



**Meeting Summary – Partnership for Food Protection Workgroup and PetNet  
Project Meeting  
Fort Worth, Texas  
November 17-18, 2009**

One hundred and twenty five federal, state and local officials met in Fort Worth, Texas on November 17-18, 2009 for the second face-to-face meeting of the members of the four Partnership for Food Protection Workgroups (WGs) and PetNet project.

**Day 1** - The meeting began with a joint session for all of the meeting participants. Mr. David Dubois, the CEO of the Fort Worth Convention & Visitors Bureau, welcomed everyone to the “City of Cowboys and Culture.” He was followed by updates from federal representatives on the Partnership for Food Protection's Coordinating Committee.

Dr. Steve Solomon, Deputy Associate Commissioner for Compliance Policy in FDA's Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA), announced some recent personnel news in FDA. Dr. Jeff Farrar, formerly with the California Department of Health, is the new Associate Commissioner for Food Protection, and Mr. Joe Reardon, formerly with the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, is the new Deputy Director of the Division of Federal-State Relations in ORA. He also announced the upcoming retirements in January 2010 of two longtime FDA employees who have been leaders in federal-state activities, Richard Barnes and Gary German. Dr. Solomon provided details on FDA's plans to establish an integrated national food safety system and how the work by the Partnership for Food Protection workgroup projects supports those plans. A document that describes this plan is on the FDA Internet at:

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/ForFederalStateandLocalOfficials/UCM183650.pdf>

Dr. Andy Maccabe, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Liaison to FDA for Food Safety, provided an update on CDC issues. Dr. David Goldman, the Assistant Administrator in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service, gave an update on White House Food Safety Workgroup activities. Dr. Michael Parker, Branch Chief for Risk Analysis in the Department of Homeland Security, gave an update on the Food and Agriculture Readiness Measurement (FARM) Toolkit initiative at DHS.

Pete Salsbury, Acting Special Assistant in ORA's Division of Federal-State Relations, reviewed the agenda and logistics. The WGs and facilitators were asked to review the

projects, and step back and think if they need to clarify/refocus anything. They were asked to consider expectations for the projects to ensure we have success stories to report at the next 50 state meeting. The WG chairs and facilitators were asked to discuss these questions: (1) Are we on track and making progress to have a success story by August 2010? (2) When we are successful, what will be different from today? And (3), What difference will success make?

After the joint session, the attendees moved to their meeting rooms. The overall objectives of this meeting include:

- Groups continue work on priority activities they have identified as goals for the project.
- All members of the Workgroups understand our goal of having one or more finished products by August 2010, the process we'll use to get there, and their roles and responsibilities.
- Workgroup members leave the meeting with clear plans and timelines for next steps needed to complete projects.
- Continue partnership and accountability between federal, state and local partners while working towards the goal of establishing an integrated national food safety system.

**Day 2** - The meeting concluded on Wednesday with a joint session. Each WG made a brief presentation on what was discussed and their proposed plans for next steps. The following are highlights taken from those presentations.

**Response WG** - Roberta Hammond presented the update:

#### **Indicators for Success**

- Improved outbreak response through better understanding of best practices and the use of: Recall effectiveness checks; NIMS/ICS for foodborne outbreaks when appropriate; Standardized outbreak response tools; and Product tracing for epidemiological investigations
- Improved Federal, state and local communication and collaboration - Details to FDA EOC
- More efficient and effective use of resources among Federal, state and local partners

#### **Recall Effectiveness**

- **Deliverable:** Pilot the NC secure web-based recall effectiveness tracking system in five states
- **Output:** Evaluate the functionality and performance of an electronic recall effectiveness system in pilot projects
- **Current Status:** Pilot has been done with 5 states using NC system
- **Action Items:** Modify NC system by January 2010 and pilot (single or multi-state recall); Solicit additional states to include in pilot; Present lessons learned and suggested enhancements to inform the FDA recall system (RES)

#### **Recall Effectiveness Using 3<sup>rd</sup> Parties**

- **Deliverable:** Pilot the use of third parties to conduct recall effectiveness checks
- **Output:** Evaluate the functionality and performance of an electronic recall effectiveness system in pilot projects
- **Current Status:** CA Dept. of Health is contracting a pilot to use 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to conduct recall effectiveness checks
- **Action Items:** CA provide report to Work Group on the lessons learned from the pilot by August 2010

#### **Details to FDA Emergency Operations Center**

- **Deliverable:** Develop a pilot program for state and local partners who are willing to be detailed for 2-3 weeks to the FDA Emergency Operations Center to improve Federal, state and local collaboration
- **Output:** Evaluation of experience from pilot project participants
- **Current Status:** Application has been developed and shared with Response WG
- **Action Items:** Invite Response WG members to apply to pilot the process (6 details available)

#### **Environmental Investigation Tools**

- **Deliverable:** Develop guidance document for sprout environmental investigations and identify key components to be utilized as a template in environmental investigations (broader effort will be referred to CIFOR)
- **Output:** Guidance document
- **Current Status:** Draft has been received and is under review by Work Group
- **Action items:** Final comments from Work Group due in January 2010 and recommendations submitted to the Coordinating Committee

#### **Incident Command System for Foodborne Disease Outbreaks**

- **Deliverable:** Inventory existing public health ICS models and best practices (OK, NC, MN, MI, FL) for foodborne disease outbreaks
- **Output:** Inventory and presentation
- **Current Status:** Models collected from OK, SC, and FL
- **Action Items:** Coordinate panel presentation on NIMS/ICS for FDA 50 State meeting August 2010

#### **Epi Traceback to Support Investigations of Foodborne Disease Outbreaks**

- **Deliverable:** Describe the potential application and utility of product tracing to inform epidemiology investigations
- **Output:** White paper
- **Current Status:** Paper drafted
- **Action Items:** Review by sub-group in December 2009 and Working Group receive for review in January 2010; recommendations forwarded to Coordinating Committee for review

**Training WG** - Brian Collins and Dave Read presented the update:

### **Charge 1**

- Establish competencies and certification for all disciplines. **In Progress- “Entry Level”**
  - Perform a job task analysis for (all the governmental jobs and stakeholders) inspectors involved in food/feed safety. **In Progress – “Entry Level”**

### **Charge 2**

- Support establishment of an International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI). **Complete.**
  - Assess and review training currently available (**In progress IFPTI/AFDO/FDA-ORAU/NEHA courses**)
  - Assess/Review Kellogg Foundation proposal (**Completed – working with IFPTI**)
  - Long-term deliverable: Comprehensive course catalog (**In progress**)

### **Moving forward**

- Assemble additional job descriptions for “entry level” inspectors by December 31st to help support a psychometrically valid process.
  - Identify and acquire documentation for *core curriculum* for “entry level” inspector
  - Identify Subject Matter Experts
- Review Draft White Paper (“Visionary Plan for Food Safety Training” - provide comments by December 1<sup>st</sup>)
- Work with consultant to *complete Job Task Analysis* for “entry level” inspectors
- Identify *specialized area curriculum* for “entry level” inspectors

### **Next Steps**

- Apply process to “higher” levels (journey, technical, leader)
- Develop additional Job Task analyses for other food/feed safety disciplines (epi, lab)
- Review existing credentialing/certification models for consideration in recommending a framework for certification

**Risk-based Workplanning WG** - Dan Danielson presented the update:

**It’s a Journey** - Ultimate Goal: Integrated Food Safety System

### **Overview of Work Planning Workgroup Pilot Project**

- Pilot Project is the first step in an phased program which is an integrated work plan to include inspections and/or samples
- Asking groups to use existing inspectional systems to conduct Phase I Pilot
- Develop baseline to determine strengths and weaknesses in current systems

### **Work Planning Working Group -TEAMS**

- Communications; Risk Analysis; Criteria Development, Analysis & Reporting; Training; and Logistics

### **TIMELINE Synopsis**

August – November 2009

- Identified cooperators and drafted a work plan
- Initial contact made with cooperators
- Collected inspectional tools
- Polled cooperators
- Briefing to CFSAN/CVM
- Developed communication process – FoodSHIELD

December 2009 – March 2010

- Cooperators conduct inspections
- Data submitted into FoodSHIELD
- Exit interviews of cooperators

April – May 2010

- Analyze data
- Draft report for August meeting

### **Accomplishments**

Phase I Pilot Cooperators (15 individuals) Selected:

- Five States- Georgia; Florida; Mississippi; Tennessee; North Carolina
- SE FDA Region and District Offices
- State Cooperators have been surveyed
- Responses compiled
- FoodSHIELD utilized for Workgroup communication and document management

### **Future Plans – PHASE II**

- Lessons learned from PHASE I
- Opportunities to improve communication
- Share sampling and inspection procedures
- Consider standardization of inspection tools

**PHASE III ????????** - Fully integrated Food Safety System

**Interactive Information Technology (IIT) WG** - Carrie Rigdon presented the update:

### **IIT WG**

- **Goal/Vision:** An integrated/interoperable food information system that links information such as laboratory, inspection, and recall data.
- **Year 1 Project Teams:** Systems Assessment; Business Needs; and Data Elements

### **IIT WG - Systems Assessment Team**

#### **Purpose:**

- In order to **meet our goal** of integrated/interoperable food safety information system we need to **understand** what the **currently available systems** are and what they do
- Provide an assessment of existing food-related systems
- Support the Other IIT WG Teams

- Support the Other Workgroups
- 7 Systems: FoodSHIELD (U of MN); eSAF (FDA); eLEXNET (FDA); NC Recall System (NC DACS); Recall Enterprise System (FDA); PulseNet (CDC); and Reportable Food Registry (FDA)
- **Assess 7 systems for:** Types of information collected; Access; Import, Data entry, Export, & Reports options; External system integration; and Other capabilities

### **IIT WG - Systems Assessment Team**

- **Current progress:** Assigned a lead for each system; Contacted a SME for the systems & collected descriptive information; Finished assessment matrix
- **Next Steps:**
  - Complete assessment of 7 existing systems we've chosen
  - Meet with IT Business Needs team
    - What are the information needs identified from the Work Planning WG project? Do existing systems meet those needs?
  - Meet with IT Data Elements team
    - What are the model or key data elements they've identified?, How do existing systems match up with model/key data elements for recalls, inspections?
  - Incorporate the needs of these groups into the matrix and Provide specific system answers to the teams
- **Deliverable:** Systems Assessment matrix, Summary, & Recommendations

### **IIT WG - Business Needs Team Objectives**

- To gather and identify the IT business needs for an Integrated systems solution to improve and better support food protection
- Partnering with Work Planning Group to gather business needs on their pilot for integrated inspections

### **IIT WG - Business Needs Team Work Plan**

- Develop questionnaire for Work Planning Group Cooperators
- Develop IT context diagrams showing information systems, storage, sharing and reporting in support of inspection processes
- Gap Analysis to identify needs
- **Deliverable:** Develop preliminary IT needs assessment statement

### **IIT WG – Data Elements Team - Recall Effectiveness**

- **Project** - Provide input from state and local jurisdictions to FDA about needed enhancements to the Recall Audit Check Report Form for development of a web based recall effectiveness check form
- **Steps**
  - Identify FDA reporting requirements for the 3rd party recall effectiveness pilot
  - Identify data fields collected for the North Carolina Recall Effectiveness Web-based Form
  - Collaborate with members from Response Workgroup on recall effectiveness
  - Identify output needs

- Identify input data that needs to be collected to allow output needs
- Revisit Form 3177 to identify data elements to keep, delete, and modify.
- Survey Workgroup participants to provide feedback on form changes
- Recommend changes needed to contractors/FDA
- **Deliverables** - Development of a web-based recall effectiveness form

**IIT WG – Data Elements Team - State Inspection Reporting to FDA**

- **Project** - Provide recommendations to data elements input from state and local jurisdictions to FDA on data elements
- **Steps**
  - Identify elements currently reported through eSAF
  - Investigate the feasibility of launching an online survey with AFDO, NACCHO, and possibly AAFCO
  - Develop the survey instrument
  - Analyze survey results
  - Recommend required minimum data elements for inspections that are reported to FDA
- **Deliverables** - Recommend enhancements to data elements reported to FDA for inspections

**PetNet Project** – Chris Melluso presented the update:

**What happened since Kansas City**

- Streamline the scope of PETNet
- Address the states’ main concerns resulting from the melamine recall
- Add some members
- PETNet should mesh with FDA’s PFEWSS

**PETNet...**

- Will surveil and track outbreaks in companion animals associated with the consumption of pet food products
- Will obtain information from multiple sources including Federal Agencies, state agencies, diagnostic laboratories and possibly others
- Will be a secure information exchange system between FDA and state agencies regulating pet food products

**The plan for this meeting was to decide...**

- **WHAT** information should be exchanged in PETNet?
- **WHEN** should the information be exchanged (proof, triggers)?
- **With WHOM** do we exchange the information?

**What did the PETNet Group do in the last 26 hours? In Fort Worth we decided...**

- PETNet will use Food Shield for alert system and for sharing data files
- What are the minimum data elements we need to share to effectively alert others in PETNet

- WHO will be members of the PETNet
- WHEN is data appropriate for distribution in PETNet

**What Data needs to be shared in PETNet?** – Species; Clinical Signs; Number of animal involved; Animal Age(s); Date Range of onset; Pet food product name; Event occurred in State and zip code (optional); Origin of information; Animal Age; Laboratory Supporting Data (yes/no); PetNet member point of contact; and Free text field description (additional information and comments)

**Other Data needs**

- Unique identifier for each entry made
- Use drop down menus as much as possible
- At this time the system is meant to alert all on the Pet Event Tracking Network
- Larger data files will be accessible through FoodShield

**WHO** should be included in the Pet Event Tracking Network (PETNet) for the secure exchange of non-public information?

**Phase 1** (Based on current legislative constraints)

- State partners: State feed control officials (those in the state who regulate pet foods)
- Federal partners: CDC; DHS; USDA; DOD

**Phase 2** (Based on pending legislation passing and reducing constraints on information sharing or expanding the use of the commissioning process and use of 20.88 confidentiality agreements)

- State vet diagnostic labs; State feed labs; State veterinarians; State Health Departments; and State Public Health Veterinarians

**WHEN is information suitable for distribution in PETNet?**

**General considerations for entering information into the PETNet**

- Information should be entered in as close to real time as possible.
- It is preferable information is entered before states or FDA sees the information in the media.
- At this time, there are no objective standards for determining when information warrants entry into the PETNet.
- PETNet participants will be experienced persons who are able to use their judgment for determining when information warrants entry into the PETNet.

**When is information appropriate for distribution through PETNet?**

- Clusters of cases and individual cases ...
  - where there is objective data showing a definitive causal relationship between consumption of the pet food product and the adverse event.
  - where a causal relationship between consumption of the pet food product and the adverse event is suspected.



- where the state is actively investigating the relationship between consumption of a pet food product and an adverse event.
- Intentional and malicious contamination or tampering of pet food products.

**Plan**

- House PETNet on FoodShield
- Identify PETNet members from all 50 states
- Educate members on use of PETNet
- Educate targeted groups on the existence of PETNet
- Educate the public on the purpose of PETNet

**Concluding Remarks** - The meeting closed with comments from Mike Taylor, Senior Advisor to the FDA Commissioner and Steve Solomon; both offered their thanks for all the hard work and the progress that's been made and they look forward to hearing about their accomplishments at the next 50 State meeting in August 2010.

Prepared by: Peter Salisbury  
Acting Special Assistant  
Division of Federal-State Relations  
Office of Regulatory Affairs / FDA  
12/15/09