



The Integrated Food Safety System (IFSS)

IFSS Toolkit



Integrated Food Safety System



- STRATEGIES
- TOOLS & METRICS
- STAKEHOLDERS
- GOAL



Toolkit Contents

Location	Name	Purpose	Audience
Page 5	Toolkit Overview	Describes goals, target audience, and approach of the IFSS Toolkit	Stakeholder decision-makers
Page 11	Toolkit User Instructions	Discusses in detail the steps for using the IFSS Toolkit	Facilitator and Recorder
Page 19	Toolkit User Instructions (Quick Start Guide)	Briefly lists the steps for using the IFSS Toolkit	Facilitator
Page 23	Preliminaries Worksheet	Helps identify participants and resources necessary to use the Toolkit	Facilitator
Page 27	Toolkit Tips for Facilitators	Describes role of Facilitator and suggestions for leading Toolkit process	Facilitator
“Focus Areas” Tab	Individual Focus Area Worksheets	Helps identify Key Indicators appropriate for program/agency/jurisdiction /organization/company related to the following:	Workgroup (or subset) from program/agency/jurisdiction/ organization/company
	<i>Focus Area 1 Worksheet</i>	Communication	
	<i>Focus Area 2 Worksheet</i>	Roles and Responsibilities	
	<i>Focus Area 3 Worksheet</i>	Integration of Legal Authority	
	<i>Focus Area 4 Worksheet</i>	Resources	
	<i>Focus Area 5 Worksheet</i>	Emergency Response	
	<i>Focus Area 6 Worksheet</i>	Global Activities	
“Resources” Tab	Resource Reference List	Lists documents to assist Workgroup members in completing Focus Area Worksheets	All Workgroup members
Last page	Participant Evaluation Form	Solicits feedback to improve future versions of IFSS Toolkit	All Workgroup members

Toolkit Overview

Toolkit Overview

Acknowledgements:

1. Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak Response (CIFOR), *Guidelines for Foodborne Disease Outbreak Response and Outbreak Response Toolkit*, Atlanta: Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, 2009.
2. International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI) under a Cooperative Agreement with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

3. Developers:

AFDO: Joseph Corby

FDA: Ellen Laymon
Tressa Madden
Priscilla Neves

IFPTI: John Guzewich
Ron Klein
Cameron Smoak

New York State: Dan Rice, Agriculture & Markets

I. Goals of the IFSS Toolkit

The goals of the IFSS Toolkit are to help public health, environmental health, and food regulatory agencies and laboratories:

- Better understand current integration efforts in their jurisdiction,
- Identify specific IFSS practices and activities that will improve the integration performance of all stakeholders, and
- Make plans to implement those activities.

II. Target Audience

The IFSS Toolkit has been developed for stakeholders involved in food safety and food defense.

The Toolkit is designed to be used within an organization and used by an interdisciplinary Workgroup with knowledge and practical experience in food safety and food defense. Use of the Toolkit by these teams will provide a broader context for assessing an organization's current integration efforts and identify potential areas for improvement, especially with respect to cross-agency/cross-discipline activities.

Use of the Toolkit with these teams will allow stakeholders to become more familiar with the roles and responsibilities of each team member, facilitate communication, and engender team-building in the process. Knowing each other and understanding each other's roles will lead to a more integrated system.

Although the interdisciplinary Workgroup is the ideal target audience, the Toolkit also can be used by persons from a single program, agency, or discipline, or even a single person within an agency who acts as a "champion" for the cause. Because integration is a team effort, however, such an approach could be recognized as more limited in scope and might best be viewed as the initial steps that could involve others at a later time.

III. Approach

The Toolkit has been developed to guide Workgroups through the identification and implementation of activities in the Toolkit that are appropriate for the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company. The Toolkit promotes a process in which users prioritize areas of integration (called Focus Areas) that are most important to the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company and then systematically undertake three steps for each prioritized Focus Area:

1. Describe current activities and procedures in the Focus Area and identify those in need of improvement.
2. Prioritize recommendations to address needed improvements.
3. Make plans to implement prioritized recommendations.

This approach will allow Workgroups to focus efforts and identify changes to improve integration that are most appropriate to effectively use limited resources within the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company.

IV. Overlap with Other National Initiatives

Several other initiatives address integration or improvement of program quality and performance at local and state public health, environmental health, and food regulatory agencies and laboratories. Most of these initiatives provide standards (i.e., goals) toward which participating agencies work without specifying activities required to meet the goals.

The IFSS Toolkit offers concrete ways to achieve compliance with many of the standards in these other initiatives (with respect to integration), and should be considered a resource by agencies involved in other initiatives. For example, the FDA's Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards and the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards require that participating programs take many steps that in part are related to integration.

The IFSS Toolkit will help users combine integration implementation with these other national initiatives, including the Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards, the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards, the Public Health Accreditation Board Standards, and the National Public Health Performance Standards.

V. Toolkit Materials

The Toolkit includes the following materials:

- Instructions describing the Toolkit process;
- A list of tips for persons who facilitate or lead the process;
- Worksheets that help users start the process and identify areas in need of improvement; and
- A participant evaluation form to provide feedback on the process.

VI. Use of the Toolkit

As previously mentioned, the Toolkit will be used by an interdisciplinary Workgroup in a jurisdiction, brought together specifically for this task. However, the Toolkit can be used in other ways. For example, the Toolkit might be used as part of the after-action review of a recall response. This setting can effectively relate problems of the outbreak response to participants who might be motivated to make improvements or changes in future responses. The Toolkit also could be used as in conjunction with meetings arranged for other purposes (e.g., State Food Safety Taskforces) or for capacity development efforts (e.g., FDA's Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards and the Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards).

VII. Contacts for Toolkit

The IFSS Toolkit was developed by IFPTI on behalf of the FDA. The IFSS Toolkit and its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the FDA.

For more information about the IFSS Toolkit or the Toolkit development process, please contact:

Gerald Wojtala, Executive Director
International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI)
49 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 300
Battle Creek, MI 49017
jerry.wojtala@ifpti.org

Toolkit User Instructions

Toolkit User Instructions

The IFSS Toolkit was developed to help stakeholders, including local and state public health, environmental health, and food regulatory agencies and laboratories, improve the efforts for integration.

I. Preliminaries

To begin using the IFSS Toolkit and to make the best use of staff time, please complete the **Preliminaries Worksheet**.

A. Identify stakeholders for which decisions will be made.

Making this decision now will allow you to concentrate your efforts, involve the right people in setting priorities, and identify changes that will be implemented.

B. Brief decision-makers from program, agency, jurisdiction, organization, or company.

Obtaining a commitment from decision-makers will help define the resources and constraints that should be considered when using the Toolkit and creating implementation plans. Use the IFSS **Toolkit Overview** to help introduce decision-makers to the various components of the IFSS Toolkit.

C. Select Workgroup to use Toolkit.

An interdisciplinary Workgroup team with practical expertise in agency, jurisdiction, organization, or company functions is ideal. Include key staff members in the team.

If your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company is involved in other initiatives aimed at capacity development or program quality and performance (e.g., Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards, Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards, Lab Accreditation Standards, and National Public Health Performance Standards), consider including staff who are involved in those initiatives.

D. Identify support staff.

1. Facilitator

To ensure success, identify a Facilitator to lead the process. The Facilitator should have extensive experience in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company and be aware of the available resources in the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company. Before assembling the workgroup, the Facilitator should become familiar with the Toolkit instructions and examine the worksheets. The Facilitator should review the **Tips for Facilitators** and ensure that participants have access to all necessary materials, including the appropriate Toolkit documents.

2. Recorder

Assign one person to record notes from the Workgroup discussions, especially conclusions about the performance of the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company in efforts for integration and decisions on actions to improve performance. The Recorder should review Toolkit worksheets before the Workgroup assembles to ensure familiarity with the format. The Recorder should make arrangements to have a laptop and the necessary files available at the Workgroup meeting, if needed.

E. Ensure that participants are familiar with the IFSS Toolkit.

To prepare to use the Toolkit, Workgroup members should become familiar with the IFSS Toolkit. Workgroup teams might then assign individual participants to take responsibility for reviewing different sections of the Toolkit.

IFPTI will provide free copies of the Toolkit to local and state public health, environmental health, and food regulatory agencies and laboratories. To request your free copy, contact IFPTI by sending an email to support@ifpti.org or by calling the support staff at (269) 441-4086.

F. Assemble the necessary supporting materials.

As an initial step in using the Toolkit, assemble copies of the Toolkit worksheets and other documents that might help in the process, including written protocols, interagency agreements, memorandums of understanding, and information on other quality improvement initiatives in which your program or agency might be involved. During Workgroup meetings, electronic versions of these documents could be projected on a screen which might help participants follow the process more closely and ensure that the participants agree with the decisions that are being made.

G. Decide on a timeframe for completing the Toolkit.

Use of the Toolkit requires a systematic, in-depth examination of integration activities in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company and might take several hours or the better part of a day to complete. Decide now whether your Workgroup team plans to work through the Toolkit process in one period or break up the process.

II. Focus Areas

A. Review Focus Areas.

In developing the Toolkit, integration activities have been divided into six major Focus Areas:

- Communication
- Roles and Responsibilities

- Integration of Legal Authority
- Resources
- Emergency Response
- Global Activities

B. Prioritization of Focus Areas.

A key step in using the Toolkit is to identify the Focus Areas that are most important for your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company to develop. (See **Prioritization of Focus Areas on page 33 of the Introduction section of the Toolkit**). You might involve the full Workgroup team or a smaller group of decision-makers in this prioritization process. The Workgroup team (or subsets of the Workgroup team) will then concentrate on the prioritized Focus Areas during the remainder of the process.

To help you understand what is included in each Focus Area, “Keys Indicators” have been identified for each Focus Area. “Key Indicators” are activities, relationships, and resources that could be critical to achieving success in a particular Focus Area. If only a few of the Key Indicators for a Focus Area are in place in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company, it could mean the Focus Area needs improvement.

If your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company is already involved in other capacity development or quality assurance initiatives, priorities identified in those efforts can be used to help prioritize Focus Areas for implementing the IFSS Toolkit:

- Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards
- Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards
- ISO/IEC 17025:2005
- Local Public Health Accreditation Board Standards
- Local Public Health Performance Standards.

In addition, review contracts, partnerships, and cooperative agreements to identify areas in need of improvement. After-action reports or debriefings among persons involved in past recall or outbreak responses can help you identify strengths and weaknesses in stakeholder cooperation during response efforts and can identify opportunities for improvement.

Finally, a growing proportion of foodborne disease outbreaks, multi-state recalls, and food emergency response episodes require the resources of more than one stakeholder for detection, investigation, or control. This is particularly true for some of the most serious foodborne illnesses (e.g., *E. coli* O157:H7 infection, salmonellosis, and hepatitis A infection) and large food recalls. Therefore, all stakeholders are encouraged to evaluate their relationship with other stakeholders during these important and serious events.

C. Examination of Priority Focus Areas.

For each prioritized Focus Area, the Toolkit will help you systematically examine integration efforts in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company and explore the Toolkit for ways to improve your effort in that Focus Area. Use the **Individual Focus Area Worksheets** to help you work through the process.

STEP 1: Describe your current activities and procedures in the Focus Area. Considering the Key Indicators, outline what is currently being done in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company. Include individuals, programs, and agencies involved; their roles and responsibilities; and routine actions and procedures undertaken. Written response protocols, if available, will help in this process. Consider other ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards).

As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, identify those that might need work to improve your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company efforts with integration.

STEP 2: Prioritize IFSS Key Indicators to address needed improvements. Rate the priority for implementation of each Key Indicator using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=Low priority and 5=High priority). If a Key Indicator is already in place in your program/agency/jurisdiction, check the appropriate box. If a Key Indicator is not relevant to your program/agency/jurisdiction, select N/A.

In considering Key Indicators to improve your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company performance in integration efforts, select those that will best use resources based on the following:

- The likely impact on the occurrence of improving integration;
- The ease of implementation, including necessary time, resources, expertise, and likely barriers; and
- Whether the Key Indicator is dependent on other conditions being in place.

STEP 3: Make plans to implement selected IFSS Key Indicators.

For each Key Indicator selected in the previous step, identify who will take the lead and the timeframe for implementation. If certain actions must precede others, make a note of this and adjust the timeframe. Identify factors that might positively or negatively influence full implementation. For example, certain staff skills or expertise might facilitate implementation of a particular Key Indicator, whereas lack of funding might inhibit implementation. Also think about ways to incorporate the Key Indicator into your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company's standard operating procedures so the activity will continue.

When the worksheet for one Focus Area has been completed, repeat steps 1–3 for each of the other Focus Areas you have selected as important for your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company to address.

III. Feedback

The Toolkit has been developed to help you explore and implement an integrated food safety system. Your feedback on the Toolkit process, the worksheets, and other materials is encouraged. A Participant Evaluation form is available in hard copy (see the **Participant Evaluation Form** at the end of this Toolkit). Ask all Workgroup team members to complete an evaluation at the end of the process. Be as specific as possible in your comments, indicating specific documents or worksheet pages. Please forward all evaluation forms and feedback to IFPTI at the address below.

IV. Contacts for Toolkit

For more information about the IFSS Toolkit, contact:

Support Department
International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI)
49 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 300
Battle Creek, MI 49017
support@ifpti.org

Toolkit User Instructions: Quick Start Guide for Facilitators

Toolkit User Instructions: Quick Start Guide for Facilitators

This document briefly lists the steps involved in using the IFSS Toolkit. For a more in-depth discussion, please see **Toolkit User Instructions**.

I. Prepare to use the IFSS Toolkit.

1. Review the **Preliminaries Worksheet**.
2. Identify the stakeholders for which decisions will be made using the IFSS Toolkit.
3. Brief decision-makers about using the IFSS Toolkit. Ask decision-makers to read the **Toolkit Overview**.
4. Select persons to participate in the Workgroup.
5. Review all Toolkit documents, focusing on the **Toolkit User Instructions** and **Toolkit Tips for Facilitators**.
6. Identify a Recorder for the Workgroup. The Recorder should make arrangements to have a laptop and LCD projector, if desired, for use during workgroup meetings.
7. Assemble the necessary supporting materials, including written protocols, after-action reports from recent recalls or foodborne disease outbreaks, and information on other quality improvement initiatives.
8. Decide on a timeframe for going through the IFSS Toolkit components.

II. Select Focus Areas to develop.

1. Assemble the Workgroup and complete the **Prioritization of Focus Areas** on page 33 of the Introduction of the Toolkit.
2. Read the purpose, Key Concepts, and Key Indicators for each Focus Area.
3. Determine which Key Indicators are relevant to your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company and which are fully or partially in place.
4. Consider ongoing work in other capacity development or quality assurance efforts and the priorities of those efforts.
5. Review stakeholder interactivity or interaction plans to identify areas in need of improvement.
6. Select the Toolkit Focus Area or Areas that represent a high priority for you to develop.

III. Identify IFSS recommendations appropriate for your stakeholders and make plans for implementation.

1. Obtain copies of the **Worksheets** for the **Focus Areas** you plan to develop.
2. Starting with the first Focus Area, review the Key Concepts and Key Indicators listed on the worksheet with the Workgroup (or an appropriate subset) and discuss your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company's current activities and procedures, making notes on the worksheet.
3. As you list current activities and procedures, identify those that might need work to

- improve your integration efforts.
4. Read through the IFSS Key Indicators related to the Focus Area as listed on the worksheet.
 5. For each Key Indicator, rate the priority for implementation (or improvement) in your program/agency/jurisdiction using a scale of 1 to 5 (1=Low priority and 5=High priority). If a Key Indicator is already in place, check the appropriate box. If a Key Indicator is not relevant to your program/agency/jurisdiction, select N/A.
 6. For each IFSS Key Indicator rated as a high priority for implementation, identify who might take the lead and the timeframe for implementation. Record that information on the worksheet that ends each Focus Area section (“Plan for Implementation or Improvement”).
 7. Identify factors that might positively or negatively influence implementation of a Key Indicator.
 8. Repeat steps 3–7 for each Toolkit Focus Area selected as a high priority for you to develop.

IV. Provide feedback on Toolkit.

1. Ask all Workgroup participants to complete the **Participant Evaluation Form** at the end of this Toolkit.
2. Forward all evaluation forms and other feedback to:

Gerald Wojtala, Executive Director
International Food Protection Training Institute (IFPTI)
49 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 300
Battle Creek, MI 49017
jerry.wojtala@ifpti.org

Preliminaries Worksheet

Preliminaries Worksheet

The IFSS Toolkit has been developed to help stakeholders—including public health, environmental health, and food regulatory agencies and laboratories—to improve the efforts in integration. To prepare for the IFSS Toolkit process and make the best use of staff time, complete this Worksheet before starting the process.

1. During the IFSS Toolkit process, for which entity will decisions be made? Be specific.

(The term “program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company” will be used to refer to this entity on all Toolkit worksheets.)

2. The IFSS Toolkit has been developed for use by interdisciplinary Workgroups, including persons with expertise in the everyday functions of the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company. To make decisions for the program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company identified above, which of the following program areas should participate in the Workgroup?

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Academia | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Industry |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> Epidemiology | <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communications | <input type="checkbox"/> Food Regulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Health Nursing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Education | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

3. What additional stakeholders might inform or enrich Workgroup discussions?

4. There are other guidelines and standards that offer concrete ways to achieve compliance with other ongoing efforts related to capacity development or program performance. What other initiatives are currently under way in your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company? *(Check all that apply.)*

- | |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State or Local Public Health Accreditation Board Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State or Local Public Health Performance Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity Grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FDA Rapid Response Team |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ISO/IEC 17025:2005 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CIFOR Guidelines |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recognized Global Standards |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ |

If you have checked any of the above initiatives, consider including staff members who are familiar with those initiatives in the Workgroup.

5. List the persons who have been invited to participate in the IFSS Toolkit process and the participants' affiliations. *To ensure success, identify a person to facilitate use of the IFSS Toolkit by the Workgroup. He or she should have extensive knowledge of the stakeholders for which decisions are being made.*

6. Workgroup Facilitator: _____

Select a person to record notes from Workgroup discussions, especially conclusions about stakeholder performance and decisions on actions to improve performance. The Recorder should review the Toolkit worksheets before the Workgroup assembles.

7. Workgroup Recorder: _____

8. Will the Recorder use hard copies or electronic versions of the IFSS Toolkit documents?

- Hard copies Electronic versions

9. Is an LCD or other type of projector available to display IFSS Toolkit documents or will Workgroup members need hard copies?

- Projector available Hard copies will be needed

10. Which of the following materials are available to your Workgroup?

- CIFOR Guidelines for Foodborne Disease Outbreak Response
- Written copies of your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company protocol(s) for inspection, investigation, surveillance, and response activities
- Summaries of food safety surveillance data
- Summaries of data from foodborne disease notification/complaint systems
- After-action reports from recent recalls, foodborne disease outbreaks, and food emergencies
- Information or documents from other capacity development or quality improvement initiatives in which your agency is involved
- Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP)
- Copies of MOUs, contracts, partnerships, and agreements with other stakeholders
- Other _____

Date Preliminaries Worksheet completed: _____

When you have finished the Preliminaries Worksheet, go to the “Prioritization of Focus Areas” on page 33 of the Introduction. You might wish to involve the entire Workgroup in selecting the priority Focus Areas or a smaller group of decision-makers before assembling the entire Workgroup.

Toolkit Tips for Facilitators

Toolkit Tips for Facilitators

Facilitator Role

Assist stakeholders responsible for efforts to integrate food safety and food defense functions with assessing their current integration efforts and determining where and how to make improvements.

Facilitator Experience

- Extensive experience in integration;
- Knowledge of resources available to help implement and carry out efforts to integrate; and
- Familiarity with the IFSS Toolkit materials and process.

Facilitation Tips

- Read through the “**Toolkit User Instructions**” and examine the worksheets before assembling the Workgroup. Think about ways in which these materials could help your Workgroup team identify and implement methods for improving integration efforts.
- Identify the stakeholders that are involved in food safety and food defense.
- Identify who will participate in the Workgroup. Remember to include representatives with different types of expertise, including epidemiology, environmental health, food regulation, the laboratory, and communication and knowledge of the agency or jurisdiction, and to include staff from other agencies as well as industry, academia, and consumers.
- Make sure that the Workgroup has access to all necessary materials including the entire IFSS Toolkit, written agency protocols, after-action reports from recent foodborne disease outbreaks or exercises, data from food safety surveillance and foodborne disease notification/complaint systems, and information on other quality improvement initiatives in which your agency might be involved.
- Before starting, ask participants to identify the objectives for the Workgroup, potential opportunities that will aid implementation of integration efforts, and any constraints that Workgroup members should take into consideration.
- Help motivate Workgroup members by sharing information regarding past integration successes. Be honest and stay positive. Do not blame people or say anything that might appear condescending.
- Walk the Workgroup through the Toolkit process, step-by-step, using the **Toolkit User Instructions (Quick Start Guide for Facilitators)**.
- Describe the general layout of the worksheets for the 6 Focus Areas (and the recurring sections) so that the Toolkit does not appear intimidating to Workgroup members.
- Help the Workgroup identify the high priority Focus Areas. Remind the Workgroup members to keep the goals of any capacity development or quality assurance

initiatives in mind. If different agencies or units are involved in the process, anticipate that the representatives might identify areas of independent interest as well as areas of shared interest.

- If Workgroup members are having difficulty identifying areas of shared interest, use standard facilitation techniques such as having people vote on the top three priorities for collaboration.
- Do not overplay the selection of priority Focus Areas, however, as most agencies and jurisdictions will benefit from improvements in several different (if not all) Focus Areas.
- Workgroups might want to focus initially on relationships with other stakeholders as a first step, because that topic will be relevant to all stakeholders and likely has broader-reaching ramifications because of its effect on integration. Remember that industry groups are among the relevant organizations with whom to develop working relationships.
- Keep the Workgroup moving. Working through the materials for a Focus Area (e.g., viewing the Keys Concepts and related Key Indicators) alone will help Workgroup members become more familiar with the Toolkit.
- When selecting actions to address a particular target for improvement, help the Workgroup focus on a few realistic goals as opposed to developing detailed expansive plans. Focusing attention and energies on a few actions might allow the Workgroup to demonstrate more immediate results that will fuel continued activities toward improvement.
- Encourage all members of the Workgroup to participate. Consider calling on individual members of the group, or otherwise encouraging quiet members to provide their input.
- Ensure that the Workgroup's findings and recommendations are accurately and concisely recorded.
- Ensure that each specialty is reflected in Workgroup recommendations (e.g., don't let all of the recommendations focus on just epidemiology or just environmental health).
- Ensure that the Workgroup develops an action plan for their recommendations, with the timeframe for implementation and assigned responsibilities.
- Identify how the recommended action plan will be coordinated with the right decision-makers to obtain the high-level support needed for implementation.
- Before the meeting is over, ensure that specific plans have been developed for addressing any priorities that were not analyzed during this work session (e.g., setting a date for a subsequent meeting).

Integrated Food Safety System: Toolkit

Integrated Food Safety System Toolkit

Purpose: The purpose of this Toolkit is to assist stakeholders in completing a self-assessment; marking progress on efforts to integrate; identifying gaps to integration; leveraging of resources; and planning of next steps to implement integration.

Outcome: An established plan; a guide to building an integrated global food safety system leading to increased public health protection.

Focus Areas:

1. **Communication**
2. **Roles and Responsibilities**
3. **Integration of Legal Authority**
4. **Resources**
5. **Emergency Response**
6. **Global Activities**

Prioritization of Focus Areas

Please rate the Focus Areas in terms of priority for your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company to develop. Circle a different number for each Focus Area. If more than one person completes this step for the Workgroup, consensus should be achieved among the people who are rating these areas before proceeding to the next step.

Focus Areas		Priority					
1	Communication: Assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with respect to communication.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	Roles and Responsibilities: Assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with other stakeholders with respect to each other's roles and responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	Integration of Legal Authority: Assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with other stakeholders with respect to legal authority.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	Resources: Assist stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient use of their collective resources.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	Emergency Response: Assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to effectively integrate responses to food emergencies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Global Activities: Assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with global stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Comments:							

Focus Area 1: Communication

1. Communication (Focus Area)

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with respect to communication.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 1: Communication

“Key Concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each Focus Area includes its own list of Key Concepts. Some Key Concepts are common to all Focus Areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other Key Concepts are unique to that Focus Area. Please review the following list of Key Concepts associated with the Communication Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 1.1 **Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) have a process to communicate in an integrated food safety system.
- 1.2 **Horizontal:** Stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) have a process to communicate in an integrated food safety system.
- 1.3 **Training:** Stakeholders receive training specific to communication within the integrated food safety system.
- 1.4 **Risk Communication:** Stakeholders develop risk communication plans within the context of the risk analysis framework.
- 1.5 **Laboratory:** Laboratories collaborate to ensure effective and efficient communication.
- 1.6 **Roles and responsibilities:** Stakeholders coordinate their communications roles and responsibilities.
- 1.7 **Evaluation and validation:** Stakeholders evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of communication activities within a food safety system.
- 1.8 **Proactive:** Stakeholders collaborate on an ongoing basis before an actual food safety incident occurs.
- 1.9 **Reactive:** Stakeholders collaborate during a food safety incident.
- 1.10 **Public:** Stakeholders maintain communication to facilitate outreach with community organizations and the public at large.
- 1.11 **Processes—SOPs:** Stakeholders determine procedures to facilitate communication on an ongoing basis and during food safety efforts.
- 1.12 **Information Exchange:** Stakeholders use multiple sources of information to identify and prioritize potential food safety incidents.

Describe current activities and procedures in the Communication Focus Area.

Describe your agency's/jurisdiction's current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., FDA Retail and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency's/jurisdiction's efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 1.1. **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) have a process to communicate in an integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					N/A
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	
1	Stakeholders collaborate within the communication network.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders interact by sponsoring or actively participating in meetings and task forces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders meet on a regular basis to identify and address issues of mutual concern.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders collaborate within a communication network to harmonize messages for various advisories and specific audiences.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders share organizational charts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholder meetings are held for the purpose of reviewing specific roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder and to identify the strengths and weaknesses that may exist.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Formalized (written) agreements or MOUs are established between stakeholders to identify specific roles and responsibilities with conflict resolution language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders use available networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Information and technology capabilities for data-gathering and sharing are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Jurisdictional clarification and legally-based responsibilities and authorities to facilitate joint efforts are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.2. **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) have a process to communicate in an integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders interact by sponsoring or actively participating in meetings and task forces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders meet on a regular basis to identify and address issues of mutual concern.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders identify their legal authority/authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders communicate their legal authority with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Formalized collaborative efforts among stakeholders have been established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders coordinate implementation of their regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.3. **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders receive training specific to communication within the integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have trained staff to communicate with media and interact with the public.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders are capable of working within an Incident Command System during food safety incidents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Training to develop communication competencies is conducted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders cross-train to better understand their food protection roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders develop, update and provide joint training courses and exercises in food emergency response that are provided regularly to facilitate collaboration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.4. **Risk Communication (Key Concept):** Stakeholders develop risk communication plans within the context of the risk analysis framework.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have knowledge of and apply the risk analysis framework for communicating risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders develop and implement risk communication strategies for ongoing operations and emergencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.5. **Laboratory (Key Concept):** Laboratories collaborate to ensure effective and efficient communication.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Laboratories communicate capacity and capabilities to stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Laboratories include communication protocols in surge capacity agreements and agreements for specialized testing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders' laboratories participate in appropriate communication and data sharing networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Laboratory communication and surveillance networks are used as tools for food protection activities by stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.6. **Roles and Responsibilities (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their communications roles and responsibilities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have organizational charts to facilitate communication.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders designate Public Information Officer(s) for media /are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Formalized efforts are established between stakeholders to identify specific roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Emergency response plans are collaboratively designed, developed, disseminated and evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.7. **Evaluation and Validation (Key Concept):** Stakeholders evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of communication activities within a food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)						
			1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
1	Stakeholders designate a person responsible for ensuring compliance with and maintenance of SOPs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
2	Stakeholders exercise the communication plan and integrate knowledge gained through research/evaluation into practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
3	Stakeholders collaborate in the development and reporting of public health Guidances to assess the effectiveness of the food safety communications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
4	Stakeholders engage in after-action reviews.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
5	Stakeholders debrief and incorporate changes in protocol with lessons learned.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
Comments:									

1.8. **Proactive (Key Concept):** Stakeholders collaborate on an ongoing basis before an actual food safety incident occurs.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A
1	Stakeholders' staff members participate in professional organizations as appropriate to their level and professional responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders' staff members interact by hosting or actively participating in meetings such as: task forces, advisory boards, or advisory committees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate by networking during non-emergency and food safety incidents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.9. **Reactive (Key Concept):** Stakeholders collaborate during a food safety incident.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have contingency plans for communication during a food safety event.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.10. **Public (Key Concept):** Stakeholders maintain communication to facilitate outreach with community organizations and the public at large.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A
1	Stakeholders consider the needs of special populations when developing messages.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders communicate with community organizations that provide a direct trusted link to diverse populations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders follow best practices for public communication.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.11. **Processes—SOPs (Key Concept):** Stakeholders determine procedures to facilitate communication on an ongoing basis and during food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have negotiated protocols and standard operating procedures with appropriate collaborative partners that outline responsibilities, duties, and communication expectations and methods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders develop a strategic communication plan for ongoing operations and food safety incidents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders integrate communication into Emergency Response and SOPs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders develop and share communication tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders develop protocols to ensure coordinated, consistent messaging during a food safety incident.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

1.12. Information Exchange (Key Concept): Stakeholders use multiple sources of information to identify and prioritize potential food safety incidents.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					N/A
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	
1	Stakeholders have compatible information management systems to effectively communicate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: COMMUNICATION

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: COMMUNICATION (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Focus Area 2: Roles and Responsibilities

2. **Roles and Responsibilities (Focus Area)**

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with other stakeholders with respect to each other's roles and responsibilities.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 2: Roles and Responsibilities

“Key Concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each Focus Area includes its own list of Key Concepts. Some Key Concepts are common to all Focus Areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other Key Concepts are unique to that Focus Area. Please review the following list of Key Concepts associated with the Roles and Responsibilities Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 2.1 Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) understand each other’s jurisdiction.
- 2.2 Horizontal:** Stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) understand each other’s jurisdiction.
- 2.3 Training:** Stakeholders receive training specific to responsibilities within the integrated food safety system.
- 2.4 Communication:** Vertical and horizontal stakeholders effectively communicate roles and responsibilities.
- 2.5 Laboratory:** Laboratories and other stakeholders collaborate to ensure effective and efficient surveillance and response activities.
- 2.6 Global:** Stakeholders understand the food safety and food defense roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in other countries.
- 2.7 Emergency Response:** Stakeholders’ emergency response roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.
- 2.8 Inspections and Enforcement:** Stakeholders understand each regulatory jurisdiction’s inspection and enforcement activities.
- 2.9 Third-Party:** Government sector and third-party inspecting organizations work together to ensure food safety and food defense.

Describe your current activities and procedures in this Focus Area.

Describe your agency’s/jurisdiction’s current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., FDA Retail and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency’s/jurisdiction’s efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.1 **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) understand each other’s jurisdiction.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A
1	Stakeholders share organizational charts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholder meetings are held for the purpose of reviewing specific roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder and to identify the strengths and weaknesses that may exist.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Formalized (written) agreements or MOUs are established between stakeholders to identify specific roles and responsibilities with conflict resolution language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders use laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.2 **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) understand each other’s jurisdiction.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders share organizational charts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholder meetings are held for the purpose of reviewing specific roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder and to identify the strengths and weaknesses that may exist.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders share work plans or assignments to avoid duplication of efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Agencies/jurisdictions review programs and documents for errors, omissions, and inconsistencies relative to their roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Formalized (written) agreements or MOUs are established between stakeholders to identify specific roles and responsibilities (including reciprocity for work acceptance) with conflict resolution language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders use laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.3 **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders receive training specific to responsibilities within the integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify acceptable competencies to enable shared/reciprocal work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders identify training curriculum to enable shared/reciprocal work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders conduct joint training efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Agency/jurisdiction cross-trains with other key agencies and organizations to better understand their food protection roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.4 **Communication (Key Concept):** Vertical and horizontal stakeholders effectively communicate roles and responsibilities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders interact by sponsoring or actively participating in meetings and task forces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders meet on a regular basis to identify and address issues of mutual concern.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders identify jurisdictional areas of concern (i.e., dietary supplements, USDA-exempt meat and poultry, cottage foods).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders know how to contact other key stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders have procedures for communication between their members and their agencies and with other agencies and organizations involved in food protection.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders routinely communicate with their partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders establish and frequently update contact lists for key persons and organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.5 **Laboratory (Key Concept):** Laboratories and other stakeholders collaborate to ensure effective and efficient surveillance and response activities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	The government sector uses laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Laboratories ensure that stakeholders are familiar with laboratory capacity and capability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Laboratories have established surge capacity agreements and agreements for specialized testing among themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Laboratories are engaged with appropriate established networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Laboratories maintain appropriate accreditation standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Laboratories establish standards for sampling, method selection, and data-reporting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.6 **Global (Key Concept):** Stakeholders understand the food safety and food defense roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in other countries.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders implement communication systems between food safety partners in other countries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders have agreements with other countries for exchange of confidential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate in international efforts to harmonize food safety efforts and take action where appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	State and local agencies participate in training opportunities regarding imported foods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	State and local regulatory agencies coordinate sharing of intelligence information including food sample testing results of imported foods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.7 Emergency Response (Key Concept): Stakeholders' emergency response roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Emergency response plans are collaboratively designed, developed, disseminated, and evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders' emergency response roles and responsibilities are documented and published.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate in drills, table top exercises, and other programs to ensure the emergency response plans are tested and evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.8 Inspections and Enforcement (Key Concept): Stakeholders understand each regulatory jurisdiction’s inspection and enforcement activities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	The government sector defines and disseminates the inspection and enforcement roles, responsibilities, and authority of each regulatory jurisdiction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Inspection and investigation protocols for the government sector are uniform.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	The government sector collaborates and coordinates inspection and enforcement efforts to maximize public health protection.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

2.9 **Third-Party (Key Concept):** Government sector and third-party inspecting organizations work together to ensure food safety and food defense.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Requirements for third-party certification and accreditation programs are developed, defined and accepted by the government sector.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Third-party organizations are accredited and third-party auditors are certified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Third-party accredited organizations and certified auditors perform in accordance with accreditation standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Focus Area 3: Integration of Legal Authority

3. Integration of Legal Authority (Focus Area)

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with other stakeholders with respect to legal authority.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 3: Integration of Legal Authority

“Key Concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each Focus Area includes its own list of Key Concepts. Some Key Concepts are common to all Focus Areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other Key Concepts are unique to that Focus Area. Please review the following list of Key Concepts associated with the Integration of Legal Authority Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 3.1 Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate their food safety efforts.
- 3.2 Horizontal:** Counterpart stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their food safety efforts.
- 3.3 Training:** Stakeholders receive training regarding their collective legal authorities within the integrated food safety system.
- 3.4 Communication:** Stakeholders effectively communicate their legal authorities.
- 3.5 Global:** Stakeholders coordinate their food safety and food defense efforts with stakeholders in other countries within the realm of their respective legal authorities.
- 3.6 Emergency Preparedness and Response:** Stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for effective and efficient implementation of their legal authorities for all hazards involving food.
- 3.7 Roles and Responsibilities:** Stakeholders coordinate their respective legal authorities.
- 3.8 Inspections and Enforcement:** Stakeholders coordinate their respective inspection and enforcement activities for effective and efficient implementation of their legal authorities.
- 3.9 Third-Party:** Government, non-government organizations (NGOs), and third-party inspecting organizations work together to ensure that food safety and food defense requirements are being met.

Describe your current activities and procedures in the Integration of Legal Authority Focus Area.

Describe your agency's/jurisdiction's current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., FDA Retail and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency's/jurisdiction's efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.1 **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate their food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify their legal authority/authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders communicate their legal authority with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Commissioning of officials conducted to maximize integration efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Formalized agreements among stakeholders have been developed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders coordinate implementation of their regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Reciprocity of laboratory test results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Reciprocity of inspection findings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Reciprocity of information-sharing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Collaboration in rule-making conducted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.2 **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Counterpart stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify their legal authority/authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders communicate their legal authority with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Formalized collaborative efforts amongst stakeholders have been developed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders coordinate implementation of their regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Reciprocity of laboratory test results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Reciprocity of inspection findings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Reciprocity of information-sharing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Collaboration in rule-making conducted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.3 **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders training regarding their collective legal authorities within the integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholder training developed in a coordinated fashion.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders trained on different legal authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	A continuing education plan has been developed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Joint Training and Exercise Activity Schedule has been developed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.4 **Communication (Key Concept):** Stakeholders effectively communicate their legal authorities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders interact by sponsoring or actively participating in meetings such as: task forces, advisory boards, or advisory committees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders meet/communicate on a regular basis with collaborative partners to identify and address issues of mutual concern.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders maintain an up-to-date Communication Resource which may include organization charts and contacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders maintain and share a compendium of laws, regulations, MOUs, guidance documents, policies, and procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders work within the National Incident Management System (NIMS) with collaborators as required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders participate in professional organizations and/or workgroups as appropriate to their level and professional responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.5 **Global (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their food safety and food defense efforts with stakeholders in other countries within the realm of their respective legal authorities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have an understanding of international food safety efforts: Codex, WHO, FAO, WTO, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders coordinate sharing of distribution for imported foods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders coordinate sharing of information relating to violative imported foods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders participate in advisory groups and training opportunities regarding imported foods.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders have an understanding of Certificate of Free Sale procedures and requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders have an understanding of import-export requirements, including trade agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders have an understanding of third-party programs for certifying foreign food facilities that comply with U.S. Food Safety Standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.6 **Emergency Preparedness and Response (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for effective and efficient implementation of their legal authorities for all hazards involving food.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
			1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1	Stakeholders work within the National Incident Management System (NIMS) with collaborators as outlined to coordinate their emergency response activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders support development of a Rapid Response Team (RRT) within their jurisdiction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholder laboratories participate in appropriate collaborative data-sharing networks (FERN, eLEXNET, PulseNet, Vet-LRN, LRN, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders determine reasons to activate and stand up emergency response activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders have appropriate emergency plans which include resource-sharing/surge capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders have appropriate emergency plans which include lab surge capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Reciprocity for professional credentialing within mutual aid agreements is conducted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.7 **Roles and Responsibilities (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their respective legal authorities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Formalized efforts are established between stakeholders to identify specific stakeholder roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	A State Food Safety Task Force has been established to clarify and coordinate stakeholder roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.8 Inspections and Enforcement (Key Concept): Stakeholders coordinate their respective inspection and enforcement activities for effective and efficient implementation of their legal authorities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Inventory of regulated firms shared with stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Nationally-recognized standards for inspection and enforcement are employed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders meet to develop work plans for coming year.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders collaborate on inspections and enforcement with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Summaries of enforcement actions are shared with stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

3.9 **Third-Party (Key Concept):** Government, non-government organizations (NGOs), and third-party inspecting organizations work together to ensure that food safety and food defense requirements are being met.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have an understanding of third-party certification programs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders establish coordination with state, local, territorial, and tribal food safety programs as a third-party program for certifying that domestic food facilities comply with applicable food safety laws and standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: INTEGRATION of LEGAL AUTHORITY

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: INTEGRATION of LEGAL AUTHORITY
 (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Focus Area 4: Resources

4. **Resources (Focus Area)**

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient use of their collective resources.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 4: Resources

“Key concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each focus area includes its own list of key concepts. Some key concepts are common to all focus areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other key concepts are unique to that focus area. Please review the following list of key concepts associated with the Resources Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 4.1 Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate their resources to enhance food safety efforts.
- 4.2 Horizontal:** Stakeholders at the same level (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their resources to enhance food safety efforts.
- 4.3 Training:** Stakeholders participate in training to achieve comparability and competency to integrate workforces and leverage resources.
- 4.4 Communication:** Stakeholders evaluate and seek interoperability of their communication resources.
- 4.5 Laboratory:** Stakeholders review and identify standard operating procedures for integrated sampling, analytical methods, surveillance, and reporting.
- 4.6 Global:** Stakeholders leverage resources to achieve global food protection.
- 4.7 Emergency Response:** Stakeholders review and evaluate their emergency response resource allocation to facilitate joint response efforts.
- 4.8 Evaluation/validation:** Stakeholders evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of resource utilization.
- 4.9 Inspections:** Stakeholders review and evaluate their inspection authorities and procedures to facilitate shared inspectional findings to optimize use of resources.
- 4.10 Enforcement:** Stakeholders review and evaluate their enforcement authorities and procedures to optimize integrated enforcement.
- 4.11 People:** Stakeholders assess resources for workforce capabilities and capacities.

Describe your current activities and procedures in the Resources Focus Area.

Describe your agency's/jurisdiction's current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., FDA Retail and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency's/jurisdiction's efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.1 **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate their resources to enhance food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders perform a jurisdictional and legal review of all in-house laws, regulations, and policies focusing on responsibilities and authorities which might impact participating in joint efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders identify and document all resources (supplies, equipment, and people) capable of being shared.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate in the development of and subsequent adoption of MOUs for direction, control, and coordination structure for food safety agency interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.2 **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at same levels (e.g., federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their resources to enhance food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders perform a jurisdictional and legal review of all in-house laws, regulations, and policies focusing on responsibilities and authorities which might impact participating in joint efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders identify and document all resources (supplies, equipment, and people) capable of being shared.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate in the development of and subsequent adoption of MOUs for direction, control, and coordination structure for food safety agency interaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.3 **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders participate in training to achieve comparability and competency to integrate workforces and leverage resources.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify training needs based on the capacity and capabilities evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders identify training resources and prioritize participation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders participate in workforce cross-training.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders participate in training courses and workshops to build capability and capacity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.4 **Communication (Key Concept):** Stakeholders evaluate and seek interoperability of their communication resources.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement						
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A	
1	Stakeholders identify communication resources and maintain an inventory of equipment and specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
2	Stakeholder participates in scheduled and structured meetings to review and discuss current communication plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
3	Stakeholders develop and maintain communication protocols for sharing resources during routine and emergency incidents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
Comments:									

4.5 **Laboratory (Key Concept):** Stakeholders review and identify standard operating procedures for integrated sampling, analytical methods, surveillance, and reporting.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholder laboratories participate in appropriate networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders are aware of laboratory capacity and capabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Laboratories have established surge capacity agreements and agreements for specialized testing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Laboratories are accredited to appropriate standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.6 **Global (Key Concept):** Stakeholders leverage resources to achieve global food protection.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify resources necessary to perform their roles and responsibilities in a global food safety system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders develop a resource plan to perform their roles and responsibilities in a global food safety system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders obtain and utilize the resources necessary to perform their roles and responsibilities in a global food safety system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.7 Emergency Response (Key Concept): Stakeholders review and evaluate their emergency response resource allocation to facilitate joint response efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders have appropriate emergency plans which include resource-sharing/surge capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders establish and maintain updated reciprocity agreements for professional credentialing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders work within the National Incident Management System (NIMS) with collaborators as outlined to coordinate their emergency response activities while sharing resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders participate in drills, table-top exercises, and other programs to ensure the emergency response plans for sharing resources are tested, evaluated, and continuously updated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders provide emergency Incident Command System (ICS) training to employees to facilitate maximum utilization of shared resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.8 **Evaluation and Validation (Key Concept):** Stakeholders evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of resource utilization.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders conduct a self-assessment of their programs based on the appropriate standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders participate in resource verification processes such as program audits.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Resource capabilities are verified through audits and/or accreditations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.9 **Inspections (Key Concept):** Stakeholders review and evaluate their inspection authorities and procedures to facilitate shared inspectional findings to optimize use of resources.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders use risk based work planning to effectively and efficiently utilize resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders leverage resources effectively and efficiently.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders use jurisdictional authorities to avoid resource duplication or gaps in efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders compare inspection program policies and procedures to identify opportunities for resource optimization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.10 **Enforcement (Key Concept):** Stakeholders review and evaluate their enforcement authorities and procedures to optimize integrated enforcement.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders develop and maintain a legal authority actions chart for inspection findings, which includes compared actions for each of the following: warning letters, re-inspection, termination of an exemption, refusal of approval or license, withdrawal of approval, determination of not being substantially equivalent, seizure of product, injunctions, prosecution, referral to a higher authority, etc. to identify ways to effectively use their collective resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders have established procedures for sharing enforcement actions to eliminate duplication of efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	To affect efficient use of resources stakeholders establish and maintain joint interagency protocol for sharing information on non-compliant facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	To leverage enforcement resources stakeholders delegate authorities for integrated food safety enforcement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

4.11 **People (Key Concept):** Stakeholders assess resources for workforce capabilities and capacities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders assemble and maintain a list of staff who have expertise that would be compatible with other stakeholder project functions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders share the inventory of staff baseline qualifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders evaluate staff performance in joint workforce activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders identify resources needs for improving capacity and capabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: RESOURCES

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: RESOURCES (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Focus Area 5: Emergency Response

5. Emergency Response (Focus Area)

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to effectively integrate responses to food emergencies.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 5: Emergency Response

“Key concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each focus area includes its own list of key concepts. Some key concepts are common to all focus areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other key concepts are unique to that focus area. Please review the following list of key concepts associated with the Emergency Response Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 5.1 Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate food emergency surveillance, detection, investigation, and response.
- 5.2 Horizontal:** Stakeholders at the same level (federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their food emergency surveillance, detection, investigation, and response.
- 5.3 Training:** Stakeholders receive training specific to emergency response within the integrated food safety system.
- 5.4 Communication:** Stakeholders integrate and coordinate their communication activities to ensure effective and efficient food emergency response.
- 5.5 Laboratory:** Laboratories collaborate to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.
- 5.6 Global:** Stakeholders ensure that their food emergency responses are integrated with appropriate international response organizations.
- 5.7 Food Emergencies:** Stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for effective and efficient implementation of response plans.
- 5.8 Roles and Responsibilities:** Stakeholders coordinate emergency response roles and responsibilities.
- 5.9 Evaluation and Validation:** Government stakeholders use appropriate standards to evaluate their separate and collective capacity to implement food emergency response.
- 5.10 Recalls:** Stakeholders coordinate their respective roles in product recalls to maximize effective and efficient implementation of recalls.

Describe your current activities and procedures in this Focus Area.

Describe your agency’s/jurisdiction’s current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., FDA Retail and Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency’s/jurisdiction’s efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 5.1 **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.) integrate food emergency surveillance, detection, investigation, and response.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Emergency response plans include the appropriate local, state and federal agencies/organizations (i.e., integrated response teams) for all hazards responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders include Incident Command System (ICS) and National Incident Management System (NIMS) in their emergency response plans and implement the systems as appropriate in their responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders at all levels supply timely and accurate information into surveillance systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders share organizational charts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders participate in emergency response planning meetings and tabletop exercises.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Formalized (written) agreements or MOUs are established between government agencies to identify specific roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders use laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders develop a framework for reviewing, revising, and updating emergency plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Stakeholders develop and update lists of appropriate contacts for emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Stakeholders have and update Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.2 **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at the same level (federal agency to federal agency or state agency to state agency or local agency to local agency) integrate their food emergency surveillance, detection, investigation, and response.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Emergency response plans include the appropriate agencies/organizations for that level of government for all hazards responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders include ICS and NIMS in their emergency response plans and implement the systems as appropriate in their responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders supply timely and accurate information into surveillance systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Government stakeholders share organizational charts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders participate in emergency response planning meetings and tabletop exercises.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Formalized (written) agreements or MOUs are established between government agencies to identify specific roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders use laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders develop a framework for reviewing, revising, and updating emergency plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Stakeholders develop and update lists of appropriate contacts for emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Stakeholders have and update Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.3 **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders receive training specific to emergency response within the integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders develop, update, and provide joint training courses and exercises in food emergency response that are provided regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders provide new employees with training on how to implement integrated food emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders' training includes ICS and NIMS components.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.4 **Communication (Key Concept):** Stakeholders integrate and coordinate their communication activities to ensure effective and efficient food emergency response.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders meet regularly to share information regarding ongoing joint activities and plan for emergency responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders have internal and external predetermined communication channels (e.g., email distribution lists, text alerts, websites).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders use available information sharing platforms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders have tested plans in place to coordinate public communications during food emergencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.5 **Laboratory (Key Concept):** Laboratories collaborate to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Laboratory capacity and capability is determined and shared with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Pre-determined laboratories are identified for specialized testing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Laboratories have established plans for sustainability of testing/surge capacity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Laboratory management has pre-approved authority to allow laboratory staff to work overtime.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Laboratories can share data/results electronically and in real time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Procedures are in place to ensure sample integrity and chain-of-custody from sample collection to reporting of analytical results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Laboratories are accredited to appropriate standards (e.g., ISO/IEC 17025:2005, CLIA, NELAP, and actively participate in FERN and other relevant proficiency testing programs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.6 **Global (Key Concept):** Stakeholders ensure that their food emergency responses are integrated with appropriate international response organizations.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement						
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A	
1	Stakeholders ensure that their food emergency responses are integrated with appropriate international response organizations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	
Comments:									

5.7 **Food Emergencies (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for effective and efficient implementation of response plans.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders jointly develop emergency response plans and test, review, and update those plans regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders' roles and responsibilities are formalized and shared with all interested parties (i.e., MOUs).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders develop a procedure for integrated activation of emergency response activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders work to support development of a Rapid Response Team (RRT) within their jurisdiction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholder coordinate with appropriate agency programs (PulseNet, OutbreakNet, RRTs, HAN, etc.) to ensure effective, efficient, and timely surveillance, detection, investigation, and responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Response capacity and capabilities are identified/defined to ensure sustainability during an event.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders have appropriate emergency plans that include resource-sharing/surge capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Recovery plans are in place that address the events necessary to return to pre-emergency conditions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.8 Roles and Responsibilities (Key Concept): Stakeholders coordinate emergency response roles and responsibilities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	N/A
1	Emergency response plans are collaboratively designed, developed, disseminated, and evaluated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders' emergency response roles and responsibilities are defined, documented, regularly tested, reviewed, and updated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Formal regularly scheduled stakeholder meetings occur to clarify and coordinate respective roles and responsibilities and improve communication (i.e., food safety taskforce, RRTs).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.9 **Evaluation and Validation (Key Concept):** Government stakeholders use appropriate standards to evaluate their separate and collective capacity to implement food emergency response.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Food regulatory agencies implement program standards the Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards (MFRPS) or the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards (VNRFPS) emergency response components.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Laboratories are accredited to appropriate standards and actively participate in relevant proficiency testing programs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Epidemiologists follow best practices for applying an epidemiological approach to food emergencies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders use existing resources to evaluate food emergency response plans and actual responses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders conduct after action review after all large food emergency responses and develop and implement after action plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

5.10 **Recalls (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their respective roles in product recalls to maximize effective and efficient implementation of recalls.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders share organization charts and contact information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders develop, test, review, and update recall plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders standardize recall effectiveness checks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Recall information is rapidly and effectively disseminated to industry and consumers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Recall plans identify recovery steps that address the actions necessary to return to normal operations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: EMERGENCY RESPONSE

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN for IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: EMERGENCY RESPONSE (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Focus Area 6: Global Activities

6. Global Activities (Focus Area)

Purpose: The purpose of this Focus Area is to assist stakeholders to perform a self-assessment of their efforts to integrate with global stakeholders.

List of stakeholders participating in discussion of Focus Area:

Name	Title	Affiliation

Key Concepts for Focus Area 6: Global Activities

“Key Concepts” are the various dimensions you’ll use to evaluate your organization’s integration efforts. Each Focus Area includes its own list of Key Concepts. Some Key Concepts are common to all Focus Areas (such as “vertical,” “horizontal,” and “training”), while other Key Concepts are unique to that Focus Area. Please review the following list of key concepts associated with the Emergency Response Focus Area prior to completing the first step in the process (next page).

- 6.1 Vertical:** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.), integrate their food safety efforts.
- 6.2 Horizontal:** Stakeholders coordinate their food protection efforts with counterpart stakeholders in other countries.
- 6.3 Training:** Stakeholders receive standardized training within the global integrated food safety system.
- 6.4 Communication:** Stakeholders coordinate their communication to facilitate global integration.
- 6.5 Laboratory:** Global laboratories and stakeholders collaborate to establish scientifically valid methods for sampling and analysis.
- 6.6 Global:** Stakeholders work together to achieve global food protection.
- 6.7 Emergency Preparedness and Response:** Global stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for all hazards involving food.
- 6.8 Roles and Responsibilities:** Stakeholders coordinate their roles and responsibilities to facilitate global integration.
- 6.9 Evaluation and Validation:** Stakeholders measure, assess, audit, and report on the efficiency and effectiveness of their individual and collaborative efforts for continuous improvement.
- 6.10 Inspections and Enforcement:** Stakeholders understand each regulatory jurisdiction’s inspection and enforcement activities.
- 6.11 Information Exchange:** Global stakeholders work to exchange and aggregate multiple sources of information and regulatory analysis to identify and prioritize potential health threats.
- 6.12 Regulatory Science:** Stakeholders collaborate to apply science-based tools, standards, and approaches to assess the safety, effectiveness, quality, and performance of regulated products.

Describe your current activities and procedures in the Global Activities Focus Area.

Describe your agency's/jurisdiction's current activities and procedures in this Focus Area. Refer to written protocols, if available, and materials related to ongoing efforts in capacity development or quality improvement (e.g., The International Comparability Assessment Tool (based on the MFRPA Standards). As you list current activities and procedures related to this Focus Area, indicate those that might need work to improve your agency's/jurisdiction's efforts to integrate the food safety system.

Activity/Procedure	Needs Improvement?
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

6.1 **Vertical (Key Concept):** Stakeholders at different levels (international, federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, etc.), integrate their food safety efforts.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement					N/A
			1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (high)	
1	Stakeholders identify their legal authority/authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders communicate their legal authority with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders collaborate in rule-making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Formalized multi-lateral agreements among stakeholders are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders coordinate implementation of their regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Reciprocity of laboratory test results is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Reciprocity of inspection findings is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Reciprocity of enforcement actions is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Stakeholders share best practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Confidence in shared standards at all jurisdictions within a food safety system (e.g., across U.S. states, EU member states) is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.2 **Horizontal (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their food protection efforts with counterpart stakeholders in other countries.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders identify their legal authority/authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders communicate their legal authority with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Formalized collaborative efforts among stakeholders are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Formalized bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements are established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Countries participate in international efforts to harmonize food safety standards and take appropriate action to update their standards where appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders collaborate in rule-making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Countries adopt rules and regulations consistent with Codex and other international norms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders coordinate implementation of their regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Reciprocity of inspection findings is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Reciprocity of enforcement actions is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
11	Specific Guidance: Number of countries with system in place to share and protect information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.3 **Training (Key Concept):** Stakeholders receive standardized training within the global integrated food safety system.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders conduct joint training and exercise to facilitate collaboration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Agency/jurisdiction cross-trains with other key agencies and organizations to better understand their food protection authorities, roles, and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders establish a training curriculum and train based upon the curriculum to ensure that staff members have the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform their jobs and participate in an integrated food safety system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Certification system to ensure comparable and competent performance of staff across all global partners, including system for record maintenance and curriculum development, is established. Specific Guidance: Percent of food safety inspectors who have met certification requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Continued education and training is provided to all stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient emergency response.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.4 **Communication (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their communication to facilitate global integration.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders interact by sponsoring or actively participating in meetings such as: alliances, task forces, or advisory boards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders meet/communicate on a regular basis with collaborative partners to identify and address issues of mutual concern.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders maintain an up-to-date communication resource which includes organizational charts and contacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders maintain and share: compendium of laws, regulations, bi-lateral and multi-lateral agreements, MOUs, guidance documents, policies, and procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders work within an established Incident Management System with collaborators when needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders participate in professional organizations and/or workgroups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.5 **Laboratory (Key Concept):** Global laboratories and stakeholders collaborate to establish scientifically valid methods for sampling and analysis.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Food laboratories are accredited to and maintain international standards that include a proficiency testing program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Laboratories establish standards for sampling, method selection, and data reporting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Reciprocity of laboratory test results is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholder laboratories have standards for laboratory data exchange and participate in appropriate collaborative data-sharing networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	The government sector uses laboratory, communication, and surveillance networks as tools for food protection activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders are aware of laboratory capacity and capability.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Laboratories have established surge capacity and specialized testing agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Specific Guidance: Number of collaborating laboratories that will provide coordinated response to high priority chemical and microbiological contamination events.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Effective and efficient surveillance, response and reporting activities exist.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.6 **Global (Key Concept):** Stakeholders collaborate to achieve global food protection.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
			1	2	3	4	5	N/A
1	Identify neutral venues to bring together government, industry, and academia.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Countries integrate their food safety regulatory programs to facilitate trade and protect public health using science-based standards and policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders have knowledge of international food safety activities such as: Codex, WHO, FAO, WTO, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders have knowledge of import-export requirements, including trade agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders coordinate sharing of distribution information for foods they import and export to facilitate effective recalls.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Stakeholders coordinate sharing of information relating to violative imported foods. Specific Guidance: number of threats avoided due to timely notice from regulatory partners. Specific Guidance: percentage of food safety incidents for which information is shared on a timely basis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders have knowledge of third-party programs with audits and conflict-of-interest standards for certifying foreign food facilities that comply with an importing nation's food safety requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders establish coordination for a third-party program for certifying that a nation's food facilities comply with applicable food safety laws and standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

(continued on next page)

9	Stakeholders establish coordination for a third-party program to audit a nation's regulatory program against the International Comparability Assessment Standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10	Stakeholders share best practices and standards to promote comparability between different countries' food safety systems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
11	Stakeholders have confidence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.7 **Emergency Preparedness and Response (Key Concept):** Global stakeholders coordinate their respective emergency preparedness and response activities for all hazards involving food.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders work within an Incident Management System with collaborators to coordinate emergency response activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders support development of an integrated response team within their jurisdiction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Stakeholders define when to activate and stand up emergency response activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders have emergency plans including resource-sharing/ capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Stakeholders have emergency plans including laboratory surge capacity agreements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Reciprocity for professional credentialing within mutual aid agreements is established.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Countries have foodborne disease and response systems which coordinate international efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Specific Guidances: Number of incidents for which multi-jurisdictional After Action Reports show designated information exchange within desired timeframes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.8 **Roles and Responsibilities (Key Concept):** Stakeholders coordinate their roles and responsibilities to facilitate global integration.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Formalized efforts are established between stakeholders to identify specific stakeholder roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Bi-lateral and multilateral agreements have been established to clarify and coordinate stakeholder roles and responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.9 **Evaluation and Validation (Key Concept):** Stakeholders measure, assess, audit, and report on the efficiency and effectiveness of their individual and collaborative efforts for continuous improvement.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Food safety authorities assess capabilities using the International Comparability Assessment Tool (ICAT).	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Food Safety authorities develop and implement continuous improvement plans based upon assessment results.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Food Safety authorities have ICAT assessments audited by an appropriate authority.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Stakeholders collaborate in the development and reporting of public health Guidances to assess the effectiveness of the food safety system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.10 **Inspections and Enforcement (Key concept):** Stakeholders understand each regulatory jurisdiction’s inspection and enforcement activities.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders prioritize inspections and enforcement based upon the risk the activities pose to public health.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Stakeholders have a clear understanding of the inspection and enforcement roles of other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3	Inspectors are designated with the authority and power to take enforcement action when they believe that there are reasonable grounds to do so.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4	Agency/jurisdictions implement uniform compliance actions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5	Inspection/investigation protocols for agencies/jurisdiction are uniform.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6	Inventory of food facilities shared with stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7	Stakeholders meet to coordinate work plans for coming year, including improved targeting of resources and expanded inspection and sample collection coverage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8	Stakeholders collaborate on inspections and enforcement with other stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9	Summaries of enforcement actions are shared with stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.11 **Information Exchange (Key Concept):** Global stakeholders work to exchange and aggregate multiple sources of information and regulatory analysis to identify and prioritize potential health threats.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Countries have agreements with other countries for exchange of confidential and non-confidential information.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2	Countries establish information management systems that are accessible and capable of sharing information with collaborators.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

6.12 **Regulatory Science (Key Concept):** Stakeholders collaborate to apply science-based tools, standards, and approaches to assess the safety, effectiveness, quality, and performance of regulated products.

#	Key Indicators	Already in Place	Priority for Implementation or Improvement 1 (low) to 5 (high)					
1	Stakeholders participate in international scientific collaborative efforts to protect public health.	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Comments:								

PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: GLOBAL ACTIVITIES

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION or IMPROVEMENT: GLOBAL ACTIVITIES (continued)

High Priority Items	Lead Person(s)	Additional Personnel	Timeframe for Implementation or Improvement	Notes

Resource Reference List

Resource Reference List

1. CIFOR. *Guidelines, Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak Response*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.cifor.us/CIFORGuidelinesProjectMore.cfm>.
2. FDA. *Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards - January 2011*. 2011 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodSafety/RetailFoodProtection/ProgramStandards/ucm245409.htm>.
3. FDA. *Manufactured Food Regulatory Program Standards*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/ForFederalStateandLocalOfficials/PartnershipsContracts/Overview/default.htm>.
4. FDA. *RRT best practices manual – Key components of effective rapid response for food and feed emergencies*. 2012.
5. FEMA. *National Response Framework*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fema.gov/national-response-framework>.
6. FEMA. *National Incident Management System*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fema.gov/national-incident-management-system>.
7. Todd E, B.C., Guzewich J, Tan A, Lee M, *Procedures to investigate foodborne illness*. 6 ed. 2011: International Association for Food Protections - Springer.
8. CDC. *PulseNet*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/pulsenet/>.
9. CDC. *Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet)*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 9]; Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/foodnet/>.
10. CDC. *OutbreakNet - Outbreak response team*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/outbreaknet/>.
11. CDC. *National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System (NNDSS)* 2012 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://wwwn.cdc.gov/nndss/>.
12. eLEXNET. *Electronic laboratory exchange network*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <https://www.elexnet.com/elex/>.
13. FDA. *PETNet: An Information Exchange For Pet Food Related Incidents*. 2011 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/Products/AnimalFoodFeeds/PetFood/ucm278278.htm>.
14. FDA. *National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS)*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/SafetyHealth/AntimicrobialResistance/NationalAntimicrobialResistanceMonitoringSystem/default.htm>.
15. FEMA, *Continuity of Operations (COOP) Multi-Year Strategy and Program Management Plan Template Guide*. 2013.
16. FDA. *ORA University (ORAU)*. 2010 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/training/forstatelocaltribalregulators/default.htm>.
17. CDC. *Health Alert Network (HAN)*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.bt.cdc.gov/han/>.
18. CDC. *The epidemic information exchange (Epi-X)*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/epix/>.
19. FDA. *Operational and Administrative System for Import Support (OASIS)*. 2009 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from:

- <http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/ImportProgram/AdmissibilityDeterminationsforShipmentsofForeign-originOASIS/ucm077691.htm>.
20. HHS. *Health Information Network (HIN)*. 2011 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: http://healthit.hhs.gov/portal/server.pt/community/healthit_hhs_gov_nationwide_health_information_network/1142.
 21. NCFPD. *FoodSHIELD*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: <https://www.foodshield.org/>.
 22. FERN. *Food Emergency Response Network (FERN)*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fernlab.org/>.
 23. FDA. *Partnership for Food Protection Reports*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/ForFederalStateandLocalOfficials/Meetings/ucm249828.htm>.
 24. AOAC. *Analytical Laboratory Accreditation Criteria Committee (ALACC)*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.aoac.org/accreditation/accreditation.htm>.
 25. Congress, U.S. *Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA)*. 2004 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://wwwn.cdc.gov/clia/regs/toc.aspx>.
 26. ISO/IEC. *ISO/IEC 17025:2005*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=39883.
 27. NELAC_Institute. *National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP)*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.nelac-institute.org/newnelap.php>.
 28. EU. *Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed* 2013 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/rapidalert/index_en.htm.
 29. FAO. *Food and agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO)*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: http://www.fao.org/index_en.htm.
 30. WHO. *The International Food Safety Authorities Network (INFOSAN)*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: http://www.who.int/foodsafety/fs_management/infosan/en/.
 31. WHO. *International Health Regulations*. 2013 [cited 2013 January 10]; Available from: http://www.who.int/topics/international_health_regulations/en/.
 32. CIFOR. *Toolkit, Council to Improve Foodborne Outbreak Response*. 2012 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.cifor.us/toolkit.cfm>.
 33. CDC/CSTE. *CDC/CSTE Development of Applied Epidemiology Competencies*. 2011 [cited 2013 January 8]; Available from: <http://www.cste.org/dnn/Home/CSTEFatures/Competencies/tabid/174/Default.aspx>.
 34. CSTE. *2010 food safety epidemiology capacity assessment*. 2010 January 8, 2013; Available from: <http://www.cste.org/webpdfs/fseca.pdf>.
 35. FDA. *Chapter 7, Recalls in the FDA Regulatory Procedures Manual*. 2011 January 14, 2013; Available from: <http://www.fda.gov/ICECI/ComplianceManuals/RegulatoryProceduresManual/ucm177304.htm>.

Participant Evaluation Form

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Please take a moment to give us your feedback about the IFSS Toolkit.

Which of the following best describes your program/agency/jurisdiction/organization/company?

- Federal Government Academia
- State Government Consumer
- Local Government Other _____
- Industry

Which of the following best describes your program area? (Check all that apply).

- Agriculture Epidemiology Public health
- Communications Food Defense Training
- Education Food Safety Other _____
- Environmental Health Laboratory _____

How did you use the Toolkit?

- One meeting
 - Multiple meetings in a short period (i.e., over a few days)
 - Multiple meetings over an extended period (over several weeks or months)
 - Other _____
-
-
-
-

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION (continued)

Please rate your response to the following statements about the IFSS Toolkit.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither/ Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
1	The IFSS Toolkit process was easy to follow.						
2	The IFSS Toolkit process moved at an appropriate pace.						
3	The IFSS Toolkit process supported a meaningful examination of our integration activities and needed changes.						
4	The “Focus Areas” used to organize the IFSS Toolkit process made sense.						
5	The Focus Areas covered most major integration activities.						
6	What integration activities were omitted from the Focus Areas?	Comments:					
7	The worksheets made it easy to review integration efforts and identify activities and procedures in need of improvement.						
8	The Key Concepts and Key Indicators helped us understand the critical aspects of integration in the different Focus Areas.						
9	The materials included in the IFSS Toolkit were adequate to undertake the process.						
10	What additional materials would have made it easier?	Comments:					
11	Please share any other thoughts or ideas you have to improve the IFSS Toolkit.	Comments:					

Your thoughts are important to us. Please send completed evaluations to: Support, IFPTI, 49 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 300, Battle Creek, MI 49017 or to support@ifpti.org.