

**Conference for Food Protection  
Executive Board Meeting Council Report  
COUNCIL II**

**DATE OF REPORT:** March 4, 2011

**SUBMITTED BY:** Chirag H. Bhatt, Council II Chair (2010-2012)

**PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES:**

## **Certification of Food Safety Regulatory Professionals**

Susan Kendrick (State) and Ron Grimes (Industry)

**COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR BOARD:**

N/A

**PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:**

1. Collaborate with the FDA Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and the FDA Division of Human Resource Development to:

- Review 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.
- Review and revise, as needed, Standard 2 classroom curriculum, time frame for completion of Steps 1 through 4 for new hires or staff newly assigned to the regulatory retail food protection program.
- Determine if the CFP Field Training Manual and forms have completely addressed all recommendations received as part of the 2007 Assessment of Training Needs (ATN) pilot project.

2. Eliminate the potential redundancy of multiple verification tools (FDA Retail Food Level I Performance Audit and FDA Procedures for Standardization and Certification of Retail Food Inspection / Training Officers) utilized by FDA programs, work in collaboration with FDA's Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, FDA's National Retail Food Team and the FDA's Division of Human Resource Development to:

- Conduct a pilot project over the next year using the FDA Retail Food Level I Performance Audit with a limited and selected number of jurisdictions. The FDA Performance Audit will be piloted for use during the two joint inspections conducted as part of the quality assurance component of Standard 4 - Uniform Inspection Program. An outline of the pilot project objectives, protocol, and projected timeline is included as Attachment A with this Issue. The CFP CFSRP work group will submit a report to the 2012 Biennial Meeting that documents the result of the pilot project and any recommendations for the use of verification tools as part of the FDA Program Standards; and, 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.

- Conduct a joint assessment of FDA Standardization Procedures and FDA Performance Audit documents to determine if both verification tools are equally viable with distinct purposes and outcomes; and,
- Explore the feasibility of merging these existing verification tool documents and provide a plan for consolidation of such; and,
- Upon determination, assess the placement and administration of final verification tool(s) within the FDA Program Standards as appropriate, or separately as appropriate; and,
- With input and guidance from the CFSRP Work Group, FDA will determine if modifications to their draft FDA Performance Audit and/or Standardization documents are needed. Any modifications that would include changes to the Program Standards will be submitted as Issues by the CFP CFSRP Work Group to the 2012 Biennial Meeting.

3. Collaborate with FDA, other federal agencies, professional and industry associations to research what criteria is currently being used to assess the education and training qualifications of independent third party auditors that have been contracted to conduct institutional foodservice, restaurant, and retail food compliance inspections in lieu of a State/local/tribal regulatory retail food program. The re-created Work Group is to provide a report to the 2012 Biennial Meeting that:

- Assesses the number of jurisdictions and geographic areas where retail food compliance inspections are conducted by independent third party auditors in lieu of a regulatory compliance program;
- Delineates the reasons jurisdictions have moved to a third party auditor inspection compliance program;
- Summarizes criteria used to select third party auditors for inspection compliance oversight responsibilities including, but not limited to, education and training qualifications;
- Assesses and determines appropriate training and standardization processes/protocols for third party auditors, and
- Identifies any agencies/organizations/working groups currently addressing education and training standards for third party auditors conducting retail food compliance inspections.

Based on the above research, the work group will provide a recommendation to the Conference as to what actions/initiatives, if any, need to be undertaken to provide a national structure for ensuring that third party auditors possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities to conduct retail food program compliance inspections.

4. Evaluate and determine the best approaches to promoting awareness and implementation of the national training model contained in the CFP Field Training Manual and forms, Appendix B-2, Standard 2. The Work Group will:

- Research the use of websites, list serves, newsletters, testimonials, presentations, and training workshops, etc.
- Assess opportunities for enhancing the electronic versions of the CFP Field Training Manual and forms to minimize paperwork.

5. Report back to the 2012 Biennial Meeting its findings regarding the above charges.

# Inspection Form Scoring

Margaret Binkley (Academia) and William Flynn (Industry)

## COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR BOARD:

N/A

## PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

October 22, 2010, initial email went to all members of the committee explaining the charge of the committee, and the process that will be followed. Everyone was asked to provide a list of available dates for conference call. A survey was sent with the email to gather information stating, Which of the following assumptions generated by the Inspection Scoring Committee are of greatest interest to address this charge?

Conference call was held December 16th. Introductions were made, objectives were formed for the committee, teams were discussed that will handle the different objectives of the committee. Stakeholders were identified. The results included:

### Introductions

Future conferences will be on webinars with toll free number and handle 100 callers at a sitting; Multiple members from one entity will be allowed

### Form objective

Is our objective as the Committee to reduce foodborne illness? Increase restaurant compliance? Or getting the word out to the public?

Can the knowledge of scores allow for the public to make better decisions about restaurant selection or reduce food-borne illness? Or both?

Survey results: over-whelming majority agrees that a form that is intuitive to both the public and inspector is the most important charge of the committee.

### Teams:

#### 1. Information Gatherers

- Gather form and gather health data from local jurisdictions who are willing to comply
- Freedom of information? Statutory? Track who is inconvenient
- Can we go to counties we know to provide FBI data (large, med, small jurisdictions)? How do we find commonality in jurisdictions? Consider the role of demographics
- FDA seek scoring system used across the country
- How many systems being used? Can we survey to identify commonalities?

#### 2. Practitioner

- Pilot test different findings to determine if it works for inspectors

### 3. Results Team

- Academia will take information; provide its meaningfulness and conclusions.

### 4. Stakeholders

- Consumers-journal submittal next week demonstrates that more narrative health reports affect the choices people make on where to eat

### 5. Health Inspectors

Email was sent with the summary of the conference call and members were asked to choose a team they wanted to be involved with. The current form listed in the food code as well as the form that was developed by the past committee were attached to the email.

Another email was sent 2/1/2011 to members of the committee along with the latest roster of members. The email informed everyone the teams for the committee, the description of the teams; information gatherers, practitioners, results team and informed members. The email asked those members who have not chosen a team as of yet to do this. Also, each team was asked to select a team leader. After teams were confirmed, conference calls for each team will take place. The inspection form developed by the past Inspection Form Committee was again attached to the email.

# Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training

Anna Starobin (Industry) and Michele Samarya-Timm (Regulatory Local)

## COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR BOARD:

## PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

The Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training Committee has created a regular schedule of monthly conference calls to work toward meeting the committee charge.

Call dates so far:

October 15, 2010, November 18, 2010, December 16, 2010, January 20, 2011

Our committee has identified a comprehensive list of Interdisciplinary Foodborne Illness Training programs compiled by IFPTI ([http://www.ifpti.org/sites/default/files/IFPTI\\_Existing\\_Food\\_Protection\\_Course\\_Catalog.pdf](http://www.ifpti.org/sites/default/files/IFPTI_Existing_Food_Protection_Course_Catalog.pdf)). The committee is planning to sort the courses by relevance to the committee charge, and identify any additional courses missing from the IFPTI list, and generate a database to categorize the courses (course intended audience, duration of the course, etc).

YUM! Brands has conducted a survey on foodborne outbreak courses utilized at a state level and the results of this survey will be analyzed by the committee. This committee will challenge members with the following action items:

1. Sort the list of the courses available on IFPTI site and add missing courses.
2. Review the courses identified and categorize them in a user friendly format.

Future committee conference calls are scheduled for the 3d Thursday of each month, at 2.00 pm – 3:30pm EST:  
March 17, 2011, April 21, 2011, May 19, 2011, June 16, 2011

# Program Standards

Nicole Grisham (State) and Debbie Watts (Local)

## COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR BOARD:

The Program Standards Committee Chair is **asking the Board to approve a proposed replacement to one of the committee members.** Paul McGinnis with Ecolab has had a change in duties that will prevent him from continuing to participate on the committee. Through discussions with Mr. McGinnis, he regrets having to withdraw his participation and wanted to recommend a replacement as a measure of good faith. Mr McGinnis is recommending, **Miriam Eisenberg**, who is a Director of the Technical, Regulatory, and Training Services in Ecolab's EcoSure Division. She is a current member of the CFP, attended the 2010 CFP in Providence, and Mr. McGinnis feels she is well qualified to participate. I support the recommendation and look to the Board to consider and approve the change to the committee roster.

## PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

The Program Standards Committee convened its first meeting on November 4, 2010 to begin discussion on the committee charges and the following items requested by the FDA Program Standards Workgroup.

### Criteria for verification auditors

FDA would like feedback on suggested criteria for verification auditors. Currently in Standard 9 it states that "an auditor, as defined in the National Standards, shall complete the verification audit." An auditor is defined as "any authorized city, county, district, state, federal, tribal, or other third party person who has no responsibilities for the day-to-day operations of that jurisdiction and is charged with conducting a verification audit, which confirms the accuracy of the self-assessment." Additionally, a verification audit is defined as "a systematic, independent examination by an external party to confirm the accuracy of the self-assessment."

### Committee work and discussion:

**The committee discussed the charge and was unclear on what exactly was the concern or need related to criteria for verification auditors. The group got additional clarification and direction from our FDA Program Standards Workgroup and discussed the various aspects to include; whether or not there are concerns with the quality of the verification audit process, are there identified problems with the verification audit process, and if criteria pertaining to minimum standards of qualifications for auditors is needing to be defined. The committee has discussed these areas and there is uncertainty that this aspect of this Standard needs any change.**

**The committee is unsure if there are any concerns with the quality of the verification audit process. There is a resource CD, containing guidance information and forms for auditors, that is a comprehensive resource for the auditing process and specific problems with the use of this CD are unclear. Additionally, many on the committee have little experience with the use of this CD and/or have not had an audit conducted with this resource to be aware of any problems. The committee will be discussing this aspect in more detail at future meetings.**

**The committee discussed and expressed concerns with requiring specific criteria, as current auditors are not an abundant resource and the definition of an auditor seems to identify qualified individuals who can fill this role. The committee discussed that the current trend is that the FDA does not serve as the auditors but that many states and/or local regulatory agencies have taken on this role. The committee has researched criteria for auditors, as a means to gain a broader interpretation of existing criteria for auditors in other forums. The committee is in the process of reviewing the information that has been collected which includes key competencies and qualities for auditors. These various components include but are not limited to: personal attributes, education, work experience, audit experience, auditor training, knowledge and skills, maintenance of auditing ability, and auditor evaluation. The committee has discussed that if work continues on these aspects of this Standard, that any information or guidance proposed will want feedback and validation through a broader perspective such as a survey or similar means. The committee will be discussing this aspect in more detail at future meetings.**

### **Need for additional changes or improvement to the Standards**

FDA would like general feedback on the use and implementation of the individual Standards and whether changes are needed to the requirements of one or more of the Standards. If the committee believes that changes or improvements can be made to one or more of the Standards, please give a brief summary of the changes needed and the reason why.

### **Committee work and discussion:**

**The committee is focusing on suggested improvements to Standard 8, Program Support and Resources.** The committee believes that this Standard as it applies to “Staffing Level” is unachievable for many jurisdictions and does not provide a realistic measurement that can be applied across various retail food regulatory programs across the nation. Currently in Standard 8, Staffing Level, it recommends “a staffing level of one full-time equivalent (FTE) devoted to food for every 280 – 320 inspections performed. Inspections for purposes of this calculation include routine inspections, re-inspections, complaint investigations, outbreak investigations, compliance follow-up inspections, risk assessment reviews, process reviews, variance process reviews and other direct establishment contact time such as on-site training.” The Standard continues to state “A process should exist for the regulated food establishments to be grouped into at least three categories based on food safety risk (See Standard 3). The number of inspections assigned per FTE should be adjusted within the 280 – 320 range depending upon the composition of low- to high –risk establishments in the assigned inventory. When an FTE is divided between program areas, the total number of food inspections planned for that FTE should be adjusted to compensate for the additional training time required to maintain competency in multiple program areas. An adjustment of planned inspections per FTE should also occur when food establishments are geographically dispersed due to increased travel time.”

While the Standard allows for flexibility in the assessment of risk based assignments, training, and travel time in compensating for inspection assignments per FTE, the committee believes utilizing a weighted measure per inspection type is more valid than applying a numerical range per FTE. The current range when applied by various jurisdictions can result in drastic differences in estimated resources needed. This drastic variation in estimated resources needed can prove challenging to justify budgets and can leave the program in a shortfall. Additionally, the inspection types included in the range vary greatly on the time and resources needed due to unforeseen variables. Inspection types such as complaint investigations, outbreak investigations, compliance follow-up inspections, risk assessment reviews, process reviews, and variance process reviews may be simple or complex depending on the nature of the elements associated with the activity.

Thus including these inspection types in the calculated range can inaccurately reflect what resources are needed to execute an effective program. **The committee believes utilizing the number of inspections per FTE is not applicable as there are too many variables.**

In addition to the variables mentioned in the Standard, many jurisdictions vary in the approach, technology, and management of their programs. Other variables identified include but are not limited to:

Agency specific administrative procedures;  
Agencies hand writing inspections in the field;  
Agencies utilizing technology to enter inspections in the field;  
Inspection times include report writing for some, others do not;  
Applications of designated staff for designated activities/inspection types;  
Varying inspection times for various inspection activities;  
Numerous operations under the definition of Food Establishment are inspected with various approaches by each agency;  
Temporary Events as one inspection for some, many inspections for others, and yet others do not inspect;  
Farmer's Markets as one inspection for some, many inspections for others, and yet others do not inspect;  
Resources and budget for travel affects the program's approach each year; and  
Agency specific travel associated with inspection activities.

The committee feels that applying an average time to the various inspection types, excluding the associated activities that vary between jurisdictions, is a more appropriate and obtainable measure. These average inspection times based on inspection type can then be used to calculate the number of FTE needed to effectively execute the program. From there a jurisdiction can still apply modifications based on their specific agency needs. The committee has shared and evaluated the various applications of assessing FTE within our own jurisdictions and is compiling recommendations, tables, and FTE assessment applications. **The committee has discussed that if work continues on these aspects of this Standard, that any information or guidance proposed will want feedback and validation through a broader perspective such as a survey or similar means. The committee will be discussing this aspect in more detail at future meetings.**

The committee agreed to have monthly meetings to be held on the first Monday of each month with the exception of April 2011. The April meeting will fall on the second Monday to accommodate attendance by committee members to the CFP Board meeting. The scheduled February 2011 meeting was canceled due to nationwide inclement weather that had a majority of committee members detained. **The committee is making great progress and will submit its recommendations to the CFP and the FDA Program Standards Workgroup by means of a summary report when all issues have been reviewed.**



# Food Protection Manager Certification

Joyce Jensen (Local) and Jeff Hawley (Industry)

Submitted to Executive Director