

## The "Recommended Solution" becomes a stand-alone document... final language MUST be clear and unambiguous.

- The following "edits" do NOT warrant an action of "Accepted as Amended":
  - ✓ Correcting typos or punctuation when the intent does not change.
  - ✓ Corrections identified by the CFP Executive Director and disseminated to all Biennial Meeting participants.
- Correct CFP terminology MUST be used: "Biennial Meeting" to refer to the 2020 meeting in Denver, and "Conference" or "Conference for Food Protection" to refer to the organization.
- All acronyms MUST be spelled out the first time used (*exception: FDA, USDA, CDC, EPA, CFP, HACCP*).
- When making specific changes to an EXISTING DOCUMENT (e.g., Food Code, CFP guidance document) OR to a "content document" (i.e., work submitted for approval with the Issue):
  - ✓ Strikethrough/underline MUST be used for changes to EXISTING language (i.e., underline new or proposed language and use ~~strikes through~~ for language to be deleted).
    - To facilitate debate, Issue submitters MUST bring any AMENDMENTS or REVISIONS to a Recommended Solution OR to a "content document" using underline/~~strike over~~ to identify changes from their original submittal. This formatting MUST be removed from the final Recommended Solution language EXCEPT as required to identify changes to existing documents.
  - ✓ The CORRECT and FULL NAME of a document or attachment MUST be referenced in the Recommended Solution.
  - ✓ The specific code section or document page number MUST be included, if applicable.
  - ✓ ANY edit recommended by Council to an existing document MUST be captured within the Recommended Solution:
    - Use cut-and-paste to move edited language into the Recommended Solution, then use appropriate underline/strikeover to designate changes.
    - ONLY the sections or paragraphs being edited need to be moved into the Recommended Solution.
- Specific direction(s) MUST be given regarding final disposition of the Issue:
  - ✓ "... a letter be sent to the FDA requesting that section \_\_\_\_ of the most current edition of the Food Code be amended as follows \_\_\_\_." **NOTE:** exact language is NOT required when recommending changes to the FDA Food Code.
  - ✓ "... a letter be sent to the FDA requesting an interpretation that clarifies / explains \_\_\_\_, and that the final interpretation document be posted to the Food Code Reference System."
  - ✓ "... a letter be sent to \_\_\_\_ requesting that further investigation be conducted to determine / resolve / study \_\_\_\_."
  - ✓ "... modified language be incorporated into \_\_\_\_."
  - ✓ "... a committee be created to study \_\_\_\_ and charged \_\_\_\_."
- EDITS must NOT violate the CFP Commercialism Policy (all Issues were vetted "as submitted").

**CREATING A CFP COMMITTEE**

- A specific committee name is NOT required.
- Charges MUST be SPECIFIC and ACHIEVABLE as work must be completed in approx. 15 months.
- Charges are to be NUMBERED and in outline format with minimal use of bullets.
- If a charge includes creating a GUIDANCE DOCUMENT, a specific TARGET AUDIENCE should be identified and included (e.g., regulators, food safety trainers, retail chain facilities, independent operators).
- All committees MUST be charged to "Report back findings and recommendations to the 2020 Biennial Meeting."

**RECOMMENDING "NO ACTION"**

"No Action" recommendations MUST be accompanied by a specific and defensible reason. The following are offered as guidance; however, Council may craft its own statement as appropriate:

1. "The Issue is adequately addressed in the current FDA Food Code, section(s) \_\_\_\_."
  - Point to consider:** If the Food Code section in question "could" be misinterpreted, should a request for clarification be submitted to the FDA rather than taking "no action"?
2. "Insufficient science / research / information has been provided to take action on the Recommended Solution."
  - Point to consider:** Should a request be submitted to Federal agencies to conduct any needed research rather than taking "no action"?
3. "Council could not reach consensus on the Issue."
  - Point to consider:** Should a CFP committee be created to study the Issue rather than taking "no action"?
4. "The Issue is outside the scope of the Conference for Food Protection."
5. "The Issue is addressed in Issue 20xx-x- \_\_\_\_."
6. "The submitter recommended that the Issue be withdrawn."

**The following are NOT acceptable reasons for taking "No Action":**

- ✓ "Submitter was not present."
  - Reason:** Submitters are NOT required to be present for an Issue to be deliberated.
- ✓ "Issue violates the CFP Commercialism Policy."
  - Reason:** All Issues were previously vetted "as submitted."