

# Audit Report AUD9-3



## Establishment details

Approval Number  1

Establishment Name

Establishment Address (with postcode)  
 . CW5

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	03/06/11	01/07/11	6.25		
Audit Write-up	07/07/11	07/07/11	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  
 (FBO),  (OV) AND  (OV)

**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 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	0
5.2 TSE/SRM Controls	0

<b>Final Score</b>	100
--------------------	-----

**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
Dec 2011

**Summary**

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

**Summary of Audit finding**

This audit was due in May 2011 but because the FBO was unable to find a suitable date due to other commitments the audit was delayed until June and booked for Friday the 3rd. On the 3rd of June some other issues took the attention of the FBO and a second date had to be booked in order to complete the audit. The second date was the 1st of July.

[

S30

]

**Audit Report**  
**AUD9-3**

[ S30

]

As usually, the audit report covers the activities and enforcement actions taken since last audit and those have an impact in the score of the different sections.

[ S30

]

[ S40 ]agreed to provide the OV with a reviewed hard copy of the HACCP plan.

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
-----------------

1.1. Potential Hazards  
Microbiological, chemical and physical hazards remain the same since last audit. The type of operations and procedures have not significantly changed since last audit.

1.2. Vulnerable consumers potentially at risk  
[ S43(2)  
]. FBO has no control on the population who may be supplied with the meat and the processes it may receive before it reaches the final consumer.

1.3. Throughput  
[ S43(2)  
]

# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

<b>2.1 Production Controls relating to carcase processing</b>		
<b>Pre-processing: compliance with (EC) 853/2004, Annex II, Sections II &amp; III:</b>		<b>Score</b>
2.1.1	Only suitable, properly identified animals are accepted for slaughter.	Poor
2.1.1i	All required documents, veterinary certificates, (trained hunter's) declarations or passports received	Adequate
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)	Adequate
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
<b>Controls during carcase dressing:</b>		
<b>Compliance with (EC) 852/2004 Annex II, Chapter IX, 3</b>		
2.1.6	Bleeding avoiding contamination of meat (as appropriate)	Good
2.1.7	Skinning/Depilation/plucking avoiding contamination of meat	Good
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	Good
<b>Post-Mortem: Compliance with (EC) 853/2004 Annex III</b>		
2.1.9	Carcases correctly dressed and presented for inspection	Good
2.1.9i	Traceability of carcasses	Adequate
2.1.9ii	Lack of faecal contamination	Adequate
<b>Post-processing: compliance with (EC) 852/2004 Annex I, Chapter IX</b>		
2.1.10	Adequate temperature control	Good
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	Good
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. and 2.1.1i. [ <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: 100px;">S30</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">]</div> [ <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: 100px;">S30</div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-right: 100px;">]</div>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FBO conducts their own checks and OV verifies the identity and eligibility of every horse before he cancels the passport ready to be returned to the relevant PIO. [

S30

]

[

S30

]

For cattle, [ S43(2) ] are processed and the FBO controls have been working well and no issues have been spotted by the FSA team or reported back to us by BCMS. The level of cattle ID verification checks conducted by the FSA team has always been 10%.

#### 2.1.2.

In general animals processed for human consumption are clean and this applies to both cattle and horses.

#### 2.1.3.

FBO requests and checks FCIs for cattle. For horses, we understand that the passport contains the minimum requirements for the FCI and for that reason we have not asked FBO to request any additional document. [ S30

]. I score this section

as "adequate" [ S30

]

#### 2.1.4.

FBO generally follows the instructions of the OV in respect of ante-mortem and decisions concerning live animals.

#### 2.1.5.

FBO does regularly assess the welfare status of animals kept in their lairage and also the welfare of the animals as they arrive to the premises. A number of animals have been humanely dispatched on welfare grounds within the audit period and that was purely FBO decisions with no OV intervention at all.

#### 2.1.6.

Horses are killed with free bullet gun and cattle are stunned with captive bolt stunner. Both species are then hoisted and hygienically bled. Steriliser for knives and facilities for washing hands are both available by the bleeding area.

#### 2.1.7.

The skins are partially removed by hand first and then the job is completed with a hide puller. The slaughter men technique is adequate and hides are generally removed without causing contamination of the carcasses.

Because the carcasses are dressed by hand and one by one, there is little opportunity for carcasses to come into contact with each other and be a source of contamination or cross contamination.

# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

Feet, tails and skins are quickly removed from production areas sent into the skin room through a hatch in the wall. In this room the skins are salted and later on taken to the skin trailer for storage until they are collected.

### 2.1.8

Evisceration is done by hand, one by one and a gut chute is available to conduct the green offal into the gut room where the stomach are emptied and SRM is removed before the different materials are disposed of into the appropriate skip (category 3/SRM).

Other than the occasional busted gut, carcasses are eviscerated hygienically and without major contamination incidents.

#### 2.1.8.i

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.

Red offal are removed from carcasses and presented for PMI. Offal hooks are used for this task and the different organs are hang in order so they can establish correlation to the carcass.

At the other end of the line, heads are also hang in order and presented for PMI. FBO staff collects samples of the horses jaw muscle ready for being tested (Thrichinella test) in their own lab.

After evisceration, carcasses are split and spinal cords are removed from both horses and beef carcasses. Carcasses are them washed down so that bone dust and remaining blood from cavities are removed. After this step, carcasses have a final inspection, trim and weighting before they are presented for PMI.

A scanner is in use at the end of the line and the MHI scans all the carcasses looking for the microchips identified at AMI so that they can be removed. All carcasses are scanned so that every effort is made to remove all microchips. The microchips removed from the carcasses are kept safe in the FSA office ready for collection as clinical waste.

Sterilisers and facilities for washing hands are available at various points of the line and FBO staff checks and records their temperature every day they operate.

### 2.1.9.

Carcasses are correctly dressed and presented for PMI.

#### 2.1.9i

The kill order is decided at the lairage stage when the animals are presented for AMI in small batches and at that point the kill order is written in the passports. The kill order is then written on the carcasses. This method works well [

S30

]. The kill order, now verified by reading the microchips, is normally maintained.

The carcasses are dispatched to a couple of customers FBO keeps copies of the delivery notes. As for the origin of the animals, FBO relies in the kill sheet which is now produced by the OV.

#### 2.1.9ii

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 low levels.

FBO is keen on improving this area, right now [ S43(2) ] market is affected by the latest E coli crisis and their customers need reassurance on the safety of their product.

As part of this line of work, FBO has appointed an abattoir foreman with overall responsibilities for hygiene of the operations, they have started with monthly carcasses microbiological tests and they are looking for options for a more hygienic dressing of the carcasses.

#### 2.1.10.

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

Carcasses are delivered in their own lorry [ S43(2) ]. At the time of loading, a number of carcasses are probed and the temperature records are kept in the FBO's diary. Because this diary is not always available on site, FBO has decided to produce a document for recording these temperature, which will be kept on site.

#### 2.1.11.

Chillers where carcasses are kept, are maintained to an acceptable standard. The lorry used for delivery of the carcasses is in very good condition and is suitable for long distance delivery of carcasses.

#### 2.1.12.

FBO uses [ S43(2) ] lab (UKAS accredited 4065) for all their microbiological tests.

Because the cattle throughput is [ S43(2) ] a year, microbiological testing of these carcasses is not compulsory and FBO is not doing any.

For horse carcasses, because their throughput is between [ S43(2) ] a year, their requirement is for testing 5 carcasses on 1 day every 12 weeks and for APC and enterobacteriae. Salmonella testing is not compulsory for this range of throughput.

Since last audit, when results were made available for carcasses tested in August and November 2010, FBO sent sets of samples in February 2011 and then June 2011. The

samples tested all negative for Salmonella and <0 for APC and enterobacteriae. FBO intends to carry on with monthly sampling of 5 carcasses.



# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

<b>2.4 Environmental hygiene / Good hygiene practises</b>		<b>Score</b>
<b>Plant complies with (EC) 852/2004</b>		
<b>Structure: complies with (EC) 852/2004 Annex II</b>		
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
<b>Water supply: potability water supply is assured</b>		
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
<b>Maintenance: arrangements protect food from contamination</b>		
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
<b>Cleaning: arrangements protect food from contamination</b>		
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
<b>Pest control: arrangements protect food from contamination</b>		
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	Adequate
2.4.12	FBO is monitoring pest activity	Good
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	Adequate
<b>Staff training/instruction and supervision</b>		
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	Adequate
<b>Health and hygiene arrangements</b>		
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		

2.4.1 to 2.4.2

The structure and plant layout has not changed since last audit and basically remains the same since it was approved.

[ S30

]

2.4.3. to 2.4.7.

FBO [ S30 ]for monitoring water quality but their aim is to test the water at least once a year. The latest water test was done in September 2010, this one was produced during the last audit and no further testing has been carried out since then.

United Utilities is the water supplier for the premises.

2.4.8 to 2.4.13.

Again, procedures for monitoring and dealing with maintenance needs are not documented. FBO's procedure basically consist of 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 undertook by the plant staff.

Since last audit, metal work and most of the abattoir ceilings have been painted. The areas were the walls join the floors have also recently been re-done. The works carry on in the hanging area and chiller.

[ S30

]

2.4.14 to 2.4.18.

FBO keeps records of a pre-operational cleaning check which is conducted in the morning, before they start processing.

[ S38 ] are the ones responsible for the cleaning of the premises once the operations for the day are completed.

Cleaning instructions [ S30 ]. FBO keeps copy of the Health & Safety data for the chemicals used for cleaning.

[ S30

]

2.4.19. to 2.4.24.

An external company is responsible for the implementation of the pest control programme. They inspect the premises regularly (monthly) and they look after the bait plan and the EFks.

According to the records they leave after each visit, the fly units (4 in total) were retubed last time in May 2011. [ S30

]

Health and Safety data for the baits in use, together with the bait plan and records of the pest control inspections are kept on site.

Some additional strip curtains have been put in place since last audit to prevent fly access into production areas from the hide room and through the back door.

2.4.25 to 2.4.33.

In terms of staff training and supervision, FBO had a briefing session with the team on the 24th of June. According to FBO, in that session they talked through personal hygiene, hygiene of the operations, hand washing procedures and use of protective clothing. In that meeting, two members of staff were appointed as lairage manager and abattoir foreman. The abattoir manager is

## Audit Report

### AUD9-3

responsible for supervising hygiene matters.

[ S30

] FBO instructed all the staff to change into clean protective clothing before they come back to the line.

Visitors are not allowed into the premises without FBO consent and if visiting the production areas, adequate PPE is provided.

<b>2.5 HACCP</b>		<b>Score</b>
<b>Principle 1 - identify any hazards that must be prevented, eliminated or reduced to acceptable levels</b>		
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
<b>Principle 2 - identify the CCPs/CPs</b>		
2.5.5	Correct identification of controls at the step or steps at which control is essential to ensure food safety	Adequate
<b>Principle 3 - establish critical limits at CCPs (or legal limits at CPs)</b>		
2.5.6	Correct identification of critical limits to ensure food safety	Good
<b>Principle 4 - establish effective monitoring procedures at CCPs/CPs</b>		
2.5.7	Monitoring arrangements established to ensure food safety	Weak
2.5.8	Suitable monitoring procedures and of records (e.g. Diary) verified by reality checks	Weak
<b>Principle 5 - establish corrective actions</b>		
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
<b>Principle 6 - establish verification procedures</b>		
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
<b>Principle 7 - establish documents and records</b>		
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
<b>HACCP training</b>		
2.5.17	Staff responsible for the development and maintenance of HACCP-based procedures have received adequate training	Good
<b>Review</b>		
2.5.18	HACCP plans are reviewed and if necessary amended to reflect changes to suppliers/products/operations/equipment/law etc.	Adequate
<b>Part 2.5 Score</b>		<b>5</b>
<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**

A documented HACCP plan covering both cattle and horse slaughter and dressing were presented today for audit.

Accurate flow diagrams describing the operations step by step are available and a hard copy is kept in the plant folders.

The hazard analysis and CCP summary were reviewed last time in May 2011 and the only version available during the audit was the original electronic document kept in [ S40 ] computer.

# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

Looking at the flow diagrams and the HACCP plan kept in the computer [

S30

]

The hazard analysis takes into account most foreseeable hazards relevant to the operations undertaken in the premises [ S30

] The two main hazards described at lairage intake are contamination from dirty skins and identification issues. [ S30

] The reality is that lairage staff conduct identification and eligibility checks in the lairage [ S30

]

[ S30

]

[ S30

] Up to now, these notes are kept in [ S40 ] diary [

S30

] The diary was presented to the OV the following week. [ S40 ] agreed to produce a form that would stay in the plant for keeping notes of these temperature checks.

FBO uses the carcasses microbiological results as their main verification tool. Apparently the temperature probes are calibrated in house [ S30 ].

I asked [ S40 ] to provide a copy of the HACCP plan to be kept in our office. He agreed to review and amend the HACCP plan in line with the notes above [ S30 ] and then provide us with a hard copy of it.

<b>3 Animal Disease (Slaughterhouses only)</b>		<b>Score</b>
<b>Potential spread of animal disease is minimised</b>		
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		

<b>Part 3 Evidence</b>
------------------------

3.1  
 Within the audit period no restrictions have been imposed by Animal Health for the species processed in this abattoir.

3.2  
 Lairage facilities and lairage field provide adequate facilities for holding livestock without increasing the likelihood of spreading diseases.

3.2.  
 Livestock stays on site for variable periods of time but since the conditions of the facilities available are adequate, this is not perceived as an increased risk of spread of disease.

3.5.  
 Facilities are provided for cleansing and disinfection of the vehicles used for transport of livestock. Omnicide is the disinfectant in use.

# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

<b>4 Animal welfare (slaughterhouse only). Compliance with WASK 1995 (as amended)</b>		<b>Score</b>
<b>Lairage conditions and animal handling promote good animal welfare</b>		
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	Good
<b>Action on welfare issues</b>		
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
<b>Slaughter processes</b>		
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
<b>Ritual Slaughter</b>		
4.19	Appropriate facilities for restraint and slaughter	N/A
4.20	Bleeding statutory time observed	N/A
<b>Slaughter by competent and appropriately trained operatives</b>		
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.

Suitable lairage conditions are available for livestock received at the premises. There is an ample lairage and also a lairage field included in the boundaries of the premises. The pens and the facilities are adequate for both cattle and horses.

4.2.

The capacity of the lairage is adequate for the average throughput. The horses the FBO purchases are normally brought into the lairage outside their operational hours. Horses brought in by their

owners are normally brought and slaughtered straight away after ante mortem inspection has been conducted.

4.3.

There are basically two entries to the lairage. The one used by the "private kills" is closer to the stunning box and this one is raised above ground level so the unloading is pretty comfortable for the horses.

4.4.

The pens are adequate for both cattle and horses. They are fitted with drinkers and hay is always available. FBO provides also bedding in the pens. FBO and the staff engaged in the lairage operations do know how to handle horses with minimum effort and stress for both men and horses.

4.5.

Some livestock spend a fair amount of time in the lairage before slaughter but the facilities are good and their welfare is not compromised.

4.6.

The guns are serviced and inspected regularly . FBO keeps records of these maintenance works.

4.8.

In the event of a serious breakdown FBO can transferred horses to his own farm and cattle can be diverted to other nearby abattoirs if needed.

4.9.

Lairage staff are very good at handling livestock and in particular horses. Animals are moved without causing to them any unnecessary stress.

4.10.

FBO can identify signs of abuse or neglect on live animals and on carcasses [ S30

]

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 are horses are brought in the stunning box before they are shot. [ S30

]

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.

4.17.

Back up guns are readily available. All of them are regularly serviced so they will be ready to use at any time.



## Audit Report

### AUD9-3

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. Horses are killed using free bullet but still, they are bled straight away after shooting.

4.21.

The slaughter men have licences appropriate for the species and methods used in the plant.

4.22.

Staff involved in the handling of live animals have the skills needed to handle both cattle and horses .

4.23.

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

5.1 Animal By-Products		Score
<b>Handling of ABP/waste to protect human and animal health</b>		
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	Good
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	Adequate
5.1 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		

**Part 5.1 Evidence**

5.1 Animal by-products are categorised under category 3 and category 1.

- All the blood is pumped into the blood tank. Its content is dispatched as category 1 material.
- Two skips are available, one for category 3 material and one for the SRM material. Pathological rejections and body parts from cattle requiring BSE testing are disposed off in the SRM skip.
- Hides and skins are salted and stored on site and then collected just a few times a year. A hide room is available for locking cattle hides pending from BSE results.
- Lairage waste and stomachs content is stored in a dedicated area and then taken by a local farmer.

[ S38 ] - FBO declared that no other animal by-products are being dispatched from the premises.

Labels are attached to the skips with the description of the materials contained in them.

[ S30 ] Basically, this consists of an on-site microbial fermentation. The system delivers live bacteria and enzymes into the drains which digest the organic material. The system is combined with a decantation tank where the solids sink to the bottom and the water on the top overflows and is discharged into the sewer. United Utilities has issued their consent to the discharge of trade effluents into the sewers (dated 08/June/2011). Once the tank is full of solids, its content will be removed and taken to an appropriate plant for its disposal. They do not know yet how often this operation will be needed.

5.2 The content of the SRM skip is stained regularly with Pantene Blue V.

5.3 FBO sends the blood and the content of both skips to [ S43(2) ]. These premises are approved for receiving both category 3 and SRM material. The destination of the hides and skins is [ S43(2) ]. FBO keeps copies of their approvals in the plant files. Commercial documents produced at the time of each consignment are kept in the plant files. FBO has kept in one folder all of them since last audit.

5.4 The storage of the animal by-products is generally done in a hygienic manner. [ S30 ]

# Audit Report

## AUD9-3

5.2 TSE/SRM Controls		Score
<b>TSE Controls</b>		
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

The cattle throughput is [ S43(2) ] and on average it has been [ S43(2) ] a month. The establishment is authorised for slaughter of any age but most of the cattle they process are on farm emergency slaughter and older cattle.

An RMOP is in place and both FBO and OV have been discussing the amendments needed since the age threshold above which all healthy cattle born in the UK must be tested for BSE increased to 72 months on Friday 1st of July. They are also aware that on farm emergency slaughtered, fallen stock and cattle found sick at ante mortem for animals born in the UK must be tested for BSE if aged 48 months or over.

SRM is removed from carcasses other than the vertebral columns. Carcasses and hides of cattle requiring BSE testing remain under FSA control until their test results are available and negative.

**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	03/06/2011	4185-SH-07/11	[ 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			
						]	

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
<b>FBO or representative action owner(s)</b>	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