

Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Report

Committee Reports are considered **DRAFT** until accepted by the Executive Board
Approved 4/20/2016

The Conference Chair, Executive Director, Council Chair, or Issue Chair may return committee reports, Issues, or attached documents requesting edits to improve clarity or understanding, or to include missing information.

Committee-submitted documents may impact the image, credibility and integrity of the Conference as an organization. With the exception of material that is copyrighted and/or has registration marks, committee generated documents submitted to the Executive Board and via the Issue process (including Issues, reports, and content documents) become the property of the Conference.

COMMITTEE NAME: **Publications ad hoc Committee**

DATE OF REPORT: Initial fall progress report Spring progress report Second fall progress report

Date submitted: **2/28/2017** Date amended (if applicable): *Click here to enter a date.* Date accepted by Executive Board: *Click here to enter a date.*

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT: Council I Council II Council III Executive Board

REPORT SUBMITTED BY: **Brian Nummer**

COMMITTEE CHARGE(S):

1. Clarify CFP Non-commercialism policy and CFP “endorsement” (in publications, committee outputs, marketing, etc)
2. Determine copyright level of CFP generated documents (public domain or CC-noncommercial use only)
3. Determine committee role in creation of a publication (including authorship; e.g. get committee approval early in the process)
4. Determine a CFP “peer review” process for documents to be placed on CFP website or bear reference to a CFP committee when submitted to a journal and determine when or if a committee may submit to a journal without CFP review
5. Write draft policy and develop draft guidance document for CFP use.

COMMITTEE WORK PLAN AND TIMELINE: DISCUSS CHARGES AND REPORT TO APRIL AND AUGUST 2017 BOARD MEETINGS.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES: Dates of committee meetings or conference calls: Several rounds of email exchange of a guidance document were performed. Two conference calls were used to fine tune the recommendations. A review was done by the CFP Executive Director.

1. **Overview of committee activities:** *see attachment*
2. **Charges COMPLETED and the rationale for each specific recommendation:** *see attachment*
3. **Status of charges still PENDING and activities yet to be completed:** *see attachment*

COMMITTEE REQUESTED ACTION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD: No requested action at this time

1. The Committee requests the Board:
 - a. read the attached document
 - b. briefly discuss items for clarity at Fall CFP Board Meeting
 - c. provide Board guidance to the Publications ad hoc committee charges

ATTACHMENTS:

1. **Content Documents:**
 - a. **Committee Member Roster** No changes to previously approved roster
 - b. **Committee Generated Content Documents (OPTIONAL):** No draft content documents submitted at this time
2. **Supporting Attachments (OPTIONAL):** Not applicable
 - a. **Publications ad hoc Committee Charges Disposition July 2017**

1. Clarify CFP Non-commercialism policy and CFP “endorsement” (in publications, committee outputs, marketing, etc)
 - CFP affirms its non-commercialism policy in all documents that bear its name as either copyright owner or other designation where it has right to do so.
 - CFP, as an organization, does NOT endorse any document or publication other than specifically provided for in the CFP Constitution and Bylaws.
 - When CFP does endorse a document a “written” statement is needed. Suggesting:
 - The Conference for Food Protection brings together representatives from the food industry, government, academia, and consumer organizations to identify and address emerging problems of food safety and to formulate recommendations. Volunteer members help identify and address emerging problems in food safety and help formulate recommendations primarily toward the retail and foodservice model food code. This document is one such recommendation.
 - (Option) This document represents the views of the volunteer members that created it and it may or may not reflect views of others, CFP constituencies, or regulatory organizations. No content of this document should be construed as regulatory code, nor would following this documents guidance indicate compliance or non-compliance with regulatory code.
 - (Option) This document was submitted for CFP stakeholder review and accepted through a formal committee and council process. Acceptance only implies CFP stakeholders were given an opportunity to comment or object to its contents.
 - (Option) This document was peer reviewed for scientific accuracy. Acceptance after peer review implies that the document meets current scientific rigor on par with publishing work in a science journal.
 - *Note the above statements are not mutually exclusive and the appropriate statement(s) are chosen for each document by CFP or its approved representative(s).*
2. Determine copyright level of CFP generated documents (public domain or CC-noncommercial use only)
 - All volunteer “works” are the property of volunteer authors until/unless rights are transferred to CFP. *With the exception of paid staff, CFP is a volunteer organization. Generally, a volunteer owns any works s/he creates while volunteering for an organization.*
 - What is the process of copyright transfer?
 - Supporting document -- committee member(s) as authors. *Submission or attachment of these documents to a CFP Issue makes no transfer of rights. Documents should carry “copyright” of authors on it for clarity.*
 - Specific charge output document with committee members as authors. A formal written transfer of rights from the authors to CFP should be made in the Committee’s final report – reflecting a vote by the committee. *Submission of documents by an individual or a committee to the Board or in an issue is NOT a transfer of rights.*
 - Documents where copyright is transferred to CFP shall be Creative Commons (attribution, non-commercial, share-alike)
 1. Attribution statement required (All materials referenced or taken from a Conference for Food Protection document do not imply CFP or stakeholder endorsement, accuracy, or regulatory compliance status of any of the information provided).

2. Non-commercial. No commercial uses are permitted without permission. *This is mostly to prevent implied CFP endorsement of commercial uses. Permission requests are submitted to the Executive Board via the Executive Director.*
 3. Non-commercial uses, re-uses, or remixes must remain share and share alike. *One CFP goal is to permit use/re-use of guidance documents for local and state regulators. This should not be impeded.*
3. Determine committee role in creation of a publication (including authorship; e.g. get committee approval early in the process)
 - Authorship (ethics)
 - CFP volunteers may take responsibility and credit only for work they have actually performed or to which they have contributed.
 - Principal authorship and other publication credits accurately reflect the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved. *Being a committee member is not automatic authorship.*
 - Minor contributions (relative to the work) are appropriately acknowledged, such as in footnotes or acknowledgements.
 - CFP Committee role in publications specified as output of a charge
 - Committee chairs shall provide committee members notice of how any committee created publication will be authored or recognized, including copyright ownership. *A committee acknowledgement vote is recommended.*
 - Contributing committee chairs and potential authors have the only and final say in authorship. CFP leadership positions are prohibited from participating in authorship decisions.
4. Determine a CFP “peer review” process for documents to be placed on CFP website or bear reference to a CFP committee when submitted to a journal and determine when or if a committee may submit to a journal without CFP review
 - Any author(s) or committee may request of the Executive Board that a document be published external to CFP. External publication cannot limit CFP use of the document. *Think similar to government authored journal articles.*
 - Any author(s) or committee may request of the Executive Board that a document be peer reviewed internal to CFP.
 - CFP peer review will be assigned to the Academic Board representative
 - Three reviewers will be sought from academia, industry, and regulatory.
 - (Blind) Peer review is identical to the desired outcomes of most science journals (e.g. poor grammar, bad formatting, and similar flaws are not permitted and are automatic rejection). Three levels of review outcome are expected: rejected (with reasons), revise (note corrections needed), or accepted. *Peer review is not a free editing service.*
 - Reviewers report back to the academic representative. That Board representative then makes a recommendation to the Executive Board for their approval and “peer reviewed” designation. *It is anticipated that regulatory members of the Board may comment on the document at that time.*

QUESTION 1. What to do when a document has already been created and approved via the committee process. Perhaps committee “review” and “peer review” are different. Council vote process?

QUESTION 2. Is Item 5 even needed? Delete all.

5. Create opportunity/process for any CFP stakeholder group to comment on CFP peer reviewed and “website published” documents
 - Any CFP stakeholder or document author may comment in writing to a CFP “web-site published” document. The comment author may ask the Executive Board to “attach” that comment permanently to the document. *This permits a stakeholder to support or object to any document content. This is especially important where regulatory code is involved. Original authors or others may seek to simply update references or recommendations based on newer versions of the food code. The document should not be edited or changed, but have comments attached.*
6. Write draft policy and develop draft guidance document for CFP use. *This is it.*
 - *It is understood that there may exist document and copyright complexities beyond the scope of this guidance. The CFP Executive Board and the author(s) of documents may address issues until mutual agreement is reached without regard for the guidance listed above. The one exception listed above is that the Executive Board may not influence authorship.*

Option for the Board:

- a. Comment and improve this document. No specific commitments are needed. The document would remain “draft guidance”.
- b. Create or formalize the ad hoc Publications committee. That committee then could be charged as needed with disposition of CFP documents going forward. Each document would be considered in its context and recommendations would be made to the board regarding this guidance and how it reflects on that particular document.