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Purpose Statement

The Secretary of Agriculture established the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) on June 17, 1981, pursuant to legislative authority contained in 5 U.S.C. 301 that permits the Secretary to issue regulations governing the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The mission of FSIS is to ensure that the Nation’s commercial supply of meat, poultry, and processed egg products is safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged through inspection and regulation of these products. FSIS is composed of two major inspection programs: (1) Meat and Poultry Inspection and (2) Egg Products Inspection.

1. The Meat and Poultry Inspection Program is authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) as amended and the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA). The purpose of the program is to ensure that meat and poultry products are safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled through inspection and regulation of these products so that they are suitable for commercial distribution for human consumption. The FY 2008 Farm bill amended the FMIA to make siluriformes an amenable species and upon approval of the Fish inspection rule in FY 2015, FSIS will begin inspection of siluriformes under the FMIA. FSIS also enforces the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act through the program, which requires that all livestock at Federally-inspected establishments be handled and slaughtered in a humane way.

FSIS conducts inspection activities at Federally-inspected meat and poultry establishments; and for State programs, the agency ensures that State meat and poultry inspection programs have standards that are at least equivalent to Federal standards. FSIS also ensures that meat and poultry products imported to the United States are produced under standards equivalent to U.S. inspection standards, and facilitates the certification of regulated products.

FSIS’ science-based inspection system, known as the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) system, places emphasis on the identification, prevention, and control of foodborne hazards. HACCP requirements include meeting sanitation, facility, and operational standards, and other prerequisite programs to control pathogen contamination and produce safe and unadulterated food.

2. The Egg Products Inspection Program is authorized by the Egg Product Inspection Act (EPIA). The program’s purpose is to ensure that liquid, frozen and dried egg products are safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled through continuous mandatory inspection of egg processing plants that manufacture these products. FSIS also ensures processed egg products imported to the United States are produced under standards equivalent to U.S. inspection standards, and facilitates the certification of exported regulated products.

During 2015, the agency maintained headquarters offices in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area; 10 district offices; the Policy Development Division in Omaha, Nebraska; laboratories at Athens, Georgia, St. Louis, Missouri, and Alameda, California; the Financial Processing Center in Des Moines, Iowa; the Human Resources Field Office in Minneapolis, Minnesota; and a nationwide network of inspection personnel in 6,389 Federally regulated establishments in 50 States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Included are 350 establishments operating under Talmadge-Aiken Cooperative Agreements. A Talmadge-Aiken plant is a Federal plant with State inspection program personnel operating as Federal inspectors under Federal supervisors. Much of the agency’s work is conducted in cooperation with Federal, State, and municipal agencies, as well as private industry.

As of September 30, 2015, the agency employment totaled 9,051 permanent full-time employees, including 622 in the Washington, DC area and 8,429 in the field. FSIS employed 9,036 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs as of September 30, 2015). This included other-than-permanent employees in addition to permanent full-time ones.
FSIS funding is broken out into the following categories:

1. Federal Food Safety & Inspection: Expenses associated with operations at all federally inspected meat, poultry and egg product establishments.
2. Public Health Data Communications Infrastructure System (PHDCIS): Expenses associated with providing public health communications and information systems infrastructure and connectivity.
3. International Food Safety & Inspection: Expenses associated with import and export operations and certifications.
4. State Food Safety & Inspection: Expenses associated with state inspected establishments and state run programs.
5. Codex Alimentarius: Funds US Codex portion of the intergovernmental Codex Alimentarius with the purpose of protecting health of consumers, coordination of food standards, and ensuring fair practices in the food trade.

Office of Inspector General (OIG) Reports

Assignment 24601-0004-21. August 12, 2015. FSIS Ground Turkey Inspection and Safety Protocols. OIG’s final report contained 8 recommendations directed at FSIS, seven are currently open and one has been closed.

Assignment 24601-0001-23. August 28, 2015. Implementation of the Public Health Information System for Domestic Inspection. OIG’s final report contained 8 recommendations directed at FSIS, and they are all currently open.

Government Accountability Office (GAO) Reports

Assignment 361507. October 21, 2014. Food Safety: USDA Needs to Strengthen Its Approach to Protecting Human Health from Pathogens in Poultry Products. GAO’s final report contained 4 recommendations directed at FSIS, and 4 are currently open.

Assignment 361446. November 6, 2014. Food Safety: FDA and USDA Should Strengthen Pesticide Residue Monitoring Programs and Further Disclose Monitoring Limitations. GAO’s final report contained 1 recommendation directed at FSIS, and it is currently open.

Assignment 361560. December 18, 2014. Federal Food Safety Oversight: Additional Actions needed to Improve Planning and Collaboration. GAO’s final report contained 1 recommendation directed at FSIS, and it is currently open.

Ongoing OIG Audits

Assignment 50601-0002-23 – Evaluation of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Process Verified Programs. OIG is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 24016-0001-23 – FSIS Follow-up on the 2007 and 2008 Audit Initiatives. OIG is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 50601-0004-31 – USDA’s Response to Antibiotic Resistance. OIG is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 24601-0002-21 – FSIS Foreign Equivalency Determinations. OIG is continuing its audit work.

Ongoing GAO Audits

Assignment 460635. Municipal Water Technologies. GAO is continuing its audit work.
Assignment 361598. USDA’s Organization and Funding of Management and Administrative Services. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 451119. Performance Information Quality. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 100045. Meat and Poultry Worker Safety. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 291264. Biosafety and Biosecurity of Federal Laboratories. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 451138. Assessment of Major Management Challenges under GPRAMA. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 100087. IT Spending on Investments in Operations and Maintenance and the Retirement of Legacy Systems. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 131349. Federal Manufacturing Programs. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 197248. Agencies’ Use of the Do-Not-Pay Initiative. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 460640. High Containment Laboratories Inactivation and Attenuation Protocols. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 100267. Federal Actions to Monitor and Control Antibiotic Resistance in Food Animals. GAO is continuing its audit work.

Assignment 100294. USDA’s Process for Determining the Safety of Imported Beef from Countries with a History of Foot-and-Mouth Disease. GAO is continuing its audit work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Appropriations                                         $1,010,689</td>
<td>$1,016,474</td>
<td>$1,014,871</td>
<td>$1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal                                                            1,010,689</td>
<td>1,016,474</td>
<td>1,014,871</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In                                                        212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out                                                       -400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Appropriation                                               1,010,501</td>
<td>1,016,686</td>
<td>1,014,871</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Available, SOY                                              4,556</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adjustments (Net)                                             354</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available                                                     1,015,411</td>
<td>1,033,799</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsing Balances                                                    -177</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Available, EOY                                              -10,780</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Obligations, FSIS                                           1,004,454</td>
<td>1,017,680</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligations under other USDA appropriations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHIS, Bovine Tuberculosis (TB) Eradication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHIS Blood Sample                                                  180</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHIS Mail Room Agreement                                           71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCFQ, Salary and benefits for detail                                47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPACE, Salary and benefits for detail                               139</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHS, Salary and benefits for detail                                -16</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Nutrition Consumer Service and (Partnership)                   125</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other USDA                                                          -165</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other USDA                                                   562</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Agriculture Appropriations                                   1,005,016</td>
<td>1,018,941</td>
<td>1,031,354</td>
<td>1,031,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS, Salary and benefits for detail                                 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA, Antimicrobial susceptibility testing                            400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other Federal                                                414</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, Poultry and Egg Products Inspection</td>
<td>153,621</td>
<td>10,631</td>
<td>174,750</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited Labs                                                     271</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Funds                                                         10,719</td>
<td>10,374</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Non-Federal                                                  164,611</td>
<td>191,307</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>188,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, FSIS                                                         1,170,041</td>
<td>1,210,648</td>
<td>1,216,854</td>
<td>1,219,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Executive Service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-15...........</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-14...........</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-13...........</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12...........</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11...........</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-10...........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-9.............</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-8.............</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-7.............</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>2,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-6.............</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-5.............</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-4.............</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-3.............</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-2.............</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Permanent Positions........ 704 | 8,891 | 9,595 | 695 | 8,890 | 9,585 | 695 | 8,770 | 9,465 | 695 | 8,733 | 9,428 |

Unfilled Positions end-of-year........ 43 | 305 | 348 | 73 | 461 | 534 | 60 | 365 | 425 | 60 | 315 | 375 |

Total Permanent Full-Time Employment, end-of-year........ 661 | 8,586 | 9,247 | 622 | 8,429 | 9,051 | 635 | 8,405 | 9,040 | 635 | 8,418 | 9,053 |

Staff Year Estimate........ 652 | 8,384 | 9,036 | 631 | 8,405 | 9,036 | 631 | 8,405 | 9,036 | 631 | 8,418 | 9,049 |

23-5
SIZE, COMPOSITION AND COST OF MOTOR VEHICLE FLEET

FSIS inspects in 6,389 meat, poultry and egg products plants and import establishments located throughout the United States. A large number of FSIS inspection personnel have responsibilities in multiple plants and work “patrol/relief assignments” traveling from plant to plant on a daily basis. Depending on the inspector’s proximity to given assignments and remote locations, inspectors may be required to travel over larger geographical areas.

All FSIS vehicles are leased from the General Service Administration’s (GSA) fleet except for a vehicle that the agency purchased to use as a mobile Food Safety exhibit. The Food Safety Discovery Zone Vehicle travels throughout the United States visiting, schools, State fairs, and similar local events. FSIS uses the Discovery Zone Vehicle to educate consumers about the risks associated with mishandling food and steps they can take to reduce their risk of foodborne illness. FSIS does not have any discrepancies between the information reported in this exhibit and the information in the Federal Automotive Statistical Tool (FAST).

Size, Composition, and Annual Costs of Operating Vehicle Fleet
(in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Sedans and Station Wagons</th>
<th>Light Trucks, SUVs and Vans</th>
<th>Medium Duty Vehicles</th>
<th>Ambulances</th>
<th>Buses</th>
<th>Heavy Duty Vehicles</th>
<th>Total Number of Vehicles</th>
<th>Annual Operating Costs ($ in 000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>11,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>11,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+42</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>11,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+48</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+2,357</td>
<td>12,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers include vehicles owned by the agency and leased from commercial sources or GSA.
** Excludes acquisition costs and gains from sale of vehicles as shown in FAST.
The estimates include appropriation language for this item as follows (new language underscored; deleted matter enclosed in brackets):

**Salaries and Expenses:**

For necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, including not to exceed $50,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), [$1,014,871,000]

$1,030,405,000; and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1327 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 138f): Provided, That funds provided for the Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure system shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That no fewer than 148 full-time equivalent positions shall be employed during fiscal year [2016] 2017 for purposes dedicated solely to inspections and enforcement related to the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act: Provided further, that the Food Safety and Inspection Service shall continue implementation of section 11016 of Public Law 110–246 as further clarified by the amendments made in section 12106 of Public Law 113–79: Provided further, that this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C.2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.
Food Safety and Inspection Service

Lead-Off Tabular Statement

Budget Estimate, 2017 ................................................................. $1,030,405,000
2016 Enacted ........................................................................... 1,014,871,000
Change in Appropriation ............................................................... +15,534,000

Summary of Increases and Decreases

(Dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$897,426</td>
<td>+$3,215</td>
<td>-$1,752</td>
<td>+$15,209</td>
<td>$914,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>+652</td>
<td>+585</td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>61,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>+1,881</td>
<td>-328</td>
<td>+226</td>
<td>16,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius .................................................................</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Discretionary Appropriations ..................................................</td>
<td>1,010,689</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>-1,603</td>
<td>15,534</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Statement
### Adjusted Appropriations Detail and Staff Years (SYs)
(Dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>Inc. or Dec.</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>SYs</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>SYs</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Appropriations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection…………………</td>
<td>$897,238</td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td>$900,853</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>$898,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+$15,209</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$914,098</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection…………</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16,589</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,487</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection…………………</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60,905</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61,568</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius…………………………</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted Approp…………………………</td>
<td>1,010,501</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,016,686</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>1,014,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+15,534</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
<td>8,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions and Transfers (Net)…………………..</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriation……………………………..</td>
<td>1,010,689</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,016,474</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cong. Relations…………………………………</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal………………………………………</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital Fund……………………………</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal………………………………………</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal. Available, SOY……………………………</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoveries, Other (Net)…………………………</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available………………………………</td>
<td>1,015,411</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,033,799</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsing Balances……………………………..</td>
<td>-177</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal. Available, EOY……………………………</td>
<td>-10,780</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligations……………………………..</td>
<td>1,004,454</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,017,680</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Project Statement

**Obligations Detail and Staff Years (SYs)**

(Dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>Inc. or Dec.</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Obligations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection.............</td>
<td>$897,061</td>
<td>$900,647</td>
<td>$898,889</td>
<td>$15,209</td>
<td>$914,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)...............</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>35,874</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection.......</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>16,106</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>16,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection...............</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>61,490</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius................................</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligations..................................</td>
<td>1,004,454</td>
<td>1,017,680</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsing Balances.....................................</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal. Available, EOY.................................</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available......................................</td>
<td>1,015,411</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,033,799</td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cong. Relations.....................................</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal..............................................</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital Fund............................</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal..............................................</td>
<td>-400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal. Available, SOY.................................</td>
<td>-4,556</td>
<td>-10,780</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoveries, Other (Net).........................</td>
<td>-354</td>
<td>-6,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Appropriation..................................</td>
<td>1,010,689</td>
<td>1,016,474</td>
<td>1,014,871</td>
<td>15,534</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Obligations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection.............</td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)...............</td>
<td>35,874</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection.......</td>
<td>16,106</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>16,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection...............</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>61,490</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius................................</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligations..................................</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>8,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsing Balances.....................................</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available......................................</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Appropriation: 1,010,689

2017 Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
<th>Amount SYs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Obligations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection.............</td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)...............</td>
<td>35,874</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection.......</td>
<td>16,106</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>16,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection...............</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>61,490</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius................................</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligations..................................</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>8,951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsing Balances.....................................</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available......................................</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Appropriation: 1,010,689
Food Safety and Inspection Service

Justification of Increases and Decreases

FSIS provides in-plant inspection of all domestic processing and slaughter establishments preparing meat, poultry, and processed egg products for sale or distribution into commerce, as well as surveillance and investigation of all meat, poultry, and egg product facilities. On March 1, 2016, FSIS will begin Federal inspection of Siluriformes fish and fish products. FSIS inspection program personnel are present for all domestic slaughter operations, inspect each livestock and poultry carcass, and inspect operations at each processing establishment at least once per shift. In addition to in-plant personnel in federally inspected establishments, FSIS employs a number of other field personnel, such as laboratory technicians and investigators. Program investigators conduct surveillance, investigations, and other activities at food warehouses, distribution centers, retail stores, and other businesses operating in commerce that store, handle, distribute, transport, or sell meat, poultry, or processed egg products to the consuming public.

FSIS ensures the safety of imported products through a three-part equivalence process which includes (1) analysis of an applicant country’s legal and regulatory structure, (2) initial and periodic on site equivalence auditing of the country’s food regulatory systems, and (3) continual point-of-entry re-inspection of products received from the exporting country. FSIS also has cooperative agreements with 27 States that operate intrastate meat and poultry inspection programs. FSIS conducts reviews of these State programs to ensure that they are “at least equal to” the Federal program. Additionally, FSIS regulates interstate commerce through cooperative agreements with 4 States that already have MPI programs that are identical to the Federal program and allows those establishments to ship products across state lines and also, potentially, to export them to foreign countries.

To carry out these Congressional mandates, FSIS:
- Employs 9,036 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs as of September 30, 2015). This includes other-than-permanent employees in addition to permanent full-time ones.
- Regulates over 250,000 different meat, poultry, and egg products
- Regulates operations at approximately 6,389 federally regulated establishments.
- Ensures public health requirements are met in establishments that each year slaughter or process
  - 145.2 million head of livestock
  - 9.17 billion poultry carcasses
- Conducts 6.92 million food safety & food defense procedures
- Condemns each year
  - Over 507.7 million pounds of poultry
  - More than 203,118 head of livestock during postmortem (post-slaughter) inspection
- In FY 2014, performed 173,185 Humane Handling (HH) verification procedures

FSIS spends approximately 80 percent of its funds on personnel salary and benefits. This is predominantly for inspection personnel in establishments, and other frontline employees such as investigators and laboratory personnel. This map represents the geographic distribution of FSIS operated/regulated establishments.

This map represents the geographic distribution of FSIS operated/regulated establishments.
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technicians. In addition to this, FSIS spends about 15 percent of its budget on travel for inspectors and investigators, state inspection programs, system infrastructure, and other fixed costs like employee workers compensation payments. The remaining five percent funds operations including: supplies for the workforce (such as aprons, goggles, hardhats, and knives), laboratory supplies, management, policy, shipment of meat/poultry samples for testing, recruitment, financial management to include billing industry, labor relations, and purchase of replacement/new equipment. Additionally, FSIS has to adjust to new or anticipated changes in the workforce, industry, law, technology, and the public, plus the introduction or spread of new diseases/pathogens.

A net increase of $12,127,000 for Agency pay costs consisting of $2,614,000 to fund annualization of the 2016 pay increase and an increase of $9,513,000 to fund the 2017 pay increase.

FSIS has a statutory mandate for carcass by carcass slaughter inspection, a once-per-shift per day presence for +processing inspection of meat and poultry, and continuous inspection of processed egg products plants. The permanent statutes for the inspection of meat, poultry, and processed egg products result in labor-intensive inspection activities, thereby making salary costs relatively inflexible.

(1) Increased pay cost of $11,802,000 for the Federal Food Safety and Inspection program.

The increase consist $2,544,500 to fund annualization of the 2016 pay increase and an increase of $9,257,500 to fund the 2017 pay increase.

(2) A net increase $226,000 for the International Food Safety and Inspection program:

The increase consist $48,750 to fund annualization of the 2016 pay increase and an increase of $177,250 to fund the 2017 pay increase.

(3) A net increase $78,000 for the State Food Safety and Inspection program:

The increase consist $16,250 to fund annualization of the 2016 pay increase and an increase of $61,750 to fund the 2017 pay increase.

(4) A net increase $21,000 for the Codex Alimentarius program:

The increase consist $4,500 to fund annualization of the 2016 pay increase and an increase of $16,500 to fund the 2017 pay increase.

A (net) increase of $8,500,000 and 13 staff years for Modernizing Scientific Approaches to Food Safety ($41,200,000 and 273 SYs available in 2016)

FSIS is strongly committed to Department and OMB goals to institutionalize the progress that agencies have already made in efforts to strengthen and use data and evidence to drive better decision-making and achieve greater impact. This proposal also addresses the President’s initiative to combat antimicrobial resistance. FSIS’ efforts to meet these goals and expectations have already begun with the continued updates to the Public Health Information System (PHIS) which now captures data in automated and useful formats. With this proposal FSIS looks to move forward and take the next steps in an iterative learning process to modernize our science based decisions by developing and using new tools to drive results. This is a coordinated and integrated effort to improve the quality and quantity of data that FSIS captures, improve the usefulness of its information, conduct better analysis, become more proactive on reducing illnesses, improve the ability to rapidly adjust to food safety threats that do occur, and to become more effective in performing the FSIS mission.
FSIS’s modernizing scientific approaches to food safety proposal is based on learning from current efforts and identifying new and innovative ways to improve food safety. FSIS is experimenting with new ways to view and combine information in order to glean fresh insights into issues and more effectively target potential sources/causes of illnesses. For example, FSIS has identified testing gaps for product classes and pathogens that need to be addressed. Using an iterative approach, FSIS will begin testing to fill-in these gaps, and the Agency will learn more about contamination and pathogen prevalence for these products/pathogens. This learning will potentially allow FSIS to 1) establish new standards and rules and 2) help better direct future efforts at determining better ways to improve food safety. Also, through collaboration with industry FSIS is trying to improve on current successful practices, identify and incorporate new technology capability, and utilize more advanced analytical tools and processes.

Two parts of this initiative (WGS and Lab analysis) propose to further increase the quality and quantity of useful data to reduce food borne illnesses. The Advanced Analytics part of the initiative provides the capability to increase FSIS’s ability to analyze current and future data to really take advantage of the data available and be able to turn it into useful information. Together they should greatly decrease illnesses by aiding the inspectors in their mission; inform policy, rulemaking and establishment of standards; improve decision making at all levels; improve industry’s awareness of their operations, increase our ability to identify and track antibiotic resistant bacteria, and become more proactive in food safety.

As part of the President’s National Strategy for Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB), USDA is charged with the development of practical mitigation strategies to limit or reduce the prevalence of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). To achieve this goal, ARS, APHIS, ERS, FSIS, NASS, and NIFA jointly developed a USDA AMR Action Plan (Plan), which calls for these agencies to make combating antibiotic resistance a programmatic and budgetary priority.

While the 2017 agencies’ budgets focuses on their specific work related to AMR, the programs and funding are inextricably linked, allowing USDA to maximize efforts, reduce duplication, and leverage the resources across the agencies in the areas of surveillance, research, education, and extension/outreach. The proposed activities of each Agency are dependent upon the partnering agencies fulfilling their proposed activities; this integrated approached allows the most timely and effective response to the AMR issue.

Consistent with the Plan, the agencies propose the following for FY 2017. NASS and APHIS will continue to collect cross-sectional and longitudinal data on farm practices and animal health. This information will be combined with information from characterization of biologic samples collected by APHIS and FSIS to evaluate and identify changes in antibiotic usage, production practices, and disease status, and to determine if current and future efforts to impact the use of antibiotics result in reduced prevalence of antibiotic resistance in animal food production and the environment. Building upon this, intramural research conducted by ARS, and competitive extramurally-funded research activities funded by NIFA will lead to better understanding and characterization of effective mitigation strategies for AMR throughout the agro-ecosystem. Data generated from ARS research, and from NIFA-funded research, education, and extension/outreach activities, will be used to inform antimicrobial stewardship efforts conducted both within and external to government. Information from these agencies will support ongoing analysis by ERS of the effects of alternative policy scenarios on farm production, profits and market outcomes.

The funding change is requested for the following items which although listed separately are linked together to form an integrated approach to improve the use of science and data to reduce illness and to combat AMR:

1. An increase of $4,500,000 and 7 Staff Years for Whole Genome Sequencing ($0 and 0 SYs available in 2016)

The Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS) capability development and implementation is a multi-year and multi-agency initiative utilizing modern sequencing instruments and associated bioinformatics infrastructure to characterize bacterial genomes with greater precision. The ultimate goal of this project is to utilize WGS technology as the multi-agency network standard for bacterial genome characterization and comparison. WGS greatly enhances
FSIS efforts to cluster and discriminate between pathogenic bacteria isolated from clinical specimens and food and environmental samples.

This significant increase in the amount of information FSIS will obtain on pathogens has many benefits to the health community and the American public. WGS will provide more specific information that can help FSIS learn more about ways the Agency may be able to influence Agency and industry processes to improve food safety. This capability is also critical to FSIS as the Agency needs to invest in a new and better technology and remain in sync with key public health partners (principally FDA and CDC) in protecting public health. WGS will provide FSIS with precision information to:

- Improve speed and accuracy in outbreak investigations and tracebacks-traceforward activities
- Help better differentiate case-patients from background, sporadic, non-outbreak patients and align and differentiate food and environmental sample isolates from clinical isolates
- Provide FSIS with valuable information on pathogen evolution/adaptation as it moves between farms, slaughter/processing facilities, retail settings, etc
- Specifically identify resistance to antimicrobial agents and sanitizers, and resulting changes in virulence attributes
- Provide improved discrimination between bacterial isolates. This will aid in identifying environmental harborage and recurrences of pathogens in FSIS-regulated establishments which can further support FSIS HACCP inspection verification and decisions regarding enforcement actions
- FSIS will provide WGS data in addition to serotype, PFGE, and antimicrobial susceptibility results to establishment owners and operators to further assist them in developing supportable HACCP systems, taking effective corrective actions and performing adequate reassessments
- Additionally WGS will consolidate several individual analytic streams (PFGE, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, serotyping, and identification of virulence characteristics) and thus improve overall speed and efficiency in sample analysis

(2) An increase of $3,000,000 and 6 Staff Years for Expanding Lab Analysis ($36,300,000 and 252 SYs available in 2016)

A key part of food safety efforts is the sampling and analysis for pathogens, adulterants and contamination. FSIS’s integrated approach to food safety has made great strides in reducing illnesses in large part because of scientifically derived standards and the sampling program. Data analysis shows that sampling food for hazards leads to a drop in contamination rates. Additionally, positive samples are tested for antimicrobial resistance, which enables better tracking and prevention of antimicrobial resistant bacteria. FSIS developed a five-year sampling plan to build upon Agency successes and through an iterative approach to continue to improve the use of data and information to drive results. Despite FSIS’s best efforts there are still areas that are not tested that could help reduce illnesses. The additional capacity requested will be used to close gaps in our testing program and eliminate exceptions to testing. These gaps fall into three main areas 1) Products not being tested: Ex. Not Ready To Eat (NTRE) products, turkey parts, fabricated steaks; 2) Species not being tested: Ex. lamb, goat, duck; 3) Hazards not currently tested: Ex. non-O157 in raw beef products, Toxoplasma gondii. This initiative will provide overdue increases to our lab analysis program which will decrease the number of illnesses due to consuming FSIS-regulated products and improve the Department’s surveillance program for AMR.

FSIS has found that verifying through sampling is one of the most effective means to decrease the contamination rate in food. Sampling products leads to behavioral changes for two main reasons. First, because industry knows we are checking, they focus more on contamination in those products. Secondly, contamination rates drop when establishments are held to a standard and results are posted. New sampling initiatives cause behavior changes in industry that leads to safer food.

Sampling products encourages regulated establishments to implement interventions. When implemented correctly, interventions decrease the bacterial load of FSIS inspected products. There is a relationship between the bacterial load and the number of people becoming ill both from regular and antimicrobial resistant bacteria.
(3) An increase of $1,000,000 for Advanced Analytics ($4,900,000 and 21 SYs available in 2016)

Advanced data analytics present an unprecedented opportunity to further our food safety mission. More than ever, vast amounts of data are easily collected. Newly available analytical techniques can enable us to gain new and deeper insights from these data. The combination of these advances creates the opportunity to move beyond observing the past and towards forecasting future scenarios.

FSIS is at a natural analytical inflection point. FSIS has increased both the size and complexity of its data holdings in recent years. PHIS was brought online in FY 2011 has significantly changed our more paper based and disjointed information into integrated and useful electronic data. This data is more accessible for analysis than it has ever been, both because of the data warehouse and PHIS. As an Agency, FSIS is committed to using data and analysis to make informed choices and decisions.

The other two parts of this initiative (WGS and Lab analysis) propose to further increase the quality and quantity of useful data to reduce food borne illnesses. This part of the initiative provides the capability to increase FSIS’s ability to analyze current and future data to really take advantage of the data available and be able to turn it into useful information to aid the inspectors in their mission; inform policy, rulemaking and establishment of standards; improve decision making at all levels; improve industry’s awareness of their operations, become more proactive in food defense; and reduce food borne illnesses.

FSIS has several goals relating to advanced analytics:

- Increase capacity, speed, and quality of the data being pulled from our systems/databases
- Increase the level and complexity of analysis capability
- Implement more automation to better use analysis resources
- Make best use of current and newly available data
- Acquire and use data from previously untapped resources
- Use data to predict potential hazards and either prevent or respond faster to these hazards
- Shape lab sampling initiatives

Operational impacts include: shortened response times, increase data driven decision making, optimize resource allocation (personnel and Lab), continuous performance measurement, improve communications and data sharing with stakeholders and other agencies

A net decrease of $3,314,000 for new methods in poultry inspection implementation

On August 21, 2014, FSIS published a final rule to change the inspection system for poultry slaughter establishments. The rule, with modifications, adopts the provisions in the January 2012 proposal. This rule will allow for the modernization of how the Agency inspects young chicken and turkey slaughter operations. The New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS), an updated science-based inspection system that positions food safety inspectors throughout poultry facilities in a smarter way. Significant public health benefits will be achieved, and foodborne illness will be prevented by focusing our inspectors’ attention on activities that will better ensure the safety of poultry. Those changes include moving some inspectors away from quality assurance tasks—including checking carcasses for bruises and feathers—to focus on food safety tasks, such as ensuring sanitation standards are being met and verifying testing and antimicrobial process controls. This science based approach means our highly-trained inspectors will spend less time looking for obvious physical defects that do not impact public health and more time making sure poultry processing facilities take steps to prevent contamination and to better control invisible food safety hazards posed by harmful bacteria.

Originally, FSIS had planned $10 million in savings for implementation of the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS) by the end of FY 2016. However, this savings has been modified due to implementation delays resulting from changes in the rule when it was published, and rate of negotiations with the union on the NPIS conversion. As a consequence of the schedule delays, FSIS has modified its estimate for saving $10 million over two fiscal years. Based on current pace/projections of establishment conversions, FSIS anticipates a savings of $6.7 million in FY2016 and $3.3 million in FY 2017.
A decrease of $1,779,000 for Billings Process Improvements

The FMIA, PPIA, and EPIA authorize FSIS to collect fees for overtime and holiday work when an establishment requests inspection in excess of the eight hours of free inspection per shift that FSIS provides. FSIS’ billing and time accounting processes are separate parallel operations that were not easily reconcilable. These disconnections caused FSIS to collect fewer fees from industry than it should have collected. FSIS new T&A system and business processes help to integrate both time and billing input which improves the process while enabling a more accurate billing method. This assists Agency personnel in billing industry in timely manner and at the correct rate and for the correct amount of time. While collection amounts may fluctuate slightly from year to year, the process improvements have resulted in a sustained increase in overall collections from previous years. Automating these processes will better institutionalize them to collect both T&A and billing data in a single data collection point for employees, thereby eliminating approximately 60% of the reconciliation process between the T&A and billing documents and improve the accuracy of billings. The results of these process improvements allows FSIS to more accurately bill industry, collect the appropriate amount of overtime and holiday fees, and can therefore reduce its appropriated funding requirements.
Summary of Proposed Legislation

Salaries and Expenses:

Program: Performance Based User Fee

Proposal: In FY 2017, FSIS proposes the collection of a user fee for performance. The performance fee, for an estimated total of $4 million, would recover the increased costs of providing additional inspections and related services due to the performance of an establishment and plant. These fees will be collected starting in 2017 and used to reduce appropriation needs in future years.

Rationale: A performance based user fee would recover the costs incurred for additional inspections and related activities made necessary due to the performance of the covered establishment and plant. Examples of the increased costs for which a performance based user fee could be charged include food safety assessments, follow-up sampling, and additional investigations due to the outbreak of disease. The measure would allow the Secretary to adjust the terms, conditions, and rates of the fees in order to minimize economic impacts on small or very small establishments and plants.

Goal: To recover costs for providing inspections and related activities due to the performance of an establishment and plant.

Offsets: There will be no offset in Fiscal Year 2017.

Budget Impact: ($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item of Change</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Budget Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Outlays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Geographic Breakdown of Obligations and Staff Years

(Dollars in thousands and Staff Years (SYs))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$30,623</td>
<td>$30,469</td>
<td>$30,859</td>
<td>$30,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>2,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>38,605</td>
<td>38,583</td>
<td>39,076</td>
<td>38,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>56,725</td>
<td>56,168</td>
<td>56,886</td>
<td>58,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>17,646</td>
<td>17,872</td>
<td>17,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>9,711</td>
<td>9,835</td>
<td>9,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>10,008</td>
<td>10,437</td>
<td>10,571</td>
<td>10,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>83,210</td>
<td>83,474</td>
<td>84,542</td>
<td>87,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>29,093</td>
<td>29,631</td>
<td>30,010</td>
<td>31,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12,445</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>13,085</td>
<td>12,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>37,648</td>
<td>37,768</td>
<td>38,251</td>
<td>37,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>16,922</td>
<td>17,058</td>
<td>17,276</td>
<td>17,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>13,923</td>
<td>14,101</td>
<td>13,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>9,224</td>
<td>9,538</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>9,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>25,359</td>
<td>27,055</td>
<td>27,401</td>
<td>27,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7,781</td>
<td>7,237</td>
<td>7,329</td>
<td>7,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>25,714</td>
<td>24,922</td>
<td>25,241</td>
<td>25,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>29,874</td>
<td>29,785</td>
<td>30,166</td>
<td>29,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>30,923</td>
<td>30,032</td>
<td>30,416</td>
<td>30,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2,529</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>25,126</td>
<td>25,337</td>
<td>25,661</td>
<td>25,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>7,837</td>
<td>7,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>13,105</td>
<td>13,272</td>
<td>13,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>40,587</td>
<td>41,317</td>
<td>41,845</td>
<td>41,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>14,066</td>
<td>13,766</td>
<td>13,942</td>
<td>13,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>7,844</td>
<td>7,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>40,477</td>
<td>39,476</td>
<td>39,980</td>
<td>39,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>11,907</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>12,027</td>
<td>11,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>4,608</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td>4,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>14,953</td>
<td>14,953</td>
<td>15,144</td>
<td>15,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>55,864</td>
<td>55,606</td>
<td>56,312</td>
<td>55,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>5,222</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>5,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>14,305</td>
<td>15,176</td>
<td>15,370</td>
<td>15,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8,723</td>
<td>8,698</td>
<td>8,809</td>
<td>8,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16,050</td>
<td>15,532</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td>15,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>204,948</td>
<td>217,840</td>
<td>220,623</td>
<td>218,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>3,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Obligations                  | 1,004,458   | 1,017,680   | 1,030,690     | 1,030,405     |
| Lapsing Balances             | 177         | -           | -             | -             |
| Bal. Available, EOY          | 10,780      | 15,819      |               |               |
| Total, Available             | 1,015,411   | 1,033,799   | 1,030,690     | 1,030,405     |

Food Safety and Inspection Service
### Classification by Objects

*(Dollars in thousands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
<td>$80,627</td>
<td>$80,979</td>
<td>$82,309</td>
<td>$83,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>505,017</td>
<td>507,219</td>
<td>499,446</td>
<td>509,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total personnel compensation</td>
<td>585,644</td>
<td>588,198</td>
<td>581,755</td>
<td>592,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefits</td>
<td>216,233</td>
<td>218,095</td>
<td>217,105</td>
<td>220,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for former personnel</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2,102</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, personnel comp. and benefits</td>
<td>802,983</td>
<td>807,273</td>
<td>800,962</td>
<td>815,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Objects:</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation of persons</td>
<td>36,594</td>
<td>37,428</td>
<td>38,493</td>
<td>38,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation of things</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>4,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental payments to GSA</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>10,334</td>
<td>10,334</td>
<td>9,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental payments to others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications, utilities, and misc. charges</td>
<td>11,981</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>10,492</td>
<td>10,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and reproduction</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory and assistance services</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>3,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services from non-Federal sources</td>
<td>34,915</td>
<td>33,117</td>
<td>48,583</td>
<td>31,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other purchases of goods and services from Federal sources</td>
<td>33,411</td>
<td>42,055</td>
<td>37,153</td>
<td>36,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of facilities</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of equipment</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and materials</td>
<td>10,853</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>12,094</td>
<td>14,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>11,451</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>10,929</td>
<td>11,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and structures</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>50,075</td>
<td>50,861</td>
<td>50,861</td>
<td>50,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance claims and indemnities</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and dividends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Other Objects</td>
<td>201,471</td>
<td>210,407</td>
<td>229,728</td>
<td>214,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, new obligations</td>
<td>1,004,454</td>
<td>1,017,680</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DHS Building Security Payments (included in 25.3) $ - $ 1,146 $ 1,170 $ 1,170

### Position Data:

| Average Salary (dollars), ES Position | $168,742 | $170,429 | $172,645 | $174,889 |
| Average Salary (dollars), GS Position | $63,320 | $64,794 | $64,072 | $65,039 |
| Average Salary (dollars), AP positions | - | - | - | - |
| Average Grade, GS Position | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| Average Grade, AP Position | - | - | - | - |
### Food Safety and Inspection Service

#### Shared Funding Projects

**Dollars in thousands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Enterprise System Management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Management Service Center</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>4,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Operations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Procurement Systems</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail and Reproduction Management</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>5,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Media and Broadcast Center</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondence Management</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management Services</td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>5,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Control Support Services</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Finance Center</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>8,526</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>8,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Technology Services</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Information Technology Center</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Services</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>4,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Working Capital Fund</strong></td>
<td>20,068</td>
<td>19,961</td>
<td>18,369</td>
<td>18,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890 USDA Initiatives</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee Liaison Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified National Security Information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of Operations Planning</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GOV Initiatives HSPD-12</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations Center</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Infrastructure Review and Assessment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based Initiatives &amp; Neighborhood Partnerships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Biobased Products Preferred Procurement Program</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-Serving Institutions National Program</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Awards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Transformation</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertribal Technical Assistance Network</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Document Security</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preauthorized Funding</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Processor Web Application</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Language Interpreter Services</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET Center</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA 1994 Program</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual University</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Garden &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Departmental Shared Cost Programs</strong></td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E-Gov:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget Formulation &amp; Execution LOB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise HR Integration</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Training</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management LOB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Management LOB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Acquisition Environment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAE - Loans and Grants</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Assistance Improvement Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Rulemaking</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geospatial LOB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GovBenefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants.gov</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, E-Gov</strong></td>
<td>877</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Total</strong></td>
<td>23,602</td>
<td>23,597</td>
<td>21,842</td>
<td>21,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food Safety and Inspection Service

STATUS OF PROGRAM

Current Activities:

The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is the public health regulatory Agency within USDA responsible for ensuring that domestic and imported meat, poultry, and processed egg products are safe, secure, wholesome, and accurately labeled, as required by the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA), and the Egg Products Inspection Act (EPIA). FSIS also enforces the Humane Methods of Slaught er Act (HMSA), which requires that all livestock at federally inspected establishments be handled and slaughtered humanely. To carry out these Congressional mandates, FSIS employs 9,036 Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) (9,483 employees). Among these employees are a frontline workforce of 7,770 permanent FTEs (8,112 employees) and 246 other-than-permanent FTEs (273 employees) that work in approximately 6,389 federally regulated establishments, three FSIS laboratories, 122 import establishments, and 150,000 in-commerce facilities nationwide. In addition, there are 1,020 FTEs (1,098 employees) who support them.

FSIS provides in-plant inspection of all domestic processing and slaughter establishments preparing meat, poultry, and processed egg products for sale or distribution into commerce, as well as surveillance and investigation of all meat, poultry and egg product facilities. FSIS inspection program personnel are present for all domestic slaughter operations, inspect each livestock and poultry carcass, and inspect each processing establishment at least once per shift. In addition to in-plant personnel in federally inspected establishments, FSIS employs a number of other field personnel, such as laboratory technicians and investigators. Program investigators conduct surveillance, investigations, and other activities at food warehouses, distribution centers, retail stores, and other businesses operating in commerce that store, handle, distribute, transport, or sell meat, poultry, or processed egg products to the consuming public. FSIS ensures the safety of imported products through a three-part equivalence process which includes analysis of an applicant country’s legal and regulatory structure, initial and periodic on site equivalence auditing of the country’s food regulatory systems, and continual point-of-entry re-inspection of products received from the exporting country. FSIS also has cooperative agreements with 27 States that operate intrastate meat and poultry inspection programs. FSIS conducts reviews of these State programs to ensure that they are “at least equal to” the Federal program. Additionally, FSIS has a second program with four States that have inspection programs that are identical to the Federal program. Under this program, State inspected establishments in the program can ship products in interstate commerce.

Strategic Plan: In 2011, FSIS developed a five-year Strategic Plan providing both the Agency and stakeholders with a roadmap on how the Agency intends to effect change over time. The Plan outlines three strategic themes: 1) preventing foodborne illness, 2) understanding and influencing the farm to table continuum, and 3) empowering people and strengthening FSIS infrastructure. The Plan includes eight discrete goals and related strategies under these goals.

Goal 1: Ensure that Food Safety Inspection Aligns with Existing and Emerging Risks.
Goal 2: Maximize Domestic and International Compliance with Food Safety Policies.
Goal 3: Enhance Public Education and Outreach to Improve Food-Handling Practices.
Goal 4: Strengthen Collaboration Among Internal and External Stakeholders to Prevent Foodborne Illness.
Goal 5: Effectively Use Science to Understand Foodborne Illness and Emerging Trends.
Goal 6: Implement Effective Policies to Respond to Existing and Emerging Risks.
Goal 7: Empower Employees with the Training, Resources, and Tools to Enable Success in Protecting Public Health.

In preparation for the 2017 FSIS budget request, the Agency utilized the goals included in its strategic plan to evaluate current and future activities, streamline areas for savings, and innovate new methods to achieve targeted outcomes. In the following report, each of the Agency’s high-priority activities is referenced to the strategic goals that it supports.
Overview of Accomplishments

**Frontline Inspection:** During FY 2015, FSIS inspection program personnel ensured that public health requirements were met in establishments that slaughter or process 145.2 million head of livestock and 9.17 billion poultry carcasses. Inspection program personnel also conducted 6.92 million food safety and food defense procedures to verify that systems at all federally inspected facilities maintained food safety and wholesomeness requirements. During FY 2015, inspection program personnel condemned more than 507.7 million pounds of poultry and more than 203,118 head of livestock during post-mortem (post slaughter) inspection. (Goals 1 & 2)

**Foodborne illness Outbreak Investigation:** FSIS coordinated investigations for 28 foodborne illness clusters representing 1,539 illnesses, 274 hospitalizations, 1 Hemolytic-uremic syndrome (HUS) case, and 3 deaths. (Goals 1, 4 & 5)

**Humane Handling:** In FY 2015, the Agency devoted 180.7 FTEs to the verification and enforcement of humane handling requirements in federally inspected establishments, spending more than 375,000 hours completing these tasks. In total, 173,185 verification procedures were performed.

**Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection:** The Poultry Slaughter Rule was published in August 2014 and is now in effect. While some provisions are voluntary, other portions are mandatory such as that all poultry slaughter establishments are required to perform their own microbiological testing. Very small and very low volume poultry slaughter establishments operating under Traditional Inspection are required to perform sampling at post-chill and all other establishments are required to perform sampling at points in their production process (pre-chill and post-chill) to show that they are controlling enteric pathogens (e.g., *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*). (Goals 1 & 2)

**Food Safety Assessments (FSAs):** Implemented the new focused Food Safety Assessment (FSA) methodology (5-7 days) in June 2015. This methodology requires that a Public Health Risk Evaluation (PHRE) be conducted first, to determine if a Food Safety Assessment is warranted, and aligns FSIS resources with public health risk. The Agency saved an estimated $1.18M and 26,600 hours within 3 months of implementation. The new FSA methodology allows FSIS to more efficiently use resources by targeting higher risk establishments. (Goals 2 & 6)

**FoodKeeper Application:** The completion and launch of the FoodKeeper application in April 2015 was a great accomplishment this fiscal year. The application provides consumers with information about safe handling and storage times for hundreds of food items, thereby supporting the Secretary’s goal to reduce food waste.

**Ask Karen:** “Ask Karen” is FSIS’ food safety virtual-representative and the most prominent feature of the FSIS website. The “Ask Karen” database received 12,260 e-mail questions and 1,769,716 answers were viewed in FY 2015.

**New Strategic Plan:** FSIS began developing the Agency’s next 5-year strategic plan, for issuance in early 2017, in consultation with federal partners and with input from industry and consumer advocacy groups on the overall food safety environment. Designated staff throughout the Agency as well as senior leadership have regularly engaged on developing the plan’s goals, outcomes, and objectives to ensure it is a high-quality, meaningful document whose information is easily accessible to FSIS’ workforce, Congress, key stakeholders, and the public.

**Advanced Analytics:** FSIS completed a Five-Year Advanced Analytics Plan. This plan outlined the current state of advanced analytics at FSIS and provided a vision for developing this program over the next five years to better use analysis resources, make the best use of current and newly available data, and acquire and use data from previously untapped sources.

**Sampling Plans:** FSIS developed its first Five-Year Sampling Plan that outlined a vision for FSIS sampling over the next five years. (Goals 1 & 6)

**Salmonella:** FSIS continued its multipronged approach to combat Salmonella in FY 2015. FSIS continued sampling of poultry carcasses, comminuted poultry, and chicken parts, and raw beef samples for analysis while also
initiating a new exploratory sampling program for Salmonella in pork products to determine the presence and levels of Salmonella in five types of processed pork products.

**FSIS leadership and Development Training:** FSIS was recognized with a USDA Cultural Transformation Award for its employee development initiatives. The Agency was acknowledged for its training, development, competency gap-closing endeavors, and preparing employees for career advancement and/or as future leaders. (Goal 7)

**Agency Fleet Management Program:** The Agency Fleet Management Program was designated as a Best Practice Model and has been adopted for USDA implementation. (Goal 7)

♦ **Federal Food Safety & Inspection Program**

**Frontline Inspection:** During FY 2015, FSIS inspection program personnel ensured public health requirements were met in establishments that slaughter or process 145.2 million head of livestock and 9.17 billion poultry carcasses. Inspection program personnel also conducted 6.92 million food safety and food defense procedures to verify that systems at all federally inspected facilities maintained food safety and wholesomeness requirements. During FY 2015, inspection program personnel condemned more than 507.7 million pounds of poultry and more than 203,118 head of livestock during post-mortem (post-slaughter) inspection. (Goals 1 & 2)

**Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection:** On August 21, 2014, FSIS published a final rule that will now require that all poultry slaughter establishments take measures to prevent contamination, rather than addressing contamination after it occurs. For the first time, all poultry slaughter establishments will be required to perform their own microbiological testing. Very small and very low volume poultry slaughter establishments operating under Traditional Inspection are required to perform sampling at post-chill and all other establishments are required to perform sampling at two points (pre-chill and post-chill) in their production process to show that they are controlling enteric pathogens (e.g., *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*). These requirements are in addition to FSIS' own testing, which the Agency will continue to perform. FSIS also established the optional New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS), in which poultry slaughter establishment must sort their own product for quality defects before presenting it to FSIS inspectors. This system allows FSIS inspectors to focus less on routine quality assurance tasks that have little relationship to preventing pathogens like *Salmonella* and instead focus more on strategies that are proven to strengthen food safety. A greater number of inspectors will now be available to more frequently remove birds from the evisceration line for close food safety examinations, take samples for testing, check plant sanitation, verify compliance with food safety plans, observe live birds for signs of disease or mistreatment and ensure plants are meeting all applicable regulations. Results: The Agency surpassed expected milestone of 20% of opted in plants converting by the end of the FY since 49% of the plants that requested NPIS had implemented by the end of FY 2015 (Goals 1 & 2)

**Training:** FSIS workforce is a cornerstone of public health protection. The workforce training strategy used by FSIS includes providing entry-level training on mission-critical inspection skills to new employees, followed by additional training as policy is updated and training to reinforce knowledge about how to perform complex public health protection duties. FSIS has adopted a regional approach to deliver training closer to the worksite and save travel costs; provide leadership training to ensure effective succession planning; and developed e-learning for targeted skills which includes CD-ROM, video, and web-based training.

During FY 2015, FSIS provided entry-level training to 309 new Food Inspectors, 439 newly promoted Consumer Safety Inspectors, 91 new Public Health Veterinarians and 80 newly hired Enforcement Investigations Analysis Officers, FSIS also included a course for Egg Inspectors, training 84 employees, and a course for Thermal Processing, training 33 employees. There were 98 new supervisors that completed the New Supervisory Training Program. (Goal 7)

FSIS also used distance education training for experienced inspectors with 644 inspectors being trained using the Situational Based Humane Handling training and over 52 inspectors participating in the Egg Products training. FSIS also updated and implemented the structured on the job training program for Food Inspectors to reinforce the information from classroom training. (Goal 7)
In FY 2015, FSIS held a Surveillance, Investigations, and Enforcement Methodology Training (SIEM) course. The SIEM training was a 2-week course developed from the statutes, Agency policy, and directive-based information. The training covered the Agency Mission and Roles, Agency Records, Regulatory Framework, Statutes, Amenability, Exemptions, Investigator Safety, Liaison, In-commerce Surveillance, Food Defense Surveillance, Investigations, Interviews, Evidence, Sampling, Photography, Investigative Reports, Case Referral/Disposition, Detentions, Seizures, and Criminal, Civil, and Administrative Enforcement. FSIS also created the first course in a planned curriculum for Compliance Investigators via AgLearn. (Goal 7)

**Outreach to States and small and very small regulated establishments:**

On September 29, 2015, FSIS held its first ever 50 State webinar. This was the first time that FSIS reached out to its public health partners in all 50 States, US Territories, and Tribal Reservations at one time to convey industry-focused food safety information. The Webinar was designed for State, Territorial, and Tribal officials who oversee foodservice operations to provide an overview of *Listeria monocytogenes* and discuss FSIS’ recently updated “FSIS Best Practices Guidance on Controlling *Listeria monocytogenes* (Lm) in Retail Delicatessens. There were 165 participants on this Webinar. FSIS will continue holding 50 State webinars on topics of mutual concern to build tighter collaboration between USDA and the 50 States, Territories, and Tribal reservations.

- FSIS also conducted 12 monthly Webinars for all 50 State and US Territory HACCP Contacts and Agriculture Extension Agents at universities across the nation. FSIS shared the latest policies and initiatives with this network so that they could disseminate this vital information to the thousands of owners and operators they come into contact with on a regular basis. (Goal 4)

- For FY 2015, FSIS exhibited at 16 exhibits and conferences, taking the Small Plant Help Desk on the road, FSIS provided outreach, technical resources, and on hand technical expertise to more than 35,000 stakeholders. The notable conferences FSIS participated in are the International Production and Processing Expo (17,000+ attendees), the Food Marketing Institute’s Annual Convention and Exhibit (8,000), the Food Safety Summit (1,200 attendees), the Institute of Food Technologists Convention (3,100 attendees), American Veterinary Medical Association Annual Convention (5,000 attendees), National Environmental Health Association Annual Educational Conference (1,200 attendees), and American Association of Meat Processors (AAMP) Annual Conference (300 attendees) (Goal 4).

- On September 23, 2015, FSIS held a Webinar focused entirely on the Cooperative Interstate Shipment (CIS) program. This Webinar featured Wisconsin’s Meat and Poultry Inspection Program Director as well as a processor participating in the program. USDA also participated in the Webinar to provide an overview of the tools and resources that USDA offers to small producers and processors through its Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative. There were 110 participants on this Webinar.

- On September 30, 2015, FSIS cohosted with the Niche Meat Processor Assistance Network a Webinar titled “Validation of HACCP Processes for Dried and Fermented Meats.” This was based off of the Agency’s recently issued “FSIS Compliance Guideline HACCP Systems Validation (April 2015).” This Webinar targeted small and very small meat processors and there were a record 170 participants.

**Humane Handling:** The position of the Humane Handling Enforcement Coordinator (HHEC) was filled in FY 2015. The HHEC provides an essential layer of oversight necessary for FSIS to meet the statutory requirements associated with the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (HMSA). Having a centralized subject matter expert provides support for nationwide correlation on humane handling and good commercial practice issues.

FSIS published a proposed rule on how the Agency intends to handle non ambulatory veal calves. In the Federal Register Notice, Requirements for the Disposition of Non-Ambulatory Disabled Veal Calves, FSIS is proposing to amend its regulations on ante-mortem inspection to remove a provision that permits establishments to set apart and hold for treatment veal calves that are unable to rise from a recumbent position and walk because they are tired or cold. Under the proposed rule, non-ambulatory disabled veal calves that are offered for slaughter will be
condemned and promptly euthanized. Prohibiting the slaughter of all non-ambulatory disabled veal calves will improve compliance with the HMSA and the humane slaughter implementing regulations.

The DVM Specialists (DVMS) continue to operate on a 12-month cycle for completing assessments in Humane Handling and Good Commercial Practices. FSIS completed 1,015 Humane Handling (HH) assessments in FY 2015 compared with 981 HH assessments completed in FY 2014.

For FY 2015, FSIS set the target at 65% of establishments visited that would have a systematic approach to humane handling. Fifty-seven out of 58 active large red meat plants currently have a systematic approach to humane handling. One hundred twenty-nine out of 159 active small red meat plants have developed a systematic approach to humane handling (81.5%) and 303 out of 500 (61%) active very small red meat plants have adopted a systematic approach. By FY 2015, out of 717 active red meat plants, 489 plants (68.2%) have implemented a systematic approach to Humane Handling and Slaughter.

In FY 2015, the Agency devoted 165 FTEs to the verification and enforcement of humane handling requirements in federally inspected establishments, spending more than 375,000 hours completing these tasks. In total, 173,185 verification procedures were performed.

**Emergency Coordination:** In FY 2015, FSIS developed and conducted six preparedness and response exercises based on Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) principles that addressed a range of mission critical issues and potential threats facing the Agency. This effort exceeded the original goal of three exercises. Each exercise led to the creation of an After Action Report/ Improvement Plan that identified critical strengths and areas for improvement, which was monitored to ensure that action items were implemented by participating FSIS program areas. The exercises ranged from FSIS’ annual human pandemic table-top exercise to a Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) focused exercise at the Agency’s proposed new Emergency Relocation Facility that allowed FSIS leadership to test out their plans for leaving the National Capitol Region during a COOP event. FSIS also held an Outbreak Investigation Exercise that provided FSIS decision makers with the opportunity to explore and test new approaches to challenges based on past outbreak investigations in a realistic environment. Other table top exercises dealt with response coordination and communication by FSIS during a cyber-security incident and response and communication coordination by investigators during a contamination incident. Finally another exercise focused on FSIS’ Directive 5500.2, Revision 6 for “Significant Incident Response,” the Patriots Plaza III Occupant Emergency Plan, Emergency Management Committee Reference Guide, and Emergency Notification Procedures. All of these exercises and completed improvement plans have resulted in FSIS being better prepared to respond to and recover from a variety of significant incidents while carrying out its critical public health activities. (Goals 7 & 8)

**Trend Analysis for FSIS Incident Management Tracking System:** Trends in significant incidents reported in the FSIS incident management system (FIMS) were tracked to inform Agency policy and preparedness plans. In addition, a baseline was established tracking foodborne illness significant incidents which resulted in reminder to FIMS users about all information that should be included for significant incidents in IMS and became an additional requirement for future modernization of FIMS. These activities helped to improve data quality and the Agency’s ability to track trends earlier and with more accuracy in FIMS. (Goals 1 & 8)

**Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza:** FSIS has continued to prepare for the possibility of an outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) in the U.S. commercial poultry supply through annual revisions of its planning documents concerning an outbreak of HPAI, as well as testing those plans with an annual tabletop exercise. During the recent 2015 outbreak of HPAI in the U.S. commercial poultry supply, FSIS worked closely in conjunction with USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the USDA HPAI workgroup, and FSIS regulated industry impacted by the outbreak. (Goals 1 & 3)

**Natural Disasters:** During FY 2015, FSIS was involved in examining the impact of approximately 17 disasters ranging from severe weather warnings to typhoons and hurricanes. These emergencies affected multiple areas including Hawaii, Guam, and Saipan. FSIS monitored outages of electricity and water to determine if any Tier 1 in-commerce firms were impacted. FSIS conducted on site visits or made phone contact with Tier 1 firms to ensure that there was no operational impact and that there were no damaged products in commerce. Additionally, FSIS
conducted outreach to consumers and the media on safe food handling practices during natural disasters and severe weather. (Goal 1 & 3)

**Foodborne Illness Outbreak Investigation:** FSIS coordinated investigations for 28 foodborne illness clusters representing 1,539 illnesses, 274 hospitalizations, one Hemolytic-uremic syndrome (HUS) case, and three deaths; four of the illness clusters led to a recall. Of the 28 investigations, seven were investigations for Shiga toxin-producing E. coli (one E. coli O157, three E. coli O157:H7, one E. coli O45, one E. coli O181, one E. coli O157:H7 and E. coli O103), 18 for Salmonella, one for Campylobacter coli and jejuni, one for Listeria monocytogenes, and one for Clostridium botulinum. (Goals 1, 4 & 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogen</th>
<th>Investigations</th>
<th>Ill</th>
<th>Hospitalized</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
<th>Resulted in Recall Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmonella</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campylobacter jejuni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple pathogens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recalls:** FY 2015 saw an increase from FY 2014 of 75 food recalls, from 82 to157, (36 beef, 22 poultry, 25 pork, and 74 combination products) for 18,596,602 total pounds of meat and poultry products (1,232,827 pounds more than was recalled in FY 2014). This increase was mainly the result of an increase in allergen-related recalls (65 in FY 2015 compared to 30 in FY 2014), many were subsequent to a large FDA recall of allergen-contaminated spices used widely in the meat and poultry industry. One hundred-five of the recalls were considered Class I (reasonable probability that eating the food will cause health problems or death), 37 were Class II (remote probability of adverse health consequences from eating the food) and 15 were Class III (use of the product will not cause adverse health consequences). Thirteen of the recalls were directly related to microbiological contamination caused by the presence of Listeria monocytogenes or STEC. Eleven of the recalls were in response to extraneous material contamination. Five recalls were caused by contamination of product by Salmonella. Sixty-five were in response to undeclared allergens in the product. The remaining 63 recalls were in response to undeclared substances, processing defects, produced without the benefit of inspection, mislabeling/misbranding, unsanitary conditions and unapproved substances. (Goals 1, 2 & 6)

**Consumer Complaint Management System (CCMS):** FSIS uses the Consumer Complaint Management System (CCMS), media reports, CDC PulseNet and SharePoint data and a number of other data sources to conduct surveillance and investigation into potential foodborne hazards associated with FSIS regulated products. Surveillance is the backbone to initiate investigation and support response. In FY 2015, FSIS evaluated 944 consumer complaints and 122 illness clusters potentially linked to FSIS regulated products. More than 20 percent of consumer complaints required additional investigation at the producing establishment or outreach to our internal and external public health partners, with some further action resulting in voluntary (seven), enforcement (three) and regulatory (one) actions at the plant. At least 40 consumer complaints were connected to recent recalls and helped to provide surveillance information to support recall effectiveness and decision-making analyses when reviewing the potential need to expand a recall. Evidence obtained in 6 of 122 monitored illness clusters suggested involvement of FSIS-products, and one (1) led to the recall of more than 28,000 pounds of adulterated product.

**In-Commerce Activities:** FSIS Compliance Investigators (CIs) conduct investigations, enforcement, and surveillance activities at warehouses, distributors, retail stores, and other businesses operating in commerce that store, handle, distribute, transport, and sell meat, poultry, and processed egg products to the consuming public. In
FY 2015, FSIS collected 475 retail ground beef samples for testing for *E. coli* O157:H7 (103 percent of FSIS’ target of 460). (Goals 1 & 4)

Also in FY 2015, FSIS CIs conducted 757 investigations in response to alleged violations of the FMIA, PPIA, or the EPIA, 91.4 percent of which were based on food safety violations. The investigative findings and evidence are documented and used to support criminal prosecutions. In FY 2015, FSIS controlled 3,604,395 pounds (3,150,837 pounds detained) of meat, poultry and processed egg products in-commerce to prevent possible injury or illness to the consumer. Additionally, 15,184 surveillance activities were conducted in FY 2015 (versus 13,655 in FY 2014). These surveillance activities focused on examination of food safety and food defense activities in accordance with Agency policy and directives. (Goal 1)

**Prosecutions and Other Legal Actions:** In FY 2015, FSIS worked directly with OGC, U.S. Attorneys, OIG, and other partners to obtain criminal convictions, fines, and other results to stop illegal slaughter activities, sale of adulterated and misbranded food, false and fraudulent use of food as inspected and passed, and other violations. Two firms and responsible officials entered pleas resulting in one felony, two misdemeanors, $3,650 in fines and restitution, and probation that served to protect the public and deter future violations. These firms were operating in violation of the FMIA and the PPIA. Additionally, FSIS issued 1,001 notices of warnings (44 from headquarters and 957 from field offices) to individuals and firms for violations of laws. These outcomes sent a strong message that food safety violations will not be tolerated. (Goals 1 & 2)

**Administrative Enforcement:** In FY 2015, FSIS filed eight administrative complaints (down from nine filed in FY 2014) to refuse or withdraw inspection for public health violations, inspector safety, or fitness convictions, including multiple, high-profile cases involving food pathogens and humane slaughter violations. FSIS negotiated three consent orders with terms that improved food safety, company ethics, and inspector safety; obtained one default judgment, indefinitely suspending inspection service for humane handling violations; issued one final decision and order indefinitely withdrawing inspection from a serious violator; and accepted one voluntary withdrawal of service. (Goal 2)

**Civil Enforcement:** In FY 2015, FSIS led litigation actions to obtain civil injunctions, civil judgments, and enforce civil decrees in three civil cases to stop ongoing violations of FSIS food safety laws; filed two civil complaints, negotiated two civil consent decrees and one additional settlement agreement for violations of an existing consent judgment and decree, resulting in the permanent cessation of operations, obtaining a total of $30,000 in civil penalties. (Goal 2)

**Administrative Civil Penalties:** In FY 2015, FSIS led litigation actions to obtain seven administrative stipulation agreements in administrative civil penalties egg cases, totaling $7,390 in administrative civil penalties for violations of shell egg temperature requirements and issued six warning notices to resolve alleged violations of law. (Goal 2)

**Misconduct Investigations:** FSIS conducted a total of 197 personnel misconduct investigations that were received through the USDA OIG Whistleblower Hotline as well as other internal and external requests. Complaints were also received from congressional sources, other USDA agencies, and public entities. FSIS completed five computer forensic investigations resulting from direct observation of inappropriate materials detected by vulnerability detection software and OIG hotline allegations. (Goal 2)

**Food Labeling Compliance:** During FY 2015, FSIS evaluated and processed 41,166 label submissions from industry for meat, poultry, and processed egg products. Of these submissions, 29,433 were approved, and 11,733 submissions were not approved and returned to be corrected. FSIS received and responded to more than 11,000 email inquiries from domestic producers and manufacturers, foreign establishments, trade groups, State and foreign government officials, embassies, Congressional offices, consumers/consumer groups, universities, and research organizations that requested guidance on labeling, food standards, ingredients, and jurisdiction policies. FSIS also sent about 5,000 advisory letters and other correspondence to manufacturers explaining labeling, food standards, ingredients, and jurisdiction policies in response to recalls and compliance actions.
Labeling: In FY 2015, analysis of the 2013 Final Rule; Prior Label Approval System – Generic Label Approval, showed that there was a 40% reduction in the number of label applications received by FSIS, and regulatory noncompliance reports citing labeling regulations were reduced by 58% in the year following implementation of the final rule.

Salmonella: FSIS continued its multipronged approach to combat Salmonella in FY 2015. Work on the Salmonella Action Plan progressed with FSIS continuing to sample poultry carcasses, comminuted poultry, and chicken parts. A moving window approach instead of set based sampling began in May for products subject to Salmonella testing to allow for more continuous sampling and better monitoring process control in establishments. The Agency also initiated a new exploratory sampling program for Salmonella in pork products to determine the presence and levels of Salmonella in five types of processed pork products. This project will evaluate the role of pork products contributing to Salmonellosis and possibly guide future regulatory programs. FSIS continues to analyze for Salmonella in all raw beef samples collected for STEC analysis.

National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS): In FY 2015 FSIS analyzed a total of 4,733 samples in the NARMS cecal sampling program. Of the total samples analyzed, 1,013 (21.41%) were positive for Salmonella, 1,552 (32.8 percent) were positive for Campylobacter, and over 95% of the positive samples were also positive for E. coli or Enterococcus. FSIS collaborated with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA), the Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) and the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) for publishing the NARMS 2012-13 integrated reports.

Chemical residue: The Agency continued to strengthen activities to verify the prevention of violative chemical residues in meat, poultry, and processed egg products. During FY 2015, FSIS reviewed the results of the nationwide survey of public health veterinarians (PHVs) in Office of Field Operations (OFO) and determined the need for more specific instructions to the PHVs for when to perform the residue screen test. FSIS worked to develop a data based Excel tool that would determine the slaughter class specific conditions most likely associated with positive residue results. FSIS then continued working to develop a residue pilot project to test the hypotheses that certain conditions are more likely to produce positive laboratory results and that these conditions vary by slaughter class. The project was approved to start in FY 2016. The results of the pilot project will inform policies to better guide PHVs on selecting carcasses for testing to maximize the probability of selecting those carcasses that may contain volatile levels of chemical residues.

The Agency’s screening methods have been expanded to encompass additional analytes. These high-capacity screens now cover 89 different veterinary drugs and 108 unique pesticides. New analyte classes include tranquilizers, anthelmintics, and pesticide groups such as organophosphates.

Sampling Plans: FSIS developed its first Five-Year Sampling Plan that outlined a vision for FSIS sampling over the next five years. FSIS continued historical work to publish an annual Agency sampling plan to inform the public of the Agency’s efforts related to microbiological, chemical residue, and other sampling programs. The plans review FSIS’ microbiological and residue sampling programs in domestic establishments, import establishments, and in-commerce facilities and describe FSIS’ overall strategy for directing its sampling resources. The plans were expected to be published on the FSIS website in November 2015. (Goals 1 & 6)

Since October 1, 2014, FSIS has analyzed 87,401 samples and completed 1,567,544 separate analyses on these samples. Additionally, FSIS conducted microbiological characterization of 6,916 bacterial isolates reporting 186,174 separate test results. Characterization includes varying methods depending on the type of isolate such as serotyping, Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis (PFGE), Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (AST).

Laboratory Testing Expansion and Innovations: FSIS worked to expand its capability to detect pathogens in FSIS-regulated products by validating a number of laboratory testing methods and expanded current methods and screening programs. Since October 2014, FSIS has validated a number of laboratory methods including:

- Automating “Most Probable” Number system for the enumeration of sanitary indicators in meat carcass sponges, poultry rinses, and raw beef, pork, and poultry products;
• Use of real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test as a confirmatory test for Shiga toxin gene detection, which offers an alternative confirmation test for *Escherichia coli*.

**Food Safety Assessments (FSAs):** In FY 2015, FSIS conducted FSAs and newly implemented PHREs to assess the design and validity of establishments’ Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) plans, Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), other pre-requisite programs, testing programs, e.g., generic E. coli written procedures, and any other programs that constitute the establishment’s HACCP system. Using scientific assessment protocols, specially-trained personnel conducted 1,158 FSAs and PHREs. These assessments determine the adequacy of food safety systems in regulated establishments. By identifying common areas of noncompliance, FSIS has been able to develop better verification instructions to the field and guidance to industry. Outcomes from for-cause FSAs resulted in 21 notices of intended enforcement from which three suspensions of operations occurred. (Goals 2 & 6)

On June 1, 2015, FSIS implemented the new focused FSA methodology, reducing the time it takes to do an FSA to 5-7 days from 38 days. The focused methodology requires that a Public Health Risk Evaluation (PHRE) be conducted first, to determine if an FSA is warranted, and aligns FSIS resources with public health risk. It allows FSIS to more efficiently use resources by targeting higher risk establishments. This new FSA methodology created a cost savings to the Agency. The average cost of an FSA before implementation of the new methodology was $5,628 compared to a cost of $2,105 with the new methodology. The average labor hours per FSA was estimated to be 130 hours prior to the change compared to 52 hours after the change was made. The average travel costs was estimated to be 75% of total Enforcement, Investigation and Analysis Officer (EIAO) travel expense before the change and 15% after the change.

**Food Defense Plans:** FSIS conducted a number of outreach activities such as developed an updated brochure entitled Food Defense in FSIS-Regulated Establishments that was released in February 2015. The brochure was included in letters to establishments announcing the 2015 Food Defense Plan Survey, distributed to FSIS District Offices, and also disseminated at meetings with industry throughout the year. Outreach activities focused on helping the smallest FSIS-regulated establishments adopt functional plans, including sending letters encouraging the development and adoption of functional food defense plans to all establishments. FSIS conducted direct outreach phone calls to 506 of the 790 establishments (64%) that did not have a functional food defense plan in 2014 exceeding the 50 percent target. Data showed that these calls may have increased adoption of functional food defense plans, by 26 establishments. Another 36 establishments requested additional information on food defense, thereby further increasing awareness and outreach. To promote awareness and adoption of food defense practices by small establishments, FSIS published an article in Small Plant News, Volume 7, Issue 5, entitled “Food Defense Within FSIS-Regulated Establishments: Are You Prepared?” In addition, FSIS also converted the standard Food Defense Plan Template to a fillable form to improve accessibility for industry to customize the template for their needs. The template had 4,058 downloads in 2015.

The Agency Inspection Program Personnel (IPP) food defense plan survey indicated that 85 percent of the establishments have a functional food defense plan, up from 84 percent in FY 2014. The percentage of very small establishments with a functional food defense plan increased from 77 percent to 78 percent in FY 2015, indicating outreach efforts to the smallest establishments continued to be successful. In addition, of the 5,056 establishments where IPP were surveyed, FSIS received results from IPP in 4,971 (98%) establishments – this is the highest response rate since the start of the survey in 2006. (Goals 2 & 3)

**Food Defense Vulnerability Assessments:** Through identification of current critical vulnerabilities and the immediate identification of new measures to reduce risk, Vulnerability Assessments (VAs) have helped FSIS drive compliance with existing policies and development of improved policies. FSIS’ outreach and education on these vulnerabilities and countermeasures raised awareness of the importance of protecting the food supply chain against intentional contamination. These inform industry, government, and academic participants. In 2015, FSIS completed a new cybersecurity VA, updates to VAs for imported products and domestic Siluriformes fish, and a summary analysis of VAs and VA updates conducted from 2003-2014. (Goal 2)
Program Evaluations: FSIS completed several surveys and evaluations during the course of FY 2015 that assisted management with program planning, implementation, improvement and accountability. Completed surveys or evaluations included:

- Evaluation of the FSIS IT Procurement Process
- Compliance Assistance Review Evaluation surveys (OIEA and OPHS)
- Hazard Identification Team Assessment
- Project Management Training Survey
- FSIS Laboratories Customer Satisfaction Survey
- ODIFP Employee Feedback Survey
- Employee Development Best Practices Survey
- Limited English Proficient Survey
- New Hire 90 Day Survey
- ECIMS Customer Satisfaction Survey
- Chicken Carcass/Parts Survey
- PHV Training Survey
- Civil Rights Employee Engagement Survey
- OPACE Communications Survey
- State Director’s Survey

(Audit 8)

Audit Recommendations: In FY 2015, FSIS closed the remaining recommendations from the OIG audit: USDA Controls over Shell Egg Inspections Assignment 50601-0001-23

FSIS Management Control Awareness Training: FSIS developed a five-module course to provide FSIS Managers and Supervisors with a high level understanding of management controls in context of operational responsibilities. The course was completed in September 2015 and provided to a select focus group for critical review and refinement. FSIS is currently formatting the materials for inclusion in AgLearn (Goal 7)

USDA Risk Management Framework: FSIS participated in the USDA Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) pilot program to implement the recently revised OMB Risk Management Framework. FSIS served as the lead for the Program and Compliance Assessment Team whose purpose was to foster collaboration and coordination between Financial Reporting Assessment Team members and Management Control Officers. FSIS completed and evaluated the proposed Entity Level Checklist (ELC) questionnaire and successfully conducted an integration workshop. This information provided the USDA OCFO with recommendations to streamline and refine the ELC questionnaire for implementation in FY 2016. (Goals 6 & 7)

Food Emergency Response Network (FERN): Through its cooperative agreements with State food emergency response laboratories, FSIS accomplished the following major activities:

FSIS continued the targeted surveillance of USDA regulated commodities (e.g. Ready-to-eat and raw meat and poultry products) at retail via FERN Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP) partner labs. Eleven states tested 793 samples for chemical compounds (toxins, poisons, and heavy metals) eight states tested 616 microbial samples for select and threat agents of FSIS products found at retail locations within their jurisdictions. Each state continues to test for one or more microbial analytes from the following list: Y. pestis, B. anthracis, Staphylococcal enterotoxin, Shigella, Salmonella, STEC, and non-E. coli O157 STEC.

FSIS participated in nine proficiency testing events this past year. These events tested FERN partner labs’ capability to find different analytes within selected food matrices. Over 240 labs participated in eight events and analyzed samples (e.g., ground pork, dried protein concentrate, mashed potatoes, dog food, apple juice, cheese, and acidified water) for the following analytes: Staph. enterotoxin B, Solamine, E. coli 0157:H7, and a multitude of gamma radionuclides. Further, FERN held its annual Biosecurity Level 3 (BSL-3) Triage Method Proficiency Check Sample demonstration in July 2015. FSIS participated in a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Nuclear Power Plant Tabletop Exercise (Nuclear power plant leaking radioactive emissions into the atmosphere following a 9.0 earthquake in northern WA) sponsored by the Integrated Consortium of Laboratory Networks (ICLN). The
exercise tested the new ICLN Data Exchange Utility, where mock data generated by the supporting network(s) was transferred to the requesting network via this utility, and the ICLN Activation Module which was used to manage an event and provide a communication capability among the ICLN and participation networks.

FSIS added five new Food Defense method submissions that were evaluated, validated and approved by the FERN Methods Coordination Committee and added to our repository of methods. The newly approved methods test for seven different analytes to include Strontium, Uranium, Americium, Plutonium, Shigella spp., Yersinia Pestis, and Francisella tularensis. (Goals 1, 4 & 5)

National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI): On January 13 and 14, 2015, the NACMPI held a meeting to discuss FSIS’ evaluation and management of chemical hazards within the National Residue Program as well as provide feedback on the Economic Research Service (ERS) Cost Calculation Model. (Goal 4)

Development of next FSIS Strategic Plan: FSIS has begun development of its 2017-2021 Strategic Plan which will continue through FY 2016. FSIS held both public and stakeholder meetings, including such agencies as the FDA and CDC, to gather input on key focus areas, issues, and trends in food safety that the Agency should consider in developing the Plan. This critical input from industry, consumer advocacy groups, and Federal collaborators has helped shape the Agency’s further development of desired outcomes, specific strategic objectives, and meaningful targets and measures to assess results.

Faces of Food Safety: In FY 2015, FSIS published 12 profiles for Faces of Food Safety, which provide an in-depth look at the individual scientists, veterinarians, inspectors, and other FSIS professionals who play an important role in public health protection. These profiles are a feature of FSIS’ monthly employee newsletter, The Beacon and are also published on the FSIS website. This series of articles offers the public a realistic picture of life as an FSIS employee, thus supporting recruitment efforts. More importantly, these articles bring a personal, human touch to the Agency’s communications, highlighting the diversity and dedication of the FSIS workforce. These efforts support USDA’s Cultural Transformation efforts. (Goal 7)

Stakeholder Inquiries: FSIS reviewed and contributed to approximately 67 draft letters to Congress and other legislators. FSIS also responded to nearly 100 inquiries from Congress, 17 of which resulted in either a conference call or in-person briefing on the Hill; more than 268 targeted inquiries from media outlets, approximately eight of which resulted in interviews with food safety officials. FSIS responded to more than 200 incoming letters overall, of which 60 percent were from consumers, individuals in the regulated community, and students. Responses include information about Agency activities, regulations, petitions, compliance, and FSIS jurisdiction. (Goal 4)

Foodborne Illness Attribution Achievements and Inter-Agency Food Safety Analytics Collaboration (IFSAC): FSIS served as chair of the Steering Committee for the IFSAC to coordinate activities and analyses across FSIS, CDC, and FDA. FSIS led the planning effort with CDC and FDA for a successful IFSAC public meeting in February 2015 at USDA to share a major report on findings from a key IFSAC project on harmonized attribution estimates using tri-Agency methods and data. The public meeting was attended by over 300 participants in person and on-line and received widespread positive media coverage with more than 30 news articles written about the meeting and the harmonized attribution estimates. FSIS also led a six-presentation symposium at the 2015 International Association for Food Protection (IAFP) in Portland, OR entitled “Evolving Methods for Foodborne Illness Source Attribution,” which provided an overview of initiatives in foodborne illness source attribution, including perspectives from IFSAC and other scientists from international governmental agencies and academia. Other major FY 2015 IFSAC accomplishments include improving and advancing communications about foodborne illness source attribution; providing foodborne illness source attribution data to help support FDA’s role in the Food Safety Modernization Act; creating a tri-Agency Communications Workgroup to address ongoing, evolving, and overarching IFSAC communications activities; and developing tri-Agency approved press releases, Federal Register Notices (FRN), Constituent Updates and a Key Messages document, among other documents. (Goals 1, 3, 4, 5, & 8)

Public Health Information System (PHIS) Alerts: PHIS alerts are data driven generated food safety messages that in-plant personnel (IPP) receive via email and/or system notification allowing IPP to proactively react to food safety information. These alerts ensure that IPP are receiving the correct sampling tasks, ensure that food defense
activities are being tracked, as well as notifying IPP that an establishment has an elevated Public Health Regulation (PHR) non-compliance rate that is close to the threshold for PHRE/FSA scheduling. Five PHIS alerts were successfully deployed, and two are pending, based on the issuance of an FSIS notice to further explain their content to IPP before launch. (Goals 1, 7, & 8)

**Data Quality:** The objective of the FSIS Data Quality Initiative is to improve the accuracy and efficiency of reporting and data driven decisions. To this end, the data quality team is documenting and analyzing known and unknown data issues, implementing data corrections, and providing detailed recommendations for preventing future issues. In FY 2015, FSIS closed 194 issues and coordinated the execution of 23 rounds of data corrections. FSIS wrote 40 detailed recommendations for PHIS enhancements and system fixes for long term data quality improvement, which included requirements for five suggestions for PHIS fixes and enhancements. (Goals 1, 7, & 8)

**FSIS Notices:**

**Salmonella and Campylobacter (Goals 1, 2 & 6):**
- **On December 1, 2014**, new sanitary dressing requirements were implemented. In addition, on February 17, 2015, all poultry slaughter establishments began complying with sampling requirements to demonstrate microbiological control for the prevention of fecal and enteric pathogen contamination during slaughter as a result of this final rule. Three FSIS Notices were issued in August to clarify the new inspection policies for field personnel.
- **On January 26, 2015**, FSIS published the Federal Register notice “Changes to the Salmonella and Campylobacter Verification Testing Program and also announced that FSIS will begin exploratory sampling of chicken parts beginning in March 2015.
- **On April 1, 2015**, FSIS issued FSIS Notice 22-15 announcing the Federal Register Notice on Changes to the Salmonella and Campylobacter Verification Testing Program (80 FR 3940; Published Jan. 26, 2015), to continuously assess the process control of an establishment. Also, implemented testing in raw pork products with samples being collected through September.
- **On April 6, 2015**, FSIS developed a draft risk assessment using the first six months of Salmonella raw ground beef data.
- **On May 1, 2015**, using continuous sampling through a moving window approach to verification testing, FSIS began to collect pathogen data weekly in large volume establishments. This approach provides a more real time estimate of percent positive product.
- **On June 19, 2015**, FSIS issued the FSIS Compliance Guideline: Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection Microbiological Sampling of Raw Poultry, designed to help small and very small poultry slaughter establishments comply with the new microbiological sampling and analysis requirements, except for establishments that slaughter rurites.
- **On July 1, 2015**, sampling of imported raw poultry products for Salmonella and Campylobacter analysis began.
- **On August 1, 2015**, FSIS issued a Notice clarifying routine sampling of raw chicken parts for field personnel.
- **On August 3, 2015**, FSIS developed an operational measure model prototype to characterize sampling subtyping results, seasonality, and weather factors affecting trends in Salmonella and Campylobacter positive sampling results from Young Chicken carcasses. Initial results of analysis of these variables were presented to the Agency’s Data Coordination Committee.
- **On September 1, 2015**, FSIS developed a draft, automated, quarterly report of its sampling data (pathogens, serotype, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE), antimicrobial resistance (AMR), residue and industry averages) by product for individual establishments.

Agency
E. coli O157:H7 and STEC (Goal 1, 2 & 6):

- **On January 21, 2015**, FSIS issued [FSIS Directive 10,010.3](#). Instructing field personnel on implementing new traceback procedures, verifying high event period (HEP) occurrences, and recalling product when there is a sole source supplier.

- **On April 29, 2015**, FSIS published a Federal Register notice announcing changes to the algorithms for sampling bench trim and raw ground beef components, other than trim, to make them more risk-based. FSIS also responded to comments on the Sept. 19, 2012, Federal Register notice, “Risk-Based Sampling of Beef Manufacturing Trimmings for *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and Plans for Beef Baseline” and provided updates on how it schedules sampling for beef manufacturing trimmings. The Agency also made the following report available: “Effective Implementation of Beef Manufacturing Trimmings Sampling Redesign (MT60).”

- **On May 13, 2015**, FSIS issued the [Compliance Guideline for Validating Cooking Instructions for Mechanically Tenderized Beef Products](#), to help establishments ensure labels on raw or partially cooked needle- or blade-tenderized beef products destined for household consumers, hotels, restaurants, or similar institutions contain validated cooking instructions that comply with the requirements in 9 CFR 317.2(e)(3)(iii).

- **On August 20, 2015**, FSIS issued [FSIS Directive 10,010.1](#). This directive clarifies sampling eligibilities under routine STEC testing programs and addressed the Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) audit findings related to FSIS N60 sampling.

- **On August 20, 2015**, FSIS issued [FSIS Directive 10,010.2](#). Instructing field personnel how to verify that establishments adequately address STEC through non-sampling verification activities was published.

- **On August 20, 2015**, two [STEC sampling training videos](#), imported and domestic raw beef products, were released when FSIS Directive 10,010.1 was issued. The training videos show inspection personnel how to collect imported and domestic raw beef samples.

- **On September 4, 2015**, FSIS issued the [Sanitary Dressing and Antimicrobial Implementation at Veal Slaughter Establishments: Identified Issues and Best Practices](#) to assist veal slaughter establishments to implement effective sanitary dressing procedures and antimicrobial treatments and to properly assess microbial testing results.

Listeria monocytogenes: (Goal 6):

- **On June 11, 2015**, FSIS issued a revised [Best Practices Guidance for Controlling *Lm* in Retail Delicatessens](#), to provide specific recommendations that retailers can take in the delicatessen (deli) area to control *Lm* contamination of ready-to-eat (RTE) meat and poultry products to highlight recommendations that are based on an evaluation of retail conditions and practices in the Inter-Agency Risk Assessment -Lm in Retail Delicatessens, as well as information from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Food Code; scientific literature; other guidance documents; and lessons learned from *Lm* control in meat and poultry processing establishments. It is expected that this retail guideline will help retailers take action to decrease the contamination of RTE deli meats at retail and decrease the potential for listeriosis, thereby helping to protect public health.

- **On June 19, 2015**, FSIS affirmed, with changes and a request for comment, the interim final rule “Control of *Listeria monocytogenes* in Ready-to-Eat Meat and Poultry Products.” FSIS made minor changes to the regulatory provisions in response to comments the Agency received, on the basis of experience in implementing the provisions, and because the way FSIS obtains establishment profile information electronically has changed. FSIS clarified in the regulations that establishments may not release into commerce product that has been in contact with *Lm*-contaminated surfaces without reprocessing the product. In addition, FSIS removed the requirement for establishments to report production volume and related information to FSIS because the Agency now routinely collects this information through its Public Health Information System. (Goals 1 & 6)

Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) (Goal 2):

- **On May 14, 2015**, FSIS issued the [FSIS Compliance Guideline HACCP Systems Validation](#). This guidance document is designed to help very small meat and poultry plants meet the initial validation requirements in 9 CFR 417.4. Enforcement actions have identified inadequate validation as leading to the
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production of adulterated product and in some cases even illnesses. Having establishments translate all the required critical operating parameters from the scientific or technical support into their processes and gather in-plant validation data demonstrating the HACCP plan is functioning as intended would reduce these instances.

**Enforcement, Investigations and Analysis Officers (EIAO) Methodology (Goals 6 & 8):**

- **On May 25, 2015,** FSIS issued [FSIS Directive 5100.1](#). This Directive updated the EIAO methodologies and created next generation FSAs methodology that allows EIAOs to respond quickly to poor performing establishments and direct Agency resources. Along with the new Directive, FSIS shortened and revised FSA tools so that FSA questions focus on EIAOs identifying key vulnerabilities that lead to better supported decisions by the district office for verification plans and enforcement actions when they are necessary.
- **On May 22, 2015** FSIS issued [FSIS Directive 5100.4](#). This Directive was the implementation of PHRE. The PHRE improves how the Agency utilizes data and gives district offices the flexibility to react to Agency data. The PHRE is a 1-2 day evaluation performed by EIAOs in collaboration with the inspector-in-charge (IIC), frontline supervisor (FLS), and consumer safety inspector (CSI) prior to scheduling a FSA.

**Humane Handling:**

- **On May 13, 2015,** FSIS proposed an amendment to its regulations on ante-mortem inspection of non-ambulatory disabled veal calves. If adopted this regulatory change will improve compliance with the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) and the humane slaughter implementing regulations. FSIS also proposed to clarify in the regulations that all non-ambulatory disabled cattle must be promptly disposed of after they have been condemned. (Goal 2)

**Shell Egg Policy Enhancement:** In continuance of the development and implementation of new policies that enforced ambient refrigeration requirements for shell eggs packed, distributed, and sold to consumers and improving food safety, FSIS Compliance Investigators (CIs) conducted 3,274 shell egg surveillances with 99.5% compliance rate in FY 2015. (Goals 1, 4, & 6)

- **International Food Safety & Inspection Program**

  **Customs and Border Protection Coordination:** **In FY 2015,** FSIS continued efforts to develop the Partner Government Agency (PGA) Message Set begun on April 27, 2014 at three ports of entry and with two Customs brokers. FSIS added eight more Customs brokers to the live environment and continues testing, development, and outreach efforts to stakeholders. All ports of entry are now available to filers of FSIS regulated products that have developed PGA Message Set capabilities in the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE). The PGA Message Set automates the collection of information provided by the importer of record (or its agent) on FSIS form 9540-1, Application for Import Inspection. These data elements are transmitted electronically when the entry is filed with Customs and Border Protection through the ACE and eliminates the need for importers of record or agents to submit a paper copy of the FSIS form 9540-1 as well as FSIS inspection personnel data entry. (Goals 2 & 8)

  **Equivalence Determinations:** **In FY 2015** FSIS initiated equivalence reviews of 11 countries, including three countries seeking equivalence for processed egg products. FSIS also reviewed requests for reinstatement of equivalence from seven countries and reinstated Ireland’s eligibility to export intact beef to the United States after beef imports from that and other EU countries were suspended in 1998 over concerns about Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE). In total, throughout FY 2015, 39 countries were eligible to export FSIS regulated products to the United States.

  **On August 31, 2015,** the FSIS published a final rule that listed Lithuania as eligible to export meat products to the United States (U.S.), which became effective on October 30, 2015. (Goal 2)
On September 18, 2015, FSIS published a proposed rule to add Namibia to the Code of Federal Regulations list of countries eligible to export meat products to the United States. This was based on FSIS’ review of Namibia’s meat laws, regulations, and inspection system, as implemented and FSIS tentative determination that they are equivalent to the FMIA, the regulations implementing this statute, and the U.S. food safety system for meat. All such products will be subject to re-inspection at United States ports of entry by FSIS inspectors. Comments were due by November 17, 2015. (Goals 2 & 6)

In FY2015, FSIS initiated the rule making process to add Honduras and Poland to the list of countries eligible to export poultry to the United States.

FSIS Meat and Poultry Inspection Seminar: From September 14 – 24, 2015, FSIS hosted 23 foreign government officials from 12 countries during a two week training course on FSIS food safety and inspection regulations and procedures.

Automation of Import Type of Inspection (TOI) Scheduling: FSIS IPP at FSIS regulated import establishments re-inspect products imported into the United States. Those re-inspection activities are known as TOIs. Prior to CY 2015, all TOI were edited/added manually into the system, which was very time intensive. An automated program was created in FY 2015 that allowed for all TOI instruction for the IPPs to be uploaded at once. The program freed up approximately 1100 hours of time that would have been needed to update each TOI manually. (Goals 1, 2, 6 & 8)

Import Re-Inspection Activities: FSIS re-inspects all meat, poultry, and processed egg products offered for import to the U.S. by eligible foreign countries at U.S. ports of entry. FSIS inspects all shipments presented at ports of entry to ensure proper certification by the foreign country and examines each shipment for general condition and labeling compliance. Additionally, PHIS randomly assigns more targeted re-inspections of approximately 10 percent of the meat and poultry presented, including laboratory sampling to identify microbiological pathogens, drug and chemical residues, and even species. FSIS determines the intervals for each type of re-inspection based on compliance history of the foreign establishment, country, and product volume from previous years. During FY 2015, approximately 4.4 billion pounds of meat and poultry products were presented for re-inspection from the eligible countries that are actively exporting product to the United States, and approximately 14.5 million pounds of processed egg products were presented from Canada. The table below provides the 2015 statistics for meat and poultry products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imported Meat and Poultry Product (FSIS Goals 1 &amp; 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Product Presented for Routine Reinspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pounds)(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Subjected to Additional TOIs (Pounds)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Product Refused Entry (Pounds)(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused Product Rectified (Pounds)(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accepted (Pounds)(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 4,442,516,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355,044,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,175,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,093,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,437,434,424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imported Processed Egg Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Product Presented for Routine Reinspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pounds)(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Subjected to Additional TOIs (Pounds)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Product Refused Entry (Pounds)(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused Product Rectified (Pounds)(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accepted (Pounds)(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 14,592,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,740,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,403,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,316,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,506,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Routine re-inspection includes the Certification and Label Verification Types of Inspection (TOIs) as well as verification of product condition and identification of shipping damage.
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In addition to port-of-entry re-inspection activities, FSIS also collaborates with other agencies to enhance inspection efforts and maintain a presence at the U.S. Customs and the Border Protection’s (CBP), the Import Safety Commercial Targeting and Analysis Center (CTAC) and the CBP’s National Targeting Center-Cargo (NTCC), targeting high-risk shipments of imported meat, poultry, and processed egg products. These facilities provide FSIS with access to the CBP’s Automated Targeting System (ATS) used to monitor, filter, and prioritize imported shipments. These facilities also provide FSIS with a mechanism to formally request holds, exams, and other instructions to CBP officers at ports of entry. With access to ATS at these facilities, FSIS is able to identify, target, and stop high risk, ineligible, and potentially ineligible shipments closer to if not prior to the time of entry.

FSIS also reviews and processes requests to return U.S. exported products. Since these shipments leave the country and travel to destinations all over the world, FSIS asks numerous questions, requests documents, and extensively reviews all information for each request to identify food defense and food safety concerns in order to determine whether these shipments are safe to return to U.S. commerce. FSIS coordinates re-inspection of shipments when necessary to ensure returning products are safe, wholesome, and unadulterated. (Goals 1 & 2)

**Ranking Algorithm for International Audit Prioritization:** FSIS developed an algorithm to rank for audit foreign countries deemed equivalent and eligible to ship product to the U.S. using each of three data inputs: responses to scored questions from the Self Reporting Tool (SRT), prior audit findings, and PHIS import re-inspection data (separately assessing both process control and risk by product type and volume). The algorithm has been used in finalizing the FY 2015 and FY 2016 audit schedules. (Goals 1, 2 & 8)

**International Food Defense Outreach:** FSIS participated in a Food Defense workshop held in Algiers, Algeria, on April 12-13, 2015. The workshop was attended by approximately 122 representatives from government, academia, and industry. Participants were introduced to the fundamental concepts and principles of food defense. Over the course of the two days, participants worked together in diverse working groups led by Algerian facilitators to develop guiding principles, preliminary goals and objectives, and an initial list of action items for development of a national food defense strategy and action plan for Algeria. This workshop resulted in the Algerian Ministry of Agriculture announcing the formation of a National Food Defense Committee to continue development of the national strategy in June 2015. In addition, FSIS included a presentation of food defense in a Meat and Poultry Inspection System Seminar in September 2015. (Goals 2 & 8)

**Self Reporting Tool (SRT):** FSIS uses responses provided in the SRT by countries interested in exporting FSIS regulated products to the US to determine whether foreign countries are maintaining equivalent inspection systems. On July 19, 2015, equivalent countries were sent a letter asking to affirm the accuracy of the information FSIS has on file and to provide any further information for answers deemed incomplete. In FY 2015, a total of 32 countries had their responses for the SRT questions uploaded in the Public Health Inspection System (PHIS). (Goals 1, 2 & 6)

**Individual Sanitary Measures:** In FY 2015 FSIS reviewed seven alternate sanitary measures to determine eligibility requirements for foreign food regulatory systems that are presently eligible to export meat, poultry, or processed egg products to the United States. Of these seven alternate measures, six were accepted as being equivalent (related to an E. coli O157:H7 method, non-STEC program, RTE sampling, two STEC programs and alternate (visual) postmortem inspection system for market hogs raised indoors) and one was determined not to be equivalent (related to an alternate sanitary measure for HACCP pre-shipment review). (Goals 2 and 6)
Audits by Foreign Countries: In FY 2015, FSIS coordinated eight foreign countries’ audits of the US food safety system to verify equivalence of food safety inspection system for meat and poultry products to the following countries: Canada, Vietnam, Korea, Taiwan, Israel, Bolivia, Japan, and Malaysia. There were no findings of non-compliances.

Directives Issued:

On November 19, 2014, FSIS Directive 9770.1, Determining the Initial Equivalence of Foreign Food Safety Systems, was revised to be in-line with the reorganization of audit duties.

In February 2015, FSIS issued a document entitled, Data Samples and Guidelines for Using the PGA Message Set for Electronic Completion of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS), Application for Import Inspection (FSIS Form 9540-1). This document is intended as a guide to understanding the FSIS data requirements when an Automated Broker Interface filer (broker or self-filing importer) is using the Automated Commercial Environment System of Customs and Border Protection to provide PGA Message Set data.

In February 2015, Prior Notification and Failure to Present: Compliance Guidance for Importing Meat, Poultry and Egg Products to the United States was issued. This guidance is designed to help importers of record (IOR), U.S. Customs brokers, and Official Import Inspection Establishment management understand and comply with FSIS import inspection regulations for meat, poultry, and processed egg products on prior notification and explains regulatory actions taken when products fail to present for FSIS re-inspection, known as “Failure to Present” (FTP).

♦ Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)

FSIS added or upgraded high-speed broadband at nearly 180 locations and deployed over 1,000 4G-capable MiFi devices, significantly improving connectivity for its field workforce. (Goals 7 & 8)

FSIS began migrating Agency computers to the USDA Enterprise Active Directory (EAD), a service that authenticates and authorizes all users, computers, and laptops accessing the FSIS and USDA networks and enforces security policies and installs/updates software. (Goals 7 & 8)

FSIS conducted a Contingency Plan functional testing exercise of all authorized IT systems. This effort was completed on June 30, 2015. To ensure consistency in the approach, the security team uses a National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)-compliant Contingency Planning functional testing checklist as well as provides training in this area. As a result of the Office of Data Integration and Food Protection (ODIFP) Contingency Plan exercise conducted on June 2, 2014, OCIO created a collaboration site for system owners in FY 2015 that included security training materials, standard operating procedures, and an avenue for them to communicate with each other. FSIS incorporated lessons learned and feedback from the exercise into the FY 2015 specific system contingency tests. All authorized FSIS systems were up-to-date on their yearly Contingency Plan functional testing as of June 30, 2015. (Goals 6 & 7)

FSIS is in the final stage of transitioning to Smartphone platforms, gaining additional functionality and performance for employees and supporting customer requirements. (Goals 7 & 8)

FSIS deployed additional or upgraded field connectivity to 160 Office of Field Operations (OFO)-designated sites in FY 2015 to modernize and improve connectivity for its field force. (Goals 7 & 8)

♦ State Food Safety & Inspection Program

Cooperative Interstate Shipment (CIS) Program: To date, Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana and North Dakota are officially approved for the CIS program. At the end of FY 2015, Ohio had nine operational CIS establishments,
Wisconsin had seven selected establishments, and Indiana had two selected establishments. North Dakota has several State establishments that have indicated an interest but have not formally applied for the CIS program yet. North Dakota anticipates that there will be at least one select establishment in FY 2016. Inspection Methods training replaced the former required training course - Food Safety Regulatory Essentials. The Inspection Methods course prepares State inspection personnel to participate in the CIS program since they need “same as” Federal inspection training. During FY 2015, in addition to the regularly scheduled training for FSIS employees, FSIS provided an extra Inspection Methods training class just for State inspectors. In addition, FSIS made its Ready-to-Eat Inspection class available to Wisconsin State inspectors.

FSIS performed onsite and record reviews of Cooperative Interstate Shipment Program and Meat and Poultry Inspection System state and contracted laboratories. As a result FSIS broadened their quality assurance programs and analytical testing of meat and poultry products.

For FY 2015, FSIS implemented the second phase of the CIS webpage. This phase enhanced the initial page by the addition of graphics as well as implementing interesting new topics regarding CIS for users. Added to the site were topics such as “AskFSIS FAQs,” “Major Differences Between CIS and Federal Inspection,” “Cooperative Interstate Shipment and Know Your Farmer Know Your Food (KYF2),” and “Cooperative Interstate Shipment Establishments.” The second phase was published for users in June 2015. In addition to the website, FSIS held its annual webinar on the CIS program. In collaboration with KYF2, FSIS hosted a webinar attracting 110 participants interested in cooperative interstate shipment (Goal 4).

During FY 2015 the District Managers from the Chicago and Des Moines District Offices; CIS State Directors from Ohio, North Dakota, Wisconsin and Indiana. The FSIS Program Coordinator, and OFO staff met to discuss current issues in the CIS program. FSIS’ Labeling and Program Delivery Division also provided a special presentation on meat and poultry label submissions to clarify labeling issues and improve understanding of label requirements.

The National CIS Coordinator participated in two outreach webinars with several hundred very small State plant owners concerning the implementation of the CIS program and answered technical questions about the CIS program. The National CIS Coordinator also developed a PowerPoint presentation introducing the CIS program and delivered in Washington, DC at a meeting with a Mexican meat and poultry delegation. (Goal 4)

**State Public Health Information System and State inspection programs:** In FY 2015, 14 PHIS reports for State inspection program personnel were published. A total of 63 PHIS reports are now available for the State users. These reports display information about humane handling, assignments, noncompliances, and inspection task reports. In FY 2015, over 16,500 reports were generated by State PHIS users. (Goals 1, 2, 4, & 8)

**State Inspection Reviews:** In FY 2015, all 27 State reviews consisting of nine onsite reviews and 27 self-assessment review determinations were completed by Sept. 30, 2015, which exceeds the expected performance measure of 90 percent of the 27 State reviews being completed. FSIS is updating the “At Least Equal To” Guidelines for State Meat and Poultry Cooperative Inspection Programs to cover amendments for laboratory methods review and data systems used to track inspection activities for those State Meat and Poultry Inspection (MPI) programs that elect not to use the PHIS, as well as, policy changes that have been published since the original guideline was published in 2008. (Goals 1, 2, 4, 6 & 7)

**In-Commerce State Activities:** In FY 2015, FSIS continues to provide support to the AssuranceNet/In-Commerce System (ANet/ICS) State program users. The successful integration of ten State programs into ANet/ICS provided State users with the ability to access five key functional areas in ANet/ICS (firm information, surveillance, investigation, product control, and enforcement). Also in FY 2015, an additional State program was trained in ANet/ICS in preparation for accessing the system. This joint system usage maintains increased communication and information sharing across programs, also providing opportunities for joint investigations with State partners to become more efficient and responsive to foodborne illness outbreaks. This integration of the State MPI programs in the ANet/ICS also results in an enhanced execution of mission critical public health functions across FSIS and State programs. (Goals 1, 2, 4, & 8)
Policy Enhancement, Development and Implementation:

- **FSIS Directive 5720.3**, Methodology For Performing Scheduled And Targeted Reviews Of State Meat And Poultry Inspection Programs, the amendment to the directive includes policy changes that clarify methodology used to evaluate State MPI programs that will align with the “At Least Equal To” Guidelines for State Meat and Poultry Cooperative Inspection Programs. (Goals 1, 2, 4, 6 & 7)

- **FSIS Form 5000-9**, Domestic Audit Checklist, the checklist was revised to be more inclusive of State MPI programs and to allow for collected data to be available for data mining and review documentation evaluation, which ensures “At Least Equal To” Federal requirements. (Goals 1, 2, 4, 6 & 7)

- **FSIS Directive 5710.1**, Designation of States for Federal Meat or Poultry Inspection, revision to this directive outlines the procedures for designating a State MPI program and individual State-inspected establishments for Federal inspection and procedures for transferring State MPI program establishments to FSIS. (Goals 1, 2, 4, 6 & 7)

**Webinars:** FSIS conducted 12 monthly webinars for the 27 State MPI Program Directors and their staffs to provide the latest policies, budget updates, and other Agency and Department initiatives so that these State programs remain at least equal to the Federal system. These monthly webinars are invaluable so that the approximate 1,500 meat and poultry plants outside of FSIS jurisdiction will continue to produce safe food.

**Outreach Activities:** In February 2015, FSIS attended the OutbreakNet/PulseNet meeting to strengthen communication and collaboration with federal and State public health partners during foodborne illness investigations. FSIS performed onsite and record reviews of Cooperative Interstate Shipment Program and Meat and Poultry Inspection System State and contracted laboratories. As a result FSIS broadened the State programs’ quality assurance programs and analytical testing of meat and poultry products.

FSIS participated in a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Nuclear Power Plant Tabletop Exercise. It tested the new ICLN Data Exchange Utility, where mock data generated by the supporting networks were transferred to the requesting network via this utility. It also tested the ICLN Activation Module used to manage an event and provide a communication capability among the ICLN and participation networks. Participants for the exercise included multiple Emergency Management and Laboratory Network representatives from each of the organizations.

FSIS began performing onsite audits of states and their contract laboratories on a rotating basis in support of the State MPI Program. The office continued these audits for the Cooperative Interstate Shipment state program.

FSIS worked with the State Programs to complete the USDA-mandated Windows 7 migration project at the start of FY 2015. FSIS provided approximately 200 State machines to support State food safety programs. FSIS worked with State programs to update outdated 3G EVDO cards with new 4G-capable MiFi devices. FSIS also worked with State programs to implement mandatory multi-factor authentication (LincPass). (Goals 7 & 8)

♦ **Codex Alimentarius**

The U.S. Codex Office manages the participation of the United States in the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies, which operate within the framework of the Joint Food Standards Program established by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations and the World Health Organization (WHO). The Codex Alimentarius Commission is an inter-governmental body with more than 185 members that sets voluntary international food safety and quality standards that protect the health of consumers and ensure fair practices in the international trade of food. The U.S. Codex Office is administratively attached to FSIS and serves a government-wide interagency clientele, as well as stakeholders in U.S. industry and consumer groups to promote U.S. interests in Codex Alimentarius’ international food standards work. (Goal 2)

**Setting Global Standards:** The Commission adopted a variety of global food safety and quality standards, including 348 maximum residue limits (MRLs) for 32 pesticides; Guidelines for the control of *Trichinella* spp. in Meat of *Suidae*; MRLs for the veterinary drugs derquantel and monepantel in sheep tissues, and emamectin benzoate in
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salmon and trout tissues, 302 provisions for food additives; General Principles for the Addition of Essential Nutrients to Foods; and maximum levels (MLs) for the contaminants lead in fruit juices and deoxynivalenol (DON) in (a) cereal-based foods for infants and young children, (b) flour, meal, semolina and flakes derived from wheat, maize or barley; and (c) cereal grains (wheat, maize and barley) destined for further processing. The U.S. Codex Office prepared draft positions for issues under negotiation at Codex meetings, and presented these positions at 11 public meetings. (Goal 2)

Committee Responsibilities and Participation: The U.S. Codex Office hosted two committee meetings: the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) in Lima, Peru, in November 2014, attended by delegates from 58 countries and 11 international organizations; and the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF), in San José, Costa Rica, in April 2015, attended by delegates from 62 countries and nine international organizations. FSIS participated in the delegations to both meetings as an alternate delegate.

FSIS scientists from OPHS are leading the CCFH working group that is developing Guidelines for the Control of Nontyphoidal Salmonella spp. in Beef and Pork. FSIS is also participating in a CCRVDF electronic working group that is examining the potential role of CCRVDF in dealing with situations where a manufactured feed for food producing animals contains an animal drug that should not be used in feed.

FSIS served as Chair of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) working group (WG) on Methods of Analysis, with China and India as co-chairs. During FY 2015, the FSIS Chair led the development of a new WG document and distributed the first draft to all WG members in October 2014. Subsequent revisions and feedback were incorporated and agreed to in January 2015, and the revised draft document was provided to the Codex Secretariat for translation and distribution to all member countries in advance of discussion at the April 2015 CCPR session. Work will continue in FY 2016. (Goals 4, 5 & 8)

Outreach: The U.S. Codex Office also manages an international outreach program to facilitate a full exchange of views among delegates to Codex meetings for the purpose of achieving consensus on the development and adoption of science-based international food standards that support U.S. food safety policy objectives. The U.S. Codex Office organized seven multi-day outreach events, including sessions with Codex delegates from countries in Africa (Togo in February, Ghana in August), Latin America and the Caribbean (Colombia in February, Uruguay in August), and Asia (Republic of Korea in June, China in September), and a joint colloquium with representatives from the Africa region and the Latin America-Caribbean region in Costa Rica in June. The Codex Office also convened a high level policy workshop with 18 opinion leaders from 10 countries in Africa, Asia and the Latin America-Caribbean regions in Washington in September. (Goal 4)

Training: The U.S. Codex Office organized a workshop in West Virginia, May 14-15, for 43 U.S. delegates from 10 federal agencies to share experiences, refine committee strategies, enhance effective delegation leadership skills, and promote consistent approaches on cross-cutting Codex issues. (Goal 7)

♦ Cross-Cutting Accomplishments

PHIS Reports: FSIS has increased the use of automated PHIS reports 15 percent over their use in FY 2014. With the launch of the FSIS PHIS, the Agency is collecting much more data about inspection activities than it has in the past, resulting in a greater need for reports summarizing this data. FSIS has expanded the suite of PHIS reports and has published: The Public Health Risk Evaluation Report, The Food Defense Plan 2015 by District, PHR Noncompliances for a Circuit, The National Data Summary Report, and Import Status by Shipping Mark. There are now 177 PHIS reports available to users based on their PHIS role, and there are 25 reports ready to be published. These 177 reports include 101 Federal reports, 63 State reports, four industry reports and nine import reports, containing information about lab sampling, slaughter, inspection tasks, establishment profile, resource management, imports and industry. In FY 2015, over 108,000 reports were generated by PHIS users. If users requested these reports from FSIS before PHIS implementation, each request would take about 10 minutes on average to complete. The ability for users to access the report on their own saves approximately 1000 work days across the Agency, allowing analysts to spend time on other more in-depth analyses and projects. (Goals 1, 2, & 6)
**Analytical Reports:** In addition to the PHIS reports, FSIS has also modified many analytical reports to include information that helps in making informed decisions. FSIS realized that the manual creation and processing of reports every time the same data is needed was inefficient and could increase the number of mistakes. FSIS identified, created, and automated more than five reports and analyses that are done on a routine basis. Not only does this make the resulting data and analysis reliable and regular, it also results in freeing up analytical time to allow FSIS to identify new trends and patterns that can be analyzed. Further, more than 30 automated reports are currently being generated on a routine basis. (Goal 8)

**Advanced Analytics:** FSIS completed a Five-Year Advanced Analytics Plan. This plan outlined the current state of advanced analytics at FSIS and provided a vision for developing this program over the next five years. FSIS advanced analytics is focused on four main areas: reporting and alerting, field support and maintenance, big data analytics, and data sharing. The five-year plan provides the framework to increase capacity, speed, and quality of the data accessed from systems/databases, increase the level and complexity of analysis capability, implement more automation to better use analysis resources, make the best use of current and newly available data, acquire and use data from previously untapped resources, such as being able to perform analysis of the narrative in a non-compliance report (NR) in PHIS; use data to predict potential hazards and either prevent or respond faster to these hazards, and shape lab sampling initiatives. (Goals 1, 2, 6 & 8)

**Occupational Safety and Health:** FSIS continued its collaboration with Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. FSIS maintained monthly injury and illness reports for all employees and made them available on the FSIS intranet. The reports have been used by safety committees and others to identify and focus on reducing the top injuries found among FSIS employees. FSIS significantly increased the breadth and scope of occupational safety and health guidance available on the FSIS intranet for use by employees and supervisors. (Goal 7)

FSIS maintained the reduced occupational injury rate below the lowest level since 2011 according to statistics provided by the Department of Labor. FSIS established injury and illness reports available on the website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupational Injury Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workers’ Compensation:** FSIS reduced its injury/illness rate to 5.5% (below a goal of 5.9%) while achieving a 7% increase in cost avoidance (total cost avoidance $1,182,425) by returning 89% of injured employees to work through the Alternative Duty Program, the Work Hardening Program and other job offers. The Agency also saved a total of $77,992 in prescription and medical cost through the use of the pharmacy program. Achieved the Agency goal of timely filing of wage-loss claims (form CA-7) of 90%, which is an increase of 5% from FY 2014. (Goal 7)

**Workplace violence:** FSIS continued its focus on outreach and education to mitigate the risks of workplace violence. FSIS processed 375 new workplace violence complaints—a 4% decrease in the number of Workplace Violence Complaints from 2014. (Goal 7)

**Smart Space initiative:** As part of USDA’s Smart Space initiative to reduce space, FSIS’ commercial leased space footprint decreased by 24,124 square feet (4.5% decrease) resulting in an annual cost savings of $296,124 including reducing records storage space by 500 square feet (5% of 9,100). (Goal 7)

**Small business contracting:** The Agency was designated as the USDA Small Business Special Achievement awardee for 2015 for exceeding all small business targets for socially disadvantaged contractors, including veteran/woman/ HUBZone (Historically Underutilized Business Zones. FSIS awarded 53 percent of its contracts to small
businesses, and exceeded the USDA small business goal of 51 percent, resulting in a contribution of over $93 million to business and commerce. (Goal 7)

Small Plant Help Desk: FSIS provides a significant amount of outreach and technical resources to small and very small plants – both Federal and State Inspected. The Small Plant Help Desk, as required by the 2008 Farm Bill, continues to serve small plant owners and operators with valuable assistance. For FY 2015, the number of inquiries remained strong at 2,031. Additional accomplishments that emerged from the Small Plant Helpdesk inquiries are as follows: Update of Departmental PowerPoint on “Grant of Inspection” for use in Outreach directly and in support of Agency activities, (June 2015); and update of EIAO presentation package power point (June 2015). Furthermore, the Agency’s Small/Very Small Plant Web Page received 4,097 views for the 4th quarter. 6,247 views were on the Agency’s Small Plant News newsletter site as well. (Goals 3&4)

Recruit and Retain Performing Employees: FSIS has made some progress improving its staffing delivery and HR services delivery. During FY 2015, FSIS reduced the average number of days to hire a candidate to 77 days per the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) model, in order to improve the applicant experience. Additionally, FSIS processed over 2,000 hiring actions in a single fiscal year, which is significantly higher than in previous years (e.g., an increase of over 600 from last year), to reduce the vacancy rate to approximately 4.15% for critical front line occupations (inspectional and veterinarian). FSIS supported the implementation of the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS) by completing VERA/VSIP implementation for employees impacted by the new Rule, as part of the transition to NPIS. FSIS also streamlined and automated the Agency performance management process while integrating over 7,000 bargaining unit positions. (Goal 7)

Labor Relations: With a concerted effort by management and union officials, FSIS made significant strides in sustaining its Labor-Management relationship. FSIS successfully conducted nine pre-decisional involvement (PDI) engagements with the National Joint Council of Food Inspections Local (NJC) ranging in topics from brucellosis, medical qualification standards, leave policies for childbirth to EAD migration and egg shell inspections along with conducting the Labor-Management meeting in the fall. FSIS continued to provide senior leadership at the local labor-management meetings to explain Agency procedures and policies. The Agency worked with the Union and negotiated several significant initiatives, reaching agreement on some to enhance food safety including NPIS, VERA/VSIP, Ante-Mortem, Concur, Imports Sanitation SOP, and webTA.

FSIS also reduced the time to respond to negotiated grievances and the time to complete disciplinary cases by 50%. To improve the supervisory employee engagement, FSIS conducted monthly training sessions across the organization on topics such as basic employee relations, time and attendance, performance management, formal and informal complaints processes, disciplinary actions, and safety & health in the field offices, along with continued support of the basic supervisor course as well as supervisory refresher training; the Catalyst program, as well as webinars various topics. (Goal 7)

Information Security: In 2015, FSIS deployed a security perimeter and additional functionality was added to the base Export component the Public Health Information System (PHIS). These components will be expanded to other systems. To combat the significant increase in cyber-security threats, FSIS continues to deploy a layered security approach with regards to protecting the Agency’s infrastructure and applications in the FSIS security perimeter. (Goals 1, 2, 6, 7 & 8)

FSIS significantly increased compliance for technical enforcement of LincPass, USDA’s personal identity verification (PIV) card for multi-factor authentication, in order to comply with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12). (Goals 1, 2, 6, 7 & 8)

FSIS leadership and Development Training: During FY 2015, FSIS provided Individual Development Plan (IDP, competency-based supervisory, management and leadership learning opportunities to 1,738 FSIS employees. FSIS was recognized with a USDA Cultural Transformation Award for its employee development initiatives. The Agency was acknowledged for its training, development, competency gap-closing endeavors, and preparing employees for career advancement and/or as future leaders. The award recognized the Agency’s culture of continuous learning through investments in education, training, and other developmental opportunities that help employees build mission-critical competencies. Specific programs that contributed to the recognition included the
FSIS Catalyst Leadership Development Program; FSIS Escalade Leadership Development Program; FSIS Experienced Supervisor Training Program; FSIS Mentoring Program; and the FSIS New Supervisor Training Program. (Goal 7)

FSIS Web Presence: Digital communication enables FSIS to quickly reach its large and diverse audiences. FSIS delivers news, food defense information, policy issuances, compliance guidance, import/export requirements, workforce training materials and more via its main website, www.fsis.usda.gov. Documents distributed through the FSIS public website represent the efforts of all FSIS program areas and support all eight strategic goals.

The public website is a window on Agency activities and for citizens, a means of participating in the policy development process. For many, the site is their only direct contact with FSIS and a primary source of their food safety information. In FY 2015, FSIS reached a total of 74,689,643 cumulative page views for www.fsis.usda.gov; the site averaged 1.3 million page views per month during the year. Website traffic is in large part media driven and therefore subject to fluctuation, but this figure exceeded the year’s target for page views. Because it is easy for customers using mobile devices (tablets, smartphones) to view the site, FSIS continues to see more mobile device use. Approximately 29 percent of more than 11 million visits to the site during the year were made using a mobile device, an increase from about 20 percent the previous year.

Over time, the website has become the primary distribution channel for items that were formerly print publications. Notable examples include laboratory methods (the Microbiology Laboratory Guidebook and Chemistry Laboratory Guidebook) and the Meat, Poultry, and Egg Products Inspection Directory. Online availability not only increases the reach and accessibility of this information, it greatly reduces the time required to produce and disseminate document revisions.

A digital subscription service notifies subscribers of additions and changes to the FSIS public website. In FY 2015, 179,860 subscribers with a total of 1,205,920 subscriptions received more than 39 million e-mail bulletins regarding their chosen topics. This direct notification is particularly popular and effective in publicizing recall information. The digital subscription service (provided by GovDelivery) continues to show growth in the number of subscribers (+10.53% over last 12 months) and total subscriptions (+5.14% over last 12 months). More website page views are attributed to this source than to any other referrer. Currently, 45 topics are listed for subscription. Many are related to import/export issues; important changes to country requirements can be conveyed to the subscriber base in a matter of hours.

Civil Rights: During FY 2015, the Agency’s Civil Rights Staff (CRS) developed and launched three new trainings on the following topics: EEO, Civil Rights and Diversity Policy, Diversity and Inclusion-Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Nondiscrimination, and Reprisal. The trainings were made available to employees through in-person workshops, webinars, teleconferences, and via the CRS internet and intranet. These trainings were mandatory for the workforce and resulted in a 96% completion rate for non-supervisory employees and 95% completion rate for managers and supervisors. SES employees were also required to complete Diversity and Inclusion training; with 100% of the SES employees completing this training. Approximately 97% of those who completed the trainings indicated they met or exceeded their expectations. (Goal 7)

In FY 2015, the Agency processed 155 informal complaints and resolved 93, for a resolution rate of 63%. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of all informal complaints were counseled timely, and 100% were offered the opportunity to participate in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). Analysis of complaint data for the past 5 years showed a reduction in formal complaints filed from 67 cases in 2010 to 62 cases in 2015. (Goal 7)

The Agency’s ADR resolution rate was 61%, which contributed to the overall complaint resolution rate of 63%. This percentage is considerably higher than USDA’s resolution rate of 44.3% and the Federal government rate of 44%. Feedback from the ADR evaluations, as well as the overall resolution rate, indicated that the Agency’s ADR process was effective in resolving workplace conflict at the informal stage. (Goal 7)

CRS completed nine Title VI compliance reviews of FSIS’s Federally Assisted State Meat and Poultry Inspection Programs (MPI) and four Title VII compliance reviews during FY 2015. All (100%) of these reviews were completed and reports issued by the end of the fiscal year. CRS completed three Civil Rights Impact Analyses
(CRIAs). All three of these CRIAs were completed timely and in accordance with Departmental regulations. In addition to the CRIAs, the Agency reviewed 183 Agency policies for Civil Rights impacts determinations. (Goal 7)

In keeping with the Agency’s Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS)/Cultural Transformation/employee engagement initiative, the Agency planned, coordinated, and executed a 2015 Diversity Training Conference. The Conference was held during the week of August 24-28, 2015. In total 225 employees from field and headquarters participated in the Conference, with approximately 150 being from the field and 75 being from headquarters. Participants attended numerous workshops that were presented by FSIS and OASCR subject matter experts in their field. Approximately, 87% of the attendees indicated that the Conference met or exceeded their expectations. (Goal 7)

AskFSIS system:
In FY 2015, FSIS supported effective policy implementation by FSIS through the askFSIS system. The askFSIS database provides online answers to technical, inspection-related questions and is designed to serve the business audience in much the same way that Ask Karen is designed to serve consumers. In FY 2015, askFSIS customers visited the site 447,229 times, conducted 238,612 searches, and viewed 494,299 published answers. The askFSIS customers also submitted 23,340 questions for individual answers. The table below provides information regarding askFSIS correspondents who submitted questions. Roughly, 55 percent of the 23,340 questions submitted to askFSIS came from FSIS Employees. (Goal 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Report Percentage of Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment - Large</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment - Other</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment - Small</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment - Very Small</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS - District Office</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS - EIAO</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS - Frontline Supervisor</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS - Other</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS at Establishment - Large</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS at Establishment - Other</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS at Establishment - Small</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS at Establishment - Very Small</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agency Other than FSIS</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry - Other</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Enhancement: In FY 2015, FSIS developed several directive revisions (FSIS Directives 5100.3, 8010.2, 8010.3) to clarify the Agency’s broad authority to conduct inspections and examinations of the premises, facilities, inventory, records, equipment, and operations of campaign Federally inspected establishments, warehouses, distribution centers, and other in-commerce facilities subject to the statutes. These statutory provisions provide program employees authority to use photography as a technique to examine facilities, equipment, operations, inventory, records, and where necessary to copy business records. In addition, FSIS revised the administrative enforcement directive (FSIS Directive 5100.3) to clarify roles and responsibilities during enforcement actions and to further describe verification plan development and implementation, types of letters that may be issued, and trace back activity documentation. In response to detention and seizure actions for frozen, raw, comminuted, stuffed, and breaded poultry products, FSIS is revising the detention and seizure directive (FSIS Directive 8410.1) to clarify communication lines and procedures during the process. FSIS expects to issue the revised directive in FY 2016. In
addition, FSIS developed a notice and sampling program to address public health concerns associated with frequent recalls of frozen, raw, comminuted, stuffed, and breaded poultry products. (Goals 1, 4, & 6)

**AssuranceNet/In-commerce System:** In FY 2015, FSIS prioritized and implemented performance improvements for the AssuranceNet/In Commerce System modules (Firm Information, Product Control, Surveillance, Investigation, Enforcement, Administrative Enforcement Report (AER), and Misconduct Investigation). FSIS also developed and implemented new data items and functionality in the ANet/ICS Hearings and Appeals module for increased management controls, including Case Information, Case Action, and Case Documentation. Additionally, FSIS developed and implemented new reporting functionality and reports in the ANet/ICS Hearings and Appeals module for case activity tracking and performance measures management, including Case Activity, Program Area, Case Disposition, Case Basis, Cost Savings, Case Docket, Performance Measures, Presiding Official, and Custom Reporting. (Goals 1, 2, 4, & 8)

**Employee Assistance Program (EAP):** As a result of increased education and outreach, the employee satisfaction rate for the EAP is 99.7 percent. One hundred percent of FSIS employees who use the services would recommend it. (Goal 7)

**Agency Fleet Management Program:** The Agency Fleet Management Program was designated as a Best Practice Model and has been adopted for USDA implementation. (Goal 7)

**Tribal Relations:** FSIS participated in the National Congress of American Indians from June 28-July 1, 2015 and provided food safety information at the “One USDA Session” held at the conference. Over 1,000 participants attended. On August 13, 2015, FSIS participated in a meeting with Choctaw Nation representatives. The tribe requested information about the State equivalency inspection program, and whether tribes are eligible for this program. They also inquired about the availability and type of technical assistance provided by FSIS (Goals 3 & 4).

**Implementation of PHIS:**

In FY 2015, FSIS continued to enhance the implementation of the dynamic and comprehensive data analytics system, the Public Health Inspection System PHIS, in domestic meat and poultry establishments and import establishments. PHIS strengthens FSIS’ data infrastructure and provides FSIS inspectors and managers with the tools needed to carry out FSIS’ food safety mission. FSIS supported PHIS implementation in the following ways:

- Analyzed data from PHIS to evaluate the effectiveness of policies. Noncompliance Records (NR), Public Health Regulations, and NR appeals represent some of the information reviewed by analyzing PHIS records. Analyses informed further development of policy.
- Delivered the exports module software, and FSIS staff is directly involved in extended user acceptance testing. FSIS staff is also engaged in further development of the export module’s functional requirements.
- The Contingency Plan Functional Test, organized by the Information System Security Officer (ISSO) for PHIS, was successful. FSIS staff participated in the training event and test scenario with the ISSO who facilitated the virtual execution of the contingency plan.
- Staff tested the communication practices necessary to ensure data integrity during a cyber-security incident using FSIS’ current emergency plans, procedures, and protocols.
- Staff ensured that FSIS policies and inspection methods harmonize with PHIS capabilities and identifying and resolving those areas where PHIS did not align with FSIS policies.
- Reengineered the PHIS Food Safety Assessment (FSA) tools. EIAOs input their FSA findings and observations in PHIS using the FSA tools. The tools provide a structured framework for conducting the FSA.
- Staff designed and deployed a new food safety tool PHRE the results of which are captured in PHIS. The PHRE is a decision-making process that is to be used by an EIAO to determine whether a District Office (DO) needs to schedule an FSA.
- **On January 15, 2015,** FSIS published a Federal Register Notice for its Establishment-Specific Data Release Plan. Under the draft Plan, FSIS will use Data.gov as a repository and point-of-access for released data. The data to be released first will be demographic datasets for all regulated establishments. Establishment demographic information is collected through the PHIS. (Goals 1 & 8)
**Information Technology Portfolio:** All major investments in the Agency’s information technology portfolio were rated green. (Goals 7 & 8)

- FSIS developed a data sharing portal in June 2015 to support a variety of applications, including AMS, APHIS and NASS slaughter data reporting and analytics. FSIS developed Predictive Analytics Data Validation programs and a data download application to support Office of Policy and Program Development (OPPD) data needs for policy development. FSIS is adding additional reports to its data sharing portal that include Sample Requests and Results. These reports will be available at the end of calendar year 2015. (Goals 4, 7 & 8)

**Other:**

- **Innovations:** In FY 2015, FSIS received 135 new technology submissions. These include waivers, *Salmonella* Initiative Program (SIP), validation, sampling, ingredients and miscellaneous notifications regarding innovations in regulated establishments. Out of the 135 submissions, 83 No Objection Letters (NOL) were issued. Eleven were suspended either upon submitters request or because of long-term studies. FSIS reactivated suspended submissions upon the submitter’s request. Five submissions were cancelled. Submissions are canceled upon submitters request or when an initial review determines the process or ingredient is not considered new technology. Thirty-six of the 135 submissions remained active at the end of FY 2015. Fifty-four (40%) of submissions were for new or reformulated ingredients, and to date, FSIS issued 35 NOLs. Twenty-nine submissions for the SIP were received. These included line speed (25) and sampling (4) waiver requests. Twenty-two NOLs out of the twenty-five line speed requests and one sampling waiver out of four requests were issued. Twenty-five retained water protocol NOLs were issued.

- **Regulatory Waiver:** In FY 2015, there were eighty-seven active waivers. Forty-seven were withdrawn on October 20, 2014 with the amendment of regulations permitting the use of approved On Line Reprocessing and Off Line Reprocessing intervention systems. Forty remain active and of them seven submissions are under review.

**Education and Outreach Accomplishments**

**Food Safety Discovery Zone:** The USDA Food Safety Discovery Zone (FSDZ) continues to be a highly visible part of FSIS’ public health mission and a key component of the Agency’s public health outreach to consumers. In FY 2015, the FSDZ traveled to seven states, including Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota and Nebraska, and reached more than 1.7 million consumers. The Midwest was selected as this year’s geographical area due to foodborne illnesses trends observed in those states linked to cultural dishes. Events were also selected strategically for their close proximity to regional offices and plants, to encourage collaboration with field personnel. Since its launch in 2010, the FSDZ has reached approximately 5.5 million consumers.

**Ad Council/Food Safe Families Campaign:** FY 2015 marked the final contract year with the Ad Council for the Food Safe Families Campaign. This year, FSIS received more than $25 million dollars in donated media and over 2 billion impressions, bringing the contract total to more than $125 million in donations since its launch in June 2011. During FY 2015, the contract used volunteer ad firm, Partners + Napier, to develop new public safety announcements (PSAs), which included TV ads, radio spots, and print and web advertising in English and Spanish. The PSAs used FSIS funded research conducted with Kansas State University to inform their subject matter, thermometer use, and cross-contamination respectively.

The Ad Council also facilitated a number of media opportunities for FSIS this year, including digital media partnerships with Facebook, Spotify and Swoop. These partnerships put FSIS PSAs in front of millions of consumers, generating hundreds of thousands of dollars in donated media revenue.

FSIS’ seasonal food safety education efforts yielded more than 32 million impressions during Thanksgiving, the Winter Holidays, the Super Bowl, Spring, Summer/Fourth of July, and Back to School. During Thanksgiving, the Super Bowl, and the Fourth of July, FSIS and the Ad Council conducted successful media tours to promote food safety related to the holidays. Results for the tours were extremely positive and are trending upwards. Nearly 100
interviews were conducted, resulting in 464 placements (this is possible because some stations air segments more than once, and some interviews were with feeder outlets that send the interview to multiple stations), and an audience of more than 10 million consumers.

This spring and summer, FSIS and the Ad Council produced a series of educational videos about food safety topics too complex to communicate about during a 30 second PSA. Topics included how to take the temperature of whole poultry, how to thaw meat safely, and how to prevent cross-contamination. Final products were added to the FSIS YouTube channel at the end of July and have already been viewed more than 30,000 times.

**FoodKeeper Application:** The completion and launch of the FoodKeeper application in April 2015 was a great accomplishment this fiscal year. The application supports the Secretary’s goal to reduce food waste by providing consumers with information about safe handling and storage times for hundreds of food items. In total, the app was downloaded more than 84,000 times between April launch and September 30. This success is due in large part to marketing of the app to national news, technology, and food outlets. The app has been mentioned by more than 200 media outlets, including Univision, Food Safety Magazine, Oprah.com, the Associated Press, Time Magazine, Food and Wine, LifeHacker, Salon, BBC World Service, Wegman’s, Fast Company Magazine, Consumer Reports, Real Simple, Every Day with Rachael Ray, Woman’s Day, and People Magazine.

This was a collaborative initiative with Cornell University and the Food Marketing Institute to create and deploy a mobile application for Android and Apple devices called FoodKeeper. The FoodKeeper application offers users valuable storage advice and cooking tips about more than 400 food and beverage items, including various types of dairy products, eggs, meat, poultry, seafood, and produce. Application users are able to submit a question to USDA using the ‘Ask Karen’ feature, which provides information about preventing foodborne illness, safe food handling and storage, and safe preparation of meat, poultry, and egg products. The application was part of a larger effort between USDA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) called the “U.S. Food Waste Challenge.” (Goals 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 & 8)

**Food Safety messages from FSIS’ Todo Cuenta Cuando se Trata de Cuidar a su Familia (Everything Counts When it Comes to Taking Care of Your Family) campaign:** Radio public service announcement aired for six weeks in Hispanic radio markets in Los Angeles, CA, and San Francisco, CA. The campaign kicked off on November 10, 2014, and concluded January 7, 2015. Radio hosts gave daily food safety tips, provided by FSIS, on handling and preparing food during the holidays. Visitors to radio station websites also saw PSAs on their station websites, which directed users to Pregúntele Ask Karen web pages. Overall, the campaign achieved 5,363,200 on-air impressions (surpassing original goal of 4 million). The online campaign reached 171,308 online impressions (surpassing our original goal of 10,000).

**USDA Meat and Poultry Hotline:** Hotline staff responded to nearly 55,000 consumer inquiries via the Meat and Poultry Hotline during FY 2015. Meat and Poultry Hotline staff also responded to 32,998 email inquiries during FY 2015. **Ask Karen:** “Ask Karen” is FSIS’ food safety virtual-representative and the most prominent feature of the FSIS website. The “Ask Karen” database received 12,260 e-mail questions, and 1,769,716 answers were viewed in FY 2015. The “Ask Karen” chat feature allows consumers to chat on-line with a Hotline food safety specialist. The “Ask Karen” chat received 2,833 chat requests in FY 2015.

**FoodSafety.gov:** In FY 2015, FSIS continued to work closely with those at FoodSafety.gov to promote content on the Food Safe Families campaign site. Total sessions, unique users, and page views were consistent with statistics from FY 2014. Four of the top five pages on the website are directly related to USDA and Food Safe Families campaign messaging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPAIGN SUMMARY</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>2,718,939</td>
<td>7,176,963</td>
<td>14,245,518</td>
<td>14,153,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>2,436,970</td>
<td>5,787,155</td>
<td>10,366,073</td>
<td>10,459,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This continued high traffic to FoodSafety.gov can be attributed to a variety of factors, including robust outreach that FSIS conducted during FY 2015. Forty blogs from FSIS were posted on FoodSafety.gov during this fiscal year (a significant increase from 28 in FY 2014). Additionally, blogs were heavily promoted on social media this year. These efforts routinely directed readers to find more information on specific FoodSafety.gov pages, contributing to the year’s increase in traffic.

During this fiscal year, FoodSafety.gov launched the new at-risk food safety web pages developed by FSIS. These pages provide specific information about why each at-risk population is high risk for foodborne illness, and how they can prevent getting sick.

Social and New Media: During FY 2015, FSIS used a variety of social and new media to advise consumers about recalls and communicate about proper safe food handling practices. Of note, we used Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, blogs, and webinars for routine outreach.

- **Twitter and Facebook:**
  - The @USDAFoodSafety Twitter account and the FoodSafety.gov Facebook account continued to see growth throughout the year from FSIS’s ongoing strategy of using non-traditional topics to communicate food safety messages. Twitter engagement was up more than 93% and Facebook engagement was up 192%. FSIS used pop culture topics like Star Wars Day (#Maythe4thBeWithYou) and #TheDress to promote food safety messages to audiences engaged in discussion about those trending topics.
  - FSIS has also seen considerable success on social media related to seasonal campaigns. The biggest success this fiscal year was the #GrillingLikeaPRO campaign. This campaign was launched in July to promote food thermometer use at the grill during the Fourth of July holiday weekend. Followers were encouraged to post pictures of them using a food thermometer with the hashtag, #GrillingLikeaPRO. The hashtag itself was used by more than 1,000 accounts and received more than 5.5 million unique impressions. Many government, nonprofit, and private business accounts participated in the campaign by promoting our food safety messages. Examples of major participants included nine Congressmen, the American Public Health Association, Johnsonville Sausage, Tyson Foods, the Department of Health and Human Services, Kaiser Permanente, and the County of Los Angeles.
  - FSIS has also continued to see high engagement with traditional food safety messages accompanied by graphics. For example, the most popular message in our Twitter account’s history was published in May. It was related to the flooding in Texas and offered consumers food safety advice with a Power Outages and Food Safety infographic.

- **Blogs:**
  - More than forty blogs were posted on a variety of USDA topics on the FoodSafety.gov blog and/or the USDA blog.
  - Blogs addressed food safety for all of the FSIS seasonal campaigns, including Thanksgiving, Winter Holidays, Super Bowl, Spring, Summer and Grilling, and Back to School.
    - There were several blogs that addressed at-risk populations like People with Cancer, Pregnant Women, and Young Children.
    - The blog platform was also used to promote different events or campaigns in which FSIS participated, including the Food Safety Presentation in Oakland, CA, #GrillingLikeaPRO, and the 30th Anniversary of the Meat & Poultry Hotline.
    - Blogs using pop culture topics proved effective as well. One blog of note utilized the half-time act, Katy Perry, to emphasize food safety and take-out food dos and don’ts. This blog became the most popular of the year.

Employee Outreach: During FY 2015, FSIS communicated with employees through five entries in the FSIS Administrator’s Blog; nine Town Hall meetings, including three for all employees and six for field employees; and weekly issues of the Wednesday Newsline publication and the monthly newsletter, The Beacon. In The Beacon, under the umbrella of accountability, senior leadership discussed the federal employee viewpoint survey, the Annual Performance Plan, and the Strategic Plan. Also, the newsletter featured 12 different employees in its faces of food safety articles that highlighted different employees from across FSIS in various mission areas. Finally, The Beacon
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took an employee centric-focus by publishing many articles on employee well-being including snapshots from the field, kudos from the field, and employee welfare articles.

During the 4th quarter of FY 2015, FSIS initiated a soft launch of “i-Impact FSIS”, an Agency initiative to help each employee understand how his or her work supports the Agency’s mission and strategic goals. In FY 2015, the soft launch workshop reached over 800 employees. This initial launch will be followed by workbook and video to be distributed to employees in FY 2016.

During FY 2015, FSIS provided Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) training to approximately 300 field employees. These sessions focused on helping employees to understand their role in the FOIA process, and how they contribute to the public’s understanding of FSIS’ mission and the work the Agency does to protect public health. The FSIS FOIA office plans to conduct more of these sessions during FY 2016, with a goal of training 50% of the Agency’s program areas and district offices.

An intranet site, InsideFSIS, brings geographically dispersed employees together in an online community. InsideFSIS facilitates and encourages communication among FSIS employees. The site is supported by a large network of content contributors, representative of all FSIS programs and offices. The site is available to any FSIS employee with Level 2 eAuthentication credentials. Features and a section called “This Week at FSIS” are updated regularly to draw attention to items of importance to all employees. The site was used effectively in FY 2015 to advise employees of upcoming technology changes and their responsibilities as end users. A feature of the intranet site is the Administrator’s Blog, which allows employees to share comments on entries posted by the Deputy Under Secretary of Food Safety. The blog is hosted on USDA Connect, a web-based suite of applications designed to foster collaboration, interaction, and operational efficiency between USDA employees and contractors across all agencies and offices. (Goal 7)

**Constituent Outreach Publications:** FSIS communicated with constituents, including consumers and industry and consumer representatives, via weekly issues of *Constituent Update*, a publication featuring articles pertaining to Agency policy and regulatory changes, FSIS sampling program results, international trade issues, and other FSIS-related issues of importance to industry and consumer groups. This publication is distributed through the FSIS website. It currently has nearly 24,000 subscribers. To further assist small businesses, FSIS published seven issues of *Small Plant News*. FSIS also published news releases that offered food safety tips to assist consumers during power outages; natural disasters, such as wildfires, tornados, and floods; holidays, such as July 4, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving and New Year’s Day; and special occasions, such as going back to school, National Food Safety Education Month, and the Super Bowl.

**West Coast Outreach:** This year FSIS conducted a pilot project of targeted food safety educational outreach to West Coast markets affected by the significant *Salmonella* outbreaks in 2013 and 2014. In total, 634 people in 29 states were impacted. Of all cases, 87 percent occurred in California, Arizona, Washington (State), and Oregon. This Salmonella outbreak was the second biggest in history. During the project, FSIS reached out to dozens of outlets, including print, television, and radio media, as well as retail and governmental partners. As a result of these efforts, educational information was covered in media stories, promoted in WIC centers, and sent to schools and local health departments. In addition, more than 500 Out-of-Home food safety public service announcements were placed in the region via the Ad Council.

A successful partnership with the Oakland Athletics baseball team also resulted from this effort. FSIS held an educational event at Parker Elementary School in California to promote safe food handling, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Food Safety, the California Department of Food and Agriculture Secretary, and Oakland Athletics First Baseman Mark Canha visited the school. During the visit, they promoted public understanding of foodborne illness during Food Safety Education Month, which occurs every September. A video about the event was shown by the Oakland As during their game that evening, and the PSA developed as a result of this partnership aired at each home game for the rest of the month.

**At-Risk Partners:** This year, FSIS exceeded the five required partnerships by establishing partnerships with more than 10 national organizations representing at-risk groups. These organizations include the National Council on Aging, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Public Health Association, Mocha
Moms, the American Society of Clinical Oncology, Now It Counts Magazine, the AIDS Project of East Bay, the Massachusetts Partnership for Food Safety Education, Text4Baby, the National Association for Family Child Care, the Greater Washington Urban League, and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

FSIS worked with these partners to disseminate targeted products, host events and webinars, develop infographics and training programs, and collaborate on social media. This year, FSIS exceeded the FY 2014 total of 1.8 million at-risk consumers by more than 200 percent (4,361,936). Below are some of the top highlights related to FSIS at-risk partnerships:

- FSIS developed web pages dedicated to each at-risk audience for the FoodSafety.gov website. These pages were officially launched in June 2015.
- FSIS secured seven interviews with Now It Counts magazine for online articles featuring food safety tips for various seasonal topics throughout the year. Several of these articles were picked up by the Huffington Post.
- Meals on Wheels shared the Food Safety for Home Delivered Meals infographic with affiliate organizations and agencies on aging, reaching a potential audience of more than 500,000.
- FSIS developed the Food Safety for People with Cancer infographic in collaboration with the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) Cancer.Net team. The infographic was shared over FSIS, Cancer.Net, and ASCO social media channels and received more than 62,750 impressions through FSIS social media platforms. The infographic was also distributed to more than 27,000 oncologists, nurses, patient educators, and caregivers in the ASCO Post, a weekly newsletter.
- FSIS sent 400 boxes of food safety education materials for young children and pregnant women to WIC Centers in California, Washington, Oregon, and Arizona.

The Ask Karen website promotes two-way communication. The Agency interacts directly with customers through its question-and-answer knowledgebase applications, the consumer-oriented Ask Karen / Pregúntele a Karen and industry-focused askFSIS. Ask Karen also offers live chat. These services address the specific questions of individual customers, thereby extending the reach and effectiveness of FSIS’ call centers.

Content published on the FSIS public site is also used on social media sites, feeds, and the government partner portal site www.FoodSafety.gov. These efforts support consumer education activities that improve home food-handling practices and prevent foodborne illness (Goal 3). Like USDA, FSIS is also making greater use of YouTube as a hosting platform. FSIS’ YouTube channel has received more than 1.15 million views since its inception. A large number of consumer food-handling videos are available. Some training videos are also being hosted, per request of the Civil Rights Staff, to facilitate access by State inspectors. Several videos on inspection-related topics such as sampling and HACCP validation, that support policy issuances, are also available.
**Mission:** The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), a public health regulatory agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), is responsible for ensuring that the commercial supply of meat, poultry, and processed egg products moving in domestic commerce or exported to other countries is safe, secure, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged. Legislative mandates provide FSIS with the authority to conduct its public health mission.

FSIS contributes to USDA Strategic Goal 4, Key Outcome 1 and its coinciding Key Performance Measures. The Agency has aligned its Strategic Plan for 2011-2016 to support the Agency’s overarching food safety mission with key FSIS activities, which directly influence how the Agency operates and allocates resources. The chart below outlines the alignment. The U.S. Codex Office, located in FSIS, also supports USDA Strategic Goals 5 and 6, through supporting the development of science-based international food safety and quality standards that protect consumer health and promote fair trade practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USDA Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Agency Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Agency Objectives</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 1:</strong> Ensure that Food Safety Inspection Aligns with Existing and Emerging Risks.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1: Minimize existing and emerging food safety hazards through the most effective means.</td>
<td><strong>Key Outcome 1:</strong> Preventing Foodborne Illness Associated with the Consumption of Meat, Poultry, and Processed Egg Products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 2:</strong> Maximize Domestic and International Compliance with Food Safety Policies</td>
<td>Objective 1.2: Resources are targeted to existing and emerging risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1.3: Surveillance, investigation, and enforcement are effectively implemented across the Farm-to-Table Continuum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 3:</strong> Enhance Public Education and Outreach to Improve Food-Handling Practices.</td>
<td>Objective 2.1: Domestic- and foreign-produced products meet food safety performance standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2.2: Humane handling and slaughter practices are a central focus of establishment employees as evidenced by the awareness of proper procedures and the implementation of a systematic approach to humane handling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2.3: Food protection and handling systems ensure protection against intentional contamination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 4:</strong> Strengthen Collaboration Among Internal and External Stakeholders to Prevent Foodborne Illness.</td>
<td>Objective 3.1: Consumers, including vulnerable and underserved populations, adopt food safety best practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3.2: Consumers have effective tools and information to keep “in-home” food safe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 5:</strong> Effectively Use Science to Understand Foodborne Illness and Emerging Trends.</td>
<td>Objective 4.1: FSIS maximizes relationships with public health and food safety partners (i.e., large, small, and very small regulated establishments; other Federal, State, and local agencies; consumer groups; academia; and other food safety stakeholders) to enhance the food safety system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.1: FSIS continually improves its capacity for and use of cutting-edge science in policy development to better defend against public health risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5.2: FSIS increases the application of cutting-edge science across the Farm-to-Table supply chain to improve public health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 6:</strong> Implement Effective Policies to Respond to Existing and Emerging Risks.</td>
<td>Objective 6.1: Public health risks are mitigated through effective strategies based on the best available information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 7:</strong> Empower Employees with the Training, Resources, and Tools to Enable Success in Protecting Public Health.</td>
<td>Objective 7.1: Each employee understands how he/she impacts public health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7.2: All employees have the knowledge, tools, and resources to accomplish the FSIS mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7.3: FSIS has a diverse, engaged, high-performing, and satisfied workforce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goal 8:</strong> Based on the Defined Agency Business Needs, Develop, Maintain, and Use Innovative Methodologies, Processes, and Tools, including PHIS, to Protect Public Health Efficiently and Effectively and to Support Defined Public Health Needs and Goals.</td>
<td>Objective 8.1: Continuously evaluate and seek to understand and employ new or innovative mission-supporting processes, methodologies, and technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 8.2: Implement value-added business processes, methodologies, or technologies that contribute to serving the FSIS mission and are applied in the appropriate areas within FSIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Selected Accomplishments toward Achievement of the Key Outcome (Provided below is a summary-level compilation of Agency accomplishments in FY 2015. Accomplishments more specifically targeting corporate performance measures are found later in the document.)

Accomplishments in FY 2015:

**FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 1: Ensure that Food Safety Inspection Aligns with Existing and Emerging Risks**

FSIS ensures food safety through the authorities of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FIMA, P.L. 90-492), the Poultry Product Inspection Act (PPIA, P.L. 90-492), and the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act (P.L. 85-765). The Agency takes actions when establishments operate in violation of these laws.

In support of these laws, Goal 1 focuses on effectively minimizing existing and emerging food safety hazards and targeting resources to existing and emerging risks. Surveillance, investigation, and enforcement are additional tools used to protect public health and respond to food safety hazards and risks associated with FSIS-regulated products. This goal has been measured through one of the Agency’s corporate performance measures, the All-Illness measure. In FY 2015, results from FSIS activities included the following:

- **Required all poultry slaughter establishments (except those that slaughter ratites) to comply with new establishment sampling and testing requirements under the Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection Final Rule, which was published in August 2014.**
- **Continued conversion of poultry slaughter establishments to the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS).**
- **Developed and published draft performance standards in the Federal Register for raw comminuted poultry and raw chicken parts.**
- **Implemented a continuous sampling/“moving window” approach—random, continuous, unannounced sampling for *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* on carcasses and the sampling of imported raw poultry—as opposed to previous set-based approach, which was daily consecutive sampling during a set period of time. This unannounced, on-going sampling will allow FSIS to better estimate pathogen prevalence.**
- **Continued analyzing all raw beef products collected for STEC testing for *Salmonella*. Through this change, the Agency has greatly increased the data it collects on *Salmonella* in beef products and can now estimate *Salmonella* prevalence in ground beef and trim.**
- **Implemented new procedures that will allow the Agency to trace contaminated ground beef back to its source more quickly, remove it from commerce, and find the root cause of the incident to prevent it from recurring.**
- **Developed a draft, automated, quarterly report of FSIS sampling data (pathogens, serotype, PFGE, AMR, residue and industry averages) by product, continued routine sampling of comminuted poultry, and initiated exploratory sampling of pork. Also, FSIS initiated routine sampling of raw chicken parts for *Salmonella*.**
- **Implemented the new focused Food Safety Assessment (FSA) methodology (5-7 days) in June 2015. This methodology requires that a Public Health Risk Evaluation (PHRE) be conducted first, to determine if a FSA is warranted, and aligns FSIS resources with public health risk. The Agency saved an estimated $1.18M, including 26,600 hours within 3 months of implementation. The new FSA methodology allows FSIS to more efficiently use resources by targeting higher risk establishments.**
- **Continued to provide support to the AssuranceNet/In-Commerce System (ANet/ICS) State program users. The successful integration of 10 State programs into ANet/ICS provided State users with the ability to access five key functional areas in ANet/ICS (firm information, surveillance, investigation, product control, and enforcement). This joint system usage supports increased communication and information sharing across state programs, and also provides opportunities for joint investigations with State partners to improve their responsiveness to foodborne illness outbreaks.**
- **Conducted 757 investigations, in response to alleged violations of the FIMIA, PPIA or EPIA, 91.4 percent of which were based on food safety violations. Compliance investigators documented their investigative findings and evidence for use in and support of criminal prosecutions. In FY 2015, FSIS controlled 3,604,395 pounds**
(3,150,837 pounds detained) of meat, poultry and egg products in-commerce to prevent possible injury or illness to the consumer, and conducted 15,184 surveillance activities (versus 13,655 in FY 2014). These surveillance activities examined food safety and food defense activities in accordance with Agency policy and directives.

FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 2: Maximize Domestic and International Compliance with Food Safety Policies

Goal 2 focuses on domestic and foreign-processed products and their adherence to food safety performance standards. In addition, this goal ensures that humane handling and slaughter practices are a central focus to establishments’ procedures, and that regulated products are protected from intentional contamination. This goal is measured using three corporate measures: the percentage of broiler plants passing the carcass Salmonella verification testing, the percentage of official establishments with a functional Food Defense Plan, and the percentage of livestock slaughter plants that follow a systematic approach to humane handing. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- 95.6 percent of broiler establishments passed the carcass Salmonella Verification Testing Standard in Q4, FY 2015, exceeding the FY 2015 goal of 94 percent.
- Increased to 85 percent in FY 2015 from 84 percent in FY 2014 the percentage of establishments with a functional food defense plan.
- Observed and documented food defense practices at approximately 96.4 percent of in-commerce facilities.
- Exceeded the FY 2015 target of 65 percent, at 69 percent of active slaughter establishments visited and subject to an onsite assessment that have a systematic approach to humane handling.
- Completed all 27 State reviews, consisting of 9 onsite reviews and 27 self-assessment review determinations by September 30, 2015, exceeding the expected performance measure of 90 percent.
- Filed eight administrative complaints to refuse or withdraw inspection for public health violations, inspector safety, or fitness convictions. These included multiple, high-profile cases involving food pathogens and humane violations. FSIS also negotiated three consent orders with terms that improved food safety, company ethics, and inspector safety; obtained one default judgment, indefinitely suspending inspection service for humane violations, one final decision and order indefinitely withdrawing inspection from a serious violator, and one voluntary withdrawal of service.
- Led litigation actions to obtain civil injunctions, civil judgments, and enforce civil decrees in three civil cases to stop ongoing violations of FSIS food safety laws; filed two civil complaints; and negotiated two civil consent decrees and one additional settlement agreement for violations of an existing consent judgment and decree, resulting in the permanent cessation of operations, and obtained a total of $30,000 in civil penalties.
- Targeted outreach to countries regarding implementing a food defense system. From FY 2012 through FY 2015, 39 countries were allowed to export FSIS regulated products to the United States. Of those, eight countries have not exported in more than three years and were determined to be inactive, requiring a reinstatement audit prior to resuming exports to the United States. FSIS targeted outreach to the remaining 31 countries that have exported FSIS product to the United States in the last three years or have been recently determined as eligible or reinstated, and accomplished outreach activities to 29 of 31 (93.5 percent) of countries to encourage implementation of a food defense system.

FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 3: Enhance Public Education and Outreach to Improve Food-Handling Practices

Goal 3 is focused on enhancing public education and external outreach to improve food handling practices. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- Created and successfully deployed a mobile application for Android and Apple devices called FoodKeeper, which was also part of a larger effort between USDA and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on
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food waste. The FoodKeeper application, developed through a collaborative initiative with Cornell University and the Food Marketing Institute, provides consumers with information about safe handling and storage times for more than 400 food and beverage items, including various types of dairy products, eggs, meat, poultry, seafood, and produce. Application users are able to submit a question to USDA using ‘Ask Karen,’ which provided information about preventing foodborne illness, safe food handling and storage, and safe preparation of meat, poultry, and egg products. The application was downloaded more than 84,000 times, had a 4.29 rating, and was mentioned in more than 200 publication/media sources.

- Received approximately 2 billion impressions from more than $25 million in donated media for public service advertising promoting safe food handling. Of note, new Public Service Announcements were launched in December 2014, in coordination with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

- Launched the #GrillingLikeaPRO campaign to promote food thermometer use at the grill during the Fourth of July holiday weekend. The hashtag itself was used by more than 1,000 accounts and received more than 5.5 million unique impressions.

- Yielded more than 32 million impressions from FSIS seasonal food safety education efforts during Thanksgiving, Winter Holidays, the Super Bowl, Spring, Summer/Fourth of July, and Back to School.

- Grew the @USDAFoodSafety Twitter account by 179,442 users, exceeding its goal by 92 percent, with mentions and retweets reaching 6,386 and 18,323, respectively, and total annual impressions of more than 7.8 million.

- Received 1,156,567 cumulative views as of the end of the fiscal year on the FSIS YouTube channel. Approximately 300,000 new views were accrued this year, about even with FY 2014’s new view statistics.

FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 4: Strengthen Collaboration among Internal and External Stakeholders to Prevent Foodborne Illness

Goal 4 is focused on the Agency’s work with stakeholders to prevent and respond to intentional and unintentional food safety hazards. FSIS works to strengthen the collaboration among internal and external stakeholders to prevent foodborne illness. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- Continued to obtain advice on matters of food safety from stakeholders through the National Advisory Committee on Meat and Poultry Inspection (NACMPI). The annual NACMPI public meeting in January 2015 sought input on FSIS’s identification and management of chemical hazards within the National Residue Program and use of the Economic Research Service’s Cost Calculation Model.

- Improved foodborne illness attribution through Interagency Food Safety Analytics Collaboration (IFSAC)-projects and activities; including completion of two projects:
  o Improved and advanced communications about foodborne illness source attribution, which included completing a series of several deliverables from FY 2013 through FY 2015, such as developing an IFSAC webpage, hosting two webinars, drafting a FAQ document, and hosting a public meeting.
  o Developed shared illness attribution estimates using tri-agency methods and data: Held a public meeting in February 2015 to share estimated harmonized attribution fractions for Salmonella, E. coli O157:H7, Lm, and Campylobacter, along with other key IFSAC projects. Meeting was attended online and in-person by more than 200 people and was well received; preparation for meeting included finalizing and clearing a report on harmonized attribution fractions and developing supporting materials, including a Federal Register Notice, constituent updates, overview documents, FAQ documents, and other materials.

- IFSAC also developed and began work on four new projects and provided a presentation to the CDC Board of Scientific Counselors, FSMA Surveillance Working Group, to solicit stakeholder input on IFSAC’s strategic direction and analytic activities based on feedback received during the public meeting. This work achieved an important goal for FSIS and IFSAC and helps inform strategies and policies for FDA and FSIS, and FSIS will incorporate results Agency performance measures, policies, and activities.
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- Expanded outreach to small and very small regulated establishments through the small plant helpdesk, direct contact through exhibits at meetings and conferences, monthly calls with state inspection directors and state HACCP contacts and coordinators, and webinars or publications focused on specific topics of interest to the smaller establishments.

- Established partnerships to share and disseminate targeted information on safe food handling with more than ten national organizations representing at-risk groups. These organizations include the National Council on Aging, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Public Health Association, Mocha Moms, American Society of Clinical Oncology, Now It Counts Magazine, AIDS Project of East Bay, Massachusetts Partnership for Food Safety Education, Text4Baby, the National Association for Family Child Care, the Greater Washington Urban League, and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation.

- Maintained a partnership with both internal and external partners such as the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) FDA and CDC; State Departments of Agriculture and Health; and USDA’s Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) to achieve our public health mission objectives.

**FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 5: Effectively Use Science to Understand Foodborne Illness and Emerging Trends**

Goal 5 tracks the effective use of science to understand foodborne illness and emerging trends. FSIS works to continuously improve its analytic, forecasting, and traceback capabilities and methods based on supportable science and current data. FSIS works to identify ways in which emerging trends (e.g., consumption patterns, methods of distribution, the increasing virulence of certain pathogens, and the evolving global supply chain) influence food safety and defense. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- Acquired two additional genome sequencers to continue to build WGS capacity and achieve superior discrimination between closely related bacterial isolates.

- Analyzed a total of 4,733 samples in the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS) cecal sampling program. Of the total samples analyzed, 1,013 (21.41 percent) were positive for *Salmonella*, 1,552 (32.82 percent) were positive for *Campylobacter* and more than 95 percent of the positive samples were also positive for *E. coli* or Enterococcus. FSIS collaborated with the CDC, FDA’s Center for Veterinary Medicine, and USDA ARS on publishing the NARMS 2012-13 integrated report.

- Developed a major Codex guidance on the control of *Salmonella* in beef and pork that recognizes the usefulness of the United States’ measures to control *Salmonella*.

- Spearheaded and introduced two charges—one related to effective *Salmonella* control strategies in poultry and one related to the attributes that define foodborne STEC as severe human pathogens-- to NACMCF in collaboration with FDA, DOD, HHS, and Department of Commerce.

- Continued to collaborate with the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) to explore the impact of antimicrobial interventions on pathogen testing, and ARS provided an update on intervention carry-over research. ARS evaluated the impact of five common intervention chemicals and identified promising rinsate additives that fully negate the impact of four intervention chemicals (Peractic Acid, Citric:Hydrochloric Acid Mix, Cetylpyridinium Chloride, and 1,3-Dibromo-5,5-dimethylhydantoin) and partially negates the impact of one intervention chemical (Acidified Sodium Chlorite) on *Salmonella* recovery.

- Identified opportunities in the Pork Exploratory Sampling Study to address risks during pig slaughter or processing and complete sampling for pathogens in pork to determine if new policies, such as setting performance standards, will make pork safer.
FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 6: Implement Effective Policies to Respond to Existing and Emerging Risks

A critically important part of FSIS activities includes developing and implementing policies and solutions to address food safety issues. FSIS continues to utilize a risk-based approach to develop and implement policies and measure their effectiveness, to address existing and emerging issues in collaboration with stakeholders. As part of this goal, the Agency keeps abreast of current research and other developmental activities, and continuously assesses whether regulatory standards and guidance materials need revision. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- Proposed new performance standards for raw comminuted poultry and chicken parts for *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*. When implemented, these new standards should help in reducing pathogen levels in these products and in meeting the *Healthy People 2020* goal.

- Implemented design changes to the beef manufacturing trimmings, bench trim, and the raw ground beef components sampling programs. Under this new design, FSIS can better estimate STEC prevalence in trim, experience improved collection rates, and strengthen FSIS verification testing so that FSIS is best positioned to detect positive samples.

- Conducted a new survey of inspectors at slaughter establishments concerning FSIS testing for residues, and used its results to set up a pilot for residue testing focused at establishments where FSIS is most likely to find positives. FSIS will use the pilot to improve the residue testing program.

- Issued revised product sampling algorithms and improved instructions to the field for *Lm* in ready-to-eat (RTE) sampling projects that focus more on higher risk products, based on data analysis conducted for RTE projects (including FSA, IVT, RLM, and routine sampling data).

- Issued the following guidance documents to improve and facilitate establishment compliance with public health regulations (PHRs): HACCP Systems Validation (April 2015), Validating Cooking Instructions for Mechanically Tenderized Beef Products (May 2015), Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection Microbiological Sampling of Raw Poultry (June 2015), and revised the Best Practices Guidance for Controlling *Listeria monocytogenes* at Retail Delicatessens (June 2015).

- Published “Identified Issues and Best Practices Related to Sanitary Dressing and Antimicrobial Implementation at Veal Slaughter Establishments.” The purpose of this document is to help veal slaughter establishments implement effective sanitary dressing procedures and antimicrobial treatments and to properly assess microbial testing results.

- Developed an operational measure model prototype to characterize sampling subtyping results, seasonality, and weather factors affecting trends in *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* positive sampling results from Young Chicken carcasses. At this point, FSIS intends to use the model results on a national, aggregated level with plans for individual establishment data to be added to operational measure capabilities.

FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 7: Empower Employees with the Training, Resources, and Tools to Enable Success in Protecting Public Health

Goal 7 works to create an engaged workforce focused on protecting public health and foster a safe and healthy environment for its employees. The Agency represents a single, unified team and uses feedback from all employees across the organization to inform management decisions. FSIS continuously improves training opportunities and recruitment processes, as well as promotes diversity across the organization. In FY 2015, results included the following:

- The NPIS was successfully negotiated and implemented. This included negotiating Voluntary Early Retirement Authority/Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (VERA/VSIP) for adversely impacted inspectors, supporting resume writing and job application workshops across the country, and synchronizing inspector position selections and training activities.

- Reduced the front line occupation vacancy rate to 4.15 percent, filling critical inspection and veterinarian positions to sustain the FSIS public health mission, while reducing the average time to hire across FSIS.
• Streamlined and automated the performance management process while integrating approximately 7,000 bargaining unit positions.

• Reduced its injury/illness rate to 5.5 percent while achieving a 7 percent increase in cost savings of nearly $1.2 million by returning 89 percent of injured employees to work through the Alternative Duty Program, Work Hardening Program, and job offers. In addition, the agency saved $77,992 in prescription and medical costs through the use of the Pharmacy Program.

• Surpassed its goal to have current telework agreements in place for 90 percent of telework eligible employees by 5 percent, and exceeded active telework participation goal by 10 percent, reaching an actual participation of 60 percent, or 10 percent more than its 50 percent goal.

• Was designated as the USDA Small Business Special Achievement awardee for FY 2015, while exceeding all small business targets for socially disadvantaged contractors, including veteran/women/ American Indian-owned, resulting in a contribution of more than $93 million to business and commerce.

• Decreased the FSIS physical footprint by 24,124 square feet, a 4.5 percent decrease, which resulted in an annual cost savings of $296,124, including reducing records storage space by 500 square feet, or 5 percent of 9,100 square feet.

• Processed 155 informal complaints and resolved 93, for a resolution rate of 63 percent. Ninety-nine percent of all informal complaints were counseled in a timely manner, and 100 percent were offered the opportunity to participate in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR).

• Planned, coordinated, and executed in August 2015 Diversity Training Conference, with approximately 150 field and 75 headquarters attendees at numerous workshops, with approximately 87 percent of attendees indicating that the conference met or exceeded expectations.

• FSIS completed four Title VII compliance review during FY 2015; all (100 percent) of these reviews were completed and reports were issued by the end of the fiscal year. CRS completed three Civil Rights Impact Analyses (CRIAs). All three of these CRIAs were completed on time and in accordance with Departmental regulations. In addition to the CRIAs, the Agency timely reviewed 183 Agency policies for Civil Rights impacts determinations.

• Provided operational services for USDA agencies in the areas of human resources, labor management relations, and mail management.

• Made significant strides towards closing the competency gaps, and put an increased focus on the Agency’s training, mentoring, development, and preparation of employees for career advancement and/or as future leaders, receiving Department-wide recognition for these efforts.

FSIS 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Goal 8: Develop, Maintain, and Use Innovative Methodologies, Processes, and Tools, including PHIS, to Protect Public Health Efficiently and Effectively to Support Defined Public Health Needs and Goals

Goal 8 is focused on evaluating, adopting, and applying innovative methods, processes, or technologies, including the Public Health Information System (PHIS), to minimize food safety hazards and serve the Agency's mission. In FY 2015, results included the following:

• Tracked a total of seven innovative initiatives, all of which established baselines, three of which completed the evaluation process and were considered effective; two of which have evaluations that are still in progress and require additional time; and two will re-establish baselines in FY 2016. The three initiatives that were considered effective were:
  o AssuranceNet/In-Commerce System (ANet/ICS)–Standardized Investigation Reports saw an increase in usage of reports by 59 percent for management and administrative staff. There was an increase in usage of reports by 29 percent for the field staff, and with guidance from management the field increased usage to 80 percent.
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- Use of social media saw new Twitter followers increase from 7,702 to 19,850, an increase of 158 percent.
- Digital Signature was implemented on designated FSIS forms.

- The two initiatives that are still in progress are:
  - Single-Sample Testing of Raw Ground Beef effort is completing data evaluation to assess whether there has been significant reduction in both time needed to collect samples in-plant and costs to ship multiple samples for testing.
  - Data.Gov effort is completing data evaluation on the usage of Agency data provided to Data.gov.

- The two initiatives that will re-establish baselines in FY 2016 are:
  - Self Reporting Tool (SRT) is a streamlined reporting tool for foreign regulatory authorities interested in exporting meat, poultry, or processed egg products to the United States. The tool allows foreign regulatory authorities to submit updated information to FSIS on a regular basis. Data analysis is currently being conducted to determine baseline of how many countries are successfully participating in the SRT program and metrics for that program.
  - Innovative Use of Microblog: In conjunction with local governments and education partners, this effort to add a new data source using social media data to help identify potential outbreaks sooner and to help reduce time for traceforward/traceback activities, made significant strides in FY 2015. An abstract describing the efforts involved in this activity's and the potential insights that it can provide was accepted by the American Public Health Association and was presented at its annual meeting.

- Developed an additional measure to support lifecycle analysis of initiatives post baseline review to ensure initiatives continue to provide stated values to the Agency. Re-evaluation timeframes for past initiatives were recommended, and FSIS will review initiatives that were both effective and not effective.

Section 2: Selected Accomplishments Expected at the 2017 Proposed Resource Level

In FY 2015, FSIS began drafting its new Strategic Plan for FY 2017-2021, which it plans to issue early in FY 2017. This new plan will have updated goals, metrics, and focus areas designed to steer the future of FSIS, as the agency continues to carry out its mission critical functions. The FY 2017-2021 accomplishments will be those driven by the new strategic plan. However, because the new strategic plan is in the development stages, the projected accomplishments in this section are described in terms of the Goals in the FY 2011-2016 Strategic Plan as the most straightforward way to propose expected selected accomplishments for FY 2017, although actual implementation in FY 2017 will be organized around a different set of goals.

FSIS Goal 1: Ensure that Food Safety Inspection Aligns with Existing and Emerging Risks

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

- Assess the effectiveness of the new FSA methodology instituted in FY 2015, and recommend or implement improvements as needed.
- Reduce *Salmonella* illnesses attributed to FSIS-regulated products. Areas under consideration for FSIS to focus on include the following:
  - Developed pork performance standards based on analysis of exploratory sampling testing.
  - Assess the sample results from the beef carcass baseline study and the testing results from the beef manufacturing trimmings ground beef verification programs, to ascertain proposed performance standards for these products and determine how best to force reductions in exposure of contaminants in these products.
  - Implement new pathogen reduction performance standards for raw chicken parts and not-ready-to-eat comminuted chicken and turkey for *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*.  
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Finalize and issue automated quarterly reports of FSIS sampling data (pathogens, serotype, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis, antimicrobial resistance, residue and industry averages) by product for individual establishments.

- Examine sampling frequency, scheduling, and other factors that impact positive rates (e.g., establishment size) to develop models for revised RTE FSAs and improve the project’s efficiency.

- Reduce non-O157 STEC illnesses attributed to FSIS-regulated products by expanding FSIS’s non-O157 testing to raw beef components other than trim to drive down public exposure to non-O157 STEC and provide slaughter establishments vital information concerning the effectiveness of their operations in order to stimulate further industry improvement. Consider alternatives to current component sampling procedures that improve ability to detect pathogens, and, therefore, prevent adulterated lots into commerce.

- Evaluate whether improvements can be made to its current sample collection procedures for bench trim and raw ground beef components other than trim to improve the Agency’s ability to detect pathogens when present and expedite sample collection, thereby reducing public exposure to pathogens and increasing inspection efficiencies.

- Optimize the impact of inspection verification activities on decreasing the public’s risk of adverse health events. FSIS will be better able to assign the most appropriate verification activity to be performed by inspection personnel. Improved characterization and alignment of risks and assigned work will mitigate adverse health events.

**FSIS Goal 2: Maximize Domestic and International Compliance with Food Safety Policies**

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

- Develop new outreach strategies for food defense and initiatives to protect against the intentional contamination of food.

- Implement a multi-year food defense strategy and food defense communications strategy to increase awareness of food defense and better integrate food defense into food safety activities of the Agency.

- Continue to better focus on food safety off-line inspection activities in implementing the NPIS.

- Ensure that 70 percent of FSIS surveillance activities focus on the highest risk facilities’ operating in a manner that maintains the food safety and food defense of the product they handle.

- Ensure that at least 83 percent of food safety violations documented during initial surveillances are corrected before follow-up surveillance.

- Ensure that 85 percent of enforcement actions (i.e., administrative, criminal, and civil) address food safety violations and deter future ones, with respect to regulated products handled in commerce.

- Continue to conduct special investigations (e.g., Incident Investigation Teams (IITs) and baselines) to collect data from the farm-to-fork continuum to understand the risk factors and behavior of pathogens along the continuum.

**FSIS Goal 3: Enhance Public Education and Outreach to Improve Food-Handling Practices**

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

- Continue its partnership with external organizations, including the International Food Information Council, and foodsafety.gov in order to further promote safe food handling messages to consumers.

- Continue partnerships with national organizations representing at-risk groups to further reach consumers with safe food handling information.

- Continue its effort to revise Safe Handling Instructions on package labels of raw meat and poultry products.

- Work to implement a learning agenda approach to facilitate continuous improvement.
• Partner with the multi-agency Social Behavioral Sciences Team to address current barriers to understanding consumer behavior with regard to FSIS-related products.

**FSIS Goal 4: Strengthen Collaboration among Internal and External Stakeholders to Prevent Foodborne Illness**

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

• Work to improve the understanding of known and emerging hazards and risks associated with FSIS-regulated commodities, from farm to table, to inform the development of agency policies to reduce, eliminate, or prevent consumer exposure to known foodborne hazards associated with meat, poultry, and processed egg products.

• Finalize new IFSAC Strategic Plan and share publicly through a variety of media channels, including a potential public meeting.

• Aim to reach, if not surpass, the 73 percent target of identified opportunities realized to improve information sharing to further enhance outreach to small and very small establishments.

• Provide outreach and support to small-scale livestock and poultry producers and small and very small State-inspected establishments to enter into, and remain in, the Cooperative Interstate Shipment (CIS) program with FSIS to support the Department’s “Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food” initiative.

**FSIS Goal 5: Effectively Use Science to Understand Foodborne Illness and Emerging Trends**

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

• Continue to expand capability to transition from the current characterization technologies (serotype, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis, and antimicrobial susceptibility testing) to whole genome sequencing, in order to align FSIS with the current status and direction of our public health partners, FDA, and CDC.

• Continue outbreak investigations, providing support to the Consumer Complaint Monitoring System (CCMS).

• Continue the National Residue program, and continue domestic and international efforts of residue avoidance.

• Refine and develop tools (quantitative modeling and analysis tools, and new laboratory methods) to measure how FSIS policies improve the safety of meat, poultry, and egg products and to better analyze the impact of agency policy on public health.

**FSIS Goal 6: Implement Effective Policies To Respond to Existing and Emerging Risks**

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

• Develop raw pork performance standards based on analysis of exploratory sampling data. Findings from the data analysis will also be incorporated into the revised second edition of the Market Hog Compliance Guideline.

• Evaluate the sample collection rates for bench trim and components other than trim to determine whether additional changes to the programs are needed to improve sample collection rates.

• Incorporate into the residue testing policy recommendations from the pilot for bob veal and dairy cows once proven effective and then extend this pilot project to other slaughter classes in 2016 including market hog and sows, pending senior management approval.

• Assess the effects of veal sanitary dressing and HACCP validation guidance documents.

• Assess the characteristics of establishments that have no public health regulation (PHR) non-compliance versus those that have PHR non-compliances.
FSIS Goal 7: Empower Employees with the Training, Resources, and Tools to Enable Success in Protecting Public Health

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

- Retain employees in mission critical occupations at a 70 percent rate for GS-1862/Consumer Safety Inspectors, GS-1863 Food Inspectors, GS-701/Public Health Veterinarians, GS-701/Veterinary Medical Officers, and GS-696/Enforcement Investigations and Analysis Officers.
- Make training and development investments for mission critical occupations, specifically certification of 70 percent of GS-201/Human Resources Management series employees, and training completion for 90 percent of hiring managers.
- Meet average time to hire of 70 days, with 23 days for staff acquisition, and 15 days for candidate review, paneling, and selection.
- Achieve a 10 percent improvement in delegated examining unit/merit promotion certificate use, to reach at least 50 percent.
- Use virtual reality tools to train, and to increase the retention rate, of newly hired inspectors.
- Continue to provide competency-based workforce training.
- Ensure 90 percent of eligible teleworking workforce having current core agreements in place, and achieve a 70 percent active telework participation goal.
- Implement injury/illness and workers’ compensation recordkeeping electronic system for improved tracking and trend analysis. This will increase effectiveness at targeting and mitigating high risk hazards for FSIS employees.
- Attempt to reduce injury/illness rate below 5.5 percent, while achieving an increase in cost savings by returning injured employees to work through the Alternative Duty Program, Work Hardening Program and job offers.
- Strive to exceed the USDA small business goals, to include at least 53 percent of awards for small business, 5 percent for small disadvantaged business, 3 percent for HUBZone small business and 3 percent for service-disabled, veteran-owned small business.
- Ensure management and program accountability for FSIS’ EEO and Civil Rights programs by conducting nine Title VI and Title VII Civil Rights and EEO compliance reviews and counseling at least 95 percent of informal EEO complaints within the regulated timeframe.

FSIS Goal 8: Develop, Maintain, and Use Innovative Methodologies, Processes, and Tools, including PHIS, to Protect Public Health Efficiently and Effectively to Support Defined Public Health Needs and Goals

In FY 2017, FSIS will:

- Continue to develop and implement a robust enterprise architecture to ensure a reliable, secure public health information infrastructure.
- Continue to provide enhancements to PHIS to comply with regulatory changes, business process changes and automation.
- Continue to provide access to the ANet/ICS to State program users. Expand the ability to access five key software functions in ANet/ICS (i.e., firm information, surveillance, investigation, product control, and enforcement), and expand ANet/ICS beyond the 10 State MPI programs that implemented this in FY 2015.
- Continue to conduct management control audits of inspection and support programs, working to improve accountability, monitor programs, and enhance program operations. FSIS commissions audits to determine the adequacy and vulnerability of management controls and program controls, and related systems.
- Continue Agency-wide monitoring of FSIS Strategic Plan goals in order to identify changing risks, monitor programs’ responses to those risks, and determine how the potential risks may impact achieving the strategic
goals. This will include cross-checking monitoring data against program operational and/or performance results, and correlate it with the submissions for FSIS Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) Annual Assurance Statement.

- Continue to upgrade skills and competencies of the inspection workforce in order to fully implement and use the new features of PHIS successfully.

### FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

**Strategic Goal Funding Matrix**

(Dollars in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Program Items</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$897,426</td>
<td>$900,641</td>
<td>$898,889</td>
<td>+15,256</td>
<td>$914,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Years</td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>8,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)</td>
<td>39,136</td>
<td>45,360</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>-15,819</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>16,589</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td>+226</td>
<td>16,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Years</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Food Safety &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>60,905</td>
<td>61,490</td>
<td>+78</td>
<td>61,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs, Strategic Goal</td>
<td>1,015,245</td>
<td>1,027,254</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>-238</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff Years, Strategic Goal</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs, All Strategic Goals</td>
<td>1,015,245</td>
<td>1,027,254</td>
<td>1,030,690</td>
<td>-238</td>
<td>1,030,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTEs, All Strategic Goals</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>8,938</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3: Summary of Budget and Performance

**Key Performance Outcomes and Measures**

The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), a public health regulatory agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), is responsible for ensuring that the commercial supply of meat, poultry, and processed egg products moving in commerce, including products for import or export, are safe, secure, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged. Legislative mandates provide FSIS with the authority to conduct its public health mission.

Ensuring the safety of the Nation’s food supply requires a strong and robust infrastructure coupled with sound science. FSIS uses a data-driven, scientific approach to food safety, incorporating both FSIS sampling data and public health data critical to combating the ever-changing threats to public health. FSIS works to reduce foodborne illness through inspections, enforcement efforts, pathogen verification testing, consumer education, partnerships with its stakeholders, and science-based policy decisions. The USDA Strategic Plan for FY 2014-2018 provides four corporate performance measures by which FSIS measures its progress. The FSIS FY 2011-2016 Strategic Plan,
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published in September 2011, identified a wider range of metrics designed to measure Agency progress in reducing foodborne illness.

FSIS contributes to one USDA strategic goal:

**USDA Strategic Goal 4. Objective 3: Protect Public Health by Ensuring Food is Safe: Ensure that All of America’s Children Have Access to Safe, Nutritious, and Balanced Meals.**

A plentiful supply of safe and nutritious food is essential to the well-being of every family and the healthy development of every child in America. USDA works to support and protect the Nation’s agricultural system and the consumers it serves by safeguarding the quality, wholesomeness, and safety of meat, poultry, and processed egg products. USDA’s programs and actions provide an infrastructure that enables the natural abundance of our lands and the ingenuity and hard work of our agricultural procedures to create a food supply that is unparalleled in its safety and quality—and puts a healthy diet within reach of every American consumer. FSIS takes a farm-to-table approach to reducing and preventing foodborne illness by investing heavily in its workforce and data infrastructure.

**Key Outcome 1: Preventing Foodborne Illness Associated with the Consumption of Meat, Poultry, and Processed Egg Products**

**Key Performance Measure:** The continued mission of FSIS is to protect consumers by ensuring that the commercial supply of meat, poultry, and processed egg products is safe, secure, correctly labeled, and packaged. To better achieve this mission and ensure alignment with its FY 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, FSIS established the following four corporate performance measures to gauge overall effectiveness:

- Increase the percentage of broiler establishments passing the carcass *Salmonella* verification-testing standard.
- Reduce the total estimated number of foodborne illness (*Salmonella, Lm, and E. coli* O157:H7) from FSIS-regulated products.
- Increase the percentage of FSIS-regulated establishments with functional food defense plans.
- Increase the percentage of slaughter plants identified during District Veterinary Medical Specialist humane handling verification visits as having an effective systematic approach to humane handling.

**Description of Performance Measures**

FSIS is the public health agency in USDA responsible for ensuring that the nation's commercial supply of meat, poultry, and processed egg products are safe, wholesome, and correctly labeled and packaged. Ensuring the safety of the Nation’s food supply requires a strong and robust infrastructure coupled with sound science. FSIS uses a data-driven, scientific approach to food safety, incorporating both FSIS sampling data and public health data critical to combating the ever-changing threats to public health. FSIS works to reduce foodborne illness through inspections, enforcement efforts, pathogen verification testing, consumer education, partnerships with its stakeholders, and science-based policy decisions.

The USDA Strategic Plan provides three corporate performance measures to FSIS that were identified in the President’s Food Safety Working Group (FSWG). The FSIS FY 2011-2016 Strategic Plan identifies a wider range of metrics designed to measure Agency progress in reducing foodborne illness. In FY 2015, FSIS reported on four corporate performance measures. The first corporate performance metric measures the increase in the percentage of FSIS-regulated young chicken establishments that pass a tightened performance standard for *Salmonella*, which was implemented on July 1, 2011. The second metric is the total annual number of estimated illnesses from *Salmonella, Lm, and E. coli* O157:H7 from all FSIS-regulated products, otherwise known as the All-Illness Measure. These pathogens are of particular concern for FSIS-regulated products because data have linked these pathogens to human illnesses. For the third metric, FSIS measures the adoption rate of functional food defense plans by regulated establishments. The fourth measure is the percentage of slaughter plants identified during District Veterinary Medical Specialist (DVMS) humane handling verification visits as having an effective systematic approach to humane handling.

By implementing steps to reduce the presence of pathogens and improve protection of the food supply, FSIS is implementing the recommendations of the FSWG and working to reduce the overall number of foodborne illnesses.
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experienced by American consumers.

**Key Performance Measures**

**FSIS Corporate Performance Measure: Percentage of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing**

In FY 2011, FSIS established a performance standard for *Salmonella* in broiler carcasses. This standard is designed to encourage industry to control for *Salmonella* and reduce the potential for human exposure. Failure to meet this standard serves as a proxy for heightened exposure potential to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass <em>Salmonella</em> Verification Testing Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowable Data Range for Met:** FSIS must meet or exceed the target to report the target was met.

**Assessment of Performance Data**

**Data Source:** Results are based upon USDA’s laboratory final results.

**Completeness of Data:** Given the publication of 80 CFR 3940 on January 26, 2015, FSIS is in a transition period for determining performance standard results. For FY 2015, all samples collected in the previous two years (October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2015) were considered, and the most recent 51 results were used to determine each establishment’s performance. Establishments with fewer than 51 results are not included in the percentage reported.

**Reliability of Data:** The data are reliable because they are based on testing and verification from the USDA’s field service laboratories for regulated establishments. Each sample is subjected to highly specific verification testing. The primary goal of the *Salmonella* sampling program is to monitor how well each establishment is maintaining control of food safety through its Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) program, sanitation, and supporting programs.

**Quality of Data:** USDA collects pathogen verification samples at a range of establishments. Testing is conducted to verify establishment pathogen reduction activities.

Revised from FY 2012’s measure of “Overall public exposure to Salmonella from boiler carcasses” as FSIS implemented a new, stricter Salmonella performance standard for broilers and turkeys on July 1, 2011.

**Analysis of Results**

**Selected Past Accomplishments Toward the Achievement of the Key Outcome FY 2015:**

This measure tracks the percent of young chicken (broiler) establishments passing the carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard. The FSIS result of 95.6 percent exceeded the FY 2015 target of 94 percent.

FSIS published its *Salmonella* Action Plan (SAP) in December 2013, which focuses on FSIS’ ambitious goal of reducing the number of foodborne *Salmonella* illnesses associated with FSIS-regulated products. The Plan included actions such as enhancing *Salmonella* sampling and testing programs for comminuted poultry and raw chicken parts, developing new strategies for inspection including initial implementation of the NPIS, as well as focusing the Agency’s education and outreach tools on *Salmonella*, and revising Compliance Guidelines for Controlling
Salmonella and Campylobacter in Raw Poultry were issued December 2014. In February 2015, all poultry slaughter establishments began complying with sampling requirements to demonstrate microbiological control for the prevention of fecal and enteric pathogen contamination during slaughter as a result of this final rule. Actual conversion of establishments to NPIS began in July 2015 and is ongoing.

Most of the projects in the SAP have been completed or are in the final stages of being completed. Some projects are “ongoing,” so that the Agency has incorporated them into other, on-going activities and therefore are being considered complete for the purposes of tracking the SAP. For example, FSIS has implemented the NPIS, an updated science-based inspection system that positions food safety inspectors throughout poultry facilities in a smarter way. Significant public health benefits will be achieved and foodborne illness will be prevented by more greatly focusing our inspectors’ attention on activities that will better ensure the safety of poultry. Those changes include moving some inspectors away from quality assurance tasks—including checking carcasses for bruises and feathers—to focus on food safety tasks, such as ensuring sanitation standards are being met and verifying testing and antimicrobial process controls. This science-based approach means our highly-trained inspectors will spend less time looking for obvious physical defects that do not impact public health and more time making sure poultry processing facilities take steps to prevent contamination and to better control invisible food safety hazards posed by harmful bacteria. Estimates show that once fully implemented the modernization in inspection activities is likely to result in a reduction of nearly 5,000 Salmonella illnesses per year in the United States. Initial poultry establishments began voluntary participation in NPIS in July 2015, and plant enrollment is ongoing.

The implementation of the PHIS further enhances the Agency’s ability to protect the public from dangerous pathogens such as Salmonella. It empowers the Agency with the most up-to-date data at the touch of button and provides a comprehensive picture of what is going on at plants across the country. Since PHIS was launched, we know more about establishment operations, volumes, HACCP plans, and other food safety programs. FSIS continues to enhance PHIS to be an even more effective tool to protect public health.

In May 2015, FSIS began continuous sampling, rather than set based sampling for products subject to Salmonella testing, including young chicken carcasses. Previously, to determine the percentage of young chicken establishments passing the performance standard for this measure, the calculation was limited to establishments with at least two complete sets of 51 samples, and it was based on the two most recently completed sets (excluding any recent samples not part of a completed set), which were normally completed in the last 2 years. To continue reporting results in the most similar way for this measure and to allow for historical comparison, FSIS will calculate the measure based on the most recent 51 samples from an establishment, collected within the past 2 years, beginning in Q4 of FY 2015.

**Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2017 Proposed Resource Level/Challenges for the Future**

FSIS intends to make further progress in reducing illnesses from the products it regulates through its ongoing activities that are focused on reducing Salmonella contamination of regulated products. Broadly, these activities include continued implementation of NPIS and increasing FSIS’ Salmonella-Related Activities for Other Products and Species.

**FSIS Corporate Performance Measure:** Total Number of Salmonella, Lm, and E.coli O157:H7 Illnesses from Products Regulated by FSIS

FSIS measures its performance on reducing foodborne illness in terms of total Salmonella, Lm, and E. coli O157:H7 illnesses from all FSIS regulated meat, poultry, and processed egg products. Estimates of total illness from all FSIS-regulated products are based on pathogen-specific case rates from CDC FoodNet data and simple food attribution estimates derived from CDC’s Foodborne Disease Outbreak Surveillance System (FDOSS) database, and are anchored to pathogen-specific illness reduction Healthy People 2020 goals. FSIS uses a simple foods attribution methodology with a rolling 3-year window of outbreak data from the publicly available CDC FDOSS database.

| Total (All) Illness Measure (Salmonella, Lm and E. coli O157:H7) |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

23-66
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Illnesses</th>
<th>491,353</th>
<th>479,621</th>
<th>427,171</th>
<th>386,265</th>
<th>382,123</th>
<th>363,547</th>
<th>353,139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Allowable Data Range for Met:** FSIS must meet or exceed the target to report the target was met.

### Assessment of Performance Data

#### Data Source:
Estimates of total illness from all FSIS-regulated products are based on case rates from CDC’s FoodNet data and simple food attribution estimates derived from the FDOSS outbreak database. They are linked to the DHHS HP2020 pathogen reduction goals.

#### Completeness of Data:
The CDC FoodNet program monitors the incidence of laboratory-confirmed infections caused by nine pathogens transmitted commonly through food in 10 U.S. sites, covering approximately 15% of the U.S. population, though CDC case rates are thought to generally represent the entire U.S. population. The case rates CDC provides to FSIS on a quarterly basis lag by one quarter, meaning that illness estimates lag by one quarter. CDC outbreak data is reported by State, local, and territorial public health agencies to CDC, but differences exist between CDC and states in reporting rates and other key reporting elements.

#### Reliability of Data:
The CDC FoodNet program is active, population-based surveillance for laboratory-confirmed infections. However, these data are subject to limitations. The CDC FDOSS program is a passive surveillance system. CDC collects reports of foodborne outbreaks due to enteric bacterial, viral, parasitic, and chemical agents. The CDC surveillance team analyzes these data to understand the impact of foodborne outbreaks and the pathogens, foods, settings, and contributing factors (for example, food not kept at the right temperature) involved. As with the FoodNet program, these data are subject to limitations.

#### Quality of Data:
Each of the data sources used to estimates illnesses has a number of limitations that affect the quality of the data used.

Updated in FY 2011 to reflect newly published illness estimates from the CDC, news, national Healthy People 2020 goals, and methodological changes. CDC case rates lag by one quarter.

### Analysis of Results

**Selected Past Accomplishments Toward the Achievement of the Key Outcome FY 2015:**

FSIS calculates an estimate of the total number of foodborne illnesses for three key pathogens: *Salmonella*, *Lm*, and *E. coli* O157:H7 from FSIS regulated products (i.e. meat, poultry, and processed egg products). This target is linked to achieving pathogen-specific Healthy People 2020 objectives for reducing illnesses due to *E. coli* O157:H7, *Lm*, and *Salmonella*.

FSIS did not achieve the Agency’s FY 2015 illness reduction target of 373,955 illnesses. The total number of illnesses attributed to FSIS-regulated products was 382,123. FSIS also did not achieve the Q4 Salmonella reduction target, although it did meet its *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Lm* targets for the All Illness Measure.

FSIS strives to achieve an ambitious reduction in *Salmonella* illnesses through the implementation of the Salmonella Action Plan, which focuses on FSIS’ ambitious goal of reducing the number of foodborne *Salmonella* illnesses associated with FSIS-regulated products. The SAP includes actions such as enhancing *Salmonella* sampling and testing programs, developing new strategies for inspection, and focusing the Agency’s education and outreach tools on *Salmonella*.

A key part of food safety efforts is the sampling and analysis for pathogens, adulterants, and contamination, which is why FSIS is increasing its lab analysis program. FSIS’s integrated approach to food safety has made great strides in reducing illnesses in large part because of scientifically derived standards and the sampling program. Data analysis shows that sampling food for hazards leads to a drop in contamination rates. Additionally, positive samples are tested for antimicrobial resistance, which enables better tracking and prevention of antimicrobial resistant bacteria.
FSIS developed a five-year sampling plan to build upon Agency successes and to continue to improve the use of data and information to drive results.

FSIS currently has a project underway to gather requirements from consumer focus group on an updated Safe Food Handling label. Based on the results of focus group testing, FSIS may engage in additional project to develop an updated Safe Handling Instruction label that will reflect the consumer input gathered by this initial project.

In addition to FSIS inspection and enforcement efforts designed to reduce the All-Illness number, FSIS undertakes a range of public education efforts intended to raise public awareness about the steps they can take in the home to reduce their risk of contracting foodborne illness (i.e. Clean – Separate – Cook – Chill). Consumer research is used to guide these efforts, which allows the agency to refine public education efforts to understand where additional efforts are needed.

FY 2015 marked the final contract year with the Ad Council for the Food Safe Families Campaign. This year, FSIS received more than $25 million dollars in donated media and more than 2 billion impressions, bringing the contract total to more than $125 million since its launch in June 2011. During FY 2015, the contract used volunteer ad firm, Partners + Napier, to develop new public safety announcements (PSAs), which included TV ads, radio spots, out-of-home, print, and web advertising in English and Spanish. The PSAs used FSIS-funded research conducted with Kansas State University to broadcast the message about thermometer use and cross-contamination.

FSIS also implemented a mobile application called the FoodKeeper, which explains food storage and safe food handling to users. It can be downloaded on smartphones and tablets, and is available through the Google Play and iTunes stores. This year more than 84,000 users downloaded the application.

FSIS engaged with the public through Twitter, where our account @USDAFoodSafety increased its total number of followers by more than 20 percent from FY 2014, to more than 773,000. Upon completion of a summer outreach campaign on Twitter, analytics revealed that agency messaging received over 5.47 million unique impressions and was used by more than 1,000 Twitter accounts. FSIS was also able to successfully add food safety information into trending topics not directly related to the USDA, such as The Oscars, #TheDress, and The X-Files.

FSIS also increased the use of innovative online consumer education tools such as Ask Karen, which saw a 30 percent increase in traffic compared to FY 2014. FSIS further conducted seasonal outreach campaigns targeting journalists and at-risk partners. These efforts drew a record 10.46 million users to FoodSafety.gov.

July 2015 marked the 30th anniversary of the Meat and Poultry Hotline; since its inception in 1985, the Hotline has handled more than 3 million public inquiries. Consumers can query the Hotline in English and Spanish—not just over the phone but also through live chat online, email, and the Ask Karen smartphone application.

In FY 2015, the Food Safety Discovery Zone (FSDZ) traveled to seven states and reached more than 1.7 million consumers. The Midwest was selected as this year’s geographical area due foodborne illnesses trends observed in those states associated to cultural dishes (i.e. Tiger Meat, Kibbeh). The FSDZ exhibited at events in rural communities, dense cities, and within largely Hispanic communities. Events were also selected strategically for their close proximity regional offices and plants to encourage field personnel participation and collaboration.

The digital subscription service that FSIS uses, GovDelivery, continues to show growth in the number of subscribers and total subscriptions. More page views are attributed to this source than to any other referrer. Prompt notification of new information drives traffic to the website. Several new topics have been added this fiscal year, and a total of 45 topics are available for subscription.

An important part of FSIS’ efforts to reduce Salmonella contamination is encouraging consumers to take steps to protect themselves from illnesses. FSIS has done this by enhancing public education and outreach to improve food handling practices, as well as pursuing updates to the safe handling instructions found on raw meat and poultry packages. Upon completion of a Twitter campaign, analytics revealed that the #GrillingLikeaPRO hashtag received more than 5.47 million unique impressions and was used by more than 1,000 Twitter accounts. Even though few food thermometer pictures were posted, the amplification of the food safety message through external partners served as an excellent template for future seasonal outreach. Successful messages on Twitter included the Summer BBQ infographic and the "Is it done yet?" graphic. A successful message on Facebook included the "Children Under Five" infographic, which reached more than 225 thousand users, and a post about the inner color of burgers versus their doneness, which reached 185 thousand users.
Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2017 Proposed Resource Level/Challenges for the Future

FSIS is strongly committed to strengthening and using data and evidence to drive better decision-making and achieve greater impact. FSIS’ efforts to meet these goals and expectations include continued updates to PHIS, which now captures data in automated and useful formats. FSIS looks to move forward and take the next steps to modernize our science based decisions by developing and using new tools to drive results. This is a coordinated and integrated effort to improve the quality and quantity of data that FSIS captures, improve the usefulness of its information, conduct better analysis, become more proactive on reducing illnesses, improve the ability to rapidly adjust to food safety threats that do occur, and to become more effective in performing the FSIS mission.

Through WGS and expanded lab analysis FSIS plans to further increase the quality and quantity of useful data to reduce food borne illnesses. Through an Advanced Analytics initiative, FSIS expects to increase capability of the Agency’s ability to analyze current and future data to take advantage of the data available and be able to turn it into useful information. Together these initiatives should greatly decrease illnesses by aiding inspectors in their work; informing policy, rulemaking and establishment of standards; improving decision making at all levels; improving industry’s awareness of their operations, increasing our ability to identify and track antibiotic resistant bacteria; and becoming more proactive in food safety.

The Agency’s WGS capability development and implementation is a multi-year and multi-agency initiative utilizing modern sequencing instruments and associated bioinformatics infrastructure to characterize bacterial genomes with greater precision. The ultimate goal of this project is to utilize WGS technology as the multi-agency network standard for bacterial genome characterization and comparison. WGS greatly enhances FSIS efforts to cluster and discriminate between pathogenic bacteria isolated from clinical specimens and food and environmental samples. This significant increase in the amount of information FSIS will obtain on pathogens has many benefits to the public health community and the American public. This capability is also critical to FSIS, as the Agency needs to embrace new and better technology and remain in sync with key public health partners (principally FDA and CDC) in protecting public health.

A key part of food safety efforts is the sampling and analysis for pathogens, adulterants, and contamination. FSIS’s integrated approach to food safety has made great strides in reducing illnesses in large part because of scientifically derived standards and the sampling program. Data analysis shows that sampling food for hazards leads to a drop in contamination rates. Additionally, positive samples are tested for antimicrobial resistance, which enables better tracking and prevention of antimicrobial resistant bacteria. FSIS developed a five-year sampling plan to build upon Agency successes and to continue to improve the use of data and information to drive results. Despite FSIS’s best efforts, there are still products and pathogens that the Agency does not currently test for and starting a program could help reduce illnesses. Expanding lab capacity will be used to close gaps in our testing program and eliminate exceptions to testing. These gaps fall into three main areas 1) products not being tested: for example, Not Ready to Eat (NTRE) products, turkey parts, fabricated steaks; 2) species not being tested: for example, lamb, goat, duck; and 3) hazards not currently tested: for example, non-O157 in raw beef products, *Toxoplasma gondii*. This initiative will provide overdue increases to our lab analysis program, which should decrease the number of illnesses due to consuming FSIS-regulated products and improve the Department’s surveillance program for Advanced Meat Recovery (AMR).

FSIS continues to work with the CDC and FDA through the Interagency Food Safety Analytics Collaboration (IFSAC). The primary objective of this group is to work collaboratively to improve coordination of federal food safety analytical efforts, beginning with foodborne illness source attribution. It is anticipated that results from attribution projects developed out of the IFSAC initiative may be incorporated into a FSIS All-Illness Measure for the next FSIS strategic plan.

For FSIS’ new strategic plan framework, the Agency is considering adopting the harmonized attribution methodology and fractions presented at a public meeting held in February 2015 by IFSAC, of which CDC, FDA, and FSIS are co-founders.

FSIS anticipates continuing its work on the Food Safe Families campaign, the FSIS website modernization enhancement, the Food Safety Discovery Zone, outreach to at-risk or underserved populations, and extensive social outreach including Twitter. FSIS is also developing materials for requirements gathering for consumer focus group testing on Safe Food Handling labels.
Food Safety and Inspection Service

**FSIS Corporate Performance Measure: Percent of Establishments with a Functional Food Defense Plan**

FSIS began measuring the status of industry’s voluntary adoption of food defense plans through annual surveys of FSIS Inspection Program Personnel (IPP) in 2006. The survey questions determine whether each FSIS-inspected establishment has a functional food defense plan (i.e., the plan is documented; measures are in place to address outside security, inside security, personnel security, and incident response; the plan was tested in the last year; and the establishment reviewed their plan in the past year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Establishments with a functional Food Defense Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowable Data Range for Met:** FSIS must meet or exceed the target to report the target was met.

**Assessment of Performance Data**

**Data Source:** Agency annual questionnaire in PHIS issued to FSIS Inspection Program Personnel (IPP) and Import Inspection Personnel.

**Completeness of Data:** The data is complete, with surveys conducted at approximately 98% of surveyed establishments in 2015. Survey response rates have been 96% or higher since 2010.

**Reliability of Data:** The data from the food defense plan survey have been collected from trained FSIS IPP since the survey was initiated in 2006. However, since food defense is not mandatory in FSIS-regulated establishments and the degree to which food defense measures are implemented may be subjective, survey results may differ based on subjectivity of IPP.

**Quality of Data:** The data from the food defense plan survey have been collected from trained FSIS IPP since the survey was initiated in 2006. However, since food defense is not mandatory in FSIS-regulated establishments and the degree to which food defense measures are implemented may be subjective, survey results may differ based on subjectivity of IPP.

Functional food defense plans are written procedures that food processing establishments should follow to protect the food supply from intentional contamination with chemicals, biological agents or other harmful substances.

**Analysis of Results**

**Selected Past Accomplishments Toward the Achievement of the Key Outcome FY 2015:**

FSIS completed the Tenth Annual Food Defense Plan Survey in June and July 2015. As in FY 2014, the survey included inspection program personnel at meat and poultry slaughter and processing establishments, processed egg products plants, and official import inspection establishments. The response rate for the FY 2015 survey was 98 percent, the highest response rate since the survey was initiated in 2006.

The FY 2015 survey found that 85 percent of all establishments have a functional food defense plan, up from 84 percent in FY 2014. As in previous years, larger establishments have a higher rate of implementing functional food defense plans: 98 percent of large establishments and 92 percent (up from 91 percent) of small establishments have functional food defense plans, while 78 percent (up from 77 percent) of very small establishments have functional plans.

FSIS’ goal is to have 90 percent of all official establishments with a functional food defense plan. FSIS conducted a variety of outreach activities to increase the percentage of establishments with functional food defense plans.
including developing guidance and tools, delivering presentations, conducting workshops, mailing letters, and calling establishments.

For example, in April-May 2015, FSIS conducted direct outreach through phone calls to approximately 64 percent of establishments that did not have a functional food defense plan based on the results of the FY 2014 Food Defense Plan Survey. In February 2015, FSIS released a new document entitled “Food Defense in FSIS-Regulated Establishments.” The document was distributed through mailings to establishments, site visits, field personnel, and meetings with industry associations. Also, FSIS provided additional information to promote industry adoption of food defense plans in Small Plant News, Volume 7, Number 5 “Food Defense Within FSIS-Regulated Establishments: Are You Prepared?”

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2017 Proposed Resource Level/Challenges for the Future:

Increasing the number of very small plants that adopt food defense plans is a challenge. Their small scale makes the time, effort, and cost involved in adopting food defense plans difficult. FSIS anticipates that adoption of food defense plans by the remaining establishments will require additional outreach and education measures to reach the target of 90 percent adoption of food defense plans.

To continue to encourage the voluntary adoption of functional food defense plans in regulated establishments, FSIS will continue outreach activities, with efforts focused on very small establishments and developing new guidance on food defense tools and resources.

**FSIS Corporate Performance Measure: Percent of Establishments with a Systematic Humane Handling Approach**

The Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978 states that the slaughtering and handling of livestock are to be carried out only by humane methods. FSIS is continually developing enforcement guidance for inspection personnel and establishments to improve humane handling and humane slaughter of livestock at federally inspected facilities. USDA considers humane methods of handling animals and humane slaughter operations a priority. The agency is presently collecting data on the extent to which industry is implementing and maintaining a systematic approach to humane handling. All FSIS inspected livestock establishments are required to handle and slaughter livestock using humane methods under the Federal Humane Methods of Slaughter Act. The four features of a humane handling and slaughter systematic approach include (1) conducting an initial assessment of locations where livestock are handled in connection with slaughter; (2) designing facilities and on-going standard handling procedures that minimize excitement, discomfort, or accidental injury to livestock; (3) conducting periodic evaluations of the humane handling methods; and (4) identifying and implementing corrective measures when necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Establishments with a Systematic Humane Handling Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowable Data Range for Met:** FSIS must meet or exceed the target to report the target has been met.

**Assessment of Performance Data**

**Data Source:** Agency DVM specialists (DVMS) conduct on site visits to assess an establishment’s humane handling procedures including whether the establishment has developed a systematic approach to its humane handling practices.

**Completeness of Data:** FSIS personnel were not able to assess all slaughter establishments in FY 2015.

**Reliability of Data:** The data is reliable because FSIS personnel use an established “Humane Handling and Slaughter Verification Tool” to record actual observations at the establishment that help determine whether the plan is present and operational.

**Quality of Data:** All establishments were not visited in FY 2016.
New target that was baselined in FY 2012, and implemented in FY 2013.

**Analysis of Results**

**Selected Past Accomplishments Toward the Achievement of the Key Outcome FY 2015:**

FSIS continued the transparency of its enforcement of federal humane handling laws by posting humane handling enforcement actions (Suspension, Notice of Intended Enforcement (NOIE), Reinstatement of Suspension) on the FSIS public website. FSIS also continued several actions regarding humane handling:

- In January 2015, FSIS published an FSIS Notice 7-15, Instructions for Writing Poultry Good Commercial Practices Noncompliance Records and Memorandum of Interview Letters for Poultry Mistreatment. This notice provides instructions to inspection program personnel (IPP) for writing noncompliance records (NR) for noncompliances with regulations on poultry Good Commercial Practices (GCP). This notice also provides instructions to IPP for composing a Memorandum of Interview (MOI) when documenting a meeting between IPP and establishment management on IPP observations of mistreatment of live poultry before slaughter. These instructions supplement FSIS PHIS Directive 6100.3, *Ante mortem and Post mortem Poultry Inspection*. As a result of that notice, and analysis of MOIs and NRs at poultry establishments the Agency is moving forward with revising existing Directives to provide better clarification on GCP enforcement.

- The second edition of the FSIS Compliance Guide for the Humane Handling and Slaughter of Livestock has been drafted and is in internal clearance. This revision will include guidance on determining sensibility and insensibility of livestock after application of a stunning blow and identify FSIS’ enforcement response to livestock stunning noncompliance. Additionally, the guide may include language on FSIS taking enforcement actions against individual livestock and poultry owners, transporters or haulers when they are responsible for inhumane handling of livestock or violations of good commercial practices (GCP) for poultry.

- FSIS published a proposed rule on the how FSIS intends to handle non-ambulatory veal calves. In the Federal Register Notice, Requirements for the Disposition of Non-Ambulatory Disabled Veal Calves, FSIS is proposing to amend its regulations on ante-mortem inspection to remove a provision that permits establishments to set apart and hold for treatment veal calves that are unable to rise from a recumbent position and walk because they are tired or cold. Under the proposed rule, non-ambulatory disabled veal calves that are offered for slaughter will be condemned and promptly euthanized. Prohibiting the slaughter of all non-ambulatory disabled veal calves will improve compliance with the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978 (HMSA) and the humane slaughter implementing regulations.

- FSIS is also developing a rule intended to include humane handling requirements for rabbit inspection. Adding humane handling requirements for rabbits will bring this program in line with FSIS’s other voluntary and mandatory inspection programs, which include requirements that ensure that the animals are treated humanely. It will also give inspectors the authority to enforce humane handling rules at establishments receiving voluntary rabbit inspection. FSIS’s voluntary inspection program for rabbits does not include humane handling and slaughter requirements. Under the current regulations, FSIS inspectors are limited in their ability to enforce generally accepted humane handling and slaughter practices. To bring the voluntary inspection of rabbits in line with FSIS’s other programs, and to give inspectors the authority to enforce humane handling and slaughter practices at establishments receiving this service, FSIS seeks to propose adding a humane handling and slaughter regulation to 9 CFR 354. The added regulation will ensure handling practices for rabbits that prevent unnecessary death, injury, or suffering, and stunning practices that produce immediate insensibility to pain that persists throughout the slaughter process.

The Humane Handling Enforcement Coordinator (HHEC) provides an essential layer of FSIS oversight necessary to meet statutory requirements associated with HMSA, and having a centralized subject matter expert provides national coordination support on humane handling and good commercial practice issues. This position was filled in FY 2015, in part after upgrading the position to reflect the Coordinator’s high level of interaction with government, industry, and welfare groups concerning enforcement strategies.
DVM Specialists (DVMS) continue to operate on a 12-month cycle for completing assessments in humane handling and good commercial practices. FSIS completed 1,015 humane handling assessments in FY 2015 compared with 981 assessments completed in FY 2014.

FSIS set the target at 65 percent of establishments visited would have a systematic approach to humane handling. By Q4, FY 2015, out of 717 active red meat plants, 489 plants (68.2 percent) have implemented a systematic approach to humane handling and slaughter. Fifty-seven out of 58 active large red meat plants currently have a systematic approach to humane handling. One hundred twenty-nine out of 159 active very small red meat plants have developed a systematic approach to humane handling (81.5 percent) and 303 out of 500 (61 percent) active very small red meat plants have adopted a systematic approach.

In FY 2015, the Agency devoted approximately 165 FTEs to the verification and enforcement of humane handling requirements in federally inspected establishments, spending more than 375,000 hours completing these tasks. In total, 173,185 verification procedures were performed.

The HHEC also analyzes the humane handling noncompliance reports to identify plants that require special attention due to recurring non-compliance. These plants have targeted visits by the District DVMS at least once within the following quarter of when the recurring non-compliance was identified.

FSIS continues to engage with meat associations as well as animal welfare organizations, including at the AMIF Animal Care and Handling Conference in October 2014, and meeting with representatives from meat associations as well as with several animal welfare organizations on issues for FSIS awareness.

Selected Accomplishments Expected at the FY 2017 Proposed Resource Level/Challenges for the Future:

Thinking ahead, the Agency has begun work on the FY 2017-2021 Strategic Plan Performance measure for humane handling, which will focus on recidivism as it relates to HH violations. One of the top reasons for FSIS enforcement actions in the area of humane handling is ineffective stunning of livestock. Establishments failing to execute effective stunning may be employing a “one size fits all” approach to stunning and restraint, even though the establishment may be slaughtering several types of species of varying sizes. As a result, FSIS believes stunning and restraint are areas that need increased attention, education and enforcement to ensure industry, especially small and very small establishments, comply with this very important requirement. Between FY 2017 and FY 2021, FSIS plans to augment its education and outreach efforts related to humane handling requirements to industry.

The Agency will continue to encourage slaughter establishments to develop and implement a robust systematic approach to humane handling, which is the key to effective compliance with humane handling regulations. Additionally, FSIS intends to develop compliance guidance on stunning and animal restraint. FSIS will utilize various methods to disseminate and educate industry on stunning methods, including the Agency’s DVMS, who perform annual humane handling assessments on all slaughter facilities.

In addition to enhancing education and outreach efforts, FSIS also plans to intensify the regulatory actions the Agency takes for repeat humane handling incidents. FSIS believes that pairing education and outreach to industry, followed by increased and more consistent enforcement, will have a positive effect on industry compliance regarding humane handling regulations.
### Department Strategic Goal: Ensure that all of America’s children have access to safe, nutritious, and balanced meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Program Items</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Food Safety &amp; Inspection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Inspection &amp; Import Re-inspection</td>
<td>727,483</td>
<td>730,391</td>
<td>728,965</td>
<td>741,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation, Enforcement &amp; Surveillance</td>
<td>8,072</td>
<td>8,104</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>8,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, Sampling &amp; Risk Analysis</td>
<td>29,227</td>
<td>29,344</td>
<td>29,287</td>
<td>29,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Defense &amp; Emergency Response</td>
<td>12,589</td>
<td>12,639</td>
<td>12,615</td>
<td>12,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Operations Control &amp; Efficiencies</td>
<td>100,025</td>
<td>100,425</td>
<td>100,229</td>
<td>101,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Education, Outreach, Evaluation &amp; Communications</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>9,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development, Implementation &amp; Oversight</td>
<td>10,402</td>
<td>10,444</td>
<td>10,423</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>897,061</td>
<td>900,647</td>
<td>898,889</td>
<td>914,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTEs</strong></td>
<td>8,793</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>8,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:** Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard

| Percent                                                        | 92%         | 96%         | 95%         | 95%         |

$ for percentage increase of broiler plants passing carcass *Salmonella* verification testing standards

$178,469 $179,141 $178,782 $181,811

**Performance Measure:** Total illnesses from all FSIS Products

| Number of illness cases                                       | 386,265     | 382,123     | 363,547     | 353,139     |

$ for reduction in total illnesses from all FSIS-regulated products

$626,289 $628,329 $627,108 $637,722

**Performance Measure:** Percent of establishments with a food defense plan

| Percent of all establishments with plan                        | 84%         | 85%         | 90%         | 90%         |

$ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a food defense plan

$91,549 $92,039 $91,880 $93,426

**Performance Measure:** Percent of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach

| Percent of all establishments with approach                     | 64%         | 69%         | 75%         | 75%         |

$ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach

$754 $1,136 $1,119 $1,138
Department Strategic Goal: Ensure that all of America’s children have access to safe, nutritious, and balanced meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Program Items</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Data Communication Infrastructure System (PHDCIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Operations Control &amp; Efficiencies</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>35,874</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>35,874</td>
<td>50,399</td>
<td>34,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measure: Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard
- Percent: 92% 96% 95% 95%
- $ for percentage increase of broiler plants passing carcass *Salmonella* verification testing standards: 5,742 7,175 10,080 6,916

Performance Measure: Total illnesses from all FSIS Products
- Number of illness cases: 386,265 382,123 363,547 353,139
- $ for reduction in total illnesses from all FSIS-regulated products: 20,074 25,069 35,219 24,165

Performance Measure: Percent of establishments with a food defense plan
- Percent of all establishments with plan: 84% 85% 90% 90%
- $ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a food defense plan: 2,871 3,587 5,040 3,458

Performance Measure: Percent of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach
- Percent of all establishments with approach: 64% 69% 75% 75%
- $ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach: 23 43 60 41

International Food Safety & Inspection
- Domestic Inspection & Import Re-inspection: 6,237 6,830 6,896 6,992
- Investigation, Enforcement & Surveillance: 127 139 140 142
- Data, Sampling & Risk Analysis: 456 499 504 511
- Food Defense & Emergency Response: 198 217 219 222
- Central Operations Control & Efficiencies: 3,860 4,227 4,268 4,327
- Training, Education, Outreach, Evaluation & Communications: 142 155 157 159
- Policy Development, Implementation & Oversight: 3,688 4,039 4,077 4,134
- Total Costs: 14,708 16,106 16,261 16,487
- FTEs: 112 120 120 120

Performance Measure: Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard
- Percent: 92% 96% 95% 95%
- $ for percentage increase of broiler plants passing *Salmonella* verification testing standards: 3,677 4,027 4,065 4,122

Performance Measure: Total illnesses from all FSIS Products
- Number of illness cases: 386,265 382,123 363,547 353,139
- $ for reduction in total illnesses from all FSIS-regulated products: 11,031 12,080 12,196 12,365
### Performance Measure: Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ for percentage increase of broiler plants passing carcass *Salmonella* verification testing standards.

### Performance Measure: Total illnesses from all FSIS Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Illness Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>386,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>382,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>363,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>353,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ for reduction in total illnesses from all FSIS-regulated products.

### Performance Measure: Percent of establishments with a food defense plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of all establishments with plan</th>
<th>$ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a food defense plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure: Percent of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent of all establishments with approach</th>
<th>$ for an increase in the percentage of establishments with a systematic humane handling approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program / Program Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Program Items</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Enacted</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Inspection &amp; Import Re-inspection</td>
<td>47,215</td>
<td>48,130</td>
<td>48,183</td>
<td>48,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation, Enforcement &amp; Surveillance</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, Sampling &amp; Risk Analysis</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Defense &amp; Emergency Response</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Operations Control &amp; Efficiencies</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>7,764</td>
<td>7,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Education, Outreach, Evaluation &amp; Communications</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development, Implementation &amp; Oversight</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>60,253</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>61,490</td>
<td>61,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program / Program Items</td>
<td>2014 Actual</td>
<td>2015 Actual</td>
<td>2016 Enacted</td>
<td>2017 Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Alimentarius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Operations Control &amp; Efficiencies</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Education, Outreach, Evaluation &amp; Communications</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development, Implementation &amp; Oversight</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>3,634</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure:** Percent of Broiler Plants Passing the Carcass *Salmonella* Verification Testing Standard

- Percent: 92% 96% 95% 95%
- $ for percentage increase of broiler plants passing carcass: 931 901 913 918

**Performance Measure:** Total illnesses from all FSIS Products

- Number of illness cases: 386,265 382,123 363,547 353,139
- $ for reduction in total illnesses from all FSIS-regulated products: 2,791 2,725 2,738 2,754

Total Costs, All Strategic Goals: 1,004,454 1,017,680 1,030,690 1,030,405

Total FTEs, All Strategic Goals: 8,933 8,938 8,938 8,951