II. Issue Draft - Maintenance and Posting of the Self-Assessment Tool (SA Tool) – Deanna Copeland’s survey results indicated that while jurisdictions would like a tool that illustrates progress with the Program Standards, most are not interested in a front facing national website. Staff from jurisdictions that use the tracking spreadsheet draft (PS2017_SA_Audit_Form_Draft.xlsx) really like the functionality. The committee reviewed a draft issue that acknowledges the value of the SA tool, asks the FDA to maintain it, and post it on a website, with the understanding that the tool is not a required document.

III. Issue Draft - Plan Review - Incorporation into VNFRFPS – The group discussed the plan review charge and reviewed a draft issue asking for continued discussion about how plan review supports reduction in foodborne illness. The issue will ask for a continuance of the discussion with some draft language that can be used during the next biennium.

V. Inconsistencies in language across the Standards – 2018 II-013 Item #3 is an ongoing issue for the program standards committee.

- During the last call, there was mention of inconsistencies related to the number of risk categories for facilities in the standards. Standard 3 requires jurisdictions to categorize facilities in terms of risks with a minimum of three categories: low, medium, and high, which not inconsistent with Standard 2, which asks new inspectors to graduate training from low risk facilities in step 2 (risk category 1) to higher risk facilities in step 3 (risk categories of 2, 3 and/or 4 depending on inventory which aligns with Annex 5, Table 1 of the 2013 FDA Food Code.) In both Standards, the requirements are to have categorization of “at least three categories based on potential and inherent food safety risks.” The intent is Standard 2 is to help new staff gain proficiency from simpler to more difficult processes.
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