Implementing a cross-jurisdictional after action review process (AAR) for major food and feed outbreaks as well as major assignments

Roberta Hammond, FDA CORE Response Manager

and

Andy Cannons, Florida Department of Health,

Laboratory Director

Charge

- *<u>Group Charge</u>: Identify specific steps to implement a cross-jurisdictional AAR process in 2012-2013*

CHALLENGES

- Fears—others will see this
  - Legal challenges—lawsuits
  - Security issues around vulnerabilities
  - Political challenges
  - Easy to criticize; harder to be constructive
- Resources
  - Not enough time to do it
  - Getting the right people
  - Leadership support

- Terminology not universal
  - Vulnerabilities vs. gaps
  - What we mean by “Information”
- Ownership of the document
  - Who gets to say what happens to the report
- Accountability for implementing recommendations

CONSIDERATIONS FOR CONDUCTING AN AAR (TRIGGERS)

- Complexity
  - Multiple jurisdictions, multiple products
- Impact
  - Public health impact
  - Impact on industry
  - Program and resource impact priorities
  - Environmental impact
  - Fiscal impact
  - Consumer impact

- Severity
  - Can be same as impact
  - Cause & affect (severity affects impacts)
  - Realized versus potential
  - Short-term
- Size
  - Geography, people, product amount, number of establishments

- Significance
  - Unusual occurrence
  - Attractive to media
  - Affected population
  - Recommended by stakeholders/participants
- Multiple jurisdictions
- If you put examples in the SOP, they are not all inclusive

Deliverables/Outcomes

1. ***FSMA 205c1A subgroup pilot***
2. ***Beta testing***
3. ***Telling the story***
4. ***Evaluation***

Deliverable 1

- *WHAT: FSMA 205c1A subgroup pilot will use After Action Review and Report SOP in the framework for cross-jurisdictional event pilot being developed*
- *WHO: suggested participants: FDA CORE, RRT, CDC (Food CORE, Centers for Excellence), state and local jurisdictions*
- WHEN: By 12/31/2012, the FSMA subgroup will have determined the specifics of the pilot (who, what and duration of pilot).

DELIVERABLE #2

- WHAT: PFP Response Workgroup to solicit volunteers for SOP Beta testing from a coordinated event/assignment (e.g., recall). Collect feedback.
- WHO: Beta test at different governmental levels. Already volunteered: FDA, states-MN and FL, and need local level volunteers. Use groups like AFDO, CIFOR, AAFCO, APHL, NEHA to help solicit volunteers
- WHEN: By January 1, 2013: Draft of SOP, assessment tool and contact information is finalized and pushed out to groups for 12 month evaluation period

DESIRED OUTCOMES FOR DELIVERABLES 1 and 2

- What worked/what did not work
- Suggested recommendations and improvement plan implementation and evaluation after implementation
- Were all players communicating
- How did conducting AR and report help the pilot
- Is timeframe appropriate for conducting AAR and Report
- Point to any needed changes in SOP
- Who was in charge (who did AAR and report) and how was it decided
- Where does the report reside
- Was AAR and Report distributed
- Put outcomes in assessment tool

DELIVERABLE #3

- Tell the story
  - PFP response workgroup to highlight success stories of the pilot and beta testing

DELIVERABLE #4

- Evaluation
  - PFP to evaluate responses from the assessment tools within a year of completion of pilot and beta testing. Make recommendations for improvement.

FINAL THOUGHTS

- Break out process was successful
- Very doable, valuable, important task
- Needs to be done
- People currently using AAR process should still be encouraged to use this SOP for comparison
- This is an opportunity for all parties to get involved and work toward a true integrated food safety system.
- Any volunteers???