



**Audit by the  
Meat Hygiene Service  
of the food business operators  
food safety management system**

**AUDIT REPORT**

Approval no.

Establishment name

Scheduled date of audit

Audit no.

	Actual hours	Date - from:	to:
Audit preparation	1.25	13 August 2007	13 August 2007
Audit visit duration on site	3.5	14 August 2007	14 August 2007
Audit write-up	3.5	16 August 2007	16 August 2007

Note: Actual hours, and dates shown must correspond to the entries on the auditor's timesheet/s.


**Part 1 - Establishment details**

Address of establishment	[-----] S38	
	[-----]	
	Inverurie	
	[-----] Postcode	[-----]

Date of previous audit (first day)	14 March 2007	Previous audit category	III
------------------------------------	---------------	-------------------------	-----

Site type (please  one only)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Slaughterhouse or Game Handling Establishment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-located meat plant (cutting plant, meat preparations plant, meat products plant)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stand alone meat plant (cutting plant, meat preparations plant, meat products plant)

Note: to create a tick type 4.

Establishment approved? (yes / no)	Yes
------------------------------------	-----

**Part 2 - Audit details**

**Auditor conducting the audit**

Name in BLOCK letters	[-----]S38
-----------------------	------------

**Food Business Operators Representative**

Name in BLOCK letters	[-----]S38
Position	TECHNICAL MANAGER
Names of others attending audit	[-----]S38

# Part 1 - Pre Set Risk Factors

## Entering of Risk Factors

The risk factors have been predetermined and can only be updated by the RO. Initially, points awarded will be based on historic data held for the establishment. The auditor must check the accuracy of this data at the audit and report any changes to the RO for amendments to be entered into the data capture system.

## 1.1 POTENTIAL HAZARDS

The risk scores allocated in this section are pre-set dependant upon the likely hazards in the establishment, as indicated in the following table:

Note: Due to the potential hazards most fresh meat establishments will be awarded at least 45 points and will therefore not be eligible to be in audit Category I.

<b>Microbiological hazards - Guidance on assessment</b>	<b>Award</b>
Potential for microbiological hazards i.e. contamination, cross-contamination, growth and/or survival of pathogenic or spoilage bacteria, viruses, parasites, and fungi, in or on the product.	30
Only frozen products handled.	5
<b>Current Score</b> This score can only be amended by Regional Office	<b>30</b>

**Evidence** (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):

SCORE CORRECT



<b>Chemical hazards - Guidance on assessment</b>	<b>Award</b>
Potential for chemical hazards i.e. contamination of meat from residues of veterinary products/pesticides/feed additives, as well as from packaging and/or careless use of chemicals (e.g. 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
<b>Current Score</b> This score can only be amended by Regional Office	<b>10</b>

**Evidence** (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):

SCORE CORRECT

Physical hazards - Guidance on assessment	Award
<b>Potential for physical hazards</b> i.e. contamination of meat by foreign bodies.	5
Only ready-wrapped products handled.	0
<b>Current Score</b> This score can only be amended by Regional Office	5
<b>Evidence</b> (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):	
SCORE CORRECT	

<b>1.1 Potential Hazards (microbiological + chemical + physical):</b>	<b>Score</b>
This score can only be amended by Regional Office after evidence are provided with this audit report	45

## 1.2 TYPE OF PROCESS CARRIED OUT

The table below indicates the risk scores allocated to establishments dependant upon the processes carried out by the FBO.  
 Note: Activity types (a)-(c) must be assessed independently even if they occur in combined establishments. Other combinations must be assessed together if handled in one establishment site.

Points should be awarded for each activity on the approval, not just activities carried out.

Activity	Guidance on assessment	Award (please tick at least one per sector)	
a) Slaughter	if only one species slaughtered	+0	
	for each other additional red meat species	+5	
	and if handling only sheep SRM or	+5	
	if handling cattle SRM or both cattle and sheep SRM	+10	
b) Dressing of Game	if only either mammals or birds dressed	+0	
	if handling both mammals and birds	+10	
c) Cutting of meat	if only either red or white meat is cut	+0	<input type="checkbox"/>
	if handling both red & white meat, and	+5	
	if handling SRM	+5	
d) Handling ready-to-eat products		+25	
e) Production of Meat Product		+10	
f) Production of Meat Preparations		+5	
g) Production of MSM		+5	
h) Production of Minced meat		+15	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Re-wrapping/ Re-packaging		+5	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Cold storage		+0	

### 1.2 Current Score

This score can only be amended by Regional Office (Note: to create a tick type 4)

**20**

**Evidence** (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):

SCORE CORRECT

### 1.3 VULNERABLE CONSUMERS POTENTIALLY AT RISK

Most establishments supplying fresh meat have the potential to supply vulnerable consumers either directly or indirectly. Situations where such supply is unlikely include suppliers of game or where the supply is to approved meat products manufacturers.

The lack of sale to vulnerable consumers has to be proved by the FBO to the auditor.

<b>Guidance on assessment</b>	<b>Award</b>
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). Meat will be further processed in approved meat product manufacturing 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 being supplied to the consumer.	20
<b>Current Score</b> This score can only be amended by Regional Office	<b>20</b>
<b>Evidence</b> (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):	

## 1.4 THROUGHPUT

This relates to number of consumers potentially at risk.

Note: The thresholds for slaughterhouses and cutting plants are as used for HACCP implementation.

Include definitions of 'very small', (i.e. equivalent to previous 'low throughput' slaughterhouses and cutting plants, likely to market locally), 'small/medium' (throughput not in other two categories) and 'large' (average weekly throughput above 500 livestock units or 200,000 birds in a slaughterhouse / over 150 metric tonnes cut meat, likely to market nationally).

<b>Guidance on assessment</b>	<b>Award</b>
Very small (i.e. equivalent to previous 'low throughput' slaughterhouses and cutting plants), 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
<b>Current Score</b> This score can only be amended by Regional Office	<b>15</b>
<b>Evidence</b> (when this pre set risk factor requires changing please provide evidence to inform your Regional Office):	
SCORE CORRECT	

Please ensure the score from each of the Pre set Risk Factor sections are in the table below:

<b>Part 1 - Pre Set Risk Factors</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.1 Potential Hazard	45
1.2 Type of Process	20
1.3 Vulnerable Consumers	20
1.4 Throughput	15



## Part 2 – Food Business Operator Actions

### Assessment of the level of compliance

To carry out the assessment of the FBO level of compliance, refer to the relevant Regulations, the Meat Industry Guide and the MHS Manual for Official Controls. The use of the Meat Industry Guide by the FBO is voluntary. The FBO's systems / procedures may be different to those described in the Meat Industry Guide but they may be valid provided they achieve compliance with the legislation.

### FBO compliance history

The history of compliance relates to the average number of deficiencies identified against legislative requirements for the FBOs own procedures and requiring OV intervention during the audit interval or previous available audits, up to a maximum period of 10 months, (use evidence recorded on MHS operational forms e.g. AUD 9/5, 9/6, ENF 11/5).

Note: OV intervention is needed to have a negative effect in the audit score. FBO initiating corrective actions where the FBO has identified a breakdown in controls is a sign of a healthy control system.

During the audit, the auditor will record evidence of the FBO compliance history, which will result in a risk score under each category e.g. 2.2 Animal welfare, based on the following guidance criteria:

	<b>Guidance on assessment</b>
Excellent	Active compliance with statutory requirements – no action necessary. FBO controls were effective and a HACCP based food management system was applied satisfactorily throughout audit assessment period.
Acceptable	<u>Occasional</u> lapses in FBO compliance with statutory requirements in the audit period where risk analysis shows only low risk of deficiencies for public health or animal welfare and following OV intervention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBO procedures required minor corrections</li> <li>• Minor corrections were needed to an otherwise good HACCP based food management system.</li> </ul> Note: <u>occasional</u> = 4 or fewer.
Poor	<u>Frequent</u> intervention by OV in the audit period to gain FBO compliance with statutory requirements where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBO procedures were inadequate</li> <li>• HACCP based principles were inadequately applied</li> <li>• action by FBO was necessary to avoid formal enforcement action.</li> </ul> <u>and</u> the above gave rise to medium or high risk deficiencies for public health and/or animal welfare. Note: <u>frequent</u> = 5 or more instances in the audit period covering 5 or fewer statutory requirements.
Unacceptable	<u>Frequent</u> intervention by OV in the audit period to gain FBO compliance with many <u>statutory requirements</u> where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBO procedures were inadequate</li> <li>• HACCP based principles were inadequately applied</li> <li>• action by FBO was necessary to avoid formal enforcement action.</li> </ul> <u>and</u> cumulatively the above gave rise to the potential for high risk to public health and/or animal welfare. <u>Or</u> there was a breakdown in specific FBO controls that actually caused: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• immediate high risk to public health</li> <li>• an animal to sustain avoidable excitement, pain or suffering</li> </ul> Note: <u>many statutory requirements</u> = 5 or more instances in the audit period covering more than 5 statutory requirements.

## 2.1 ANIMAL HEALTH RISKS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SIGNIFICANCE

Note: This category will only apply in slaughter and wild game processing establishments.  
The assessment will reflect the outcome of verification and monitoring including

- Food Chain Information (where available)

Verify FBO's controls on FCI before it is passed to the OV

- Animal identity

Verify FBO's controls on animal identification to ensure that only properly identified animals, accompanied by the correct documentation e.g. cattle passports or Animal Health Act documentation (where required) are accepted for slaughter.

- Compliance with TSE/BSE testing requirements as contained in the establishment RMOP.
- Compliance with other testing requirements for TB, Brucella, Trichinella etc.

Verify FBO's controls to confirm eligibility (identification and/or segregation if necessary) of animals requiring testing.

- Compliance with pre ante mortem requirements

Verify FBO's controls of incoming animals are adequate to ensure clean and healthy animals are slaughtered.

Scores allocated for each assessment are as follows:

Assessment – Animal Health Risks of Public Health Significance	Award
Excellent or not applicable	0
Acceptable	5
Poor	15
Unacceptable	25

**Evidence** (provide evidence in bullet form to support your score. Use operational reports, enforcement records, FBO's compliance with GHP and HACCP controls and include observations from the audit. In normal circumstances no more than 400 words):

NOT APPLICABLE

2.1 Score

0



## 2.2 ANIMAL WELFARE

Verify:

FBO's controls of animal welfare procedures to effectively identify visible signs of abuse or neglect on live animals.

FBO's lairage conditions and animal handling promotes good animal welfare.

FBO has competent and appropriately trained establishment staff and slaughtering procedures to safeguard animal welfare standards.

Assessment – Animal Welfare	Award
Excellent or not applicable	0
Acceptable	5
Poor	10
Unacceptable	15
<b>Evidence</b> (provide evidence in bullet form to support your score. Use operational reports, enforcement records, FBO's compliance with GHP and HACCP controls and include observations from the audit. In normal circumstances no more than 400 words):	
NOT APPLICABLE	
<b>2.2 Score</b>	<b>0</b>

## 2.3 HYGIENIC PRODUCTION

Verify:

FBO's carcasses dressing procedures and meat handling practices, further handling, storing, cutting and processing minimises meat cross contamination.

FBO's controls ensure that meat entering the food chain is free from SRM.

FBO's controls on animal by-products are adequate to ensure by-products ensure compliance with legislation.

FBO's controls on the temperature of meat comply with legislation.

FBO's controls ensure only meat produced in accordance with the legislation is properly marked with the identification mark.

Assessment – Hygienic Production	Award
Excellent or not applicable	0
Acceptable	5
Poor	15
Unacceptable	25
<p><b>Evidence</b> (provide evidence in bullet form to support your score. Use operational reports, enforcement records, FBO's compliance with GHP and HACCP controls and include observations from the audit. In normal circumstances no more than 400 words):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hygiene of production.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a dedicated chilled reception area for the intake of product which provides ample space for operations.</li> <li>• There are written intake procedures which are satisfactory. Temperature of product is checked at intake (all product must be below 5 degrees) A between pack probe is used for vac-packed product.</li> <li>• Precutting inspection is completed in the chilled intake area for exposed cuts and after unwrapping for vacpacked product.</li> <li>• The reception chill has limited space resulting in packed and unpacked product being stored in the same chill. A policy is in place which should minimise the risk of cross contamination. No contact between packed and unpacked product was observed.</li> <li>• A rack system is in use within the chills. The risk of drip contamination to lower shelves is minimised by inclusion of drip trays.</li> <li>• Hygiene of cutting operations was satisfactory.</li> <li>• The mincing operation was observed at audit. The operation has been moved to a dedicated, temperature controlled room and controls considered fully satisfactory. All mince is blast frozen immediately following production.</li> <li>• Burger production [REDACTED] r12(5)(e). No foodstuffs, seasonings or additives are being added and in effect burgers are simply pressed mince. The operation was not observed on the day of audit.</li> <li>• [REDACTED]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hygiene of packing operation satisfactory.</li> <li>• <b>SRM controls.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No SRM is generated on site.</li> <li>• Only bone in beef bearing a blue stripe label is admitted.</li> <li>• Procedures and documentation for intake controls on bone in beef satisfactory.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>ABP Controls</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Category 2 and 3 animal by-product generated on site. No Category 1 material generated</li> <li>• Suitable, secure lidded storage is available for both category 2 and 3 materials. This material is stored in the chill prior to despatch (treated as food till despatch)</li> <li>• Adequate Supplies of Black dye verified at audit</li> <li>• Category 3 bins labelled appropriately. Category 2 and 3 material is collected by [-----]</li> <li>-----]S43. FBO copy of Renderers licence available in ABP file. Samples of commercial documentation examined were considered fully satisfactory.</li> <li>• 3mm traps are fitted in the cutting room</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Temperature control.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cold chain is respected.</li> <li>• Temperature recording is by a combination of thermograph and manual checks.</li> <li>• Chills, freezers and workrooms are normally continually thermographed, which is alarmed. Thermograph records are signed off on a daily basis by management.</li> <li>• Manual air temperature checks are also taken twice daily during production (Monday to Saturday) as verification.</li> <li>• Temperature of incoming fresh and frozen product is checked and adequately recorded.</li> <li>• Comprehensive Manual product temperature checks are completed by supervisors every two hours during production..</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Records were examined and considered satisfactory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate temperature checks are completed on minced product both before and during the mincing the operation.</li> </ul> <p>Temperature records of "first" and "second" mince demonstrate production temperatures of 2-4C on average. The critical limit used here for second mince (immediately after production) is 4C. The FBO is aware that Mince must be cooled rapidly to below</p>	
<b>2.3 Score</b>	<b>0</b>

## 2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL HYGIENE

Refer to part Two of the Guide to the Food Hygiene and other Regulations for the Meat Industry (Meat Industry Guide)

Verify at least the following and any other policies or procedures as set out by the operator:

FBO's conditions for holding livestock minimise the spread of disease e.g. lairages must be cleaned and disinfected.

FBO's cleaning procedures and standards prevent contamination of meat and minimise micro organisms on animal transport vehicles and crates.

FBO's controls for establishment maintenance, structure and equipment.

FBO's controls for the exclusion of pests.

FBO's controls ensures adequate water quality.

FBO's controls for staff health.

FBO provides training for staff.

General structure and layout, including adequate lighting and ventilation.

Assessment – Environmental Hygiene	Award
Excellent or not applicable	0
Acceptable	5
Poor	15
Unacceptable	25
<p><b>Evidence</b> (provide evidence in bullet form to support your score. Use operational reports, enforcement records, FBO's compliance with GHP and HACCP controls and include observations from the audit. In normal circumstances no more than 400 words):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cleaning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleaning schedules are available and a recording system is in place signed off by cleaner and supervisor. The plant employs two full time cleaners plus a hygiene manager. In addition, each area manager checks his/her own section on a daily basis for hygiene standards.</li> <li>• Corrective actions are recorded by [-----]S40, the technical manager.</li> <li>• Preoperational cleaning records satisfactory.</li> <li>• Cleaning standards considered very good.</li> <li>• Microbiological surface testing; see section 2.4.</li> <li>• Data sheets are on file for chemicals (supplied by [-----]S43) and a dedicated lockable chemical store is provided in the wash room.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Structure and maintenance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major refurbishment of the factory is now completed with the new intake area, office accommodation, changing facilities, canteen and packing store completed since last audit.</li> <li>• [REDACTED]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Pest Control</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pest control procedures satisfactory.</li> <li>• A written policy was inspected and [-----]S43 provides an external service of 8 routine visits plus 1 technical visit annually.</li> <li>• [REDACTED]</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Data sheets, uptake records EFK maintenance records all satisfactory.</li> <li>• <b>Water supply</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water supply is from mains. A detailed supply plan and sampling protocol are available.</li> <li>• Four parameter monthly testing is undertaken. The last samples dated 25/07/07 were satisfactory</li> <li>• Two six parameter test results, from the main tank and the main inlet tank, dated 17/05/07 were examined and found satisfactory. Testing includes the microbiological parameters detailed in the industry guide for mains supply.</li> <li>• Water tank not inspected at audit.</li> <li>• A satisfactory physiochemical test report with covering letter dated 22/11/06 was available for [-----]S43.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Personal hygiene.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff health controls are generally appropriate.</li> <li>• A satisfactory visitor policy is in use.</li> <li>• All staff hold medical certificates or a comprehensive pre-employment health questionnaire has been completed</li> <li>• Reporting of illness policies and return to work policies are in place with evidence of recent entries.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>2.4 Score</b>	<b>0</b>



## 2.5 CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TO CONTROL HAZARDS

### Overall judgment

The auditor will assess the objective evidence recorded in each audited area on the Audit Report and make an overall judgement about compliance and management procedures during the audit period, based on the guidance in the table below.

Note: The items listed are areas that the auditor should consider when making the judgement, not a detailed or exhaustive list of requirements to be met.

2.5 CONFIDENCE IN MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TO CONTROL HAZARDS		
Assessment	Guidance on assessment	Award
Excellent	<p>FBO's demonstration of competency regarding hygiene and food safety gives high confidence that hazards will be controlled on an ongoing basis. e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compliant in all audited areas or only few OV interventions required on low risk issues</li> <li>• HACCP plans kept under review</li> <li>• HACCP principles embedded into staff routines, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective action</li> <li>• fully documented policies and procedures re in place to ensure continuing good hygiene practices, particularly with regard to staff training, cleaning and maintenance procedures</li> <li>• accredited to quality assurance schemes and subject to third party audits. Act immediately on complaints</li> <li>• actively seek advice</li> <li>• rarely obtain poor microbiological test results.</li> </ul>	0
Acceptable	<p>Management attitude to hygiene and food safety gives reasonable confidence that hazards will be controlled on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>The auditor has evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the FBO is complying with regulatory requirements in most audited areas</li> <li>• where there have been low risk issues out of control, the FBOs corrective actions have been, or are being, applied appropriately and effectively.</li> </ul>	5
Poor	<p>Attitude to hygiene and food safety gives little confidence that hazards will be controlled on an ongoing basis. The auditor has evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBO procedures poor or unacceptable in many audited areas</li> <li>• numerous inadequate FBO procedures that collectively indicate a trend towards loss of control</li> <li>• medium or high risk deficiencies are identified by the FBO but not effectively managed.</li> </ul>	15
Unacceptable	<p>Management attitude to hygiene and food safety gives minimal confidence that hazards will be controlled on an ongoing basis. The auditor has evidence of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unsatisfactory application of HACCP principles, particularly with regard to monitoring and corrective action</li> <li>• few policies and procedures in place to ensure continuing good hygiene practices, particularly with regard to staff training, cleaning and maintenance procedures</li> <li>• unwilling to act on complaints, previous advice and enforcement</li> <li>• failure to act on poor microbiological test results</li> <li>• unacceptable FBO procedures in many audited areas and are reasonably likely to lead to exposure of humans or animals to an unacceptable level of hazard (e.g. poor or unacceptable FBO controls that require immediate OV intervention)</li> <li>• required records are absent, incomplete or have been altered, to a degree that means the auditor has no confidence in the system being audited</li> <li>• unacceptable FBOs monitoring procedures repeatedly fail to identify medium or high risk deficiencies.</li> </ul>	30

## Record of objective evidence for the score awarded

• [REDACTED]

• **Management commitment** to HACCP is sufficient with adequate resources to allow effective implementation and maintenance of HACCP based controls. See SANCO/1955/2005/annex 1

• A comprehensive **scope** is provided. [REDACTED]

• **Team:** A satisfactory multidisciplinary team approach has been taken.

• The team includes [-----]S40, team leader plus 10 other members.

• Satisfactory minutes of team meetings, including action points, are included in plan documentation. See SANCO/1955/2005/annex 1, 1.1

• Description of **product** is satisfactory and in accordance with SANCO/1955/2005/annex 1, 1.2 and 1.3

• Satisfactory, validated **flow diagrams** were inspected for meat cutting, mincing, burger production and handling of frozen products in accordance with SANCO/1955/2005/annex 1, 1.4.

• **Prerequisite programmes** are adequately integrated into the HACCP based food safety management system. The plan has been simplified and is now much easier to follow. Product temperature is considered a CCP rather than a prerequisite.

• **Hazard analysis** has been completed and is acceptable.

• Hazards and their source are identified and appropriate controls are generally included.

• Some checks and inspections are given as controls and are more accurately monitoring procedures, for example at CCP 1 and 3 temperature “checks” are given as a controls.

• Hazard analysis is generally in accordance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (a)

• **CCP identification** was achieved using a decision tree and justifications are included.

• CCPs identified considered reasonable.

• CCP determination is in accordance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (b).

• **Critical limits** for CCP's are satisfactory and clearly separate “safe” from “unsafe”. They are measurable or observable.

• Setting of critical limits is considered to be in compliance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (c)

• **Monitoring** procedures are generally adequate with responsible person, frequency, written procedure and a reference to recording system included.

• **Documentation** is available relating to the methodology for monitoring CCPs but this would benefit from being developed into a clear work instruction which could also be used as a training aid.

• Monitoring procedures are adequately cross referenced to other HACCP plan documentation.

• Monitoring records were checked and found satisfactory.

• [REDACTED].

• Monitoring procedures are generally in compliance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (d)

• **Corrective action** procedures consider instructions for line stoppage, quarantine of product, re-establishment of control and investigation of cause. Recording procedures for corrective actions are included.

• Documentary evidence is available to verify that corrective action procedures are completed and recorded both for prerequisite programmes, and for CCPs. Many examples of operators own checks detecting and resolving problems were noted at audit. The FBO takes a proactive approach in addressing the root cause of the issue when considering corrective actions required.

• Corrective action procedures are generally in compliance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (e)

• **The summary table** included in the plan provides useful information to facilitate validation and verification.

• The plans for all operations have been validated. Documentation is available to confirm that issues were identified during initial validation ( for example flow diagram inaccurate, legislation out of date, frequency not included for monitoring,) and that subsequent revalidation occurred having updated the plan.

• **Verification.** [REDACTED]

• External verification has been adequately considered and is appropriately acted upon.

• Microbiological verification is considered satisfactory.

• Verification (including validation) is generally in accordance with (EC)852/2004 article 5 (2) (f)

• **Documents and records**

• Comprehensive and fully satisfactory policies and procedures including written work instructions are available for many audited areas.

• [REDACTED]

• Some monitoring procedures have been documented as controls.

• [REDACTED].

• **Review procedures** include provision for review following internal change, external change or on a scheduled basis.

2.5 Score

0

Please ensure the score from each of the Food Business Operators Actions sections are in the table below:

<b>Part 2 - Food Business Operator Actions</b>	<b>Score</b>
2.1 Animal Health Risks of Public Health Significance	0
2.2 Animal Welfare	0
2.3 Hygienic Production	0
2.4 Environmental Hygiene	0
2.5 Confidence in Management systems to Control Hazards (including HACCP)	0
<b>Part 2 - FBO Actions Total Score</b>	<b>0</b>

## AUDIT RISK ASSESSMENT – FINAL SCORE

<b>AUDIT RISK ASSESSMENT – FINAL SCORE</b>	<b>Score</b>
Part 1 - Pre Set Risk Factors	100
Part 2 - Food Business Operators Actions	0
<b>Final Score</b>	<b>100</b>

## AUDIT CATEGORY

<b>Points Range</b>	<b>Audit Category</b>	<b>Minimum Audit Frequency</b>
0 - 45	I	At least once every 12 months
50 - 90	II	At least once every 8 months
95 - 135	III	At least once every 5 months
140 - 180	IV	At least once every 3 months
185+	V	At least once every 2 months

<b>Final Score</b>	<b>Audit Category</b>	<b>Date Next Visit (+/- 20 days)</b>
100	III	14 January 2008