

Conference for Food Protection – Committee Periodic Status Report

Template approved by the Executive Board May 2014

Committee Periodic Status Reports are considered DRAFT until reviewed and acknowledged by the Executive Board

COMMITTEE NAME: Unattended Food Establishments

COUNCIL or EXECUTIVE BOARD ASSIGNMENT: Council 1 (established by 2014-I-19)

DATE OF REPORT: February 26, 2015

SUBMITTED BY: Ric Mathis and Larry Eils, Committee Co-Chairs

COMMITTEE MEMBER ROSTER:

See attached roster for updated member listing and Executive Board approval; one member, Scott Gilliam, transitioned from state government to industry

COMMITTEE CHARGE(s):

1. Develop recommendations on whether and how the Food Code should be modified to address unattended food merchandising operations;
2. Consider any existing guidelines from FDA and others and develop a CFP guidance document that could assist states when addressing the need to have alternative protective provisions in place when approving a waiver or variance for entities that do not meet section 2-101.11 and 2-103.11 of the 2013 Food Code; and
3. Report back to the 2016 Biennial Meeting with a recommendation to Council 1

COMMITTEE'S REQUESTED ACTION FOR EXECUTIVE BOARD (If Applicable):

None at this time.

PROGRESS REPORT / COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES WITH ACTIVITY DATES:

1. Progress on Overall Committee Activities

After several very productive email meetings (9/15, 9/22, 10/7, 10/21, 1/12), a conference call was held on February 12, 2015. During the call, the committee had a great deal of meaningful discussion. The committee gained consensus regarding the initial approach to section 2-101.11 in that these establishments should not be required to have a PIC present during all hours of operation. The committee also had a lengthy discussion about how the operation should be characterized and defined. Ultimately it was agreed that the Co-chairs along with a subcommittee would use existing information from Indiana and Ohio and other available resources to develop a composite definition, which will be discussed at the next conference.

2. Progress Addressing each Assigned Committee Charge

Charge #1: Even though this charge was discussed, the committee determined that it would be more appropriate to outline the parameters of this operation via a definition to ensure that the recommendations did not have unintended consequences. **CHARGE # 1 IN PROGRESS.**

Charge #2: While the committee has not engaged in comprehensive discussion on the guidance information supplied by FDA, there was consensus regarding the preliminary approach to that 2-101.11 by exempting these operations from a PIC being present during all hours of operation. **CHARGE #2 IN PROGRESS.**