

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					
Audit visit duration on site	04/06/10		5.75		
Audit Write-up	17/06/10		5.00		

Note: - actual hours, and dates shown, must correspond to entries on the auditor's timesheet/s.
Note: - 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 carcass processing	5
2.2 Hygienic Production within Cutting Plants dealing with unprocessed products	N/A
2.3 Hygienic Production with Cutting Plants dealing with processed products	N/A
2.4 Environmental hygiene / Good hygiene practices	5
2.5 HACCP	5
3.0 Animal Disease	
4.0 Animal Welfare	
5.1 Animal By-products	5
5.2 TSE/SRM Controls	5

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
November 2010

Summary

Corrective action completed since last audit

CA Reference (MM/YY plus	Outcome
[S30
]

Summary of Audit finding

Recently the slaughter on Monday was added to usual Friday's slaughter.[S40] is not working anymore as technical advisor for plant and [S40] has been advising FBO in this position since February 2010.

[S30]

[S30]

[

S30

]

Audit Report

AUD9-3

1.1 Potential hazards		
MICROBIOLOGICAL HAZARDS		Award
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		Award
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		Award
Potential for hazards i.e. contamination of meat by foreign bodies		5
Only ready wrapped products handled		0
	1.1 Score	Award
	Microbiological hazards	30
	Chemical hazards	10
	Physical hazards	5
	1.1 Score	45

1.2 Vulnerable consumers potentially at risk		Award
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		Award
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

Full approval for slaughter of domestic bovine animals and horses was granted by FSA on 23/02/2007. Entire age range of cattle is slaughtered (8-30, 30-48, Over 48 months) is slaughtered with activities covered by RMOP.

Slaughter takes place on [S43(2)], with average weekly throughput [S43(2)]. Operator accepts casualties and emergency slaughtered cows from farms, the plant OV is contacted to check on the emergency slaughter licence and to do the post mortem inspection of carcase and body parts.

The population of consumers is uncertain, the horse carcasses are [S43(2)]. Emergency slaughtered and casualty animals are stamped by squared stamp and sold [S43(2)]

Meat may be exposed to chemical, physical and biological hazards.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.1 Production Controls relating to carcase processing		
Pre-processing: compliance with (EC) 853/2004, Annex II, Sections II & III:		
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	Good
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	Good
2.1.9i	Traceability of carcasses	Good
2.1.9ii	Lack of faecal contamination	Good
Post-processing: compliance with (EC) 852/2004 Annex I, Chapter IX		
2.1.10	Adequate temperature control	Adequate
2.1.11	Controls avoid cross-contamination during storage, despatch and delivery.	Good
2.1.12	Compliance with the requirements of (EC) 2073/2005 Article 3	Weak
2.1.13	Hygienic handling of edible co-products	Good
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 There were no incidents with incorrectly identified animals (bovine, horses) during audit period. How the identity of bovine animals is checked prior slaughter was agreed between plant OV and FBO in RMOP. All the cattle passports are scanned in administration office, where the cattle register is recorded. The movement notification is sent to BCMS by internet. In lairage, there is the crush available to check the eartags.

The colour spraying is used for hides to separation of over and under 48 months old cattle in lairage.

Horse passports are checked by office staff for identity and eligibility of horse to be slaughtered as fit for human consumption (Section IX) and details about passport number, name of horse association, horse name and owner name are recorded. The robust traceability is important for Trichinella sampling results and in this slaughterhouse it is well maintained.

New rules for horse passports requirements were discussed between plant based OV and FBO.

Appearance of horse is compared to passport drawing immediately after unloading in presence of [S40] (lairage manager) and OV to ensure, the colour and signs are identical.

2.1.1i Beef and horse passports are checked and scanned in administration office before slaughter. Only after this check, animal can be released for slaughter.

2.1.2 Livestock cleanliness is one of the critical limits in step "Selection for slaughter ". The FBO has adopted previous MHS Clean Livestock policy as guidance of what is and what is not acceptable. Lairage supervisor is well experienced with handling of live animals and he was trained in HACCP

Audit Report

AUD9-3

implementation in the step of animal's intake. HACCP is as well displayed in staff canteen as "continuous training" for personnel comments or observations.

The incident of dirty animal being brought by farmer is recorded into intake book as exceptional reporting (who, when, grade of cleanliness, corrective action). This is CCP 1 and bovine animal is checked in crush during reading of eartag. Generally, there are no problems with cleanliness of horses, these are coming with clean hides due to system they are kept on farms.

If lairage staff detect dirty animal, OV and foreman is alerted and decision is made about corrective action. The farmer is instructed accordingly and the staff of line is alerted to pay extra attention during dressing, especially final trimmer.

There are no records in OV documents about problem with dirty animals being presented for ante-mortem inspection.

2.1.3 Request, receive, check and act on FCI is part of HACCP permanent procedures. It is established in CCP 1 that lairage personnel must assess the presence of FCI (Section IX in horse passport and FCI for cattle) on the arrival of animals. Blank copy is available for farmers who for some reason do not bring cattle FCI with them. There is no history of missing FCI during audit period.

2.1.4 FBO follows the instruction of OV in respect of ante-mortem inspection and decisions concerning live animals. [

S31

]

2.1.5 Animals are supervised during unloading by OV and [S40], who is well experienced in handling of animals, checking of the identity and he is appointed welfare officer as well. Lairage is supervised 24/7 as there are some [S38]

2.1.6 Slaughter of horses was observed. Deep chest stick is used for bleeding and there is steriliser near slaughter point to sterilise knives between animals. There was no evidence of visible contamination in bleeding cut area on the carcasses and this is confirmed by contamination records produced by FSA operatives during p. m. inspection.

2.1.7 The animals are dressed on cradles with average speed [S43(2)] per hour. The practices observed were adequate and speed of dressing allows the staff to wash the hands and sterilise tools frequently to minimise contamination.

The amount of slaughtermen working on line is [S43(2)] and as was confirmed by plant OV, the presence of one of the owners as foreman in the slaughterhall improves the practices and techniques a lot.

Number of sterilisers is available and they are visually checked as part of preoperational morning routine. [S30

] [S40] [

S30

]. The hot water

is fed from central boiler and then, each steriliser has the individual element.

[S30

] [S40] [

S30

].

2.1.8 Anuses were bagged and oesophagus was clipped during evisceration. The precaution were taken to avoid spillage of faecal gastro intestinal content during evisceration.

Audit Report AUD9-3

2.1.8i Carcases and offal were not in contact before p . m. inspection and no direct cross-contamination risk was identified during processing. [S30]

The ducting sleeve on splitting saw was fitted. The bone dust is washed in separate washing cabinet.

There are separate facilities ready for dressing of casualties and emergency slaughtered animals, but his was not observed during audit visit

2.1.9 Carcases were correctly dressed and presented for p. m. Inspection. Before the carcases are presented for inspection, there is a position of final trimming done by staff. Correlation of offal to carcase is maintained.

2.1.9i The traceability back to farm or supplier is well maintained with lairage and office records about animals (cattle register, horse passport book).

For horses, this information are recorded: full address, date of arrival, number of passport, who has issued the passport, name of horse and kill number. Beef passports are scanned what provides full information about animal.

Every beef carcases is individually labelled with label bearing date of slaughter, kill number, ear tag number, plant number, plant name and batch number. Batch number is generated automatically by cattle computer labelling system based on day of slaughter.

The horse carcases have label with week number, kill number and date of kill.

The red offal, if harvested, are identified as daily batch, despatched in plastic bag, with label bearing date of kill and health mark (stamped).

2.1.9ii No evidence of faecal contamination presented on carcases during p. m. inspection was observed during audit visit. This is supported by FSA contamination records, where very low incidents are identified and recorded.

2.1.10 Maintenance of cold chain is established in HACCP, where critical limits for meat before despatch were established and are correct (meat below 7, red offal below 3 Degrees Celsius). Temperature in transport lorries was established as below 4 Degrees Celsius.

2 chillers are available for refrigeration, both of them have installed monitoring probe for ambient temperature. Chiller temperature is observed during day of slaughter. Meat is probed next day early morning before despatch and loading by [S40] . The blank form was presented where date, carcase and offal section was available for recording of probe reading. No frequency (how many carcases) are to be probed was established – it was agreed the first, middle and last carcase at least, which makes it 5 % from [S43(2)]carcases in one batch.

Only blank form was available as the actual records were kept in [S40] lorry, which broke that morning. [S30]

]

Own transport vehicles are used for delivery and export of meat. These are checked at loading by [S40] and thermograph can be printed from built-in thermometers.

New handheld probe was recently purchased with manufacturers calibrations. In-house calibration is done as well against [S40] calibrated probe, however no records or calibration certificate for his probe were provided.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

provided.

2.1.11 Carcases were well spaced during storage in chillers. Red offal are stored hanging on racks after p. m. inspection. There was no sign of cross-contamination identified during audit visit. Operational cleaning is done between cattle and horse slaughter.

2.1.12 Micro sampling of carcases is supposed to increase comparing to past due to [S43(2)] throughput:

-the throughput for horses is [S43(2)] per year – sampling to be done for Enteros and TVC as 5 carcases once a week for 2 weeks as initial frequency (10 samples altogether), and 5 carcases on one day every 12 weeks as reduced frequency after satisfactory initial results

-the throughput for cattle is [S43(2)] per year – sampling as 5 consecutive carcases once year for TVC and Enteros

-Salmonella is not required

The last sampling was done on 22/05/2009 for horses and on 19/12/2008 for cattle.

[S30]

2.1.13 Occasionally edible red offal are harvested and sold [S43(2)] – they are stored on racks and

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.2 Hygienic Production within Cutting Plants dealing with unprocessed products (cutting, dicing and mincing)		OV Assessment
Processing compliance with (EC) 853/2004 Annex III		
2.2.1	Controls ensure that cross contamination is eliminated, prevented or reduced to acceptable levels during operations	
2.2.2	Compliance with the requirements for raw materials	
2.2.3	Maintenance of the cold chain	
2.2.4	Compliance with the requirements of (EC) 2073/2005 Article 3	
2.2.5	Separation of exposed from packaged product	
2.2.6	Identification marking and traceability	
2.2 Score:		N/A

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 2.2 Evidence

This section is intentionally blank

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.3 Hygienic Production within Cutting Plants dealing with processed products (Meat preps, RTE, Meat products)		OV Assessment
Processing compliance with (EC) 853/2004 Annex III		
2.3.1	Controls ensure that cross contamination is eliminated, prevented or reduced to acceptable levels during operations	
2.3.2	Compliance with the requirements for raw materials, including additives	
2.3.3	Controls provide assurance that critical limits are achieved: pasteurisation and cooling rates for RTE products	
2.3.4	Compliance with the requirements of (EC) 2073/2005 Article 3	
2.3.5	Compliance with the requirements of the Miscellaneous Food Additives & the Sweeteners in Food (Amendment)(E/S/W) Regulations 2007	
2.3.6	Identification marking and traceability	
2.3 Score:		N/A

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 2.3 Evidence

This section is intentionally blank

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.4 Environmental hygiene / Good hygiene practises - Plant complies with (EC) 852/2004		OV Assessment
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	Adequate
2.4.4	FBO's operating procedures are carried out as described	Adequate
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	Adequate
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	Good
2.4.12	FBO's records confirm each of the above requirements is being met.	Good
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.	Weak
2.4.15	FBO's operating procedures are carried out as described	Adequate
2.4.16	FBO is monitoring cleaning efficacy	Good
2.4.17	FBO is taking effective corrective action on cleaning deficiencies he identifies	Good
2.4.18	Adequacy of cleaning of premises and vehicles and of records is verified by reality checks during the audit /audit period	Good
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	Adequate
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	Adequate
Staff training/instruction and supervision		
2.4.25	FBO has an appropriate staff training programme	Adequate
2.4.26	Training programme is carried out as described	Adequate
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	Adequate
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 Structure and layout provides adequate protection from hazards. The buildings and fabrication is aged in some areas, but FBO takes the precaution measures to protect the food from risk of contamination or temperature abuse. [S30

] During following weeks, the maintenance work is planned in slaughterhall (cleaning and painting of overhead fixtures). More refurbishment is planned.

[S30

] 2.4.3 The supplier of water is United Utilities. Distribution water plan is done with marked all outlets. There is storage tank used. The latest annual physiochemical analysis is available for year 2008.

[S30

[S30

] 2.4.4 The latest one was done on 09/03/10 for six parameters (TVC on 37 C/44 hours, TVC 22 C/68 hours, Total coliforms, E.coli, Enterococci, Sulphite reducing Clostridia) with good results. The microbiology is tested in UKAS accredited laboratory AlControl.

2.4.5 Results of water sampling are monitored.

2.4.6 No need for corrective action was identified as the results keep coming back as negative. MIG was advised as source of guidance in case of need of corrective action.

2.4.7 Sampling results are kept and available for inspection.

2.4.8 [S40] is in charge of identification of maintenance needs. There was recently hired new maintenance operative that will take care of maintenance needs as well. Maintenance planning schedule is used from FSA FBO Daily Diary where are/item, work required, planned for, completed, signature.

2.4.9 Pre-operational checks are done and any identified maintenance problem is recorded into maintenance schedule. The last records were high level cleaning, coving to floors and walls repaired,...

2.4.10 – 2.4.11 FBO is identifying deficiencies and these are corrected within reasonable timescale. As the building, fabrication and equipment is aged in some areas, owners plan preventive and corrective maintenance to keep premises adequate for processing of food.

2.4.12 Maintenance schedule was available for inspection.

2.4.13 No major maintenance deficiencies were identified during audit visit [

S30

] 2.4.14 Cleaning is done in house by staff. Since March 2009 the foam cleaning was introduced into slaughterhouse.

Variety of chemicals is used and stored away from food production areas. The list of detergents and chemicals is listed.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

[S30

]

2.4.15 Cleaning is done by operatives after finish. Variety of chemicals is used and premises were found in clean state. There used to be cleaning checklists in use before, but no evidence was provided during audit visit about using the same records or any other records.

2.4.16 [S40] (office operative) does pre-operational checks and records any identified deficiencies into pre-operational records. This is communicated to cleaning crew and [S40] .

2.4.17 Corrective action is taken if the poor cleaning standard is identified during checks.

2.4.18 Entire site was found in clean state. High level cleaning is due as some parts of rails went rusty, but this was already identified by [S40] and it is planned in maintenance schedule.

2.4.19 Pest control is provided by external contractor [S43(2)] , with scheduled visits every 6 weeks. Bait and EFK plan is done, together with COSHH data for poisons available. Pest control folder is kept with all the information and reports.

2.4.20 According to records, the contractor provides regular visits and service as agreed in contract.

2.4.21 The reports are signed by Food Business Operator for any recommendations or corrective actions.

2.4.22 The recommendations are followed and corrective action done as advised by contractor.

2.4.23 Folder with records is kept up-to-date.

[S30 [S40] [S40]

]

2.4.25 Training programme (matrixes, instruction) were prepared by [S40] for various topics (HACCP, SRM protocol, welfare,...). The training material for staff consists from variety of instructions (personal hygiene, health certificate, knife usage, slaughter of OTM cattle, action following contamination, HACCP awareness, hazards in meat).

HACCP is displayed in staff facilities as continuous reminder for personnel.

2.4.26 The training programme as such was carried out according to [S40] schedule. Since then no new entries were made into training matrix. [

S30

]

[S30]

2.4.27 [S40] is monitoring staff performance and correcting any deficiencies immediately.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.4.28 As described above, [S40] as owner and working as foreman on line as well, has a great knowledge and authority to correct and address any poor work practices.

2.4.29 Slaughtermen were seen working with good hygiene practices (washing of hands, sterilising knives).

2.4.30 Medical certificates and return to work policy is available. The visitor's health self declaration is requested from people entering food processing areas.

Hygiene rules were prepared and distributed to staff. Changing facilities and canteen were found in clean state. The washing room was painted recently. The boot wash and apron washer is available in washing room and there are several sinks on the line to be used when necessary.

2.4.31 It is in return to work policy what to do in case of concern. Health concern of personnel are dealt with by management.

[S30]

2.4.33 Health rules were followed during audit period, there is no record about OV concern related to this area.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

2.5 HACCP		OV Assessment
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	Adequate
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	Adequate
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	Weak
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)	Adequate
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 4 Score		5

Good (0) - HACCP based procedures applied satisfactorily, kept under review and embedded into staff routine, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective actions

Adequate (5) - HACCP based procedures generally applied with FBO corrective actions effectively applied where there have been low risk issues out of control

Weak (15) - HACCP based procedures inadequately applied which indicate a trend toward loss of control

Poor (25) - HACCP based procedures not applied or unsatisfactory implementation, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective action

Part 2.5 Evidence

2.5.1 New HACCP was done by [S40] and separate HACCP was prepared for horses and for cattle (OTM, UTM, O48M, Casualty slaughter). HACCP must be amended – 2 members of team are not working on site ([S40] Some parts are from [S40] (product description, hazard analysis, HACCP team, scope of HACCP) and some were reviewed and amended by [S40] .

2.5.2 Product description and production process were described, considering intended use and customers.

2.5.3 Flowcharts were prepared and appear to be correct and complete.

Audit Report AUD9-3

2.5.4 Hazard analysis was done for each step of production – chemical, biological, physical hazard. analysis considers likelihood and severity of all possible hazards. Scope of HACCP was prepared as well.

2.5.5 Each step in HACCP is identified as CP or CCP. These CCPs were established by hazard analysis:

intake of live animals and selection to slaughter
removing of hides
evisceration
SRM removal
Storage and despatch – chilling

2.5.6 Critical limits were established:

1. Category 3 in previous MHS clean livestock policy , passports reconciled, eartags of cattle checked
2. and 3. – here, the control measures were listed (steriliser temperature, hygiene practices,...) and it was corrected to limit “ no visible contamination “ immediately after request
4. no SRM attached to carcase after splitting
5. temperature limit – correct

2.5.7 Monitoring arrangements were established – method, frequency, responsibility, records:

1. livestock is checked by lairage staff (identity check, cleanliness) and [S40] (documents and scanning of passports)
- 2.-3.-4. Monitoring by operative on scale (or [S40] if working on line)
5. Despatch records are produced [S30]

2.5.8 [S40] do checks on operatives and practices and dressing. For monitoring of animal identity and cleanliness, the records are available. For monitoring of contamination, as it was explained, exceptional reporting is used. No major problems were identified and FSA contamination monitoring records are very low as well. Any problem with individual operatives performance is addressed by management.

2.5.9 Corrective actions were established – generally described very well, dealing with product at the time but finding and eliminating root cause as well (“retrain”). Minor correction done for step “ SRM removal” where was added the actual corrective action with affected carcase.

2.5.10 For selection for slaughter, no sign of corrective action was recorded. Horse cleanliness is very good and small throughput of cattle does not cause problem with dirty animals. For dressing, the exceptional reporting is used and for despatch, [S30]

2.5.11 As [S40] is in charge of HACCP now, has reviewed some section and still need to work on another. He is aware of validation and verification requirement once the HACCP is finished. The last formal verification was done in June 2009.

2.5.12 Micro sampling of carcasses is supposed to increase comparing to past due to higher throughput:

-the throughput for horses is [S43(2)] per year – sampling to be done for Enteros and TVC as 5 carcasses once a week for 2 weeks as initial frequency (10 samples altogether), and 5 carcasses on one day every 12 weeks as reduced frequency after satisfactory initial results

-the throughput for cattle is [S43(2)] per year – sampling as 5 consecutive carcasses once year for TVC and Enteros

-Salmonella is not required

The last sampling was done on 22/05/2009 for horses and on 19/12/2008 for cattle.

Audit Report AUD9-3

[S30]

2.5.13 Some verification (reality checks) is done by [S40] and owner, during plant visits. As explained above, [formal verification was not done yet and FBO does not comply with micro sampling requirements.

2.5.14 New version of RMOP was agreed between FBO and OV. HACCP is under review of new technical advisor. Some parts of HACCP pre-requisites documents must be prepared – water micro sampling procedure, cleaning schedules.

2.5.15 Some daily activities are recorded (identification records, intake book, cattle register, pre-operational checks, maintenance schedules, temperature monitoring – not provided for inspection), some are recorded as exceptional recording – contaminations.

2.5.16 Pest control reports, water sampling results are signed by management.

2.5.17 HACCP (CCP mentoring, critical limits and corrective actions) is displayed in canteen for operatives. Once the final version of HACCP is finished by [S40], this will be signed by personnel as training record as well.

2.5.18 Last formal HACCP review was done in June 2009 by [S40]. As new technical advisor, [S40] is in process of reviewing of HACCP based procedures. Review is yet to be finished.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

3 Animal Disease (Slaughterhouses only)		OV Assessment
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 The instruction from Animal health are followed when necessary

3.2 Lairage is closable and there are isolation pens available for use if necessary.

3.3. Animals are delivered the evening before slaughter and during slaughter day as well. Animals usually don't stay overnight in lairage.

3.4 Currently there are no restriction in disease control on site.
If necessary, these would be implemented when required.

3.5 The facilities for cleaning and disinfection of livestock vehicles are available for use (OMNICIDE). The cleaning/disinfection declaration form for drivers is kept in the office and whoever does not clean on site , is requested to fill in the form. Records were checked.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

4 Animal welfare (slaughterhouse only). Compliance with WASK 1995 (as amended)		OV Assessment
Lairage conditions and animal handling promote good animal welfare		
4.1	Structures safeguard animal welfare (adverse weather protection, adequate ventilation, suitable lairage conditions)	Good
4.2	Adequate capacity for normal throughput	Good
4.3	Adequate unloading facilities (suitable ramps, containing rails)	Good
4.4	Holding pens are adequate (bedding, water / food provision - if left overnight, species/group segregation, densities)	Good
4.5	Scheduled arrival/waiting times safeguard animal welfare	Good
4.6	Adequate maintenance of stunning equipment & records	Good
4.7	Crates/modules in acceptable condition	N/A
4.8	Breakdown procedures are adequate	Good
4.9	Correct procedures and use of instruments to make animals move	Good
Action on welfare issues		
4.10	There is effective identification of visible signs of abuse or neglect on live animals and on carcasses	Good
4.11	Animals awaiting slaughter are inspected each morning and evening, prompt action is taken to relieve suffering where this is required	Good
Slaughter processes		
4.12	Use of stunning box condition/head restrainer	Good
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	Good
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	Good
4.18	Humane bleeding	Good
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	Good
4.22	Adequate number of welfare-trained staff, availability of competent, authorised person while animals on site	Good
4.23	Availability of welfare codes / guidance	Good
4 Score:		0

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 The lairage facilities are good for throughput, with good ventilation, spaced pens, access to water and stock of feed/bedding available. Two separate lairages are available for cattle and for horses. Outside filed paddock is used as well but for short period of time and then animals are moved to lairage (there is no shed for protection against weather condition).

4.2 The capacity is adequate for normal throughput.

4.3 Unloading facilities are satisfactory, animals are unloaded directly after arrival and penned. Private horses are usually slaughtered immediately after arrival upon the customer's request.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

4.4 Animals have access to drinkers and are provided with bedding and hay. Different groups are lairage in different pens so there is no risk of trauma from unfamiliar or aggressive animals.

4.5 Arrival of animals is scheduled to minimise waiting time in lairage. Lairage provides comfortable environment for animals awaiting slaughter even for longer period.

4.6 Maintenance equipment is checked regularly with record log available and kept.

4.7 N/A

4.8 Facilities (lairage), stock of feed and bedding and monitoring of premises 24/7 by operatives living on site is adequate in case of serious breakdown and long lasting stay of animals in lairage.

The welfare policy was prepared by [S40] in the past where the clear statement is expressed, that welfare of animals is protected at all the time. The entire process from unloading to kill is analysed and rules are set. The contact for Trading Standard and Animal Health is part of document.

4.9 No electric goad or stick or anything else are used in lairage. Lairage personnel is very experienced in handling of animals.

4.10 Every animal is checked on arrival and any problem is reported to OV immediately (if he is not present during unloading). [

S31

]

4.11 Site and lairage is monitored 24/7, by lairage personnel during operation hours and by operatives living on site.

4.12 Stunning pen does not have head restrainer, this stunning pen was built for both horses and cattle and no horse will ever put its head there due to this animal's nature and behaviour. This was accepted as well during full approval visit. The slaughtermen are well experienced for years to stun animals without distress of missed shots.

4.13 N/A not in use

4.14 Captive bolts pistols are being used for cattle stunning with cartridge size 22 mm.

A free bullet pistol is used for killing horses, cartridge size 32mm, grade 71 and provides an adequate power for killing of horses.

4.15 N/A

4.16 N/A

4.17 Spare stun equipment was near stunning pen ready for use.

4.18 Slaughter of horses was observed – bleeding was fast, profuse and complete before further dressing.

4.19 -4.20 N/A

4.21 The slaughtermen are well experienced for years in stunning or killing of cattle and horses. Slaughterman licences are available in the plant office.

4.22 [S40] is appointed welfare officer.

Owners are very careful and takes a pride of fact, that they provide service of slaughtering of horses and that the welfare of any animal coming to premises is protected as much as possible.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

5.1 Animal By-Products		OV Assessment
Handling of ABP/waste to protect human and animal health		
5.1	Animal by-products, including SRM, are accurately and reliably categorised	Good
5.2	Animal by-products, including SRM, are securely collected and stained where necessary	Adequate
5.3	Animal by-products, including SRM, are dispatched to approved premises with required documentation	Good
5.4	Plants comply with 852/2004 & 1774/2002 for waste management and records	Good
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

5.1.1 The animal-by-products produced on site are: SRM (all rejections and condemned carcasses, green offal, not harvested red offal, blood),hides and manure. Category 2 and unused category 3 are disposed off as category 1 SRM.

5.1.2 Skip are used for storage of SRM in the yard. Blood tank is used for storage of blood. Hides are stored in hide room. Blue dye is available for staining of SRM. [

S30

]

5.1.3 The renderer is [S43] (approval number 37/065/8001/ABP, valid until 31/08/2010. Despatch documentation was checked for blood, SRM for details and found in order.

As the plant slaughter horses, it is often visited by people from [S38]or collection of specimens for teaching purposes

Hides are salted and stored in 2 available lockable hide rooms. The receiver is [S43(2)] Despatch tickets checked and kept by FBO.

5.1.4 Drains in slaughterhall are covered by grids, and content of these is disposed off as Category 1.

Audit Report

AUD9-3

5.2 TSE/SRM Controls		OV Assessment
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	Adequate
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:		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

N/A (0) - Not applicable

Part 5.2 evidence

5.2.1 There is no evidence of carcasses presented for p. m. inspection with SRM (spinal cord) attached to carcasses.

5.2.2 Majority of cattle slaughtered in site are O48M cattle. RMOP is agreed between OV and FBO about collection of brain stem samples and security arrangements for meat prior receiving of results.

[S30]

5.2.3 Meat is not released for human consumption and health marked before receiving of negative TSE results. This is supervised by FSA staff.

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	04/06/2010	4185-SH-06/10	[S30]	0	1 of 2

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	H		
					H		
					H		
					H		
					H		
					H		
					H		
]	H		
				<input type="checkbox"/> Additional information attached by FBO	<input type="checkbox"/>		

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

Audit Report AUD9-3

No. of pages
2 of 2

[S30	H		
					H		
]	H		
<input type="checkbox"/>				Additional information attached by FBO	<input type="checkbox"/>		

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