



Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada: A Government-Industry Forum

hosted by:

The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition (CSCFSC)
The Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group (CFISIG)
The Federal/Provincial/Territorial Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC)
The Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP)

May 18, 2004
Ottawa, Ontario

Summary Report

Acknowledgements

The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition would like to extend its sincere appreciation to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) through the Canadian Food Safety and Quality Program for their financial support of this project. As part of the Agricultural Policy Framework, federal-provincial-territorial governments are working with industry to enhance food safety and food quality in Canada. Opinions expressed in this document are those of the participants and not necessarily AAFC.



Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Agriculture et Agroalimentaire Canada

Canada

The Forum could not have taken place without the co-operation of the secretariats of the Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group (CFISIG), the Federal/Provincial/ Territorial Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC) and the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP) and the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition (CSCFSC).

For further information contact:

Albert Chambers
Secretariat
Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition
19 Elm Street, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1R 6M9
613-233-7175
cscfsc@monachus.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
FORUM AGENDA	2
OPENING REMARKS	3
SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS.....	4
INTEGRATING FOOD SAFETY SYSTEMS IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND	4
UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE CANADIAN SUPPLY CHAIN FOOD SAFETY COALITION	4
UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL FOOD SAFETY COMMITTEES.....	5
THEME #1 – ADVANCING COLLABORATION ON NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY STANDARDS, CODES AND RECOGNITION	5
CERTIFICATION SYSTEMS: ALTERNATIVES FOR FOOD SAFETY	5
INTEGRATING FOOD SAFETY SYSTEMS IN CANADA – A COMPANY PERSPECTIVE	6
ADVANCING COLLABORATION ON NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY STANDARDS, CODES AND RECOGNITION – A GOVERNMENT PERSPECTIVE	6
THEME #2 – TOWARDS NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR INDUSTRY	7
BREAKOUT GROUP REPORTS AND SUGGESTED ACTIONS	8
THEME 1: ADVANCING COLLABORATION ON NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY STANDARDS, CODES AND RECOGNITION	8
<i>National Codes.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Recognition and Certification.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Auditor Training and Auditor Certification.....</i>	<i>15</i>
THEME 2: TOWARDS NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR INDUSTRY.....	18
PLENARY FEEDBACK.....	20
CONCLUDING REMARKS	22
APPENDICES	23
QUESTIONS FOR THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS	24
NOTES FROM THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS.....	28
<i>Advancing Collaboration on National Food Safety Standards, Codes and Recognition.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Towards National Food Safety Training Programs for Industry</i>	<i>35</i>
BIOGRAPHIES	38
FORUM PARTICIPANTS	42

Introduction

Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada: A Government-Industry Forum was conceived as a collaborative initiative by the steering committee of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition (CSCFSC) and co-chairs of the three federal/provincial/territorial committees that have responsibility for coordinating food safety policy and implementation in Canada: the Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group (CFISIG), the Federal/ Provincial/ Territorial Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC) and the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP).

The purpose of the forum was to provide opportunities for both industry and government to network and share information on food safety issues of common interest, in the domestic and international arena, to explore the challenges ahead and the expectations surrounding the integration of food safety systems in Canada and to identify opportunities for new industry/government collaboration. In particular, the participants were challenged to focus on two key themes:

- **Theme 1:** Advancing Collaboration on National Food Safety Standards, Codes and Recognition; and,
- **Theme 2:** Towards National Food Safety Training Programs for Industry

In order to provide a framework for these discussions, general presentations were given on the experience of Australia and New Zealand in integrating food safety policy development and the work of the CSCFSC and the three FPT food safety committees. Then, presentations specific to the two forum themes were provided.

Subsequent to these presentations, participants proceeded into breakout sessions to further explore issues related to the two forum themes. Participants opting to take part in discussions relating to advancing collaboration on national food safety standards, codes and recognition were divided into three subgroups: national codes, recognition and certification and lastly, auditor training and auditor certification. Those choosing food safety training opted to work as one large group. Each of the discussion groups worked with a set of prepared questions (see Appendix 1) which had been provided to participants in advance of the forum. Upon returning to the plenary, each table offered an overview of, and highlights from, its discussions.

This report summarizes the presentations, captures the reports from the breakout sessions and sets out the actions suggested by the Forum participants. The appendices provide more detailed notes from the breakout discussions. The presentations are available at www.foodsafetycoalition.ca, the website of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition.

Forum Agenda

Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada: A Government-Industry Forum

May 17 (Evening Reception) and May 18 (Forum), 2004
Laurier Room, Courtyard Marriott, Ottawa, Ontario

AGENDA

May 17, 2004

5:30 - 7:00 pm Opening Reception

May 18, 2004

8:30 - 8:45 am	Introductions	CSCFSC ¹ and FPT Food Committees ²
8:45 - 9:45	Integrating Food Safety in Australia and New Zealand	Melanie Fisher and Bob Boyd, FSANZ ³
9:45 - 10:15	Updates on CSCFSC and FPT Food Committees' Activities	CSCFSC and FPT Food Committees
10:15 - 10:30	Health Break	
10:30 - 12:15	Theme Presentations:	
•10:30	1- Advancing collaboration on national food safety standards, codes and recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don Wilson, Don Wilson & Associates • Rob Marshall-Johns, The Oppenheimer Group • Dr. Gwen Zellen, OMAF⁴
•11:30	2- Towards national food safety training programs for industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joyce Reynolds, CRFA⁵ • Kevin McLeod, AHW⁶
12:15 - 1:15 pm	Lunch (provided)	
1:15 - 2:45	Concurrent break-out sessions for Themes 1 and 2	
2:45 - 4:00	Plenary:	
•2:45	Break-out Groups' Reports	
•3:45	Plenary Discussion and Feedback	
4:00 - 4:15	Conclusion (next steps and time lines)	CSCFSC and FPT Food Committees

¹ CSCFSC - Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

² FPT Food Committees - Federal/Provincial/Territorial Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC); the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP); and the Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group (CFISIG)

³ FSANZ - Food Standards Australia New Zealand

⁴ OMAF - Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

⁵ CRFA - Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association

⁶ AHW - Alberta Health and Wellness

Opening Remarks

The Forum participants were welcomed by Mr. Wendell Joyce, Treasurer of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition and Technical Director, Canadian Poultry and Egg Processors Council. Mr. Joyce reviewed the forum agenda and explained the nature of the dialogue that was planned for the day. He noted that participants were there as knowledgeable individuals, not representatives of their government, association or business. As such, they were expected to share their knowledge and views and to engage each other in an open and frank dialogue on the matters at hand. He also noted that no decisions were expected, although it is expected the results of the forum would have an impact on the ongoing work of the Federal/Provincial/Territorial committees and on the collaborative activities of these committees, governments and the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition.

Summary of Presentations

Integrating Food Safety Systems in Australia and New Zealand

Presented by Ms. Melanie Fisher, General Manager, Standards (Canberra) and Dr. Bob Boyd, Chief Medical Officer, Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ)

Ms. Fisher and Dr. Boyd reviewed in some detail the bi-national and intergovernmental mechanisms that have been established between New Zealand and Australia and between the national government and the state and territorial governments in Australia to govern food regulations and setting food standards. This new structure involves a ministerial council of health, agriculture and other ministers, a supporting committee structure and an independent agency – Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ). There is a clear separation of policy making, which is done by the council of ministers, and standards setting, which is the responsibility of FSANZ. In Australia, the governments have entered into an agreement to implement the national standards. Enforcement is undertaken by the New Zealand government, the Australian states and territories and the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS). FSANZ also has responsibility for handling food safety emergencies, including coordination of the national recall system, informing consumers about labelling and other food matters, and meeting new challenges.

Update on the Activities of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

Presented by Bryan Walton, Past-Chair, Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

Mr. Walton outlined the events leading up to the establishment of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition (CSCFSC) in 2000, its rationale, vision and mission. He then proceeded to describe the food industry's expectations of itself and of governments' vis-à-vis food safety actions and policy. Included in these lists were the expectation that food businesses would accept their responsibilities for food safety, exercise due diligence and engage in collaborative initiatives and, that governments would have a balanced approach to food safety, utilize sound science, seek to harmonize policies between jurisdictions and work with industry. Mr. Walton also noted that industry associations were developing about forty HACCP-based programs that are radically changing the Canadian approach to food safety. Looking ahead, he indicated that the CSCFSC had identified a set of priority issues for industry/government collaboration, including: regulatory approvals, official recognition of pre and post farm HACCP-based programs, the development of industry-led infrastructure, further work on the national codes, industry participation in the development of a new intergovernmental decision-

making mechanism for food safety policy, the continued harmonization of food safety policies and international acceptance of the Canadian approach to food safety.

Update on the Activities of the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Food Safety Committees

Presented by Ms. Kristine Stolarik, Executive Director, Liaison, Preparedness and Policy Coordination, Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Ms. Stolarik reviewed the roles and activities of the Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group (CFISIG), the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC) and the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP) and then moved on to discuss their collaborative activities. Over the past several years these have focused on the development of the Food Safety and Quality Chapter of the Agricultural Policy Framework (APF), a strategic plan for food safety and the response and management of emergency situations, like the BSE crisis. She noted that there was increasing collaboration amongst the committees, with joint meetings and regular sessions of the co-chairs. She also noted that the FPT committees were engaging industry in committee work such as the development of the recognition protocol and code development and establishing joint priorities in collaboration with the CSCFSC. Looking ahead, it was suggested that the three FPT committees would be working more closely together to implement the APF and to develop a new national food policy. Finally, there would be increased activity as the new governance structure is articulated to enhance food safety policy development and link the senior policy levels with the work done in the committees.

Theme #1 – Advancing collaboration on national food safety standards, codes and recognition

Certification Systems: Alternatives for Food Safety

Presented by Don Wilson, Don Wilson & Associates

Mr. Wilson set out some of the options available to the food supply chain and individual firms vis-à-vis certification and the national or international standards system. He described in some detail the conformity assessment continuum and noted the advantages and disadvantages of approaches such as: supplier declaration of conformity, inspection, product certification, existing management systems like Quality Management Systems (QMS) and the proposed food safety

management system under the draft ISO 22000 standard. Mr. Wilson also briefly outlined the federal/ provincial/territorial recognition approach and the role that certification could have with respect to food safety auditors. In conclusion, he noted that there were a number of potentially useful options both within the international standards system and through government recognition that could provide firms along the supply chain with a means to demonstrate their conformity to food safety requirements.

Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada – A company perspective

Presented by Mr. Rob Marshall-Johns, Director of Operations, The Oppenheimer Group

Mr. Marshall-Johns quickly described the Oppenheimer Group's business as a year round marketer of fresh produce with a strong national and regional focus that involves importing and exporting over 150 fruit and vegetable commodities from over twenty countries. Food safety is a priority for the Oppenheimer Group but one that requires considerable attention and focus. Of particular concern are the different customer requirements that producers and distributors must meet. These range from regulations in every market to firm specific requirement and the third party standards that have been developed over the past decade (e.g. British Retail Consortium standard, EUREPGAP, SQF 2000, etc.). Mr. Marshall-Johns noted that the Group had found it necessary to develop its own program in order to meet these standards and that it was working with its suppliers to implement it globally. He also noted that this activity puts considerable pressure on suppliers who are experiencing multiple audits, different interpretations of standards, increased costs and confusion. In conclusion, Mr. Marshall-Johns asked a number of questions about the role of government and industry, the need for a "clearly defined and regulated standards and requirements" and the training and certification of food safety auditors.

Advancing Collaboration on National Food Safety Standards, Codes and Recognition – A government perspective

Presented by Dr. Gwen Zellen, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

To introduce the government perspective, Dr. Zellen stepped back to the late 1980's and reviewed several important initiatives – the internal trade agreement of 1989 and the "Blueprint for the Canadian Food Inspection System" (1993) – before introducing the 2002 Agriculture Policy Framework (APF). She noted that the vision set out by ministers was for an "integrated food inspection system that is responsive to both consumers and industry". Canada's food safety system is a complex combination of international standards and trade obligations,

national standards and programs, provincial and territorial standards and programs and, in some cases, municipal standards. In 1995, there were more than seventy-seven Acts regulating the production, processing and retailing of food in Canada. Governments were struggling within this heritage to redefine and improve food safety. This involved the development of the codes – where an ambitious plan foresaw the creation of a total of twenty-five. It also involved the establishment of the recognition protocols and FPT frameworks for voluntary HACCP and HACCP-based industry initiatives. Looking ahead, Dr. Zellen described a set of issues “at the end of the CFISIG era” such as: resource and funding concerns vis-à-vis legislation and the codes; governance of food safety policy; harmonization challenges across jurisdictions; equivalency concerns; treatment of imports; sharing information; acceptance of the Canadian approach by its international trading partners; fine tuning of the “bar” or standards; and the overall volume of work and expectations. Some of the answers to these challenges have been provided through the APF and the associated funding. However, considerable work remains and to accomplish it, she noted that governments and industry must “work better together to advance collaboration”.

Theme #2 – Towards National Food Safety Training Programs for Industry

Presented by Joyce Reynolds, Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association and Kevin McLeod, Alberta Health and Wellness

This joint industry/government presentation was intended to provide a case study of the development of a national standard for food safety education program for the food retail and food service sector. Ms. Reynolds and Mr. McLeod reviewed the importance of food safety education in this sector and the challenges facing it in the multiple jurisdictions where it is regulated. They indicated that there were at least two approaches open to governments. They could adopt the regulatory approach based on inspection, compliance, re-inspection/monitoring and enforcement or an educational approach which directly engaged the industry and the workers and established a mode of self-inspection and compliance. Mr. McLeod reviewed the overall educational approach and the related instructional strategies. Linkages to the Food Retail and Food Service Regulations and Code were noted, particularly, the model regulations requirement for food premises operators and the expected learning outcomes within the model code. Ms. Reynolds. Ms. Reynolds next noted the barriers to achieving national uniformity, in particular the differences in provincial and territorial requirements. For industry, these barriers present challenges in the choice of educational program, requirements for workers and managers to retrain when moving to new jurisdictions and the lack of audit capacity for industry developed training programs. The FPTCFSP had, as a result, undertaken a pilot project with these sectors to develop a national standard for the accreditation of food safety educational programs. At a later stage the project would result in the selection of an accreditation mechanism.

Breakout Group Reports and Suggested Actions

Theme 1: Advancing Collaboration on National Food Safety Standards, Codes and Recognition

In this breakout session, Government and industry participants were asked to choose from amongst three (3) sub themes. As a result there were seven subgroups or discussion tables formed. Three tackled a series of questions on National Codes, two tables discussed Recognition and Certification and the final two tables reviewed the issues and challenges surrounding food safety auditor training and certification.

National Codes

Background

The federal, provincial and territorial governments have developed with industry participation a series of national codes. These include codes for meat and poultry, horticulture, dairy, food retail and food service and commercial pre-packaged and non-pre-packaged water. In addition, a Common Legislative Base initiative has been completed. It is aimed at encouraging all jurisdictions to develop a similar legislative base for food safety and quality, thereby facilitating the adoption of harmonized regulations and standards. Amending procedures have been developed to accompany several of these initiatives.

In other countries, similar processes have been developed. For example in the United States, there is a “base” food law and a very sophisticated and inclusive decision-making process, called the Conference for Food Protection, which proposes and votes on amendments. It includes a wide range of participants - governments at all levels, industry, food safety professionals and consumer representatives. Finally, the Australian national government, states and territories and the New Zealand government have recently established a common mechanism for developing food safety policy and standards.

Report from Group 1

A number of questions were posed during discussion of national codes. For instance, what is this whole system of standards, codes and recognition? What are everybody's expectations? There was agreement that national codes and regulations must be consistent across the country. As well, their use as reference documents is critical. The new national food policy approach that is now being discussed will assist in moving in this direction. Finally, implementation codes cannot just be developed. A sound plan to ensure their implementation is critical.

In terms of action, discussion included policy decisions for implementation. One must have a focus for why this is being done. There needs to be a reaffirmation by senior

politicians, both at health and agricultural government ministries. While work can be undertaken at the bureaucratic and industry levels, without political buy-in and a commitment to supply the necessary resources, the work of bureaucrats and industry will be of little use.

The national structure should be identified and ownership clarified. The question of who owns the codes must be resolved. Theoretically, everybody, including the regulators, industry and Canadian consumers, would own the codes. These codes need to be understood to be a food safety issue and not just serve as trade documents. It is important to recognize the codes as the main focus of food safety. The dedication of resources, in particular at the government level, to assist in developing and implementing these codes is paramount.

In speaking to the issue of stakeholders, if viewed in terms of the present “people holding the pen”, the stakeholders would be coalitions of industry partners as well as any individuals with a concern, or interest, in food safety. From a food safety perspective, stakeholders would include all Canadian consumers in addition to anybody outside of Canada consuming its products.

To engage stakeholders, they must be involved at the ground level. Not only, for example, should a strong retail person be involved, but average people from the street. Further discussion will be required to determine whether this is best accomplished at a consumer association level and how to ensure that everybody is represented.

A key requirement when looking at the development of national codes is to outline who will be doing what. If there is a change of responsibility for the co-development, holding and management, everybody must know what their respective roles are. Without a clear understanding of roles, assignments will not be allocated properly.

Other issues identified were whether stakeholder responsibility would be all inclusive and the notion that politics, and political will, is very important in maintaining and ensuring that all stakeholders buy-in to this. Therefore, there needs to be political affirmation, or reaffirmation, that this is an important issue to pursue, maintain, develop and enhance. Sufficient resources to address this are vital.

Finally, it will be necessary to undertake an examination of existing mechanisms to ensure codes remain current, whether in the United States or elsewhere.

Report from Group 2

The ultimate goal is to have an outcome-based regulation and code, and these requirements code should lead all Canadians to foods produced in Canada and meet this national code. While the overarching regulations should be national, the commodity codes within the national code would be modified as required.

The food safety bar should be raised. Although some commodities already have a high level of food safety, others do not. Food safety must be consistently auditable.

Political will is required. There must be a high level of political leadership as without it there is a risk that the issue will not move forward. A synergy between industry and ministers is necessary. A national system cannot be established without interaction between these two key players.

Finally, the arena of food safety requires an equivalent process to that of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. To do so, a ministerial level committee that is able to start the process, should be formed. This needs to have its roots at a national level, not a federal, provincial or territorial level, and such a group would work together towards identifying political and industry stakeholders, creating a White Paper that would ultimately lead to the creation of a Canadian Council of Ministers of Food Safety.

Report from Group 3

Given Canada's composition in terms of its constitution, legislation and so forth, a national food safety code is undoubtedly an excellent approach for Canada.

The current process for accomplishing these codes is sound. The formula consisting of one-third federal government, one-third provincial/territorial government, one-third industry appears to be working. It is transparent and there is buy-in to the process.

However, when examining implementation some issues were identified. Much like the Codex Alimentarius Commission process, there are areas for improvement. While most would agree that the Codex process is beneficial in the way it proceeds, there are problems with implementation. Therefore, there should be an initial agreement when creating a code as to the timeline for its adoption. A code cannot be created in isolation, but needs to have an associated plan for its adoption. As well, adherence to the code must be tackled. The three separate components of the code must be addressed, that of its development, its implementation and it being undertaken in identical fashions in each jurisdiction, the latter ensuring that the codes result in the same outcome for everybody.

Although a process for amending codes does exist, many people are unaware of it while others do not have a firm grasp of all of the associated details. The amendment process must be more transparent. More people need to be involved in, and aware of, the amendment process.

In terms of action items, the federal/provincial/territorial Committee of Agriculture Ministers that currently exists should assume responsibility for starting the process of making these codes easier to execute, thus ensuring they are implemented, useful and being used. It was noted that in some cases, these codes may require some degree of involvement from Ministers of Health.

If it is the case that Canada will have these codes, then the political commitment to establish them is necessary. Once the political commitment exists, the rest will follow.

Other action items included addressing the greatest problem, that is, the equivalency between provinces/territories and resources to implement the codes. However, while inter-provincial trade should be the result of this equivalency, issues relating to trade with the United States then surface. As well, a dispute resolution mechanism is required. As an example, if someone were to consider that a particular code was not being implemented properly, a mechanism to resolve this concern must be available.

In summary, it was noted that while it was felt that the codes were on the right track, some improvement was needed in terms of implementation of the codes.

Summary of Suggested Actions Groups 1, 2 and 3

Code Development and Policy Making

- Explore other models of development for codes
- Governments should to allocate needed resources
- Get key stakeholders involved at ground level
- Ensure codes remain outcome and science based
- Food safety should be priority, as opposed to trade issues
- Establish minimum food safety standards
- Ensure consistency of code implementation (regulations) across Canada
- Ensure feasibility codes for all business sizes (micro to large)
- Explore linkage between codes and the proposed National Food Policy

Code Implementation

- Develop implementation plan (including timelines, amendment process, etc) in tandem with code development
- Further formalize the amendment process
- Ensure equivalency amongst provinces and territories
- Develop a dispute resolution process to address inappropriate application of codes

Governance and Process

- Ensure buy-in by elected officials and senior civil servants from development stage to implementation
- Consider the development of a ministerial level committee (e.g. Canadian Council of Ministers of Food Safety)
- Continue industry/government partnership
- Clarify ownership of codes, responsibilities of stakeholders and increase transparency

Recognition and Certification

Background

A federal/provincial/territorial agreement has been negotiated to provide for the recognition of the national on-farm food safety programs. This recognition involves a review of the technical soundness generic HACCP model and industry requirements (GPPs and CCPs) and an assessment of the administrative effectiveness of the management systems put in place by the national commodity group. This is to assure the continued soundness of its program, the consistent operation of its conformity assessment system and the effectiveness of its auditor training activities.

Various certification programs for food safety or HACCP systems are also being established in Canada. Some of these are private initiatives operated by auditing firms, while others are operated with some provincial government involvement (for example: by the Bureau de normalization du Québec and by the Canada General Standards Board for Ontario's "HACCP Advantage" program). There are also programs that are operated by buyers in the food chain. As well, there is an international standard for food safety management systems that is under development (ISO 22000). None of these certification programs have yet been accredited by the Standards Council of Canada.

All these approaches allow a farm or a business to demonstrate their compliance with industry requirements or "standards" in order to provide their customers with an increased assurance about food safety.

Report from Group 4

There is tremendous value in having a government system for recognition of food safety programs across the whole food continuum. Presently, a system is being established for on-farm safety recognition. This should be undertaken across the entire food chain.

Governments recognize technical soundness of on-farm programs which is tremendously valuable. There are few jurisdictions in the world where such recognition exists. Having government confirm that what is being done is technically sound is of merit.

In terms of oversight of the management system, there is definitely a role for government while the actual system, itself, could be developed by industry, private companies or national producer agencies. Ideally, recognition and certification should include involvement of a combination of government and other organizations.

Systems have to reflect risk and be outcome-based. The system that is developed must be appropriate and therefore instead of looking at questions such as the frequency of an audit, one must examine whether the system reflects the risk of the production. A low risk production could mean that a low system should be in place to demonstrate that all

the right things are being done. It might not be the case that everybody needs third party auditing. For low risk producers, a producer declaration might be all that is required.

The key is that all types of systems should be available to be recognized by government. Although a consensus was not reached as to how this should happen, the need for qualified auditors in the field was acknowledged. Some considered it necessary for these auditors to undergo standard training although others felt that it was sufficient to be outcome-based. Determining a method for achieving auditor qualification warrants further discussion.

It was noted that the systems that are developed have to be flexible, credible and outcome-based.

In terms of who will take the lead, there are leadership roles for both industry and government, depending on the specific activity. Firstly, there should be a partnership between industry and government to develop an oversight system. What should be developed should be determined during discussions between these two groups. While industry should assume the lead in creating the system, as it is industry's system, government should take the lead in the oversight mechanism. In other words, implementation would be handled by government.

With respect to engaging people, association involvement will be necessary and the right people will need to be invited to the table. In all probability, incentives will need to be provided to these individuals, and in many cases these incentives will need to be in dollars. This will result in food safety systems being implemented throughout the food chain. As an example, without the Canadian On-Farm Food Safety Program, there would be many small on-farm producers that would not have considered, nor instituted, a safety program.

Lastly, there was recognition that resources will be an issue. Does government have resources to provide on-farm and off-farm food safety recognition systems? Does industry have the resources to implement food safety systems? These questions demonstrate why it is critical to have risk-based and outcome-based systems.

Report from Group 5

A credible recognition system is underpinned by having government recognized standards that are also recognized by trading partners. A fair amount of discussion occurred regarding industry efforts to meet so many requirements and working through the certification recognition systems that exist at present. Also discussed was the importance of dealing with issues internally, nationally and extending it further into the North American environment and then more broadly to an international level. The underlying work would be to develop standards that can be accepted, that can meet minimum requirements associated with international requirements and that can be recognized in Canada by both industry and government.

A challenge in this area is the requirement for balance between specificity in these standards and sufficient flexibility to achieve outcomes. There needs to be enough specificity in order for industry to understand what is expected, as well as for government and certifying bodies to have a clear understanding of how standards will be assessed and recognized.

Discussion also focused on establishing a credible, verifiable system to ensure industry complies with the standards. The first step towards this end would be to develop minimum standards. The issue of the certification system and what is needed in this area was explored. As well, there is a need to develop national standards for auditors to provide a minimum base for competency. Finally, extension of some of these competencies to deal with specific sector issues, recognizing that there is a need for that specific exercise to have a credible recognition process in some sectors, was explored.

In terms of standards, it was stressed that standards must be science-based and risk-based. Those areas where the greatest risks exist should be emphasized. It is one matter to attempt to solve the problems internally, but an entirely different matter to extend this to the North American and international environment. Some possibilities around NAFTA elements of harmonization and looking at those being potential venues for pushing forward with mutual recognition types of approaches were explored.

Lastly, in addressing which stakeholders should have the lead, it was felt that the joint Forum provided an excellent combination of people and therefore would serve as a good venue for future action.

Summary of Suggested Actions Groups 4 and 5

Government Recognition

- Recognition should be available to all food safety programs not just on-farm programs
- Industry and governments should collaborate to develop the oversight mechanisms
- Recognition requirements must be science-based and risk-based

International Recognition

- Government and industry need to work together to ensure international acceptance/recognition of Canadian programs (e.g. Codex, NAFTA, etc)

Certification and Auditing

- Establish credible, verifiable system to ensure industry complies with standards
- Certification schemes are needed for HACCP and HACCP-based programs
- National standards are needed for auditor training and certification

Auditor Training and Auditor Certification

Background

The development of food safety management systems for almost every segment of the food chain and the introduction of HACCP requirements for federally and provincially registered establishments will create a demand for trained food safety auditors. Auditors will be required by those businesses implementing these programs and the firms providing audit and certification services and at all levels of government.

In countries that have already experienced this demand (for example: Australia and New Zealand, England, Ireland, the United States) governments and/or industry have taken steps to ensure consistency. These have included setting training criteria and establishing formal certification programs for the auditors.

In Canada, the on-farm programs have already established a training program for on-farm food safety auditors based on CFIA's HACCP training criteria and the ISO's approach to auditor training. Some Canadian food safety auditors have been certified through the systems in place in other countries.

Report from Group 6

The discussion within the group focused on certification and training of auditors and the form this would take, as well as the demand for auditors and types of criteria for certification.

The desired outcome would be a listing of items that need to occur in terms of auditor training that builds on some mechanisms already in place. A list of core competencies that are similar for all auditors should be developed. These competencies need to be defined. Additionally, there might be supplementary industry sector competencies that will differ between sectors.

After the competencies are defined, and then a mechanism must be developed to verify that the competencies are being met. As well, one must define what could be considered as equivalents. The action plan would therefore be to develop generic competencies and to then define what equivalencies can be met to meet the competencies. An organization would need to be identified that will define the latter. Once identified by a relevant organization, whether a national commodity group or service provider, it is possible to outline what additional competencies an auditor in a particular sector will require. This particular element would be built into the management system. The management function must be able to ensure that there is consistency in what the auditor is doing. Maintaining auditor uniformity stems from ensuring core competencies, equivalencies and training exists, and that the management function is in place.

There are a number of different mechanisms for this to happen, mechanisms for how auditors are trained. Auditors would be specific to particular industries and the type of experience brought to the function. For example, an individual with extensive retail experience would not be sent to conduct an on-farm audit.

In terms of establishing core competencies, it would be ideal to blend on-farm (producers and/or associations), post-farm companies and/or associations, government and registrars and/or private service providers. Representatives from these areas would work towards forming the core competencies ensuring that they are clear, distinct and flexible.

Report from Group 7

Divergent views were expressed on the need for auditors in the short-term versus long-term, as a result of sector differences.

With respect to government needs, several factors were involved, but at the core was whether the food safety program would be voluntary or mandatory. It was felt that it would be critical to have well trained auditors, acting independently, who would be able to deliver in a consistent, qualified and competent manner.

Regarding the training of food safety auditors, there should be a minimum set of requirements applicable to any individual undertaking audits. This base, or core segment, would be identical for all auditors. Depending on what was being audited, there could be supplementary requirements that the auditors would need to meet. Given the possibility that there would be different requirements, training performance would therefore be different and warrants further discussion.

In terms of the minimum training requirements, certainly there is a need for training and experience particular to each sector. As well, HACCP and general auditing principles should be incorporated.

The importance of auditor certification will vary as each sector has its own distinct needs. At a general level, there is a need for consistency and reasonable costs related to certification. The more diverse a sector, the more costly the system can be for the sector. Consistency should be examined from an accommodation perspective and level within the supply chain. All sides of the equation must be reviewed, including vertically and horizontally. For instance, at the on-farm level from one sector or one commodity there needs to be uniformity applied. Furthermore, from the on-farm sector up through the distribution level there needs to be audit consistency.

In discussing priorities, several questions were posed. With what should we start? Is there a need to examine auditing certification? Is there a need to examine audit training? Firstly, auditor requirements must be set. Once this has been established other steps would follow. Commodity and industry groups should work towards defining the parameters for auditors who will be auditing their programs. Input from

federal, provincial and territorial governments relating to what would be required is also needed.

Attention should be paid to the needs of those tackling multiple commodities or industry sectors.

Lastly, actions related to auditor training and certification should be lead by commodity groups and industry associations with partners from the federal/provincial/territorial committees. There is value in examining what others are involved in, and planning, and experience is gained from discussions related to the activities of different sectors.

Summary of Suggested Actions Groups 6 and 7

Ensuring a trained supply of qualified food safety auditors

- Core competencies for auditors need to be developed for all sectors along the food chain
- Credentialing for multi-sector or multi-commodity food safety auditors should be available
- Methods for determining equivalency need to be identified
- Cost effective auditor training capacity has to be developed
- Government oversight should be explored by FPT committees

Ensuring credible audits

- Mechanisms to ensure consistency of audits within sectors and along the food chain need to be explored
- Audit consistency should be linked to government recognition

Theme 2: Towards National Food Safety Training Programs for Industry

Background

The presentation provided an overview of the importance of food safety education for food handlers and their managers in the food service and retail sectors, what are the challenges in achieving uniformity across the country, and how the Sub-committee on Food Retail/Foodservice Food Safety Education is addressing these challenges. The purpose of the break-out session was to discuss these issues in more detail, not only in the food retail/food service sector, but also in other areas of interest (e.g., other sectors of the food continuum, specific commodity groups, etc.).

Report from Group 8

There are different sectors along the food chain, such as farms, processors, retail and food service. These three areas were explored resulting in recognition that in each there are unique concerns.

Regardless of the type of training that is required, it must be recognized and transferable right across Canada. Training needs to be portable and flexible. There needs to be affordability from an industry and administration standpoint.

Training must also be accessible; that is both by language and also geographically, such as to, and in, remote areas. Training has to be able to reach all geographic areas to ensure that people are able to benefit from the standardization of some form of training in each of the three identified areas.

With respect to retail food services, there is an established entity already working with the Food Retail and Food Services Regulation and Code. The group examines how the sector can establish a program that will meet the needs of food safety within restaurants and grocery stores.

Two options for the retail and food services sector were identified. The first possibility was the creation of a national exam for food safety standards within these two industries. Linked to this could be a centrally located and marketed national registry of those who have passed the exam. Secondly, there could be a body that evaluates existing programs to ascertain whether they would qualify to meet standards.

Further discussion focused on training versus certification. While it might be reasonable to require that owners, managers and others in similar positions achieve certification, others, such as the hostess at a restaurant, or the teller at the cash register at the grocery store, might not need to have a certificate confirming course or training completion.

There was agreement that there are some areas where certification is warranted while in others areas it is not. For example, many larger companies have established standard operating procedures that their employees must follow or training that must be successfully completed. A significant amount of time and resources have been put toward this effort and these operating procedures do usually include a food safety component.

For the processing and farm sectors, the recommendation would be to create similar bodies to that found in the restaurant and grocery sectors. These bodies would assume responsibility for analyzing their respective sectors. The processing sector, it was noted, should examine HACCP-based programs and determine how food safety training would fit into a HACCP program and whether there were other options. With respect to the farm to fork continuum, there are different issues to be addressed. Those with expertise in this field should be brought together. It was proposed that it would not be appropriate to develop one broad food safety exam encompassing all the sectors involved; however, all sectors could evaluate.

A strong recommendation emanating from discussions, and a significant long-term goal, would be food safety education at the high school level. It would be of great benefit to bring awareness of issues such as hand washing and cross contaminations at an early stage. Individuals should learn about these life skills prior to entering the workforce or post-secondary institutions. Ideally, all individuals should be attuned to food safety, not just those who are involved in college programs relating to the hospitality sector or find themselves working, as an example, in a restaurant.

Summary of Suggested Actions Group 8

National Food Safety Training

- Government agreement is required to ensure that food safety training will be nationally recognized, portable, accessible and affordable
- National exams and registries need to be explored and developed

Development of Training Programs

- All segments of the food chain should explore training requirements
- Process used in retail and food service pilot is a good model for the food chain
- Needs assessments should be used to tailor requirements
- Linkages to HACCP-based programs need to be explored
- Existing programs need to be evaluated and recognized if equivalent

Consumer Food Safety Education

- Food safety education in secondary schools should be increased significantly to ensure a more knowledgeable workforce

Plenary Feedback

After the reports of the breakout session groups, an opportunity was provided to all the participants to comment on the issues raised and the suggestions made. The following comments were made by individuals either to introduce new ideas or to support suggestions or points that had been made during the group sessions or reports:

- ✦ During discussions held by one of the groups tasked with addressing national codes, it was noted that significant dialogue had focused in the area of voluntary versus mandatory standards and the advantages/disadvantages of each approach. It was felt that this issue needed to be part of any discussion related to integrating food safety systems in Canada. The differences, both in process and in outcome, of using each approach must be identified and clearly understood.
- ✦ It was noted that it should be stressed that industry is very much engaged in this effort and key players are assisting in moving efforts forward on a timetable determined by industry. Leaders in this venture are innovative and willing to take responsibility for bringing forward new ideas. Generally, food safety issues are being driven by these “big” players, the result of which has advanced Canada as far as it now is. While industry is moving to its own time, government tends to be perceived as somewhat out of tune, or perhaps even behind what is needed. The key is that both elements have to be present. Industry and government must work together on this issue. One sector cannot address this issue in isolation. The primary message that must be put forward is that industry is not going to stop. Industry will continue to move forward, but government needs to move with the industry. This issue of timing needs to be discussed in greater detail and efforts made to ensure that industry and government are in synchronization.
- ✦ Significant discussion for one of the groups related to codes being model regulations and interpretive guidelines and about their implementation and difficulty in working through these issues. It was agreed that these codes need to be science-based. The entire issue of trade should be dealt with separately. This separation of science and trade concerns was an issue that resonated throughout the discussion.
- ✦ With respect to government involvement in the process and roadblocks, there are a lot of associations that have undertaken a great deal of hard work in terms of voluntary codes. The technical review process is seen as very beneficial. If the government can ensure that resources are in place to continue that involvement, as well as having resources in place for an actual recognition process for some of the standards, that would be ideal. There are a number of associations both on-farm and post-farm that want to look at the next implementation phase. For many, there is a lot of one-on-one work that has to be done with members who want to move forward. However, part of being able to access government funding is the requirement that the recognition process must be completed. As a result, there is frustration, from the perspective of being able to get into the “nitty-gritty”

of the implementation stage, in having to wait for the recognition. There are many things that can help in moving the implementation stage forward. A critical component is to make sure that the momentum continues, resulting in being able to reach the implementation phase.

Concluding Remarks

Dr. Anne MacKenzie, Co-Chair of FPTAFIC and Associate Vice-President of Science Evaluation, CFIA provided the closing remarks for the forum. She noted that this was the first government/industry event of this nature, an experiment in both dialogue and the exploration of common concerns. As such, the FPT committees and the Coalition had taken a risk in deciding to hold it. However, the risk had been well worth it and the results were a clear demonstration of what could be achieved. Dr. MacKenzie noted that it had not been a day for decision-making as the participants were not authorized to make decisions. Yet, it had been a good day for sketching directions and the results would be seriously considered by the FPT committees and the Coalition. Dr. MacKenzie thanked all the presenters and all the participants and ventured, in closing, to suggest that there would be a second government/industry forum to follow this first.

Appendices

Questions for the Breakout Sessions

The following questions were developed by the Forum planning committee and circulated to registered participants in advance of the Forum to stimulate discussion in the breakout sessions.

Questions for Breakout Session on Theme #1: National Codes, Recognition and Auditing

A. Tables discussing National Codes

Questions for Discussion

1. As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, what expectations does your sector or government have of the national codes? How well are the codes understood? What factors influence your expectations? Have these been realized? What can be done?
2. What role do you see for the national codes in the future? How does the development of recognized national and auditable HACCP or HACCP-based programs for each segment of the food chain fit in with the national code approach?
3. Food safety policy and regulatory requirements have not been harmonized across the country. What are the impediments to harmonization? What measures could governments and industry take together to overcome these impediments?
4. Some of the codes have amendment processes. Are these working? What options or alternatives might be considered to the current processes? Would the American model of a regular conference work in Canada? What about the Australian approach discussed this morning?

For the Report

5. What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada's approach to national code development and implementation? For the development of national industry programs?
6. Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing the proposals discussed today? How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion? What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

B. Tables discussing Recognition & Certification Issues

Questions For Discussion

1. Looking at your segment of the food industry, which approach do you think will best suit it:
 - official government recognition of the industry run national program?
 - access to a private certification scheme?
 - use of an ISO standard for food safety management systems?
 - a combination of approaches?
2. As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, do you believe that the federal/provincial/territorial recognition program should be open to the national industry food safety programs outside the farm sector? What are the potential advantages and disadvantages, if any, of doing this?
3. What expectations should the food supply chain and regulators have for those businesses that provide food safety certification or food safety auditing? What can be done to ensure these expectations are met?
4. Canada does not currently have any “rules” in place respecting food safety (or HACCP) certification or auditing. What priority should be given to a discussion of these “rules”?

Questions for the Report

5. What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada’s approach to food safety program recognition and/or certification?
6. Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing a Canadian approach to food safety certification? How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion? What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

C. Tables discussing Auditor Training & Auditor Certification Issues

Questions for Discussion:

1. What need do you expect Canadian food businesses to have for food safety auditors over the next 2 to 5 years? Will it be significant or marginal? Will there be demand for internal or staff food safety auditors? What will the demand be for external or third party auditors? What will government’s needs be?
2. As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, what expectations do you have concerning the training of food safety auditors?

-
3. Some food safety auditors will be auditing HACCP-based programs or auditing previously recognized HACCP plans in facilities. Others will be asked to review and “approve” a HACCP program and then audit it (e.g. under Ontario’s HACCP Advantage program or under the proposed ISO 22000 food safety management system). What differences, if any, should there be in the training requirements for these types of auditors or for auditors working with different segments of the chain? What, if any, issues may arise from having different training requirements?
 4. As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, how important is auditor certification to your business, customers or government?
 5. What priority should the food supply chain and governments put on dealing with the issues of auditor training, auditor certification, etc?

For Report

6. What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada’s approach to ensuring a trained supply of qualified food safety auditors?
7. Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing a Canadian approach to food safety auditor training, auditor certification, etc.? How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion? What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

Questions for the break-out session on Theme # 2: Towards national food safety training programs for industry

Questions for discussion:

1. What are the challenges with food safety education in your area of interest?

Area:

Challenges:

2. What are the potential solutions to overcome these challenges?
3. Are there mandatory food safety education programs in your area of interest?

Area:

Yes (which ones)/No:

4. Would a national standard for food safety education be beneficial in your area of interest?

Area:

Yes (why)/No (why not):

5. What would be the limitations (e.g., jurisdictional, structural...) to achieving a national food safety education standard that would be applicable in your area of interest?

Area:

Limitations:

6. What are potential solutions to overcome the limitations identified in (5)?

Area:

Potential solutions:

7. Are you aware of other initiatives in your area of interest that have the same aim as that of the Sub-committee on Food Retail/Food Services Food Safety Education (i.e. to develop a national standard for the accreditation of food safety education programs)?

Area:

Initiatives:

8. Could the initiative of the above-noted Sub-committee be used as a model in your area of interest?

Area:

Yes (why) / No (why not):

For the report:

9. What should be included on a short list of recommended actions for advancing national food safety training programs for industry?
10. Which stakeholders should have the lead in following up on these recommended actions? How can these stakeholders be engaged in further discussions?

Notes from the Breakout Sessions

Advancing Collaboration on National Food Safety Standards, Codes and Recognition

Group 1 - National Codes

As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, what expectations does your sector or government have of the national codes?

- ✦ Benchmarks
- ✦ Consistency throughout the country
- ✦ National food policy
- ✦ Reference documents = policy with political will
- ✦ Implementation in a timely fashion
- ✦ Scientifically valid and contemporary

How well are the codes understood?

- ✦ “No”, some confusion for small businesses
- ✦ National versus federal
- ✦ Concerns about awareness of politicians (only interested if there is a problem...)
- ✦ Lack of awareness for store keepers
- ✦ Approach is outcome-based regulations complemented by descriptive guidelines
- ✦ Lots of interpretation
- ✦ Different provincial interpretations
- ✦ Detail versus latitude
- ✦ Consistency flexibility
- ✦ Industry preference for prescriptive
- ✦ Lawyers and legal system

What factors influence your expectations?

- ✦ Inter-provincial trade
- ✦ Enhanced uniformity across the country
- ✦ Same rules leads to bilateral agreements
- ✦ Timing
- ✦ Renewal of food safety systems in the jurisdictions

Have these been realized?

- ✦ Shared jurisdiction
- ✦ Why not?

-
- ✦ Need to satisfy all stakeholders (small and large)
 - ✦ Rural/urban
 - ✦ Infrastructure and resources
 - ✦ Liability
 - ✦ Realized in some parts of the country (British Columbia, Alberta) but uniformly
 - ✦ Not mandatory to implement

What can be done (improved)?

- ✦ Recognition from respected body (for example: CFIA) → government oversight
- ✦ Full-time secretariat
- ✦ Ownership of responsibility
- ✦ Dedication of resources
- ✦ Need to be realistic
- ✦ Reasonable objectives
- ✦ Who fosters continuity of regulation
- ✦ More formalized amendment process
- ✦ Change the political governance, structure, for example: Australia, New Zealand
- ✦ Industry needs to talk with elected officials, lobbying
- ✦ Regulations that are reasonable for industry (all groups – small, large)

What role do you see for the national codes in the future?

- ✦ “Steer” the course
- ✦ National food safety standards → becomes national regulations
- ✦ Full-time secretariat
- ✦ Dedication of resources

How does the development of a recognized national and auditable HACCP or HACCP-based programs for each segment of the food chain fit in with the national code approach?

- ✦ Cross-referenced
- ✦ National recognition

Food safety policy and regulatory requirements have not been harmonized across the country. What are the impediments to harmonization?

- ✦ Reality
 - ✦ Priorities in implementation
 - ✦ Need for systematic risk assessment
 - ✦ Politics, political will
 - ✦ Different frameworks
 - ✦ Multi-jurisdictional responsibilities and authority
 - ✦ Resources
 - ✦ Legal drafting
-

- ✦ Liability in law, that is: regulatory

What measures could governments and industry take together to overcome these impediments?

- ✦ “Building code” approach
- ✦ Examine other models, codes
- ✦ Apply needed resources
- ✦ Lobby for science-based
- ✦ Keep trade issues separate (as much as possible)
- ✦ Prioritize food safety
- ✦ Establish minimum standards (in interest of who?)
 - Canadians
 - Other

Some of the codes have amendment processes. Are these working?

- ✦ No – overly technical, too bureaucratic

What options or alternatives might be considered to the current processes?

- ✦ See “building code” model
- ✦ Need central oversight
- ✦ Resources
- ✦ Clearly identified ownership and management structure
- ✦ Terms of reference

Would the American model of a regular conference work in Canada?

- ✦ (Open, exhaustive process)
- ✦ Conference for food protection
- ✦ Industry-government meeting helpful

What about the Australian approach discussed this morning?

- ✦ Concern regarding constitution structure
- ✦ Should be examined as an option
- ✦ Administration
- ✦ FSANZ ↔ Council of Ministers
Decisions

What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada’s approach to national code development and implementation?

- ✦ Policy decisions for implementation

- ✦ Reaffirmation by senior politicians (Health and Agriculture)
- ✦ Identify national structure of responsibility, clarify ownership
- ✦ Dedicated resources, government!

For the development of national industry programs?

- ✦ Process in place to ensure use of codes.

Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing the proposals discussed today?

- ✦ CFIA, F/P/T, AAFC, HC
- ✦ Coalition of industry partners
- ✦ Everybody with concern or interest

How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion?

- ✦ Get key stakeholders involved at ground level
- ✦ Responsibility needs to be assigned first

What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

- ✦ Not inclusive, overtaken by other issues
- ✦ Power politics

Group 2 - National Codes

Regulatory – outcome-based regulation with interpretive code also with (voluntary – non-regulatory*) outcome-based requirements leading to all Canadians having access to all foods produced in Canada created in conformance with this national code.

*Discussion of pros and cons of voluntary versus regulatory approach (cross jurisdictions, cop versus helper, opportunities for improvement versus violation, etcetera).

Overarching national regulation with commodity-based codes.

Raise the food safety bar so that all commodities will be at the same level and be uniformly auditable to the code.

High level political leadership and will.

Subsequent process resources.

Need a synergy between industry and minister.

Federal/Provincial/Territorial Food Safety Committee ministerial level (same idea as CCME) identify:

- ✦ Political stakeholders,

- ✦ Industry stakeholders,
- ✦ Consumer stakeholders.

White Paper at F/P/T level.

Group 3 - National Codes

Requirements:

- ✦ Increased transparency of process
- ✦ Partners (industry and governments) on development and ongoing amendments
- ✦ Facilitate trade (inter-provincial)
- ✦ Process for development good (one-third government, one-third provincial/territorial, one-third industry)

Areas for improvement:

- ✦ Adoption timeline
- ✦ Equivalency code
- ✦ Increased transparency of amendment process

Action List:

- ✦ Leaders – F/P/T Agriculture Ministers
- ✦ Leaders – Ministers of Health involvement
- ✦ Resource commitments → need a crisis...?
- ✦ Implementation issues:
 - Equivalency between provinces
 - Resources
 - Dispute resolution
 - International equivalency with United States

Group 4 - Recognition and Certification

What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada's approach to food safety program recognition and/or certification?

- ✦ Government recognition across food continuum
 - Technical soundness
 - Oversight of management systems (who = NPO, private)
- ✦ Systems have to reflect risk and be outcome-based
- ✦ Auditors should be qualified

Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing a Canadian approach to food safety certification?

- ✦ Partnership (industry/government) (oversight development)
- ✦ Industry – system development
- ✦ Government

- Technical review
- Management system oversight

How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion?

- ✚ Invite them
- ✚ Provide incentives (\$)

Group 5 - Recognition and Certification

- ✚ Need government recognized standards accepted by trading partners within and outside Canada.
- ✚ Need credible system to certify that industry complies with standard.
- ✚ First step: National government recognized minimum standards to act as base for all commodities → specific sector standard/needs.
- ✚ National accredited auditor standards minimum as a base.
→ Specific sector accreditation and audit procedures.
- ✚ Minimum standards must be science-based/risk assessment-based.
- ✚ International accreditation and audit against Canadian sector standards.
- ✚ National minimum standards and accreditation.
- ✚ Starting point CODEX general principles for food hygiene.
- ✚ Industry/government (federal and provincial/territorial). This group? CFISIG?
- ✚ Sector specific industry/government → different stakeholders.
- ✚ Market driven.

Group 6 - Auditor Training and Auditor Certification

What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada's approach to ensuring a trained supply of qualified food safety auditors?

- ✚ Develop a list of competencies
- ✚ Core and industry specific
- ✚ Mechanism to prove these competencies are met – equivalencies
- ✚ Link to recognition programs

Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing a Canadian approach to food safety auditor training, auditor certification, etcetera? How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion? What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

- ✚ Ideally: One stakeholder group
 - On farm
 - Post farm
 - Government
 - Registrars
 - Associations

- Companies
- ✦ Develop core competencies for all sectors

Group 7 - Auditor Training and Auditor Certification

What need do you expect Canadian food businesses to have for food safety auditors over the next two to five years? Will it be significant or marginal? Will there be demand for internal or staff food safety auditors? What will the demand be for external or third party auditors? What will government's needs be?

- ✦ Significance of need varies with sector (for example on-farm → significant needed, retail → marginal)
- ✦ There will be demand for both (internal and external)
- ✦ Government needs vary depending on whether the food safety program is voluntary or mandatory. In all situations there is a need for well-trained, consistent, qualified, independent, competent auditors
- ✦ Government would need, for voluntary industry program, to provide oversight to ensure program is delivered effectively

As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, what expectations do you have concerning the training of food safety auditors?

- ✦ Training on minimum requirements (same for every audit)
- ✦ Risk of increased costs if training requirements are required for auditors that have experience in auditing but are required to take courses and pass exams
- ✦ Different training requirements may apply for internal audit and external audit

Some food safety auditors will be auditing HACCP-based programs or auditing previously recognized HACCP plans in facilities. Others will be asked to review and "approve" a HACCP program and then audit it (e.g. under Ontario's HACCP Advantage program or under the proposed ISO 22000 food safety management system). What differences, if any, should there be in the training requirements for these types of auditors or for auditors working with different segments of the chain? What, if any, issues may arise from having different training requirements?

- ✦ We need to identify the requirements of the management system for food safety programs within the recognition process
- ✦ Minimum training requirements:
 - Training and experience in sector (specific)
 - Training and experience in HACCP
 - Training and experience in auditing principles

As a supplier, customer or regulator along the food chain, how important is auditor certification to your business, customers or government?

- ✦ Varies upon sector
- ✦ Need for consistency
- ✦ Cost (how much \$ we are ready to “spend”)
- ✦ Consistency needs to be looked at from one commodity to another/from one level of the distribution chain to another

What priority should the food supply chain and governments put on dealing with the issues of auditor training, auditor certification, etcetera?

- ✦ Auditor requirements (needs to be discussed now to be ready for when we need it)

What should be included on a short list of actions for advancing Canada’s approach to ensuring a trained supply of qualified food safety auditors?

- ✦ Commodity and industry groups working at food safety program recognition should define the parameters required for auditors to “audit” their customized programs
- ✦ Get input from federal/provincial/territorial government/committee on what would be required for auditor’s training program
- ✦ Look at needs of those that handle multiple commodities (and would require multi-audits or auditors that have multiple experience/credentials)

Which stakeholders should have the lead in developing a Canadian approach to food safety auditor training, auditor certification, etcetera? How can the necessary stakeholders be engaged in this discussion? What are the potential issues that may arise with that particular stakeholder leading?

- ✦ Lead by multi-commodity with partnership with F/P/T covering value chain

Towards National Food Safety Training Programs for Industry

Group 8

What are the challenges with food safety education in your area of interest?

- ✦ Certification } handler level - FRFS
- ✦ Program approval } handler level - FRFS
- ✦ Criteria }
- ✦ High percentage turnover }
- ✦ Different provincial/territorial requirements
- ✦ Lack of single (national) outcome based exam
- ✦ Language barriers
- ✦ Different educational levels
- ✦ Management buy-in

- ✦ Lack of legislation
- ✦ Different legislation in provinces/territories
- ✦ Affordability and accessibility
- ✦ Geographic dispersion
- ✦ Advertising network is vast and issues – no single source database of food-related companies in Canada
- ✦ Skill set of trainers is a challenge
- ✦ Technical transfer → of research results to industry for their use
- ✦ Blanket training

Public Health Inspection

- ✦ Food safety education programs are designed for FRFS and when beyond it → they take program FRFS and modify it for commodity groups
→ not the best way
→ different processes, therefore cannot address the unique food safety concerns of that group

What are the potential solutions to overcome these challenges?

Solution: Outcome based exam

Recommendation: including core questions and commodity/industry specific questions
→ the exam is nationally recognized and each commodity group would have input into questions based on HACCP

Recommendation: Education in school system (long-term goal)

Needed conditions in place – legislated mandatory training

Recommendation: → regulators need to ensure it is implementable and agreement on what programs are nationally
→ affordable and accessible
→ given that not all training is regulated in all sectors

Blanket training → Do needs assessment to tailor education towards that group

Are there mandatory food safety education programs in your area of interest?

Provincially inspected food processing:	No
Food commodity:	No
Nova Scotia – FRFS:	Some mandatory
Retail level in Ontario:	Mandatory to provide training and not mandatory to take it through health unit

What should be included on a short list of recommended actions for advancing national food safety training programs for industry?

- ✦ Commodity group should link with government regulatory with that

Other

Solution: Type of training is related to the risk within the continuum
→ Sector specific

Recommendation: Utilize GMP approach within HACCP model → on a generic basis can obtain industry requirements

Solution (Action): In certification situation nationally accepted exam – based pulling from questions – bank covering all concerns in code, all could teach to
Covering all learning outcomes in code
Provincial registry
Canadian firearm course; example of national exam
National exam, but demonstrate course completion
Program, then national exam
(Registry of approved certification courses, then exam)
National exam is an entry and not geared towards specific commodity group

Theme

- ✦ Avoid duplication
- ✦ What you learn should be transferable
- ✦ Training – flexible and affordable, accessible

Action

- ✦ Commodity group revisit HACCP-based program to determine if their training component meets food safety needs of their commodity, to be more formalized

Action (Recommendation)

- ✦ Produce template (commodity specific) for each commodity to fill in to create a framework for ultimate program
→ to create commodity specific program

Biographies

Bob Boyd

Dr. Boyd, Chief Medical Advisor for Food Standards Australia New Zealand, is a public health medicine specialist and a Fellow of the Royal Australasian College of Medical Administrators. Based in the Wellington office of FSANZ, he provides medical input into all aspects of food standards work across both countries.

After nearly a quarter of a century in senior positions with the NZ Ministry of Health, Bob says his appetite for food regulation was whetted when he led the Health team to combine with staff from the Ministry of Agriculture to form the NZ Food Safety Authority in 2002.

Melanie Fisher

Melanie Fisher is the General Manager, Food Standards (Canberra) Branch in Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ). She has extensive experience at senior levels in the Australian Government covering a range of subjects including environmental and resource management, primary industries and structural adjustment, and scientific analyses to support agricultural, fisheries and forestry policy development.

Prior to joining FSANZ she was the Deputy Executive Director of the Australian Government's Bureau of Rural Science where her responsibilities included developing social science methods and analyses relevant to primary production sectors and their supporting communities; and overseeing drought assessments and management, fisheries assessments and forests resource analyses and assessments.

Melanie has qualifications in psychology and public policy and has published in the areas of public policy approaches to drought, risk perception and communication and public policy theory.

Rob Marshall-Johns

Rob Marshall-Johns is responsible for all The Oppenheimer Group's quality control and operations systems and initiatives. He joined Oppenheimer in 1992 as technical services manager, bringing a strong background of quality control, as he previously worked for the New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board. Rob's technical and operational expertise in the agriculture business has been crucial in establishing Oppenheimer's Food Safety and Security Program. He also helped design and develop the technical grade and quality standards manuals for the organization's products around the world. In 1995, Rob became general manager of quality control and operations and took on the role of director in 1999.

In 2003, Rob represented The Oppenheimer Group as he addressed a U.S. congressional sub-committee hearing, exploring the need for federal regulations to ensure port security. He spoke about the organization's food safety and security protocols, cargo identification and screening, transportation security, advance transmission of cargo information and provided recommendations to the committee on its behalf. Rob has been a sitting member of the United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association's (USA) International Trade Council since January of 2003.

Kevin McLeod

Kevin McLeod is employed with Alberta Health and Wellness as the Senior Team Leader of Environmental Public Health within the Disease Control and Prevention Branch. Prior to this, Kevin, was the Director of an Environmental Health program for a rural health jurisdiction implementing programs and activities dedicated to the administration of the Public Health Act and the protection of public health.

Kevin is also an Adjunct Professor with Concordia University College in Edmonton providing a course of instruction in Population Health Promotion and Education.

Joyce M. Reynolds

Joyce Reynolds, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs of the Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association, is responsible for creating a more favourable business environment for Canada's \$43 billion foodservice industry through advocacy on key federal and provincial issues such as payroll taxes, employment standards, labour legislation, training, food safety and nutrition. Joyce is responsible for assisting the foodservice industry to meet its commitment to protect the health of Canadians and has spear-headed the development of CRFA's National Food Safety Training Program (NFSTP). In addition, she is responsible for and works closely with CRFA's "Restaurant Caucus" made up of federal Members of Parliament.

She is staff advisor to the association's Government Affairs: Federal Committee, Human Resources Advisory Committee, and Food Safety Advisory Committee. Reynolds is also a Vice-Chair, Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

Since joining CRFA in 1979, Joyce has been Director of Education, administering a national seminar program attracting 2,000-3,000 participants annually, and Executive Director of the Canadian Hospitality Foundation. After successfully restructuring the Foundation, Joyce was appointed Director of Human Resources. In 2001, she was promoted to her current position of Senior Vice President of Government Affairs.

Prior to joining CRFA, Joyce studied Hotel and Food Administration at the University of Guelph, where she received her Bachelor of Commerce degree. She is the author of numerous training manuals and articles including Safety Manual for Canada's Foodservice Industry and the Responsible Service of Alcoholic Beverages.

CRFA is Canada's largest hospitality association with 17,000 members representing restaurants, bars, hotels, caterers, institutions, educators and foodservice suppliers. CRFA's mission is to create a favourable business environment and deliver tangible benefits to its members in all sectors of Canada's foodservice industry.

Gwen Zellen

Graduated from Ontario Veterinary College and then did a Masters of Science and a Diploma in pathology to further develop expertise in Poultry virology and pathology fields. Worked as a Poultry and Fur-Bearing Animal Pathologist with OMAFRA in 1984 and since that time became the Laboratory Head of the Guelph Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory.

Carried on with technical training and obtained a Masters of Business Administration from Wilfrid Laurier University in 1995.

Has held a variety of Director level positions in OMAFRA including Leadership and Organization Development, Field Services, Business Development; Education Research and Laboratories, Food Inspection.

Currently, Director of Food Safety Policy Branch leading implementation of a multi-ministry process to improve Ontario's food safety system and actively involved with various national federal/provincial/territorial committees with a link to food safety.

Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group

In 1994, Federal/Provincial/Territorial Agriculture Ministers endorsed the Blueprint for the Canadian Food Inspection System, which outlined the need for, and a vision of, an integrated food inspection system responsive both to consumers and to industry. The Blueprint was subsequently agreed to by Health Ministers. In that same year, the Canadian Food Inspection System Implementation Group was created and mandated by Agriculture Ministers to implement the Blueprint. This group provides a coordinated federal/provincial/ territorial approach to advance food safety in Canada and develops model regulations and codes in support of the integrated food inspection system.

F/P/T Agri-Food Inspection Committee

Mandated by F/P/T Agriculture Ministers in 1989, the F/P/T Agri-Food Inspection Committee (FPTAFIC) works to resolve technical, inspection and implementation issues with respect to agricultural inputs, agri-food inspection, and plant and animal health from farm to table. The Committee is also responsible for dealing with technical barriers to trade under the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Agreement on Internal Trade and strives to “bridge the gap” between science and policy by providing science-based advice/information to policy makers.

F/P/T Committee on Food Safety Policy

Mandated by Health Canada in 1986, the F/P/T Committee on Food Safety Policy (FPTCFSP) assists Health Canada in its development of food safety standards and policies within a public health context and is a key advisory group to Health Canada. The committee also develops integrated policy implementation strategies (e.g. unpasteurized juice, sprouts, labelling of raw meat).

Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition was formed in December 2000 by national associations representing all segments of the food chain from input suppliers through primary production, processing, manufacturing, transportation, distribution to final marketing at retail or in food service. It is a unique organization that is open to all national, provincial and local industry associations with an interest in food safety.

Forum Participants

Industry Association Participants

Tracey L. McGrath
Animal Nutrition Association of Canada

Bruce M. Fortin
Association of Supervisors of Public Health Inspectors of Ontario

Carole Fortin
Association québécoise de la distribution des fruits et légumes

Tracey Firth
Canadian Animal Health Institute

Victoria Sikur
Canadian Broiler Hatching Marketing Agency

Susan E. MacInnes
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors

Bryan D. Walton
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors

Jackie H. Crichton
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors

Alan Grant
Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors

Heather Holland
Canadian Federation of Agriculture

Heather Gale
Canadian Horticultural Council

William Stevens
Canadian Mushroom Growers' Association

Catherine Scovil
Canadian Pork Council

Wendell Joyce
Canadian Poultry and Egg Processors Council

David A. Dempster
Canadian Produce Marketing Association

Marie-Claude Thibault
Canadian Produce Marketing Association

Joyce Reynolds
Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association

Dale F. Adolphe
Canadian Seed Growers Association

Jim McCullagh
Canadian Seed Institute

Albert Chambers
Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

Steve D. Leech
Chicken Farmers of Canada

Charles D. Milne
CropLife Canada

Ian J. Anderson
Fisheries Council of Canada

Kristina Fixter
Food and Consumer Products Manufacturers of Canada

Robert DeValk
Further Poultry Processors Association of Canada

Keith Mussar
I.E. Canada

Gerry Walker Ontario
Tender Fruit Producers' Marketing Board

Other Industry Participants

Marie-Josée Forest
Canada Bread Company

Peggy LeSueur
Canadian Research Institute for Food Safety

Laura Anderson
Canadian Grain Commission

Donald W. Wilson
Don Wilson & Associates

Frank J. Schreurs
Guelph Food Technology Centre Director

Dan Corbett
National Quality Institute

Jyoti M. Sahasrabudhe
Sahasrabudhe & Associates Inc.

Paul D. Valder
The Steritech Group, Corp.

Rob Marshall-Johns
The Oppenheimer Group

Jim G. Kostuch
TrainCan, Inc.

Federal Government Participants

Wendy Hillier
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada

Bobby Matheson
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada

Janice L. Pemberton
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada

Nathalie Durand
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Danielle Karamchandani
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Dan Lutz
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Colleen Griffin
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Christianne Ranger
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Bernice Losier
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Anne MacKenzie
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Greg Orriss
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Louise J. Sharpe
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Stephen J. Stephen
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Diane Taylor
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Kristine Stolarik
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Emile P. Lebel
Canadian Forces Personnel Agency

Andy Teliszewsky
Health Canada

Paul Mayers
Health Canada

Lucie Olson
Health Canada

Kheng Tan
Health Canada

Mark Samadhin
Health Canada

Marie-Claude Tardif
Health Canada

Anne-Marie St-Laurent
Health Canada

Provincial/Territorial Participants

Cornelia M.A. Kreplin
Alberta Agriculture, Food and Rural Development

Kevin R. McLeod
Alberta Health and Wellness

Bruce M. Fortin
Association of Supervisors of Public Health Inspectors of Ontario

Larry D. Copeland
BC Centre for Disease Control

Robert J. Prins
BC Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Craig P. Nowakowski
Government of the Northwest Territories

Eric W. Bergsma
Government of Yukon

Peter W. Willmott
Halton Region Health Department

Nelson Bowley
Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives

James P. Drew
Manitoba Health

Mark Durkee
Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture and Fisheries

James P. McCorry
Nova Scotia Department of Health

Thomas Baker
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

Lindsay J. Arthur
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

Gwen Zellen
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

Andrea Martin
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

Joseph M. Bradley
PEI Department of Health and Social Services

Lucile Giguère
Quebec Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

Daniel Tremblay
Quebec Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food

Mitchell J. Demyen
Saskatchewan Agriculture, Food and Rural Revitalization

Louis J. Corkery S
Saskatchewan Health

Kevin L. Bowers
Yukon Agriculture Branch

International Participants

Bob Boyd
Food Standards Australia New Zealand

Melanie Fisher
Food Standards Australia New Zealand