



CANADIAN SUPPLY CHAIN FOOD SAFETY COALITION

COALITION CANADIENNE DE LA FILIÈRE ALIMENTAIRE POUR LA SALUBRITÉ DES ALIMENTS

**Food Safety Auditor Qualifications and Competencies Project
Dialogue on a Canadian Approach
(AAFC SYSD-027-CSCFSC)**

**Final Project Report
30 July 2012
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada**

Table of Contents

- 1.0 Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition**
- 2.0 Project Background**
- 3.0 Project Objective**
- 4.0 Project Process**
- 5.0 Activity 1 – Shaping the Dialogue**
 - Project Definition**
 - Administration**
- 6.0 Activity 2 – Informing the Dialogue**
 - Background Research**
 - Monitoring International Initiatives**
- 7.0 Activity 3 – The Dialogue**
 - Workshop #1 – 17 January 2012**
 - Workshop #2 – 13 March 2012**
- 8.0 Activity 4 – Validating the Consensus**
 - Consensus Statement**
 - Validation Process**
- 9.0 Activity 5 - Communicating**
- 10.0 A Canadian Approach - Next Steps**
- 11.0 Annex - Workshop Participants**
 - 1st Workshop**
 - 2nd Workshop**

1.0 Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition

The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition was formed in December 2000 and incorporated in 2007 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.

Our Vision: Canada's agriculture, fisheries and food industry will have a world-class reputation for producing and selling safe food.

Our Mission: The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition will facilitate, through dialogue within the food industry and with all levels of government, the development and implementation of a national, coordinated approach to food safety to ensure credibility in domestic and international marketplaces.

Since its foundation it has undertaken a number of special projects and held several forums and other workshops to foster the discussion of food safety in Canada. Information related to these can be found on its website at: www.foodsafetycoalition.ca The Coalition also advocates directly with all levels of government, but particularly through a set of relationships with key federal departments (e.g. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada) and the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Food Safety Committee.

2.0 Project Background

As part of its mission to facilitate dialogue and to encourage the development of a national approach to food safety, the Coalition in 2008 initiated a project to engage the agri-food industry and governments in the development of a National Strategy for Industry-led Food Safety Programs. This project was completed and the report published in March of 2009¹. This final report identified a set of four (4) principles upon which the strategy is grounded:

Principle #1: Food safety is a shared responsibility of all participants in the supply chain, input suppliers, businesses involved with the production, processing, manufacturing, importing, distribution, retailing and marketing of food, all levels of government and consumers;

Principle #2: Governments at all levels, the agri-food industry and other stakeholders should foster and facilitate the development of an integrated, co-ordinated, and national approach to food safety policy and regulation based on sound scientific risk assessment and risk management principles and on international standards.

Principle #3: Industry and government food safety initiatives should encourage the implementation of HACCP and/or HACCP-based food safety systems by businesses all along the supply chain.

Principle #4: Food businesses, governments and other stakeholders have a responsibility to adequately resource, proactively manage, update, maintain and continually improve their individual and collaborative food safety systems and food safety initiatives.

The Strategy also identified:

- (i) a set of seven (7) goals for the Canadian food safety system in 2013;
- (ii) specific actions that could be taken to realize these goals;
- (iii) the parties responsible for implementing the actions; and,
- (iv) milestones that could be utilized to assess progress in achieving the identified goals and actions.

Goal #3 expressed industry's expectations for strengthening Canada's food safety training and auditing infrastructure and Action 3.2 spoke specifically to the matter of defining the requirements for 3rd party, industry and government auditors in the context of emerging international requirements.

¹ <http://www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/upload/File/National%20Strategy%20for%20Industry-led%20Food%20Safety%20Programs%20-%20Final%20Version%20-%202031%20March%202009.pdf>

Strategic Area: Industry		
Goal: #3 – Strengthen Canada’s Food Safety Training and Auditing Infrastructure		
Actions	Responsibility	Milestones
3.1 Strengthen food safety training programs by utilizing on-line tools, diversifying the availability of training across languages, and harmonizing protocols across jurisdictions	3.3 Industry associations as program owners, governments and other stakeholders, including educational institutions and training organizations	3.3 .1 Accessible food safety training for food businesses implementing industry-led food safety programs, employees, etc 3,3,2 National recognition of employee food safety training programs (e.g. foodservice, etc)
3.2 Define Canadian food safety auditor requirements for 3 rd party, industry and government auditors in the context of the emerging international requirements	3.2 CSCFSC initiative to engage associations, FPT governments and other stakeholders	3.2 National set of requirements for food safety auditors suitable for each segment of the supply chain and for both 3 rd party and government food safety auditors
3.3 Improve auditor training and audit consistency	3.3. Industry as program owners (through Working Groups if continued or established), and other stakeholders, including educational institutions and auditor training organizations	3.3 Greater sharing and alignment, where appropriate, of training programs and requirements

The discussions leading up to the development of the National Strategy were not the first time that this issue had been identified. Earlier, in 2004, industry and government participants in a *Government/Industry Forum on Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada*² hosted by the Coalition and three federal/provincial/territorial committees dealing with food safety considered the current situation in Canada respecting food safety auditor training and qualifications, including the on-farm food safety auditor training program recently established by the Canadian On-Farm Food Safety (COFFS) Working Group and global developments. While the Forum made no recommendations, the breakout sessions that reviewed this matter all concluded that ensuring a trained supply of qualified food safety auditors was a priority and that this could require:

- development of core competencies for auditors for all sectors along the food chain (perhaps through the use of national standards);
- credentialing for multi-sector or multi-commodity food safety auditors;

² <http://www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/upload/Forum%20report%20final%202004.pdf>

- identification of methods for determining equivalency;
- development of cost effective auditor training capacity; and,
- exploration of the need for government oversight.

The 2009 National Strategy allocated responsibility for following up on Action 3.2 to the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition. After further discussions with its members, with other stakeholders and with governments, the Coalition applied for and received funding in the fall of 2011 from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada under the Canadian Food Safety and Traceability Initiative, a Growing Forward program, to undertake a project.

3.0 Project Objective

The Coalition's *Food Safety Auditor Qualifications and Competencies Project* is intended to engage its members and other stakeholders, including the federal, provincial and territorial governments, other industry associations, academic institutions, participants in the national standards system, etc. in a dialogue on food safety auditor qualifications and competencies in Canada.

The objective of this dialogue is twofold:

- First, it will provide an opportunity to share information and to identify issues with respect to private and public sector requirements, international standards and developments globally in the field of food safety auditor qualifications and competencies; and,
- Second, it will determine if there is a consensus as to whether or not a Canadian approach to food safety auditor qualifications and competencies is required and if so, how it can be achieved and what infrastructure needs there might be to implement and sustain it.

4.0 Project Process

This twofold objective is to be realized through two workshops and an iterative process of validation of the resulting recommendation(s).

To initiate the project, the Coalition invited a group of stakeholders, members, other organizations and representatives of governments to participate in a steering committee.

Then a background research paper was prepared to facilitate the sharing of information and the establishment of a common base of knowledge about food safety auditor qualifications and competency requirements both domestic and foreign.

The 1st Workshop was held on 17 January 2012 and focused on information sharing and issue identification.

The 2nd Workshop was held on 13 March 2012 and focused on determining if there is a consensus on the need to develop a Canadian approach to food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. It also considered whether there was an emerging consensus, how a Canadian approach could be achieved and what infrastructure might be needed to implement and sustain it.

Following the 2nd Workshop, the participants were asked to review and validate a consensus statement and an action plan. The statement and plan were then circulated to a broader audience, including stakeholders that could not participate in the workshops, for their consideration and electronic validation.

5.0 Activity 1: Shaping the Dialogue

5.1 Project Definition

The board of directors of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition had primary responsibility for the project. However, to assist them in their work, the Coalition, in August 2011, invited a number of key stakeholders to participate in a steering committee. The stakeholders included representatives of industry-led food safety programs, certification bodies, Canada's national accreditation body and observers from the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Food Safety Committee representing both the federal and provincial governments. Participants included: Heather Gale (CanadaGAP), Viki Sikur (Canadian Hatching Egg Producers), Frank Schreurs (GFTC), Victor Muliyl (SGS), Stephen Cross (SCC), Martin Firth (CFIA) and Daryl Loback (Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development).

The role of the committee was to provide advice to the board concerning the project, particularly the design of the workshops and the background materials, etc. The committee held two conferences calls and provided input on the programs and initiatives to be researched for the background paper, the form and content of the workshops, the organizations to be invited to participate in the workshops and other matters.

As most steering committee members participated in the workshops, they continued to have considerable input into the project as it evolved along its path.

5.2 Project Administration

The Coalition entered into an agreement with an accountant with considerable experience with the requirements of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada respecting projects funded under the Canadian Integrated Food Safety Initiative (CIFSI) and its predecessors to deliver the financial management of the project.

An agreement was also signed with the project consultant, Monachus Consulting. This firm also provides the Coalition's secretariat and its president, Albert Chambers, acts as the Coalition's executive director. This contract covered management of the project, the development of the background research paper and monitoring of international initiatives under Activity 2.

6.0 Activity 2 – Informing the Dialogue

6.1 Background Research ³

The Purpose of the Background Paper was to provide examples of food safety auditor qualification and competency requirements from both the public and private sectors, in Canada and globally. The selection of the examples was made in part on their prominence or influence and in part on the availability of the information.

The materials presented within the examples are for the most part direct excerpts from the most recently available online sources. These have been supplemented by materials obtained directly from some initiatives through the monitoring process discussed below.

An initial list of areas to be covered in the paper was prepared for consideration by the steering committee. It included:

- International standards system requirements such as ISO 17021:2011 and ISO 22003:2007 which cover personnel involved in food safety management system (FSMS) certification and the work of the International Accreditation Forum on requirements for management system and FSMS assessors;
- Personnel Certification Body requirements for FSMS auditors and other personnel from RABQSA and IRCA;
- Government Requirements for auditors and inspectors in Canada and globally, with an emphasis on the United States, Australia/New Zealand, Europe, etc.;
- Private Sector Requirements such as the Global Food Safety Initiative and FSMS certification schemes in Canada and globally; and,
- Other Exercises to set National Characteristics, such as that conducted in Australia starting in 1999.

Before the project's completion in July 2012, the background research paper went through four major revisions. An initial draft was circulated prior to the 1st Workshop, a second version was circulated prior to the 2nd Workshop and then a third draft was provided to participants in the validation step for the consensus statement in May 2012. Finally, the paper was updated in July to provide additional information from the project monitoring activities on the ISO, GFSI and American initiatives on food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. With each draft the range of programs/initiatives reviewed increased as did the depth of the information provided. The paper grew from 115 pages in Draft 1 (January 2012) to 191 pages in its final version (July 2012).

³ A copy of the 4th version of the Background Research paper can be found at:
www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/index.php?id=10

The paper is structured in two parts, Part A for private sector programs/initiatives and Part B for government initiatives. It provides information on the following:

Part A – Private Sector Initiatives

- International Standards System
 - ISO Standards (ISO 17021/ISO 22000, ISO Guide 65, draft ISO 17065)
 - IAF Assessor Competencies (draft version)
- Global Food Safety Initiative
- American Programs:
 - American Society for Quality Certified HACCP Auditor
 - National Environmental Health Association Certified Professional of Food Safety (CP-FS)
 - National Environmental Health Association Food Safety Auditor
- IRCA
- RABQSA
- GlobalGAP
- QS Scheme (Germany)
- SQF, IFS & BRC
- Canadian Schemes
 - National On-Farm Food Safety Recognition Program
 - Selected Commodity-specific OFFS Programs
 - National Post-Farm Food Safety Recognition Program
 - Selected Segment-specific Post-Farm Programs

Part B - Public Sector Requirements

- Australia
- Canada - Federal
- Canada - Provincial
- South Africa
- United States (FDA)

Three of these initiatives are occurring simultaneously with this project. The Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI) established a technical working group (TWG) in late 2010 to develop a new set of food safety auditor requirements for inclusion in a revised version of its Guidance Document. This project took as its model the work done in Australia in the previous decade to develop competency requirements for food safety auditors. The second initiative, undertaken by the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) under contract to the US Food and Drug Administration, uses a similar but slightly more detailed approach to develop its job task analysis (JTA) and from the start was designed to result in a credentialing scheme which could function as the basis for a personnel certification scheme accredited under ISO 17024. The third initiative is the revision of ISO TS 22003:2007 *Food safety*

management systems — Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of food safety management systems. Launched in October 2011, this revision process will likely result in the transformation of the requirements for food safety auditors and others working in the certification of FSMS from an approach based in part on qualifications and in part on competencies, to one mostly based on competencies. The ISO working group is making full use of the GFSI and NEHA materials as well as other materials as it too incorporates a variation on the job task analysis approach to define the knowledge and skills required. The ISO project is also incorporating work done in the 2011 revision of ISO/IEC 17021 *Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems*, ISO 22003's base standard and a job task analyses done in 2010-2011 by the International Accreditation Forum for assessors of certification bodies working generically in the field of management systems and specifically in FSMS certification.

The prevalence of the JTA approach to developing competencies for auditors and, more specifically for food safety auditors, was a major thematic input to the project Dialogue. A second major theme from this work is that many, but not all, of the initiatives reviewed either incorporate or are considering the use of accredited personnel certification schemes. Examples include the RABQSA, IRCA, the Australian government requirement for 3rd party auditors, the three American programs (ASQ and the two NEHA programs) and the FDA's program for its own and state inspectors/auditors. In addition, this approach is being seriously considered by the GFSI as a mechanism for implementing its new competency requirements.

6.2 Monitoring International Initiatives

A second source of information for the Dialogue was the monitoring initiatives that the project undertook. These involved direct participation in the meetings of three of the initiatives noted above: GFSI, ISO and NEHA. The project consultant was able to continue participation in the GFSI meetings in October 2011 and February 2012⁴ and to attend the two meetings held by the ISO working group (March & June 2012) with project funding. Travel by the project consultant to the NEHA project meetings in April, May and July 2012 was funded by NEHA/FDA.

Monitoring these initiatives provided firsthand information on their methodologies and outcomes which was directly transferred into the Dialogue. It also provided access to a wide network of experts from industry, governments, the global accreditation and certification community and professionals engaged in the development of competency requirements. This network was utilized to provide speakers for the workshops and to secure documentation for analysis and inclusion in the background research paper drafts. Initiative outputs, such as drafts of the GFSI competency requirements and the IAF assessor requirements, were circulated directly to the workshop participants and other stakeholders in the Dialogue.

⁴ The consultant had previously participated in the GFSI TWG meetings in October 2010, February 2011 and May 2011.

Monitoring also provided opportunities for input into work of these initiatives. Dialogue participants were informed of the public review process undertaken by GFSI in late 2011 and early 2012 and encouraged to make comments. They were also informed of the validation process undertaken by NEHA in May 2012 and encouraged to participate in the electronic survey.⁵

⁵ NEHA utilized the same survey tool (SurveyMonkey™) used by the Coalition for the validation of the recommended consensus statement in May/June 2012.

7.0 Activity 3 – The Dialogue

7.1 1st Workshop – 17 January 2012⁶

Workshop Scope

The purpose of the 1st Workshop was to provide an opportunity for sharing information and identifying issues not to arrive at a consensus on a Canadian approach to food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. The presentations were structured to provide updates on public and private sector requirements and to explore current international trends.

Presentations

To launch the Dialogue, four presentations were made. To make the first, Dr. Cynthia Woodley, Vice President of Professional Testing Inc. (Orlando, Florida) joined the Workshop by web link. Dr. Woodley's professional background as a psychometrician includes extensive experience in developing requirements and assessment approaches for auditors and other professionals, including the new International Accreditation Forum (IAF) requirements for its assessors, for the US Conference for Food Protection's Certified Food Safety Manager Program and for the US government's National Renewable Energy Laboratory's energy auditor. The presentation focussed on the theory and practice of using a competency based approach. It reviewed definitions, described the methodologies available including the use of job task analysis (JTA), discussed the importance of determining the eligibility criteria for the assessment. Dr. Woodley also reviewed the role of personnel certification and of ISO 17024

The next two presentations provided a brief introduction to the requirements in the public sector for food safety auditors and inspectors. Mr. Vance McEachern, Executive Director, Inspection Modernization at the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) spoke to the federal government's recently launched inspection modernization initiative. Mr. Daryl Loback, Growing Forward Administrator, Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development, brought a provincial perspective.

Mr. McEachern's presentation was the first made to industry on CFIA's new inspection modernization initiative. With respect to training for the modernized system (based on one set of powers and one Act)⁷, CFIA intends to consolidate multiple programs into an improved training program that keeps inspectors current of best practices and scientific advances. With respect to competencies, CFIA currently focuses on technical competencies that include:

- knowledge of various food processing tools, equipment and technologies;
- understanding of scientific disciplines associated with food processing;

⁶ A detailed report on the 1st Workshop can be found at <http://www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/index.php?id=10>

⁷ In June 2012, the federal government introduced Bill S-11, Safe Food for Canadians Act, to provide the legislative basis for the modernization initiative.

- knowledge of CFIA, other government departments, Canadian private and public sectors, international public and private sectors; and,
- knowledge of legislation under which the inspected organization operates.

It is in the process of setting the new, “modernized” requirements which will take into consideration

- a review and analysis of international food safety inspection systems and inspector competencies to identify international best practices and standards ;
- establishing networks with New Zealand, Australia and United States to facilitate consultation and on-site visits to observe and analyze inspection systems, methodologies, tools and approaches; and,
- an analysis of competencies required by Canadian inspectors which, when completed, will be integrated into the horizontal approach to training and recruitment.

Mr. Loback indicated that there was not a common set of inspector/auditor competencies across all provinces and that within some provinces there was likely variation between those set by the agriculture and the health departments if they each had responsibilities for discrete segments of the supply chain. Some provinces have adopted certification by the Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors⁸ for some inspectors. He also noted that in the provinces that have established HACCP certification programs for small processors (Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta) criteria had been set for the 3rd party auditors. These conform to the federal/provincial/territorial recognition program protocol and covered such elements as:

- personal, includes communication skills and behaviour;
- thorough understanding of HACCP Reference standard;
- adequate auditing skills based on the completion of a recognized auditor training course based on ISO 19011 audit principles and methodologies;
- demonstrated understanding and experience of particular industry/commodity area(s);
- food safety and HACCP knowledge demonstrated by successful completion of a recognized HACCP training course or equivalent experience with designing and implementing HACCP programs; and
- appropriate education as demonstrated by a diploma or degree in food safety, food microbiology, food science, veterinary science or a related field.

⁸ <http://www.ciphi.ca>

The final two presentations reviewed private sector initiatives. Mr. Frank Schreurs, President, Guelph Food Technology Centre, provided the perspective of a certification body active in the audit and certification of food safety management systems as well as in the provision of 2nd party food safety audits for various companies. A review of international trends in food safety auditor competencies and qualifications, based on the background paper circulated prior to the Workshop, was presented by Mr. Albert Chambers, Executive Director of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition.

Mr. Schreurs presentation on certification bodies covered three main topics: qualifications and competency; requirements and challenges from Scheme owners; and, future expectations. He noted that many of the concepts outlined in Dr. Woodley's presentation were being actively used by certification bodies at this time.

The presentation reviewed existing requirements such as those set for certification bodies under the ISO standards for accreditation, food safety certification scheme requirements (e.g. BRC, SQF, CanadaGAP, etc.). He discussed this from both the qualifications and competencies perspectives. He noted that meeting scheme requirements could be challenging and, in some cases, added significant new costs. Schemes frequently set different qualifications for auditors active in the same food categories or required training that was in many respects a duplication of training in other schemes. He noted that the administrative requirements of schemes (reporting, databases, etc.) were all different and this presented challenges as well.

His presentation also reviewed industry expectations (e.g. travel costs, availability of qualified auditors for schemes and food categories, audit duration, etc.), government demands (e.g. the new US Food Safety Modernization Act) and benchmarking scheme changes (e.g. the GFSI initiative)

The final presentation covered international trends in food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. This presentation was a summary of first draft of a background paper and quickly walked through the following areas:

- Definitions
- ISO/TS 22003;2007 – the Emerging Core
- GFSI Proposals – Key Elements
- IRCA Types & Grades
- US Developments – What our neighbours are doing?
- Australian Example.

He noted the influential role that the international standards system's definitions and standard (e.g. ISO 17021:2011 and ISO TS 20003:2007) were having and the impact that the strengthening of the competence based approach in the former was having on accreditation requirements for certification bodies and through the GFSI benchmarking scheme.

Mr. Chambers reviewed the GFSI initiative, the move to a competence based approach using the JTA approach and the expected outcome (i.e. incorporation of the new requirements in the GFSI Guidance Document in 2012).

The presentation next reviewed several examples of other international developments:

- Personnel certification bodies for FSMS auditors (i.e. International Registry of Certified Auditors (IRCA)) which currently uses qualifications;
- US activities to establish both a national training system (through the Partnership for Food Protection initiative) and a personnel certification scheme for US government inspectors/auditors as well as state and other auditors undertaking regulatory audits for USDA and FDA and the, as yet undefined, requirements in US Food Safety Modernization Act accredited 3rd party certification;
- Australia's 13 year process (finished in 2011) to develop requirements using the JTA tools and a national framework endorsed by the governments;

Breakout Sessions

Following the presentations, the Workshop participants formed four breakout groups to discuss the presentations and the background paper. These groups discussed three topics:

Topic A – Role of Competencies & Qualifications: Questions were put forward concerning: the balance of competencies and qualifications; differentiation in these requirements based on risk or type of scheme being implemented (e.g. regulatory versus voluntary or site-specific hazard analysis versus generic HACCP-based) or other factors; and the fit of the competency models discussed in the Background Paper or in the presentations.

Topic B – Mechanisms for Improving Consistency & Credibility: Questions discussed included: the approaches to developing requirements and to assessing qualifications and competencies (high level descriptions versus detailed task); certification body responsibility or personnel certification schemes; and differences if any between public and private sector expectations.

On Topic A, the breakout groups reported a wide range of concerns but also expressed considerable consistency. Amongst the concerns/issues raised were: flexibility – one size does not fit all; challenges of measuring competency objectively; overlap in knowledge/skills required by public and private sectors but some significant differences in focus; need for new training programs; importance of market expectations (domestic and international); Canada's HACCP-based programs); the challenge of consistency; the role of on-going calibration; and balancing of cost and value in such areas as accreditation, personnel certification, etc. Overall, the breakout groups indicated that competencies were as important as or more important than qualifications and that consideration be given to developing Canadian competencies.

On Topic B – Mechanisms for Improving Consistency and Credibility, there was a greater divergence of views amongst the breakout groups. These ranged from strong support for certification of food safety auditors based on competency to considerable scepticism about the concept, its value and cost. Another contentious issue was on the requirements for public and private auditors. Here several groups supported a common approach but others noted that while core knowledge and skills existed, the different approaches (inspection versus audit) meant there were different bodies of knowledge and skills required. There was however greater agreement on the value of training programs to achieve uniformity and consistency. Overall, credibility and consistency were recognized as very important issues, especially as both the public sector inspector/auditor and the private sector auditor are central players in the effectiveness of both systems.

Plenary: Conclusions and Next Steps

Following the breakout group reports, the plenary session considered **Topic C – Drafting a Consensus at the 2nd Workshop**. The purpose of this discussion was to seek input on the following questions:

- Are there other food safety auditor models that should be described and circulated?
- What additional background or synthesis materials should be developed and circulated?
- Are there other steps that should be undertaken prior to the 2nd Workshop?
- Do you have any suggestions about the format and conduct of the 2nd Workshop? (e.g. use of facilitator, stakeholders to be invited, agenda, length (1 day or more), etc.).

The participants' suggestions for further research to inform the Dialogue included:

- Supplementing the background paper with more information on the Australian model and requirements from Canadian HACCP-based programs and filling in gaps on other initiatives.
- Preparation of a matrix of requirements from various models (although it was noted that the significant differences between the qualifications and competence approaches could make developing this matrix a challenge).

Looking forward to the next Workshop, participants indicated that some key stakeholder groups, were not well represented. Efforts should be made to encourage their greater participation as well as participation by more CBs and the Standards Council of Canada as the accreditation body.

There was agreement that the 2nd Workshop should be facilitated and it was reported that funds had been allocated for that purpose in the project's budget.

7.2 2nd Workshop – 13 March 2012⁹¹⁰

The 2nd Workshop was held on 13 March 2012, once again in Ottawa. Its objectives were:

- To begin to shape a consensus on the direction that Canada could take with respect to the qualifications and competencies of both private sector and public sector food safety auditors;
- To identify steps to reaching that objective; and
- To scope out the infrastructure needs vis-à-vis this critical component of the food safety system for the coming decades.

A presentation served as launch point for discussion, highlighting what is happening on the world stage regarding food safety qualifications and competencies. To work towards common ground, participants considered four possible options for Canada with respect to qualifications and competencies of food safety auditors (the options are presented in Section 6.0). Three rounds of discussion in small groups provided participants with the opportunity to discuss each option using a Café approach, with each round building on the ideas shared in the previous round. The following key questions guided discussion:

- *For this to be a compelling path for Canada to follow over the next 2-3 years, what would the ideal end outcome be?*
- *What would be the main impediments or drawbacks to following this path?*
- *If this is a compelling path what are the critical success factors that will need to be in place and/or essential processes that will need to be undertaken to assure the ideal outcome is achieved (e.g. process steps, key infrastructure needs)?*

After the Café and plenary discussion, participants were asked to prioritize their first and second choice options for the most compelling path moving forward. In plenary, they discussed the results of the prioritizing activity, what had emerged as the likely first choice option and then the wording of the final option that described the best direction that Canada could take with respect to the qualifications and competencies of food safety auditors. As a final exercise, participants identified and discussed possible next steps for moving forward.

Presentation Summary

Mr. Albert Chambers, Executive Director for CSCFSC, presented updated review of international developments regarding food safety qualifications and competencies based on draft 2 of the background research document circulated to participants in advance of the workshop. The

⁹ A detailed report on the 2nd Workshop can be found at <http://www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/index.php?id=10>

¹⁰ Presentations made at the 1st Workshop have been posted to the Coalition's website at www.foodsafetycoalition.ca

presentation reviewed definitions and summarized public sector initiatives in Canada, Australia, and the United States and private sector initiatives at the international level through the ISO and GFSI.

It was noted that the research had identified important Canadian developments, for example:

- the inclusion of food safety auditor requirements in the National On-Farm/Post-Farm Food Safety Recognition Programs;
- the intention of CFIA to harmonize and update requirements for its food safety inspectors/auditors as a key component of its Inspection Modernization Project;
- the development by some provinces of new requirements for provincial inspectors as part of the FPT meat hygiene initiative and of the re-assumption of responsibilities for provincial inspection; and
- the adoption of GFSI requirements by industry-led schemes that are benchmarked by that scheme.

Moving on to Australia, the presentation described the complex web of participants at the government level and process used by that country to arrive at its current set of food safety auditor requirements and its approach to certification and approval over a 13 year process concluding in 2011. He noted that the National Food Safety Auditing Framework takes a risk-based approach (high, medium, low) and is based on a core curriculum with assessments set out in national standards for:

- auditor competencies (national units of competency);
- technical and educational qualifications;
- specialised auditing competencies;
- witness audits and legislative assessments; and
- a code of conduct for regulatory food safety auditors.

The final results of this initiative are:

- A competency based personnel certification scheme for food safety auditors (the National Food Safety Auditor Scheme), established using ISO 17024 and operated by RABQSA that encompasses first, second and third party food safety auditors and is applied throughout the supply chain and across commercial and regulatory boundaries.
- Requirements for Regulatory Food Safety Auditors based on a national policy, guidelines and framework which were fully implemented in October 2011 and apply to government auditors (Commonwealth/State/Territorial) and third party auditors doing regulatory audits.

The upcoming revision of ISO TS 22003:2006 was briefly described and put into the context of the 2011 revisions to its base standard, ISO 17021:2011, and the expected linkage to a new standard, ISO 17065:201x which will replace ISO Guide 65 (used for the accreditation of product certification).

Mr. Chambers then provided an overview of current developments in the revision of auditor requirements for the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI). He also reported on the February 2012 recommendation of the GFSI technical working group to the board of directors. These covered both short-term and long-term implementation.

- Recommendations for short-term implementation (up to 2 years) are:
 - Conduct a validation of the proposed competency requirements;
 - Harmonize current schemes with respect to auditor food categories;
 - Implement GFSI current requirements with all Accreditation Bodies (AB);
 - New requirements for AB's assessors;
 - Harmonize requirements (ISO 22003) for all Certification Bodies (CB), including those using Guide 65;
 - Develop common auditor competency assessment tools for CBs; and,
 - Participate in revision of ISO 22003.

- Recommendations for long-term implementation (beyond 2 years) are:
 - Form stakeholder committee consistent with ISO 17024 requirements; and,
 - Establish guidelines for personnel certification schemes for accredited, certified auditors

Recent US developments to establish requirements for the competency of both domestic and foreign food safety auditors in both the public and private sectors and to establish new assessment expectations, including the use of accredited personnel certification bodies were reviewed. And, the FDA's contract with the National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) to develop a personnel certification scheme for foreign and third party auditors was highlighted as a new initiative to be monitored.

The presentation concluded by noting the complexity of the subject of food safety auditory qualifications and competencies, the rapid pace of developments, the strong emphasis on demonstration of competence and independent personnel certification and the convergence among public and private sector requirements and international standards/schemes.

Breakout Sessions

Following the presentations, participants considered four possible options for Canada with respect to qualifications and competencies of food safety auditors. Three rounds of discussion in small groups provided participants with the opportunity to discuss each option using a Café approach, whereby participants rotated around stations and with each round reviewed and built upon the ideas shared in the previous round. The Options or pathways discussed were:

OPTION A

Canada continues on its current track, including: implementation of the National On-Farm/Post-Farm Recognition Programs food safety auditor requirements, of CFIA's inspection modernization project and of separate provincial government initiatives; and, the adoption, as required, of GFSI's benchmarking requirements by Canadian schemes.

OPTION B

Canada monitors the international scene (e.g. GFSI, ISO, US FSMA, etc.) and prepares to adapt to new international expectations and standards (e.g. competency requirements, assessment approaches and certification options) by strengthening its capacity and infrastructure.

OPTION C

Canada monitors the international scene (e.g. GFSI, ISO, US FSMA, etc.) and prepares to adapt to new international expectations and standards (e.g. competency requirements, assessment approaches and certification options) and the public and private sectors work to identify what characteristics specific to Canada also need to be integrated into Canadian food safety auditor qualifications and competencies.

OPTION D

Canadian private and public sectors work together to develop a shared/collective Canadian view of food safety auditor qualifications and competencies, assessment approaches and certification options and actively engage to bring the Canadian view into the international processes underway.

These discussions were guided by three questions:

- For this to be a compelling path for Canada to follow over the next 2-3 years, what would the ideal end outcome be?
- What would be the main impediments or drawbacks to following this path?
- If this is a compelling path what are the critical success factors that will need to be in place and/or essential processes that will need to be undertaken to assure the ideal outcome is achieved (e.g. process steps, key infrastructure needs)?

The results of the successive rounds of discussion are recorded in the 2nd Workshop report. They include details on the unique elements of an ideal option for each pathway, comments on the impediments, and identification of critical success factors or essential processes.

Plenary Discussion

In plenary, the participants reported back on the highlights of their Café discussions. The following key points were shared:

- Participants noted that there were many commonalities across the four options and wondered who would take the lead, who would take ownership and direct it, and who would cover the costs of implementation. They also wondered who would lend credibility to the selected approach so that it would be recognized externally in the international marketplace.
- **Option A** was seen as preferable to Option B because it referenced the existing government food safety recognition programs and offered a perspective on moving forward to adopt new global standards (GFSI).
- **Option B** was seen as too passive and lacking in direction. It was described as the “wait and see” option, with an overemphasis on monitoring the international scene. Participants were unclear about the reference in Option B to adapting and strengthening capacity and infrastructure, and wondered who would be responsible for modifying and adapting Canadian capacity.
- **Option C** was viewed as more proactive than Options A or B, with the intention of identifying characteristics specific to Canada that need to be integrated into Canadian food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. Participants noted that while it is important to adapt to international standards, the GFSI does not apply to all sectors in the Canadian market, where requirements currently address the regulatory environment. Option C was also seen as presenting a balanced approach, emphasizing cooperation between industry and government.
- **Option D** seemed the most ideal with respect to advancing a shared/collective Canadian view of foods safety auditor qualifications and competencies and actively engaging to bring this view into international processes. However, participants identified this option as the most resource and cost-intensive and did not think it would be realistic to achieve within the time-frame required to have input into international processes that are already underway.
- Participants also commented on:
 - The lack of definition about what is required to make auditing more consistent, although consistency was identified as an ideal outcome for all four options. At this time, interpretations are shifting and it will be important to arrive at an agreement on what is validation, what is training, and what makes a regulatory auditor accountable vs. an industry auditor. A framework is needed to achieve cooperation and transparency.

- The need for a process moving forward that includes full consultation with stakeholders within their own networks and with stakeholders who did not participate in the meeting. This includes clarifying who will lead and own the process and who will represent Canada on the international scene (with the suggestion that it is possible to have multiple voices in different contexts delivering a common message).
- The importance of building on current mechanisms for communicating at the international level to avoid “reinventing the wheel”; these mechanisms could be used to convey common messages and might not require significant investment. For example, there may be Canadian representatives that could bring forward whatever emerges as the recommended direction for Canada.
- The need to identify characteristics of Canadian capacity and infrastructure and how they could be strengthened.
- The importance of overcoming the belief that international standards are demanding and difficult to achieve, which is not necessarily the case. They are not necessarily higher than the standards set in Canada or unachievable by a small producer.

The facilitator then invited participants to select their preferred pathway. Using post-it notes of different colours, each participant indicated their first choice and their second choice and the following table presents the results of the activity.

Results of Participant Selection of Preferred Option		
Preferred Pathway	First Choice	Second Choice
A	5	5
B	1	4
C	15	5
D	5	7

Overall Option C received the most participant “votes”, and significantly more participants indicated it as their first choice for a preferred pathway.

To move towards common ground, the facilitator next invited participants to share the conditions that would need to be in place in order for them to support Option C as the recommended Canadian approach to food safety auditor qualifications and competencies. Participants stated the following conditions:

- More adequately acknowledge the reality of existing programs in Canada and use language that recommends building upon these.
- Once parameters for Canada have been identified, it would be useful to bring these to the international fora as indicated in Option D; however, this is sequential and must follow what is outlined in Option C. With this in mind, the notion of being proactive at the international level could be added to C.
- Define what is meant by Canada, what makes the Canadian approach unique, and who will represent Canada on the international scene; there must be agreement on this before seeking broader validation.
- Recognize that the Canadian context is different; for example, it is important to recognize that different sectors have different markets and that some sectors do not have an international market.
- Add that Canada monitors “and participates” in the international scene.

A modified Option C based on the above conditions was developed and shared with participants for validation:

REVISED OPTION C

Recognizing that Canada currently has a number of initiatives related to food safety auditor qualifications and competency (e.g., the National On-Farm/Post-Farm Recognition Programs Food Safety auditor requirements, CFIA's inspection modernization project, separate provincial government initiatives and Canadian schemes that have adopted GFSI benchmarking requirements)

- X (to be defined) (involving public and private sectors) will:
- Monitor and participate in the international scene (e.g., GFSI, ISO, US FSMA, etc.);
- Work with the public and private sectors to identify what characteristics are specific to Canada
- Consider the adaptations required to meet new international and domestic expectations and standards (e.g., competency requirements, assessment approaches and certification options)
- Consider the measures needed to strengthen Canada's capacity and infrastructure
- [Be proactive in participating in international initiatives]

Participants requested the following additional modifications:

- For the fourth bullet, change “consider” to “provide” the adaptations required to meet new international and domestic expectations.

- For the second bullet, flesh out “work with” the public and private sectors to identify what characteristics specific to Canada.
- Do not leave the last bullet (now in brackets) as optional.
- Add a new bullet: “Harmonize initiatives internally in Canada”; this idea is missing.
- Question about 3rd and 4th bullet (adaptations and measures), wondering whether this is intended to take into account the resources needed. Mr. Chambers indicated “yes”, the wording is broad and intended to take resources into account.
- The revised Option C articulates the “what”; “who” and “how” still need to be addressed.
- Measures need to be defined more clearly; suggested to include “sustainable and justifiable measures”.
- Suggestion to broaden the reference to the CFIA’s inspection modernization project to the FPT initiatives; perhaps with CFIA inspection modernization project as an example in brackets.

It was agreed that these suggestions would be taken into account, along with the results of the “next steps” exercise, in formulating the final modification of Option C that will be circulated with the project final report.

Next Steps Discussion

To conclude the workshop, participants were asked to discuss the following question in small groups and to report back in a brief plenary:

What priority next steps should be taken over the next 6 – 12 months towards advancing the path that the group has identified to be the compelling one [Option C – Modified] for Canada to take with respect to the qualifications and competencies of both private and public sector food safety auditors?

The detailed notes from these small group discussions are reported in Annex D of the 2nd Workshop report. In summary, the participants suggested the following priority next steps:

- The Coalition could lead the next phase of the project and seek another round of AAFC funding, drawing in government partners.
- A committee to guide the process should be established by the Coalition with membership from stakeholders (e.g. governments, SCC, supply chain associations, etc.).
- An action plan could include the following steps:
 - Step 1 (April – June 2012) – validation of modified Option C and identification of resources, funding application, etc.

- Step 2 (July – December 2012) – refine the approach through a consensus building activity; gather additional information; develop a set of core competencies; etc.
- Step 3 (January - June 2013) - Validate draft list through stakeholder feedback (1 – 3 months); assess whether it meets or exceeds international standards; and finalize consensus and approval from all stakeholders (3 months);
- In parallel with these steps, the participants recommended continued participation in international meetings relevant to auditor competency initiatives (e.g., GFSI auditor competence technical working group; ISO; etc.); and,
- Further work on existing models (e.g., Australia) on how and who trains their auditors, as a precursor to determining how and who in Canada would deliver auditor training and/or provide auditor training programs.

8.0 Activity 4 – Validating the Consensus

8.1 Consensus Statement

Following the March workshop, a draft consensus recommendation was prepared and circulated to the participants for review. The preamble to finalized draft recommendation read as follows:

The participants to the March workshop indicated that they had arrived at their recommendation taking into account the following:

This Recommendation is based on the recognition that Canada currently has in place or underway a number of initiatives in the private and public sectors related to food safety auditor qualifications and competency. These include:

- *The requirements set out in the federal-provincial-territorial National On-Farm Food Safety Recognition Program and the National Post-Farm Food Safety Recognition Program for HACCP-based and HACCP systems food safety auditors;*
- *The requirements established by Canadian industry associations for auditors in their on-farm and post-farm HACCP-based food safety programs;*
- *The requirements established for auditors by several provincial governments in their food safety certification programs for food processors;*
- *The current requirements set by CFIA or by provincial, territorial or municipal governments for food safety auditors and/or inspectors within their jurisdictions; and,*
- *The initiatives underway to modernize their food safety inspection systems by CFIA and several provinces.*

This Recommendation is also based on the recognition that there is considerable discussion and work underway outside Canada on the matter food safety audit and certification personnel qualifications and competencies which will have a significant impact on the public and private sectors in Canada. These initiatives which are all slated to be completed by early 2013 include:

- *The Global Food Safety Initiative's (GFSI) project to define competency requirements for food safety auditors working within food safety management system certification schemes benchmarked by the GFSI;*
- *The US National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) project for the US Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) to develop a credentialing program for third party food safety auditors who will conduct audits outside the United States either directly for USFDA or in the context of various programs being established under the 2011 Food Safety Modernization Act;*
- *The USFDA project, in concert with its state, territorial and tribal nations partners, to develop a personnel certification program for food safety inspectors and/or auditors who will conduct audits within the United States under the 2011 Food Safety Modernization Act;*

- *The project by ISO TC34/SC17 and ISO/CASCO Joint Working Group 36 (JWG36) to revise ISO TS 22003:2007 Food safety management systems -Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of food safety management systems to, amongst other things, update the competency requirements for food safety auditors and other personnel involved in certification of food safety management systems; and,*
- *The project by the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) to set competency requirements for management system assessors auditing certification bodies for the purposes of accreditation.*

The draft recommendation read as follows:

The participants in the March workshop agreed, that given the above, the private and public sectors need to ensure that Canada is prepared to adapt to new international expectations and standards (e.g. qualifications and competency requirements, assessment approaches, credentialing or certification options, etc.) and to ensure that characteristics specific to Canada are integrated into Canadian food safety auditing and certification personnel qualifications and competencies.

To achieve this outcome, the participants recommended (Revised Option C) that:

- *The Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition take the lead and implement a second phase for its project on food safety auditor qualifications and competencies:*
- *The Coalition identify partners in the private and public sectors, including partners from the supply chain, the national standards community and governments (federal-provincial-territorial) to participate in the second phase and form a working group;*
- *The working group be tasked with:*
 - *Monitoring and proactively participating in the international initiatives that are developing food safety auditing and certification personnel qualifications and competencies requirements (e.g. GFSI, ISO, US FDA/NEHA, etc.);*
 - *Identifying food safety auditing and certification personnel qualifications and competencies specific to Canada;*
 - *Identifying the adaptations required to meet new international and domestic expectations and standards for food safety auditing and certification personnel and to ensure that Canada has in place the required infrastructure and resources;*
 - *Organizing a stakeholder workshop early in 2013 to provide a forum for information sharing and consensus building; and*
 - *Submitting a report with recommendations no later than 31 March 2013.*

8.2 Validation Process

To validate the draft consensus recommendation, the Coalition involved a broader group of stakeholders through an on-line survey¹¹. On 25 May 2012, the draft statement and an action plan were circulated to the participants and invitees to both workshops, the members of the Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition, the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Food Safety Committee members and other stakeholders who had indicated an interest in the project. The stakeholders were provided with a copy of the statement and the action plan¹² plus a copy of the survey questions so that they would be fully informed and could seek input within their stakeholder communities prior to responding to the survey. Initially, the closing date for the survey was set for 26 June 2012, but it was subsequently extended to 28 June 2012.

The response to the survey was very positive – 35 individuals and organizations participated. Of these 48.3% participated in the 1st Workshop and 41.4% participated in the second.

The draft consensus statement was endorsed by 96.6% of survey participants and nine (9) made additional comments. These expressed a range of concerns and/or suggestions. Of note were concerns raised by representatives of the national on-farm food safety programs about the continued role of the national recognition program. Other matters raised included the importance of both domestic and international recognition of any new requirements, the role of existing training and educational institutions in future training, benchmarking new requirements with key trading partners (e.g. US, New Zealand, Australia) and the need for requirements for both regulatory and private sector auditors.

The proposed project or action plan was endorsed by 100% of those responding. There were eight (8) comments on this question. These primarily raised points about the implementation of the action plan, the inclusion of stakeholders and, once again, about the importance of being sensitive to the existing industry-led food safety programs and the government recognition programs.

¹¹ The Coalition used SurveyMonkey™ for the validation process.

¹² The project or action plan is discussed in Section 10 below.

9.0 Activity 5 – Communicating

The original project work plan envisioned the use of several mechanisms for communication about the project. To launch the project, the Coalition issued a press release setting out the project scope and objectives and indicating the sources of funding, including Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's contribution through the Canadian Integrated Food Safety Initiative, a Growing Forward program. It then utilized its website to post materials from the two workshops and drafts of the background research paper.

Invitations to participate in the project and its workshops were widely circulated and new stakeholders from the identified audiences were welcomed at each stage of the project. The 1st Workshop was attended by 29 participants and the second by 27.

The project consultant also accepted invitations to present about the project, including one to speak to the *National Forum on Food Safety: Enhancing Canadian Leadership in Food Safety Policy and Practice* held in Edmonton on 11-12 January 2012. The forum was organized by the Universities of Alberta and of Calgary, by Olds College and by the governments of Alberta and of Canada. The forum drew 87 food safety leaders representing the federal government, provincial governments, industry and academia from across Canada.

10.0 A Canadian Approach - Next Steps

The project was successful in creating a Dialogue on an issue fundamental to the future credibility of private and public food safety systems in Canada. Although long delayed, having been initially recommended by the 2004 Industry/Government Forum on Integrating Food Safety Systems in Canada¹³, the Dialogue did occur at a critical juncture in the development of new international requirements for food safety auditors and other personnel involved in the certification of food safety management systems.

The three stage process utilized a first workshop to inform, a second to shape a consensus and finally a widely accessible on-line survey to validate the consensus statement proved to be very effective. Participants in the workshops came from each of the stakeholder groups initially identified and represented governments, the certification community, training organizations, certification bodies, individual food businesses and associations from all along the agri-food supply chain.

With the very positive endorsement of the consensus statement, the stage is well set for a second phase of this project based on the action plan which was also endorsed. This plan proposed the following actions to be undertaken by the Coalition:

1. *Prepare and submit a funding application for Phase 2 of the project to AAFC (late June 2012).*
2. *Invite stakeholders to participate in the project through a stakeholder group (August 2012). Invitees to include:*
 - a. *Coalition Members*
 - b. *Governments, including:*
 - i. *Federal/Provincial/Territorial Food Safety Committee*
 - ii. *Canadian Food Inspection Agency*
 - iii. *Health Canada*
 - iv. *Provincial Governments operating food safety certification schemes*
 - c. *Members of the national standards community*
 - i. *Standards Council of Canada*
 - ii. *Canadian audit and certification bodies*
 - d. *Other Canadian stakeholders (including academic, training and other organizations)*
3. *Form a Working Group with balanced representation from the four categories noted above to undertake the tasks identified in the March Workshop recommendation (August 2012):*
 - a. *International Initiatives (starting in August 2012 and concluding in March 2013):*

¹³ <http://www.foodsafetycoalition.ca/index.php?id=10>

- i. *Attending key meetings of initiatives (e.g. GFSI, ISO, US FDA/NEHA, etc) ;*
 - ii. *Reviewing draft requirements and/or other proposals related to assessment, credentialing, certification, training, etc and providing Canadian input;*
 - iii. *Consulting with and reporting to stakeholders.*
- b. *Canadian Initiatives (starting in September 2012 and concluding in March 2013):*
 - i. *Identifying food safety auditing and certification personnel qualifications and competencies specific to Canada;*
 - ii. *Monitoring and participating in Canadian initiatives (e.g. CFIA Inspection Modernization, FPT discussions, Provincial initiatives, etc);*
- c. *Developing a Canadian Approach (starting in September 2012 and concluding in March 2013):*
 - i. *Identifying the measures (e.g. standards, assessment tools, credentialing, certifications, etc.) required to meet the new international and domestic expectations for food safety auditing and certification personnel*
 - ii. *Identifying the resources required to ensure that Canada has in place the infrastructure needed to meet the new requirements; and,*
 - iii. *Organizing a stakeholder workshop (early 2013);*
- d. *Reporting (starting in September 2012 and concluding in March 2013):*
 - i. *Periodically to the stakeholder group;*
 - ii. *At the stakeholder workshop (February/March 2013);*
 - iii. *Finally, by 31 March 2013.*

The Coalition prepared an application for funding this new project to AAFC's Canadian Integrated Food Safety Initiative. The application was informally submitted for initial review prior to the closure of the validation process and formally submitted immediately upon its conclusion.

11 - Annex A – Workshop Participants

1st Workshop – 17 January 2012

Susan Abel	Food & Consumer Products Canada
Candice Appleby	Small Scale Food Processors Association
Janice Arnold	ExcelGrains Canada
Albert Chambers	Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition
Erica Charlton	Canadian Poultry & Egg Processors Council
Judy Chong	Produce Smart Business Services
Andrew Clarke	Maple Leaf Foods
Jorge Andres Correa	Canadian Meat Council
Jackie Crichton	Consultant
Martin Firth	Canadian Food Inspection Agency & the FPT Food Safety Committee
Nadia Gagnon	ED Foods
Heather Gale	Canadian Horticultural Council
Heather Holland	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Tara Jowett	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Dawn Lawrence	Canadian Pork Council
Daryl Loback	Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development & the FPT Food Safety Committee
Vance McEachern	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Chris Nash	Egg Farmers of Canada
Greg Northey	Canadian Federation of Agriculture
Michael Nyisztor	Medina Quality Assurance
Johanna Oehling	Food Processors Human Resources Council
George Patterson	Food Processors of Canada
Rae Payette	Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
Julie Press	QMI-SAIGlobal
Sally Rutherford	Dairy Processors Association of Canada
Frank Schreurs	Guelph Food Technology Centre
Viki Sikur	Canadian Hatching Egg Producers
Michel Smith	Egg Farmers of Canada
Caroline Wilson	Chicken Farmers of Canada

2nd Workshop – 13 March 2012

Susan Abel, FCPC
Janis Arnold, ExcelGrains Canada
Jennifer Bullock, Ontario Veal Association
Albert Chambers, Canadian Supply Chain Food Safety Coalition
Erica Charlton, Canadian Poultry & Egg Processors Council
Judy Chong, Canadian Produce Marketing Association
Jackie Crichton, Consultant
James de Valk, FPPAC
Martin Firth, CFIA
Lauren Fox, CFIA
Heather Gale, Canadian Horticultural Council
Grant Hackman, Peak of the Market
Heather Holland, CFIA
Nadean Kennedy, Ontario Ministry of Food and Rural Affairs
John Kukoly, BRC
Macelle Lavergne, Costco Wholesale Canada Ltd
Dawn Lawrence, Canadian Pork Council
Paul Leblanc, Canadian Horticultural Council
Daryl Loback, Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development
Katherine Morissette, dftAgroExpert (EuroConsultants)
Victor Muliyl, SGS SSC North America
Chris Nash, Egg Farmers of Canada
Rae Payette, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Frank Schreurs, GFTC
Victoria Sikur, Canadian Hatching Egg Producers
Phil Watney, International Food Safety Suppliers Ltd.
Caroline Wilson, Chicken Farmers of Canada

Facilitators

Sue Cass, One World Inc. (Facilitation)
Lynn Chiarelli, One World Inc. (Report)