<div align="center">

Conference for Food Protection
Executive Board Meeting Committee Report

</div>

COMMITTEE NAME: <u>Electronic Reporting</u>

COUNCIL (I, II, or III): <u>II</u>

DATE OF REPORT: 7<u>/23/2009</u>

SUBMITTED BY: <u>Chirag H. Bhatt</u>

COMMITTEE CHARGE(S):

2008 II-036
Charge 1: Consider options to make the results of the "Best Practices and Lessons Learned" as identified in the 2006-2008 Electronic Data Capture and Reporting Committee Survey 2 available to jurisdictions considering an electronic data capture system.
Charge 2: Conduct research into the feasibility of providing an anonymous, central electronic database for the collection of electronic data from jurisdictions across the country.
Charge 3: Work with jurisdictions to create a pilot project for collection of inspection data and include it in an anonymous test database and identify any challenges associated with such database development.

PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

July 2008
Kimberly Stryker is a co-chair for this committee.
A committee participation email was sent out to interested applicants.

A Google Group was created and each member was invited to join where they can obtain files, post messages and review other details, notes. http://groups.google.com/group/**CFPERC**

The committee has met three times via conference calls.

1st call - October 22, 2008
Attended: Chirag Bhatt, Kim Stryker, Charles Otto, Carole Selman, Dale Yamnik, Padraic Juarez, Steven Barcewski

Discussion included:
- We must identify the public health benefits of creating such a database.
- We must know: who is our audience/user and what is the purpose of the database (how will the data be used).
- Vast difference in agencies collecting inspection data. Some using the CFP-recommended form, while others using different format and some still using the 44-point inspection.
- Possibility of tying this database to FDA's Risk Factor study.
- Private industry/government being skeptical about sharing the names of businesses.
- Some agencies may not wish to share their data with others.
- Industry QA staff may benefit from having a database that allows them to solve the food safety issues quickly.
- Public perception (as to Industry acceptance).
- Learning curve for public to understanding the inspection results.

- Data-mapping at the central database based on FDA FBI risk factors and technical challenges.
- Need to consider variety of data sources to see if the concept will work.

SWOT analysis based on the CFP charge given to the committee.
Plan of Action:
Members will post files, documents, surveys, other reference materials on the group page and participate in SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity, threats) analysis.

2nd call - January 21, 2009

Attended: Chirag Bhatt, Kim Stryker, Dale Yamnik, Padraic Juarez, Colleen Paulus

Discussion included:
- SWOT analysis for 2 charges
- Pros and Cons
- Public Health Information Network (PHIN)
- FDA participation in committee discussions

Plan of Action:
1. Members will participate in SWOT analysis.

2. Members will review the website pages at PHIN. http://www.cdc.gov/PHIN/

3. Chirag will try to ensure that someone from FDA participates in the committee discussions.

3rd call - February 24, 2009

Attended: Chirag Bhatt, Kim Stryker, Padraic Juarez, Colleen Paulus, Stephen Barscewski, Charles Otto, Richard Ramirez, Becky Vigue, John Marcello (Special guest)

Rebecca Vigue and Richard Ramirez are FDA's representatives on this committee. As a committee, we invited John Marcello to share his insight regarding the FDA's Risk Factor study relative to the committee's charge.

Discussion included:
- We discussed, at length, the parallel nature of committee's charge to FDA's Risk Factor survey. Ultimately, we agreed that there is value in the existence of a central, anonymous database.
- John Marcello shared some of the challenges and tasks related to the baseline survey and FDA's plans. Some of the major challenges – QA, statistical analysis and related tasks, who maintains the database, etc. Group discussions included feasibility of creating the central database and the specific challenges associated with that, such as funding, resources, who maintains it, where is it warehoused, actual benefits, parameters, what items are to be collected, willingness by locals/state agencies to participate, incentives for participating agencies, etc.
- Reminder to the committee as to the charge given by last conference.
  A. We are to conduct **research into the feasibility** of providing an anonymous, **central electronic database** for the collection of electronic data from jurisdictions across the country.

  B. If it is feasible, then we are to work with jurisdictions to **create a pilot project for collection of inspection data** and include it in an anonymous test database and identify any challenges associated with such database development.

Plan of Action:
Members will participate in SWOT analysis. Share their ideas, feedback by sending either SWOT document or Word document to Chirag so notes can be compiled and shared with the members before next call. MUST DO FOR ALL!!!

During next conference call, the committee will primarily focus on deciding whether such a project is feasible. If the project is feasible, then the focus will shift on identifying the parameters and related challenges and logistics.

4th call – May 12, 2009

Attended: Chirag Bhatt, Kim Stryker, Padraic Juarez, Richard Ramirez, Carole Selman, Steve Barcewski, Colleen Paulus

Discussion included:
- Chirag's appointment as vice-chair on Council II (Doug Campbell leaving)
- Outsourcing the task
- Recommendation to the Executive Board
- Value of anonymous national voluntary database
- Compare with FDA Baseline surveys

Plan of Action:
1. Members will participate in SWOT analysis. Share their ideas, feedback by sending either SWOT document or Word document to Chirag so notes can be compiled and shared with the members before next call.

2. Members will receive call notes and documents related to committee report to be submitted. Members will participate and decide on the subsequent tasks.

5th call – July 7, 2009

Attended: Chirag Bhatt, Kim Stryker, Richard Ramirez, Steve Barcewski, Colleen Paulus

Discussion included:
- Charges to the committee and timely completion.

Plan of Action:
1. Members will provide their feedback to Chirag and Kim.

Chirag and Kim will work on draft recommendations to the CFP.
Charge 1 – We will ask CFP to make the previous committee survey results' link available on the website a bit easier.
Charge 2 – We will provide information about the reality and explain the pros and cons of having an anonymous database to CFP.
Charge 3 – We will inform the CFP that due to resource and funding issues at several agencies, CFP should solicit sponsorship for the technology and related work. We will also provide some specifications.

ROSTER:

No changes to the committee roster have been made.

Last Name	First Name	Constituency	Employer	Email
Bhatt	Chirag	Ind (Tech)	Garrison Enterprises, Inc.	cbhatt@garrisonenterprises.net
Stryker	Kimberly	State	Alaska Food Safety and Sanitation	kimberly.stryker@alaska.gov
Juarez	Padraic	State	Florida Dept of Health	padraic_Juarez@doh.state.fl.us
Yamnik	Dale	Ind (FS)	Yum Brands	dale.yamnik@yum.com
Otto	Charles	Fed	CDC	cotto@cdc.gov
Paulus	Colleen	State	Minnesota State Health Dept	colleen.paulus@state.mn.us
Cannon	Beth	Ind	Steritech	beth.cannon@steritech.com
Selman	Carole	Fed	CDC	zxg4@cdc.gov
Barcewski	Stephen	Local	City of San Antonio	stephen.barscewski@sanantonio.gov
Vigue	Rebecca	FDA	FDA/CFSAN	rebecca.vigue@fda.hhs.gov
Ramirez	Richard	FDA	FDA/CFSAN	richard.ramirez@fda.hhs.gov