HACCP-BASED INSPECTION MODELS

PROJECT (HIMP)

YOUNG TURKEY INSPECTION

Implementation Date: 1/9/05

Table of Contents

HACCP-BASED INSPECTION MODELS PROJECT (HIMP)

Model Phase Performance Standards for Young Turkey Plants

Performance Standard Categories	Performance Standards**
Food Safety (FS-1) Condition – Infectious **(Examples: septicemia, toxemia)**	**Zero**
Food Safety (FS-2) Contamination – Digestive Content (Fecal material)	**Zero**
Other Consumer Protection (OCP-1) Condition - Animal Diseases* (Examples: airsacculitis, arthritis, ascites, cadaver, enteritis, erysipelas, generalized inflammatory process, neoplasms, nephritis, osteomyelitis, pericarditis, salpingitis, tenosynovitis)	**1.2%**
Other Consumer Protection (OCP-2) Condition- Miscellaneous (Examples: breast blister, bruises, external multilation, fractures, overscald, scabs, localized inflammatory process)	**56.6%**
Other Consumer Protection (OCP-3) Contamination - Digestive Content (Ingesta, crop, esophagus, intestine)	**12.7%**
Other Consumer Protection (OCP-4) Dressing Defects – Other (Examples: extraneous material, feathers, lung, oil gland, trachea, bile)	**95.9%**
Other Consumer Protection (OCP-5) Dressing Defects – Digestive Tract Tissue (Examples: bursa of fabricius, cloaca,	**7.5%**

* Conditions exhibiting a septicemia or toxemia are considered food safety hazards.

**Performance standards for OCP-1 through 5 are based on the 75th percentile of the ranges of baseline data from 16 Young Turkey slaughter plants.

YOUNG TURKEY HACCP-BASED INSPECTION MODELS PROJECT (HIMP)

The Young Turkey HIMP consists of three inspection activities: Carcass Inspection, Verification Inspection, and System Inspection.

Carcass Inspection

Carcass inspection is the post-mortem inspection of each carcass following the plant's sorting activities. The Carcass Inspector (CI) is stationed at a fixed location on the evisceration line

The Carcass Inspector (CI):

- Visually* inspects each carcass on the line, at a fixed location prior to the chiller.
    - Visually inspects the exterior of the carcasses as they are presented, to determine if they are adulterated.
    - Condemns carcasses that clearly exhibit condemnable conditions.
    - Hangs back carcasses if there is a question of whether the carcass is condemnable.
    - Diseases or conditions to be identified include:

Disease/Conditions**

Septicemia/Toxemia
Fecal contamination
Cadaver
Mutilation
Overscald
Generalized Conditions

*The CI inspection is meant to be hands-free, however, that does not mean hands-off. Any manipulation required should be rare.

****NOTE**: If inspection personnel condemn a carcass, the corresponding viscera will also be condemned, unless the carcass was condemned for fecal contamination, mutilation, or overscald. If the plant discards all viscera produced within the time period in which the carcass was condemned, individual viscera do not need to be identified. The Inspector-In-Charge (IIC)/Supervisory Public Health Veterinarian (SPHV) should record carcasses condemned by the CI on Draft HIMP Form- 14.

B. Identification of Defects by the Carcass Inspector (CI)

1. Food Safety Defects

a. AFTER Critical Control Point (CCP)

If the CI, located **after the establishment's CCP** for **FS-1 (Infectious Conditions)** or **FS-2 (Fecal Material Contamination)**, identifies an FS-1 or FS-2 defect he or she will:

- Stop the evisceration line, and verbally notify the establishment to hang the affected carcass back for condemnation or reprocessing. Once the carcass is removed from the evisceration line, the inspector will restart the line.
- Verbally notify the plant and the Inspector-In-Charge (IIC)/Supervisory Public Health Veterinarian (SPHV) of the finding(s).
- Document each finding on a Non-Compliance Record (NR), after leaving the CI fixed position, coded as an 03J01 procedure.
- Complete an 03J02 procedure after leaving the CI fixed position on the line (i.e., when rotated to verification inspection duty).

If a Verification Inspector (VI) finds additional food safety noncompliance in the same slaughter production lot, the VI will document each additional FS finding on a separate NR. All findings will be taken into consideration when the VI verifies the plant's corrective actions. (See "Verification Inspection" and Appendix 1, "Food Safety Documentation Procedures").

b. BEFORE Critical Control Point (CCP)

If the CI, located **before the establishment's CCP** for **FS-1 (Infectious Conditions)** or **FS-2 (Fecal Material Contamination),** identifies an FS-1 or FS-2 defect he or she will:

- Stop the evisceration line, and verbally notify the establishment to hang the affected carcass back for condemnation or reprocessing. Tally each FS-1 or FS-2 finding on a sheet of paper or other recording device.
- Once the carcass is removed from the evisceration line, the inspector will restart the line.
- Notify the IIC/SPHV if he or she believes that the dressing processes for visible fecal contamination may not be under control.

The IIC/SPHV will then:

- Evaluate the process
- Record FS defects on Draft HIMP Form-14 when notified by CI.
- Evaluate findings and determine if the defects indicate a system noncompliance. Document the noncompliance on an NR if it is determined that there is a system noncompliance
- Any regulatory non-compliance will be documented on a NR.

2. Other Consumer Protection (OCP) Defects

Condemns carcasses that clearly exhibit condemnable conditions. If the CI observes OCP defects that in their opinion may indicate a loss of process control they should inform the IIC/SPHV, who can then determine if a product/system assessment is necessary. This product/system assessment should be conducted by the IIC/SPHV through one or more of the following:

- Product observation at the CI station,
- Process verification (for example 04C01, 06D01 01C01/2, and 03J01/2 verifications),
- Utilization of HIMP-Tools data,
- Assess plant control charts and Statistical Process Control (SPC) data,
- Other records review.

If the IIC/SPHV determines that an unscheduled verification test should be performed, the decision should be documented by the IIC/SPHV on HIMP Form-14. The IIC/SPHV may also determine that other action is warranted, as indicated by the results of the product/system assessment and the OCP category/categories involved. Any action(s) taken are to be recorded on Draft HIMP Form 14.

If the CI observes OCP defects and/or generalized conditions occurring at a frequency that, in their opinion, is affecting their ability to properly perform their inspection duties, they should inform the IIC/SPHV, who can then determine if a product/system assessment is necessary. This product/system assessment should be conducted by the IIC/SPHV through:

- Product observation at the CI station,
- Process verification (for example 04C01, 06D01 01C01/2, and 03J01/2 verifications),
- Utilization of HIMP-Tools data,
- Assess plant control charts, and SPC data,
- Other records review.

If the IIC/SPHV determines through their systems assessment that the level of OCP defects reaching the CI station is affecting the ability of the CI to properly inspect as delineated in 9 CFR 381.65(a), then action should be taken. Actions to be considered by the IIC/SPHV include:

- *Unscheduled verification of product at the VI location*
- *Documentation on Draft HIMP form 14*
- *Unscheduled process verification checks (e.g., 04C01, 06D01, 01C01/02)*
- *Other process adjustment to facilitate proper inspection*

In considering the appropriate action, the IIC/SPHV will factor in the OCP defect category, the nature of the defect (e.g., intermittent or continuous), and plant response.

Verification Inspection

Verification inspection is a system verification activity that continuously monitors and evaluates the HACCP and OCP process control plans and determines whether the plant is meeting relevant regulatory requirements and performance standards.

A. The Verification Inspector (VI):

- Conducts scheduled and unscheduled sampling by examining carcasses, before the CI position, to determine if the plant is complying with relevant performance standards.
- Examines plant records to assist in determining if regulatory compliance exists.
- Verifies post-chill process control, as delineated in the plant's Process Control Plan (PCP). This can be either through a records review or through observation of plant personnel performing monitoring and/or verification of the post-chill component of the PCP.
- Verifies regulatory compliance through examination of plant records (including HACCP records, SSOP records, etc).
- Shows plant management all defects that are detected.
- Conducts ante-mortem inspection.

.

B. Food Safety Verification Procedures

1. Scheduled Food Safety Verification Sampling

The IIC/SPHV will:

- Schedule, prior to each shift, the randomized selection of eight 10-bird-sample sets per line.
- If the plant is engaged in product action to remedy a problem at the time a random sample is scheduled, the IIC will suspend random sample selection until the plant has completed its action.
- Compiles Draft HIMP Form-11 data for each shift.

The VI will:

- Inspect each carcass of the eight 10-bird-sample sets for FS-1 and FS-2 defect categories. (A finding of any FS-1 and FS-2 defects constitutes a failed set).
- Notify the IIC and plant of any failed sets.
- Record any food safety defects found on Draft HIMP Form-11.
- Document noncompliance on an NR (see below).

Notify the plant if any OCP defects are identified during the FS verification activities. These OCP defects are not scored on HIMP Form 11, but may be considered by the IIC in determining frequency/number of OCP verifications.

2. Unscheduled Food Safety Verification Sampling

Unscheduled Food Safety Verification Sampling is conducted in the same manner as Scheduled Food Safety Verification Sampling and the duties of the IIC/SPHV and the VI are also the same (See above), except that the IIC/SPHV determines whether and when to schedule additional sampling.

C. Food Safety Verification Documentation Procedures:

If the VI finds a food safety defect (FS-1 or FS-2), he or she will document the noncompliance on a NR.

- If the VI finds a food safety defect during a verification procedure, it is documented using either the 03J01 or 03J02 procedure code (See Appendix 1, "Food Safety Documentation Procedures").
- If the defect is documented using a 03J01 procedure code, the VI will also perform a 03J02 procedure to verify that all regulatory requirements have been met for this specific slaughter production lot. The VI will communicate the finding(s) to the IIC/SPHV. If during this production period, the CI (located after the CCP) or VI finds additional food safety defects, he or she will document these findings on separate NRs. All findings will be taken into consideration when the VI verifies the plant's corrective actions (See Appendix 1, "Food Safety Documentation Procedures").

D. Other Consumer Protection (OCP) Verification and Documentation Procedures

The IIC/SPHV will:

- Schedule, prior to each shift, the randomized selection of OCP-verification samples.
- Determine the correct OCP-verification-sample size per shift.

The sample size is determined by the number of evisceration lines and is composed of 10 bird-sample-sets. The minimum number of sample sets per line is two sets (20 birds) and the minimum number of birds per shift is 40. The two OCP-verification-sample sets per line will be randomly selected from the previously selected 8 food-safety-sample sets.

- Authorize shifting sampling from one line to another, if indicated.
- Compile Draft HIMP Form-11 data for each shift.
- Evaluate OCP-verification data for each shift using Table 1, "Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size" (See below) and record the findings on Draft HIMP From-13.
- Inform plant of its OCP performance status.

The VI will:

- Examine each carcass of the 10-bird-sample-set for the OCP defect categories.
- Notify the plant of any OCP defects.
- Record any defects found on Draft HIMP Form-11.

TABLE 1: Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size

	40 Bird Sample	50 Bird Sample	60 Bird Sample	70 Bird Sample	80 Bird Sample
OCP-1 Performance Standard*	1/40	1/50	1/60	1/70	2/80
OCP-2 Performance Standard*	25/40	31/50	37/60	43/70	49/80
OCP-3 Performance Standard*	7/40	8/50	10/60	11/70	13/80
OCP-4 Performance Standard*	40/40	50/50	60/60	70/70	80/80
OCP-5 Performance Standard*	4/40	5/50	6/60	7/70	8/80

***See page 3 for descriptions of OCP Performance Standard Categories**

E. Unscheduled Verification Sampling

The IIC/SPHV will:

- Initiate and coordinate all unscheduled verification sampling. The IIC/SPHV requests unscheduled testing at a frequency necessary to assess the process.
- Verify that results are recorded on Draft HIMP Form-11.
- Document on Draft HIMP Form-14, the reason(s) for the unscheduled sampling. In some cases, the IIC/SPHV may request unscheduled verification sampling because a VI or CI has identified a problem that must be addressed immediately. In other instances, the IIC/SPHV may allow the plant an opportunity to correct an identified problem and then request unscheduled verification sampling to confirm that the problem has been corrected.
- Notify the plant of the results of all direct-bird examinations and plant records examinations.

F. Evaluation of Verification Inspection for OCP-1 Performance Standards

For OCP-1 evaluation, the IIC will:

- Determine if a plant exceeds the **maximum limit** at any time during a shift (see Table 2, "OCP-1 Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes", below) using data accumulated from all Draft HIMP Form-11's.
- Provide the plant with a copy of Draft HIMP Form-12 showing any failure that exceeds the maximum limit.
- Issue a noncompliance record (NR) for the failure. Refer to Appendix 2, "OCP-1 Documentation Procedures".

TABLE 2: OCP-1 Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes (Carcasses with defects allowed per sample)

	40 Bird Sample	50 Bird Sample	60 Bird Sample	70 Bird Sample	80 Bird Sample
OCP-1 Performance Standard*	3/40	3/50	4/60	5/70	5/70

***See page 3 for descriptions of the OCP-1 Performance Standard Categories**

Plant action taken in response to an OCP Performance Standard failure:

- Maintain control of all identified product from the lot that exceeded the maximum limits. (Table 2, "OCP-1 Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes", above).
- Immediately conduct post-chill sampling of a minimum of 40 birds.
- If the post-chill sample exceeds the maximum limit (Table 2, "OCP-1 Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes", above) rework all of the represented product using good commercial practices for handling and reconditioning.
- After all product represented by the post-chill sample has been reworked, test a randomly selected subgroup of reworked product.
- If the tested subgroup exceeds the baseline maximum limits, again rework all represented product.
- Conduct pre-chill testing until re-establishment of process control is demonstrated by test results that show that pre-chill OCP-1 levels are at or below the performance standard for the appropriate sample size in Table 1, "Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size".
- Once process control is re-established, birds should be marked and placed in the chiller.
- Continue testing birds at post-chill until all of the marked birds have exited the chiller.
- Assess the cause(s) of the maximum limit failure including appropriate evaluation of the Process Control Plan.
- Respond to the NR that documented the failure of the OCP-1 maximum limits.(Table 2, "OCP-1 Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes")

The IIC/SPHV will (during rework):

- Conduct or assign verification of plant segregation, identification, product control, and rework processes.
- Record observations, results, and actions on Draft HIMP Form-14.
- Initiate an unscheduled OCP verification check to verify that the process is under control. Utilize the performance standard as set for OCP-1 in Table 1, "Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size")
- Restart Table 1, "Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size" testing.

G. Extended Process Evaluation for OCP Performance Standards (25 day period[1])

The IIC/SPHV will:

- Evaluate plant performance for OCP-1 through 5 defects, using the Draft HIMP Form-11 compiled data compared with Table 1, "Maximum Allowable Number of OCP Defects in a Given Sample Size", over a 25-day period for each OCP category.
- Use Table 3, "Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May Be Exceeded", to assess whether the plant has exceeded the 25-day limits.
- Record on Draft HIMP From-13 the plant performance for the 25-day period on a per shift basis.
- Notify the plant of its daily accomplishments.
- Issue an NR, if at any point within the 25-day period the 25-day limit, listed in Table 3, "Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performances Standards May Be Exceeded" (See below), and is exceeded for any OCP category. (See Appendix 2, "OCP-1 Documentation Procedures").

The plant must:

- Reassess its Process Control Plan when the Table 3, "Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May Be Exceeded", maximum days are exceeded.
- Meet with the IIC/SPHV to describe corrective and preventive actions.
- Respond to the NR that documented the plant's failure in exceeding the maximum days for any OCP categories.

TABLE 3: Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May Be Exceeded (Per 25-Day Period)

OCP-1	OCP-2	OCP-3	OCP-4	OCP-5
5 Days	8 Days	6 Days	N/A	7 Days

[1] A 25-day period will end at a full 25 days provided that the Table 3 Maximum Allowable Days are not exceeded. If the Table 3 Maximum Allowable Days are exceeded before 25 days are completed, e.g. on the 13th day, the period stops and an NR is issued. The IIC/SPHV begins a new 25-day period at that time.

H. Examination of OCP Plant Records

The IIC/SPHV or VI will:

- Examine and review the plant's OCP-sampling records four times per line per shift. Plant records examination may also include observations of plant sample selection and data recording procedures.
- Record the results of plant-records reviews on Draft HIMP Form-14 (IIC/SPHV only).

The IIC/SPHV or VI may:

- Examine and review fewer than four of the plant's OCP-sampling records if more direct-bird-OCP examinations are conducted on a line, for example, when unscheduled verification sampling is conducted (see Unscheduled Verification Sampling Section, below).

I. Ante-mortem Inspection and Records Examination

1. Ante-mortem Inspection

   The IIC/SPHV will:

   - Randomly select, prior to the start of the shift, the scheduled ante-mortem sampling time.
   - Inspect live birds, or assign VI to inspect birds, at least once per shift.
   - Request unscheduled live-bird examinations, as appropriate.
   - Record results on Draft HIMP Form-14.

2. Ante-mortem Records Examination

   The IIC/SPHV will:

   - Randomly select the times for the ante-mortem records checks, prior to the start of the shift.
   - Review, or assign the VI to review, ante-mortem records, at least once per shift.
   - Request unscheduled record verifications, as appropriate.
   - Record results on Draft HIMP Form-14.

J. Off-Line Verification (See Appendix 4, "Off-Line Salvage and Reprocessing")

The VI will:

- Inspect reworked parts at the point designated in the plant's HACCP or Process Control Plan.
- Inspect reworked parts at the specified plant salvage area
- Individual parts shall be passed or condemned.

The CI will:

- Inspect visually each carcass or major portion at the carcass inspection station.

System Inspection

The IIC/SPHV is responsible for the following activities:

- Assessing the overall design and execution of all the plant processes under its HACCP and process control procedures.
- Supervising the effectiveness of carcass and verification inspection.
- Conducting a product/system assessment when an unscheduled verification test is requested. The product/system assessment should be conducted through product observation at the CI station, process verification, or records review. If the IIC/SPHV determines that an unscheduled verification test should be performed, the decision should be documented by the IIC/SPHV on HIMP Form-14.
- Verify, or delegate the verification, of performance standards when notified by the CI, and at other scheduled or unscheduled times.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of the establishments TOC procedures through verification to ensure adequate removal of unwholesome tissues.
- Regularly conducting defect correlation meeting activities with the plant management. The Agency expects that correlation will be frequent and ongoing.
- Completing Draft HIMP Form 14 on a daily basis. Also recording, on Draft HIMP Form 14, flock test results and Verification/Corrective Action procedures which were performed, i.e. records review, organoleptic examination, ante-mortem examination, unscheduled verifications.
- Verify that all inspectors are utilizing safe work habits including the use of stop buttons and buzzers.
- Determines when a plant that is in corrective action has had enough time to implement corrective action before FSIS conducts a verification test.
- Records post-chill process control verification results on HIMP form 14.
- Routinely uses the HIMP-Tool and evaluates plant process control charts to assess process control in the establishment, take appropriate actions, as necessary, and document any actions on Draft HIMP Form 14. If the IIC determines that a trend or history of noncompliance is occurring, the Frontline supervisor is to be notified for further evaluation. [2]
- Retain records for two fiscal years prior to the present FY. For example, on October 1, 2005 (FY 06) discard any records prior to October 1, 2003 (FY 03).

[2] Upon review of available data, it may be determined that a 30-Day reevaluation letter is to be issued to the plant.

Appendix 1

Food Safety Documentation Procedures

Major points:

- All food safety noncompliance for a specific slaughter production lot are documented on separate NRs coded as an 03J01. This includes all FS findings by the VI and may include product from multiple lines.
- The HACCP plan defines production lots.
- FSIS Verification tests for sep/tox and for the zero visible fecal material food safety standard are conducted prior to the CI regardless of the location of any plant CCPs..
- The quality of the documentation for all NRs should be sufficient to justify subsequent Agency system verification actions.

Examples:

1. A plant's HACCP plan designates product lots on a time basis of 2 hours of production. Assume: The FS-1 CCP is located at the final wash. The FS-2 CCP is located after the CI.

At 8 am, the Line 2 VI finds a bird with fecal contamination while conducting a 03J01 procedure. He/she issues an NR and notifies the plant and the IIC/SPHV. The plant implements corrective actions in compliance with 9 CFR § 417.3. Fifteen minutes later, the Line 1 CI condemns a bird for sep-tox. The Line 1 CI also notifies the plant and the IIC/SPHV of this finding. In this example, the Line 1 CI would document his/her FS-1 findings on a separate NR. Both inspectors would verify the plant's corrective actions as part of the 03J02 procedure.

At 2 PM (which would be in a different production lot), the Line 1 CI, finds a bird with fecal contamination. He/she stops the line, has the affected carcass removed from the line, notifies the IIC/SPHV and tallies the FS-2 finding.

2. The plant's HACCP plan describes a product lot as one day's production.

At 10 am, the Line 3 CI, located before the FS-2 CCP, finds a bird with fecal contamination. He/she stops the line, has the affected bird removed, notifies the plant and the IIC/SPHV, and tallies the FS-2 findings. At 10:05 am, the Line 3 VI, while conducting an 01 procedure, finds a bird with fecal contamination. The Line 3 VI also notifies the plant, the Line 3 CI, and the IIC/SPHV. At 3 PM (the same production lot), the Line 2 VI finds an additional bird with fecal contamination. He/she also notifies the plant, and the IIC/SPHV. In this example, the Line 3 VI is responsible for documenting a 03J01 NR and ensuring completion of the 03J02 procedure including verification of the corrective actions. The Line 2 VI is also responsible for documenting a 03J01 NR and ensuring completion of the 03J02 procedure including verification of the corrective actions. The IIC/SPHV is responsible for coordinating the documentation of all of the findings and determining the appropriate conclusions based on the findings.

3. The plant's HACCP Plan has a CCP after the Carcass Inspector.

At 10 am, the Line 3 CI, located before the zero fecal tolerance CCP, finds a bird with fecal contamination. He/she notifies the plant, has the affected carcass removed from the line, and notifies the IIC/SPHV and the VI of the finding and tallies the finding on a sheet of paper or other recording device. No other fecal defects are identified for this lot. The IIC/SPHV is responsible for coordinating all findings of food-safety noncompliance and for determining the appropriate conclusions based on those findings.

4. The HACCP Plan has a FS-2 CCP before the CI.

At 8 am, the Line 2 CI, located after the plant's zero fecal tolerance CCP, finds a bird with fecal contamination. He/she notifies the plant and the IIC/SPHV and has the affected carcass removed from the line. The plant would implement corrective actions according to 9 CFR § 417.3. In this example, the Line 2 CI would document his/her findings on an NR as part of a 03J01 procedure and ensure completion of the 03J02 procedure, including verification of the corrective actions, upon rotating into the VI position.

Appendix 2

OCP-1 Documentation Procedures

Major points:

- The relevant regulatory citation for a failure of either OCP-1 Maximum Limits or Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May be Exceeded for an OCP-1 Performance Standard is 9 CFR § 381.3(b).
- The noncompliance classification indicator for a failure of either OCP-1 Maximum Limits or Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May be exceeded for an OCP-1 Performance Standard is Product, economic, 04C01.

Examples of Documentation :

1. An example of a noncompliance description for a failure to meet the OCP-1 Maximum Limits (Table 2,) follows:

   At 1300 hours during a verification sampling procedure for OCP-1 in *[insert name of plant]*, a *[insert number of lines*]-line plant, the OCP-1 Maximum Limits from Table 2 "Maximum Limits for Various Sample Sizes" of the Young Turkey Inspection HIMP draft 3, 2/18/2003 were exceeded. (Line 3 at 0630 hours – 3 airsacculitis, Line 2 at 1000 hours – 1 IP, Line 3 at 1300 hours – 4 airsacculitis, for a total of 8 defects out of 60 birds sampled). Notified *[insert name of notified persons]*.

2. An example of a noncompliance description for a failure to meet the Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May be Exceeded for an OCP-1 Performance Standard (Table 3,) follows:

For the 25-day period from Jan 11 to Feb 14, 2001, the Maximum Allowable Days OCP Performance Standards May be Exceeded for an OCP-1 Performance Standard were exceeded on [*insert appropriate date, i.e., the date on which the allowable number of days was exceeded*]. As documented on Draft HIMP Form-13, the OCP-1 performance standard was exceeded on the following dates: [*insert appropriate dates*]. Notified [*insert appropriate name*].

Appendix 3

Poultry Pre-Chill Inspection Station

Major points:

- The carcass inspection station is to be established at or after the zero tolerance verification location, i.e. between the final wash and before the chill step.
- Facility requirements must include:

1. A level conveyor line for the entire length of the inspection station.
2. At least 4 feet of space for the inspector on the inspection stand.
3. A minimum of 200 foot-candles of shadow-free lighting with minimum color rendering index of 85.
4. An "on-line" hand- rinsing facility for the inspector and helper, if a helper is present.
5. Hang back racks positioned within easy reach of the inspector.
6. A buzzer switch for notifying plant management.
7. A condemn barrel.
8. A clipboard for recording observed conditions.
9. A conveyor line stop/start switch located within easy reach of the inspector.
10. A helper or an alternative plan, for carcass removal, provided by the plant

Presentation of carcasses must include the following:

1. One carcass per shackle (occasional double hung carcasses may be permitted).
2. Both carcass hocks must be in the shackle (occasional double hung carcasses may be permitted).
3. Consistent presentation with the back of the carcasses toward the inspector.
4. Minimal carcass swinging motion.

Safety issues to be addressed must include:

1. TSP spray (e.g., barrier to prevent TSP from contacting inspector; goggles if requested by inspector).
2. Water spray.
3. High traffic area.
4. Overhead structures.

Appendix 4
Off-Line Salvage and Reprocessing

Major points:

- Regarding salvage and reprocessing requirements, the plant must have in its HACCP or Process Control Plan an efficient and effective means of controlling salvaged and reprocessed product.
- The plant will determine where salvaged and reprocessed carcasses or "major portions" (as defined at 9 CFR § 381.170(b)(22)) are capable of being re-hung on the main evisceration line. The plant may propose an alternative method to hanging carcasses back on the line as long as it does not affect the efficiency of verification activities.
- FSIS will inspect each carcass that is moved to off-line salvage or reprocessing.
- FSIS will verify, to the extent necessary, salvage and reprocessing process control.

Plants must:

- Conduct a hazard assessment of all off-line salvage and reprocessing practices in accordance with 9 CFR § 417.2.
- Identify a sanitary means of handling product that is directed off-line.
- Maintain control of identified product.
- Rework product using good commercial practices for handling and reconditioning.
- Have each reworked carcass inspected by the CI by re-hanging on the main evisceration line all such carcasses and major portions unless an alternate procedure is proposed in the plants HACCP and Process Control Plan.
- Present for inspection at a specified location all edible parts that are not able to be re-hung on the main evisceration line.