

Audit Report AUD9-3



Establishment details

Approval Number 1

Establishment Name

Establishment Address (with postcode)

Site Type Slaughterhouse or Game Handling Establishment (dressing and/or cutting)
 Cutting Plant co-located or standalone (cutting, meat preparations, meat products, re-packaging, game handling - where no dressing)

Audit details

Audit number

	Date		Actual hours		
	From	To	IAUD	GAUD	GIMP
Audit Preparation	29/11/10	29/11/10	1.00		
Audit visit duration on site	03/12/10	03/12/10	4.25		
Audit Write-up	13/12/10	13/12/10	7.00		

Note: - actual hours, and dates shown, must correspond to entries on the auditor's timesheet/s.
 indicates actual audit date for calculating next frequency.

Date of previous audit

Previous audit category

No. of follow-up enforcement visits since last audit

Auditor conducting audit

Name in BLOCK letters

Telephone number

Email address

Food Business Operator or their representative

Name in BLOCK letters

Email:

Position

Names & positions of other attending audit

Please note: information held by Food Standards Agency, including audit reports, is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and may be published and/or disclosed in response to a request.

**Submit the original completed report to the Delivery Planning Unit.
Retain copy of completed report at plant for 1 year and then destroy.**

Audit Report

AUD9-3

Audit risk assessment - final score
--

Part 1 – Risk factors	Score
1.1 Potential hazards	45
1.2 Vulnerable consumers potentially at risk	20
1.3 Throughput	15

Part 2 – Food Business Operator Actions	Current
2.1 Production controls relating to carcase processing	5
2.2 Hygienic Production within Cutting Plants dealing with unprocessed products	0
2.3 Hygienic Production with Cutting Plants dealing with processed products	0
2.4 Environmental hygiene / Good hygiene practices	5
2.5 HACCP	5
3.0 Animal Disease	0
4.0 Animal Welfare	5
5.1 Animal By-products	5
5.2 TSE/SRM Controls	0

Final Score	105
--------------------	-----

Audit category

Points range	Audit frequency
0-50	12 months
55-75	8 months
80-105	5 months
110-150	3 months
155+	2 months

Audit frequency
5 months

Month of next visit
May 2011

Summary

Corrective action completed since last audit	
CA Reference (MM/YY plus no.)	Outcome
[S30
]

Audit Report
AUD9-3

Summary of Audit finding

[

S30

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

1.1 Potential hazards		
MICROBIOLOGICAL HAZARDS		Score
Potential for hazard i.e. cross-contamination, growth and/or survival of pathogenic spoilage bacteria, viruses, parasites and fungi in or on the product		30
Only frozen products handled		5
CHEMICAL HAZARDS		Score
Potential for hazard i.e. contamination of meat from residues of veterinary products/pesticides/feed additives, as well as from packaging and/or careless use of chemicals (cleaning products, disinfectants, lubricants)		10
Some potential (e.g. animals/meat from assured sources therefore potential contamination is from packaging/production environment only)		5
Only ready wrapped products handled		0
PHYSICAL HAZARDS		Score
Potential for hazards i.e. contamination of meat by foreign bodies		5
Only ready wrapped products handled		0
	1.1 Score	Score
	Microbiological hazards	30
	Chemical hazards	10
	Physical hazards	5
	1.1 Score	45

1.2 Vulnerable consumers potentially at risk		Score
Meat supplied (directly or indirectly) is not likely to be served to groups of 20+ vulnerable people (e.g. hospital, day care centre, nursing home) and/or it will be further processed in approved establishments.		0
There is uncertainty about the population who may be supplied with the meat and the nature of the process it may receive before it reaches the consumer		20
	1.2 Score	20

1.3 Throughput		Score
Very small (i.e. equivalent to previous 'low throughput' slaughterhouses and cutting premises), likely to market locally		5
Small/medium throughput not in other two categories (default for meat processors until size known)		15
Average weekly throughput above 500 livestock units or 200,000 birds in a slaughterhouse/over 150 metric tonnes cut meat, likely to market nationally		20
	1.3 Score	15

Part 1 Evidence

This establishment holds approval for slaughter both horses and cattle. They are also authorised to slaughter cattle of every age group. The abattoir has an on site lab, approved by VLA, where they test their own horse carcasses for Trichinella before they are released into the food chain.

This establishment also accepts emergency slaughter cattle and procedures are in place for cold inspection of these carcasses. This particularity is also covered in the RMOP.

Overall, and since the nature of the operations have not changed, risk factors remain the same.

Other than the emergency slaughter carcasses (square health mark) everything else is dispatched [S43(2)].

[S43(2)]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.1 Production Controls relating to carcase processing		
Pre-processing: compliance with (EC) 853/2004, Annex II, Sections II & III:		Score
2.1.1	Only suitable, properly identified animals are accepted for slaughter.	Good
2.1.1i	All required documents, veterinary certificates, (trained hunter's) declarations or passports received	Good
2.1.2	Only clean animals are processed for human consumption, or adequate preventative measures are taken	Good
2.1.3	FBO requests, receives, checks and acts on FCI for all animals (or batches of animals where appropriate)	Good
2.1.4	FBO follows the instructions of the OV in respect of Ante-Mortem and decisions concerning live animals (as appropriate)	Good
2.1.5	FBO assesses the welfare status of each animal on arrival (as appropriate).	Good
Controls during carcase dressing:		
Compliance with (EC) 852/2004 Annex II, Chapter IX, 3		
2.1.6	Bleeding avoiding contamination of meat (as appropriate)	Good
2.1.7	Skinning/Depilation/plucking avoiding contamination of meat	Adequate
2.1.8	Evisceration avoiding contamination of meat	Adequate
2.1.8i	Controls ensure that cross contamination is eliminated, prevented or reduced to acceptable levels during other processing operations	Adequate
Post-Mortem: Compliance with (EC) 853/2004 Annex III		
2.1.9	Carcases correctly dressed and presented for inspection	Adequate
2.1.9i	Traceability of carcasses	Adequate
2.1.9ii	Lack of faecal contamination	Adequate
Post-processing: compliance with (EC) 852/2004 Annex I, Chapter IX		
2.1.10	Adequate temperature control	Good
2.1.11	Controls avoid cross-contamination during storage, despatch and delivery.	Adequate
2.1.12	Compliance with the requirements of (EC) 2073/2005 Article 3	Adequate
2.1.13	Hygienic handling of edible co-products	N/A
2.1 Score:		5
Good (0) - Active compliance; no action necessary Adequate (5) - Occasional lapses in compliance; minor corrections needed; broadly compliant Weak (15) - Frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to medium or high risk deficiencies Poor (25) - Frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to potential/immediate risk N/A (0) - Not applicable		
Part 2.1 Evidence		
2.1.1. Most of the horses processed in this establishment come in in batches. In order to conduct a proper ante mortem inspection and verification of eligibility for slaughter, lairage staff will present these horses to the OV in small batches of 3-4 animals in one pen together with the relevant passports. Since each Passport Issuing Organisation (PIO) use their own passport model, finding and checking all the sections is a time consuming activity but essential [S30] [S30]]		

Audit Report

AUD9-3

[
S30

]

[
S30

]

Some "private horses" (pet horses which for whatever reason the owner decides to slaughter) are brought most of the times one by one and within the abattoir operational hours since the owner most of the times wants to be satisfied that the animals is humanely destroyed. In these occasions, it is normally the owner of the horse who personally decides the intended outcome of the carcass and sign the passport accordingly themselves.

Cattle are brought in most of the times outside the operational hours and the plant staff conduct identity checks. Cattle requiring BSE testing are lairaged separately from those which do not have to be tested. These controls seem to be working well and this establishment is under 10% FSA cattle ID verification checks.

2.1.1.i Valid cattle and horses passports are presented with the relevant animals before they are allowed to be slaughtered.

2.1.2. Cleanliness of livestock is not an issue. Horses tend to have quite clean coats and most of the cattle they process is dairy cattle.

2.1.3. FBO checks cattle FCIs and for those animals which may arrive without one, spare blank copies are made available to the farmers.

2.1.4. Following with the notes made for point 2.1.1., ultimately, FBO follows the instructions of the OV in respect of ante-mortem and decisions concerning live animals.

2.1.5. [S38] there is always someone available to check the animals kept in the lairage 24/7. Lairage casualties are not unusual and procedures have been agreed with the FBO so that private vets can come and conduct ante-mortem inspection of the animal and then the carcass and all its body parts are made available to the OV for post mortem inspection (there was one case in October where the body parts were not kept and the FSA team refused to health mark the carcass).

2.1.6. Animals are hygienically bled and sterilisers are available by the bleeding area.

2.1.7. to 2.1.8i Carcasses are dressed on a cradle and the skin is partially removed by hand and finally pulled away. The OV has been working with the FBO during these two last months improving the dressing techniques to reduce carcass contamination and to make sure any contamination is trimmed away at the earliest opportunity.

Both skins and green offal are moved into their respective rooms and away from the production

Audit Report

AUD9-3

areas.

Sterilisers for tools and knives and facilities for washing hands are available at various points of the line as well as steriliser for the splitting saw. FBO checked their temperature during today's inspection of the premises [

S30

]

[

S30

]

Since some of the horses may have microchips implanted (for identification), OV and FBO agreed a procedure for scanning all the horse carcasses at the very end of the dressing to ensure these physical hazards are removed from the carcasses and destroyed.

2.1.9. [

S30

] A procedure has also

been agreed to make sure the horses' heads and offal are presented for post mortem inspection in a manner that it is possible correlation with the carcasses.

2.1.9i Since the new procedures for ante mortem inspection of the horses were introduced, the kill number is written on both the passport and the carcass. From the passports, FBO produces kill sheets for both cattle and horses.

2.1.9ii Since the ultimate target for presence of faecal contamination on carcasses is zero, there is always room for improvement, but overall the contamination records produced by FSA show very low levels.

2.1.10. Carcasses are moved into the chiller once they have been health marked. FBO also applies two stamps on the carcasses: one to indicate that the carcasses have been testes for trichinella (T) and another one to indicate the that it is an equine carcass (EQUINE). These are not legal requirements but customer specifications.

The chiller have been fitted with data loggers and the information can be downloaded at any time. The system is alarmed the operative responsible for the maintenance receives SMS in his Mobile phone any time the temperatures get out of specification.

At dispatch, FBO probes a few carcasses and records those temperatures in his personal diary. These records were presented for audit.

2.1.11. [

S30

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

FBO dispatches the carcasses to his two customers [S43(2)] himself and in his own lorry. The customers specify the environmental temperature settings during transport (2 degrees Celsius).

2.1.12. A set of 5 horse carcass samples were tested on the 13/08/10 after this matter was raised during the last audit. The samples were tested for Salmonella, enteros and TVC and all the results were within the acceptable levels. [S30

] The test results for this second set (22/11/10) was all nil. The Technical Advisor took the samples himself and explained how he damps the sponge in some water and then takes the sample rubbing the sponge on the carcass. I find 0 to be an unusual result and I mentioned it to both the FBO and the OV to keep one eye on the next set of results. The samples are tested by FAL, which is UKAS accredited and widely used by other FBOs in the area.

2.1.13. No edible co-products are handled in this establishment.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.4 Environmental hygiene / Good hygiene practises		Score
Plant complies with (EC) 852/2004		
Structure: complies with (EC) 852/2004 Annex II		
2.4.1	Structure/layout provides adequate protection from hazards for the current throughput & operations	Adequate
2.4.2	Adequacy of protective measures is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Adequate
Water supply: potability water supply is assured		
2.4.3	FBO has operating procedures in place to monitor water quality	Good
2.4.4	FBO's operating procedures are carried out as described	Good
2.4.5	FBO is monitoring water test results.	Good
2.4.6	FBO takes adequate corrective actions when necessary	Good
2.4.7	FBO's records confirm each of the above requirements is being met.	Good
Maintenance: arrangements protect food from contamination		
2.4.8	FBO has operating procedures in place for monitoring maintenance needs	Good
2.4.9	FBO's operating procedures are carried out as described	Good
2.4.10	FBO is identifying deficiencies	Adequate
2.4.11	FBO is correcting deficiencies within a reasonable timescale	Adequate
2.4.12	FBO's records confirm each of the above requirements is being met.	Adequate
2.4.13	Adequacy of maintenance and of records is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Adequate
Cleaning: arrangements protect food from contamination		
2.4.14	FBO has operating procedures in place to specify cleaning.	Good
2.4.15	FBO's operating procedures are carried out as described	Adequate
2.4.16	FBO is monitoring cleaning efficacy	Adequate
2.4.17	FBO is taking effective corrective action on cleaning deficiencies he identifies	Adequate
2.4.18	Adequacy of cleaning of premises and vehicles and of records is verified by reality checks during the audit /audit period	Adequate
Pest control: arrangements protect food from contamination		
2.4.19	FBO has operating procedures in place or contract to specify pest control arrangements.	Good
2.4.20	FBO's operating procedures or contract is carried out as described	Good
2.4.12	FBO is monitoring pest activity	Adequate
2.4.22	FBO is taking effective corrective action on pest activity	Good
2.4.23	FBO's records confirm each of the above requirements is being met.	Good
2.4.24	Adequacy of pest controls is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Good
Staff training/instruction and supervision		
2.4.25	FBO has an appropriate staff training programme	Good
2.4.26	Training programme is carried out as described	Good
2.4.27	FBO is monitoring the effectiveness of staff training	Good
2.4.28	FBO is taking effective corrective action when training deficiencies are identified	Good
2.4.29	Adequacy of training/supervision and of records is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Good
Health and hygiene arrangements		
2.4.30	Appropriate staff and visitor health monitoring and hygiene advice arrangements are in place	Good
2.4.31	FBO is taking adequate corrective actions when monitoring indicates causes for concern	Good
2.4.32	Adequacy of personal hygiene practices is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Adequate
2.4.33	Adequacy of health rules and of records is verified by reality checks during the audit/audit period	Good
2.4 Score		5
Good (0) - active compliance; no action necessary Adequate (5) - occasional lapses in compliance; minor corrections needed; broadly compliant Weak (15) - frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to medium or high risk deficiencies Poor (25) - frequent lapses in compliance giving rise to potential/immediate high risk		

Audit Report

AUD9-3

Part 2.4 evidence

2.4.1 to 2.4.2 The structure and plant layout has not changed significantly since the plant was approved and despite the place shows signs of wear, it is basically compliant with the legal requirements.

2.4.3. to 2.4.7. FBO's procedure for monitoring water quality consists of testing 4 samples of water once a year. The sampling points are: storage tank, hot water pump, mains and lairage. The last set of samples was tested on the 10/09/10 for the parameters recommended in the MIG and the results were good.

North Wes Water is the water supplier and they produce an annual Water Quality Report. FBO keeps on site the report produced in December 2008 and agreed to download from the internet the latest version available.

A water distribution plant is kept in the plant folders.

2.4.8 to 2.4.13. FBO's procedure for monitoring maintenance needs are based on their own daily observations. One of the operatives [S40] is the "maintenance man" and contractors are only brought in for very specific jobs that cannot be undertaken by the plant staff.

[S30 [S40]

]

[S30

2.4.14 to 2.4.18. Plant staff are responsible for the cleaning of the premises. They do some general cleaning at the end of each operational day and the operatives [S38] do some further cleaning and help with the maintenance work the days the plant does not operate.

According to FBO copy of the cleaning instruction was on the wall of the canteen [S30]

Operatives are asked to keep records of the cleaning they do in the Cleaning Schedules. These records were presented for audit [S30

]. For verification of the cleaning activities, a Pre-operational Hygiene Check is conducted before operations start. Most days, [S40] does this job but today [S40] could not make due to the snow and [S40] was responsible for doing it. These records were up to date (although [S40] had not recorded his observations for the day yet).

The cleaning is done using a power washer and the main chemical they use is just bleach. The bleach is kept in the hygiene room.

2.4.19. to 2.4.24. FBO uses an external contractor [S43(2)] for supplying the pest control programme. There is a bait and EFK plan in the plant files.

The technician inspects the premises almost every month, last visit was on the 05/11/10 and they look after both the baits and the fly killers.

Door discipline seems good and [S30

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.4.25 to 2.4.29. The training strategy is based on in house training and briefing sessions. Some posters for reference are available on the canteen walls) and FBO keeps some notes of the main areas covered in the training sessions. The most recent were "Personal hygiene" on the 18/10/10 and again 02/11/10 and RMOP review on the 16/07/10.

The language is an important barrier with the [S38] workers and some of the OVs have been able to help with punctual difficulties.

Some of the slaughter men working at this plant also work in other local abattoirs so they do not rely solely on the training provided at this plant.

2.4.30. to 2.4.33. FBO is quite strict with their visitors policy and nobody is allowed inside the premises without their authorisation. CCTV cameras have just recently been installed in the perimeter of the premises.

Their own staff are not allowed in the production areas unless they are wearing appropriate protective clothing and hygiene room is available.

Plant staff practices were observed on the day of the audit and daily monitored by the FSA team.

[

S30

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.5 HACCP		Score
Principle 1 - identify any hazards that must be prevented, eliminated or reduced to acceptable levels		
2.5.1	Documented HACCP based procedures cover all operations	Good
2.5.2	Description of product(s) /production process	Good
2.5.3	Accurate and complete process flow diagram	Good
2.5.4	All relevant hazards covered	Good
Principle 2 - identify the CCPs/CPs		
2.5.5	Correct identification of controls at the step or steps at which control is essential to ensure food safety	Good
Principle 3 - establish critical limits at CCPs (or legal limits at CPs)		
2.5.6	Correct identification of critical limits to ensure food safety	Good
Principle 4 - establish effective monitoring procedures at CCPs/CPs		
2.5.7	Monitoring arrangements established to ensure food safety	Good
2.5.8	Suitable monitoring procedures and of records (e.g. Diary) verified by reality checks	Adequate
Principle 5 - establish corrective actions		
2.5.9	Corrective action procedures established to ensure food safety	Good
2.5.10	Suitable corrective actions and of records (e.g. Diary) verified by reality checks	Adequate
Principle 6 - establish verification procedures		
2.5.11	Validation and verification arrangements established to ensure food safety	Adequate
2.5.12	Arrangements for microbiological sampling and analysis of results are established	Adequate
2.5.13	Suitable verification procedures, including microbiological sampling, and of records verified by reality checks	Adequate
Principle 7 - establish documents and records		
2.5.14	Staff procedures for day to day control of food safety hazards are recorded and kept up to date (SOPs / RMOPs etc)	Good
2.5.15	Records are established for keeping note of day to day checks and activities for the control of food safety (Diary etc)	Adequate
2.5.16	Management records are established for keeping note of supervisory checks and actions (Diary etc)	Adequate
HACCP training		
2.5.17	Staff responsible for the development and maintenance of HACCP-based procedures have received adequate training	Good
Review		
2.5.18	HACCP plans are reviewed and if necessary amended to reflect changes to suppliers/products/operations/equipment/law etc.	Good
Part 2.5 Score		5
<p>Good (0) - HACCP based procedures applied satisfactorily, kept under review and embedded into staff routine, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective actions</p> <p>Adequate (5) - HACCP based procedures generally applied with FBO corrective actions effectively applied where there have been low risk issues out of control</p> <p>Weak (15) - HACCP based procedures inadequately applied which indicate a trend toward loss of control</p> <p>Poor (25) - HACCP based procedures not applied or unsatisfactory implementation, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective action</p>		

Part 2.5 Evidence	
2.5.1.	A documented HACCP plan cover the slaughter and dressing of both cattle and horses. [S40] and [S40] are the member of the HACCP team.
2.5.2. to 2.5.4.	Two process flow diagram cover the different steps of each process and a documented hazard analysis is in place.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.5.5. The CCPs chosen for each flow diagram are relevant to ensure food safety:

- CCP 1. Delivery and selection for slaughter.
- CCP 2. Hide removal.
- CCP 3. Evisceration.
- CCP 4. Split carcass and SRM removal (cattle).
- CCP 5. Chill storage and distribution.

2.5.6. The critical limits identified for each CCP are relevant to food safety and take into consideration the legal requirements where available.

2.5.7. and 2.5.8. Monitoring arrangement for each CCP are appropriate. FBO has chosen "exception report" for all the CCPs (1 to 4) except for chill storage and distribution. The results of the monitoring activities for CCPs 1 to 4 are supposed to be recorded in a diary (exception report) that was not available on site the day of the audit (it had been taken to the offices the company has in Bakewell and could not be brought back due to the poor weather conditions). CCP 5 monitoring activities (environmental temperatures of the chillers, temperature of the carcasses at dispatch and environmental temperatures of the lorry during distribution) are [S40] responsibility and his records were available for audit.

2.5.9. and 2.5.10. Corrective actions contained in the HACCP plan are appropriate but, again, because the diary where the notes are kept was not available, these could not be verified.

2.5.11. to 2.5.13. The validation and verification procedures consist of:

- Management meetings which are also used to review the HACCP. [S40] keeps notes of these activities in his own diary.
- [S40] reviews the operational records [S30]
- FBO submits water and carcasses samples for microbiological testing [S30]

2.5.14. to 2.5.16. The RMOP for processing cattle requiring BSE testing is up to date and it covers the processing of lairage casualties and emergency slaughters at the farm as well. Another important document is the RMOP for testing the horse carcasses for Trichinella. This procedure is reviewed regularly by VLA.

The diary in use for operative records was not available and only come of [S40] records were presented during the audit.

2.5.17. Staff responsible for the development and maintenance of HACCP plan have sufficient knowledge to develop this this task.

2.5.18. The HACCP plan is kept up to date.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

3 Animal Disease (Slaughterhouses only)		Score
Potential spread of animal disease is minimised		
3.1	On suspect cases, instructions from Animal Health are followed promptly	Good
3.2	Conditions of holding livestock minimise the spread of disease	Good
3.3	Time to slaughter minimises risk of spread of disease	Good
3.4	Animal health restrictions in disease control areas are implemented	Good
3.5	Livestock vehicles and crates are adequately cleaned and disinfected	Good
3 Score:		0
Good (0) - active compliance; no action necessary Adequate (5) - occasional lapses in compliance; minor corrections needed; broadly compliant Weak (15) - frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to medium or high risk deficiencies Poor (25) - frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to potential/immediate high risk N/A (0) - Not applicable		

Part 3 Evidence

3.1. Animal Health has not provided any specific instructions within the audit period.

3.2. Livestock is kept in a lairage, with adequate capacity for current throughput and there are a number of pens that could be used as isolation facilities if needed. Most of the times all the horses delivered in the lairage are slaughtered on site even if the animals are not intended for human consumption. Only occasionally some horses are returned back to their origin or to the knackers yard.

3.3. Because the establishment does not operate [S43(2)], animals may be delivered in the lairage and spend there some time before they are slaughtered. Private horses are killed straight away and the horses delivered in batches are normally brought in the day before they are to be slaughtered.

3.4. No issues have been identified with regards to breaches in restrictions in disease control areas.

3.5. FBO provide hauliers facilities for cleansing and disinfecting their vehicles on site.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

4 Animal welfare (slaughterhouse only). Compliance with WASK 1995 (as amended)		Score
Lairage conditions and animal handling promote good animal welfare		
4.1	Structures safeguard animal welfare (adverse weather protection, adequate ventilation, suitable lairage conditions)	Adequate
4.2	Adequate capacity for normal throughput	Adequate
4.3	Adequate unloading facilities (suitable ramps, containing rails)	Adequate
4.4	Holding pens are adequate (bedding, water / food provision - if left overnight, species/group segregation, densities)	Adequate
4.5	Scheduled arrival/waiting times safeguard animal welfare	Adequate
4.6	Adequate maintenance of stunning equipment & records	Adequate
4.7	Crates/modules in acceptable condition	N/A
4.8	Breakdown procedures are adequate	Adequate
4.9	Correct procedures and use of instruments to make animals move	Adequate
Action on welfare issues		
4.10	There is effective identification of visible signs of abuse or neglect on live animals and on carcasses	Adequate
4.11	Animals awaiting slaughter are inspected each morning and evening, prompt action is taken to relieve suffering where this is required	Adequate
Slaughter processes		
4.12	Use of stunning box condition/head restrainer	Adequate
4.13	Effective electric stunner setting & times (audio or visible device, voltmeter and ammeter), electrode positioning and measures to ensure good electrical contact	N/A
4.14	Correct captive bolt strength & head shooting sites	Adequate
4.15	Adequate water bath levels (avoid pre stun shocks)	N/A
4.16	Procedures provide assurance re the welfare of animals killed by exposure to gas mixtures	N/A
4.17	Access to back-up stunning and manual backup for automatic equipment	Adequate
4.18	Humane bleeding	Adequate
Ritual Slaughter		
4.19	Appropriate facilities for restraint and slaughter	N/A
4.20	Bleeding statutory time observed	N/A
Slaughter by competent and appropriately trained operatives		
4.21	Slaughterer's licence adequate for each species, operation and instrument	Adequate
4.22	Adequate number of welfare-trained staff, availability of competent, authorised person while animals on site	Adequate
4.23	Availability of welfare codes / guidance	Adequate
4 Score:		5
Good (0) - active compliance; best practice Adequate (5) - compliant with WASK Weak (15) - WASK non compliance no avoidable excitement, pain or suffering Poor (25) - WASK non compliance with avoidable excitement, pain or suffering N/A (0) - Not applicable		
Part 4 Evidence		

4.1. Overall loading and lairage facilities provide suitable conditions to both cattle and horses. The lairage provides appropriate protection against adverse weather conditions.

4.2. The capacity of the lairage is adequate for the average throughput.

4.3. The unloading area is raised above ground level, so animals can be unloaded without stepping onto any ramp.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

4.4. The holding pens are provided with dry bedding, drinkers and feeders. Animals kept in the lairage are provided with hay. There are enough holding pens as to keep animals groups/species segregated.

4.5. The amount of time the animals stay in the lairage do not compromise their welfare and because there is always someone on site, if anything happens, actions can be taken quite quickly.

4.6. The guns are serviced and inspected regularly and every time [S40] is on site, he specifically instruct staff to service the guns again and records of these activities are kept on site.

4.7. N/A

4.8. Since the processing of the carcasses is mainly manual, the likelihood of a severe breakdown is low but if it happens horses can be returned/taken to other stable and for cattle, there are other abattoir in the area that could accept these animals once Animal Health authorises the movement.

4.9. Animals are moved gently and the use of instrument to make move animals is minimal or none at all.

4.10. FBO can identify signs of abuse or neglect on live animals and on carcasses.

4.11. There is always someone on site 24/7 and animals are regularly inspected. Calls out of hours are not unusual for lairage casualties or emergency slaughters on farm.

4.12. Both cattle and horses are brought in the stunning box before they are shot.

4.13. N/A.

4.14. Cattle and ponies are stunned with a captive bolt gun and they use cartridges 0.25 cal, 4 grain. There are 3 of these guns. For horses, they use a free bullet gun with cartridge 32 auto. The head shooting sites are appropriate for both species.

4.15. and 4.16. N/A

4.17. Back up guns are readily available.

4.18. Animals are bled as soon as they are hoisted and they are allowed to bleed for at least 30 seconds before the dressing starts.

4.19. and 4.20. No Ritual slaughter takes place at these premises.

4.21. The slaughter's licences were reviewed and found that the slaughtermen have registered licences valid for the species and equipment used on site. On the 26/11/10, the OV issued 3 provisional licences.

4.22. Staff handling livestock have appropriate knowledge and skills and to do so.

4.23. Plant management have access to animal welfare codes and guidance issued by different organisations interested in protecting animal welfare.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

5.1 Animal By-Products		Score
Handling of ABP/waste to protect human and animal health		
5.1	Animal by-products, including SRM, are accurately and reliably categorised	Adequate
5.2	Animal by-products, including SRM, are securely collected and stained where necessary	Good
5.3	Animal by-products, including SRM, are dispatched to approved premises with required documentation	Adequate
5.4	Plants comply with 852/2004 & 1774/2002 for waste management and records	Adequate
5.1 Score		5
Good (0) - active compliance, no action necessary Adequate (5) - occasional lapses in compliance; minor corrections needed; broadly compliant Weak (15) - frequent lapses in compliance; giving rise to medium or high risk deficiencies Poor (25) - frequent lapses in compliance giving rise to potential/immediate high risk		
Part 5.1 Evidence		
<p>5.1. 1. The animal by-products generated from the slaughter of cattle and horses are split into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blood is collected in a blood tank and categorised as Category 1. - Hides from both cattle and horses are categorised as Category 3. - Two skips are available, one for Category 3 and one for Category 1. Everything that falls under the SRM definition and rejections from the line (pathology/contamination) are collected in the SRM skip. Everything else goes in the Category 3 skip. Since these two metal skips are labelled with magnetic labels that keep falling, [S30] <p>On the day of the audit, I inspected the content of these skips and the [S30] had some calves in it. When FBO was asked about it, the response from [S40] was that he had collected those bodies from a farm earlier in the morning and intended to take them to the knackers yard but the vehicle broke down and decided to dispose the bodies in the abattoir skips. FBO agreed to stain all the contain of this skip and send it as Category 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some horses heads, tracheas and uterus are taken by various organisation for training/ research purposes. <p>5.1. 2. Blood tank, skips and hide trailer are kept within the boundaries of the premises and lockable gates keep these materials secure. The SRM material is stained with Pantene Blue V.</p> <p>5.1.3. The destination of the animal by-products generated on site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blood (SRM) and both SRM and Category 3 skips are taken to [S43(2)] - Hides are taken to [S43(2)] by [S43(2)] - Some of the offal (fit for human consumption) are taken to the FBO's knackers yard where, apparently, they are authorised to produce pet food. <p>[S38]</p> <p>[S30]</p> <p>[[S43(2)] S30]</p>		

Audit Report
AUD9-3

[S40]]

[S30 [S43(2)]]

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

5.2 TSE/SRM Controls		Score
TSE Controls		
5.2.1	Meat entering the food chain is free from SRM	Good
5.2.2	Permitted O48M cattle intended for the food chain are tested for BSE/TSE	Good
5.2.3	Meat from all animals tested for BSE/TSE does not enter the food chain unless tested negative	Good
5.2.4	Imported carcasses meet requirements for the removal of SRM	N/A
5.2 Score:		0
Good (0) - active compliance, no action necessary Adequate (5) - occasional lapses in compliance, minor corrections needed, broadly compliant Weak (15) - frequent lapses in compliance, giving rise to medium or high risk deficiencies Poor (25) - frequent lapses in compliance, giving rise to potential/immediate high risk N/A (0) - Not applicable		

Part 5.2 evidence

5.2.1. Cattle of every age group is slaughtered in these premises and those requiring BSE testing are processed in accordance with agreed RMOP. SRM is removed from every carcass (other than VC SRM) before they are health marked.

5.2.2. Within the audit period, all cattle requiring BSE testing was tested before the carcasses were released into the food chain.

5.2.3. Chiller where BSE testing carcasses are stored are locked by the FSA and they are not released until we get negative results.

5.2.4. N/A.

Audit Report AUD9-3

Audit of the FBO Food Safety Management System - Corrective Action Report (CAR)

Establishment Name	Approval No.	Audit Date	Audit No.	No. of new CA	No. of existing CA	No. of pages
High peak Meat Exports Ltd	4185	03/12/2010	4185-SH-12/10	[S30]	0	1 of 1

For completion by auditing OV					For completion by FBO or Representative		
CA Reference*	Audit Report Reference (e.g. 2.1.5)	Target completion date	Follow-up visit required	Summary of Corrective Action Required (as agreed at closing meeting between OV and FBO)	Priority	Corrective Action Taken	Date Completed
[S30	L		
					M		
]	M		

Additional information attached by OV Additional information attached by FBO

CA Reference*: MM/YY plus consecutive no. starting at '1' for each new audit visit.

Confirmation	Name	Signature	Date
FBO or representative action owner(s)	I acknowledge discussion of the audit findings detailed in the Corrective Action Report		

Please note: Information held by the Food Standards Agency, including audit reports, is subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and may be published and/or disclosed in response to a request