

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

+ + + + +

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON

MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION

+ + + + +

PLENARY SESSION

+ + + + +

August 9, 2007

8:30 a.m.

George Mason University
3401 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, Virginia

CHAIR: MR. ALFRED V. ALMANZA
Administrator, FSIS

MODERATOR: MR. ROBERT TYNAN
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Public Affairs
Education and Outreach

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

MS. KIBBE M. CONTI
MR. BRIAN R. COVINGTON
DR. CATHERINE N. CUTTER
DR. JAMES S. DICKSON
MR. KEVIN M. ELFERING
MR. MIKE W. FINNEGAN
MS. CAROL TUCKER FOREMAN
DR. ANDREA L. GRONDAHL
DR. JOSEPH J. HARRIS
DR. CRAIG W. HENRY

Free State Reporting, Inc.
1378 Cape St. Claire Road
Annapolis, MD 21409
(410) 974-0947

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: (cont.)

MS. CHERYL D. JONES
MR. MIKE E. KOWALCYK
DR. EDNA NEGRON-BRAVO
DR. SHELTON E. MURINDA
DR. MICHAEL L. RYBOLT
MR. MARK P. SCHAD
MR. STANLEY A. STROMBERG

ALSO PARTICIPATING:

MS. ELIZABETH BOODY
DR. LORAIN CANNON
DR. MICHELLE CATLIN
DR. DANIEL ENGELJOHN
MS. KIM GREEN
MS. LAVONNE JOHNSON
DR. CAROL MACZKA
MR. BRYCE QUICK
DR. RICHARD RAYMOND
DR. JANE ROTH
MR. BILL SMITH
DR. DANAH VETTER
DR. ISABEL WALLS
DR. PAT BASU
MS. OLGA MORALES
MR. STANLEY PAINTER
DR. AL YANCY

I-N-D-E-X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Opening - Mr. Robert Tynan	236
Questions from the Committee on the Briefing Papers	
Update on State Reviews Mr. Bill Smith and Dr. Jane Roth	238
Presentation and Discussion on Data Collection and Analysis of FSIS Standard Operation Procedures Dr. Michelle Catlin	
Do you have any suggestions for improving our strategy for data collection and analysis?	267
Do you have other suggestions for stakeholder input in this process?	276
Do you have any other suggestions for conducting peer review?	283
Do you believe it would be worthwhile to form an on-gong Subcommittee to assist FSIS in evaluating various data issues? If so, please provide a rationale as to why it would be useful and recommendations on how it would be structured and should operate.	284
Presentation and Discussion on Subcommittee on Data - Rules and Responsibilities	290
Subcommittee 1: Presentation and Discussion of Report from Thursday's Session	
Issue: Linking FSIS Activities to it's Public Health Goals	300

I-N-D-E-X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Comments from Mr. Alfred V. Almanza, Administrator, FSIS	322
Subcommittee 2: Presentation and Discussion of Report from Thursday's Session	
Issue: Pilot Project to Explore Mechanisms for Sharing Industry Data with FSIS	322
Wrap up and Adjourn - Mr. Bryce Quick, Deputy Administrator, FSIS	345

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (9:23 a.m.)

3 MR. TYNAN: This is Day 2 of our National
4 Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection,
5 and is sort of our report out morning.

6 I have a number of things that we need for
7 our agenda. So it's a little bit different than what
8 you see on the agenda that's in your notebook. So
9 for today, I propose the following agenda.

10 We had some discussion yesterday, very
11 early one, regarding a briefing paper concerning
12 State Reviews. I have Mr. Bill Smith and Dr. Jane
13 Roth from our Office of Program Evaluation,
14 Enforcement and Review, and they're here to respond
15 to some of the questions that came up yesterday.

16 So I would propose that we would begin our
17 session today with a little bit of discussion about
18 that and see if we can respond to any questions that
19 you have on that.

20 And then Michelle Catlin yesterday was kind
21 enough to be the recorder of some of our comments
22 related to our first issue topic, concerning SOPs.

1 So she put some notes together. She's going to walk
2 us through the notes and then, again as a plenary
3 session, I'd like to adjust the notes, come to some
4 conclusions and see if the Committee as a whole is
5 good with the report. We'll get that finalized and
6 out. That will be response to issue number 1.

7 And then I'll have each of the two
8 Subcommittees that we had, Subcommittee 1 and
9 Subcommittee 2, report out. Again we'll project
10 their reports on the screen and as a group, we'll
11 modify and work on a little bit further those two
12 Subcommittee reports and once we're satisfied that we
13 have an acceptable report for the majority of the
14 Committee, that will become the recommendations of
15 the Advisory Committee.

16 And then last but not least, what I would
17 like to do is go back and revisit the conversation we
18 had concerning a standing Subcommittee related to
19 Data. We put together a small duties, roles,
20 responsibilities statement for that Committee, and I
21 will maybe walk us through that, we'll talk a little
22 bit about it, and hopefully get that reasonably

1 finalized as well, and do all of that sometime by
2 11:30, noon, and be finished.

3 Having said that, I mentioned yesterday
4 that we needed volunteers for that standing
5 Subcommittee on Data, and there were a number of
6 people that have chattered with me already. If there
7 are other folks that are interested in participating
8 in that Committee, I would certainly like to know
9 that this morning if we could. So before we conclude
10 our day here, if you can catch me on a break or
11 between some of the Committee sessions or send me a
12 quick e-mail from your Blackberry, that would help
13 immensely. So if you haven't spoken with me already
14 and would like to participate in that Committee, I
15 would like to conclude that as well.

16 And so with that, if everyone is in
17 agreement on our agenda for the meeting this morning,
18 then we'll begin the proceedings. Are there any
19 questions, comments at this particular point?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. TYNAN: Cool. And with that, we'll
22 start -- we'll revisit our discussion from yesterday

1 or continue our discussion from yesterday of the
2 briefing paper related to State Reviews and I think
3 Mrs. Foreman, I think you had some concerns with
4 that, and as I say, Mr. Smith and Dr. Roth are here
5 to respond to some of your questions and concerns.

6 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Thank you very much.
7 I'm sorry I'm sitting working on Subcommittee Number
8 1 over here.

9 I'd like to -- thank you all for coming
10 over. I hope it doesn't interrupt your day, and I
11 certainly hope you weren't on vacation.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I wanted to go over
14 the OIG report where they had made a number of
15 specific recommendations and you had reached
16 management agreement with OIG on everything I believe
17 but there were some -- part of the management
18 agreement was things that you said you would take
19 care of, and I just wanted to go through and ask if
20 you, in fact, had taken care of all of those things
21 that they suggested.

22 And if I could find the report it would

1 help, but I know it's buried in here. You might help
2 by telling the Committee what some of those things
3 were and what you did.

4 DR. ROTH: Okay. Just let me begin by
5 saying that the OIG Report was completed really in
6 the end of October of 2005, and then subsequent to
7 that, we addressed the 12 recommendations that were
8 made in October 2005. The OIG report looked at state
9 program and our reports from 2003.

10 So what we're talking -- what I'd like to
11 focus on is what we did today and where we're going.
12 The bottom line is we have responded and addressed
13 all 12 recommendations and we have reached management
14 decision on all 12 of them.

15 Once again, the state review process has
16 been very strong since we've redesigned, rewritten
17 the manual. There are the nine components. We have
18 the self-assessment reviews and the on site reviews
19 that are quite comprehensive. So I don't know what
20 specifically you want.

21 We basically are focusing on a systems
22 approach. We're requiring the state programs to have

1 ongoing management controls. So when we review the
2 state programs and when they sign their submissions,
3 they're saying not only are their programs at least
4 equal to at this point in time, but they can maintain
5 that system for the coming 12 months. So it's very
6 important that they have in place management
7 controls, checks and balances, supervisory oversight
8 for component 3 which is the lab component. We look
9 at what actions they take when there's a positive
10 sample and also what preventative actions they have
11 in place.

12 So we also have a very, very strong review
13 team, and I think that you have access to the FSIS
14 review manual, which is on the website. There also
15 is the copy of the 2006 report. The new report will
16 come out at the end of this fiscal year, the end of
17 this calendar year. That will cover the
18 determinations made for 2007.

19 A new review manual is being crafted and
20 will be sent to the state directors the middle of
21 this month, and the state directors will have until
22 the middle of November to submit their self-

1 assessment submission for this year.

2 So I think that all parties should be very
3 comfortable with the determinations that are made.
4 The state directors will tell you that the bar has
5 been raised significantly in the past years, and that
6 we are continuing to ensure that the state programs
7 maintain their at least equal to status. They are
8 involved as we put out new directives. There is
9 monthly conference calls to ensure that any questions
10 that they have are answered.

11 So I don't know what else to tell you
12 except that the report that you're looking at, all
13 the concerns have been addressed, management
14 decision's been made and once again that was
15 addressing what took place in 2003.

16 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Terrific. My major
17 question was that all of those recommendations where
18 you made commitments to do things by specific dates,
19 and this document shows that you did do that.

20 I have a couple of other concerns that I'd
21 like to raise about it. I know that the requirement
22 is that the state programs be equal to the federal

1 program. I think the public really wants to know are
2 the individual plants that are selling product under
3 state inspection producing product that is as clean
4 and safe and unlikely to cause foodborne illness as
5 that that's produced in federal establishments?
6 That's an important element.

7 DR. ROTH: Well, I can tell you that the
8 way that we're looking at the state programs is to
9 ensure that takes place, that we are ensuring that
10 the program system-wide, that the standards are
11 clear, that the states have enough inspection
12 personnel to carry out the program, that if a
13 particular plant has a noncompliance, that that is
14 immediately addressed, corrective enforcement action
15 -- the correct and appropriate enforcement action is
16 taken. And so I think we feel very comfortable
17 saying, yes.

18 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Let me raise two
19 things about that please. The OIG Report mentioned
20 that I believe it was the individual plants, they
21 went into in Mississippi, that none of them were
22 meeting all of the HACCP and SSOP requirements. Were

1 they directed as a result of the FSIS visit to remedy
2 those things? You have no authority to tell them to
3 remedy them. You I assume told the state. How do
4 you handle that?

5 DR. ROTH: You are correct. But what we do
6 when we're out there doing the reviews of the state
7 plants, is we're actually looking at the states
8 performing their inspection. And we expect the
9 states to take the appropriate action. If they
10 don't, we would take, we would, you know, take that
11 but we would never leave an establishment if there
12 was a concern about public safety. We would never do
13 that.

14 And then they are expected to simply do
15 exactly what the federal plants do. A NR is written.
16 The plants are expected to respond with appropriate
17 corrective action, and then as necessary, the state
18 program follows up.

19 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: The OIG Report
20 specifically mentioned the instances in the
21 Mississippi plant, and I think it was plants, where
22 they had not cleaned the saws since the preceding

1 day's activities. So they clearly weren't meeting
2 the federal standard. FSIS has no authority then to
3 say to that plant when you're in there, go clean the
4 saws. You tell the state and the state presumably
5 tells the company. But the state hadn't told the
6 company the day before to do that.

7 DR. ROTH: I'll start and Bill can fill in.
8 First off, I don't -- when anyone has an operation,
9 it's not going to be perfect every single day. What
10 we're looking at is that we're providing oversight to
11 ensure adulterated product doesn't leave the
12 establishment. And so the state inspection program,
13 we believe, is ensuring that adulterated product does
14 not leave that establishment. And we look -- we will
15 take action if the state does not take action. That
16 is the bottom line.

17 In all cases, when we are there reviewing
18 the plant or we see at the record reviews that there
19 are problems, the state is responsible to take
20 action. But what we're looking for is for the state
21 system to work, the state inspection program to work.

22 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: How do you follow up

1 to know that the state took that action that it was
2 supposed to take? That was, you know, a moment
3 where, a snapshot where you were there, and it wasn't
4 happening.

5 DR. ROTH: Okay.

6 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Did the reviewers then
7 say to the state, you've got to fix this?

8 DR. ROTH: We actually not only expect the
9 individual plant to send us a corrective action, we
10 expect the corrective action to show that it'll be
11 taken throughout the entire system, the whole entire
12 state program.

13 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Good. Good.

14 DR. ROTH: We also do follow up reviews and
15 we will go back on site if we feel that is necessary.

16 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

17 DR. ROTH: And then obviously as we move
18 forward in the subsequent year, we would also, you
19 know, look at that to make sure that that is being
20 maintained.

21 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Thank you. I've got
22 just about three more questions. There was some

1 disagreement between FSIS and OIG over the IPPS forms
2 that showed that your reviews were strictly of the
3 plant's performance, not the state inspector's
4 performance. Is that, is that one of those things
5 that got worked out?

6 DR. ROTH: Yeah, I'm sure it did get worked
7 out, yeah.

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay. Finally, and I
9 appreciate the information, actually there are two
10 things. One, did you get the money back from Texas
11 yet?

12 DR. ROTH: I would assume yes. I don't
13 want to --

14 MR. SMITH: It's my understanding --

15 DR. ROTH: Yes.

16 MR. SMITH: -- yes.

17 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: It has been paid 100
18 and whatever thousand dollars it was.

19 DR. ROTH: Yes.

20 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

21 MR. SMITH: It doesn't come to FSIS.

22 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I know it doesn't come

1 to FSIS.

2 DR. ROTH: We either reduce the amount of
3 it the subsequent year but, yes, it has been
4 corrected.

5 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

6 DR. ROTH: And plus we've put in checks and
7 balances for moving forward, so that we have much
8 better control and oversight of the funding.

9 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: My greatest question,
10 this is a continuing problem for me with state
11 inspection, is that you deferred judgments on some of
12 the state programs so that they could remedy the
13 problems that you raised with them. And sometimes
14 that took some time to do. For us, that translates
15 as individual plants in those states continued to
16 operate and sell meat and poultry to the public, when
17 you had said that the state plan really was not
18 adequate, the program wasn't adequate, to meet the
19 equal to requirement. So that up to the point where
20 you made that determination, it wasn't equal to. And
21 between the time you made the decision to defer until
22 you got their problems worked out and they were equal

1 to, it wasn't equal to. So there may in some of
2 these instances been long periods of time when those
3 plants weren't operating -- those states weren't
4 operating equal to programs. And you only review
5 them every three years.

6 DR. ROTH: No, a couple of your statements
7 are incorrect.

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

9 DR. ROTH: We review the states every year.
10 We do an annual review --

11 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

12 DR. ROTH: -- every year, and that is a
13 very comprehensive review. Also when we ensure, we
14 would not be deferring any statement program if we
15 felt public health was at risk. So I mean we really
16 to make that very clear.

17 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: That's not clear in
18 any documents. There's nothing that says, that I
19 have found, that says we deferred and said they
20 weren't equal to because we couldn't call them equal
21 to, but there was no public health issue.

22 DR. ROTH: Our job is not only to determine

1 that they are at least equal to today. We want to
2 ensure that they can maintain that at least equal to
3 status. And so there are times when people deserve
4 an opportunity to reinforce what we're seeing, and we
5 want to ensure that we have a level of confidence
6 that, you know, is beyond question when we make the
7 final determination. Maybe Bill wants to add
8 something.

9 MR. SMITH: I just want to make sure on
10 this authority question that we're also clear, and
11 that is the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the
12 Poultry Product Inspection Act provide the Secretary
13 and us as his agents, the ability to designate an
14 individual plant if there is a concern about public
15 health, and we have not done that because that is our
16 ability to use that authority. We will use it we
17 need to, and so there should not be a concern that if
18 there's a public health concern, that that's not
19 being addressed.

20 Each and every time to this point, the
21 states, we have been satisfied when we've left that
22 the state has addressed any noncompliance.

1 DR. ROTH: Dr. Raymond wants to --

2 DR. RAYMOND: Dr. Raymond. I'll just add
3 on a little bit. Carol, you've raised good points
4 and I've had some of these conversations for the
5 benefit of the rest of the folks in the room, and I
6 want to elaborate just a little bit.

7 What we would do with the state inspection
8 program is similar to what we would do with the
9 federal inspected plants. Sometimes we will
10 immediately pull inspection from the plant and
11 sometimes we will issue a notice of intent to enforce
12 which gives the plant a certain amount of time to
13 correct whatever the problem is if we feel that it's
14 not an imminent threat to the public's health.

15 I would compare that action of the federal
16 plant with what we would do with the state program,
17 and when we did these comprehensive assessment and
18 got into each one of these state programs for an on
19 site visit, there were a couple of states that we
20 said, you've got some issues, you're not equal to,
21 you need to fix it and correct it and then we'll go
22 back and make sure they did. Same as a NOIE would

1 be.

2 And we didn't necessarily designate any
3 plants in one state, but in one state, where the
4 situation we felt was a little more egregious than
5 the others, we did with a mutual agreement with the
6 state, we took over inspection of I don't know if
7 it's 8 or 9, about 25 percent of the plants. So we
8 just took over inspection, and we didn't truly
9 designate them, but we just worked with the state and
10 said, you've got a problem. We need to guarantee to
11 the people of the state that this food is safe for
12 consumption, and we did take over several plants in
13 that state, while they attempted to get to the equal
14 to status.

15 We also positioned our own inspection
16 workforce, not just in those plants but for the
17 plants that were still under state inspection, we
18 worked with the state inspectors to make sure there
19 was no product coming out of those plants that was
20 unsafe for public consumption. As you know, we
21 eventually designated the whole state and took over
22 the state. But we did provide extra intensive

1 inspection while we were working with them.

2 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Just a couple of quick
3 questions. Thank you. And I do know that all that's
4 the case.

5 Before New Mexico, when was the last time
6 that you designated a state for failure to meet its
7 obligations, rather than the state just actively
8 saying we don't want to do it anymore?

9 MR. SMITH: Any designations that I've been
10 associated with in my 30 years has always been the
11 state has decided to, for whatever purpose, turnover
12 inspection to the federal. So we have never in my,
13 that I'm aware of, designated a state for -- other
14 than their request to do that.

15 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: But in New Mexico's
16 case, they requested it but they did it under duress.
17 You were pressuring them. Has there been any similar
18 case during your time, Bill? You all are being more
19 vigorous about this than perhaps the Department has
20 been in the past.

21 MR. SMITH: There has been situations way
22 back. I can go back to the nineties and even late

1 eighties when one or two states determined that they
2 would not have the financial resources to do it, so
3 they gave up for those reasons which was a little
4 bit.

5 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Yeah, I most certainly
6 experienced that.

7 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I was struck by the
9 language, the U.S. Court of Appeals, in the Ohio case
10 where they sued saying USDA didn't have the
11 constitutional authority to prohibit the interstate
12 sale of state inspected product, and the Court noted
13 that USDA inspectors are in USDA plants every day.
14 They're not in state inspected plants every day.
15 There is only this annual -- there's only the review
16 which is ordinarily a self-review and then is
17 followed up with on site reviews in some cases.

18 I would certainly feel better about it if
19 you were, if you visited those state plants, not just
20 the program, but the plants once a year for some sort
21 of audit. It wouldn't keep them from doing -- going
22 back to their old ways the next day, but at least the

1 public would know that there's somebody there at
2 least once a year. I really appreciate your
3 providing all the information to me. It's been every
4 helpful.

5 How many telephone calls did you get from
6 Congressional offices when you started sending people
7 out to do those on site reviews?

8 MR. SMITH: I'm not --

9 DR. ROTH: You mean the regular on site
10 reviews?

11 MR. SMITH: Yeah, we're not --

12 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: No, some of the
13 comprehensive reviews and the deferrals in Missouri
14 and Mississippi. You didn't hear from any of those
15 members of Congress?

16 DR. ROTH: We're all shaking our head.

17 MR. SMITH: We, as part of this process,
18 inform the Governor's offices as well as the
19 Congressional, what we're doing, when we're going, so
20 they know that there's no surprises, and so they're
21 kept to date. So there's no phone calls because
22 we're interacting and reaching out before we even go.

1 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay. Thank you. I
2 appreciate that.

3 MR. TYNAN: Are there other comments from
4 the Committee to finish this particular topic up?
5 Stan, is that your -- do you have a comment? Stan,
6 we'll let you have the last word.

7 MR. PAINTER: Thank you. Stan Painter with
8 the National Joint Council. I'm wondering what is
9 the Agency's definition of equal to. Could you
10 expand on that just a little bit more on the equal to
11 portion of it regarding the inspection?

12 DR. ROTH: It's at least equal to, and in
13 the manual, for each of the nine components, we state
14 what the criteria is with regard to each of the nine
15 components. We're not requiring the states to do
16 identical or exactly as FSIS does it. We are
17 requiring the states to have the same bottom line, to
18 have the same results in respect to each of the
19 components. And then also they are responsible for
20 addressing, for implementing all our regulations.

21 MR. SMITH: I'd just like to add, they are
22 responsible to have the same authorities, to

1 demonstrate that they can financially carry out those
2 authorities, that they can enforce them, prosecute
3 them, seize, detain, retain. So everything that's
4 required in the Federal Meat Inspection Act, Poultry
5 Product Inspection Act, and Egg Product Inspection
6 Act, we must see in their authorities in order to be
7 considered equal to.

8 MR. PAINTER: Okay. Does that mean they
9 will have the backing of the Meat Act and Poultry
10 Act, they will have the same authorities under those
11 two things as federal inspectors currently have in
12 enforcing regulations?

13 DR. ROTH: Yes.

14 MR. PAINTER: What would take place in the
15 event of a recall?

16 MR. SMITH: I'm not sure what you mean.

17 MR. PAINTER: Tainted product goes out,
18 what would happen? If a state -- something under
19 state, would they notify the Agency?

20 MR. SMITH: The states presently because
21 it's intrastate, yes, states apply the same program
22 we do interstate which is they would do an interstate

1 notice. They'd notify us just like we notify them
2 when we're doing a recall and as far as I also know,
3 if plants intrastate fail to recall product, then
4 they can detain and seize. That's why it's important
5 they have those authorities.

6 MR. PAINTER: Okay. The capability of
7 people power, I'm trying to be politically correct
8 here, as far as people power and training, is the
9 training requirements going to be the same for state
10 inspector as federal inspectors?

11 DR. ROTH: At least equal to.

12 MR. PAINTER: Are they going to develop or
13 attend an FSRE training such as we currently have?

14 MR. SMITH: Again, the program, the
15 training they receive needs to be equal to our
16 training.

17 MR. PAINTER: Do they have that at the
18 present time?

19 DR. ROTH: Yes, absolutely.

20 MR. PAINTER: And how has that been
21 qualified?

22 MR. SMITH: It's been determined with our

1 criteria that it's -- so that it covers the same
2 thing. So the same things, ante-mortem, post-mortem,
3 raw product processing, shelf stable processing and
4 thinks like cooking and lethality, delivery and
5 stabilization, those are the things that we look for,
6 whether they attend FSRE training or whether they run
7 their own program.

8 DR. ROTH: What Bill just said is that a
9 lot of the state personnel participate in our
10 training. So we either open up -- our training is
11 available to some, and then they can conduct their
12 own training.

13 MR. PAINTER: What about the testing, the
14 testing of product and the sampling? How will that
15 be handled?

16 DR. ROTH: Well, the state programs are
17 required to have an at least equal to sampling
18 program for *Listeria*, *Salmonella*, *E. coli*, and your
19 both for the annual self-assessment and when they go
20 on site, look closely at the protocol. They look at
21 what the states are doing on a positive.

22 DR. RAYMOND: I'm just going to jump in

1 here, Stan, just to make sure we're answering your
2 questions. Your last question I think was how well
3 they test? I want to make sure, are you talking
4 about how we currently do it or if the law was passed
5 and allowed interstate shipment? Is that where
6 you're coming from?

7 MR. PAINTER: That's correct.

8 DR. RAYMOND: That's why I don't think Jane
9 was answering that way. So I just want to make sure.
10 I think Stanley is asking if the law when it went
11 into effect, whatever it is, the amendment to
12 HR22419, I think that's really where Stanley's
13 questions are.

14 MR. PAINTER: That's correct. I'm asking
15 if the state program is allowed to do the interstate
16 shipment.

17 DR. RAYMOND: And what I'd like to do,
18 Stan, we'll try to get those questions answered, you
19 know, verbally here, but what I'll do also is pass
20 around technical comments that we provided to the
21 House, as they're working on the amendment, and so
22 everybody in the room does know the United States

1 Department of Agriculture President, Administration
2 does not have a position on interstate shipment at
3 this time. What we've been asked to do is provide
4 technical comments, and I think some of your
5 questions you'll see addressed in our technical
6 comments. We have some concerns such as number 6, in
7 there, is about recalls. You're asking about recalls
8 and I don't think we answered. Bill said, you know,
9 within the state, this is what would happen, and I
10 think your question really went to interstate. So
11 you'll see on number 6, we do raise questions about
12 it.

13 I'm also going to pass around a copy of the
14 amendment for anyone who wants to little extra stuff
15 to haul home, if you're interested in reading the
16 amendment because I think it's important to know
17 what's in the amendment when we discuss these issues,
18 so we're on the same page.

19 And you'll see in the amendment, it does
20 say on page 784 that the state will adopt provisions
21 identical to articles 1, 2 and 4. So now we're not
22 talking about at least equal to. Now we're talking

1 about identical which is a different definition.
2 Jane gave you the fact that we have the definition of
3 at least equal to for the nine categories. We do not
4 have definitions of identical, because identical
5 would mean identical.

6 MR. PAINTER: Well, and I apologize if I
7 confused anyone but my questions were all relating to
8 the House bill and state inspection and going across
9 state lines. Does this mean there would be daily
10 visits by an inspector?

11 MR. SMITH: Yes.

12 MR. PAINTER: Okay. Federal monies, toward
13 the program, the state now gets federal monies.
14 Would that increase?

15 MR. TYNAN: Stan, I'm sorry. Can I -- do
16 you just have another series of questions or was
17 there some thought or comment. I think Mr. Elfering
18 has had his card up. So I think he has a comment.

19 MR. PAINTER: Okay. Well, yeah, I just had
20 a few more questions regarding what would take place,
21 and I thought that was the process that we were
22 dealing with here, was to get some answers to

1 questions.

2 MR. TYNAN: That's fine.

3 MR. PAINTER: I was thinking that that was
4 the reason that Jane and Bill came in.

5 MR. TYNAN: No, that's correct. No, no,
6 no. I'm not questioning that, but we do have some
7 other issues that we have to deal with, and so this
8 was just a follow up to our discussion tomorrow. So
9 if you have a whole series of questions, then we can
10 try and work with you perhaps after the meeting.

11 MR. PAINTER: Will it be on record?

12 MR. TYNAN: No, that's fine. Go ahead. Do
13 you have a lot more?

14 MR. PAINTER: I'll make it quick.

15 MR. TYNAN: Okay.

16 MR. PAINTER: If the bill passes, will
17 states be allowed to export to foreign countries?

18 MR. SMITH: We've addressed that in our
19 technical comments, and so that's an issue we raise.
20 We don't have any answer for that.

21 MR. PAINTER: Receiving of imports, will
22 states be able to set up import houses and receive

1 import of product?

2 MR. SMITH: Again, our technical comments,
3 right now imports are going through our ID -- I mean
4 our import warehouses and I don't expect any changes
5 on that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Elizabeth Boody from
7 our Congressional Public Affairs Staff can answer any
8 technical questions about that in a moment.

9 MR. PAINTER: I have one final issues --

10 MS. BOODY: Referring to the --

11 DR. PAINTER: Excuse me.

12 MS. BOODY: Sorry. We're referring to
13 language in the Farm Bill now, right?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

15 MS. BOODY: It's -- language. So it's not
16 really an amendment anymore.

17 MR. PAINTER: One final comment, and that
18 was regarding the MAW or the question regarding the
19 MAW. Would the standards be the same. We
20 affectionately refer to the method of assigning work
21 as MAW, the standard as proposed would be the same?

22 MR. SMITH: Again, what we need to

1 understand, the definition of identical, and that was
2 a request we made in our technical amendments. Any
3 reimbursement that the Agency would be doing, the
4 establishment or the state would have to determine or
5 demonstrate to use what constitutes a -- , what
6 constitutes the grade level of that person, and then
7 -- because that becomes a reimbursement issue. And
8 so we would be looking for very similar to what we're
9 doing.

10 MR. PAINTER: Well, see, now you went from
11 identical to similar. Now I'm confused as to how we
12 got from identical to similar.

13 MR. SMITH: Again, I think I've said twice,
14 that one of the first questions in our technical
15 response has a little better definition of identical,
16 and so identical to what demonstrates, you know, 2080
17 years for a staff year, that would be identical. How
18 that's recorded in the system is the issue, and again
19 I agree with you, Stan. We in our technical comments
20 have quite explicitly said we need to fully
21 understand the terminology of identical.

22 MR. PAINTER: Thank you.

1 MR. TYNAN: As I said, we're going to let
2 Stan have the last word today. So we're going to
3 close out this topic if we can and begin the
4 substantive business that is normally what we do on
5 our second day of the Advisory Committee.

6 The first topic, I invite Dr. Catlin to
7 come up and --

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Could I --

9 MR. TYNAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: -- while she's getting
11 there. I want to thank the staff again for all your
12 answers and for this technical comment document. I'd
13 urge everybody to read the questions that the Agency
14 raises here because they are obviously seeking
15 additional information from the Congress, and some of
16 those questions I think are really hard to answer
17 particularly with regard to how states would get
18 inspected product back after it's crossed the state
19 line and needed to be recalled. My guess is that
20 Congress is going to tell you all to do it, and I'm
21 not sure how you're going to do it either. Thanks
22 again.

1 MR. TYNAN: Okay. And with that,
2 Dr. Catlin's getting a microphone. So this is going
3 to be a little bit complicated in terms of walking us
4 through the material. We're going to project the
5 combined notes from yesterday's discussion regarding
6 standard operating procedures for data. Michelle was
7 kind enough to put all of that together. So let's go
8 through it very briefly. She's going to walk us
9 through it and then we can make any comments or
10 suggestions, modifications that we need to, and then
11 we'll consider that he report for issue number 1 for
12 the Committee.

13 DR. CATLIN: Michelle, and this way you all
14 get to see how bad a typer I am.

15 The first question that was discussed
16 yesterday with regard to Dr. Walls' presentation was
17 do you have any suggestions for improving our
18 strategy for data collection and analysis? I tried
19 to take the comments that -- I tried to capture the
20 comments and I tried to form them into paragraphs or
21 recommendations last night. So they probably still
22 need some work.

1 But what I put was that the Subcommittee
2 supports the development of the framework for
3 collecting and analyzing data, and believes in
4 general that the strategy for data collection and
5 analyses is sound. It does suggest that the DAIG
6 consult with others on this process, especially Mike
7 Taylor, who has recently done related work. The
8 Committee emphasizes that data should be collected
9 for a purpose, not just for the sake of collecting
10 data and that the thought should always be towards
11 what the issue is that needs to be addressed. The
12 Committee also cautions that the task being
13 undertaken is large especially given the potential
14 volume of data and the time length for activity
15 should be taken into consideration, so as to not
16 delay the progress on projects. That's the first
17 paragraph.

18 I then went on to try and capture what else
19 was said.

20 The Committee also emphasized that the DAIG
21 should be examining existing data and not just moving
22 towards collecting new data. All data within a given

1 data set should be considered to avoid cherry picking
2 the data, and the data should be representative. If
3 it's inspection data, it should be representative of
4 all facilities, not unique to those from which it was
5 gathered. The Committee also indicated that input
6 from field personnel, including inspectors, and
7 frontline supervisors, who use the databases would be
8 useful. Different types of data including
9 qualitative information can be very useful and should
10 be captured possibly as support for the quantitative
11 data.

12 MR. TYNAN: Maybe at this point before we
13 go on to the next question, perhaps we should work
14 with each question individually. So if there are
15 some thoughts from the Committee about that or does
16 it reflect the conversation that we had yesterday.
17 Or now that you're thinking about it, are there other
18 things that we need to include. Dr. Harris.

19 DR. HARRIS: This is extremely trivial but
20 we may as well correct it. The very first sentence
21 should be the Committee, not the Subcommittee.

22 DR. CATLIN: Ah, thank you.

1 MR. TYNAN: We just wanted to see if you
2 were paying attention. Are there other comments or
3 thoughts? Mr. Kowalcyk.

4 MR. KOWALCYK: Yeah, one comment about when
5 you get down to discussing the qualitative
6 information. I feel that we should recommend that
7 data sources that are essentially qualitative
8 information, the Agency should look at ways to making
9 that information more manageable in the data
10 collection environment. An example would be a NR
11 form right now is a fairly wide open form for
12 handwritten comments. We don't want to lose the
13 comments but the Agency should look at ways to
14 standardize that form and have things such as I guess
15 check boxes that are easily portable to a
16 quantitative data field.

17 DR. CATLIN: The check boxes and dropdown
18 menus?

19 MR. KOWALCYK: Yeah.

20 DR. CATLIN: Does that sound good? The
21 Agency should explore ways to standardize qualitative
22 data, example, check boxes, dropdown menus, to make

1 it more amenable to analysis.

2 MR. KOWALCYK: I think that would be a good
3 addition.

4 MR. TYNAN: Mr. Schad.

5 MR. SCHAD: Yeah, Mike, I just wanted to
6 make sure I understood what you were saying there.
7 In losing some of the written description, we want to
8 be sure we're, by going to check boxes and stuff,
9 we're still adding more -- I can't say the word, be
10 more specific about it.

11 MR. TYNAN: Yes.

12 MR. SCHAD: I just didn't want to lose the
13 -- that's what we do need to be more specific about,
14 the description of the NR. Is that what you were
15 getting at, Mike?

16 MR. KOWALCYK: Yeah.

17 MR. SCHAD: I just wanted to be sure.

18 MR. KOWALCYK: I don't mean it to replace
19 the comments that would be on the form, but can there
20 be changes made to a form like that.

21 MR. SCHAD: I mean I agree with you as to
22 having too much wording in there, we lose a lot but I

1 just wanted to make sure, we weren't getting back to
2 too generalized information.

3 MR. KOWALCYK: Correct.

4 MR. SCHAD: Yeah, okay. All right.

5 MR. TYNAN: I'm going to recognize
6 Ms. Jones. I know that she was the one that brought
7 up the whole issue of qualitative data originally.

8 MS. JONES: Thank you. I just wanted to
9 make sure that the point didn't get lose and that the
10 qualitative data that I was suggesting supports the
11 quantitative data. So when you -- and I don't mean
12 that it can be. There are many ways, as I think
13 someone mentioned before, to quantify qualitative
14 data, which is fine. But you don't want to lose,
15 because there have been some concerns about
16 everything from NRs and I'm still very new, so I'm
17 still understanding these concepts, so if I misspeak,
18 just correct me. But the NRs have certain amounts of
19 qualitative data. However, there are questions about
20 whether or not that information is actually correct.
21 So if you're -- it's fine to quantify that. But at
22 the same time if you want to validate the data by

1 identifying another source, actually to do I think
2 one of the -- an interview, line inspectors or what
3 have you to ensure that what you're pulling from the
4 existing databases or data sets is supported by
5 what's actually going on.

6 MR. KOWALCYK: I would agree with that. I
7 don't think if you take something where you may get
8 to a simple yes or no, did this occur, I don't think
9 you would necessarily want to -- I'm not saying that
10 we would replace any of the quantitative --
11 qualitative data or eliminate it. And I would agree,
12 that's a good way to validate what's going on if you
13 see a trend over certain types of things -- . Then
14 the Agency can go out and look at the qualitative
15 comments that are in a common set of NRs or that have
16 similarities in the actual quantitative measures, to
17 see if the descriptions are consistent.

18 So again exploring those ways I think would
19 allow for that and to make it a more standardized way
20 to have that data shared and aggregated across the
21 country.

22 DR. CATLIN: So I've added to try and

1 capture your thought, Dr. Jones. What I've added is,
2 possibly as support for or verification of
3 quantitative data. Does that capture it without
4 losing anything else that anyone else wants?

5 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Henry.

6 DR. HENRY: Thank you, Robert. I think
7 just to tag that on a little bit, the risk-based
8 coalition and others have made recommendations to
9 FSIS relative to the improvement of NR databasing if
10 you will, and it was commented on yesterday that the
11 Agency's already moving down that road trying to
12 standardize the form.

13 I think one of the things that would be
14 very useful, dropdown boxes, et cetera. There are
15 key phrases or key sentences that can be consistently
16 used in those dropdown boxes that will provide
17 additional context as opposed to just saying, you
18 know, noncompliance for regulation 417, blah, blah,
19 blah. We need to have some of those other things
20 that really get to the meat of the matter. And if
21 they are applicable, that's what should be in the
22 dropdown box, which would help standardize an agreed

1 upon terminology used by the inspectors and makes it
2 very clear as to where the issue lies. That's just
3 my suggestion. How well Michelle can capture all
4 that remains to be seen, but thank you.

5 DR. CATLIN: How's that? I can read it.

6 DR. HENRY: That's perfect.

7 DR. CATLIN: Can you read it okay back
8 there?

9 MR. TYNAN: If it's perfect, we won't have
10 any more discussion about it. Dr. Vetter.

11 DR. VETTER: I'll just add to what
12 Dr. Henry and Mr. Kowalcyk were talking about. I
13 think it is possible, and I know some of that's going
14 on, and I would, you know, maybe even some more
15 additional specific code. We live in a -- kind of
16 world sometimes with our codes and making them, you
17 know, more specific for some of the tasks that we do
18 every day, might be helpful in making some of that
19 qualitative data more quantitative.

20 Simply being able, if you want to connect
21 it to microorganisms being able to have some sort of
22 way to do that as well, that it pertains to a

1 specific program, addressing a microorganism, which
2 that would -- you would know that as an inspector
3 because the plant would have specified that within
4 maybe their SSOP program or their HACCP programs or
5 something like that.

6 And one of the ways to verify and validate
7 that is through the supervisory chain of command.
8 That's one of our responsibilities and what we're
9 held accountable for.

10 And then the last comment that I would
11 make, it's kind of trivial, but in light of the group
12 that I represent, you not only ask inspectors and
13 frontline supervisors but also PHV, public health
14 veterinarians for their input.

15 MR. TYNAN: Other thoughts on question
16 number 1.

17 (No response.)

18 MR. TYNAN: Does that sort of capture your
19 thinking, Danah?

20 Okay. All right. Let's move onto question
21 number 2.

22 DR. CATLIN: Okay. The question here was

1 do you have other suggestions for stakeholder input
2 in this process?

3 I tried to capture the discussion by saying
4 that the Committee believe that broad stakeholder
5 input in the process will be essential. Stakeholders
6 include other agencies such as CDC, Congress and
7 industry. Other agencies who have dealt with similar
8 issues could be engaged to learn from their
9 activities. Industry input will be extremely
10 valuable when collecting information from the field.
11 The field workforce should also be engaged as a
12 stakeholder in the process to help ensure that the
13 data collection is robust and consistent. The
14 expectations of stakeholders should be clear and it
15 should be included at the initiation of a project and
16 through the end. To ensure continued stakeholder
17 participation, the results should be delivered on
18 time and should meet the stated goals of the project.
19 The results of the data analysis should also be made
20 available publicly for stakeholders to see, review
21 and use.

22 MR. TYNAN: Comments on 2 or does that

1 reflect pretty much the discussion you had yesterday?
2 Mr. Kowalcyk.

3 MR. KOWALCYK: Is the Agency open to -- in
4 -- there was also the data analysis as well as the
5 data could be available through maybe FOIA so that a
6 third party organization that does research could
7 conduct similar analysis to, you know, validate
8 results.

9 DR. CATLIN: Does other people want to
10 answer? My only thought is some of it would be
11 proprietary and we probably couldn't but I could as
12 appropriate or as allowable.

13 MR. KOWALCYK: I think that would be fair.

14 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you, Michael.
15 Other comments on question number 2? Does it seem
16 pretty much okay? I'm watching Michelle's fingers
17 fly over the keyboard. Shall we go to question --

18 DR. CATLIN: Wait, I missed some of it.

19 MR. TYNAN: I'm sorry.

20 DR. CATLIN: The Committee believes that
21 there have been issues with consistency of FSIS data
22 and the data needs to become more consistent, the

1 development of standard operating procedures and
2 increased training on data collection could increase
3 that consistency. And my apologies. I didn't
4 realize there was more on the next page.

5 MR. TYNAN: I'm sorry. Dr. Vetter. Thank
6 you, gentlemen.

7 DR. VETTER: I would just say that the
8 training not only on data collection but data entry,
9 how it's actually entered into the system.

10 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Henry.

11 DR. HENRY: Yes. I don't know if this is
12 redundant or not but I'm sure that Stan and Danah can
13 comment on it. I think relative to that FSIS
14 training on SOPs for data collection, sampling, et
15 cetera, as is good for all, what's good to hear is a
16 verification and validation of that training. So
17 Stan commented on testing, but I think anyone
18 involved with the process that they've been trained
19 on should be verified and validated if it's not
20 already being done.

21 DR. CATLIN: So the effectiveness of the
22 training should be --

1 DR. HENRY: Verified and validated.
2 Because without that, the collection of any data
3 remains in question.

4 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Painter.

5 MR. PAINTER: Yeah, Stan Painter with NJC.
6 And I'd like to say that what Dr. Henry just stated,
7 if we could put something to say, what we have now
8 says the effectiveness of the training. In some
9 cases, there's no training period. That there needs
10 to be an emphasis on training, training and then
11 evaluate the effectiveness of the training.

12 MR. TYNAN: So your issue is that in some
13 places it may need to be developed.

14 MR. PAINTER: Increased training in what
15 was just highlighted, but in some cases there's no
16 training period. Anything that you done would be an
17 increase at that point in time. The increased
18 training gives the allusion that there has been
19 training from the onset.

20 DR. CATLIN: How about training or
21 increased training.

22 MR. PAINTER: Okay.

1 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Are we all okay on
2 question 2? Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Kowalcyk.

3 MR. KOWALCYK: Thank you.

4 MR. TYNAN: I thought you were fanning
5 yourself there. I apologize.

6 MR. KOWALCYK: No, I'm right under the
7 vent. This is great.

8 In regards to the training, I think maybe
9 taking a step back and should the Agency evaluate
10 whether or not it has the right amount of resource,
11 human resource, financial resource, to oversee, audit
12 and manage the data and data collection process.
13 Training is one thing, and that's great. But it may
14 be a fair recommendation to the Agency that the
15 Agency evaluate its structure to support this
16 initiative. Do you have the right people in the
17 right positions that are empowered to make decisions
18 about the data?

19 DR. CATLIN: And we do, there is more about
20 that in one of the next questions as well. So --

21 MR. KOWALCYK: Okay.

22 DR. CATLIN: When we get there, it may be

1 redundant but to accomplish this, FSIS should
2 evaluate the structure to support this initiative and
3 associated training. The ability to evaluate --

4 MR. KOWALCYK: Maybe structure and
5 resources or if you cover that further on down, then
6 that --

7 DR. CATLIN: We do have resources further
8 down.

9 MR. KOWALCYK: Okay.

10 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Walls.

11 DR. WALLS: Michelle, would you mind going
12 back up to the beginning of what you were saying
13 about stakeholders. I just want to be clear.
14 Stakeholder input, CDC, Congress, industry, and
15 perhaps you should say consumer representatives after
16 industry. Thank you.

17 DR. CATLIN: Thank you.

18 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Stan, did you have a
19 follow up question or comment?

20 MR. PAINTER: No, I'm fine.

21 MR. TYNAN: Okay. That's okay. I just
22 want to make sure I catch everything.

1 Okay. Question number 3.

2 DR. CATLIN: Question number 3, do you have
3 any other suggestions for conducting peer review?

4 The Committee agrees that external peer
5 review is a critical aspect of the data collection
6 and analysis process. Subject matter experts should
7 be used and there are advantages to having subject
8 matter experts convened as a standing team to avoid
9 the large learning curve that could be involved each
10 time. To have an effective peer review process, it
11 will be essential that any assumptions the Agency
12 used in its analyses are presented in a transparent
13 manner. The subject matter experts should be given
14 very specific tasks that fit with their areas of
15 expertise and should address not only the analysis
16 but the appropriateness of the data being used in the
17 analysis. The Committee is aware that proper peer
18 review can require considerable resources and
19 recommends that FSIS allocate the necessary resources
20 to ensure it is conducted properly. In request for
21 resources for this activity, it should be clear that
22 data analysis and peer reviews are the reason for the

1 request.

2 MR. TYNAN: Comments. Mr. Elfering.

3 MR. ELFERING: Yeah, this is Kevin
4 Elfering. I would just for your SMES put must. Do
5 you like that for an acronym? SMES.

6 DR. CATLIN: Yes, I use that acronym. I
7 was proud of myself for not using it in here. And
8 that's my academy training. We're never allowed to
9 say must at the National Academy. So I never say it.

10 MR. TYNAN: But do you say SMES is the
11 question. Other comments on number 3?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Very good. Then we'll
14 pass onto question number 4.

15 DR. CATLIN: Okay. Question 4 and 5 were
16 combined, or actually it was just question 4
17 according to this. Do you believe it would be
18 worthwhile to form an ongoing Subcommittee to assist
19 FSIS in evaluating various data issues. If so,
20 please provide a rationale as to why it would be
21 useful and recommendations on how it would be
22 structured and should operate.

1 The response I put down was the Committee
2 believes that forming an ongoing Subcommittee to
3 address data issues and advise FSIS on the overall
4 process as they undertake data projects would be
5 useful and recommends doing so. It would like to
6 ensure, however, that the Subcommittee will not just
7 be an additional step for FSIS to go through, slowing
8 down any data analysis process, and that the right
9 people are involved including a statistician, not
10 just more people. The Committee agrees that the
11 expertise on NACMPI is complimentary to the expertise
12 of the Agency and that a Subcommittee of NACMPI would
13 have added value in the process. One area in
14 particular that the Subcommittee could assist is
15 problem definition. The timeframe for request to the
16 Subcommittee as well as the number of requests must
17 be taken into account.

18 MR. TYNAN: There's nothing on the next
19 page now, is there?

20 DR. CATLIN: I believe no. Nope, that's
21 it.

22 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Comments on question

1 number 4 in the usefulness of a standing
2 Subcommittee.

3 (No response.)

4 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Now we will talk at the
5 end and I wanted to leave it so that we could adjust
6 the time a little bit to talk about the rules and
7 responsibilities of that Subcommittee. So we'll do
8 that at the end if that's agreeable to everybody. So
9 in case we get pressed for time, we can perhaps do
10 that sort of on an e-mail basis as opposed to
11 necessarily take the time of the group. But if
12 you're all in agreement with issue number 1, is there
13 any dissenting opinions? Sort of yes?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. TYNAN: There being no noes that I can
16 hear, we'll accept issue number 1, the material that
17 Michelle just read, and do a little editing to make
18 sure that we've got everything spelled right and
19 everything correct. So we'll do that, and we'll
20 consider that to be the final report of the Advisory
21 Committee. And thank you, Michelle, for doing that.

22 DR. CATLIN: My pleasure.

1 MR. TYNAN: It's about 25 after 10:00. I
2 know some -- oh, I apologize. Stan.

3 MR. PAINTER: Stan Painter with the NJC.
4 I'm wondering as far as the question 4, what is meant
5 by about midpoint down, expertise of NACMPI is
6 complimentary to the expertise. What do we mean by
7 complimentary? And how is it complimentary?

8 DR. CATLIN: That I took from the
9 discussion when discussing about whether or not
10 NACMPI would have the right expertise to be able to
11 be this Subcommittee and there was a discussion that
12 the NACMPI does have a lot of expertise that the
13 Agency doesn't have necessarily in house, and that
14 they could provide a valued input onto it. So I sort
15 of captured that by the word complimentary.
16 Different but useful, would form together a good mix.

17 MR. PAINTER: Stan again. To me, you know,
18 the group can make their own decision but to me, when
19 you're complimenting something, you know, maybe
20 you're just adding to it, but you're not an integral
21 part of it.

22 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Henry.

1 DR. HENRY: Could we possibly insert
2 terminology that it would be substantially additive
3 as opposed to just complimentary?

4 DR. CATLIN: Yes.

5 DR. HENRY: Something like that. And that
6 part that I think Stan brought up, also we discussed
7 within this Subcommittee or this group that they
8 would also have a latitude which I think is
9 referenced to including a statistician, that there
10 actually could be additional outside subject matter
11 experts that would come in to assist that
12 Subcommittee in their analysis of whatever their
13 tasks are, which is not exactly spelled out there,
14 but I think it's implied when we say including the
15 statistician.

16 DR. WALLS: That is going to be spelled out
17 though, I'm sorry --

18 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Walls.

19 DR. WALLS: That is going to be spelled
20 out. We have a one page description, actually it's
21 more than one page, for the Subcommittee and it is
22 spelled out in more detail that it could include

1 additional or that the Subcommittee would be able to
2 identify outside peer reviewers who could peer review
3 data for example. But the Subcommittee is a
4 Subcommittee.

5 DR. HENRY: Sounds like a great plan.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. TYNAN: Okay. And with those last
8 comments -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 DR. CATLIN: Do I need to add something
10 here or do we think we take care of that in the
11 mission? I see yeses and noes around the table. The
12 Subcommittee would also be able to identify and
13 consult with external experts to add even greater
14 value.

15 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Walls, did you want to make
16 a --

17 DR. WALLS: Maybe we should look at the
18 charter for the Subcommittee at this point. Would
19 that be of value.

20 MR. TYNAN: We could do that. We could do
21 that. So for the time being, we'll consider the
22 report for issue number 1 as a good thing. We'll

1 transition, and we'll talk a little bit about the
2 charter or rules and responsibility for it right now,
3 and maybe --

4 DR. CATLIN: I have no idea where that is.
5 Is it on here?

6 MR. TYNAN: I think this reflects some of
7 the discussion we had yesterday. I think I've worked
8 with Carol's staff in sort of modifying what we had
9 started to do the other day. I think I mentioned
10 that we had started on a rules and responsibilities
11 statement for the Subcommittee, and I think that will
12 be helpful to each of you in terms of deciding
13 whether you want to participate on the Committee or
14 not.

15 So essentially the purpose of the
16 Subcommittee, it's established to assist the Food
17 Safety and Inspection Service to achieve its public
18 health goals, through providing advise to the Agency
19 on issues relating to data collection and analysis.
20 That's pretty straightforward.

21 And the background, we just simply reflect
22 that this came out of this meeting, it was agreed by

1 the Advisory Committee members, that we volunteer to
2 participate, to form an eight person Subcommittee. I
3 think we talked about eight people. It that's
4 incorrect, please let me know.

5 The Agency would make the final selections
6 on the members. That's pretty much the precedent we
7 had with our prior Subcommittee in the last term when
8 we did processing. And ideally the Subcommittee
9 would be balanced representations from the four
10 constituent groups of the Advisory Committee. So
11 that's sort of the background.

12 And I think where we were beginning to talk
13 was a little bit about the description of the duties
14 that we were proposing to have for the Subcommittee,
15 and essentially the duties, and I won't ready the
16 introductory statement, but it's to make
17 recommendations related to things such as the
18 Agency's Standard Operating Procedures. Some of the
19 things that we're talking about here, I'm sure are
20 going to come up as part of the Subcommittee work.
21 The technical plans developed through the Agency's
22 SOP process. We talked about prioritizing Agency

1 data analysis issues and data sets for review. We
2 talked about identifying independent external peer
3 reviewers, to help in that peer review process that
4 we mentioned in question number 3. Development of
5 pilot projects for utilization of industry data. So
6 some of the recommendations you make here, the
7 Subcommittee will be doing some additional work with
8 that, with linking Agency activities to public health
9 goals and last but not least, other similar projects
10 to help inform Agency decision making.

11 And I think Mrs. Foreman mentioned
12 yesterday, her perspective was that it was going to
13 be a broader kind of a thing, not doing the actual
14 analysis kind of thing, but sort of the process, the
15 procedures, the way of moving forward. So that's
16 essentially the duties and responsibilities.

17 The Subcommittee members, ideally we have
18 two members from each of the representative groups on
19 the Advisory Committee, would serve on the
20 Subcommittee, and we're going to ask the Subcommittee
21 to select a chairperson for their deliberations to
22 help maybe liaison with us and sort of organize and

1 decide on what the agendas would be for the meetings.

2 As necessary, the Agency is going to
3 designate individuals to work with the Committee. I
4 think there was a lot of discussion yesterday about
5 having subject matter experts available. So we wrote
6 that into the statement so that if there are issues
7 that come up, that we can get the appropriate people
8 to help you in your deliberations.

9 The members who are also going to be asked
10 to serve with other subject matter experts, may be
11 asked, to serve with other subject matter experts as
12 independent peer reviewers. Some of you have some
13 expertise that we would like to tap into as peer
14 reviewers as well. So we may call upon you to do
15 that as well. So that's sort of the membership.

16 The meetings, the Subcommittee is going to
17 meet as necessary to complete their tasks. The
18 Subcommittee is going to primarily do their work by
19 teleconference but, however, there may be some
20 requirement to do some traveling. If that's the
21 case, the Agency, as we do here, will cover the
22 appropriate costs, but I doubt very much that that

1 will be necessarily, but if it is, we'll take care of
2 those issues as well. And on the teleconferences, I
3 over looked it, but that we would try on any of the
4 teleconference to have at least one member from each
5 of the representative groups participate. So that
6 everybody has their voice even though it may not be
7 the full two people for each group, that we have at
8 least one there.

9 The reporting, and I think this reflects
10 our discussion yesterday, the Subcommittee would be
11 reporting back to the full Committee before reports
12 are sent to the Agency as the official NACMPI work.

13 Now it may be that we won't wait for one of
14 our two meetings each year. So we may send things
15 out through e-mail and try and get some -- find a
16 quicker vehicle to do some of this, but if we can do
17 it at these meetings, then we will do that as well,
18 but certainly it will come back through you before
19 anything is finalized.

20 The term of the charter I think as we
21 talked about yesterday would run through the term of
22 this Committee. So when this Committee expires in

1 July of '09, the Subcommittee will also expire, and
2 then for the next term, if we need that Committee
3 again, we'll restructure it.

4 The Agency support, OPABO, our office as we
5 do for this particular Committee, will provide the
6 logistical support for the Subcommittee.

7 And last but not least, we'll let
8 Mr. Almanza approve that after we're agreeable to it.

9 So that's sort of the terms that we had
10 laid out. Are there areas that we need to go back to
11 and talk a little bit about or are you just generally
12 comfortable with that the way it is? Mr. Kowalczyk.

13 MR. KOWALCYK: Thank you, Robert. On the
14 reporting piece, I know report back to the full
15 Committee, the Subcommittee's findings. Should we
16 require that the full Committee, it may not be
17 through an in person meeting but get consensus from
18 the full Committee before we move on? Should we
19 spell that out?

20 MR. TYNAN: I think that's a good idea, and
21 that was in my thinking, but perhaps having that
22 specifically stated would be a good idea. I'm going

1 to ask Michelle if she wouldn't mind skipping back up
2 to duties.

3 DR. CATLIN: Is that okay?

4 MR. KOWALCYK: Yeah, I think that's fine,
5 so that the Committee's all aligned with the
6 Subcommittee's recommendations.

7 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you, Michelle. So
8 this is sort of the description of duties. Does this
9 sort of capture what the thinking was? Yesterday,
10 again I think we were talking about higher level
11 kinds of issues to help frame the way we go forward
12 as an Agency. Dr. Henry.

13 DR. HENRY: Yeah, just making sure we
14 capture it, because of what Isabel was saying, I
15 don't see that we've used the terminology subject
16 matter experts but is that what's implied by
17 identification of independent, external peer
18 reviewers? Because that's -- I think that that's
19 what we wanted to make sure we had the ability to
20 bring in additional subject matter experts to provide
21 their input to the task at hand. Does that sound
22 right?

1 MR. TYNAN: Did you want us to say such --

2 DR. HENRY: I see there's -- it's sounds
3 like the appropriate way to do that, external peer
4 reviewers, yeah, I mean because I think of it as I
5 look at it there, identification of independent,
6 external peer reviewers, sounds like we're kind of
7 farming it out. That's a separate task I think from
8 this. I mean if the Subcommittee is tasked to make
9 an analysis, make a recommendation, evaluate a
10 process, then they may bring in some other outside
11 experts to convey their knowledge and wisdom but the
12 external peer reviewer, that's a separate issue that
13 I think is outside, may actually have a completely
14 different set of recommendations or evaluation than
15 what this Committee. So I ask for clarification.

16 MR. TYNAN: Thank you, Craig.

17 DR. WALLS: Just to make sure we're clear,
18 what we mean by that is that if we were going to
19 subject something to external peer review, this
20 Subcommittee can recommend potential external peer
21 reviewers as subject matter experts. Mr. Rybolt or
22 Dr. Rybolt. I apologize.

1 DR. RYBOLT: I think what Dr. Henry's
2 saying is that there should be a separate bullet
3 point here. We're talking about peer review, but
4 we're also -- we also discussed yesterday actually
5 bringing in other people that we need, Mike Taylor
6 for example, or someone like that if the -- I say we,
7 but if the Subcommittee needs some subject matter
8 experts. So it should be a separate bullet point.

9 DR. HENRY: This is Craig. I concur.
10 That's exactly what I was after. We just need to
11 break that out as a separate line item for clarity.

12 MR. TYNAN: And we'll take it off the next
13 -- the subject matter expert off the next bullet. So
14 is it redundant?

15 DR. CATLIN: No.

16 MR. TYNAN: Okay.

17 DR. MACZKA: I think we want to add as part
18 of the Committee -- Subcommittee.

19 MR. TYNAN: Other things in relation to the
20 charter that we need to talk about? Were there any
21 of the other paragraphs that were of concern?

22 (No response.)

1 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Could we consider that
2 sort of the final recommendation to go with question
3 number 4? Would that be agreeable to everybody?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. TYNAN: I see no dissenting voices. So
6 we'll consider that done. Okay. Thank you,
7 Michelle.

8 It's about 20 minutes to 11:00. I'm going
9 to give the Committee a choice. This is a hard one
10 to do. We can take maybe a short break for 10
11 minutes or we can press on and try and be done.
12 Short break? Okay. Short break. Ten minutes.
13 Could we get back by 10 minutes to --

14 (Off the record.)

15 (On the record.)

16 MR. TYNAN: Our discussion of Subcommittee
17 number 2, Mr. Mark Schad is the chairperson. I'm
18 sorry. Subcommittee Number 1. I apologize. I'm
19 thinking 1, 2, 3. I just wanted to be sure you were
20 paying attention. Subcommittee Number 2, and talking
21 about linking activities to public health goals. Do
22 I have that part correct? Okay. All right. That's

1 Subcommittee 1. Okay. Thank you very much. And
2 with that -- all right. With that, I'm going to turn
3 it over to Mr. Schad to give his Subcommittee report.
4 LaVonne Johnson of our OPAAEO staff is going to make
5 her best effort to make the modifications and changes
6 that are necessary. So, Mark, take it away.

7 MR. SCHAD: Thank you, Robert. First of
8 all, I want to thank the Subcommittee for their
9 diligent work. We not only did a lot of work last
10 night but a lot of people after we broke up yesterday
11 afternoon did some work at home and we did a lot of
12 work this morning also. So thanks to the
13 Subcommittee.

14 Subcommittee 1 recognized that these were
15 very broad issues. Furthermore the Subcommittee has
16 concerns about the adequacy of the currently
17 available data, specifically the *Salmonella*
18 verification data, and the public health NRs. Trying
19 to predict and minimize public health problems based
20 on a potential correlation between USDA inspection
21 activities and a public health event may be beyond
22 the scope of existing data which was not collected

1 for this purpose. It is part of a regulatory
2 activity.

3 Question number 1, what analyses or
4 approaches would you propose to determine the
5 relationship between FSIS activities and
6 contamination rates in FSIS-regulated foods such as
7 correlation analyses?

8 The Committee's response was, before using
9 public health NRs, such as ones from HACCP, and the
10 pathogen data sets such as *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter*,
11 -- O157:H7, to attempt public health correlation,
12 FSIS should convene a panel of public health experts
13 including appropriate statisticians to review the
14 extent to which the existing data can be incorporated
15 in a public health correlation. SSOP NRs and public
16 health food safety assessments may able be able to be
17 evaluated for correlation data after review by
18 outside expert panel including appropriate
19 statisticians.

20 And right now I'd just like to pause to see
21 if anybody from the Subcommittee had any further
22 comments or changes they would like to make? Jim.

1 Jim Dickson.

2 DR. DICKSON: The only addition that we had
3 as a Subcommittee was that this expert panel, this
4 could be done by e-mail and teleconference, something
5 that could be done fairly rapidly, as opposed to a
6 long drawn out process. We felt like this could be
7 done as I said in fairly short order.

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I apologize. I don't
9 know what you said because I just walked in here but
10 before we -- after we finished and before we got in
11 here, I had a brief meeting with some of the staff
12 who suggested that if we -- is this the language
13 right here? That if we -- but if we go up just a
14 little bit and say -- if we would have the staff
15 analyze a limited portion of the data and right
16 before the words, should analyze a limited portion of
17 the data and convene a panel of public health
18 experts, that this would be more -- that would make
19 the exercise more useful to them.

20 MR. TYNAN: I'm sorry. Mrs. Foreman, could
21 you --

22 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Analyze a limited

1 portion of the data and convene, and then it's just
2 the same. My understanding, and the staff may have
3 to step in here, is that you haven't done much
4 analysis of this yet. Is that correct?

5 DR. MACZKA: Actually we have done some
6 analysis, but we can -- then I think the next step
7 and may I suggest we might want to consider bringing
8 it to this group now that this Subcommittee that we
9 are thinking of establishing under this Committee
10 that will deal with data issues, and then you all
11 could even suggest other people that we bring in to
12 look at the information. Would that work?

13 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I think this
14 Committee's going to be -- I'd rather see you have a
15 group of public health statisticians --

16 DR. MACZKA: Okay.

17 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: -- and other experts
18 take a look at this. I think that was the nature of
19 our conversation.

20 DR. MACZKA: Okay. But you didn't want to
21 work through -- you don't want to work through the
22 Subcommittee on Data to help identify those people?

1 That's pretty much where I was going. If you don't
2 want --

3 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I would probably leave
4 that to the staff --

5 DR. MACZKA: Okay.

6 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: -- but I'm open to
7 whatever the Subcommittee and the Committee thinks on
8 that.

9 MR. SCHAD: Yeah, this is Mark Schad. I
10 just wanted to ask, I know we had a little meeting
11 here. Is that essentially what the rest of it, when
12 we talked about it prior to this presentation?

13 DR. HENRY: Craig Henry. I think that this
14 sounds right. This addition, the terminology sounds
15 correct, and I think that what Carol's proposing is
16 commensurate with what we discussed earlier. I mean
17 it makes sense, especially in this guise, we could
18 utilize the time and expertise of the Subcommittee
19 which would foster this alone.

20 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay.

21 DR. HENRY: I concur.

22 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Okay. Great.

1 DR. MURINDA: I just want to refine the
2 terminology. The paper is for analyzing that data is
3 to generate preliminary information that can be used
4 by the expert panel to provide additional
5 information.

6 MR. TYNAN: That's a question.
7 Mrs. Foreman, is that what your thinking was?

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Our goal here is to
9 determine the extent to which the existing data can
10 actually be incorporated in public health
11 correlation. I want to find the best way to do that.
12 So, Shelton, I'm not sure what language you need to
13 put in there.

14 DR. MURINDA: My addition was that the
15 essence of analyzing that small piece of data is to
16 generate preliminary information that can be used by
17 the expert panel to provide information on how to --

18 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Yes.

19 DR. MURINDA: -- best analyze the bigger
20 set of data.

21 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: I understand.

22 DR. MURINDA: So they can give you most

1 precise advice if you have -- if they rather have an
2 idea of what type of data you generated without
3 looking at the compass of information.

4 MR. TYNAN: So by taking that smaller body,
5 they can --

6 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Yeah.

7 MR. TYNAN: -- that will inform them for
8 the next step, which is looking at the larger --

9 DR. MURINDA: Quite right.

10 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Dr. Murinda, how would
11 you suggest we capture that or maybe Michelle has a
12 suggestion?

13 (Laughter.)

14 DR. MURINDA: On that sentence I guess
15 where it says, on that first paragraph, FSIS should
16 analyze relevant portion of the data to generate I
17 guess preliminary data or information.

18 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Shelton, does that
19 work for you all? Or does that confuse you?

20 DR. CATLIN: No, that works except Carol's
21 pointing out it might be convene a panel working with
22 the Subcommittee on data, whatever our other

1 Subcommittee name is, the new Subcommittee, just to
2 clarify that. But, no, that works and I think we
3 would be able to get better insight if we were able
4 to do a bit of preliminary analysis and have some
5 results to show.

6 MR. TYNAN: So we'll say convene a panel of
7 public health experts working with the Subcommittee.
8 Okay. And we'll put in the appropriate name,
9 whatever that might be. I think Dr. Raymond has a
10 comment.

11 DR. RAYMOND: Just wordsmithing, but I
12 don't know if you can analyze data to generate data.
13 You might analyze relative portions of data to
14 generate something, preliminary thoughts or
15 preliminary whatever.

16 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Analysis.

17 DR. RAYMOND: Analysis would be a great
18 word for that.

19 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: Analyze it to -- no,
20 you don't want analysis in there.

21 DR. RAYMOND: And then the second part is
22 convene a panel of public health expert panel --

1 experts should be plural and panel should be
2 eliminated. Yeah, right, LaVonne. That's
3 duplicative.

4 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Mr. Covington.

5 MR. COVINGTON: Well, I yield to the
6 Subcommittee Chairperson to yield the floor to us
7 since I believe he was --

8 MR. TYNAN: I'm sorry.

9 MR. COVINGTON: -- he was asking his own
10 Subcommittee their thoughts at this point.

11 MR. SCHAD: As long as the Subcommittee's
12 fine, we can go with it that way. Is the
13 Subcommittee fine with what we've got now?

14 DR. HENRY: Craig Henry. I would like to
15 go back to our Subcommittee a moment on terminology
16 and I think this would be commensurate with what FSIS
17 was asking for in this task. We are saying up there
18 in the extent to which existing data can be
19 incorporated, in a public health correlation, we did
20 use the word predict earlier, and I think the intent
21 of this was to try to see if a correlation actually
22 was predictive of a potential health risk, and if

1 that interpretation is correct, then I would yield to
2 Michelle to correctly, wordsmith that and possibly
3 change it from incorporated in a public health
4 correlation and rather become predictive. Because
5 that's what -- a smaller analysis is intended to
6 determine whether or not the data and the process is
7 predictive of a risk to the consumer, and then, if
8 so, if there is enough indication that that's
9 possible, then you certainly could expand your data
10 set, expand your analysis, et cetera, if the
11 Subcommittee agrees. Thank you.

12 DR CATLIN: I think it's being wordsmithed
13 as we speak.

14 DR. HENRY: LaVonne's got it handled.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. SCHAD: If there's no additional
17 thoughts from the Subcommittee, anybody else?

18 MR. COVINGTON: Thank you. I was trying to
19 maintain parliamentary procedure here. Just a couple
20 of questions for those of us that weren't in the
21 Subcommittee in the discussions. Could you elaborate
22 on the use of the term of public health NR and then

1 also a little bit more clarification on a public
2 health FSA? Was that intended to be a FSA that's for
3 cause or was it specific for pathogen findings or et
4 cetera? Thank you.

5 MR. SCHAD: The Subcommittee can correct me
6 if I'm wrong, I thought we were talking about the
7 public health NRs as proposed in the RBI work but I
8 need some help on how we --

9 MR. COVINGTON: So categorization that's
10 already been presented.

11 MR. SCHAD: I need some help on the FSAs.

12 DR. HENRY: Yeah. Regarding the FSAs, we
13 were using general terms. So it would be for either
14 routine FSA or for cause, any and/or all of the
15 above. Again that would be germane to the analysis.

16 MR. TYNAN: Michael.

17 MR. KOWALCYK: Michael Kowalcyk. I guess
18 in the Subcommittee's discussion of using an expert
19 panel, public health experts, statistical analysts,
20 statisticians and the such, was there any discussion
21 to what that -- what you would require of that panel?
22 It seems to me that this would be a really good

1 opportunity to have published a technical document
2 signed off by those subject matter experts relating
3 to the data that the Agency already has through their
4 past collection efforts, and what they're tending to
5 collect as to the appropriate use of that data, and
6 it seems to be that there would be some long-term
7 benefit to that? So did the Subcommittee talk about
8 having, you know, charging this panel with coming up
9 with a document that evaluates, you know, just not
10 limited to this correlation analysis, but the data
11 that exists to associate adverse events in the plant
12 and public health consequences? Did the Subcommittee
13 discuss that at all?

14 MR. SCHAD: I think, Mike, we were looking
15 at maybe not something to that extent. We were
16 looking at some kind of outside experts to look at
17 the data, but we wanted to do it in a timely fashion.

18 MR. KOWALCYK: I understand that but
19 sometimes the investment up front may outweigh -- the
20 long-term benefit may outweigh the short-term costs.
21 So I'm just wondering if the Subcommittee considered
22 that because two and a half years, we don't want to

1 come back to the same issues again if we can avoid
2 it.

3 MR. SCHAD: Yeah, I think Carol's got a
4 comment on that.

5 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: The answer is, no, we
6 didn't. I think it's a good idea that we have that
7 kind of technical paper, but that may be the kind of
8 technical paper that your Subcommittee wants to spend
9 some time deciding how it should be done. We were
10 working under real short time constraints and we
11 didn't think about this, and we didn't want to bog
12 this particular group down in a long, long process,
13 but it seems to me, especially if they're going to
14 work with the Subcommittee, that it would be a good
15 thing to task the Subcommittee with doing.

16 MR. TYNAN: Carol, did you have a comment?

17 DR. MACZKA: Eventually that analysis and
18 any analysis we use will be part of the technical
19 plan that we mentioned in the SSOPs which will
20 undergo stakeholder input and peer review. So as I
21 see this, this is sort of like a preliminary first
22 step. We just wanted to see, is there a correlation?

1 We wanted to be convinced of that, but that
2 eventually will be part of the technical plan. And
3 then, you know, as we said before, one of the charges
4 of the Subcommittee on Data, which will report back
5 to the larger Committee will be to look at the
6 technical plans. So it's all rolling into that
7 technical plan.

8 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: We were really
9 concerned that we don't have anything right now that
10 says that the public health NRs and the *Salmonella*
11 sets can be correlated to a public health outcome,
12 and we don't want to go too far down that path
13 without having a better notion than we have right
14 now.

15 MR. KOWALCYK: I agree with that. I think
16 maybe it should be culled out in this Subcommittee
17 report that it would feed into the Standard Operating
18 Procedures technical plan so that way we're
19 transparent, because with the data infrastructure,
20 the analysis, we're juggling a few balls here and
21 they're pretty heavy. So I just want to make sure
22 everything is documented so that nothing falls

1 through.

2 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: That would be what
3 language?

4 MR. KOWALCYK: I think there should be some
5 language added, review of existing data and how it
6 relates to the Standard Operating Procedures for data
7 integration.

8 MR. TYNAN: Michael, could you specifically
9 point to where you were thinking that that will go
10 and maybe what your suggestion is? If Mark's
11 agreeable, we'll --

12 MR. SCHAD: Yeah, is the Subcommittee and
13 the rest of the Committee agreeable with that?

14 DR. HENRY: This is Craig Henry. Yeah,
15 that's fine, regarding that point. Oh, I'm sorry.
16 Jim's got his tent card up.

17 DR. DICKSON: I'm sorry. Just a point of
18 clarification, Michael. What we were thinking and my
19 interpretation of the Subcommittee was we wanted this
20 expert panel to look at the data that is currently
21 available in the short-term, to assist the data
22 analysis group in their preliminary work. What

1 you're saying is a great idea but what we're trying
2 to do I think with this is trying to look at what
3 they have in front of them right now and move forward
4 with that.

5 MR. KOWALCYK: Okay. I agree with that
6 sentiment that they would look at the current data
7 but whatever their findings are, you would still be
8 collecting that data going into the future so that
9 you would need some way to incorporate it into the
10 Standard Operating Procedures. That was the concern
11 I wanted to call out in here. I agree that the data
12 that is currently available so that they can address
13 the limitations of the data and what assumptions need
14 to be made and any interpretation of that data.

15 MR. TYNAN: Carol or Michelle.

16 DR. CATLIN: Would it work if we added a
17 sentence after the end of that paragraph, appropriate
18 statisticians, all of these analyses once established
19 as to how to do them appropriately would then be
20 incorporated into a technical plan as per the
21 Standard Operating Procedures and undergo peer review
22 and stakeholder input.

1 MR. KOWALCYK: I would be willing to sign
2 onto that, and then, you know, also add not just the
3 analysis but the interpretation of the analysis. So
4 how do you interpret the analysis that comes out of
5 this. It may be very valuable but you don't want to
6 run too far with it if it's not appropriate.

7 DR. CATLIN: Right.

8 MR. TYNAN: Craig.

9 DR. HENRY: This is Craig Henry. I want to
10 go with what Michael just said because his last
11 statement was very key, and it's in tandem with
12 Carol's characterization. We're answering the direct
13 question that was put to us by FSIS which has to do
14 with what activities should FSIS look at that might
15 be correlated with a public health outcome. Was it
16 predictive? Could it be predictive?

17 Our real focus is on question 2. We have,
18 you know, a concern about as we said earlier in the
19 opening paragraph, which Mark read. We have concern
20 about the applicability and value of that data. It
21 has 100 percent value, 100 percent applicability for
22 what it was originally designed to do, and that's

1 where we are today.

2 However, to truly get to the meat of the
3 matter, which is changing public health outcome,
4 we've got to drill down and get down to the specifics
5 hence moving onto part 2 where I think the meat of
6 the matter will arise.

7 And I think the amount of time and funding
8 and resources that are thrown at part 1, is
9 appropriately captured now by at least a preliminary,
10 you know, investigation because there's no point in
11 continuing to beat the dead horse when we know we
12 need to revitalize the program as I think will be put
13 forth under part 2.

14 MS. TUCKER FOREMAN: -- and I both agree
15 with that.

16 DR. HENRY: Carol's saying that we agree.
17 So it must be something of validity.

18 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Other comments?

19 MR. SCHAD: I'm going to the response for
20 question 2. What analyses or approaches would you
21 propose to determine the relationship between
22 contamination rates in FSIS-regulated foods and food

1 related human illness such as expert elicitation and
2 risk assessment?

3 And this is not in this report, but in our
4 discussion, we actually flip-flopped it, instead of
5 going from B to C, we went C to B. We thought that
6 would be more appropriate to approach the issue from
7 that angle.

8 Well-developed research programs must be
9 developed to properly identify and reduce risk
10 association with pathogens of concern from foodborne
11 illnesses and originating from FSIS amenable
12 products. Federal funding must also be available to
13 obtain significantly valuable and applicable
14 attribution data and epidemiological
15 (quantitative/qualitative data) in pursuit of
16 foodborne pathogens. This includes appropriate
17 integration of existing data contained in federal and
18 state repositories. Federal funding should be
19 provided to pay for all sample submissions from
20 establishments for pathogen isolation, enumeration
21 and serotyping. This should also include sufficient
22 funding for expanding the PFGE database to determine

1 how widespread various pathogen serotypes may be as
2 associated with foodborne illnesses. Funding should
3 be sufficient for the research to obtain samples,
4 (1) from raw product entering the plant, (2) from
5 product exiting a specific intervention intended to
6 reduce/eliminate the pathogen of interest,
7 (3) finished product obtained from retail store
8 shelves.

9 FSIS may try to correlate regulatory
10 activities verifying a given intervention in an
11 attempt to predict an increased pathogen risk
12 associated with finished products. A joint effort
13 including funding among the federal and state
14 agencies, that is USDA, FDA, CDC, State Departments
15 of Agriculture and Health, is essential if the
16 recommended approach is to be successful. Specific
17 interventions need to be developed and available for
18 use at the FSIS regulated establishments. APHIS and
19 FDA, ZBM need to work together to provide incentives
20 to allied industries to develop the appropriate
21 interventions. Regulatory barriers need to be
22 removed as previously experienced with probiotics and

1 inactivated vaccines.

2 Any comment from the Subcommittee?

3 DR. HENRY: Craig Henry. Just a little
4 wordsmithing. First line, top paragraph, I think
5 we've got a little redundancy. It should say well
6 developed research programs are required to properly
7 identify rather than it must be developed again. In
8 the heat of the battle, our wording is not always the
9 best. Thank you.

10 DR. MURINDA: I had a similar comment on
11 that one but my choice of wording was well defined
12 and on the third paragraph, we have pathogen
13 isolation and enumeration and serotyping. I think we
14 should rephrase it to pathogen isolation,
15 identification, enumeration and not necessarily
16 serotyping but typing. There are many methods of
17 typing that can be used. Serotyping is just one of
18 them. So pathogen isolation, identification,
19 enumeration and typing.

20 MR. SCHAD: Is that okay with everybody
21 else?

22 DR. HENRY: This is Craig Henry. I concur.

1 MR. SCHAD: Have you got that, Robert? Any
2 other comments?

3 MR. TYNAN: Okay. So far, so good.

4 MR. SCHAD: Okay.

5 MR. TYNAN: Cool.

6 MR. SCHAD: And we believe we responded to
7 question 3 in our response to question 2. So
8 essentially that's our report to the Committee.

9 MR. TYNAN: Thank you, Mark. Any other
10 comments before we go to our next -- okay. Going
11 once, going twice. Is the report acceptable to the
12 Committee as a whole? Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

14 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Hearing no dissent,
15 we'll consider that the report of the full Advisory
16 Committee.

17 I'm going to change the agenda again. This
18 shows you how flexible we are here at the Food Safety
19 and Inspection Service. I spoke with Mr. Almanza,
20 and he has a conflict with some travel, and he wanted
21 an opportunity to say something to the Committee
22 before he has to leave. So if you don't mind, I'm

1 going to ask Mr. Almanza to come up

2 MR. ALMANZA: Well, I apologize for having
3 to bail out, but I wanted to stay as long as I could.

4 This has been an interesting, interesting
5 meeting. All of you have had some very valuable
6 comments and I mean I'm really appreciative of all
7 the hard work that everybody has done. The open
8 comments, the comments that you all have had in the
9 hall and otherwise, and truly this is what this
10 process is meant to be. So I just wanted to tell you
11 all thank you, and I just didn't want to run out the
12 door without telling you that. So I appreciate that,
13 and I look forward to working with you all on a
14 continuing basis. Okay.

15 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Raymond laid Mr. Almanza's
16 card down. That must mean that he's gone now from
17 the meeting.

18 Okay. With that, we're going to make a
19 transition to Subcommittee 2. Subcommittee 2 was
20 chaired by Mr. Elfering. So I'm going to invite him
21 to go through the Committee's report, and we'll go
22 through the same kind of drill, come to a consensus

1 and I think we'll be pretty well done.

2 MR. ELFERING: Thank you, Robert. I would
3 also like to thank our Committee, and for all of the
4 good comments. We had some pretty interesting
5 discussions and I think one of the things we could
6 have probably discussed all evening was just the
7 definition of what volume is.

8 And I'd also like to thank the FSIS staff
9 that were available for answering questions as well,
10 very beneficial to have the technical expertise, and
11 I'd also like to thank the audience participants as
12 well. We had some people from industry and one of
13 the consumer groups that had some very valuable input
14 as well. I'd like to thank them for all of their
15 comments.

16 Well, let's get into the pilot project to
17 explore mechanisms for sharing industry data with
18 FSIS. And the first question is what type of
19 industry data would be appropriate for use in a risk-
20 based inspection system or algorithm for use in
21 processing establishments? For example, presence and
22 absence, enumeration, serotype, subtype, data for

1 pathogens, plant environment monitoring data
2 including presence and absence, enumeration,
3 serotype, subtype, data for pathogens, volume data,
4 other data and please provide a rationale as to why
5 various types of data would be appropriate and
6 beneficial for use in RBI.

7 Well, first of all, the Subcommittee
8 acknowledges that while a voluntary pilot project to
9 collect and possibly use industry data could be a
10 valuable exercise, there are a large number of
11 challenges and limitations such as current
12 methodologies, economics and data interpretation that
13 must be considered. The Subcommittee suggests FSIS
14 first provide a clear objective for the application
15 of the data including specific data requirements for
16 the voluntary pilot, and if the data needs would
17 include confidential, commercial and proprietary
18 information, FSIS must consult the Office of General
19 Counsel for a legal opinion on collection use and
20 release of these data.

21 Regarding the types of industry data
22 appropriate for use in the risk-based inspection

1 system, for processing establishments, the
2 Subcommittee suggests that several types of data
3 could be most useful. Each type, with its own
4 limitations. The Subcommittee recognizes that data
5 should be applicable to all segments of the industry
6 such as plant size, volume of product, when
7 considered for use with the RBI system. And in order
8 to use these data as part of the RBI system,
9 consideration must be given for ensuring the
10 integrity and accuracy of the data as well as
11 protecting proprietary information. To ensure this,
12 FSIS must implement systems to verify the validity
13 and usefulness of the data.

14 Presence and absence of pathogens or their
15 indicators in products, could be the most useful, but
16 consideration must be given that industry testing
17 schemes vary widely in design, purpose and intent.
18 Serotype and enumeration data may also be useful for
19 some products when available, but it's pretty much
20 understood that that is not typically done by the
21 industry. Presence and absence certainly is, but
22 there's very little serotyping or enumeration done on

1 any testing.

2 Environmental testing, presence and absence
3 for data for pathogens and indicators could be useful
4 particularly in ready-to-eat establishments. Again,
5 results must be viewed with consideration of the
6 design and purpose of the testing protocol.

7 Volume data can be an important
8 consideration especially if ranges are defined and
9 utilized. Questions remain about whether volume
10 should be expressed as product produced or shipped,
11 as there is a difference in this particular
12 definitions. Also plant records are not categorized
13 the same way from plant to plant, and seasonal
14 variation in production also occurs in many
15 establishments and must be considered.

16 Other data, sanitation effectiveness,
17 monitoring or verification data could be useful
18 especially for facilities utilizing objective
19 techniques such as bioluminescence techniques.

20 Implementation of pathogenic interventions
21 data from interventions could be useful but must be
22 considered in the context of validation information

1 documenting the effectiveness of the intervention as
2 applied in the specific plants.

3 And I was surprised we were able to come up
4 with all of that last night and this morning, but do
5 we have any comments at all or additions from the
6 Committee members first?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. ELFERING: Seeing none, are there any
9 questions or comments at all from the Committee as a
10 whole?

11 MR. TYNAN: Dr. Henry must not have a
12 flight.

13 DR. HENRY: My flight got canceled last
14 night. Sorry. If you could scroll down just a piece
15 to the serotyping -- yeah. That environmental
16 testing, go down a little further -- yeah. Relative
17 to -- let's see. Where is it there? The
18 bioluminescence, other data. Yeah.

19 I would say that certainly other techniques
20 such as that should be validated techniques, and I
21 raise that point relative to things such as allergen
22 prevention programs. I mean today and as we have

1 been in the past, we're certainly operating under
2 organoleptic procedures which still remain
3 efficacious. There certainly is a desire for having
4 more validated testing procedures but those kits have
5 not been validated in that light and the
6 bioluminescence certainly is a nice tool but it
7 certainly is not something that would be recognized
8 to say, well, if you have bioluminescence then, you
9 know, product running down that line is going to be
10 adulterated. So just a caution relative to how
11 that's interpreted. Thank you.

12 MR. ELFERING: Thanks a lot, Craig, and I
13 think we may address that later on by having these --
14 anybody who is volunteering is going to have to
15 submit methodologies and actually some verification.
16 I know bioluminescence is emerging into a lot of
17 different areas and have not necessarily been
18 validated yet. So we think that it could probably be
19 useful, but maybe further on we'll actually have a
20 little bit more clarification.

21 MS. GREEN: Robert.

22 MR. TYNAN: Yes, Kim. Ms. Green.

1 MS. GREEN: One of the things on question 1
2 and 2, they were to consider those in the context of
3 a pilot project. I thought I did hear some support
4 from the Subcommittee around, you know, in the
5 context of a pilot project about potentially moving
6 forward, looking at volume and volume ranges, but I
7 didn't kind of see that captured in our notes. I
8 mean we talked about it, but going back to kind of
9 that setting, the first part of the question which is
10 in the context of the pilot program, I'm just
11 wondering if the Subcommittee might be able to give
12 us a little bit more impetus to go forward there.

13 MR. ELFERING: Brian, do you want to
14 address that?

15 MR. COVINGTON: Well, there may be some
16 clarification language that we put in but the last
17 paragraph before the other data, does talk about
18 specifically the ranges as they're defined and
19 utilized, and then we get into the questions that
20 still remain over how you define those ranges. So --

21 MS. GREEN: Kevin, would you -- would the
22 Subcommittee be amenable if we said if we worked it

1 out with the new Subcommittee a little bit more
2 detail on a pilot project around volume data? Is
3 that something the Subcommittee might be willing to
4 have be in there?

5 MR. ELFERING: I will put that in front of
6 the Subcommittee and if they're agreeable to that, we
7 certainly can. Is that something we want to include
8 in the report?

9 MR. TYNAN: Is there a suggestion or
10 statement that we need to include there that says
11 that will become part of the Subcommittee
12 responsibility?

13 MR. ELFERING: Yes, why don't we add
14 something in there. I don't know where it would
15 actually fit the best.

16 MS. GREEN: Kevin, how about just a
17 suggestion, this is Kim Green. How about something
18 like specifics of a potential pilot project around
19 volume data would be worked out with the -- and we
20 have to give the name of our new standing
21 Subcommittee, Data Subcommittee? Is that
22 appropriate?

1 MR. TYNAN: Could you repeat that for us,
2 Kim?

3 MS. GREEN: Absolutely. Specifics of a
4 potential pilot project -- sorry, Lorraine --
5 potential pilot project, details or specifics, would
6 be developed by the Agency -- no, okay -- worked out
7 in conjunction with the NACMPI Subcommittee on Data
8 Analysis, as I understand is the title.

9 DR. RYBOLT: This is Michael Rybolt. We
10 actually addressed in question 3, I don't think it's
11 wrong to put it here, but in question 3, we actually
12 talk about going with a pilot and using the National
13 Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Data Analysis
14 before conducting a pilot. So that is address in
15 question 3, but maybe if you wanted to put something
16 specific about doing a volume pilot up here may be
17 appropriate as well.

18 MS. GREEN: Thanks, Michael. Kevin, would
19 it be all right to leave it here then, too, also?

20 MR. ELFERING: Yes, I think that would be
21 fine.

22 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: This is Edna. I thought

1 that your comment was related to the volume ranges,
2 not really to the pilot. So it's a different thing
3 we addressed like Michael said, in question 3 about
4 the pilot project but this is different. Ranges,
5 volume ranges is different from the other, the whole
6 pilot. So if you want to have some clarification
7 about volume in here, it's different to whatever was
8 said.

9 MS. GREEN: Perhaps a wording suggestion
10 there, potential pilot project around volume data,
11 just leave it a little bit more generic. Okay. I
12 see an acquisition of a head there. Okay. Great.

13 MR. TYNAN: Does that sort of capture the
14 thought there, that sentence? Is everybody in
15 agreement so far?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. TYNAN: Other comments on this one, and
18 then we'll let Kevin take us to the next question.

19 (No response.)

20 MR. ELFERING: We'll go to question 2, and
21 we've got an easy answer. See question 1. They're
22 really pretty much the same, pretty much the same.

1 So actually Lorraine will cut and paste all of our
2 responses and that will also be the answer to
3 question 2.

4 So if nobody minds, I'll move on to
5 question 3. How should the Agency obtain the data?
6 For example, mechanisms of collection, direct from
7 industry to FSIS databases via the Internet with a
8 secured identity, contract laboratory data or
9 collection as part of inspection activity by FSIS
10 inspectors of industry records and information. And
11 please provide rationale for any recommended
12 mechanisms of data collection.

13 FSIS should be prepared to use a variety of
14 mechanisms to collect data. Establishments vary in
15 their technological capabilities and financial
16 resources and may not all be able to submit data in
17 the same way. The Agency may need to form a large
18 selected sample group from which to solicit volunteer
19 establishments to avoid self-selection bias.

20 A pilot project should be large enough to
21 be sufficient representative of the industry and a
22 sufficient review and analysis of the pilot

1 procedures and protocols should be conducted by the
2 National Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Data
3 Analysis before commencement of the pilot.

4 Any questions at all or additions from the
5 Subcommittee? Michael.

6 MR. KOWALCYK: Thank you, Kevin. Michael
7 Kowalcyk. In the last sentence, review and analysis
8 of the pilot procedures and protocols, I think we
9 should add some language there that addresses the
10 interaction that this Subcommittee should in my
11 opinion have with the Data Analysis and Integration
12 Group. Because whatever comes from a voluntary
13 program, if it's something that FSIS in the future
14 would foresee to be used in a broader scope, I think
15 it would be a key time to talk to those folks at
16 FSIS, to see if this is something that is feasible
17 either for a larger voluntary project or some other
18 project related to risk-based inspection that is down
19 the road. Because I think the earlier those
20 conversations occur, a lot of issues can be ferreted
21 out earlier, if it's a hardware constraint that the
22 Agency has, if it's a human resources constraint that

1 exists. I think this would be a good point to put
2 that language in there that interaction with the Data
3 Analysis and Integration Group should also occur.

4 MR. ELFERING: So do you have a suggestion
5 for one sentence? It looks like it's been started
6 there.

7 MR. KOWALCYK: I would say conducted by the
8 Subcommittee in collaboration with -- you might need
9 another sentence, in collaboration with DAIG. So
10 that last sentence, after NACMPI Subcommittee, in
11 collaboration with DAIG. I guess you would insert
12 that after data analysis. Yep.

13 MR. ELFERING: And then you can erase that
14 last sentence there.

15 Any other questions from the Subcommittee?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. ELFERING: Any questions or suggestions
18 from the Committee as a whole?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. ELFERING: Seeing none, we're going to
21 move onto the final question. If industry data are
22 used, how does FSIS ensure data quality. For

1 example, verification by FSIS inspectors, use of
2 standardized methods and laboratory certification,
3 use of third party audits, and please provide
4 rationale as to why various methods would or could
5 ensure data quality.

6 The Subcommittee recommends FSIS use the
7 resources available to ensure that the minimum
8 standards for microbiological and laboratory
9 methodologies, for example, sampling, should be
10 formalized prior to the commencement of the pilot.
11 Establishments must submit the methodology and use
12 along with any pertinent documentation to ensure the
13 minimum standards mentioned above are met.

14 The pilot should begin with a simple plan.
15 FSIS should identify the resources necessary to
16 verify the data and clearly define the role of its
17 workforce in this pilot program.

18 Any suggestions or additions at all from
19 the Subcommittee?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. ELFERING: Are there any additions or
22 corrections or suggestions from the Committee as a

1 whole?

2 DR. MURINDA: I do have reservations on use
3 of the term minimum standards. I think we need to
4 strive for acceptable standards, not minimum
5 standards.

6 MR. ELFERING: I think one of the things
7 that we were probably discussing, there are some
8 standards that are already established for sampling,
9 for example, by FSIS and that would be the minimum
10 standard that would be used and if you have a
11 suggestion on how we can improve upon that, we
12 certainly would accept that.

13 MS. GREEN: I didn't get the sense from the
14 Subcommittee that they meant minimal standards. What
15 they meant is sort of what is the standard that
16 people are using and meeting, not some sort of --
17 yeah, acceptable rather than minimum.

18 MR. COVINGTON: And it may be as simple as
19 adding acceptable after minimum.

20 DR. MURINDA: I will take that.

21 MR. ELFERING: See how well this Committee
22 with this Subcommittee works.

1 MR. TYNAN: I love it when it all comes
2 together.

3 DR. ELFERING: Any other questions?
4 Dr. Henry?

5 DR. HENRY: Thank you, Kevin. I was just
6 reflecting back on Subcommittee 1's recommendations,
7 and not that these are disjointed but certainly if we
8 were able to achieve appropriate federal funding to
9 handle, if you will, the laboratory analysis of said
10 samples, that submission could go to a central
11 laboratory or accredited laboratory which would
12 eliminate some of the concerns reflected here in
13 Subcommittee 2. This certainly would be a standing
14 value as is written, should those samples now go
15 through the in house laboratory of the establishment
16 or something else. So we should at least be
17 cognizant of that fact, that if we get the funding as
18 is recommended in number 1, this number 2 issue may
19 become somewhat of a mute point, but just for what
20 it's worth.

21 MR. TYNAN: Is that a comment? Do you want
22 something -- Dr. Henry, is that something you want to

1 have included as part of the --

2 DR. HENRY: Just throw it out. If the
3 Subcommittee believes that has any merit and requires
4 some wordsmithing, I think that's great. Other than
5 that, we go for it as is written. I mean it
6 certainly can stand alone, but if there was a
7 reference back to Subcommittee 1's recommendations,
8 whatever or however you might do that. It's just a
9 thought.

10 MR. ELFERING: I'd ask our Subcommittee if
11 there would be -- if we want to include that in
12 there?

13 DR. RYBOLT: This is Michael Rybolt. I
14 don't think we need to include it. I mean I think
15 the comment has merit but because we were thinking of
16 this in context of a pilot, and at this point not
17 having the labs, I mean in the future obviously that
18 would definitely be the case, but at this point,
19 we'll leave it as is.

20 MR. ELFERING: I think that's one of the
21 things that we needed to do, that we needed to set in
22 our head that this only applied to a pilot.

1 Well, if there's no other comments, I'll
2 turn it back over to Robert, and thanks again.

3 MR. TYNAN: Mr. Painter, do you have again
4 perhaps again the last word?

5 MR. PAINTER: Stan Painter with the NJC.
6 My understanding was part of the question was the
7 role of the inspectors and maybe I missed it. Can
8 you point out in any of the recommendations the
9 portion of the question that addresses or the portion
10 of the answer that addresses the role of the
11 inspector?

12 MR. ELFERING: I think at this point, we
13 really need -- we talked about that a little bit, and
14 we felt that in this particular, as a pilot, that all
15 of this data initially should be submitted only by
16 the plant, that it should be really an issue of a
17 pilot program, a voluntary program and at this point
18 it should just be submitted by the plant. Now that
19 doesn't mean that in the future that if, you know, if
20 there would be, you know, an expansion of this pilot
21 program, that there certainly would be some roles for
22 FSIS workforce in the field as well, but for this

1 initial -- we really want, and again going back, it
2 should start with a very simple plan.

3 MR. PAINTER: So in the pilot, if I
4 understand you correctly, in the pilot phase, the
5 inspection staff, the inspectors or supervisory
6 inspectors would not be involved period?

7 MR. ELFERING: Not at this initial phase,
8 no.

9 MR. TYNAN: Ms. Green.

10 MS. GREEN: Yes. Kevin, I'm not sure I got
11 that -- I guess I'd like to hear the rest of the
12 Subcommittee, and there was an acknowledgement in the
13 last sentence up there, too, that as part of the
14 pilot program, we would take a look at what a
15 verification step would be and it might involve our
16 workforce. So we do have that sentence in there.

17 MR. ELFERING: But again I think that is --
18 initially it's intended that it would be voluntary
19 submission, that there would be minimal input from
20 the workforce. Would the Subcommittee like to add
21 anything to that or make any further clarifications?

22 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: This is Edna. I just

1 think that with this instance, that it says there in
2 the last sentence, FSIS should identify the resources
3 necessary, maybe that will take care of that because
4 it's not necessary that they're out. We just want
5 FSIS to -- if it is an inspector, it's somebody else
6 who has the capability of certain, verify that
7 information. It might not be the inspector on that
8 plan. So -- and that will take care. Simple but
9 sharing with them.

10 MR. TYNAN: Okay. So the way it's worded
11 now is acceptable, Edna?

12 DR. NEGRON-BRAVO: Well, I think it is.

13 MR. TYNAN: Okay. Thank you.
14 Mr. Kowalcyk.

15 MR. KOWALCYK: Yeah, I think to follow up
16 on that comment and, Stan, at our meetings last night
17 and this morning about this, even in question 3, the
18 variety of mechanisms, I don't think we intended to
19 exclude the inspection force as a mechanism to work
20 within this process. Now to Kevin's point for a
21 voluntary program, and that's done on a pilot basis,
22 a lot of that would probably fall on those plants

1 that would volunteer, but in assisting with that
2 collection and as is well in the verification in our
3 recommendation, is putting back on the Agency to
4 really identify what resources are available to
5 ensure that the data is accurate, it meets the
6 standards to be put into a pilot program. That may
7 fall on the inspection workforce and I think -- I
8 don't want to speak for the full Subcommittee, but it
9 seems like we didn't have enough information at that
10 time to actually call out which specific resource
11 would be necessary to verify the data or even collect
12 it. Is that an accurate statement, Kevin?

13 MR. ELFERING: Yes, it is, and I think one
14 of the things that really discussed a lot is that
15 unless there's some method of being able to protect
16 this data, it would be very difficult to even find a
17 plant that would voluntarily participate in this
18 particular program. So I think that's pretty
19 imperative that that needs to be addressed as well.

20 MS. GREEN: Although, Kevin, this is Kim
21 Green. Just to amend that a little bit, although we
22 did get some consensus from the Subcommittee that if

1 we were talking about volume ranges that there was
2 less concern around that then --

3 MR. ELFERING: Yes.

4 MS. GREEN: -- pathogen data or another
5 type of data.

6 MR. ELFERING: Volume data, from a range
7 would certainly be, you know, that that is something
8 that would be more considerable.

9 MS. GREEN: Thank you.

10 MR. TYNAN: If there are no other specific
11 comments on the report, I guess the question becomes,
12 is that report acceptable from the Committee as a
13 whole?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. TYNAN: Seeing no dissent, I'm assuming
16 that that is the recommendations of the full Advisory
17 Committee.

18 And with that, I think we have the major
19 issues that we wanted to talk about at this meeting
20 completed. I wanted to mention just very briefly, I
21 think for those of you who are traveling, I think
22 Loraine has provided you with some of the materials

1 regarding travel reimbursement and so on. The sooner
2 you get those back to us, the sooner we can help you
3 with that. So hopefully we'll do a little bit better
4 job than we have in previous Committees to get those
5 kinds of things going for you. So hopefully that
6 will be helpful.

7 And I want to personally thank you for all
8 the good comments and the hard effort. I know
9 everybody came in a little bit earlier this morning
10 to get started in trying to get things wrapped up.
11 So from my perspective, as the Moderator, I'm very
12 appreciative of all the activity and effort everybody
13 put in.

14 And with that, Mr. Almanza, I know is gone,
15 but I'm going to ask Mr. Quick, as the Deputy
16 Administrator of FSIS to do closing remarks and do
17 the adjournment.

18 MR. QUICK: Kevin, this will only take 15
19 minutes or maybe 20, I don't know. I think you were
20 talking faster towards the end.

21 On behalf of the Agency, I want to
22 recognize something. I think when they created this

1 meeting, and this Committee, this is what the
2 founders intended. You all have been an incredible
3 help to us and this is the critical business of the
4 Agency. We've been at this for a number of years.
5 It's not the first time you've heard about data, but
6 we thank you for your input.

7 Last night it was really neat to see the
8 commitment and energy in the Committees as you
9 discussed this important building process that we're
10 going through on data. We recognize as an Agency
11 that we're only as good and we're only as effective
12 as public servants as our data is. And we know that
13 we can do better, and we're gong to continue with
14 this process until we get it right.

15 We'd appreciate throughout the year as you
16 think about this and whether you're serving on the
17 Subcommittee that we created today or not, if you
18 have opinions, and if you have input, please give it
19 to us. You've seen -- I think one of the most
20 outstanding presentations this Agency has -- that
21 I've ever witnessed, and I want to recognize Carol
22 Maczka and her group, if you guys would stand up, and

1 also there's somebody that --

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. QUICK: There's also one other person,
4 right over here on the side, Dan Engeljohn, could you
5 stand up please. He's been on the edge of his seat
6 the whole meeting.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. QUICK: Carol and he at the executive
9 level have led our data effort, and we're very proud
10 of what they've accomplished, but you're going to see
11 a lot more. We're trying to turn the Agency into
12 data geeks and we hope that you guys will join us in
13 that geekdom.

14 So travel safely and thank you again for
15 your participation in this meeting.

16 (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., the meeting was
17 concluded.)

18

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
in the matter of:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
MEAT AND POULTRY INSPECTION
PLENARY SESSION

Arlington, Virginia

August 9, 2007

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcription thereof for the files of the
United States Department of Agriculture, Food Safety
and Inspection Service.

DOMINICO QUATTROCIOCCHI, Reporter
FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.