to perform or administer; and
 - c. Examine whether there is an additional burden placed on enrollees or FDA (in time, money, or added complexity of the Standards) associated with development of a system to ensure that jurisdictions are uniformly recognized for partial achievement of the Standards.
3. Serve as a sounding board for FDA with respect to ideas generated during collaboration with the other entities such as the National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO), Partnership for Food Protection (PFP) and Association of Food and Drug Officials (AFDO).

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Debbie C. Watts, MPH, Co Vice-Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Tulsa Health Department 5051 South 129th East Avenue
City/State/Zip: Tulsa, OK 74134
Telephone: (918) 595-4305
E-mail: dwatts@tulsa-health.org

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Angie Cyr, Retail Program Standards Subcommittee Co-Lead
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Minnesota Department of Health 18 Wood Lake Drive SE
City/State/Zip: Rochester, MN 55904
Telephone: (507) 206-2744
E-mail: Angie.Cyr@state.mn.us

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-010

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

PSC 5 - Amend Retail Program Standard 7

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Amend Standard 7 of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Retail Program Standards) to allow electronic mechanisms, such as social media and web-based meetings for forums, to be used as a method to satisfy the requirement for two-way interaction between regulatory authorities and industry/community stakeholders.

Public Health Significance:

Several jurisdictions have asked whether the use of social media sites such as twitter, blogs or food program websites with surveys or feedback buttons would meet the Retail Program Standard No. 7 requirements. In its current form, Standard 7 (written in 1997 before the modern internet) requires an annual 'meeting' with stakeholders with the intent to facilitate program feedback from industry and consumers in the community. The stated intent is to foster communication exchange between regulatory, industry and consumers. Web-based forums for communication have expanded since the late 90's and can provide an effective mechanism for feedback to the retail food regulatory program. These web-based forums offer two-way communication with not only the food industry but also for consumers, who have traditionally been difficult to include in formal, face-to-face meetings in a meaningful way.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA recommending the following changes to Standard 7 of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is in strikethrough format):

Standard 7

Industry and Community Relations

This standard applies to industry and community outreach activities ~~utilized~~ used by a retail food regulatory program to solicit a broad spectrum of input into a comprehensive-regulatory food program ~~about a retail food regulatory program's previous, current, and future activities~~, communicate sound public health food safety principles, and foster and recognize community initiatives focused on the reduction of foodborne disease illness risk factors.

Requirement Summary

The jurisdiction documents participation in forums that foster communication and information exchange among the regulators, industry and consumer representatives.

The jurisdiction documents outreach activities that provide educational information on food safety.

Description of Requirement

1. Industry and Consumer Interaction

The jurisdiction sponsors or actively participates in meetings forums with two-way communication such as food safety task forces meetings, advisory boards, ~~or~~ advisory committees, customer surveys, web-based meetings or forums, or other mechanisms. These forums shall present information on food safety, food safety strategies and interventions to control risk factors. Offers of participation must be extended to industry and consumer representatives.

2. Educational Outreach

Outreach encompasses industry and consumer groups as well as media and elected officials. Outreach efforts may include industry recognition programs, websites, newsletters, Fight BAC™[®] campaigns, food safety month activities, food worker training, school-based activities, ~~customer surveys~~ use of oral culture learner materials, or other activities that increase awareness of the foodborne illness risk factors and control methods to prevent foodborne illness. Outreach activities may also include posting inspection information on a website or in the press.

Agency participation in at least one activity in each of the above categories annually is sufficient to meet this standard.

Outcome

The desired outcome of this standard is enhanced communication with industry and consumers through forums designed to solicit input to improve the retail food safety regulatory program. A further outcome is the reduction of foodborne illness risk factors through educational outreach and cooperative efforts with stakeholders.

Documentation

~~The~~ Quality records needed for this standard ~~reflect activities over the most recent five-year period and include:~~

1. Minutes, agendas or other records documenting that forums were conducted,
2. For formal, recurring meetings, documents such ~~documents~~ as by-laws, charters, membership criteria and lists, frequency of meetings, roles, etc.,
3. Surveys, web feedback links with associated follow-up materials and review documents,

4. Documentation of ~~performed actions or~~ activities designed with input from industry and consumers to improve the control of foodborne illness risk factors, or
5. Documentation of food safety educational efforts.

Statements of policies and procedures may suffice if activities are continuous, and documenting multiple incidents would be cumbersome, (e.g., recognition provided to establishments with exemplary records or an on-going website).

Submitter Information 1:

Name: David Lawrence, Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Fairfax County Health Department 10777 Main Street, Suite 111
City/State/Zip: Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 246-8435
E-mail: David.Lawrence@fairfaxcounty.gov

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Debbie C. Watts, MPH, Co Vice-Chair
Organization: Program Standards Committee
Address: Tulsa Health Department 5051 South 129th East Avenue
City/State/Zip: Tulsa, OK 74134
Telephone: (918) 595-4305
E-mail: dwatts@tulsa-health.org

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-011

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Amend VNRFRPS – Standard 4 – Uniform Inspection Program (Part 1)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Amend Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standard (VNRFRPS) No. 4 to reflect recommendations from the 2012 CFP Uniform Inspection Program Audit Pilot Project Report.

The Pilot Project Report is available with this Issue as a supporting attachment; it is also currently posted on the CFP website at:

<http://www.foodprotect.org/media/guide/uniform-inspection-program-audit-pilot-project-report.pdf>

Public Health Significance:

The 2012 CFP Uniform Inspection Audit Pilot Project Report evaluated the Uniform Inspection Program process and audit worksheet as tools for conducting the quality assurance evaluations in Program Standard No. 4.

Implementing the following changes will address some of the recommendations provided in the Pilot Project Report, while also providing greater flexibility, improved program quality assessment, and greater consistency between Program Standard No. 2 and No. 4:

1. More closely align the ten Program Elements described in Program Standard No. 4 with the Performance Elements and Competencies contained in the Standard No. 2 - CFP Field Training Plan for new hires or staff newly assigned to the retail food protection program.
2. Provide a re-ordered listing of the Program Elements in Program Standard No. 4 to reflect the organized flow of the inspection process.
3. Increase the minimum number of required field assessments (joint inspections) to maintain consistency with the current statistical model upon which Standard 4 is based; this calculation is shown in "Attachment C - Update: Explanation of the Statistical Model for Program Standard No. 4."

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS), Program Standard No. 4 - Uniform Inspection Program, be amended to reflect the changes shown in "Attachment A - Proposed Amendments to Program Standard No. 4 - Uniform Inspection Program" (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is in strikethrough format).

Submitter Information:

Name: Mary Cartagena
Organization: Food and Drug Administration
Address: 5100 Paint Branch ParkwayHFS-320 Rm 3B038
City/State/Zip: College Park, MD 20740
Telephone: 240-402-2937
E-mail: mary.cartagena@fda.hhs.gov

Content Documents:

- "Attachment A- Program Standard No. 4 - Uniform Inspection Program"

Supporting Attachments:

- "Attachment B-Explanation of the Statistical Model for Program Standard No.4"
- "Attachment C-Updated Explanation of the Statistical Model for Prog. Std. 4"
- "Attachment D- Uniform Inspection Program - Audit Pilot Project Report"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-012

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Amend VNRFRPS – Standard 4 – Uniform Inspection Program (Part 2)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Amend the FDA Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS) No. 4 - Uniform Inspection Program to reflect recommendations from the 2012 CFP Uniform Inspection Program Audit Pilot Project Report.

The Pilot Project Report is attached to the "Part 1" Issue on this topic; Issue titled: Amend VNRFRPS - Standard 4 - Uniform Inspection Program (Part 1)

*The report is also currently posted on the CFP website at:
<http://www.foodprotect.org/media/guide/uniform-inspection-program-audit-pilot-project-report.pdf>*

Public Health Significance:

The 2012 CFP Uniform Inspection Audit Pilot Project Report evaluated the Uniform Inspection Program process and audit worksheet as tools for conducting the quality assurance evaluations in Program Standard No. 4.

Implementing the following changes will address some of the recommendations provided in the Pilot Project Report, while also providing greater flexibility, improved program quality assessment, and greater consistency between Program Standards No. 2 and No. 4:

1. Clarify that jurisdictions may assess additional performance elements as part of their field assessment process. However, for the purposes of achieving conformance with the Standard, only the performance elements specified in the Standard will be used to assess conformance with the Standard.
2. Clarify that the assessment of the performance elements is not an all-or-nothing approach. (For instance, someone that misses one risk factor out of 10 risk factors during a field assessment may still achieve an acceptable level of performance/uniformity on a particular performance element.)

3. Clarify that enrolled jurisdictions may wish to create a field assessment tool that includes specific comments and feedback for the individual food safety inspection officer.
4. Clarify how establishments should be selected for the field assessment process.
5. Provide specific guidance about the file review process.
6. Clarify who should conduct the field assessment and associated file review.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS), Program Standard No. 4 - Self-Assessment Instructions and Worksheet, be amended to reflect the changes shown in "Attachment A - Instructions and Worksheet for Conducting a Self-Assessment" (language to be added is underlined; language to be deleted is in strikethrough format).

Submitter Information:

Name: Mary Cartagena
Organization: Food and Drug Administration
Address: 5100 Paint Branch ParkwayHFS-320 Rm 3B038
City/State/Zip: College Park, MD 20740
Telephone: 240-402-2937
E-mail: mary.cartagena@fda.hhs.gov

Content Documents:

- "Attachment A-Proposed Amendments for PS No.4-SelfAssessmentInstr.Worksheet"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-013

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Amend FDA VNRFRPS Standard 9 – Program Assessment

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Amend Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS) Standard No. 9 to adjust the required facility types for a Risk Factor Study, such that nine separate facility type assessments would no longer be a requirement. This would be consistent with FDA's approach to the current Risk Factor Study which no longer includes nine separate facility types.

Public Health Significance:

In order to achieve conformance with Program Standard No. 9, a jurisdiction must collect risk factor data every 60 months, write a report and analyze the data, and implement an intervention strategy based on the data collected in the risk factor study. Jurisdictions may collect risk factor data through a risk factor study, or through routine inspectional data. However, jurisdictions must collect data for each facility type identified in Program Standard No. 9, if the facility type is regulated by the jurisdiction. Program Standard No. 9 currently identifies nine (9) specific facility types:

- Institutions
 - Hospitals;
 - Nursing Homes;
 - Elementary Schools (kindergarten through grade 5)
- Restaurants
 - Full Service
 - Fast Food
- Retail Food Stores
 - Delis;

- Meat Departments;
- Seafood Departments;
- Produce Departments

After the completion of FDA's third Risk Factor Study and subsequent Trend Analysis Report, FDA embarked on a revised Risk Factor Study design that incorporates lessons learned from the first ten year study. One substantial modification to the current risk factor study design involves the facility types chosen for the data collection. Rather than collect data for each of the nine facility types, FDA modified its approach by adjusting the facility types within certain facility categories used for data collection. This new design allows for greater flexibility to collect meaningful data and identify trends.

FDA would like enrolled jurisdictions to use this new model, including the changes to the facility type categories, and have the changes incorporated into Program Standard No. 9 as described below. Jurisdictions would continue to be required to collect and analyze data from all facility categories under their regulation, but would incorporate the following new options;

1. Rather than specify the nine (9) facility types that must be included, Program Standard No. 9 would specify four (4) broad facility categories:
 - (1) Health Care;
 - (2) Schools (kindergarten through grade 12);
 - (3) Restaurants;
 - (4) Retail Food Stores.
2. In order to meet Standard 9, jurisdictions would be required to collect and analyze data for each facility category under regulation.
3. Jurisdictions would have flexibility to evaluate patterns and subcategories within each facility category. For instance, a jurisdiction could separate the restaurant category into the traditional 'full service' and 'fast food' type operations, or all restaurants could be evaluated together.

The proposed changes will provide greater efficiency and flexibility, and enable a risk-based approach when measuring the success of a program to reduce the occurrence of foodborne illness risk factors.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to FDA requesting that the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS), Standard Number 9 - Program Assessment, be amended to reflect the changes shown in *"Attachment A - Proposed Amendments to Program Standard No. 9 - Program Assessment."*

Those areas of the Standard with proposed changes are noted below (underline indicates language to be added; strikethrough format used to indicate language to be deleted)

STANDARD 9

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

This Standard applies to the process used to measure the success of a jurisdiction's program in reducing the occurrence of foodborne illness risk factors to enhance food safety and public health in the community.

Requirement Summary

Program management must ensure that:

1. A risk factor study on the occurrence of the five foodborne illness risk factors is conducted and repeated at least once every 60 months to measure trends in the occurrence of the risk factors;
2. An analysis is made of the data collected and a report on the outcomes and conclusions of the risk factor study is written; and
3. A targeted intervention strategy designed to address the occurrence of the risk factor(s) identified in their risk factor study is implemented and the effectiveness of such strategy is evaluated by subsequent risk factor studies or other similar tools.

Description of Requirement

To achieve the criteria of Standard 9, a jurisdiction must ensure that:

A. A risk factor study and report on the occurrence of the five (5) foodborne illness risk factors must be completed. A risk factor study serves two purposes:

1. To identify risk factors most in need of priority attention in order to develop strategies to reduce their occurrence.
2. To evaluate trends over time to determine whether progress is being made toward reducing the occurrence of foodborne illness risk factors. Studies designed to measure trends require analysis of data over a period of time, and no single point in time can be used to derive trend conclusions.

B. The risk factor study includes all facility ~~types~~ categories under regulation by the jurisdiction.

It is recommended that a jurisdiction's first risk factor study be conducted as soon as possible following its first self-assessment, before programmatic changes are made. There is value in using the first study to establish a "baseline" against which future performance can be measured. Program improvements and changes may then be reflected in subsequent studies.

C. The risk factor study information is to be updated at least once every 60 months to measure trends specific to the occurrence of the five (5) foodborne illness risk factors.

The data collection and analysis ~~for the various facility types under regulation by the jurisdiction~~ may occur at various times over the 60-month period, as long as all facility ~~types~~ categories under regulation are included in the 60-month cycle. The 60-month study update is required to maintain achievement of Standard 9. The subsequent studies and reports will ~~determine whether or not indicate if~~ there has been a net change in the occurrence of the risk factors.

The ~~nine (9)~~ four (4) facility ~~categories~~ types are:

- ~~Institutions~~
 - ~~Hospitals;~~

- ~~Nursing Homes;-~~
 - ~~Elementary Schools (K-5)-~~
 - Restaurants
 - ~~Full-Service-~~
 - ~~Fast-Food-~~
 - ~~Retail Food Stores~~
 - ~~Delis;-~~
 - ~~Meat Departments;-~~
 - ~~Seafood Departments;-~~
 - ~~Produce Departments-~~
1. Health Care:
 2. Schools (K-12):
 3. Restaurants;
 4. Retail Food Stores.

D. A jurisdiction may use routine inspection data or may conduct a separate data collection in completing a risk factor study. A data collection instrument similar to the FDA Model Data Collection Form using the IN, OUT, NA, and NO convention, is required.

Failure to use this convention skews the data toward either IN compliance or OUT of compliance. The FDA data collection instrument is not intended as an inspection form. However, jurisdictions that have developed an inspection form using the IN, OUT, NA and NO convention may use that inspection form as a survey instrument.

If the jurisdiction uses a different form, the data may be difficult to compare with the data from the *FDA National Foodborne Illness Risk Factor Studies* or with data from other jurisdictions.

E. A jurisdiction must ensure that a targeted intervention strategy designed to address the occurrence of the risk factor(s) identified in their Risk Factor Study is implemented and the effectiveness is evaluated by subsequent Risk Factor Studies or other similar tools. Jurisdictions are encouraged to incorporate various types of interventions such as code changes, educational and training activities, enforcement and compliance strategies, etc. The purpose of the intervention strategy is to attempt to affect improvement in reducing priority risk factor(s) occurrence rates between measurement intervals and assess their effectiveness.

Outcome

The desired outcome of this Standard is to enable managers to measure their program against national criteria and to demonstrate improvement in food safety. The process identifies program elements that may require improvement or be deserving of recognition.

Documentation

The quality records required for this standard include:

1. Survey reports on the occurrence of risk factors and *FDA Food Code* interventions,

2. Survey collection tools or inspection sheets used for the data collection,
3. Documentation that each facility ~~category type under regulated~~ is surveyed during the 60-month survey cycle,
4. Documentation of performed interventions, actions or activities designed to improve the control of risk factors,
5. Documentation that the effectiveness of performed interventions is evaluated.

Submitter Information:

Name: Mary Cartagena
Organization: Food and Drug Administration
Address: 5100 Paint Branch ParkwayHFS-320 Rm 3B038
City/State/Zip: College Park, MD 20740
Telephone: 240-402-2937
E-mail: mary.cartagena@fda.hhs.gov

Content Documents:

- "Attachment A-Proposed Amendments to Program Standard No. 9 - Program Assess"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-014

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report - Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The 2014-2016 CFSRP Workgroup seeks Council's acknowledgement of its final report.

Public Health Significance:

A national model that addresses training and the professional development of regulatory retail food safety professionals is essential to enhancing the effectiveness of the nation's retail food protection system. The Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards, Standard 2 training and standardization model should be viewed as a working document that will need to be updated and revised to meet the ever-changing retail food safety environment. The Conference for Food Protection provides the mechanism to:

1. Maintain and update this national training model;
2. Explore additional training and/or assessment needs for regulatory retail food programs; and
3. Build consensus among all retail food safety stakeholders.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

1. Acknowledgment of the 2014-2016 Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP) final report, and
2. Extending thanks to all the 2014-2016 CFSRP members for their work and dedication and to those organizations/agencies that they represent for supporting the Conference for Food Protection process.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: DeBrena Hilton
Organization: CFSRP Workgroup Co-Chair

Address: Tulsa Health Department 5051 S. 129th E. Avenue
City/State/Zip: Tulsa, OK 74134
Telephone: 918-595-4302
E-mail: dhilton@tulsa-health.org

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Angela Benton
Organization: CFSRP Workgroup Co-Chair
Address: Jetro/Restaurant Depot 133-11 20th Avenue
City/State/Zip: College Point, NY 11356
Telephone: 718-939-6400 ext.601
E-mail: Abenton@jetrorrd.com

Content Documents:

- "Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP) Roster"
- "Final Report - Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals"

Supporting Attachments:

- "CFSRP Conference Call Minutes"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-015

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

CFSRP 2– Reassign Charges to the Program Standards Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The CFSRP Workgroup recommends that it be dissolved as a standalone workgroup and that future issues dealing with the certification of food safety regulation professionals be assigned to the Program Standards Committee in order to ensure a consistent and uniform approach to addressing the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFRPS).

Public Health Significance:

The management of issues relating to the certification of food safety regulation professionals by the Program Standards Committee will eliminate any potential confusion among CFP stakeholders concerning the entity that is responsible for addressing issues related to the VNRFRPS and will also eliminate the potential for redundancy of work related to the VNRFRPS.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that the Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP) Workgroup be dissolved as a standalone workgroup, and that the remaining subcharges from Issue 2014 II-002, Charge 1 be reassigned to the 2016 - 2018 Program Standards Committee as follows:

Collaborate with the FDA Division of Human Resource Development, and the Partnership for Food Protection Training and Certification Workgroup (PFP TCWG) to:

1. Continue review of all initiatives: existing, new or under development; involving the training, evaluation and/or certification of food safety inspection officers. This collaborative working relationship will ensure the sharing of information so as not to create any unnecessary redundancies in the creation of work product or assignment of tasks/responsibilities.

2. Review the results of the partnership for food protection training and certification work group recommendations for the nationally recognized Retail Food Curriculum based on the Retail Food Job Task Analysis (JTA) to determine if changes are needed in the Standard 2 curriculum. Identify any gaps and recommendations for change and review the time frame for completion of Standard 2 Steps 1 through 4 for new hires or staff newly assigned to the regulatory retail food protection program.
3. Continue to assess if any changes will be needed in Standard 2-Trained Regulatory Staff based on the current standard for review referenced in (1) above to provide better alignment with Standard 4 of the VNRFRPS.
4. Report back their findings and recommendations to the 2018 Biennial Meeting of the Conference for Food Protection.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: DeBrena Hilton
Organization: CFSRP Workgroup Co-Chair
Address: Tulsa Health Department 5051 S. 129th E. Avenue
City/State/Zip: Tulsa, OK 74134
Telephone: 918-595-4302
E-mail: dhilton@tulsa-health.org

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Angela Benton
Organization: CFSRP Workgroup Co-Chair
Address: Jetro/Restaurant Depot 133-11 20th Avenue
City/State/Zip: College Point, NY 11356
Telephone: 718-939-6400 ext.601
E-mail: Abenton@jetrord.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-016

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report: Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (IFITC)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The 2014-2016 Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (IFITC) seeks the Council's acknowledgement of its report.

Public Health Significance:

The Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee has been tasked with:

1. Use the Crosswalk submitted in the 2012-2014 Committee report to identify current gaps in the training for Program Standard #5 as established by Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak Response (CIFOR) and the Partnership for Food Protection as best practices for foodborne illness investigation.
2. Identify new training programs as they relate to the Crosswalk and Standard 5.
3. Work within the Conference process to post the Crosswalk document from the 2012-2014 Committee to the CFP Website.
4. Report back to the 2016 biennial meeting a revised Crosswalk document for foodborne illness investigation.

The Committee believes that it has completed the assigned charges set by the Conference.

It is our belief that the need for foodborne illness training is important, and given that different jurisdictions do not use a consistent approach to foodborne illness investigations, the gathering and sharing of this information will make it possible for health agencies, universities, industry and other non-governmental organizations to determine if the training materials they are using matches the requirements of Standard 5.

The Committee does believe that improved training opportunities should increase awareness as well as promote the importance of Foodborne Illness Investigations.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

1. Acknowledgement of the report of the Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee.
2. Thanking the Committee members for their work and dedication for completing the charges.

Submitter Information:

Name: James Steele
Organization: IFITC
Address: Walt Disney World PO Box 10,000
City/State/Zip: Lake Buena Vista, FL 32830
Telephone: 321-395-1665
E-mail: james.steele@disney.com

Content Documents:

- "Report: Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (IFITC)"
- "Crosswalk - Requirements For Foodborne Illness Training Programs"
- "CFP Committee Roster Interdisciplinary FBI Training Committee 11302015"

Supporting Attachments:

- "Minutes - 2016 Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-017

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

IFITC 2 – Approval and Posting of the Crosswalk

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

That the Conference considers that new and updated foodborne disease outbreak training programs will continue to occur and that all target agencies could benefit from a process that updates the list of training program and reviews the programs. Posting the Crosswalk will provide a tool that will facilitate the development of robust foodborne illness training programs.

Public Health Significance:

Delays in reporting or investigating a possible foodborne disease outbreak can prolong an outbreak event, potentially resulting in further illness or economic disruption. Effective training of public health professionals, health agencies, universities and industry in outbreak response can mitigate the negative impact of any outbreak. However, these entities may not be aware of the foodborne disease outbreak trainings that are currently in existence.

The Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee believes that these opportunities provide the chance for the Conference for Food Protection to continue to influence the food and beverage community, health agencies, universities, in the minimum, to review their Foodborne Illness Training to determine if their program is complete as outlined in Standard 5. The Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee created a Crosswalk titled Crosswalk - Requirements for Foodborne Illness Training Programs Based on Standard 5 that we recommend is posted to the CFP website.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

1) approving the document titled *"Crosswalk - Requirements for Foodborne Illness Training Programs Based on Standard 5"* created by the Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (document is attached to the Issue titled: Report - Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee).

2) posting the final document on the CFP website in MS Word and PDF.

Submitter Information:

Name: James Steele
Organization: IFITC
Address: Walt Disney World PO Box 10,000
City/State/Zip: Lake Buena Vista, FL 32830
Telephone: 321-395-1665
E-mail: james.steele@disney.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-018

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

IFITC 3 - Reassign Charges to Program Standards Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

That the Conference considers that new and updated foodborne disease outbreak training programs will continue to occur and that all target agencies could benefit from a process that updates the list of training programs and reviews the programs. The IFITC firmly believes that the better avenue to continue this work will be under the Programs Standards Committee, a standing committee of the Conference for Food Protection.

Public Health Significance:

Delays in reporting or investigating a possible foodborne disease outbreak can prolong an outbreak event, potentially resulting in further illness or economic disruption. Effective training of public health professionals, health agencies, universities and industry in outbreak response can mitigate the negative impact of any outbreak. However, these entities may not be aware of the foodborne disease outbreak trainings that are currently in existence.

The Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee believes that these opportunities provide the chance for the Conference for Food Protection to continue to influence the food and beverage community, health agencies, universities, in the minimum, to review their Foodborne Illness Training to determine if their program is complete as outlined in Standard 5.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

dissolving the Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee.

The Conference further recommends assigning the Program Standards Committee with the following standing charges:

1. Identify available resources related to foodborne illness training.
2. Assess any newly developed foodborne illness training courses or programs.

3. Maintain the document titled *Crosswalk - Requirements For Foodborne Illness Training Programs Based on Standard 5* as a resource and content baseline for foodborne illness training.
4. Report back any findings and recommendations to each biennial meeting of the Conference for Food Protection.

Submitter Information:

Name: James Steele
Organization: IFITC, Co-Chair
Address: Walt Disney World PO Box 10,000
City/State/Zip: Lake Buena Vista, FL 32830
Telephone: 321-395-1665
E-mail: james.steele@disney.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-019

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Clarification for Re-standardization in VNRFRPS Standard 2

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (Program Standards) establish best practices for regulatory programs that license and inspect foodservice and retail food establishments; when applied, the Program Standards are intended to enhance uniformity within and between regulatory agencies.

A major requirement in Standard 2 (Trained Regulatory Staff) is the standardization of at least 90% of the regulatory inspection staff. Standard 2 is specific in stating that continuing standardization (re-standardization) *"shall be maintained by performing four joint inspections with the 'training standard' every three years,"* but lacks specific requirements related to the protocol or process to be used when conducting these joint inspections. The common assumption is that the process used for initial standardization shall also be used for re-standardization... but this is not stated in Standard 2.

In addition, the Program Standards Definition for a "training standard" lacks requirements for both continuing education and re-standardization. Again, the common assumption is that re-standardization of a "training standard" is required every three (3) years, with the same continuing education requirements as for regulatory inspection staff, and using the same process as that used for initial standardization of the "training standard"... but none of this is stated in the Definitions or in Standard 2.

Public Health Significance:

Non-specific language regarding continuing standardization in the Definitions and in Standard 2 requires every program manager who has achieved conformance with Standard 2 to make assumptions about how to effectively achieve re-standardization in his/her jurisdiction. In addition, a lack of stated requirements forces an auditor to also make assumptions about the requirements during a verification audit. Differing interpretations... and differing expectations... could result in a non-confirming audit. Moreover, specific

requirements that might be acceptable by one auditor... could be rejected in a subsequent audit by a different auditor.

The absence of specific language regarding continuing standardization (re-standardization)... and the need to rely on unstated (and potentially differing) assumptions... could easily result in regulatory agencies being held to vastly different requirements in order to successfully pass a second (and subsequent) verification audit of Standard 2.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA recommending:

1) Clarification of continuing standardization (re-standardization) requirements in the *Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards-January 2015* by insertion/deletion of the following language in the DEFINITIONS and in STANDARD 2 (*only those paragraphs impacted are included below; language to be inserted is in underline format and language to be removed is in strikethrough format. Full text of Standard 2 and suggested edits is available in the attached content document titled: **VNRFRRPS Standard 2 Revision - full text***):

a) DEFINITIONS - Definition #29

Training Standard - An individual who has successfully completed the following training elements AND standardization elements in Standard 2 and is recognized by the program manager as having the field experience and communication skills necessary to train new employees. The training and standardization elements include:

1. Satisfactory completion of the prerequisite curriculum;
2. Completion of a field training process similar to that contained in Appendix B-2;
3. Completion of a minimum of 25 independent inspections and satisfactory completion of the remaining course curriculum; ~~and~~
4. Successful completion of a standardization process based on a minimum of eight inspections that includes development of HACCP flow charts, completion of a risk control plan, and verification of a HACCP plan, similar to the FDA standardization procedures-;
5. Completion of a minimum of 20 contact hours of continuing education in food safety every three (3) years as outlined in Standard 2; and
6. Successful standardization renewal every three (3) years based on the same protocol and field inspection process as that used to achieve initial standardization.

b) STANDARD 2, Trained Regulatory Staff (see attached content document titled: **VNRFRRPS Standard 2 Revision - full text**)

Requirement Summary, STEP 4: Food Safety Inspection Officer - Field Standardization

Continuing standardization (re-standardization) shall be maintained by performing four joint inspections with the "training standard" every three years; joint inspections shall be conducted using the same protocol, include the same field exercises, and apply the same scoring and assessment criteria used during initial standardization.

Note: If a jurisdiction updates their standardization protocol, or their scoring and assessment tools, the most recent version shall be used during re-standardization.

Should a jurisdiction fall short of having 90% of its retail food program inspection staff successfully complete the Program Standard 2 criteria within the 18 month time frame, or should a jurisdiction fail to meet all re-standardization requirements every three years, a written protocol must be established to provide a remedy so that the Standard can be met. This protocol would include a corrective action plan outlining how the situation will be corrected and the date when the correction will be achieved.

Documentation

The quality records needed for this standard include:

1. Certificates or proof of attendance from the successful completion of all the course elements identified in the Program Standard curriculum (Steps 1 and 3);
2. Documentation of field inspection reports for twenty-five each joint and independent inspections (Steps 2 and 3);
3. Certificates or other documentation of successful completion of a field training process similar to that presented in Appendix B-2. NOTE: The CFP Field Training Manual is available for the Conference for Food Protection web site: <http://www.foodprotect.org/> and is located under the icon titled "Conference Developed Guides and Documents."
4. Certificates or other records showing proof of satisfactory standardization and/or re-standardization (Step 4);
5. Contact hour certificates or other records for continuing education (Step 5);
6. Signed documentation from the regulatory jurisdiction's food program supervisor or training officer that food inspection personnel attended and successfully completed the training and education steps outlined in this Standard.
7. Date of hire records or assignment to the retail food program; and
8. Summary record of employees' compliance with the Standard.

2) Updating of any support material or documents related to Standard 2 and the Definitions of the *Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards-January 2015* to reflect any language change.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Manuel Ramirez
Organization: City of Berkeley, Division of Environmental Health
Address: 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor
City/State/Zip: Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: 510-981-5261
E-mail: mramirez@cityofberkeley.info

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Vicki Everly
Organization: City of Berkeley, Division of Environmental Health
Address: 2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor
City/State/Zip: Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: 510-501-0417

E-mail: veverly@cityofberkeley.info

Supporting Attachments:

- "• VNRFRPS Standard 2 Revision - full text"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-020

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Reevaluation of FDA VNRFRP Standard 8

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The FDA *Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards* (VNRFRPS) provides an excellent framework for measure of conformity and serves as a benchmark for local health departments. It is our opinion that Standard 8 should be reevaluated to promote more feasible, sensible, and realistic criteria that can be obtained by health departments without reducing the overall objective of Standard 8.

Public Health Significance:

Standard 8 of the VNRFRPS creates an unattainable standard that prohibits local health departments (LHDs) from achieving this level of model operation.

Very few LHDs have met this Standard. Of this small number, many were one person jurisdictions that do not operate on the same capacity of the majority of LHDs. From the FDA VNRFRP website, of the 671 LHDs that are enrolled, only 27 have met Standard 8 thru self-assessment, 14 of those conducted their assessments over 5 years ago, and only 2 of the 27 were actually verified via an audit.

While the Standard surely should exist, the logic model doesn't seem sound when it is unattainable or impractical to efficient operations of LHDs. Standard 8 should be reevaluated, not to reduce the quality of the benchmark, but to review the criteria to be sure it is accurate and reasonable, as well as being an attainable standard of measure for LHDs to strive to attain.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that the CFP Program Standards Committee be charged to evaluate Standard 8 of the FDA Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards, as follows:

1. review the "Description of Requirements" for "Staffing Level" to ensure they are accurate, reasonable, and attainable for jurisdictions of all sizes,

2. report back their findings and recommendations to the 2018 Biennial Meeting of the Conference for Food Protection.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Michael Schaffer
Organization: Harris County Public Health & Environmental Services
Address: 2223 W. Loop S.
City/State/Zip: Houston, TX 77027
Telephone: 713-274-6400
E-mail: mschaffer@hcphe.org

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Deanna Copeland
Organization: Harris County Public Health & Environmental Services
Address: 101 S. Richey, Ste. G
City/State/Zip: Pasadena, TX 77506
Telephone: 713-274-6443
E-mail: dcopeland@hcphe.org

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-021

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Recommended Food Code adoption process

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

This Issue makes it easy for all stakeholders to quickly identify differences between a jurisdiction's food code and the FDA Food Code.

Adoption of the FDA Food Code by States, Territories and Local jurisdictions can be a laborious process. Besides taking a long time and extensive resources of regulatory authorities, it is often difficult to determine which sections of a jurisdiction's food code are different from the FDA Food Code. This issue asks the conference to consider providing in Standard 1 of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (or anywhere else FDA feels appropriate) a suggested method for FDA Food Code adoption.

This issue recommends adoption via an exception process. A number of states have utilized this process successfully, Iowa, New Mexico, North Carolina and West Virginia for example. As the jurisdiction reviews the latest FDA Food Code for adoption, it creates a statute or administrative rule which:

1. First adopts the current version of the FDA Food Code;
2. Secondly creates paragraphs within their statute/rule which adopt jurisdiction specific requirements which replace or amend the referenced sections of the FDA Food Code.

Public Health Significance:

This process does not compromise food safety in any manner and would simplify the Food code adoption process. Since many multi-jurisdictional companies utilize the current version of the FDA Food Code as their standard for Food Safety, it would allow them to easily identify Food Code sections that differ from the FDA Food Code. A few of the advantages of this type of adoption process include:

1. Less chance of transcription errors-missing words, misspelled words, etc.
2. Less chance of missing relevant Food Code citations or cross references.

3. Changes from the FDA Food code are easy to pick out since they will be incorporated into a much briefer rule. No need to search the whole food code of a jurisdiction to see what is different.
4. Less chance of industry being out of compliance with a jurisdiction's food code since they did not know that a jurisdiction's food code differed from the FDA Food Code in any given section.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to FDA recommending that Standard 1 of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards include a process for adopting the FDA Food Code with exceptions. The following is sample language:

When adopting the FDA Food Code, the following is a recommended process:

1. Adopt Chapters 1-7 or 8 (if it's compatible with the jurisdiction's administrative procedures) if allowed by the jurisdiction's rulemaking process and by stakeholders.
2. Any changes should then be incorporated into this administrative rule citing which specific sections of the FDA Food code are not being adopted or are being modified. List specific wording changes that are replacing the exempted FDA sections, including a reference to the specific FDA section being changed.
3. Additional jurisdiction specific chapters may be added and may include items such as mobile units, temporary events, cottage foods, etc.
4. When adding additional chapters, consider reviewing available guidance documents on the CFP and Association of Food and Drug Officials (AFDO) websites for model codes that can be used in creating additional content.
5. An 'unofficial' inspectors copy of the final adopted code be created which includes full text of the Food Code including changes so inspectors do not need to cross reference back and forth between the FDA Food Code and the jurisdiction's adopted rule.

Submitter Information:

Name: Christopher Melchert
Organization: National Restaurant Association
Address: 2055 L Street NWSuite 700
City/State/Zip: Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202-973-3960
E-mail: cmelchert@restaurant.org

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-022

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This issue was submitted for consideration at a previous biennial meeting, see issue: 2014, III-017; the recommended solution has been revised.

Title:

Complimenting Unannounced with Scheduled Inspections

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

30,000+ health inspectors/assessors have an opportunity to be more focused on prevention in keeping with the principles of Active Managerial Control (AMC) and in the spirit of the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA).

A condition for improved learning for food handlers and their managers can be achieved by scheduling inspections rather than trying to learn during routine, unannounced inspections, especially when key managers are missing.

Local initiatives show that a scheduled assessment format is capable of culture change and the building of mutual respect between inspector and operator. Once a program of scheduled inspections is implemented neither party wants to return to former practices.

Discussions with the person-in-charge (PIC) and senior facility management, focused on prioritized risks, uncover many risks that cannot be discovered by observation alone. This point is crystallized in this quote from an operator during an outbreak investigation. "Why didn't you point out all these risks? Why did you wait until we had an outbreak?"

<http://handwashingforlife.com/blog/mike-mann/scheduled-restaurant-inspections>

Public Health Significance:

Better-utilized health inspector time can protect the public by minimizing foodborne outbreaks.

Minimally trained foodservice managers and staff threaten public health. Without knowledge of clear risk-based objectives, managers are themselves barriers to effective and sustainable staff training as they set priorities and control budgets. It is the onsite manager education that has been the missing link, and high industry turnover rates exacerbate the issue.

There are approximately 30,000 inspector/trainers in the U.S. who conduct an estimated 20 million retail food inspections per year. Encouraging unannounced inspections will improve public health by focusing some of these inspections on communication and a training partnership between industry and regulators.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA recommending that the 2013 Food Code Annexes be amended to encourage complimenting unscheduled with scheduled inspection programs by regulatory agencies.

Submitter Information:

Name: Jim Mann
Organization: Handwashing For Life
Address: 1216 Flamingo Parkway
City/State/Zip: Libertyville, IL 60048
Telephone: 847-918-0254
E-mail: jmann@handwashingforlife.com

Supporting Attachments:

- "Olmsted County Receives "Model Practice Award""
- "Olmsted County Crumbine Award Package"
- "Olmsted County - Risk Factor Identification"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-023

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report - Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC)

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Please acknowledge the final report and thank the 2014-2016 Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC) members for their effort in addressing the charges from the 2014 Biennial Meeting of the Conference for Food Protection.

Public Health Significance:

Food establishments have fewer critical risk factors according to the CDC as stated in the endorsement letter to the Conference for Food Protection (dated April 5, 2006, and referenced on the Conference website) when food establishments employ managers who have a Food Protection Manager Certification in accordance with the Conference for Food Protection's Standards.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

acknowledging the Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC) final report with attachments, and extending thanks to the Committee members for their work.

The Conference further recommends that the FPMCC continue its work on unfinished Issues from the 2014 Biennial Meeting, including:

1. Issue II-012 - Continue work with the CFP Executive Board and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI)-CFP Accreditation Committee (ACAC) to maintain the Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification Programs in an up-to-date format; including, but not limited to, recommending language for items that could be made less prescriptive without a negative effect on security.
2. Issue II-015 - Determining the process and requirements for potential acceptance of the International Organization for Standardization/ International Electrotechnical Commission (ISO/IEC) 17024-2012 for food protection manager certification as an additional option to and without impact on the existing CFP Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection

Manger Certification Programs, with the input of standards development expertise from American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

3. Report back its findings and recommendations to the Executive Board and the 2018 Biennial Meeting of the Conference for Food Protection.

Submitter Information:

Name: Jeff Hawley, Chair
Organization: Food Protection Manager Certification Committee
Address: Harris Teeter, LLC701 Crestdale Rd
City/State/Zip: Matthews, NC 28105
Telephone: 704-844-3098
E-mail: jhawley@harristeeter.com

Content Documents:

- "Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC) Roster"
- "Report: Food Protection Manager Certification Committee"
- "Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Mgr Certification Programs"

Supporting Attachments:

- "Security Evaluation Workgroup Baseline & Summative Self-Report Findings"
- "CFP-ISO Standards Comparison Equivalency Report"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-024

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

FPMCC 2- Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Mgr Certification

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC) proposes revisions to the Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification Programs to incorporate punctuation, italics, capitalization, and other non-substantive changes.

Public Health Significance:

Food establishments have fewer critical risk factors according to the CDC as stated in the endorsement letter to the Conference for Food Protection (dated April 5, 2006, and referenced on the Conference website) when food establishments employ managers who have a Food Protection Manager Certification in accordance with the Conference for Food Protection's Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification Programs.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

approval of revisions to the *Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification Programs* to incorporate punctuation, italics, capitalization, and other non-substantive changes (See Content Attachment 3 attached to Issue titled: Report - Food Protection Manager Certification Committee).

Submitter Information:

Name: Jeff Hawley, Chair
Organization: Food Protection Manager Certification Committee
Address: Harris Teeter, LLC701 Crestdale Rd
City/State/Zip: Matthews, NC 28105
Telephone: 704-844-3098
E-mail: jhawley@harristeeter.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-025

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Mandatory Food Protection Manager Certification for Persons in Charge

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

This issue is seeking a modification of the 2013 FDA Food Code to require that the designated "Person in Charge" (PIC) of a Food Establishment be a certified food protection manager who has passed a test that is part of an accredited program, as defined by the FDA Food Code. This modification would allow the regulatory authority the flexibility to exempt food establishments from this requirement if the regulatory authority deems the operation poses minimal risk of causing or contributing to foodborne illness.

Public Health Significance:

(Note: numbers in square brackets [x] refer to references found in Attachment A.)

Foodborne pathogens impose over \$15.5 billion (2013 dollars) in economic burden on the U.S. public each year [1]. CDC estimates that each year 48 million people in the U.S. get sick, 128,000 are hospitalized, and 3,000 die of foodborne diseases [2, 3]. Norovirus is the leading cause of foodborne illnesses for which a specific pathogen can be identified (58%), and accounts for 26% of foodborne illness hospitalizations and 11% of foodborne illness deaths. Nontyphoidal *Salmonella* causes 11% of foodborne illnesses, and accounts for the most foodborne illness hospitalizations (35%) and deaths (28%) [3].

On average, Americans eat out at retail food service establishments 4.5 times a week [4]. CDC has consistently identified retail food service establishments as the location of about 60% of foodborne illness outbreaks since 1993 [5, 6]. Many of these outbreaks are associated with unsafe practices within the establishments. Surveillance data show that factors associated with poor food preparation practices within establishments contributed to 35% of restaurant outbreaks with a single etiology, and factors associated with food worker health and hygiene contributed to 64% of those restaurant outbreaks [7]. Twenty percent of food workers have reported working while sick with vomiting and diarrhea, and infected food workers cause about 70% of reported norovirus outbreaks from contaminated food [8, 9].

Public health agencies have recognized that restaurants and other retail food facilities are avenues of exposure of the public to foodborne illness pathogens. Based on the assumption that certification leads to greater food safety knowledge and managers with this knowledge will successfully implement active managerial control of risk factors associated with foodborne illness and outbreaks, many public health agencies have required retail food service establishment manager food safety certification and even food worker food safety training. For example, the Illinois Food Service Sanitation Code requires manager certification, and as of July 1, 2014, the Illinois Code requires food handler training [10]. According to the National Restaurant Association's ServSafe website, 25 states require manager food safety certification and individual counties in 11 additional states also require certification of managers [11].

Based at least in part on the same assumptions made by public health agencies regarding certification, and recognizing their vulnerability to foodborne illness and disease outbreaks, the food industry has taken a leadership role in supporting food safety training and certification for their employees. For example, several chains require manager certification, regardless of their jurisdiction's regulations.

The assumption that manager food safety knowledge and certification will support active managerial control of risk factors has a scientific basis. Published studies that show the benefits include the following.

- Brown et al. (2014) found that certified managers and workers had greater food safety knowledge than noncertified managers and workers. Other studies on this topic conducted in local settings have reached similar conclusions [12-15].
- Bogard et al. (2013) found that managers in restaurants with a certified manager reported better food safety practices than managers in restaurants without a certified manager [16]. Specifically, managers in restaurants with a certified food manager, compared to managers in restaurants without a certified food manager, more often said that:
 - Workers in their restaurant were required to tell a manager when they were sick with gastrointestinal illness symptoms.
 - They took the final cook temperature of hamburgers.
 - They did not serve undercooked (rare or medium-rare) hamburgers.
- Kassa et al. (2010) found that restaurants with certified managers had significantly fewer critical food safety violations than restaurants without certified managers. [17]
- Cates et al. (2009) found that restaurants with certified managers present during inspection were less likely than restaurants without certified managers present to have critical violations in five of seven inspection categories.[18]
- Hedberg et al. (2006) found that restaurants in which an outbreak had occurred were less likely to have a certified manager than restaurants in which an outbreak had not occurred [19].
- In 2009, FDA found that full service restaurants with a certified manager present during the inspection, compared to those without a certified manager present, had fewer occurrences of risk factors in three of five categories. In 2004, FDA found that

full service restaurants had fewer occurrences of risk factors in two of five categories [20, 21].

Data from these studies indicate that manager certification is related to increased manager food safety knowledge, better food safety practices and inspection scores, and fewer foodborne illness outbreaks.

The Conference for Food Protection currently recognizes four providers of food protection manager certification. They provide accessible training in different languages. For example, the web site of one of the four certification providers reports that more than 5 million foodservice professionals have been certified through its food protection manager certification program.[22] showing that high quality resources for training and certifying food managers are readily available. There may be other accredited certification programs (e.g., state certified programs) that meet the Conference standards and provide the same conveniences.

A food safety certification requirement for food service establishment Persons-in-Charge is supported by the facts that:

- a large proportion of foodborne illness outbreaks are associated with retail food service establishments, indicating a lack of active managerial control of risk factors,
- the existing body of evidence supporting a link between manager certification and retail food safety,
- many state and local public health agencies already require certification,
- quality training and certification resources are readily available,
- the food industry may benefit from manager certification through reduced health and economic risks of foodborne outbreaks.

Exemption

Some establishments pose lower foodborne illness risk than others. It is appropriate for state and local agencies, by way of codes and ordinances or by policy, to establish criteria for what types of permitted establishments could be exempt from the mandatory manager certification requirement and for determining the conditions under which the minimum number of certified food protection managers must be some number greater than one.

Factors to consider when establishing such criteria include the size and scope of the operation, the hours of operation, and the types of foods sold or served.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that the 2013 FDA Food Code be modified as follows:

1. Requiring that the Person in Charge be a certified food protection manager who has passed a test that is part of an accredited program, as defined by the FDA Food Code.
2. Provide an exception to requiring the Person in Charge to be a certified food protection manager if the regulatory authority deems the establishment to pose minimal risk of causing or contributing to foodborne illness either at certain times of operation or based on the nature of food preparation.

Submitter Information:

Name: Laura Brown
Organization: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Address: 4770 Buford Highway, MS F-28
City/State/Zip: Atlanta, GA 30341
Telephone: 404-310-8556
E-mail: lrg0@cdc.gov

Supporting Attachments:

- "Attachment A - References"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-026

Council Recommendation: Accepted as Submitted _____ Accepted as Amended _____ No Action _____

Delegate Action: Accepted _____ Rejected _____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Report - Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures (CBP) Committee

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

The 2014 - 2016 Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee has addressed recommendations from the 2014 Biennial Meeting and have prepared a report summarizing its work.

Public Health Significance:

The Constitution, Bylaws and Procedure Committee shall submit recommendations to improve the Conference administrative functions through proposals to amend the Constitution and Bylaws and Conference Procedures.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

acknowledgement of the submitted committee report and appreciation for the work of the 2014 - 2016 Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee members.

The Conference also recommends continued work by the Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures (CBP) Committee on charges assigned by the Executive Board to:

1. Review the Conference for Food Protection governing documents (Conference for Food Protection Constitution and Bylaws, Conference Procedures, Conference Biennial Meeting Manual, position descriptions, conference policies, etc.) to facilitate a merger and conformance of these documents into a comprehensive "Conference for Food Protection Manual." (Issues 2012-II-001, 2012-II-004, and 2014-II-018)
2. Review Industry constituency on Council 1.
3. Report back to the Executive Board; and submit recommendations as Issues at the 2018 Biennial Meeting.

Submitter Information:

Name: Lee M. Cornman
Organization: CFP Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee
Address: Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services3125
Conner Boulevard, # 185
City/State/Zip: Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650
Telephone: 850.245.5595 / 850.245.5547
E-mail: Lee.Cornman@FreshFromFlorida.com

Content Documents:

- "CBP Committee Final Report"
- "2016 Constitution and Bylaws Roster"

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-027

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

CBP 2 – Revision of CFP Commercialism Policy

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Several past incidents have occurred where the Conference for Food Protection (CFP) name and/or logo have been used or misused, without the consent of the Conference body or the Executive Board, to endorse or promote a product, process or service by brand name. Examples of such incidents include an article in a food safety related publication concerning CFP committee activities and the use of the CFP name and/or logo endorsing training programs. Additionally, there has been recent concern expressed by CFP members on the endorsement of products, processes or services by brand name during CFP committee meetings. As a result, the CFP Executive Board charged the Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee with reviewing the existing Commercialism Policy with regards to these concerns and to "discern whether it is sufficient to apply to situations where the CFP name or logo is used in an unsanctioned manner by entities other than the CFP."

Upon review and deliberation of these concerns, the Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee has drafted a more comprehensive policy addressing the development of committee Issues and/or supporting documents, the Issue submission process, and the intellectual property of the Conference.

Public Health Significance:

The Constitution and Bylaws/Procedure Committee shall submit recommendations to improve the Conference administrative functions through proposals to amend the *Constitution and Bylaws and Conference Procedures*.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

the current CFP Commercialism Policy (established 2000) be revised as provided below (language to be added is in underline format):

COMMERCIALISM POLICY

PURPOSE

This policy has been developed by the Executive Board to establish guidelines for the use of:

- 1) commercial names, logos, or other information in Issues submitted to the Conference and in Issues or documents developed through the Conference for Food Protection (CFP) committee process and,*
- 2) CFP intellectual property including the Conference for Food Protection name and/or logo, without the express approval of the CFP Executive Board.*

POLICY

Approval for use of the Conference for Food Protection name and/or logo is done through request and approval via the Conference for Food Protection Executive Board.

Issue Submission:

- The Conference for Food Protection shall not endorse the use of a product, process or service by brand name.*
- Issues submitted for consideration at a Biennial Meeting will be reviewed; and those where brand names are used in the Issue, rationale or solution will be rejected.*
- The Issue Submission Form will contain a statement that reads, "It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process."*

Intellectual Property:

- The use of Conference for Food Protection (CFP) name and/or logo for commercial, promotional and/or endorsement purposes is prohibited by any entity other than the CFP without the express approval of the CFP Executive Board. Prohibited usage may include, but is not limited to research, press releases, product promotions, etc.*

Submitter Information:

Name: Lee M. Cornman
Organization: CFP Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures Committee
Address: Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services3125
Conner Boulevard, #185
City/State/Zip: Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650
Telephone: 850.245.5595 / 850.245.5547
E-mail: Lee.Cornman@FreshFromFlorida.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-028

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted _____	Accepted as Amended _____	No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Issue History:

This is a brand new Issue.

Title:

Committee to Explore Technology Solutions for Implementing CFP Guidance

Issue you would like the Conference to consider:

Retail food establishments are at risk for emergencies or disasters that could endanger the safety of the food and products sold to consumers. To assist these establishments in managing such crises, the CFP developed "The Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments" (document available on the CFP website at www.foodprotect.org/media/guide/Emergency%20Action%20Plan%20for%20Retail%20food%20Est.pdf). This document offers guidance to retail food stores and food service establishments, including very large and very small entities, as to the steps necessary to protect the public's health when circumstances affect food safety.

Safety guidance can only be effective if its existence is known and its recommendations are properly executed. Retail food establishments must not only train their employees, but such training has to prepare them to react appropriately in a crisis. Barring such training, or in cases where the fully trained employee is absent, individuals responding to a crisis must have committed the guidance to memory or be able to read, understand, and implement the guidance (if it is even readily available) during high pressure situations.

Requiring or recommending that food establishments post or maintain paper copies of safety guidance is a solution for the past. Technology is available, or can be easily developed, to assist employees with implementing the guidance at the time of the crisis with little or no training, allowing them to respond to changing circumstances under stressful conditions without relying on prior training or printed safety manuals.

Public Health Significance:

Food service employees come from every demographic category and educational background. Many employees are minors, some are new to the workforce, and experience levels can vary greatly among establishments. The workforce continues to become increasingly tech savvy, and the effectiveness of safety guidance should not depend so heavily upon traditional teaching methods that are skewed toward those with greater

maturity, education, or experience. Well designed, simple to use technology that brings the solution to the employee can help level the playing field.

For example, in-car navigation systems are very common and freely available on smart phones to provide drivers with turn-by-turn directions for even the most complicated journeys. The majority of Americans today own smart phones. On demand, step-by-step instructions, much like GPS navigation, that help guide food service employees through a crisis would greatly increase the consistency of responses in the event they are activated. This, in turn, would enhance public safety by ensuring that safety guidance like the CFP's "Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments" is followed properly.

As things stand today, the utility of CFP's guidance, and therefore the public safety benefits of this guidance, is limited to those circumstances where food service employees are effectively trained as to their implementation or aware of their existence. Technology available at an employee's fingertips to guide them through the proper procedures in a time of crisis would greatly enhance public safety.

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

that a technology committee be formed and charged to:

1. Make recommendations to the Conference for Food Protection in regard to:

(a) exploring technology solutions to assist food service employees to more effectively implement the 2014 Conference for Food Protection "Emergency Action Plan for Retail Food Establishments, Second Edition" and any other existing or future safety guidance provided by the CFP as deemed appropriate; and

(b) determine potential revisions to CFP's guidance, recommending technology solutions or adopting standards for the use of such solutions.

2. Report Committee recommendations to the 2018 Conference for Food Protection Biennial Meeting.

Submitter Information 1:

Name: Sean Monahan
Organization: DoRightly, LLC
Address: 106 West Boston Street
City/State/Zip: Seattle, WA 98119
Telephone: 206-849-6821
E-mail: smonahan@dorightly.com

Submitter Information 2:

Name: Robert Furnier
Organization: DoRightly, LLC
Address: 6725 Miami Avenue, Suite 100
City/State/Zip: Cincinnati, OH 45243
Telephone: 512-792-6720
E-mail: bobfurnier@gmail.com

It is the policy of the Conference for Food Protection to not accept Issues that would endorse a brand name or a commercial proprietary process.

