

Meeting about forming an Innovation Group/Scrum housed within MDA or MDH

Orville Freeman Building

October 13, 2016; noon – 2 pm

Present:

Linda Prail, MDH

Sarah Leach, MDH

Val Gamble, MDA

Cecilia Coulter, MFMA

Jane Jewett, MISA

Tracie Zerwas - MDH

Kathy Zeman (phone), MFMA

Reason for the group:

- Figure out applicable statutes and licensing for new business models
  - Go through everything related to the model
  - “Time-boxed” so you don’t lose momentum
  - Fluid enough to bring in the right people for the task at hand
- 
- Similar in structure and function to the “enforcement forum” within MDH, although this would deal with business development rather than enforcement.
  - Similar to the group within MDA that has begun meeting every other week to deal with complex licensing questions.
  - Needs to include non-regulatory representatives; i.e. SFA, RTC, MFMA, MISA. Those groups can do some advocacy: help the entrepreneurs ask the right questions, connect regulatory and non-regulatory dots.
  - If housed within a regulatory agency, this group won’t be able to deal with all of the business planning/insurance/finance/marketing questions – those are another sphere – but need to connect the spheres.
    - Fluid group membership could help; bring in the right experts.

Recommendations:

- Answer two main questions:
  - Why do you need this? (And, why NOW?)
  - What is the greater good if this is approved?
- State very clearly:
  - WHAT is the problem
  - HOW will you solve it
  - WHO will you solve it with
  - WHO will you solve it for
- Present 5 tight arguments; 4 of them with numbers. Suggested talking points:

- Needed and necessary; this is a pressing problem
- Timeliness
- Improve the economy
- Help underserved populations
- Contribute to equity
- Regulatory reform >> connected to expanded business opportunities
- Public vs. private funding; provide rationale
- Answer the question: Why do some businesses need this and others navigate the system okay?
  - Tie to innovation; pushing the envelope = need more help
  - Tie to equity; level the playing field for small-scale food entrepreneurs

More things to consider or hash out re: design of the concept:

- Complexity of delegated authority involvement
  - DON'T suggest elimination of delegated authority.
  - Make them required to be part of the group.
  - Leverage for that could be via involvement of MDH's Environmental Health Continuous Improvement Board.
    - Local public health agencies are a strong voice within EHCIB
    - Formed 2 yrs ago and is still defining its role, but momentum is in the direction of working together on things like performance measures and evaluation

<http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/local/cib/>

- Justification for both Delegated Authority and Agency involvement could be via referencing of the Voluntary National Retail Food Regulatory Program Standards:
  - Standard #1 – Regulatory Foundation
  - Standard #7 – Industry & Community Relations

<http://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/ProgramStandards/ucm245409.htm>

Or the Public Health Accreditation Board Standards & Measures:

<http://www.phaboard.org/accreditation-process/public-health-department-standards-and-measures/>

- Focus on MDA first, rather than MDH.
  - MDH has fewer license categories
  - MDH perceives their biggest problem as people coming in without business plans.
  - Also an agency problem; not enough funding for enough staff to do consulting with applicants.

- Funding
  - Ask for 2 years
  - Don't ask to split it between agencies; have it all in one agency.
  - Outside funding is permitted in agencies, but it's difficult. It still has to be approved by the Legislature.
  - Funding for a new position like a facilitator for the group could come from outside funding held by an organization; similar to Bush grant; place a person in the agency but have someone else pay them.
    - BUT, with this scenario, would still need dedicated time from agency staff.
  - Ask for FTE's – worth of time. That's flexible; then you can have several people contributing time.
  - Require a report or timeline with specific indicators. Helps with Legislators' concerns re: accountability.
  
- Terminology/Model
  - "Task Force" vs. "Advisory Committee" – look at some models of other state-level committees
  - "Pilot Project" – these can actually last for a long time.
  - Sub-group of Food Safety & Defense Task Force?  
<https://mn.foodprotectiontaskforce.com/>
  
  - Look at Dairy Diagnostic Teams as a model. Kathy Zeman has an older report on that model. Currently called "Dairy Profitability and Enhancement Teams:"  
<http://www.mda.state.mn.us/grants/grants/diagnostics.aspx>
  
- Build in a feedback aspect that will benefit the agencies – smart process
  - Surveying or interviewing of entrepreneurs to determine where & how information should be presented to them
  - Collect information about effective messaging