

**2018 - 2020 CFP Program Standards Committee Subcommittee #1**

**Issue # 2018 II-013-PSC; Issue # 2018 II - 014**

**Meeting Minutes**

February 19, 2019 (3:00 – 4:00 pm EST)

**I Roll Call** - Andre Pierce opened the meeting and conducted roll call:

*Present:* Krista Click (Hendricks County, IN), Deanna Copeland (Harris County, TX), Jean Edsall (Compass Group), Amber English (Washoe County, NV), Adam Kramer (CDC), Andre Pierce (Wake County, NC), Robert Sudler (FDA), Kenesha Williamson (Publix)  
*Absent:* Angie Cyr (Minnesota Department of Health), Katey Kennedy (FDA), Jeffrey Lindolm (iCertainty)

**II. Antitrust Statement** – Andre Pierce read the Conference for Food Protection Antitrust Statement: [http://www.foodprotect.org/media/policy/Policy\\_CFP\\_Antitrust\\_Statement.pdf](http://www.foodprotect.org/media/policy/Policy_CFP_Antitrust_Statement.pdf)

**III. FoodSHIELD access** – FoodSHIELD will be used to house committee work and, during meetings, to allow computer screen sharing.

**IV. Charges** related to Subcommittee #1.

**Issue 2018 II-013 – Report – Program Standards Committee (PSC) (2016-II-009)** was accepted at the last meeting. The Conference recognized the report and thanked those who contributed to it. The Conference assigned four charges to the PSC with the final charge (#4) to bring a report and recommendations to the 2020 biennial meeting. During the meeting, the group reviewed three charges and assigned members responsibility to investigate and bring information back to the March meeting for discussion to facilitate a decision to include in the final report from the committee. The charges are in two categories: 1) to examine the burden of creation of a system that allows jurisdictions to report progress with their self-assessments (partial achievement) and 2) to identify inconsistency in languages across the nine standards.

- i. Burden and cost/benefit of creation of a system that allows jurisdictions to report progress with benchmarks of their self-assessments (partial credit). Some points discussed:
  - a. Achievement of a Program Standard is currently all or none.
  - b. Claims of meeting a standard must verified by volunteer auditors who are often challenging to find.
  - c. Some jurisdictions would like to report achievement of benchmarks within a standard and have acknowledgement.
  - d. Failure to achieve a standard may be outside a jurisdiction’s control. Ex. Minnesota – cheese curds, North Carolina counties don’t have authority to adopt Food Code.
  - e. Claims of partial achievement (progress with a self-assessment) – Would this require verification by a volunteer auditor and associated increased burden?
  - f. Jurisdiction claims of meeting particular standards is posted at <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtectio>

Item 3.8.4

[n/ProgramStandards/UCM434742.xlsx](https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/ProgramStandards/UCM434742.xlsx) . This site shows a jurisdiction's self reporting of meeting standards as well as verification by an auditor.

- g. Updates to the FDA's website and listing require 508 Compliance (OMB).
  - h. There is an electronic form that mirrors the paper forms in the Program Standards which provides a visual to display progress with benchmarks in the self-assessment. Action: Explore options of tools and websites for showing progress of benchmarks of a standard and discuss the burden of additional verification by volunteer auditors. Bring this information back to the March meeting for discussion and a possible decision. Members interested in this discussion: Robert Sudler, Amber English, Jean Edsall, Andre Pierce
- ii. Inconsistencies of language within the Program Standards. We asked the group to solicit feedback for users to identify opportunities to clean up language. Action: Members are to poll stakeholder and bring back information to the March meeting. Have inconsistencies already been identified? Bring those back so we have a consolidated list of concerns. Interested: Deanna Copeland, Andre Pierce

**Issue 2018 II-014 – Improvements to VNRFRPS** was not originally written as charges. The Executive Board assigned them as charges in August 2018. They are:

- i. Standard 1 – Recognize when a jurisdiction doesn't have control over regulatory authority of its jurisdiction – recognize efforts to achieve portions within its control. Action: This discussion should be rolled into the discussion from Issue 2018 II-013 with the small group (Robert Sudler, Amber English, Jean Edsall, Andre Pierce) and brought back at the March meeting. 3/20/2019 - 2018 II-014 Item 1 is not a charge from the executive board.
- ii. Standard 5 – Ensure future edits of Standard 5 align with the most recent Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak Response (CIFOR) guidelines. 2018 II-014 Item 2 is not a charge from the executive board. Action: none identified during call
- iii. Consider introducing plan review into the standards. Action: none identified during call
- iv. FDA's Listing of Jurisdictions - <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/ProgramStandards/UCM434742.xlsx> What does partial recognition look like and what level of burden would be placed on FDA and volunteer auditors?
- v. Clearinghouse – incorporate into the Program Standards as much as possible. Robert Sudler showed us the new location of the link <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/ProgramStandards/ucm245409.htm> that has been placed at the top of the main page to draw users attention to the information. It was formerly more difficult to find.

Item 3.8.4

Action: All should look at this change and provide feedback or concurrence at the March meeting.

- V. Next meeting – March 21, 2019 at 3:00 PM – FoodSHIELD and Call-In Information: Dial 877-394-5901, then when prompted enter Access Code 8301601 followed by #