Peer Review Plan

Preliminary Title: The Food Safety Performance of Raw Chicken Suppliers to the National School Lunch Program

Type of Report (ERR, EIB, EB, TB, SOR,)

[ ] Independent Review
[ X ] Influential Scientific Information

Agency: Economic Research Service

USDA

Agency Contact: Ephraim Leibtag; leibtag@ers.usda.gov

Subject of Review: This report examines the food safety performance of establishments supplying raw chicken to the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) through the commodities program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS). Under this program, AMS is required to select the lowest-cost bidder. As with all chicken sold in the United States, the chicken bought by AMS for the NSLP must comply with food safety standards issued by the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS). AMS does not set more stringent requirements for *Salmonella spp* (a pathogen) in chicken than that established by FSIS. However, producers that supply chicken to NSLP and other high-profile buyers do have incentives to invest in food safety controls because food safety problems associated with sales to such buyers could harm suppliers’ reputations.

Purpose of Review: The purpose of the review is to ensure the high-quality of the economic analysis, transparent explanation of methods, objective interpretation of results, and effective communication to the intended audience.

Type of Review: [ ] Panel Review [ X ] Individual Reviewers

[ ] Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 01/08/15 End: 04/20/15 Completed: 04/20/15

Number of Reviewers: [ ] 3 or fewer [ X ] 4 to 10 [ ] More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: Economists

Reviewers selected by: [X] Agency [ ] Designated Outside Organization

Organization’s Name:

Opportunities for Public Comment? [ ] Yes [X] No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:

How:

When:

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? [ ] Yes [X] No

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? [ ] Yes [X] No