



Funding for this conference was made possible, in part, by a grant from the Food and Drug Administration. Views expressed in written conference materials or publications and by speakers and moderators do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the Department of Health and Human Services; nor does any mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organization imply endorsement by the United States Government.

Conference for Food Protection

2016

Biennial Meeting

Boise, Idaho

Council II

Final Issue

Recommendations with Assembly of Delegates Action

Susan Quam, Chair

Wisconsin Restaurant Assn.
Madison, WI

David Lawrence, Vice-Chair

Fairfax County Health Dept.
Fairfax, VA

Regulatory

Richard Akin
Florida DBPR – Division of Hotels and
Restaurants
Bonita Springs, FL

Thomas Arbizu
Texas Dept. of State Health Services
Austin, TX

Hector Dela Cruz
Los Angeles County Environmental
Health
Van Nuys, CA

Joetta DeFrancesco
Florida Department of Ag. And
Consumer Services
Bonitat Springs, FL

Julie Hults
City of Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI

Jeff Lang
Lane County Environmental Health
Eugene, OR

Donald Todd Mers
Ohio Department of Agriculture
Reynoldsburg, OH

Christopher Sparks
Texas Dept. of State Health Services
Austin, TX

Christine Sylvis
Southern Nevada Health District
Las Vegas, NV

Industry

Angela Benton
Jetro Restaurant Depot
College Point, NY

Kevin Connell
Wawa, Inc.
Media, PA

Courtney Halbrook
Brinker International
Dallas, TX

Jeff Hawley
Harris Teeter
Mathews, NC

Larry Lynch
National Registry of Food Safety
Professionals
Orlando, FL

Tara Paster
Paster Training, Inc.
Gilbertsville, PA

Kate Piché
National Restaurant Association
Solutions
Chicago, IL

Becky Stevens-Grobbelaar
YUM! Brands, Inc.
Louisville, KY

Sharon Wood
H-E-B
San Antonio, TX

Academia

Dr. Jay Neal
University of Houston
Houston, GA

Consumer

Darin Detwiler
STOP Foodborne Illness
Chicago, IL

Allen Reich
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ

Council Consultants

Erik Coleman
CDC
Atlanta, GA

Stephen Hughes
FDA
College Park, MD

Brad Webb
USDA-FSIS
Athens, GA

Parliamentarian

Michael Antee
FDA - ORA
Seattle, WA

Industry Alternates

Rance Baker
NEHA
Denver, CO

Francie Buck
Sealedair (Diversey)
Racine, WI

Bryan Chapman
StateFoodSafety.com
Orem, UT

Liz Corchado-Torres
National Registry of Food Safety
Professionals
Orlando, FL

Amanda Douglas
Wawa, Inc.
Wallingford, PA

Ashley Eisenbeiser
Food Marketing Institute
Arlington, VA

Joshua Funk
KFC
Louisville, KY

Scott Gilliam
Meijer
Grandville, MI

Tim Westbrook
Publix Super Market
Lakeland, FL

Doug Wilmsmeyer
Alchemy Systems
Austin, TX

Regulatory Alternates

Stacie Duitsman
Kansas City Missouri Dept. of Health
Kansas City, MO

Dr. Ernest M. Julian
Rhode Island Department of Health
Providence, RI

Debbie Watts
Tulsa Health Department
Tulsa, OK

Council II – 2016 Issue Listing

Number	Issue Title	As Submitted	As Amended	No Action	Assembly of Delegates
II-001	Report and Re-create - Employee Food Safety Training Committee	X			Accepted
II-002	Report- Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee	X			Accepted
II-003	Re-create - Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee	X			Accepted
II-004	Imminent Health Hazard: Modify Enforcement & PIC Duties		X		Accepted
II-005	Demonstration of Knowledge regarding Food Allergen Labeling			X	Accepted
II-006	Report – Program Standards Committee (PSC)	X			Accepted
II-007	PSC 2 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-003		X		Accepted
II-008	PSC 4 - Posting of Retail Program Standards Infographic on CFP Website		X		Accepted
II-009	PSC 3 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-005	X			Accepted
II-010	PSC 5 - Amend Retail Program Standard 7	X			Accepted
II-011	Amend VNRFRPS – Standard 4 – Uniform Inspection Program (Part 1)	X			Accepted
II-012	Amend VNRFRPS – Standard 4 – Uniform Inspection Program (Part 2)	X			Accepted
II-013	Amend FDA VNRFRPS Standard 9 – Program Assessment	X			Accepted
II-014	Report - Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP)	X			Accepted
II-015	CFSRP 2– Reassign Charges to the Program Standards Committee	X			Accepted
II-016	Report: Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (IFITC)	X			Accepted
II-017	IFITC 2 – Approval and Posting of the Crosswalk		X		Accepted
II-018	IFITC 3 - Reassign Charges to Program Standards Committee	X			Accepted
II-019	Clarification for Re-standardization in VNRFRPS Standard 2	X			Accepted
II-020	Reevaluation of FDA VNRFRP Standard 8	X			Accepted
II-021	Recommended Food Code adoption process		X		Accepted
II-022	Complimenting Unannounced with Scheduled Inspections			X	Accepted
II-023	Report - Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC)	X			Accepted
II-024	FPMCC 2- Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Manager Certification	X			Accepted
II-025	Mandatory Food Protection Manager Certification for Persons in Charge	<i>Issue transferred to Council I</i>			
II-026	Report - Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures (CBP) Committee	X			Accepted
II-027	CBP 2 – Revision of CFP Commercialism Policy	X			Accepted
II-028	Committee to Explore Technology Solutions for Implementing CFP Guidance			X	Accepted
II-029	Establish a CFP Standing Finance Committee (late-breaking Issue)	X			Accepted

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-001

Council	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> x </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report and Re-create - Employee Food Safety Training Committee

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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> x </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report- Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee

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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Re-create - Demonstration of Knowledge (DoK) Committee

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.

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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended _____	<u> X </u> No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Imminent Health Hazard: Modify Enforcement & PIC Duties

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

that a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that Section 8-404.11 of the 2013 Food Code be amended by adding a new paragraphs (C) and (D) as follows (underline format used for new language.)

8-404.11 Ceasing Operations and Reporting.

(A) Except as specified in ~~¶¶¶~~ (B), (C), and (D) 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 may not need to discontinue operations if the facility has experienced an extended interruption of water or electrical service, provided the facility has a specific written emergency operating plan that has been approved by the REGULATORY AUTHORITY and if a certified FOOD protection manager takes immediate corrective action to eliminate, prevent or control the risk or hazard in accordance with the specific written approved emergency operating plan and if the PERMIT HOLDER informs the REGULATORY AUTHORITY that the specific risk or hazard has occurred and that the specific written approved emergency operating plan has been implemented. Pf

(D) The REGULATORY AUTHORITY has the sole discretion whether or not to establish an approval process.

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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended _____	No Action <u>X</u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Demonstration of Knowledge regarding Food Allergen Labeling

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

no action. The intent of the submitter to amend the Food Code section is not clearly defined as written. The Council is unclear on ways to address this need and is concerned about unintended consequences of changing the Food Code. Allergen labeling is already addressed in section 3-602.11 (B) (5) of the Food Code.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report – Program Standards Committee (PSC)

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.

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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended	<u> X </u> No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected	_____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

PSC 2 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-003

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

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

1. Work with the Program Standards Committee to 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 and report back to the 2018 CFP biennial meeting;
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.

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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended	<u> X </u> No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected	_____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

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

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

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

Note: a PDF of the guidance document is attached to Issue 2016 II-006 titled: Report – Program Standards Committee (PSC)

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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

PSC 3 - Recommendations from Issue 2014 II-005

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).

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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

PSC 5 - Amend Retail Program Standard 7

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 Q~~ 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).~~

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

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

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).

*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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

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

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).

*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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Amend FDA VNRFRPS Standard 9 – Program Assessment

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 regulationed 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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report - Certification of Food Safety Regulation Professionals (CFSRP)

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.

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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

CFSRP 2– Reassign Charges to the Program Standards Committee

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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report: Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee (IFITC)

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.

*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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended _____	<u>X</u> No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

IFITC 2 – Approval and Posting of the Crosswalk

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) Prior to posting the final document on the CFP website in MS Word and PDF bring forward the purpose of the document to the front of the document and clarify the distinction between the program standards and training programs.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

IFITC 3 - Reassign Charges to Program Standards Committee

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.

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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Clarification for Re-standardization in VNRFRPS 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: **VNRFRPS 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: *VNRFRPS 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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Reevaluation of FDA VNRFRP Standard 8

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.

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	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended	<u> X </u> No Action _____
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected	_____

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Recommended Food Code adoption process

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

that the attached *"Food Code Adoption Best Practice"* guidance document be posted on the CFP website. This document provides a recommended short-form format for adopting the FDA Food Code. This format clearly identifies differences, if they exist, between the FDA Food Code and a local jurisdiction's food code.

Attachment: *"Food Code Adoption Best Practice"*

*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.*

Food Code Adoption Best Practice

The Conference for Food Protection supports complete and uniform adoption of the FDA Food Code. Complete and uniform adoption of the FDA Food Code has many benefits for stakeholders, including reduced complexity and the ability to facilitate better compliance. Additional benefits associated with complete and full adoption of the FDA Food Code can be found on FDA's Retail Food Protection website¹.

Although substantial progress has been made in Food Code adoption, at this time, not all States, Territories and Local jurisdictions or Tribal Nations, have adopted the FDA Food Code. In locations where complete and uniform adoption of the FDA Food Code has not occurred, it is often difficult to determine which sections of a jurisdiction's food code are different from the FDA Food Code.

A best practice for recognizing differences between a jurisdiction's code and the FDA Food Code is 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. Adopts the current version of the FDA Food Code;
2. If/where necessary, creates paragraphs within their statute/rule which adopt jurisdiction-specific requirements that replace or amend the referenced sections of the FDA Food Code.

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

Adoption Via Exception Process:

When adopting the FDA Food Code:

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. If/where necessary, any changes should then be incorporated into this administrative rule by 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 Food Code sections, including a reference to the specific FDA code section being changed.
3. Additional jurisdiction specific chapters may be added at the end of a jurisdiction's food code 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.

¹ www.fda.gov/FoodCode

5. An 'unofficial' inspector's copy of the final adopted code can 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.

Benefit:

This best practice 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 jurisdictional 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.

**Conference for Food Protection
2016 Issue Form**

Issue: 2016 II-022

Council	Accepted as	Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted _____	Amended _____	No Action <u>X</u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted _____	Rejected _____	

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Complimenting Unannounced with Scheduled Inspections

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

no action because insufficient science/research/information has been provided to take action on the Recommended Solution.

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	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report - Food Protection Manager Certification Committee (FPMCC)

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.

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

FPMCC 2- Standards for Accreditation of Food Protection Mgr Certification

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).

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	Accepted as		Accepted as	
Recommendation:	Submitted	<u> X </u>	Amended	<u> </u> No Action <u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Report - Constitution, Bylaws and Procedures (CBP) Committee

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.

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	<u>X</u>	Accepted as Amended	_____	No Action	_____
Delegate Action:	Accepted	_____	Rejected	_____		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

CBP 2 – Revision of CFP Commercialism Policy

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.*

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	Accepted as	Accepted as			
Recommendation:	Submitted	Amended	No Action	<u>X</u>	
Delegate Action:	Accepted	Rejected			

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Committee to Explore Technology Solutions for Implementing CFP Guidance

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends....:

no action. The creation of a technology committee results in redundancies as existing committees already have the freedom and ability to address technological solutions as needed. This issue is outside the scope of the Conference for Food Protection.

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-029

Council Recommendation:	Accepted as Submitted	<u> X </u>	Accepted as Amended	<u> </u>	No Action	<u> </u>
Delegate Action:	Accepted	<u> </u>	Rejected	<u> </u>		

All information above the line is for conference use only.

Title:

Establish a CFP Standing Finance Committee

Recommended Solution: The Conference recommends...:

modified language to the CFP Governing Documents be incorporated as follows: (new language is underlined; language to be deleted is in strikethrough):

1.) Amending the CFP Constitution and Bylaws *Article XIV Committees* by adding a new subsection in Section 2. and subsequent renumbering as follows:

Section 2. The following standing committees shall be established:

- Subsection 1.* Audit Committee;
- Subsection 2.* Constitution and Bylaws/Procedures Committee;
- Subsection 3.* Finance Committee
- Subsection 3.* ~~4.~~ Issue Committee;
- Subsection 4.* ~~5.~~ Managers Training, Testing and Certification Committee;
- Subsection 5.* ~~6.~~ Nominating Committee;
- Subsection 6.* ~~7.~~ Program Committee;
- Subsection 7.* ~~8.~~ Program Standards Committee;
- Subsection 8.* ~~9.~~ Resolutions Committee; and
- Subsection 9.* ~~10.~~ Strategic Planning Committee.

2.) Amending the CFP Constitution and Bylaws *Article XV Duties of the Committees* by adding new language in Section 8, and subsequent renumbering of Sections 8-9. The new Section is as follows:

Section 8. The Finance Committee shall report to the Executive Board. The Finance Committee shall provide financial oversight for the Conference. Duties of the Finance Committee shall include budgeting and financial planning, financial reporting, and the creation and monitoring of internal controls and accountability policies. The Finance Committee will include 5-7 members from the Executive Board. The Finance Committee membership should be reflective of the Conference membership and members will serve a term of at least two years.

Subsection 1. The Finance Committee responsibilities include:

a. Budgeting and Financial Planning

1. Develop an annual operating budget with staff.
2. Approve the budget within the finance committee.
3. Monitor adherence to the budget.
4. Set long-range financial goals along with funding strategies to achieve them.
5. Develop multi-year operating budgets that integrate strategic plan objectives and initiatives.
6. Present all financial goals and proposals to the CFP's Executive Board for approval.

b. Reporting

1. Develop useful and readable report formats with staff.
2. Work with staff to develop a list of desired reports noting the level of detail, frequency, deadlines, and recipients of these reports.
3. Work with staff to understand the implications of the reports.
4. Present the financial reports to the full board.

c. Internal Controls and Accountability Policies

1. Create, approve, and update (as necessary) policies that help ensure the assets of the Conference are protected.
2. Ensure policies and procedures for financial transactions are documented in a manual, and the manual is reviewed annually, and updated as necessary.
3. Ensure approved financial policies and procedures are being followed.

3.) Amending the Biennial Meeting/Conference Procedures Manual by adding new language in Section VIII B.1. The new Section will read as follows:

VIII. Committees

B. Standing Committees

1. The following standing committees shall be established: the Audit Committee; Constitution and Bylaws/Procedures Committee; Finance Committee; Issues Committee; Managers Training, Testing, and Certification Committee; Nominating Committee; Program Committee; Program Standards Committee; Resolutions Committee; and Strategic Planning 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.