codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

ALINORM 05/28/16

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Twenty-eighth Session

Rome, Italy, 4 - 9 July 2005

REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT HYGIENE

Christchurch, New Zealand, 14 -17 February 2005

Note: *This report includes Codex Circular Letter CL 2005/8-MH*

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

CX 5/25 **CL 2005/8-MH**
February 2005

TO: Codex Contact Points
Interested International Organizations

FROM: Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission,
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy

SUBJECT: **Distribution of the Report of the Eleventh Session of the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene (ALINORM 05/28/16)**

The report of the Eleventh Session of the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene (CCMH) is attached. It will be considered by the 28th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Rome, 4 - 9 July 2005)

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS/INFORMATION

Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat, at Step 6 of the Codex Procedure (ALINORM 05/28/16, Appendix II). See also paras 11 through 67 of this report.

Governments and interested international organizations in observer status with Codex are invited to comment on the above document and should do so in conformity with the *Guide to the Consideration of Standards at Step 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards including Consideration of any Statements relating to Economic Impact* of the *Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and Related Texts* (Codex Alimentarius, Procedural Manual, Fourteenth Edition, pages 26-27) . Comments should be forwarded to the Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy (fax +39 06 57054593; e-mail codex@fao.org), ***preferably by e-mail***, **not later than 30 April 2005.**

Contents

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Eleventh Session of the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene reached the following conclusions:

The Committee agreed:

- to forward the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat to the 28th Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (see para. 66 and Appendix II);
- to request the Commission to revoke the following Codex texts: *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat* (CAC/RCP 11-1976, Rev. 1-1993); *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Game* (CAC/RCP 29-1983, Rev. 1-1993); *Recommended International Code for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals and for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Judgment of Slaughter Animals and Meat* (CAC/RCP 41-1993); *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat and Poultry Products* (CAC/RCP 13-1976, Rev. 1 (1985); *Recommended Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing* (CAC/RCP 14-1976); *Recommended International Code of Practice for the Production, Storage and Composition of Mechanically Separated Meat Intended for Further Processing* (CAC/RCP 32-1293) as superseded by the draft Code (see para. 66);
- to request the Commission to revoke the *General Principles for Meat Hygiene* (CAC/GL 52-2003) adopted by the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which were included in Section 4 of the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat (see para. 67).

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMISSION:

The Committee:

- noted that it had accomplished the work assigned to it by the Commission and agreed that, until such a time as the Commission would require it to undertake further work, it should remain adjourned *sine die* (see para. 68).

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO OTHER COMMITTEES:

Codex Committee on General Principles:

The Committee:

- noted the risk analysis definitions on Food Safety Objective, Performance Objective and Performance Criterion adopted by the 27th Session of the CAC on an interim basis and recommended that the Codex Committee on General Principles propose these definitions for final adoption. The Committee used these definitions as appropriate in the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat being elaborated at this Session. It also noted that definitions for "process criterion" and "risk-based" were elaborated for use in the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat and, as they had generic application, there was a need for their definition and application in a harmonized way throughout the Codex system (see paras 6-7).

  Process criterion - The physical process control parameters (e.g. time, temperature) at a specified step that can be applied to achieve a performance objective or performance criterion.
  Risk-based - Containing any performance objective, performance criterion or process criterion developed according to risk analysis principles.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

AGA	Animal Production and Health Division (of FAO)
ALOP	Appropriate Level of Health Protection
BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
CAC/RCP	Codex Alimentarius Commission / Recommended Code of Practice
CAC/GL	Codex Alimentarius Commission / Guidelines
CCFH	Codex Committee on Food Hygiene
CCGP	Codex Committee on General Principles
CCMH	Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene
CL	Circular Letter
CRD	Conference Room Document
ESN	Food and Nutrition Division (of FAO)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSO	Food Safety Objectives
GHP	Good Hygienic Practices
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
JEMRA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment
OIE	Office International des Epizooties / International Office of Epizootics
QA	Quality Assurance (systems)
RTE	Ready to Eat
SLDBs	Small and Less Developed Businesses
SSOP	Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures
WHO	World Health Organization

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The 11th Session of the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene was held in Christchurch, New Zealand from 14-17 February 2005 at the kind invitation of the Government of New Zealand. The Session was opened and chaired by Dr Andrew McKenzie, Executive Director, New Zealand Food Safety Authority. The Session was attended by delegates from 36 Member countries and one Member organization[1] and observers from 5 international organizations. A complete List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)[2]

2. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as the Agenda for the Session. It agreed to consider the information from FAO and OIE under Agenda Item 2.

3. The Delegation of the European Community presented CRD 1 on the division of competence between the European Community and its Member States according to Rule II.5 of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

MATTERS REFERRED FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 2)[3]

4. The Committee noted matters arising from the 27th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Rome, 28 June – 3 July 2004) regarding the Amendments to the Procedural Manual; Strategic Planning of the Codex Alimentarius Commission; Action Plan for Codex-wide Development and Application of Risk Analysis Principles and Guidelines; Review of the Mandates of Codex Committees and Task Forces; FAO/WHO Project and Trust Fund for Enhanced Participation in Codex; Relations between the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other International Organizations; and Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

5. In particular, the Committee commented and/or made decisions on the following matters:

Risk Analysis Definitions

6. The Committee noted the risk analysis definitions on Food Safety Objective, Performance Objective and Performance Criterion adopted by the 27th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission on an interim basis and recommended that the Codex Committee on General Principles propose these definitions for final adoption. The Committee used these definitions as appropriate in the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat being elaborated at this Session (see also para 17).

7. The Committee also noted that definitions for "process criterion" and "risk-based" were elaborated for use in the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat and, as they had generic application, there was a need for their definition and application in a harmonized way throughout the Codex system.

Information from the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)

8. The Representative of FAO informed the Committee of recent activities of the FAO Food and Nutrition Division (ESN) and of the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA), in particular reference was made to the launch in 2004 of the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) which provides users with information on international standards, national regulations, scientific evaluations, etc. The Representative indicated that FAO/WHO were reviewing the provision of scientific advice to Codex and member countries and that this will include procedural guidelines, management options and improved coordination. A number of new publications in the FAO/WHO Microbiological Risk Assessment Series were noted. FAO/WHO were also developing tools to assist countries in using risk analysis and working to enhance their participation in Codex. Work was also in progress on the Application of HACCP in Small and Less Developed Businesses (SLDBs).

---

1 CRD 1 (EC Annotated Agenda for the 11th Session of the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene).

2 CX/MH 05/11/1.

3 CX/MH 05/11/2; CRD 2 (OIE contribution to Agenda Item 3); CRD 3 (Comments from the European Community); CRD 6 (Information on FAO/ESN Activities for CCMH); CRD 7 (Information on FAO/AGA Activities for CCMH).

9. The Representative drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that FAO continues to work with countries world-wide through its Regular Programme, Technical Cooperation Programmes (TCP) and General Cooperation Programmes (GCP) with the objective of implementing the work of Codex. There have been regional workshops on Good Practices for the Meat and Livestock Sector in Windhoek, Namibia in April 2004 and Good Practices for the Poultry Industry in Hammamet, Tunisia in September 2004. Further workshops are planned for Egypt and Kenya during 2005. Also in 2005, FAO will host an Expert Consultation on Capacity Building for Surveillance and Prevention of Zoonotic Diseases. Attention was also drawn to the new resources on meat safety that have recently been developed including a new Manual of Good Practices for the Meat Industry; Guidelines for Humane Handling, Transport and Slaughter of Livestock; Manual on Meat Inspection for Developing Countries; and others.

Information from the Office International of Epizootics (OIE)

10. The Observer of the OIE informed the Committee about recent activities of the OIE Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety, in particular as it related to the development of the Draft Guide to Good Farming Practices which has been circulated as CRD 2. The Observer encouraged the members of the Committee to provide their comments to the OIE in due course.

DRAFT CODE OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE FOR MEAT (Agenda Item 3)[4]

11. The Committee recalled that at its 10th Session it had agreed to incorporate the provisions for processed meat in the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat and to attach as an integral part of the Code, the Annexes on "Risk-Based Evaluation of Organoleptic Post-Mortem Inspection Procedures for Meat" and "Verification of Process Control of Meat Hygiene by Microbiological Testing". The draft text was circulated for comments at Step 6 for consideration at this present Session.

12. The Committee also recalled that paragraph 11 of the Code provided a description of the Code's hierarchical structure with General Principles of Meat Hygiene in Section 4, subsets of general principles in double-line boxes, general text for each section, and then more prescriptive texts in single-line boxes that was based on current knowledge and practice.

13. At its 10th Session, the Committee agreed on definitions for the purpose of the draft Code and noted that it would be necessary to realign the definitions of risk analysis terms and make consequential changes throughout the text to this effect.

14. The Committee considered the draft Code section by section and, in addition to editorial amendments and some corrections to the French and Spanish version of the Code, it agreed to the following changes:

General Comments

15. The Committee noted that the nature of the comments submitted to the current Session ranged from substantial through to editorial and consequential. It agreed not to reopen a debate on those comments for which agreement had been reached at previous meetings.

16. The Committee replaced the term "examined" with "inspected" throughout the text in accordance with the decision at its 10th Session on the use of the terms "examination" versus "inspection". Similarly the term "carcass" was replaced with "body of animal" where appropriate.

17. In accordance with its decision regarding the risk analysis definitions adopted by the 27th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (see para. 6), the Committee agreed to replace the term "performance criteria" with "performance objective or performance criterion" as appropriate throughout the Code.

---

[4] ALINORM 04/27/16, Appendix II and comments at Step 6 submitted by Australia, Canada, Colombia, European Community, Egypt, Sudan (CX/MH 05/11/3); Argentina, United States of America (CX/MH 05/11/3, Add.1), New Zealand Secretariat (CRD 4), India (CRD 5); Thailand (CRD 8), Costa Rica (CRD 9), Indonesia (CRD 10) and Japan (CRD 11). Reports of Working Groups (CRDs 12-16).

Specific Comments

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

18. At the beginning of paragraph 3, the Committee added "At the national level" to more accurately reflect the content of the paragraph. It similarly modified footnote (1) to refer to the OIE on-going work on the guidelines for application at national level addressing 'ante- and post-mortem activities in the production of meat to reduce hazards of public and animal health significance'. It deleted the last part of the footnote to avoid the possible misinterpretation that Codex was delegating part of its public health functions to the OIE.

SECTION 2 - SCOPE AND USE OF THIS CODE

19. Similarly, paragraph 10 was amended to avoid the possible misinterpretation that Codex was delegating part of its public health functions to the OIE and to highlight that the Code contained linkages with the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code to enhance consistency between OIE and Codex texts.

SECTION 3 - DEFINITIONS

20. In accordance with its previous decision (see para. 6), the Committee aligned the risk analysis definition for "Food Safety Objective" and added "Performance Objective" and "Performance Criterion" as adopted by the 27th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The definition for "Performance Criteria" was deleted.

21. The Committee amended the definition for "Process Criteria" to "The physical process control parameters (e.g. time, temperature) at a specified step that can be applied to achieve a performance objective or performance criterion" and the definition for "Risk-based" to "Containing any performance objective performance criterion or process criterion developed according to risk analysis principles". In noting that a draft definition for "Process criterion" was under discussion in the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene and that Codex had not yet developed a definition for "Risk-based", it added a footnote to both definitions to the effect that they were working definitions for the purpose of the Code and subject to consequential changes as a result of future discussion in Codex.

22. The Committee recognised the need to add a definition for the term "Validation" to avoid confusion with the term "Verification". The new definition reads "Obtaining evidence that the food hygiene control measure or measures selected to control a hazard in a food is capable of effectively and consistently controlling the hazard to the appropriate level". Similarly to the previous decision, it added a footnote to the effect that it was a working definition for the purpose of the Code and subject to change to consequential future discussion in Codex.

23. It placed the definition for "Verification" before that for "Verification (operator)" as more appropriate both in terms of listing the terms alphabetically and to the document. To fully distinguish the term from "Verification" as performed by the competent authority, the Committee included "by the operator" in the definition for "Verification (operator)".

24. The Committee agreed to remove the square brackets from the definition for "Veterinary Inspector" while maintaining the text unchanged.

25. It also agreed that the definitions would be listed in alphabetical order in both the French and Spanish versions of the Code.

SECTION 4 - GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE

26. The Committee agreed to include in this section the text of the "Codex *General Principles of Meat Hygiene*" (CAC/GL 52-2003) and to request the 28th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission to withdraw the General Principles text from the Codex Alimentarius.

SECTION 5 - PRIMARY PRODUCTION

27. For clarity the last sentence of paragraph 15 was amended to refer to the presence of certain zoonotic agents which were not detectable by routine organoleptic or laboratory tests and where special measures might need to be taken; and the example of possible exposure to cysticercosis was added.

SECTION 5.2 - HYGIENE OF SLAUGHTER ANIMALS

28. The third bullet of the first box in paragraph 19 was modified to "provide monitoring and surveillance systems that …" to maintain consistency with the second bullet of the second box. In the first bullet of the second box the first instance of "unsafe" was removed and the footnote was moved to the second instance of the term.

29. The third bullet in paragraph 21 was modified to read "conditions causing animal stress may exist or arise that are likely to result in an adverse impact on the safety and suitability of meat".

SECTION 5.4 - HYGIENE OF FEEDINGSTUFF

30. The Committee agreed that, although provisions for feed and feed ingredients were already adequately covered by the Codex *Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding* (CAC/RCP 54-2004), it was important to keep some paragraphs in the text to highlight key elements.

31. The term "Feedingstuff" was changed to "Feed and feed ingredients" in the title and throughout the Code for consistency with the language used in the Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding. The footnote to the title was removed as no longer valid and a footnote was added to the first sentence of paragraph 24 to refer to the Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding. In the last sentence of paragraph 30, "and testing protocol" was added to include the concept of considering specific test methodologies.

SECTION 5.5 - HYGIENE OF ENVIRONMENT

32. The title of the section was changed to refer to the hygiene of the primary production environment. In the third bullet of the first box the term fertilizer was removed as it was not possible to monitor such items at the level of small scale farmers/primary producers, especially in developing countries.

SECTION 5.6.1 - TRANSPORT OF SLAUGHTER ANIMALS

33. The last bullet of the first box of paragraph 32 was amended to clarify that animal stress could impact on the safety of meat.

SECTION 5.6.2 - TRANSPORT OF KILLED WILD GAME

34. In paragraph 34, the first sentence was amended to acknowledge that killed wild game was only partially dressed in the field; the second sentence was modified to read "The use of these vehicles for this purpose …" for clarity.

SECTION 6. - PRESENTATION OF ANIMAL FOR SLAUGHTER

35. The Committee moved paragraph 43, duly amended, as a new paragraph 36 bis (renumbered paragraph 37) as it referred to the screening of animals upon arrival at the abattoir and it was not part of ante-mortem inspection.

SECTION 6.2 - CONDITIONS OF LAIRAGE

36. The Committee deleted the example of classification of animals by age in the third bullet of the box of paragraph 39 (renumbered paragraph 40) as it could not be generally applied to all species and could be misleading.

SECTION 6.3.2 - IMPLEMENTATION OF ANTE-MORTEM INSPECTION

37. The first bullet in the box of paragraph 48 was revised for clarity and to provide the flexibility of using some means other than a certificate to demonstrate animals have passed ante-mortem inspection at primary production, to read "provide verifiable information required by the competent authority with respect to ante-mortem inspection carried out at primary production".

38. The last sentence of paragraph 49 was amended to read "If ante-mortem inspection has occurred and there is a delay of more than 24 hours before slaughter, ante-mortem inspection should be repeated" to make the sentence more clear.

SECTION 6.3.3 - INFORMATION ON ANIMALS PRESENTED FOR SLAUGHTER

39. The reference to the destination of condemned animals was removed from the last bullet of the box in Section 6.3.3 as it is covered by national legislation.

SECTION 8.4 - DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF AREAS WHERE BODIES OF ANIMALS ARE DRESSED OR MEAT MAYBE OTHERWISE BE PRESENT

40. In paragraph 68 the verb "allow" was changed with "facilitate" for consistency with the language used in paragraph 73.

SECTION 8.6 - WATER SUPPLY

41. In paragraph 80, the Committee specified that where non-potable water is supplied, the reticulation system should be designed and appropriately identified so as to prevent cross-contamination of potable water.

SECTION 8.8 - FACILITIES AND EQUIPEMENT FOR PERSONAL HYGIENE

42. In the first bullet of the first box of paragraph 85, the term "where necessary" was changed with "in the appropriate locations" as it was more precise.

SECTION 9 - PROCESS CONTROL

43. The Committee deleted the example of *Clostridium perfringens* in paragraph 86 as not appropriate. Paragraph 89 was clarified by specifying that ready-to-eat products might require specific microbiological testing regimes that incorporate microbiological criteria. It also added a footnote related to the Codex *Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods* (CAC/GL 21-1997).

SECTION 9.1 - PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO PROCESS CONTROL

44. In bullet (iii) of the double-line box, "the level of" before "microbiological contamination" was deleted as redundant.

SECTION 9.2.2 - HACCP

45. In paragraph 99, "for many products" was added at the end of the sentence as microbiological testing for verification of HACCP systems was unnecessary for some products, including canned meat. For clarification, the example in paragraph 101 was changed to a pasteurised product.

SECTION 9.2.3 - OUTCOME-BASED PARAMETERS FOR PROCESSED CONTROL

46. The Committee deleted the example of "zero tolerance" for visible faecal contamination in paragraph 106 to avoid misinterpretation as to its meaning. In paragraph 108, the example and the accompanying phrase was moved to follow "regulatory requirements" as the example described the regulatory requirements rather than the linkage to consumer protection. Paragraph 110 was deleted in its entirety as it repeated paragraph 105.

SECTION 9.2.4 - REGULATORY SYSTEMS

47. The Committee divided paragraph 114 (renumbered paragraph 113) into two paragraphs to better specify the role of the competent authority (paragraph 114 – renumbered paragraph 113) and the role of the official inspector (paragraph 114 bis – renumbered paragraph 114).

SECTION 9.3 - GENERAL HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCESS CONTROL

48. The Committee changed "application" with "monitoring the achievement" in the second bullet of the box in paragraph 118 as more appropriate.

SECTION 9.4 - HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR SLAUGHTER AND DRESSING

49. Paragraph 120 was modified to better specify that only animals used for stock handling could enter the abattoir, provided that they stay in the live animal handling area of the abattoir. In the second last bullet in the box of paragraph 122 "meet required criteria for process control" was replaced at the end of the sentence for clarity.

SECTION 9.5.1 - DESIGN OF POST-MORTEM INSPECTION SYSTEMS

50. In the tenth bullet of the box in paragraph 136, the example was deleted for consistency with a previous decision (see para. 46).

SECTION 9.6 - POST-MORTEM JUDGEMENT

51. The second sentence of paragraph 143 was changed with the following sentence "The level of training, knowledge, skills and ability required for judgement may be less in situations where edible parts demonstrating a specific abnormality are always judged to be unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption and appropriately disposed of" to improve the clarity of the concept. The examples in the fourth and fifth bullets of the box in paragraph 144 were deleted as not relevant.

SECTION 9.7 - HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCESS CONTROL AFTER POST-MORTEM INSPECTION

52. In the fourth bullet of the fifth box in paragraph 151, "during and" was added before "after heating" to make the text more inclusive.

SECTION 9.9 - RECALL SYSTEMS

53. The Committee noted that at its last meeting it had agreed that there was need for further discussion and work on this Section. It considered the drafts (CRDs 12 and 16) prepared by a Working Group which met during the Session and which took into consideration the written comments submitted. The drafts resulted in a more appropriate text and a more accurate reflection of the communication expectations associated with the removal of products that are in circulation. The Committee agreed with the proposals: to rename the section "Systems for removing products that are in circulation"; to highlight the need to inform the competent authority when an establishment operator removes products for public health reasons; to specify that the systems should be capable of withdrawing, recalling and detaining products as relevant to the circumstances; to specify the competent authority's verification role; and to provide for the main elements of the system.

SECTION 11.1 – PERSONAL CLEANLINESS

54. In the last bullet of the box in paragraph 168 (renumbered paragraph 169), the Committee changes "amenities" with "locations" as more appropriate.

ANNEX I - RISK-BASED EVALUATION OF ORGANOLEPTIC POST-MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR MEAT

55. The Committee recalled that the purpose of this Annex was to present a framework for developing organoleptic post-mortem inspection procedures as they apply to public health protection. The Committee deleted the footnote in the title as a definition for "risk-based" was already included in the Code.

INTRODUCTION

56. The footnote referencing the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat in paragraph 1 was deleted as no longer relevant.

57. The Committee reversed the order of paragraphs 3 and 4 (renumbered paragraphs 5 and 3) to improve the clarity of the flow of the narrative. It agreed to add an additional paragraph 3 bis (renumbered paragraph 4) to highlight that in the absence of risk assessments, other sources of scientific data on food-borne risks to human health could be used.

SECTION 2 - OBJECTIVES OF RISK-BASED POST-MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR MEAT

58. In second bullet of paragraph 5 (renumbered paragraph 6) "preventing meat borne risk" was replaced by "reducing risk by preventing exposure to meat borne hazards" for clarity.

SECTION 3.1 - RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

59. The second sentence in paragraph 6 (renumbered paragraph 7)in relation to risk management activities was aligned with Codex wording.

SECTION 4 - GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RISK-BASED POST-MORTEM MEAT INSPECTION PROCEDURES

60. In the last part of the first bullet under (ii) "the greatest extent appropriate and practicable" was deleted as not appropriate.

SECTION 5.3 - PERFORMANCE ATTRIBUTES

61. The Committee amended the title to "Sensitivity" and agreed to change the content of the section as proposed by a Working Group in CRD 13, with the understanding that paragraph 16 related to sensitivity of a post-mortem inspection procedures would follow paragraph 14 (renumbered paragraph 15).

ANNEX II - VERIFICATION OF PROCESS CONTROL OF MEAT HYGIENE BY MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING

INTRODUCTION

62. The Committee recognized that with the inclusion in the Code of the new risk analysis definitions for "performance objective' and "performance criterion" adopted by the Commission, there was a need to replace the generic term "performance criteria" with more specific terms as appropriate to microbiological verification of process control. The Committee agreed that where reference was made to risk based verification of process control, the terms "performance objective" and "performance criterion" would be used; and where reference was made to verification of process control using more general criteria, the term "microbiological testing" would be used.

SECTION 4.1 - SPECIFICATIONS

63. The Committee deleted the sentence in paragraph 9 in relation to achieving compliance with microbiological performance criteria at a particular step as this concept was already covered in the text.

SECTION 4.2 - FREQUENCY OF VERIFICATION

64. The title of this section was amended to "Frequency of sampling" as it better reflected its content.

SECTION 4.4 - REGULATORY APPLICATION

65. The Committee amended the first sentence in paragraph 17 by changing "cut-offs" to "limits" for clarification purposes and deleted a specific example on "moving windows" in the last sentence of this paragraph as a comprehensive list of examples was not prepared.

Status of the Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat

66. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat to the 28th Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 and requested the Commission to revoke the following Codex texts: *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat* (CAC/RCP 11-1976, Rev. 1-1993); *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Game* (CAC/RCP 29-1983, Rev. 1-1993); *Recommended International Code for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals and for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Judgment of Slaughter Animals and Meat* (CAC/RCP 41-1993); *Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat and Poultry Products* (CAC/RCP 13-1976, Rev. 1 (1985); *Recommended Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing* (CAC/RCP 14-1976); *Recommended International Code of Practice for the Production, Storage and Composition of Mechanically Separated Meat Intended for Further Processing* (CAC/RCP 32-1293) as superseded.

67. The Committee also requested the Commission to revoke the *General Principles for Meat Hygiene* (CAC/GL 52-2003) adopted by the 26th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which was included in Section 4 of the draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 4)

68. The Committee noted that it had accomplished the work assigned to it by the Commission and agreed that, until such a time as the Commission would require it to undertake further work, it should remain adjourned *sine die*. The Committee agreed to bring forward the adoption of the report to 17 February 2005 since the agenda had been completed.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject Matter	**Step**	**Action by:**	**Document Reference (ALINORM 05/28/16)**
Draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat	8	Governments 28th CAC	Paras 11-67 Appendix II

Appendix I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIRPERSON:
PRESIDENT:
PRESIDENTE:

Dr Andrew McKenzie
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835 Wellington
New Zealand
Tel: +64 4 463 2502
Fax: +64 4 463 2501
Email: andrew.mckenzie@nzfsa.govt.nz

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Dr Marcelo Oscar BALLERIO
Asesor Coordinación Punto Focal Codex
Secretaría Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca y Alimentacion
ARGENTINA
Tel: +054 11 434 92549
Fax: +054 11 434 92549
Email: maball@mecon.gov.ar

Dr Andrés SCHNÖLLER
Director de Fiscalizacion de Productos de Origen Animal
SENASA
Paseo Colón 367
6° píso frente
(1063) Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel: +054 11 4342 2756
Fax: +054 11 4331 5908
Email: dfpoa@senasa.gov.ar

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Stephen BAILEY
Principal Advisor, Food Exports Group
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel: +61 2 6272 5383
Fax: +61 2 6272 4112
Email: steven.bailey@daff.gov.au

Mr Garry CULLEN
Manager, Meat Policy
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel: +61 2 6272 5516
Fax: +61 2 6271 6522
Email: garry.cullen@daff.gov.au

Ms Amanda HILL
Assistant General Manager, Primary Production & Food Safety
Food Standards Australia New Zealand
55 Blackall St, Barton ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel: +61 2 6271 2632
Fax: +61 2 6271 2278
Email: amanda.hill@foodstandards.gov.au

Mr Ian JENSON
Food Safety R&D Manager
Meat and Livestock Australia
Locked Bag 991
North Sydney NSW 2059
AUSTRALIA
Tel: + 61 2 9643 9264
Fax: +61 2 9463 9182
Email: ijenson@mla.com.au

Mr Tom MAGUIRE
National Processing Director
Australia Meat Industry Council
PO Box 20
Narrabundah ACT 2604
AUSTRALIA
Tel: +61 2 6295 0104
Fax: +61 2 6295 0104
Mobile: +61 419 001 0018
Email: tmaguire@amic.org.au

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Prof Peter WEBER
Director of Veterinary Services
Ministry of Health and Women
Radetzkystraße. 2
A- 1031 Vienna
AUSTRIA
Tel: +43 1 71100 4825
Fax: +43 1 710 4151
Email: anita.chvatal@bmgf.gv.at

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE/BÉLGICA

Dr Magda VAN CAUWENBERGHE
Veterinarian
Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain
WTC 3
Boulevard Simon 30 8 étage
B-1000 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: 00 32 476 560 762
Fax: 00 32 2 360 1038
Email: magda.vancauwenberghe@favv.be

BOTSWANA

Stephan GHANIE
Principal Veterinary Office
Ministry of Agriculture
Dept of Animal Health & Production
P/Bag 00 32
Gaborone
BOTSWANA
Tel: +267 533 0243
Fax: +267 533 3255
Email: sghanie@gov.bw

Mr Thabani Felicious MACHACHA
General Manager
Botswana Meat Commission
Private Bag 119
Francis Town
BOTSWANA
Tel: 00267 2414838
Fax: 00267 2401550
Email: tmachacha@bmc.bw

CANADA/CANADÁ

Dr Bill ANDERSON
Acting Director
Food of Animal Origin Division
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Dr, Room 132
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0Y9
CANADA
Tel: +613 221 7081
Fax: +613 228 6636
Email: andersonw@inspection.gc.ca

Dr Merv BAKER
Special Policy Advisor
Programs Branch
59 Camelot Dr, Ottawa,
Ontario K1A OY9
CANADA
Tel: +613 221 7027
Fax: +613 228 7295
Email: mbaker@inspection.gc.ca

Dr Thomas FELTMATE
Manager, Food Safety Risk Analysis Unit
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
3851 Fallowfield Road

PO Box 11300
Nepean, Ontario, K2H 8P9
CANADA
Tel: +613 228 6698 ex 5982
Fax: +613 228 6675
Email: tfeltmate@inspection.gc.ca

CHINA, PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF/CHINE

Mr CHEN Jianliang
Director of Division
Shanghai Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Rm 1325, No.1208, Minsheng Road, Pudong New Area, Shanghai
P.R. China
Tel: +86 21 685 44751
Fax: +86 21 6854 4849
Email: chjl@shciq.gov.cn

Mr GENG Jie
Veterinary Doctor
Shenzhen Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
No.1011, Fuqiang Road
Shenzhen City
Tel: +86 755 838 860 95
Fax: +86 755 833 73673
Email: gengjie@szciq.gov.cn

Mr LI Chunfeng
Director of Division
General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine of the People's Republic of China
No.9 Madiandonglu, Haidian District
Beijing
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Tel: 0086 10 822 62010
Fax: 0086 10 822 60174
Email: licf@aqsiq.gov.cn

Mr LIU Zhong Yong
Vice Director of Division
Guandong Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
No.66, HuaCheng Road, Zhujiang Xincheng, Guangzhou,
Guandong
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Tel: 0086 20 38290150
Fax: 0086 20 38290153
Email: liuzhongy@gdciq.gov.cn

Dr Thomas SIT
Senior Veterinary Officer
Food and Environmental Hygiene Dept
43/F, Queensway Government Offices
66 Queensway
Hong Kong
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Tel: +852 2867 5420
Fax: +852 2521 8067
Email: thcsit@fehd.gov.hk

Mr Kim-Man LIU
Chief Health Inspector
Food and Environmental Hygiene Dept
43/F, Queensway Government Offices
66 Queensway
Hong Kong
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Tel: +852 2867 5583
Fax: +852 2521 4784
Email: kimmliu@fehd.gov.hk

COSTA RICA

Manuel Miranda DIAZ
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
MAG, Ministry Agriculture
COSTA RICA
Fax: +506 260 8648
Email: mmiranda@protecnet.go.cr

DENMARK/DANEMARK/DINAMARCA

Ms Susanne JENSEN
Administrator, Food Scientist
Ministry of Food Agriculture and Fisheries
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration
Mørkhøj Bygade 19
2860 Søborg
DENMARK
Tel: +45 33 95 60 57
Fax: +45 33 95 60 01
Email: sjj@fvst.dk

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY/COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE/COMUNIDAD EUROPEA

Mr Jerome LEPEINTRE
Administrator
European Commission
F101 4/78
B-1049
Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: +32 2 299 3701
Fax: +32 2 299 8566
Email: Jerome.lepeintre@cec.eu.int

Ronald DWINGER
Legislative Officer
European Commission
F101 4/78
B-1049
Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: +32 2 298 7325
Fax: +32 2 296 9062
Email: Ronald.dwinger@cec.eu.int

FINLAND/FINLANDE/FINLANDIA

Ms Eeva-Riitta WIRTA
Senior Veterinary Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Department of Food and Health, Foodstuffs of Animal Origin
PO Box 30, FIN-00023 Government
FINLAND
Tel: +358 9 1605 2298
Fax: +358 9 1605 3338
Email: eeva-riitta.wirta@mmm.fi

Dr Marjoriikka KERÄNEN
Senior Officer
Meat and Fish Hygiene Unit, National Food Agency
PO Box 28 00581 Helsinki
Finland
Tel: +358 9 3931 577
Fax: +358 9 3931 594
Email: marjoriikka.keranen@nfa.fi

FRANCE/FRANCIA

Dr Pascale GILLI-DUNUYER
Chef du bureau des Matières Premières
Direction Générale de l'Alimentation
Ministere De L'Agriculture De L'Alimentation, de la Peche et de la Ruralité
251 Rue de Vauginard 75732
Paris Cedex 15
FRANCE
Tel: 01 49 55 84 28
Fax: 01 49 55 56 80
Email: Pascale.dunuyer@agriculture.gouv.fr

GEORGIA/GÉORGIA

Mr Zurab RUKHADZE
Veterinary Doctor
Veterinary Department
Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia
15a Tamarashvili St
Tbilisi
GEORGIA
Tel: +995 99 17 43 55
Email: zu_rugeo@hotmail.com

Mr Paata ZAKARASHVILI
Head of Georgian Poultry Association
16 Krtsanisi St
Tbilisi
GEORGIA
Tel: +995 99 21 82 52
Fax: +995 32 30 34 33
Email: p_zakarashvili@gpa.ge

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE/ALEMANIA

Dr Ralf ROTHENEDER
Higher Executive Officer
Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture
Unit 329 Meat Hygiene
Rochusstrasse, 1, 53123 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel: +49 0 228 529 4685
Fax: +49 0 228 529 4945
Email: ralf.rotheneder@bmvel.bund.de

Dr Lüppo ELLERBROEK
Head of Unit, Director
Federal Institute for Risk Assesment (BfR)
Diedersdorfer Weg 1
12277 Berlin
GERMANY
Tel: +49 30 8412 2121
Fax: +49 30 8412 2966
Email: l.ellerbroek@bfr.bund.de

INDIA/INDE

Ms Nita CHOWDHURY
Joint Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperation, Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying
Krishi Bhavab, New Delhi 110016
INDIA
Tel: +011 338 3228
Fax: +011 338 3228
Email: nitac@nic.in

Mr R K BOYAL
General Manager, APEDA
Ministry of Commerce
3rd Floor NCUI Building, 3, Siri Institutional Area
August Kranti Marg, New Delhi 110016
INDIA
Tel: +651 4046
Fax: +651 4046
Email: gmrkb@apeda.com

Mr S K SINGH
General Manager
Venkateswara Hatcheries Ltd
World Trade Centre
Babar Road, Connaught Place
New Delhi 110001
INDIA
Tel: +91 11 234 13986
Fax: +91 11 246 33870
Email: shyamkuldeepsingh@reiffmail.com

INDONESIA/INDONÉSIE

Mr Adnan AHMAD
Head of Veterinary Public Health Laboratory
Official Province Government of Livestock,
Marine and Fisheries
INDONESIA
Mr Bachtiar MOERAD
Directorate of Veterinary Public Health,
Directorate General of Livestock,
Ministry of Agriculture
INDONESIA
MS Marlina Surachmi TAHRIR
Minister Counsellor (Economic)
Indonesian Embassy
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND

IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF/IRAN, RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE/IRAN, REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA

Dr Sayed Farzad TALAKESH
Public Health Expert & National Codex Secretary
Iran Veterinary Organization
Vali-Asr Ave., S.J. Asadabadi St.
PO Box 14155/6349
Tehran
IRAN
Tel: + 98 21 895 0876
Fax: +98 21 895 7252
Email: sftalakesh8@hotmail.com

IRELAND/IRLANDE/IRLANDA

Mr David NOLAN
Senior Superintending Veterinary Inspector
Department of Agriculture and Food
Agricultural House 3W
Kildare Street, Dublin 2
IRELAND
Tel: +353 1 607 2978
Fax: +353 1 678 9733
Email: davidw.nolan@agriculture.gov.ie

ITALY/ITALIE/ITALIA

Dr Lidia CECIO
Ministry of Health
DGSVA Ufficio IX
Piazzale Marconi 25
00145
Rome
ITALY
Tel: +39 06 5994 6183
Fax: +39 06 5994 6657
Email: l.cecio@sanita.it

Dr Ciro IMPAGNATIELLO
Ministero delle Politiche Agricole e Forestali
Via Sallustiana 10
00187 Roma
ITALY
Tel: +0039 06 466 56 511
Fax: +0039 06 488 02 73
Email: impagnatiello.c@politiche.agricole.it

JAPAN/JAPON/JAPÓN

Dr DVM Toshiro KAWASHIMA
Chief Deputy Director
Animal Health and Animal Products Safety Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo 100-8950
JAPAN
Tel: +81 3 3502 8206
Fax: +81 3 3502 3385
Email: toshiro_kawashima@nm.maff.go.jp

Mr Narihiko KAWAMURA
Deputy Director
Inspection and Safety Division
Department of Food Safety
Pharmaceutical and Food Safety Bureau
Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8916
JAPAN
Tel: +81 3 3595 2337
Fax: +81 3 3503 7964
Email: kawamura-narihiko@mhlw.go.jp

Mr Hironobu NAKA
Deputy Director
Food Safety and Consumer Policy Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8950
JAPAN
Tel: +81 3 5512 2291
Fax: +81 3 3597 0329
Email: hironobu_naka@nm.maff.go.jp

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE/LITUANIA

Mr Arturas BAGOTYRIUS
Deputy Director
State Food and Veterinary Service
Siesiku Str 19
07170
Vilnius-10
LITHUANIA
Tel: +37052491655
Fax: +37052404362
Email: abagotyrius@vet.lt

Mr Darius REMEIKA
Deputy Director
State Food and Veterinary Service
Siesiku Str 19
07170
Vilnius-10
LITHUANIA
Tel: +37052491629
Fax: +37052404362
Email: dremeika@vet.lt

MALAYSIA/MALAISIE/MALASIA

Dr Matta ABD. RAHMAN
Deputy Director General
Department of Veterinary Services, Malaysia
9th floor, Wisma Chase Perdana
Off Jalan Semantan, Damansara Heights
50630 Kuala Lumpur
MALAYSIA
Tel: +603 2094 0103
Fax: +603 2094 0762
Email: matta@jph.gov.my

Dr Fuzina Nor HUSSEIN
Head, Abattoir Management and Development Unit
Department of Veterinary Services
8th & 9th Floor
Wisma Chase Perdana
Off Jalan Semantan
Bukit Damansara
50630
Kuala Lumpur
MALAYSIA
Tel: 603 2094007
Fax: 603 20935804
Email: fuzina@jph.gov.my

MEXICO/MEXIQUE/MÉXICO

MVZ Marcelo Signorini PORCHIETTO
Subdirector Ejecutivo de Efectos Poblacionales
Comisión Federal para la Protección Contra Riesgos Sanitorios
COFREPRIS
Tel: +52 5555 146934
Fax: +52 5550 805415
Email: msignorini@salud.gob.mx

Lic. Renee Salas GUERRERO
Subdirectora Ejecutiva de Operación Internacional
Comisión Federal para la Protección Contra Riesgos Sanitarios
COFEPRIS
Tel: +5255 5514 8586
Fax: +5255 5208 2974
Email: rsalas@salud.gob.mx

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS/PAÍSES BAJOS

Dr Arie OTTEVANGER
Policy Coordinator
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
PO Box 20350
2500 EJ, The Hague
NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 70 340 6886
Fax: +31 70 340 5554
Email: a.ottevanger@minvws.nl

Ms Ana VILORIA ALEBESQUE
Policy Officer
Department of Food and Veterinary Affairs
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
PO Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague
NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 70 378 4778
Fax: +31 70 378 6141
Email: a.i.viloria.alebesque@minlnv.nl

Mr Wim RIEPMA
Policy Officer
PVE, Product Boards for Livestock, Meat and Eggs
PO Box 460
2700 AL Zoetermeer
NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 79 368 7504
Fax: +31 79 368 7588
Email: w.riepma@pve.agro.nl

Mr Aad VAN SPRANG
Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority
Prinses Beatrixlaan 2
PO Box 19506
2500CM Den Haag
NETHERLANDS
Tel: +31 70 448 4473
Email: aad.van.sprang@vwa.nl

Dr Philip LANDON
Administrator
General Secretariat
Council of Ministers of the EU
Rue de la Loi 175
B-1048 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel: +322 235 4966
Fax: +322 285 6198
Email: philip.landon@consilium.eu.int or
secretariat.codex@consilium.eu.int

NEW ZEALAND/NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE/NUEVA ZELANDIA

Dr Tony ZOHRAB
Director, Animal Products Group
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 463 2600
Fax: +64 4 463 2501
Email: tony.zohrab@nzfsa.govt.nz

Ian BALDICK
Public Service Association Union Organiser
Public Service Association
RD 2, Drury, South Auckland
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: 025 439 634 (cell phone)
Fax: +64 9 294 6132
Email: ian.baldick@psa.org.nz

Ms Judy BARKER
Assistant Director (Animal Products Standards)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 463 2606
Fax: +64 4 463 2643
Email: judy.barker@nzfsa.govt.nz

Dr Derek BELTON
International Co-ordination Manager & CVO
MAF, Biosecurity New Zealand
PO Box 2526
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 474 4155
Fax: +64 4 474 4257
Email: derek.belton@maf.govt.nz

Dennis BUTLER
Environmental Resources Manager
Alliance Group Ltd
PO Box 1472
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 3 379 6100
Fax: +64 3 366 0595

Kevin CRESSWELL
Technical Executive
Meat Industry Association
PO Box 345
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 495 8337
Fax: +64 4 473 1731
Email: kevin.cresswell@mia.co.nz

Keith GUTSELL
Public Service Association Delegate
Asure NZ
103 Albert St
Invercargill
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: 025 243 2209 (cell phone)
Email: keith.kg@es.co.nz

Dr Richard JANES
Chairman
Asure NZ Ltd
PO Box 1141
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: 021 577 090
Fax: 04 471 1604
Email: pepper@xtra.co.nz

Mr Graeme KEELEY
Technical Manager
PPCS Ltd
NEW ZEALAND

Dr Gerhard NORTJE
Vice President Science & Development
Encos Global Systems Ltd
Level 10, BNZ House
129 Hereford St
PO Box 1077
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 3 377 4089
Fax: +64 3 377 4189
Email: Gerhard@encos.com

Mr Terry PIERSON
Chief Executive
Asure NZ Ltd
PO Box 1141
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: 03 353 1370
Fax: 03 353 1371
Email: terry.pierson@asure.co.nz

Ms Caryll SHAILER
Chief Executive Officer
Meat Industry Association of NZ
PO Box 345
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 473 6465
Fax: +64 4 473 1731
Email: caryll.shailer@mia.co.nz

Mr Kelvan SMITH
National Operations Manager
Asure NZ Ltd
Box 1141
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 3 353 1370
Fax: +64 3 353 1371
Email: kelvan.smith@asure.co.nz

Ms Leonie WARD
Quality Manager
Asure NZ Ltd
PO Box 1141
Christchurch
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: 03 353 1370
Fax: 03 353 1371
Email: leonie.ward@asure.co.nz

Dr Phil WARD
Technical Policy Manager (Animal Products)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +
Fax: +
Email: phil.ward@nzfsa.govt.nz

Martin WOLFE

NORWAY/NORVÉGE/NORUEGA

Mr Paul SKJAKER
Senior Adviser
Norwegian Food Safety Authority
Postboks 383, Mattilsynet
N-2381 Brumunddal
NORWAY
Tel: +47 23 21 68 00
Fax: +47 23 21 68 01
Email: paul.skjaker@mattilsynet.no

Ms Hanne STEEN
Senior Advisor DVM
Gilde Norwegian Meat Cooperative
P.B 360 Økern
0513 OSLO
NORWAY
Tel: +47 22 09 23 92
Fax: +47 95 93 79 83
Email: hanne.steen@gilde.no

Ms Jorunn VORMELAND
Senior Veterinary Advisor
Norwegian Food Safety Authority
Dalen, N-5584
Bjoa
NORWAY
Tel: +47 53 76 76 71
Fax: +47 51 68 43 01
Email: jorunn.vormeland@mattilsynet.no

REPUBLIC OF KOREA/RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE/REPÚBLICA DE COREA

Dr LEE, Sang Jin
Deputy Director
Livestock Products Sanitation Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)
MAF, 88 Gwanmunro, Gwacheon City
Kyunggi-Do
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Tel: +82 2 500 1930
Fax: +82 2 503 0020
Email: sjlee@maf.go.kr

Ms RA, Youn Kyoung
Veterinary Officer
Livestock Product Safety Division
National Veterinary Research and Quarantine Service (NVRQS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
#480, Anyang 6-Dong Manan-gu,
Anyang City
Kyunggi-Do
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
Tel: +82 31 467 1965
Fax: +82 31 467 1974
Email: rayk@nvrqs.go.kr

SINGAPORE/SINGAPOUR/SINGAPUR

Dr Hon Keong LEONG
Assistant Director (Inspection Services & Epidemiology Division)
Food and Veterinary Administration
Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority of Singapore
Veterinary Public Health Centre
10 Perahu Rd
SINGAPORE 718837
Tel: +65 6795 2820
Fax: +65 6861 9492
Email: leong_hon_keong@ava.gov.sg

SPAIN/ESPAGNE/ESPAÑA

Mr Jesús MARTÍN RUIZ
Jefe De Area De Veterinaria De Salud Publica
Ministerio Sanidad Y Consumo
Agencia Española De Seguridad Alimentaria
Alcala 56
28071 Madrid
ESPAÑA (SPAIN)
Tel: +34 91 338 0862
Fax: +34 91 338 0561
Email: amartinez@msc.es

Mr Jose Luis PARAMIO
Jefe De Area De Higiene Ganadera
Direccion General De Ganaderia
Ministerio De Agricultura
Pesca Y Alimentación
C/- Alfonso XII
62-1a Planta- 28071
Madrid
ESPAÑA (SPAIN)
Tel: +34 91 347 37 05
Fax: +34 91 347 82 99
Email: jparamio@mapya.es

SWEDEN/SUÈDE/SUECIA

Dr Tor BERGMAN
Deputy Chief Veterinary Officer
Public Health
Swedish National Food Administration
Box 622
SE – 751 26 Uppsala
SWEDEN
Tel: +46 18 17 55 87
Fax: +46 18 17 53 10
Email: tor.bergman@slv.se

Dr Viveka LARSSON
Head of Meat Inspection Service
National Food Administration
Box 622
SE – 751 26 Uppsala
SWEDEN
Tel: +46 18 17 55 00
Fax: +46 18 17 14 98
Email: viveka.larsson@slv.se

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE/SUIZA

Dr Ursula WITSCHI
Dr. med.vet. Scientific employee
Swiss Federal Office of Public Health
CH – 3003 Bern
SWITZERLAND
Tel: +41 31 323 44 31
Fax: +41 31 322 95 74
Email: ursula.witschi@bag.admin.ch

THAILAND/THAÏLANDE/TAILANDIA

Dr Chaweewan LEOWIJUK
Deputy Director General
Department of Livestock Development
69/1 Phyathai Rd
Rajthawee, Bangkik
THAILAND
Tel: 66 2653 4404
Fax: 66 2653 4900
Email: Chaweewl@dld.go.th

Ms Nantana POSANACHAROEN
Senior Veterinary Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standard
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Rajadamnern Nok. Avenue
Bangkok 10200
THAILAND
Tel: +662 281 6569
Fax: +622 280 3899
Email: nantana@acfs.go.th

Mr Boonpeng SANTIWATTANATAM
Vice Chairman of Food Processing Industry Club/ Board of Director, The Federation of Thai Industries
The Federation of Thai Industries
Queen Sirikit National Convention Center Zone C. 4th floor
60 New Rachadapisek Road
Klongtoey, Bangkok 10110
THAILAND
Tel: +66 2 229 4255
Fax: +66 2 229 4941
Email: boonpeng@cpf.co.th

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES/EMIRATES ARABES UNIS/EMIORATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS

Mr Yousef Saeed AL SAADI
Food Microbiologist
Dubai Municipality
PO Box 34733
Dubai
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
Tel: +9714 301 1724
Fax: +9714 335 8448
Email: yalsaadi@eim.ae

Mr Sami Abdulla GARGASH
Head of Veterinary Services Section
Dubai Municipality
PO Box 67
Dubai
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
Tel: +9714 289 1711
Fax: +9714 289 1123
Email: sagargash@dm.gov.ae

Mouza S ALMUHAIRI
United Arab Emirates University
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
Email: muhairi.m@uaeu.ac.ae

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME-UNI/REINO UNIDO

Kenneth CLARKE
Senior Veterinary Adviser
Food Standards Agency
The Quadrant, Newburn Riverside
Newcastle-upon-Tyne
NE15 8NZ
ENGLAND
Tel: +44 191 229 5409
Fax: +44 191 229 5446
Email: kenneth.clarke@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE/TANZANIA, REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE

Dr Claude John Shara MOSHA
Chief Standards Officer
Tanzania Bureau of Standards
PO Box 9524
Dar es Salaam
TANZANIA
Tel: +255 22 2450 298/22 741 324 495
Fax: +255 22 2450 959
Email: cjmosha@yahoo.co.uk or info@tbs-tz.org

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA

Dr Perfecto SANTIAGO
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Food Safety and Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Room 3130 South Building
Washington, DC 20250-3700
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 205 0452
Fax: +202 690 5634
Email: perfecto.santiago@fsis.usda.gov

Dr William JAMES
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of International Affairs
Food Safety and Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Room 3143 South Building
Washington, DC 20250-3700
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 720 5362
Fax: +202 690 3856
E-mail: william.james@fsis.usda.gov

Ms Edith E. KENNARD
Staff Officer
U.S. Codex Office (RM 4861 SOAGRIBG)
Food Safety and Inspection Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue
Washington, DC 20250
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 720 5261
Fax: +202 720 3157
E-mail: edith.kennard@fsis.usda.gov

Dr Morris POTTER
Lead Scientist for Epidemiology
FDA, Centre for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
60 Eighth St NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
UNITED STATES
Tel: 404 253 1225
Fax: 404 253 1218
Email: mpotter@cfsan.fda.gov

Mr John REILLY
International Trade Specialist
US Department of Agriculture
Foreign Agricultural Service
ITP\Food Safety and Technical Services Division
1400 Independence Ave, SW
Room 5548- South Building
Washington DC 20250
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 690 2148
Fax: +202 690 0677
Email: john.reilly@fas.usda.govn

Ms Jenny SCOTT
Senior Director
Food Safety Programs
Food Products Association
1350 I Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 639 5985
Fax: +202 639 5991
Email: jscott@nfpa-food.org

Dr Armia TAWADROUS
Director
USDA/FSIS
Office of International Affairs
FSIS Codex Program
Room 3841-South Building
1400 Independence Ave, SW
Washington DC 20250-3700
UNITED STATES
Tel: +202 720 2933
Fax: +202 720 6050
Email: armia.tawadrous@fsis.usda.gov

Mr Lucas WARD
Student / Researcher
University of Colorado at Boulder
Department of Geography
Guggenheim Hall
Boulder, Colorado 80309
UNITED STATES
Tel: + 303 492 4279
Fax: +303 492 7501
Email: lucas.ward@colorado.edu

VANUATU

Mr Jack REUBEN
Meat Inspector Quarantine and Livestock, VQIS
PMB 095, Port Vila
Vanuatu
Tel: (678) 23519
Fax: (678) 23185
Email: vqlsvila@vanuatu.com.vu

OBSERVER ORGANISATIONS

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)

Dr Andrew W SPEEDY
Senior Officer, Animal Production and Health Division
FAO
Viale Delle Terme Di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel: +39 6 5705 2425
Fax: +39 6 5705 5749
Email: andrew.speedy@fao.org

Institut International du Froid
International Institute of Refrigeration

Mr Guill Le ROUX
Senior Microbiologist – Food Safety
AgResearch Limited
Ruakura MIRINZ Centre, Private Bag 3123
Hamilton
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 7 838 5177
Fax: +64 7 838 5625
Email: guill.leroux@agresearch.co.nz

The International Association of Consumer Food Organizations (IACFO)

Caroline SMITH DE WAAL
Director of Food Safety
Centre for Science in the Public Interest
1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
Tel: +202 777 8366
Fax: +202 265 4954
Email: cdewaal@cspinet.org

International Co-operative Alliance (ICA)

Mr Kazuo ONITAKE
Head of Unit, Safety Policy Service
Japanese Consumers' Co-operative Union (JCCU)
Co-op Plaza 3-29-8, Shibuya, Shibuyaka
Tokyo 150-8913
JAPAN
Tel: +81 3 5778 8109
Fax: +81 3 5778 8002
Email: kazuo.onitake@jccu.coop

World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)

Dr Alex THIERMANN
President Terrestrial Animal Health Commission
World Organization for Animal Health
12, rue de Prony
75017 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: +33 1 44 15 18 69
Fax: +33 1 42 67 09 87
Email: a.thiermann@oie.int

CODEX SECRETARIAT

Ms Annamaria BRUNO
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel: +39 06 57056254
Fax: +39 06 57054593
Email: annamaria.bruno@fao.org

Dr Jeronimas MASKELIUNAS
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel: +39 06 57053967
Fax: +39 06 57054593
Email: Jeronimas.Maskeliunas@fao.org

NEW ZEALAND SECRETARIAT

Dr Steve HATHAWAY
Director (Programme Development)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 646
GISBORNE
Tel: +64 6 867 1144
Fax: +64 6 868 5207
Email: steve.hathaway@nzfsa.govt.nz

Dr Judi LEE
Assistant Director (Programme Development)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
95 McGregor Road
RD 2, Papakura
AUCKLAND
Tel: +64 9 2929131
Fax: +64 9 2929131
Email: judi.lee@nzfsa.govt.nz

Ms Cindy NEWMAN
Executive Manager
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
WELLINGTON

Ms Audrey TAULALO
Assistant (Administration)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
WELLINGTON

Ms Melissa QUARRIE
Policy Analyst (Codex)
New Zealand Food Safety Authority
PO Box 2835
WELLINGTON

Appendix II

DRAFT CODE OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE FOR MEAT[1]

At Step 8

Table of Contents 21

[1] This Code supersedes the following Codex Codes of Practices: Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat (CAC/RCP 11-1976, Rev. 1-1993);Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Game (CAC/RCP 29-1983, Rev. 1-1993); Recommended International Code for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals and for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Judgement of Slaughter Animals and Meat (CAC/RCP 41-1993); Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Processed Meat and Poultry Products (CAC/RCP 13-1976, Rev. 1 (1985); Recommended Code of Hygienic Practice for Poultry Processing (CAC/RCP 14-1976); Recommended International Code of Practice for the Production, Storage and Composition of Mechanically Separated Meat Intended for Further Processing (CAC/RCP 32-1293).

CODE OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE FOR MEAT

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Meat has traditionally been viewed as a vehicle for a significant proportion of human food-borne disease. Although the spectrum of meat-borne diseases of public health importance has changed with changing production and processing systems, continuation of the problem has been well illustrated in recent years by human surveillance studies of specific meat-borne pathogens such as *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* spp., *Campylobacter* spp. and *Yersinia enterocolitica*. In addition to existing biological, chemical and physical hazards, new hazards are also appearing e.g., the agent of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE). Furthermore consumers have expectations about suitability issues which are not necessarily of human health significance.

2. A contemporary risk-based approach to meat hygiene requires that hygiene measures should be applied at those points in the food chain where they will be of greatest value in reducing food-borne risks to consumers. This should be reflected in application of specific measures based on science and risk assessment, with a greater emphasis on prevention and control of contamination during all aspects of production of meat and its further processing. Application of HACCP principles is an essential element. The measure of success of contemporary programmes is an objective demonstration of levels of hazard control in food that are correlated with required levels of consumer protection, rather than by concentrating on detailed and prescriptive measures that give an unknown outcome.

3. At the national level the activities of the Competent Authority having jurisdiction at the slaughterhouse (usually Veterinary Administrations[2]) very often serve animal health as well as public health objectives. This is particularly the case in relation to ante- and post-mortem inspection where the slaughterhouse is a key point in animal health surveillance, including zoonoses. Regardless of jurisdictional arrangements, it is important that this duality of functions is recognized and relevant public health and animal health activities are integrated.

4. A number of national governments are implementing systems that redefine the respective roles of industry and government in delivering meat hygiene activities. Irrespective of the delivery systems the competent authority is responsible for defining the role of personnel involved in meat hygiene activities where appropriate, and verifying that all regulatory requirements are met.

5. The principles of food safety risk management[3] should be incorporated wherever appropriate in the design and implementation of meat hygiene programmes. Specifically, work conducted by JEMRA, JECFA and FAO/WHO Expert Consultations and resulting risk management recommendations should be considered. Further, newly-recognised meat-borne risks to human health may require measures additional to those usually applied in meat hygiene, e.g., the potential for zoonotic transmission of central nervous system disorders of slaughtered livestock means that additional animal health surveillance programmes may need to be undertaken.

2. SCOPE AND USE OF THIS CODE

6. The scope of this code covers hygiene provisions for raw meat, meat preparations and manufactured meat from the time of live animal production up to the point of retail sale. It further develops 'The Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene' [4] in respect of these products. Where appropriate, the Annex to that code (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point System and Guidelines for its Application) and the Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods[5] are further developed and applied in the specific context of meat hygiene.

---

2 OIE is currently working on guidelines on application at national level addressing ‘ante- and post-mortem activities in the production of meat to reduce hazards of public and animal health significance’.

3 Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius (Codex Procedural Manual, 14th Edition); Proposed Draft Working Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (CX/FH 05/37/6).

4 CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003.

5 CAC/GL 21-1997.

7. For the purposes of this code, meat is that derived from domestic ungulates, domestic solipeds, domestic birds, lagomorphs, farmed game, farmed game birds (including ratites) and wild game. This Code of Practice may also be applied to other types of animals from which meat is derived, subject to any special hygienic measures required by the competent authority. Further to general hygiene measures applying to all species of animal as described above, this code also presents specific measures that apply to different species and classes of animals, e.g. wild game killed in the field.

8. The hygiene measures that are applied to the products described in this code, should take into account any further measures and food handling practices that are likely to be applied by the consumer. It should be noted that some of the products described in this code may not be subjected to a heat or other biocidal process before consumption.

9. Meat hygiene is by nature a complex activity, and this code refers to standards, texts and other recommendations developed elsewhere in the Codex system where linkages are appropriate, e.g., Principles for Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification (CAC/GL 20 - 1995), Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (CX/FH 01/7 and ALINORM 03/13 paras 99-128), General Guidelines for Use of the Term "Halal" (CAC/GL 24-1997) and recommendations of the *Ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding (ALINORM 01/38 and ALINORM 01/38A).

10. To provide information that will enhance consistency, linkages should also be made to the standards, guidelines and recommendations contained in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code that relate to zoonoses.

11. Subsets of the general principles (Section 4) are provided in subsequent sections within ‘double-line boxes’. Where guidelines are provided at the section level, those that are more prescriptive in nature are presented in ‘single-line boxes’. This is to indicate that they are recommendations based on current knowledge and practice. They should be regarded as being flexible in nature and subject to alternative provisions so long as required outcomes in terms of the safety and suitability of meat are met.

12. Traditional practices may result in departures from some of the meat hygiene recommendations presented in this code when meat is produced for local trade.

3. DEFINITIONS

13. For the purposes of this code, the following definitions apply. (Note that more general definitions relating to food hygiene appear in The Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene[6]).

Abattoir Any establishment where specified animals are slaughtered and dressed for human consumption and that is approved, registered and/or listed by the competent authority for such purposes.

Animal Animals of the following types:

- Domestic ungulates;
- Domestic solipeds;
- Domestic birds i.e. poultry;
- Lagomorphs;
- Farmed game;
- Farmed game birds, including ratites;
- Wild game, i.e. wild land mammals and birds which are hunted (including those living in enclosed territory under conditions of freedom similar to those of wild game);
- Animals as otherwise specified by the competent authority.

[6] Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev.4-2003).

Ante-mortem inspection[7]	Any procedure or test conducted by a competent person on live animals for the purpose of judgement of safety and suitability and disposition
Carcass	The body of an animal after dressing.
Chemical residues	Residues of veterinary drugs and pesticides as described in the Definitions for the Purpose of the Codex Alimentarius[8].
Competent authority[9]	The official authority charged by the government with the control of meat hygiene, including setting and enforcing regulatory meat hygiene requirements.
Competent body	A body officially recognised and overseen by the competent authority to undertake specified meat hygiene activities.
Competent person	A person who has the training, knowledge, skills and ability to perform an assigned task, and who is subject to requirements specified by the competent authority.
Condemned	Inspected and judged by a competent person, or otherwise determined by the competent authority, as being unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption and requiring appropriate disposal.
Contaminant	Any biological or chemical agent, foreign matter, or other substance not intentionally added to food that may compromise food safety or suitability.[10]
Disease or defect	Any abnormality affecting safety and/or suitability.
Dressing	The progressive separation of the body of an animal into a carcass and other edible and inedible parts.
Equivalence	The capability of different meat hygiene systems to meet the same food safety and/or suitability objectives.
Establishment	A building or area used for performing meat hygiene activities that is approved, registered and/or listed by the competent authority for such purposes.
Establishment operator	The person in control of an establishment who is responsible for ensuring that the regulatory meat hygiene requirements are met.
Food safety objective (FSO)	The maximum frequency and/or concentration of a hazard in a food at the time of consumption that provides or contributes to the appropriate level of protection (ALOP).
Fresh Meat	Meat that apart from refrigeration has not been treated for the purpose of preservation other than through protective packaging and which retains its natural characteristics.
Game depot	A building in which killed wild game is temporarily held prior to transfer to an establishment, and which is approved, registered and/or listed by the competent authority for this purpose. *(Note that for the purposes of this code, a game depot is a particular type of establishment).*

7 These and other procedures and tests stipulated by the Competent Authority, may also be conducted, in particular for the purposes of animal health.

8 Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

9 The Competent Authority provides official assurances in international trade of meat. Requirements for certification for public health and fair trade purposes have been developed by the Codex Committee on Food and Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (ref. CAC/GL 26-1997). Requirements for certification for animal health (including zoonoses) purposes are contained in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code (ref. Section 1.2 Obligations and ethics in international trade). Both should be read in parallel where veterinary certification is required.

10 Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003).

Good Hygienic Practice (GHP)	All practices regarding the conditions and measures necessary to ensure the safety and suitability of food at all stages of the food chain.[11]
Hazard	A biological, chemical or physical agent in, or condition of, food with the potential to cause an adverse health effect.[12]
Hunter	A person involved in the killing and/or bleeding, partial evisceration and partial field dressing of killed wild game.
Inedible	Inspected and judged by a competent person, or otherwise determined by the competent authority to be unsuitable for human consumption.
Manufactured Meat	Products resulting from the processing of raw meat or from the further processing of such processed products, so that when cut, the cut surface shows that the product no longer has the characteristics of fresh meat.
Meat	All parts of an animal that are intended for, or have been judged as safe and suitable for, human consumption.
Meat hygiene	All conditions and measures necessary to ensure the safety and suitability of meat at all stages of the food chain.
Meat preparation	Raw meat which has had foodstuffs, seasonings or additives added to it.
Mechanically separated meat (MSM)	Product obtained by removing meat from flesh-bearing bones after boning or from poultry carcasses, using mechanical means that result in the loss or modification of the muscle fibre structure.
Minced meat	Boneless meat which has been reduced into fragments.
Official inspector	A competent person who is appointed, accredited or otherwise recognised by the competent authority to perform official meat hygiene activities on behalf of, or under the supervision of the competent authority.
Organoleptic inspection	Using the senses of sight, touch, taste and smell for identification of diseases and defects.
Performance criterion	The effect in frequency and/or concentration of a hazard in a food that must be achieved by the application of one or more control measures to provide or contribute to a performance objective (PO) or a food safety objective (FSO).
Performance objective	The maximum frequency and/or concentration of a hazard in a food at a specified step in the food chain before the time of consumption that provides or contributes to a food safety objective (FSO) or ppropriate level of protection (ALOP), as applicable.
Post-mortem inspection[13]	Any procedure or test conducted by a competent person on all relevant parts of slaughtered/killed animals for the purpose of judgement of safety and suitability and disposition.
Primary production	All those steps in the food chain constituting animal production and transport of animals to the abattoir, or hunting and transporting wild game to a game depot.
Process control	All conditions and measures applied during the production process that are necessary to achieve safety and suitability of meat.[14]

11 WHO Teachers Handbook, 1999.

12 Definitions for the Purpose of the Codex Alimentarius. Procedural Manual, 14th edition.

13 These and other procedures and tests stipulated by the Competent Authority, may also be conducted, in particular for the purposes of animal health.

14 The “process” includes ante- and post-mortem inspection.

Process criterion	The physical process control parameters (e.g. time, temperature) at a specified step that can be applied to achieve a performance objective or performance criterion[15].
Quality assurance (QA)	All the planned and systematic activities implemented within the quality system and demonstrated as needed, to provide adequate confidence that an entity will fulfil requirements for quality.[16]
Quality assurance (QA) system	The organisational structure, procedures, processes and resources needed to implement quality assurance.
Raw meat	Fresh meat, minced meat or mechanically separated meat [17].
Ready-to-Eat (RTE) products	Products that are intended to be consumed without any further biocidal steps.
Risk-based	Containing any performance objective, performance criterion or process criterion developed according to risk analysis principles.[18]
Safe for human consumption	Safe for human consumption according to the following criteria: • has been produced by applying all food safety requirements appropriate to its intended end-use; • meets risk-based performance and process criteria for specified hazards; and • does not contain hazards at levels that are harmful to human health.
Sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs)	A documented system for assuring that personnel, facilities, equipment and utensils are clean and where necessary, sanitised to specified levels prior to and during operations.
Suitable for human consumption	Suitable for human consumption according to the following criteria: • has been produced under hygienic conditions as outlined in this code; • is appropriate to its intended use[19]; and • meets outcome-based parameters for specified diseases or defects as established by the competent authority.
Validation	Obtaining evidence that the food hygiene control measure or measures selected to control a hazard in a food is capable of effectively and consistently controlling the hazard to the appropriate level.[20]
Verification	Activities performed by the competent authority and/or competent body to determine compliance with regulatory requirements.
Verification (Operator)	The continual review of process control systems by the operator, including corrective and preventative actions to ensure that regulatory and/or specified requirements are met**.**
Veterinary Inspector	An official inspector who is professionally qualified as a veterinarian and carries out official meat hygiene activities[21] as specified by the competent authority.

15 This is an interim definition for the purpose of this Code.
16 ISO 8402.
17 This does not preclude interventions for the purpose of pathogen reduction.
18 This is an interim definition for the purpose of this Code.
19 See for example the General Guidelines for Use of the Term "Halal" (CAC/GL 24-1997).
20 This is an interim definition for the purpose of this Code.

4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE

i. Meat must be safe and suitable for human consumption and all interested parties including government, industry and consumers have a role in achieving this outcome.[22]

ii. The competent authority should have the legal power to set and enforce regulatory meat hygiene requirements, and have final responsibility for verifying that regulatory meat hygiene requirements are met. It should be the responsibility of the establishment operator to produce meat that is safe and suitable in accordance with regulatory meat hygiene requirements. There should be a legal obligation on relevant parties to provide any information and assistance as may be required by the competent authority.

iii. Meat hygiene programmes should have as their primary goal the protection of public health and should be based on a scientific evaluation of meat-borne risks to human health and take into account all relevant food safety hazards, as identified by research, monitoring and other relevant activities.

iv. The principles of food safety risk analysis should be incorporated wherever possible and appropriate in the design and implementation of meat hygiene programmes.[23]

v. Wherever possible and practical, competent authorities should formulate food safety objectives (FSOs) according to a risk-based approach so as to objectively express the level of hazard control that is required to meet public health goals.

vi. Meat hygiene requirements should control hazards to the greatest extent practicable throughout the entire food chain. Information available from primary production should be taken into account so as to tailor meat hygiene requirements to the spectrum and prevalence of hazards in the animal population from which the meat is sourced.

vii. The establishment operator should apply HACCP principles. To the greatest extent practicable, the HACCP principles should also be applied in the design and implementation of hygiene measures throughout the entire food chain.

viii. The competent authority should define the role of those personnel involved in meat hygiene activities where appropriate, including the specific role of the veterinary inspector.

ix. The range of activities involved in meat hygiene should be carried out by personnel with the appropriate training, knowledge, skills and ability as and where defined by the competent authority.

x. The competent authority should verify that the establishment operator has adequate systems in place to trace and withdraw meat from the food chain. Communication with consumers and other interested parties should be considered and undertaken where appropriate.

xi. As appropriate to the circumstances, the results of monitoring and surveillance of animal and human populations should be considered with subsequent review and/or modification of meat hygiene requirements whenever necessary.

xii. Competent authorities should recognise the equivalence of alternative hygiene measures where appropriate, and promulgate meat hygiene measures that achieve required outcomes in terms of safety and suitability and facilitate fair practices in the trading of meat.

---

21 These may include animal health objectives.

22 Specific meat hygiene requirements should address biological, chemical and physical hazards; and pathophysiological and other characteristics associated with suitability for human consumption.

23 Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius, Procedural Manual, 14th edition; Codex Committee on Food Hygiene, proposed draft Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management (CX/FH 05/37/6); Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Consultation on Principles and Guidelines for Incorporating Microbiological Risk Assessment in the Development of Food Safety Standards, Guidelines and Related Texts; Kiel, Germany, 18-22 March 2002.

5. PRIMARY PRODUCTION

14. Primary production is a significant source of hazards associated with meat. A number of hazards are present in animal populations intended for slaughter and their control during primary production, often presents considerable challenges, e.g., *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* spp. *Campylobacter* spp and various chemical and physical hazards. A risk-based approach to meat hygiene includes consideration of risk management options that may have a significant impact on risk reduction when applied at the level of primary production.[24]

15. Provision of relevant information on animals intended for slaughter facilitates application of risk-based meat hygiene programmes, and allows inspection procedures to be tailor-made to the spectrum and prevalence of diseases and defects in the particular animal population. This may be particularly important in situations where the presence of certain zoonotic agents is not detectable by routine organoleptic or laboratory tests, and special measures may need to be taken, e.g. possible exposure to cysts of *Cysticercus bovis*.

16. Voluntary or officially recognised QA systems implemented at primary production should be appropriately taken into account during verification of regulatory requirements.

17. The principles and guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section III of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003).

5.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO PRIMARY PRODUCTION

i. Primary production should be managed in a way that reduces the likelihood of introduction of hazards and appropriately contributes to meat being safe and suitable for human consumption.

ii. Whenever possible and practicable, systems should be established by the primary production sector and the competent authority, to collect, collate and make available, information on hazards and conditions that may be present in animal populations and that may affect the safety and suitability of meat.

iii. Primary production should include official or officially-recognised programmes for the control and monitoring of zoonotic agents in animal populations and the environment as appropriate to the circumstances, and notifiable zoonotic diseases should be reported as required.

iv. Good hygienic practice (GHP) at the level of primary production should involve for example the health and hygiene of animals, records of treatments, feed and feed ingredients and relevant environmental factors, and should include application of HACCP principles to the greatest extent practicable.

v. Animal identification practices should allow trace-back to the place of origin to the extent practicable, to allow regulatory investigation where necessary.

5.2 HYGIENE OF SLAUGHTER ANIMALS

18. Both primary producers and the competent authority should work together to implement risk-based meat hygiene programmes at the level of primary production that document the general health status of slaughter animals, and implement practices that maintain or improve that status, e.g., zoonoses control programmes. QA programmes at the level of primary production should be encouraged and may include application of HACCP principles as appropriate to the circumstances. Such programmes should be taken into account by the competent authority in the overall design and implementation of risk-based meat hygiene programmes.

[24] Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius, Procedural Manual, 14th edition.

So as to facilitate the application of risk-based meat hygiene programmes:

- Primary producers should record relevant information to the extent possible on the health status of animals as it relates to the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption. This information should be made available to the abattoir as appropriate to the circumstances.
- Systems should be in place for return from the abattoir to the primary producer, of information on the safety and suitability of slaughter animals and meat, in order to improve the hygiene on the farm and, where producer-led QA-programmes are applied, to be incorporated into these programmes to improve their effectiveness.
- The competent authority should systematically analyse monitoring and surveillance information from primary production so that meat hygiene requirements may be modified if necessary.

19. The competent authority should administer an official programme for control of specified zoonotic agents, chemical hazards and contaminants. This should be co-ordinated to the greatest extent possible with other competent authorities that may have responsibilities in public and animal health.

Official or officially-recognised programmes for specified zoonotic agents should include measures to:

- control and eradicate their presence in animal populations, or subsets of populations, e.g., particular poultry flocks;
- prevent the introduction of new zoonotic agents;
- provide monitoring and surveillance systems that establish baseline data and guide a risk-based approach to control of such hazards in meat; and
- control movement of animals between primary production units, and to abattoirs, where populations are under quarantine restrictions.

Official or officially-recognised programmes for chemical hazards and contaminants should include measures to:

- control the registration and use of veterinary drugs and pesticides so that residues do not occur in meat at levels that make the product unsafe[25] for human consumption, and
- provide monitoring and surveillance systems that establish baseline data and guide a risk-based approach to control of such hazards in meat.

20. Animal identification systems, to the extent practicable, should be in place at primary production level so that the origin of meat can be traced back from the abattoir or establishment to the place of production of the animals.

21. Animals should not be loaded for transport to the abattoir when:

- the degree of contamination of the external surfaces of the animal is likely to compromise hygienic slaughter and dressing, and suitable interventions such as washing or shearing are not available,

[25] Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods (CAC/GL 16-1993) (under revision).

- information is available to suggest that animals may compromise the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption, e.g., presence of specific disease conditions or recent administration of veterinary drugs. In some situations, transport may proceed if the animals have been specifically identified (e.g. as "suspects") and are to be slaughtered under special supervision; or
- conditions causing animal stress may exist or arise that are likely to result in an adverse impact on the safety and suitability of meat.

5.3 HYGIENE OF KILLED WILD GAME

22. Only limited knowledge can be gained on the health status of populations of wild game hunted for meat; however, the competent authority should consider all sources when gathering such information. In this respect, hunters should be encouraged to provide relevant information, e.g., geographical origin of wild game, and any clinical symptoms of disease observed in wild animal populations.

23. Wild game should be harvested in a manner so that:

- killing methods are consistent with the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption; and
- their geographical origin is not subject to relevant official prohibitions on harvest, e.g., in the case of concurrent chemical pest control programmes or animal health quarantine.

24. Hunters are particularly important in providing information on killed animals. They should be aware of their responsibilities in terms of supplying to the establishment, all relevant information that may impact on the safety and suitability of killed wild game meat, e.g., symptoms of disease immediately before killing, grossly-apparent diseases and defects detected during partial field dressing and/or evisceration. The competent authority should require that hunters or other people involved in harvesting of wild game undergo basic training in meat hygiene appropriate to field procurement, e.g., recognition of diseases and defects, application of GHP in partial field dressing and transport to a game depot.

25. As wild game are killed in the field, appropriate hygienic practices immediately following death are essential to minimise contamination of edible parts. GHP should be applied to the extent practicable during bleeding, partial dressing, e.g., removal of the head, and/or partial evisceration (where allowed by the competent authority).[26]

Bleeding and partial dressing of killed wild game in the field should include:

- bleeding and partial evisceration as soon as possible after killing (unless exempted by the competent authority for a particular species of wild game);
- partial skinning and/or partial dressing in a manner that minimises the level of contamination of edible parts to the lowest level practicable;
- removal only of those parts of the animal that are not necessary for post-mortem inspection and judgement; and
- retention of the lungs, liver, heart and kidneys as a minimum if partial evisceration is carried out, either by natural attachment to the carcass or identified and packaged as an attachment to the carcass, unless a hunter, who is a competent person, has carried out an inspection and has not detected or suspected abnormalities.[27]

26. Game depots should not be simultaneously used for a purpose other than receiving and holding killed wild game, unless the competent authority specifies other uses and conditions.

---

[26] Partial evisceration usually only involves removal of the gastrointestinal tract, and this aids cooling.

[27] In the case of small killed wild game, the competent authority may allow full evisceration.

27. Delivery of killed wild game to a game depot or an establishment should be within time limits established by the competent authority considering harvesting, environmental conditions and desired food safety outcomes. The body and other animal parts should not be frozen before dressing and post-mortem inspection in an establishment, unless unavoidable due to ambient temperatures.

5.4 HYGIENE OF FEED AND FEED INGREDIENTS

28. Feeding of animals during primary production should be subject to good animal feeding practice[28].. Records should be maintained at the manufacturing level, on the origin of feed and feed ingredients to facilitate verification.

29. There is a need for collaboration between all parties involved in production, manufacturing and use of feed and feed ingredients, so as to establish any linkage between identified hazards and the level of risk to consumers that may result from transmission through the food chain[29].

Animals should not be given feed and feed ingredients that:

- are recognised as likely to introduce zoonotic agents (including transmissible spongiform encephalopathies - TSEs) to the slaughter population; or
- contain chemical substances, (e.g., veterinary drugs, pesticides) or contaminants that could result in residues in meat at levels that make the product unsafe for human consumption.

30. The competent authority should implement appropriate legislation and controls governing the feeding of animal protein to animals where there is a likelihood of transmission of zoonotic agents, and this may include a ban on such feeding when justified by risk management. Any processed feed and feed ingredients should be subject to appropriate microbiological and other criteria according to a specified sampling plan and testing protocol, and maximum limits for mycotoxins.

5.5 HYGIENE OF THE PRIMARY PRODUCTION ENVIRONMENT

31. Primary production of animals should not be undertaken in areas where the presence of hazards in the environment could lead to an unacceptable level of such hazards in meat.

The competent authority should design and administer monitoring and surveillance programmes appropriate to the circumstances that address :

- hazards arising from animals and plants that may compromise the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption;
- environmental contaminants that may result in levels in meat that make the product unsafe for human consumption; and
- ensuring that potential carriers such as water, are not significant vehicles for transmission of hazards.

Facilities and procedures should be in place to ensure that:

- housing and feeding platforms where used, and other areas where zoonotic agents and other hazards may accumulate, can be effectively cleaned, and are maintained in a sanitary condition (refer to Section 10);
- systems for active processing and/or disposal of dead animals and waste should not constitute a possible source of food-borne hazards to human and animal health; and

[28] Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding (CAC/RCP 54-2004).

[29] OIE International Animal Health Code (chapters on zoonotic diseases); OIE Guidelines on antimicrobial resistance.

- chemical hazards required for technological reasons are stored in a manner so that they do not contaminate the environment or feed and feed ingredients and thereby pose a risk to human health.

5.6 TRANSPORT

5.6.1 Transport of slaughter animals

32. Transport of slaughter animals should be carried out in a manner that does not have an adverse impact on the safety and suitability of meat.[30]

Slaughter animals require transport facilities to the abattoir that ensure that:

- soiling and cross-contamination with faecal material is minimised;
- new hazards are not introduced during transport;
- animal identification as to the place of origin is maintained; and
- consideration is given to avoiding undue stress that may adversely impact on the safety of meat (such as stress-induced shedding of pathogens).

Transport vehicles should be designed and maintained so that:

- animals can be loaded, unloaded and transported easily and with minimal risk of injury;
- animals of different species, and animals of the same species likely to cause injury to one another, are physically separated during transport;
- use of floor gratings, crates or similar devices limits soiling and cross-contamination with faecal material;
- where the vehicle has more than one deck, animals are protected from cross-contamination as appropriate ;
- ventilation is adequate; and
- cleaning and sanitising is readily achieved (refer to Section 10).

33. Transport vehicles, and crates where used should be cleaned and if necessary sanitised as soon as practicable after animals have been unloaded at the establishment.

5.6.2 Transport of killed wild game

34. Following killing and partial dressing in the field, the body and other parts should be transported to an establishment, including a game depot, without delay and in a manner that minimises contamination of edible parts. The use of these vehicles for this purpose should be consistent with good hygienic practice and any specific regulatory requirements.

35. Unless deemed unnecessary due to low environmental ambient temperatures, the temperature of the body should be actively reduced as quickly as possible after partial field dressing and transport.

6. PRESENTATION OF ANIMALS FOR SLAUGHTER

36. Only healthy, clean and appropriately identified animals should be presented for slaughter.

[30] OIE International Animal Health Code (chapter on transport); Report of the OIE Working Group on Animal Welfare, October 2002.

37. All animals should be screened upon arrival at the abattoir. Where abnormalities in behaviour or appearance suggest that an individual animal or a consignment of animals should be segregated, this should occur and the competent person undertaking ante-mortem inspection should be notified.

38. Ante-mortem inspection is an important pre-slaughter activity, and all relevant information on animals presented for slaughter should be utilised in meat hygiene systems.

6.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO ANIMALS PRESENTED FOR SLAUGHTER

i. Animals presented for slaughter should be sufficiently clean so that they do not compromise hygienic slaughter and dressing.

ii. The conditions of holding of animals presented for slaughter should minimise cross-contamination with food-borne pathogens and facilitate efficient slaughter and dressing.

iii. Slaughter animals should be subjected to ante-mortem inspection, with the competent authority determining the procedures and tests to be used, how inspection is to be implemented, and the necessary training, knowledge, skills and ability of personnel involved.

iv. Ante-mortem inspection should be science- and risk-based as appropriate to the circumstances, and should take into account all relevant information from the level of primary production.

v. Relevant information from primary production where available and results of ante-mortem inspection should be utilised in process control.

vi. Relevant information from ante-mortem inspection should be analysed and returned to the primary producer as appropriate.

6.2 CONDITIONS OF LAIRAGE

39. Holding of animals presented for slaughter has an important effect on many aspects of slaughter, dressing and the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption. The cleanliness of animals has a major influence on the level of microbiological cross-contamination of the carcass and other edible parts during slaughter and dressing. A range of measures appropriate to the animal species may be applied to ensure that only animals that are sufficiently clean are slaughtered and to assist in reducing microbiological cross- contamination.

40. Quality assurance (QA) systems implemented by the establishment operator should enhance achievement of appropriate conditions of lairage on an on-going basis.

The establishment operator should ensure conditions of lairage that include:

- facilities are operated in a way that soiling and cross-contamination of animals with food-borne pathogens are minimised to the greatest extent practicable;
- holding of animals so that their physiological condition is not compromised and ante-mortem inspection can be effectively carried out, e.g., animals should be adequately rested and not overcrowded and protected from weather where necessary;
- separation of different classes and types of slaughter animals as appropriate, e.g., separation of animals with special dressing requirements, and separation of “suspects” that have been identified as having the potential to transfer specific food-borne pathogens to other animals (refer to 6.3);
- systems to ensure that only animals that are sufficiently clean are slaughtered;
- systems to ensure that feed has been appropriately withdrawn before slaughter;
- maintenance of identification of animals (either individually, or as lots, e.g., poultry) until the time of slaughter and dressing; and

- conveying of relevant information on individual animals or lots of animals to facilitate ante- and post-mortem inspection.

41. The competent authority or the competent body should take into account QA systems properly implemented by the establishment operator, in setting the frequency and intensity of verification activities necessary to determine that the conditions of lairage are in accordance with regulatory requirements.

6.3 ANTE-MORTEM INSPECTION

42. All animals presented for slaughter should be subjected to ante-mortem inspection, by a competent person whether on an individual or a lot basis. Inspection should include confirmation that the animals are properly identified, so that any special conditions pertaining to their place of primary production are considered in the ante-mortem inspection, including relevant public and animal health quarantine controls.

43. Ante-mortem inspection should support post-mortem inspection by application of a specific range of procedures and/or tests that consider the behaviour, demeanour and appearance, as well as signs of disease in the live animal.

Animals described below should be subject to special controls, procedures or operations imposed by the competent authority (which may include denial of entry to the abattoir) when:

- animals are not sufficiently clean;
- animals have died in transit;
- a zoonotic disease posing an immediate threat to either animals or humans is present, or suspected;
- an animal health disease subject to quarantine restrictions is present, or suspected;
- animal identification requirements are not met; or
- declarations from the primary producer, if required by the competent authority (including compliance with good veterinary practice in the use of animal medicines), are absent or inadequate.

6.3.1 Design of ante-mortem inspection systems

44. Ante-mortem inspection should be included as an integral component of an overarching risk-based system for the production of meat, with systems for process control (refer to Section 9) incorporating appropriate components. Relevant information on the slaughter population, e.g., animal class, health status, geographical region of origin, should be utilised in both the design and implementation of ante-mortem inspection systems.

45. Ante-mortem inspection, including procedures and tests, should be established by the competent authority according to a science and risk-based approach. In the absence of a risk-based system, procedures will have to be based on current scientific knowledge and practice.

46. Ante-mortem procedures and tests may be integrated and implemented together so as to achieve public health and animal health objectives. In such cases all aspects of ante-mortem inspection should be science-based and be tailored to the relevant risks.

47. Where indicated by public health concerns, measures additional to routine ante-mortem inspection may be required.

Characteristics of a risk-based ante-mortem inspection programme are:

- procedures for confirmation of proper animal identification in accordance with national legislation;

- design and application of organoleptic procedures and tests that are relevant and proportional to meat-borne risks associated with clinical signs of illness and grossly-detectable abnormalities;
- tailoring of procedures to the spectrum and prevalence of diseases and defects reasonably likely to be present in the slaughter population, taking into account the type of animal, geographical origin and primary production system;
- integration with HACCP-based process control to the extent practicable, e.g., application of objective criteria for ensuring appropriate cleanliness of animals presented for slaughter;
- on-going tailoring of procedures to information received from the primary production unit, where practicable;
- use of laboratory tests for hazards that are unaddressed by organoleptic inspection when their presence is suspected, e.g., chemical residues and contaminants; and
- return of information to the primary producer so as to seek continuous improvement in the safety and suitability status of animals presented for slaughter (refer to 6.4).

6.3.2 Implementation of ante-mortem inspection

48. The competent authority should determine how ante-mortem inspection is to be implemented, including identification of the components that may be applied at primary production rather than the abattoir, e.g., in the case of intensively-raised poultry.[31] The competent authority should establish the training, knowledge, skills and ability requirements of all personnel involved, and the roles of the official inspector, including the veterinary inspector (refer to 9.2). Verification of inspection activities and judgements should be undertaken as appropriate by the competent authority or competent body. The final responsibility for verifying that all regulatory requirements are met should lie with the competent authority.

The responsibilities of the establishment operator in respect of ante-mortem inspection include:

- providing verifiable information required by the competent authority with respect to ante-mortem inspection carried out at primary production;
- segregation of animals if, for example, they have recently given birth during transport or in lairages, or have recently aborted and/or show retained foetal membranes;
- applying identification systems for individual animals or lots of animals until the time of slaughter that document the outcome of ante-mortem inspection, and after slaughter in the case of “suspect” animals;
- presentation of animals that are sufficiently clean; and
- prompt removal of animals that have died in the lairage, e.g., from metabolic disease, stress, suffocation, with the permission of the competent person undertaking ante-mortem inspection.

49. Ante-mortem inspection at the abattoir should occur as soon, as is practicable after delivery of slaughter animals. Only animals that are judged to be sufficiently rested should proceed to slaughter, but should not be withheld from slaughter any longer than necessary. If ante-mortem inspection has occurred and there is a delay of more than 24 hours before slaughter, ante-mortem inspection should be repeated.

Ante-mortem inspection systems required by the competent authority should include the following:

- all relevant information from the level of primary production should be taken into account on an on-going basis, e.g., declarations from the primary producers relating to the use of veterinary drugs, information from official hazard control programmes;

[31] In some cases the competent authority may allow slaughter on the farm for particular classes of animal, e.g., farmed game, and in such cases the slaughter animals should be subject to ante-mortem inspection and other hygiene controls as determined by the competent authority.

- animals suspected as being unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption should be identified as such and handled separately from normal animals (refer to 6.2 and 8.2);
- results of ante-mortem inspection are made available to the competent person undertaking post-mortem inspection before animals are inspected at the post-mortem stations so as to augment final judgement. This is particularly important when a competent person undertaking ante-mortem inspection, judges that a suspect animal can proceed to slaughter under special hygiene conditions.;
- in more equivocal situations, the competent person undertaking ante-mortem inspection may hold the animal (or lot) in special facilities for more detailed inspection, diagnostic tests, and/or treatment;
- animals condemned as unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption should be immediately identified as such and handled in a manner that does not result in cross-contamination of other animals with food-borne hazards (refer to 8.2); and
- the reason for condemnation should be recorded, with confirmatory laboratory tests being carried out if deemed necessary. Feed back of this information to the primary producer should take place.

50. Slaughter of animals under an official or officially-recognised programme for the eradication or control of a specific zoonotic disease, e.g., salmonellosis, should only be carried out under the hygiene conditions specified by the competent authority.

6.3.3 Ante-mortem judgement categories

Ante-mortem judgement categories include:

- passed for slaughter;
- passed for slaughter subject to a second ante-mortem inspection, after an additional holding period, e.g., when animals are insufficiently rested, or are temporarily affected by a physiological or metabolic condition;
- passed for slaughter under special conditions i.e. deferred slaughter as “suspects”, where the competent person undertaking ante-mortem inspection suspects that post-mortem inspection findings could result in partial or total condemnation;
- condemned for public health reasons i.e. due to: meat-borne hazards, occupational health hazards, or likelihood of unacceptable contamination of the slaughter and dressing environment following slaughter;[32]
- condemned for meat suitability reasons;
- emergency slaughter, when an animal eligible for being passed under special conditions could deteriorate if there was a delay in slaughter; and
- condemned for animal health reasons, as specified in relevant national legislation.

6.4 INFORMATION ON ANIMALS PRESENTED FOR SLAUGHTER

51. Information provided on animals presented for slaughter may be an important determinant of optimal slaughter and dressing procedures and is a prerequisite for effective design and implementation of process control by the establishment operator. The competent authority should analyse relevant information and take it into account when setting hygiene requirements for risk-based hygiene systems throughout the entire food chain (refer to 9.2).

[32] The competent person may judge, after post-mortem inspection in special facilities, that edible parts of the animal can be salvaged for a particular purpose e.g. pet-food.

52. The competent authority may require monitoring of animals presented for slaughter to establish baseline information on the prevalence of hazards in the slaughter population, e.g., specified meat-borne pathogens, chemical residues greater than maximum residue limits. The competent authority should design and implement these monitoring activities according to national public health goals. Scientific analysis and dissemination of results to interested parties is the responsibility of the competent authority.

So as to facilitate science- and risk-based meat hygiene throughout the entire food chain, systems should be in place that provide:

- on-going information on animals presented for slaughter for incorporation into HACCP plans and/or quality assurance (QA) programmes that are part of process control;
- information back to the primary producer on the safety and suitability status of animals presented for slaughter; and
- information to the competent authority that facilitates on-going review.

7. PRESENTATION OF KILLED WILD GAME FOR DRESSING

53. Killed wild game presented at an establishment have been subject to different harvesting, handling and transportation arrangements compared to live animals presented for slaughter. Killed wild game should undergo an appropriate inspection before dressing and full post-mortem inspection commences, so as to prevent undue contamination of the dressing environment and wastage of resources.

7.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO INSPECTION OF KILLED WILD GAME PRESENTED FOR DRESSING

i. Inspection of killed wild game for safety and suitability prior to dressing should be risk-based to the extent practicable, and should take into account relevant information available from the field.

7.2 INSPECTION OF KILLED WILD GAME PRESENTED FOR DRESSING

54. The inspection should determine to the extent possible whether hygienic practice for field-harvested animals has been appropriately applied, including an assessment of cleanliness sufficient for hygienic dressing. Special measures required by the competent authority to facilitate post-mortem inspection, e.g., correct identification and attachment of viscera separated from the animal body (refer to 5.3), should be confirmed at this time.

55. The inspection should take into account any information available from harvesting in the field, e.g., presence of abnormalities at the time of death, geographical location. Where practicable, the results should be returned to hunters or other people involved in harvesting of wild game so as to improve their knowledge of and contribution to meat hygiene.

56. Inspection of killed wild game for safety and suitability prior to dressing should be risk-based to the extent practicable, given that the entire animal may not be presented for dressing, e.g., the gastrointestinal tract of large killed wild game will most likely have been discarded in the field. Inspection procedures prior to dressing and post-mortem inspection, will be necessarily limited in nature. They should be focused on detecting abnormalities intrinsic to field harvesting of wild game, e.g. signs of natural death or the animal being moribund at the time of death, the effects of a misplaced or expanding bullet, decomposition, and any evidence of intoxication with poisons or environmental contaminants. Systems for the implementation of inspection procedures and judgements should be based on those used for ante-mortem inspection of other classes of animals (refer to 6.3).

57. Identity of the body of the animal along with those parts required for post-mortem inspection, should be maintained until final post-mortem judgement.

8. ESTABLISHMENTS: DESIGN, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

58. The principles and guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section IV of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4 2003).

59. The competent authority should allow variations in the design and construction of game depots and establishments processing killed wild game, and their facilities, where they are by necessity impermanent, as long as meat hygiene is not compromised.

8.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO ESTABLISHMENTS, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

i. Establishments should be located, designed and constructed so that contamination of meat is minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

ii. Facilities and equipment should be designed, constructed and maintained so that contamination of meat is minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

iii. Establishments, facilities and equipment should be designed to allow personnel to carry out their activities in a hygienic manner.

iv. Facilities and equipment that are in direct contact with edible parts of animals and meat, should be designed and constructed so that they can be effectively cleaned and monitored for their hygiene status.

v. Suitable equipment should be available for control of temperature, humidity and other factors as appropriate to the particular processing system for meat.

vi. Water should be potable except where water of a different standard can be used without leading to contamination of meat.

60. Each establishment should have appropriate facilities and equipment for competent persons to properly carry out their meat hygiene activities.

61. Laboratory facilities necessary to support meat hygiene activities may be located in the establishment or provided at a separate location.

8.2 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF LAIRAGES

62. Lairages should be designed and constructed so that they do not lead to undue soiling of the animal, cause undue stress of the animal, or otherwise adversely impact on the safety and suitability of meat derived from animals held therein.

Lairages should be designed and constructed so that:

- animals can be held without overcrowding or injury, and are not exposed to climatic stress;[33]
- there are appropriate layout and facilities for cleaning and/or drying of animals;
- ante-mortem inspection is facilitated;
- floors are paved or slatted and allow good drainage;
- there is an adequate supply and reticulation of clean water for drinking and cleaning, and facilities are provided for feeding where necessary;
- there is a physical separation between lairages and areas of an abattoir where edible material may be present;

[33] In the case of poultry and farmed game birds, facilities should be available to park transport vehicles in areas that are well ventilated, and are protected from direct sunlight, inclement weather and extremes of temperature.

- "suspect" animals can be segregated and inspected in separate areas.[34] These areas should include facilities that are capable of secure holding of "suspect" animals pending slaughter under supervision, in a manner that precludes contamination of other animals; and
- there is an adjacent area with adequate facilities for cleaning and sanitation of transport vehicles and crates, unless there are facilities within close distance that are approved by the competent authority.

63. Special facilities may be required to handle condemned animals.

These facilities should be:

- constructed so that all parts, gut contents and faeces from condemned animals can be held under secure containment as appropriate to the circumstances; and
- constructed and equipped so as to facilitate effective cleaning and sanitation (refer to Section 10).

8.3 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF SLAUGHTER AREAS

64. Stunning and bleeding areas should be separated from dressing areas (either physically or by distance), so that cross-contamination of animals is minimised.

65. Areas for scalding, dehairing, defeathering, scraping and singeing (or similar operations) should also be appropriately separated from dressing areas.

66. Where slaughter is carried out the processing line should be designed so that there is constant progress of animals in a manner that does not cause cross-contamination.

67. Special facilities may be required to slaughter and dress "suspect" or injured animals.

Where these facilities exist they should be:

- easily accessed from pens containing "suspect" or injured animals;
- constructed with suitable facilities for hygienic storage of parts derived from "suspect" or injured animals; and
- constructed and equipped so as to facilitate effective cleaning and sanitising (refer to Section 10).

8.4 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF AREAS WHERE BODIES OF ANIMALS ARE DRESSED OR MEAT MAY OTHERWISE BE PRESENT

68. All areas and facilities where bodies of animals are dressed or meat may be present should be designed and constructed so that they facilitate GHP,[35] and contamination of meat is minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

Rooms and other areas in which bodies of animals are dressed or meat may be present should be designed and constructed so that:

- cross-contamination during operations is minimised to the greatest extent practicable;
- effective cleaning, sanitation and maintenance can be carried out during and between periods of operation; (refer to Section 10);

[34] In the case of poultry and farmed game birds, "suspect" birds are usually slaughtered on the slaughter line under special hygiene provisions.

[35] Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1 - 1969, Rev. 4-2003).

- floors in areas where water is present slope sufficiently to grilled or otherwise protected outlets so as to ensure continual drainage;
- exterior doors do not open directly into the area;
- chutes separately conveying different parts of animals are fitted with inspection and cleaning hatches where these are necessary for sanitation;
- separate rooms or separated areas are used for skin-on dressing of pigs or other animals, when other classes of animals are being dressed at the same time;
- separate rooms are used for:

  - emptying and cleansing of alimentary tracts, and further preparation of clean alimentary tracts, unless such separation is deemed unnecessary;

  - handling of meat and inedible parts of animals after they have been so designated, unless these products are otherwise separated by time or distance;

  - storage of inedible animal parts such as hides, horns, hooves, feathers and inedible fats;
- there is adequate natural or artificial lighting for hygienic process control;
- there are appropriate facilities for the preparation and storage of edible fats;
- access and harbouring of pests are effectively restricted; and
- adequate facilities are provided for secure storage of chemicals, (e.g., cleaning materials, lubricants, branding inks) and other hazardous substances so as to prevent accidental contamination of meat.

69. Appropriately designed and insulated rooms should be available as necessary for cooling, chilling and freezing of meat.

Establishments that de-bone or otherwise cut up meat should have for this purpose:

- facilities that allow constant progress of operations or that ensure separation between different production batches;
- a room or rooms, capable of being temperature-controlled; and
- separation of the boning, cutting and primary wrapping area from the packaging area, unless hygiene measures are in place to ensure that packaging does not contaminate meat.

70. Wood may be used in rooms for curing, smoking, maturing, pickling, storage and dispatch of meat preparations and manufactured meat when essential for technological reasons, as long as meat hygiene requirements are not compromised.

71. Drainage and waste disposal systems should not be a source of contamination of meat, the potable water supply or the processing environment. All lines should be watertight and adequately trapped and vented, with catch basins, traps and sumps that are isolated from any area where bodies of animals are dressed or meat may be present.

72. Establishments should have an appropriate area, sufficiently protected from environmental contamination and capable of preventing adverse temperature variations, for dispatching meat.

8.5 DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF EQUIPMENT WHERE BODIES OF ANIMALS ARE DRESSED OR MEAT MAY BE PRESENT

73. All equipment used in areas where bodies of animals are dressed or meat may be present should facilitate good hygienic practices (GHP). Equipment and containers in rooms and other areas where bodies of animals are dressed or meat may be present should be designed and constructed so that contamination is minimised. Meat should not be allowed to contact the floor and walls, or fixed structures not designed for such contact.

74. Where slaughter lines are operated, they should be designed so that there is constant progress of animal bodies, carcasses and other parts, in a manner that prevents cross-contamination between different parts of the slaughter line and between different slaughter lines. In establishments where meat preparations and manufactured meat are circulating, the layout and equipment should be designed to prevent cross contamination between products of different status and products at different production stages.

75. All rooms and other areas in which animals are dressed or meat may be present should be equipped with adequate facilities for washing hands, and should be equipped with adequate facilities for cleaning and sanitation of implements where required (refer to Section 10).

Facilities for cleaning and sanitation of equipment should:

- be designed to effectively clean and sanitise the particular equipment;
- be located convenient to work stations; and
- have waste water ducted to drains.

76. Equipment and implements for use with inedible or condemned parts of animals should be distinctively identified.

77. Establishments should be provided with adequate means of natural or mechanical ventilation so as to prevent excessive heat, humidity and condensation, and ensure that air is not contaminated with odours, dust or smoke.

Ventilation systems should be designed and constructed so that:

- air-borne contamination from aerosols and condensation droplets is minimised;
- ambient temperatures, humidity and odours are controlled; and
- air flow from contaminated areas, (e.g., slaughter and dressing areas) to clean areas, (e.g., chilling rooms for carcasses) is minimised.

78. Equipment used for heat treatment of manufactured meat and meat preparations should be fitted with all control devices necessary to ensure that an appropriate heat treatment is applied.

8.6 WATER SUPPLY[36]

79. Adequate facilities should be provided for monitoring and maintaining potability, storage, temperature control, distribution of water and for the disposal of waste water.

Equipment should be installed that provides:

- an adequate and easily accessible supply of hot and cold potable water at all times;
- hot potable water for effective sanitising of equipment, or an equivalent sanitation system;
- potable water at a temperature appropriate for hand-washing; and

[36] Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene, Section 5.5 (CAC/RCP 1 - 1969, Rev. 4-2003).

- sanitising solution used according to manufacturers' specifications supplied as and where necessary;

80. Where non-potable water is supplied for various uses e.g., fire fighting, steam production, refrigeration, reticulation systems should be designed and identified so that cross-contamination of the potable water supply is prevented.

8.7 TEMPERATURE CONTROL

81. In the absence of suitable temperature, humidity and other environmental controls, meat is particularly vulnerable to survival and growth of pathogens and spoilage micro-organisms.

82. Facilities and equipment should be adequate for:

- Cooling, chilling and/or freezing of meat according to written specifications;
- Storage of meat at temperatures that achieve the safety and suitability requirements; and
- Monitoring of temperature, humidity, air flow and other environmental factors so as to assure that process control regimes are achieved.

83. Where steam is generated in the cooking of meat, it should be properly vented out of the area in order to minimise the potential for condensation and not be allowed to permeate into adjoining rooms.

8.8 FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT FOR PERSONAL HYGIENE

84. Slaughter and dressing of animals and animal parts, and further handling of meat preparations and manufactured meat presents many opportunities for cross-contamination of meat by food handlers (refer to Section 11). Appropriate personal hygiene facilities are needed to minimise cross-contamination of meat from this source.

85. Facilities and equipment should be provided, designed and located so that meat safety is not compromised. Where necessary, separate amenities should be provided e.g. for staff handling live animals, condemned products (refer Section 11).

Facilities for personal hygiene should include:

- changing rooms, showers, flush toilets, hand-washing and hand-drying facilities in the appropriate locations, and separate areas for eating; and
- protective clothing that can be effectively cleaned and minimises accumulation of contaminants.

All areas in which exposed meat may be present, should be equipped with adequate facilities for washing hands that:

- are located convenient to work stations;
- have taps that are not operable by hand;
- supply water at an appropriate temperature, and are fitted with dispensers for liquid soap or other hand cleansing agents;
- include hand drying equipment where necessary, and receptacles for discarded paper towels; and
- have waste water ducted to drains.

8.9 MEANS OF TRANSPORT

Vehicles or shipping containers in which unprotected meat is transported should:

- be designed and equipped so that the meat does not contact the floor;
- have joint and door seals that prevent entry of all sources of contamination; and
- where necessary, be equipped so that temperature control and humidity can be maintained and monitored.

9. PROCESS CONTROL

86. An extensive range of hazards are associated with meat, e.g., *Salmonella* spp. and veterinary drug residues; the processing environment, e.g., *Listeria monocytogenes;* and food handlers themselves, e.g., *Staphylococcus aureus* and hepatitis viruses. Effective process control, that includes both GHP and HACCP, is necessary to produce meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption.

87. The principles and guidelines presented in this section should satisfy the general objectives and guidelines in Section V of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003). They are developed in this section in respect of hazards in meat however they are equally applicable to suitability characteristics.

88. Many aspects of slaughter and dressing procedures have the potential to result in significant contamination of meat, e.g., hide/feather removal, evisceration, carcass washing, post-mortem inspection, trimming, and further handling in the cold chain. Systems for process control should limit microbial cross-contamination in these circumstances to as low as practicably achievable, and reflect the proportional contribution of these controls in reducing meat-borne risks to human health.

89. Ready-to-eat (RTE) products may require specific microbiological testing regimes that incorporate microbiological criteria.[37]

9.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO PROCESS CONTROL

i. Production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption requires that detailed attention be paid to the design, implementation, monitoring and review of process control.

ii. The establishment operator has the primary responsibility for implementing systems for process control. Where such systems are applied, the competent authority should verify that they achieve all meat hygiene requirements.

iii. Process control should limit microbiological contamination to the lowest level practicable, according to a risk-based approach.

iv. HACCP should be applied wherever practicable as the system of choice for process control, and should be supported by prerequisite GHP that includes sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs).

v. Process control should reflect an integrated strategy for control of hazards throughout the food chain, with information available from primary production and pre-slaughter being taken into account wherever possible and practicable.

vi. All bodies of animals should be subjected to post-mortem inspection that is science- and risk-based, and is tailored to the hazards and/or defects that are reasonably likely to be present in the bodies of animals presented for inspection.[38]

---

[37] Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

[38] Where risk assessment capability is not available, post-mortem inspection carried out according to current scientific knowledge and practice should be capable of achieving the level of consumer protection required.

vii. The competent authority should determine the procedures and tests to be used in post-mortem inspection, how that inspection is to be implemented, and the necessary training, knowledge, skills and ability required of personnel involved (including the role of veterinarians, and personnel employed by the establishment operator).

viii. Post-mortem inspection should take into account all relevant information from primary production, ante-mortem inspection, and from official or officially-recognised hazard control programmes.

ix. Post-mortem judgements should be based on: food-borne risks to human health, other human health risks, e.g., from occupational exposure or handling of meat in the home, food-borne risks to animal health as specified in relevant national legislation, and suitability characteristics.

x. Performance objectives or performance criteria for the outcome of process control and post-mortem inspection activities should be established by the competent authority wherever practicable, and should be subject to verification by the competent authority.

xi. Where appropriate, microbiological testing, for verification purposes, should be included in meat preparation and manufactured meat HACCP plans. Such testing should be relevant to the type of product and the likely risks to consumers, including vulnerable sub-populations.

xii. Competent bodies or competent persons may be engaged by the establishment operator to undertake prescribed process control activities[39], including ante-[40] and post-mortem inspection, as approved by the competent authority.

xiii. Handling of ready-to-eat (RTE) products up until the point of sale to the consumer should ensure that there is no contact with non- ready-to-eat (RTE) products, and any other exposure to potential sources of microbiological contamination is minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

xiv. Voluntary or officially recognised quality assurance (QA) systems may be implemented by the establishment operator where they enhance meat hygiene activities, and they may be taken into account in the verification of regulatory requirements by the competent authority.

9.2 PROCESS CONTROL SYSTEMS

90. Effective process control requires design and implementation of appropriate systems. Industry has the primary responsibility for applying and supervising process control systems to ensure the safety and suitability of meat, and these should incorporate prerequisite GHP and HACCP plans as appropriate to the circumstances.

91. A documented process control system should describe the meat hygiene activities applied (including any sampling procedures), performance objectives or performance criteria (if set), verification activities, and corrective and preventative actions.

92. Competent bodies or competent persons suitably recognised by the competent authority may be engaged by the establishment operator to undertake prescribed process control activities, including post-mortem inspection. These activities should be part of HACCP or QA systems as appropriate to the circumstances.

93. Process control systems relating to food safety should incorporate a risk-based approach. Application of HACCP principles in the design and implementation of process control systems should be according to The Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System and Guidelines for its Application (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003). The Guidelines for the Design, Operation, Assessment and Accreditation of Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CAC/GL 26-1997) provide general requirements for control of operations for food as they relate to international trade.

---

[39] Prescribed process control activities may include "Officially recognised inspection systems" (CAC/GL 20 - 1995).

[40] Ante-mortem inspection as covered in Section 6.3.

9.2.1 Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs)

94. Pre-operational and operational sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs) should minimise direct and indirect contamination of meat to the greatest extent possible and practicable. A properly implemented SSOP system should ensure that facilities and equipment are clean and sanitised prior to start of operations, and appropriate hygiene is maintained during operations. SSOP guidelines may be provided by the competent authority, which may include minimum regulatory requirements for general sanitation.

Characteristics of sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs) are:

- development of a written SSOP programme by the establishment that describes the procedures involved and the frequency of application;
- identification of establishment personnel responsible for implementing and monitoring SSOPs;
- documentation of monitoring and any corrective and/or preventative actions taken, which is made available to the competent authority for purposes of verification;
- corrective actions that include appropriate disposition of product; and
- periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the system by the establishment operator.

95. Microbiological verification of SSOPs can utilise a range of direct or indirect methods. Establishment operators should use statistical process control or other methods to monitor sanitation trends.

96. In the case of ready-to-eat (RTE) products, microbiological verification of SSOPs for food contact and non-food contact surfaces is likely to be of higher intensity than for other types of product.

9.2.2 HACCP

97. HACCP systems for production of meat are a proactive means of process control for food safety purposes.[41] Validation of a HACCP plan for meat should ensure that it is effective in meeting performance objectives or performance criteria (refer 9.2.3), taking into account the degree of variability in presence of hazards that is normally associated with different lots of animals presented for processing.

98. Verification frequency may vary according to the operational aspects of process control, the historical performance of the establishment in application of the HACCP plan, and the results of verification itself. The competent authority may choose to approve HACCP plans and stipulate verification frequencies.

99. Microbiological testing for verification of HACCP systems, e.g. for verification of critical limits and statistical process control, is an important feature of HACCP for many products.

100. Guidelines for the development of HACCP programmes to achieve pre-determined process criteria stipulated by the competent authority should be provided to establishment operators so as to guide development of process and product-specific HACCP plans. Guidelines should be developed in consultation with industry and other interested stakeholder organisations, and may be differentiated according to processing category, e.g.:

- Raw ground or comminuted e.g. pork sausage
- Meat with secondary inhibitors / non-shelf stable e.g. cured corned beef
- Heat treated / not fully cooked, non-shelf stable e.g. partially-cooked patties
- Fully cooked / non-shelf stable e.g. cooked ham
- Non-heat treated / shelf stable e.g. dry salami
- Heat treated / shelf stable e.g. beef jerky
- Thermally processed / commercially sterile e.g. canned meat

[41] Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System and Guidelines for its Application, (Annex to CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003).

- Specific ethnic processes, e.g. tandoori

101. When developing HACCP plans for heat-treated meat preparations and manufactured meat, the establishment operator should fully document as appropriate to the process, all thermal process parameters, post-heat treatment handling, and additional preservation treatments appropriate to the intended process outcome e.g. a pasteurised product. Process parameters for cooling of heat-treated products may incorporate as appropriate to the product, rapid cooling, slow cooling, or interrupted cooling. Previously heated products should not be packaged above a minimum temperature, e.g. 4° C, unless it can be demonstrated that cooling after packaging does not compromise product safety.

102. HACCP plans for meat preparations and manufactured meat that are cooked should include monitoring and documentation of parameters that ensure appropriate internal temperatures are reached. Internal temperatures of product should be taken as necessary to verify the adequacy of the cook.

9.2.3 Outcome-based parameters for process control

103. In a risk-based meat hygiene system, verification of process control is greatly strengthened by establishment of performance objectives or performance criteria for the outcome of specified activities. In most cases these will be established by the competent authority. When performance objectives or performance criteria are established, industry can use them to readily demonstrate adequate process control for food safety characteristics of meat.

104. The establishment should have a documented process control system for implementing corrective actions that will allow it to consistently meet performance objectives or performance criteria. Process review and any other corrective and preventative actions required as a result of non-compliance with performance objectives or performance criteria should be properly recorded. The competent authority should implement a system for collecting and analysing results from all establishments to the greatest extent possible, and periodically review process control trends in relation to national meat hygiene goals.

105. Where possible, performance objectives or performance criteria should objectively express the level of hazard control as derived from the application of risk analysis principles. In the absence of sufficient knowledge of risks to human health, performance objectives or performance criteria can initially be established from baseline surveys of current performance, and subsequently modified as appropriate to reflect public health goals. Where outcome-based parameters have been established for suitability characteristics of meat, outcomes should be practically achievable and reflect consumer expectations.

106. Organoleptic parameters may also be established.

Performance objectives or performance criteria for outcomes of process control systems act to:

- facilitate validation of process control systems;
- facilitate derivation of process parameters at various steps in the food production system;
- allow maximum flexibility and technical innovation in the way the establishment operator achieves the required level of performance;
- facilitate industry-wide consistency in performance;
- provide an objective basis for outcome-driven regulatory guidelines and standards, e.g., statistical process control requirements, prevalence of Salmonella spp.;
- improve hazard control over time so as to enhance the level of consumer protection; and
- facilitate determination of the equivalence of sanitary measures.

107. Microbiological performance objectives or performance criteria, process criteria and microbiological criteria for ready-to-eat (RTE) products should be risk-based according to the category of product e.g. not heat treated and shelf stable, heat treated and shelf stable, fully cooked and not shelf stable. Microbiological verification tests should be undertaken by the establishment at a frequency appropriate to the circumstances. The competent authority may also implement testing to verify that appropriate control is maintained by industry. HACCP plans applied by the establishment should document corrective and preventative measures to be taken in the event of positive tests for pathogens or toxins.

108. Where performance objectives or performance criteria are established as regulatory requirements e.g., guidelines for allowable levels of generic *E. coli*, standards for absence of *E. coli* O157:H7, maximum residue limits for chemicals with acute toxicity, explanation of the linkage to an appropriate level of consumer protection should be provided to all interested parties,.

109. In some circumstances a performance criterion may be established as a microbiological criterion that defines the acceptability of a production lot, e.g. based on the presence/absence or number of microbes, and/or the quantity of their toxins or metabolites according to a specified sampling plan.[42]

110. The competent authority should, wherever practicable, recognise different risk-based meat hygiene activities within its competence, which have been demonstrated to meet at least the same risk-based meat hygiene outcomes.

9.2.4 Regulatory systems

111. The competent authority should have the legal power to set and enforce regulatory meat hygiene requirements, and has the final responsibility for verifying that all regulatory requirements are met. The competent authority should:

i. Establish regulatory systems (e.g. recall, traceback, product tracing, etc., as appropriate) and requirements, e.g. training, knowledge, skills and ability of personnel (generally at a national level).

ii. Undertake specified meat hygiene controls that are designated activities of the competent authority, e.g., official sampling programmes, those aspects of ante and post-mortem activities specified by the competent authority, or official certification.

iii. Verify that process control systems implemented by the establishment operator meet regulatory requirements e.g. GHP, SSOPs, HACCP, as appropriate.

iv. Verify that competent bodies are carrying out functions as required.

v. Carry out enforcement actions as necessary.

The competent authority should verify compliance with:

- GHP requirements for: animals presented for slaughter (and killed wild game presented for dressing), establishments, facilities and equipment, process control, transport, and hygiene of personnel;
- SSOPs;
- HACCP plans;
- all regulatory requirements relating to ante- and post-mortem inspection;
- performance and process parameters that are regulatory requirements, e.g., microbiological statistical process control requirements, standards for Salmonella spp.;
- chemical residue and contaminant levels that are below maximum limits as described in relevant legislation and national sampling plans;
- official or “officially-recognised” zoonoses control programmes, e.g., microbiological tests for *E. coli* O157:H7; and

[42] Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods (CAC/GL 21-1997).

- additional risk management measures as specified by the competent authority.

112. Verification activities may include assessment of processing activities carried out by establishment personnel, documentary checks, organoleptic inspection of edible parts and meat, taking of samples for laboratory tests and testing for pathogens, indicator organisms, residues, etc. Approval/registration/listing of an establishment may facilitate the ability of the competent authority to verify that it is operating in compliance with regulatory requirements.

113. The competent authority(s) should conduct appropriate monitoring of verification activities performed by the operator, and the nature and intensity of that monitoring should be based on risk and performance. The distribution and retail sale of products should be included in this monitoring to an extent that the risks to the consumer are mitigated.

114. The official inspector (including the veterinary inspector) should verify compliance with the regulatory requirements and may use additional documentary checks, procedures and tests in this role. Rules governing the presence of the official inspector during ante- and post-mortem inspection, and during processing, cutting, and storage of meat, should be determined by the competent authority in relation to deployment of other competent persons, and in relation to potential risks to human health associated with the classes of animals and meat involved.

115. A national meat hygiene programme should be subject to verification by the competent authority.

Where the establishment operator does not comply with regulatory requirements, the competent authority should carry out enforcement actions that may include:

- slowing of production while the operator regains process control;
- stopping production, and withdrawing certification for meat deemed to be unsafe or unsuitable for its intended use;
- withdrawing official supervision, or accreditation of competent persons;
- ordering specified treatment, recall or destruction of meat as necessary; and
- withdrawing or suspending all or part of the approval/registration/listing of the establishment if process control systems are invalid or repeatedly non-compliant.

9.2.5 Quality assurance (QA) systems

116. Whenever there are verifiable quality assurance (QA) systems in place in the industry, the competent authority should take them into account.[43]

9.3 GENERAL HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCESS CONTROL

117. Process control should meet the general hygiene requirements of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene.[44]

General hygiene requirements for process control should include for example:

- water for cleaning and sanitising of a standard that is appropriate for the specific purpose, and used in a manner that does not directly or indirectly contaminate meat;
- cleaning of facilities and equipment that involves disassembly where necessary, removal of all debris, rinsing of parts, application of an approved cleaner, repeat rinsing, reassembly, and further sanitizing and rinsing as appropriate;

[43] Guidelines for the Design, Operation, Assessment and Accreditation of Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems - Section 4 "Quality Assurance" (CAC/GL 26-1997).

[44] Note that general requirements for control of incoming materials, use of water, packaging, documentation and records, and recall procedures are described in the recommended international code of practice: general principles of food hygiene (CAC/RCP 1 - 1969, Rev. 4-2003).

- handling and storage of containers and equipment in a way that minimises the potential for contamination of meat;
- assembly of containers or cartons in rooms or areas where meat may be present in such a manner that there is minimal possibility of contamination; and
- controlled access of personnel to processing areas.

118. The competent authority and industry should utilise appropriately accredited or otherwise recognised laboratories when verifying process control and carrying out other meat hygiene activities. Testing of samples should utilise validated analytical methods.[45]

Laboratory testing may be required for:

- verification of process control;
- monitoring the achievement of performance or microbiological criteria;
- residue monitoring;
- diagnosis of disease conditions affecting individual animals; and
- monitoring of zoonoses.

9.4 HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR SLAUGHTER AND DRESSING

119. Only live animals intended for slaughter should be brought into an abattoir, with the exception of animals that have undergone emergency slaughter outside the slaughterhouse and have appropriate veterinary documentation.

120. No animal other than an animal intended for slaughter should enter an abattoir, with the exception of animals used for stock handling provided these animals stay in the live animal handling area of the abattoir.

121. An animal should only be slaughtered or dressed in an abattoir if a competent person is available to undertake ante- and post-mortem inspection. In cases of emergency slaughter where a competent person is not available, special provisions established by the competent authority will apply to ensure that the meat is safe and suitable for human consumption.

122. All animals brought to the slaughter floor should be slaughtered without delay, and stunning, sticking and bleeding of animals should not proceed at a rate faster than that at which bodies of animals can be accepted for dressing.

During initial dressing operations, and with due consideration to minimising contamination:

- slaughtered animals that are scalded, flamed or similarly treated should be scoured of all bristles, hair, scurf, feathers, cuticles and dirt;
- the trachea and oesophagus should remain intact during bleeding, except in the case of ritual slaughter;
- bleeding should be as complete as possible; if blood is intended for food, it should be collected and handled in a hygienic manner;
- exposure of the tongue should be done in such a way that the tonsils are not cut;
- skinning of the head may not be required for some classes of animals e.g. goats, calves, sheep, provided that heads are handled in such a way as to avoid undue contamination of meat;

[45] Guidelines for the assessment of the competence of testing laboratories involved in the Import and Export Control of Food (CAC/GL 27-1997).

- before the removal from the head of any parts intended for human consumption, the head should be clean and, except in the case of animal bodies that are scalded and dehaired, skinned to an extent sufficient to facilitate inspection and the hygienic removal of specified parts;
- lactating or obviously-diseased udders should be removed from animal bodies at the earliest opportunity;
- removal of udders should be done in such as way that the contents do not contaminate the animal bodies;
- gas skinning or dehiding (pumping of air or gas between the skin or hide and the underlying tissue to facilitate skinning) should only be permitted if it can meet required criteria for process control; and
- hides/fleeces should not be washed, de-fleshed or left to accumulate in any part of an abattoir or establishment that is used for slaughter or dressing.

123. Poultry and farmed game birds, following de-feathering, can only be effectively cleaned of dust, feathers and other contaminants by the application of potable water. Washing of the animal bodies at multiple steps in the dressing process, and as soon as possible after each contaminating step, reduces the adherence of bacteria to the skin which can minimise overall carcass contamination. (Washing after evisceration and post-mortem is also necessary for technological reasons, as this is the only method available to routinely clean carcasses before entry to the chilling process). Washing may be carried out by several methods e.g., spraying, immersion washing.

124. Farmed ratites may have an excessive amount of dust and dirt trapped in their feathers, and this has the potential for significant contamination of the dressing area unless there is adequate separation by distance, physical barrier, or other means, e.g., positive ventilation.

125. Once the removal of the hide/fleece has commenced, or dehairing has occurred, animal bodies should be separated from each other to avoid contact, and this should be maintained until each carcass has been inspected and judged by a competent person undertaking post-mortem inspection. (Note: While full separation of carcasses is more difficult in the case of poultry and farmed game birds, such contact should be minimised).

During dressing, and with due consideration to minimising contamination:

- where bodies of animals are skinned, this process should be completed before evisceration;
- water in scalding tanks should be managed so that it is not excessively contaminated;
- evisceration should be carried out without delay;
- discharge or spillage of any material from the oesophagus, crop, stomach, intestines, cloaca or rectum, or from the gall bladder, urinary bladder, uterus or udder, should be prevented;
- intestines should not be severed from the stomach during evisceration and no other opening should be made into an intestine, unless the intestines are first effectively tied to prevent spillage, except in the case of poultry and game birds;
- stomachs and intestines and all inedible material derived from the slaughtering and/or dressing of bodies of animals should be removed as soon as possible from the dressing area, and processed in a manner that does not cause cross-contamination of meat;
- methods used to remove visible and microbial contamination should be demonstrated to be effective and meet other requirements as specified by the competent authority; and
- faecal and other material should be trimmed or otherwise removed from carcasses in a manner that does not result in further contamination, and which achieves appropriate performance objectives or performance criteria for process control.

126. Animal bodies and carcasses should not come into contact with surfaces or equipment unless practically unavoidable. Where use of equipment involves contact by design, e.g., in the case of automatic eviscerating machines, the hygiene of the equipment should be appropriately maintained and monitored.

127. Where a competent person undertaking post-mortem inspection, considers that the manner in which animals are being slaughtered or dressed, or meat is further handled, will adversely affect the safety and suitability of meat, that competent person should enforce a reduction in the rate of production or the suspension of operations or other appropriate measures, as deemed necessary (refer to 9.2.4).

128. Establishment operators should meet the requirements of the competent authority in terms of presentation of edible parts of bodies of animals for post-mortem inspection. Parts of slaughtered animals that have been removed before post-mortem inspection is performed should remain identifiable, as belonging to a single carcass (or a group of carcasses) when required for post-mortem judgement.

129. Facilities and equipment for slaughtering and/or dressing may be used for other purposes, e.g. for animal health emergency slaughter, provided appropriate cleaning and sanitation requirements are met.

130. The competent authority should encourage development and adoption of innovative technologies and procedures at the establishment level that reduce cross-contamination and enhance food safety, e.g., enclosing the terminal rectal intestine in a bag and tying off.

9.5 POST-MORTEM INSPECTION

131. All carcasses and other relevant parts should be subjected to post-mortem inspection, which preferably should be part of an overarching, risk-based system for the production of meat.

132. Post-mortem inspection of carcasses and other relevant parts should utilise information from primary production and ante-mortem inspection, together with the findings from organoleptic inspection of the head, carcass and viscera, to make a judgement on the safety and suitability of parts intended for human consumption. Where the results of organoleptic inspection are insufficient to accurately judge carcasses and other relevant parts as safe or suitable for human consumption, the parts should be set aside and followed up with confirmatory inspection procedures and/or tests.

9.5.1 Design of post-mortem inspection systems

133. Post-mortem inspection procedures and tests should be established by the competent authority according to a science- and risk-based approach. The competent authority has responsibility for establishing judgement criteria and verifying the post-mortem inspection system. In the absence of a risk-based system, procedures will have to be based on current scientific knowledge and practice.

134. Post-mortem procedures and tests may be integrated and implemented together so as to achieve public health and animal health objectives. In such cases, all aspects of post-mortem inspection should be science-based and be tailored to the relevant risks.

135. Relevant information on the animal population, e.g., animal type, health status, geographical region of origin, should be utilised in both the design and implementation of post-mortem inspection systems.

136. Where indicated by public health concerns, routine screening of carcasses and other relevant parts by methods other than organoleptic inspection may be required for suspected hazards, e.g., testing for *Trichinella* spp.

Characteristics of a risk-based post-mortem inspection programme are:

- design and application of organoleptic procedures and tests that are relevant and proportional to meat-borne risks associated with grossly-detectable abnormalities;
- tailoring of procedures to the spectrum and prevalence of diseases and defects reasonably likely to be present in the particular slaughter population, taking into account the type (age), geographical origin and primary production system of the slaughter animals, e.g., multiple incisions of relevant muscles in all pigs from geographical regions where *Taenia solium* is present;

- procedures that minimise cross-contamination through handling to the greatest extent practicable, and may include procedures that are limited to visual observation of carcasses and other relevant parts in the first instance if justified by risk assessment;
- inspection of non-edible parts of animals where they may play an indicator role in the judgement of edible parts;
- modification of traditional procedures where scientific investigation has shown them to be ineffective, or, of themselves, hazardous to food, e.g., routine incision of lymph nodes of young animals to detect granulomatosus abnormalities;
- application of more intensive organoleptic procedures on a routine basis when a disease or condition capable of general distribution is found in a single part of a carcass and other relevant parts, e.g., cysts of *Taenia saginata* in cattle, xanthosis;
- application of additional risk-based inspection procedures on a routine basis when live animals are positive to a diagnostic test, e.g., tuberculin test in cattle, mallein test in horses;
- use of laboratory tests for hazards that are unaddressed by organoleptic inspection, e.g., *Trichinella* spp., chemical residues and contaminants;
- application of measurable outcomes of organoleptic inspection that reflect a risk-based approach;
- integration with HACCP plans for other process control activities;
- on-going tailoring of procedures to take into consideration information received from the primary producer on a lot-by-lot basis; and
- return of information to the primary producer so as to seek continuous improvement in the safety and suitability status of animals presented for slaughter (refer to 6.4).

9.5.2 Implementation of post-mortem inspection

137. Post-mortem inspection should occur as soon as is practicable after slaughter of animals, or delivery of killed wild game animals. Inspection should take into account all relevant information from the level of primary production and ante-mortem inspection, e.g. information from official or officially-recognised hazard control programmes, information on animals slaughtered as "suspects".

138. The competent authority should determine: how post-mortem inspection is to be implemented, the training, knowledge, skills and ability required of personnel involved (including the role of the official inspector, the veterinary inspector, and any personnel not employed by the competent authority), and the frequency and intensity of verification activities (refer to 9.2.4). The final responsibility for verifying that all post-mortem inspection and judgement requirements are met should lie with the competent authority.

139. Carcasses and other relevant parts condemned by the competent person undertaking post-mortem inspection, as unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption should be identified as appropriate and handled in a manner that does not result in cross-contamination of meat from other carcasses and relevant parts. The reason for condemnation should be recorded, and confirmatory laboratory tests may be taken if deemed necessary.

The responsibilities of the establishment operator in respect of post-mortem inspection include:

- maintenance of the identity of a carcass and other relevant parts (including blood as appropriate) until inspection is complete;
- skinning and dressing of heads to the extent necessary to facilitate inspection, e.g., partial skinning to allow access to sub-maxillary lymph nodes, detaching of the base of the tongue to allow access to the retropharyngeal lymph nodes;
- skinning of heads to the extent necessary to allow hygienic removal of edible parts, when this is a processing option;

- presentation of a carcass and other relevant parts for inspection according to the requirements of the competent authority;
- a prohibition on establishment personnel intentionally removing or modifying any evidence of a disease or defect, or animal identification mark, prior to post mortem inspection;
- prompt removal of foetuses from the evisceration area, for rendering or other processes as allowed by the competent authority, e.g., collection of foetal blood;
- retention in the inspection area of all carcasses and other relevant parts required for inspection, until inspection and judgement has been completed;
- provision of facilities for identifying and retaining all carcasses and other relevant parts that require more detailed inspection and/or diagnostic tests before a judgement on safety and suitability can be made, in a manner that prevents cross-contamination of meat from other carcasses and other relevant parts;
- condemnation of parts of the carcass trimmed from the region of the sticking wound;
- routine condemnation of the liver and/or kidneys from older animals where the competent authority has determined that there may be accumulation of heavy metals to an unacceptable level;
- use of health marks (as specified by the competent authority) that communicate the outcome of post-mortem inspection; and
- co-operation with competent persons undertaking post-mortem inspection, in all other ways necessary to facilitate effective post-mortem inspection, e.g., access to processing records, and easy access to all carcasses and other relevant parts.

Post-mortem inspection systems, should include:

- procedures and tests that are risk-based to the extent possible and practicable (refer to 9.5.1);
- confirmation of proper stunning and bleeding;
- availability of inspection as soon as is practicable after completion of dressing;
- visual inspection of the carcass and other relevant parts, including inedible parts, as determined by the competent authority;
- palpation and/or incision of the carcass and other relevant parts, including inedible parts, as determined by the competent authority according to a risk-based approach;
- additional palpation and/or incisions, as necessary to reach a judgement for an individual carcass and other relevant parts, and under appropriate hygiene control;
- more detailed inspection of edible parts intended for human consumption compared with inspection of those parts for indicator purposes alone, as appropriate to the circumstances;
- systematic, multiple incisions of lymph nodes where incision is necessary;
- other organoleptic inspection procedures, e.g., smell, touch;
- where necessary, laboratory diagnostic and other tests carried out by the competent authority or by the establishment operator under instruction;
- performance objectives or performance criteria for the outcomes of organoleptic inspection, if available;
- regulatory authority to slow or halt processing so as to allow adequate post-mortem inspection at all times;

- removal of specified parts if required by the competent authority, e.g., "specified risk materials" for BSE; and
- proper use and secure storage of equipment for health marking.

140. The competent authority and industry should record and disseminate the results of post-mortem inspection as appropriate. Notifiable human or animal health diseases and cases of non-complying residues or contaminants should be reported to national competent authorities as well as to the owner of the animal(s). Analysis of the results of post-mortem inspection over time is the responsibility of the competent authority, and the results of such analyses should be made available to all interested parties.

9.6 POST-MORTEM JUDGEMENT

141. Post-mortem judgement of edible parts as safe and suitable for human consumption should primarily be based on food-borne risks to human health. Other risks to human health, e.g., from occupational exposure or from handling of meat in the home, also are an important consideration. Judgements in relation to suitability characteristics of meat should reflect consumer acceptability requirements appropriate to intended end-use. [46]

142. Although outside the mandate of Codex, post-mortem inspection programmes may be utilised to identify and judge carcasses and other relevant parts according to risks to animal health, as specified in relevant national legislation.

Judgement of edible parts as safe and suitable should take into account information from the following sources:

- information from primary production (refer to Section 6);
- observations made of animals in the lairage;
- ante-mortem inspection; and
- post-mortem inspection, including diagnostic tests, where required.

143. Judgements should be based on science and risks to human health to the greatest extent possible, with guidelines being provided by the competent authority. Judgements should only be made by competent persons. The level of training, knowledge, skills and ability required for judgement may be less in situations where edible parts demonstrating a specific abnormality are always judged to be unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption and appropriately disposed of.

144. Where the initial results of post-mortem inspection are insufficient to accurately judge edible parts as safe or suitable for human consumption, a provisional judgement should be followed up with more detailed inspection procedures and/or tests. Pending the outcome of more detailed inspection and/or diagnostic tests, all parts of the animal that are required for further investigation should be held under the control of the competent person undertaking these activities.

Judgement categories for edible parts include:

- safe and suitable for human consumption;
- safe and suitable for human consumption, subject to application of a prescribed process, e.g., cooking, freezing;[47;]
- held on suspicion of being unsafe or unsuitable, pending the outcome of further procedures and/or tests.

[46] The competent authority may take into account varying needs of different consumer populations so that suitability judgements do not distort the economics of the food supply.

[47] The competent person can instruct that following post-mortem inspection, edible parts held under suitable inventory control can be designated as safe and suitable when subjected to a particular process e.g. freezing, cooking, canning.

- unsafe for human consumption but able to be used for some other purpose, e.g., pet-food, feed and feed ingredients, industrial non-food use, providing there are adequate hygiene controls to prevent any transmission of hazards, or illegal re-entry to the human food chain;
- unsafe for human consumption and requiring condemnation and destruction;
- unsuitable for human consumption, but able to be used for some other purpose, e.g., pet-food, feed and feed ingredients, industrial non-food use, providing there are adequate controls to prevent illegal re-entry to the human food chain;
- unsuitable for human consumption, and requiring condemnation and destruction; and
- unsafe for animal health reasons as specified in national legislation, and disposed of accordingly.[48]

145. When edible parts are judged to be safe and suitable for human consumption subject to application of a prescribed process, the specifications for that process should be verified by the competent authority as sufficient to eliminate/reduce or adequately remove the hazard or condition of concern, e.g., specifications for retorting, high temperature rendering and freezing.

9.7 HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR PROCESS CONTROL AFTER POST-MORTEM INSPECTION

146. Operations following post-mortem inspection include all procedures until the point of retail sales, e.g. chilling of carcasses, de-boning and cutting, further preparing, processing, packaging, freezing, storing, and distribution to the point of retail sale. Particular attention needs to paid to temperature control, with temperatures of freshly slaughtered and dressed carcasses and other edible parts being reduced as rapidly as possible to a temperature that minimise the growth of micro-organisms or the formation of toxins that could constitute a risk to human health. It is also important that the cold chain is not interrupted except to the minimal extent necessary for practical operations, e.g., handling during transportation.

147. In the case of poultry and farmed game birds, viscera or parts of viscera, apart from kidneys, should be entirely removed as soon as possible, unless otherwise permitted by the competent authority.

Meat passed as safe and suitable for human consumption should be:

- removed without delay from the dressing area;
- handled, stored and transported in a manner that will protect it from contamination and deterioration;
- held under conditions that reduce its temperature and/or water activity as quickly as possible, unless cut up or de-boned pre-rigor; and
- held at temperatures that achieve safety and suitability objectives.

In the case of poultry or farmed game birds undergoing immersion chilling:

- the immersion chilling process should meet hygiene criteria as specified by the competent authority;
- the reduction in carcass temperature should be as rapid as possible;
- carcasses emerging from the process should have a lesser microbiological count for indicator organisms and pathogens than those entering the process; and

[48] In some circumstances, edible parts may be judged as suitable for human consumption but subject to restricted distribution because the animals were sourced from geographical areas under quarantine for animal health reasons.

- sanitation requirements should include complete emptying, cleaning and sanitation of tanks as appropriate.

148. An official health mark applied to meat, wrapping or packaging, should provide recognition that the product has been produced in accordance with regulatory requirements, and should assist with trace-back to the establishment of origin if required. When used as part of an official meat hygiene programme, the health mark should include the approval/registration/listing number of the establishment, be applied in such a way that it cannot be re-used, and be legible. Other marks may denote conformance with commercial specifications, or unacceptability for human consumption, e.g., distinctive brands for pet-food.

149. Official health marks may be applied directly to the product, wrapping or packaging, or be printed on a label affixed to the product, wrapping or packaging. In circumstances of bulk transport to another establishment for further handling, processing or wrapping, health marks may be applied to the external surface of the container or packaging.

Where carcasses, parts of carcasses or other meat is placed in a holding room:

- all requirements for hygienic control of operations must be adhered to e.g., chiller loading rates, stock rotation, specifications for temperature and relative humidity;
- carcasses and parts of carcasses, whether hung or placed in racks or trays, should be held in a manner permitting adequate circulation of air;
- the potential for cross-contamination via dripping of fluids should be prevented; and
- water dripping from overhead facilities and condensation should be controlled to the extent practicable, to prevent contamination of meat and food contact surfaces.

150. Rooms and equipment for cutting, mincing, mechanical separation, meat preparation and the manufacturing of meat should be designed such that activities can be carried out separately, or in such a manner that does not led to cross contamination.

151. Fresh meat intended for cutting or de-boning should be brought into work rooms progressively as needed, and should not accumulate on work tables. If fresh meat is cut or de-boned prior to reaching temperatures that are appropriate for storage and transport, it should be immediately reduced in temperature to prescribed levels.

When fresh meat is cut or de-boned pre-rigor:

- it should be transported directly from the dressing area to the cutting up or de-boning room;
- the cutting up or de-boning room should be temperature-controlled and directly linked to the dressing areas, unless the competent authority approves alternative procedures that provide an equivalent level of hygiene; and
- cutting up, de-boning and packing should be done without delay and should meet all requirements for hygienic process control.

When raw meat is minced:

- it should be obtained only from parts of animals as approved by the competent authority e.g. striated muscle and adherent fatty tissues[49];
- it should not contain bone fragments or skin;

[49] Striated muscles from affected animal species should have undergone an examination from Trichinella as specified by the competent authority.

- any grossly abnormal tissues and / or post-dressing contamination should be removed before mincing; and
- the competent authority may specify compositional criteria.

When raw meat is mechanically separated, the competent authority should:

- restrict the type of animal parts that can be used e.g. non-use of skulls;
- set compositional standards for maximum calcium content; and
- require specific labelling of the final product.

When raw meat is minced, mechanically separated or used in meat preparations:

- the competent authority can specify maximum time/temperature schedules for process control at each step of production e.g. maximum times and temperatures from chilling or freezing of raw material to the time of preparation, maximum temperatures during production, maximum times before chilling or freezing;
- unless used directly as an ingredient for meat preparations and manufactured meat, it should be immediately wrapped and/or packaged, followed by immediate refrigeration;
- the competent authority may specify microbiological performance objectives, performance criteria, process criteria or microbiological criteria for raw materials and final product;
- establishments should have in-line magnets or other means of detecting contamination with metal fragments as appropriate; and
- it should not be refrozen after thawing.

When meat preparations or manufactured meat are handled:

- the process flow of raw meat awaiting processing and during processing should ensure uniform turnover of accumulated product and avoid possible cross-contamination, e.g. between raw materials and ready-to-eat products;
- supply and addition of non-meat ingredients should be subject to good hygienic practice and HACCP as appropriate and practicable, and may involve decontamination treatments e.g. for herbs and spices;
- products that include non-meat protein products (as defined or standardised by Codex) should be appropriately labelled[50];
- process control for non-commercially sterile products should prevent pathogen growth and toxin production during all processing activities e.g. during fermentation, partial heat treatment, drying, maturing and curing. Process criteria may include for example, correct pH after fermentation, correct time/temperature schedules during and after heating or smoking, correct moisture / protein ratio after drying, correct formulation and application of nitrite as a cure ingredient;
- if heat and/or other processing treatments are not sufficient to ensure the stability of the product, the product should be cooled to an appropriate storage temperature and in a manner that ensures product safety is not compromised as a result of germination and subsequent growth of pathogenic sporeformers;

[50] Codex General Standard for the Labelling of Prepackaged Food (CODEX STAN 1-1985, Rev. 1-1991).

- product formulations e.g. distribution of antibacterial ingredients throughout cooked sausage emulsions, addition of cultures, adjustment of pH, should achieve required levels of pathogen control;
- microbiological contamination of raw meat used to produce fermented products should be as low as possible, and similarly, mechanically separated meat should only be used if appropriate time / temperature schedules to achieve product safety requirements of the competent authority are used;
- processing of shelf-stable products in hermetically sealed rigid containers should be according to Codex guidelines;[51]
- cooked products should achieve time / internal temperatures that are validated as achieving appropriate pathogen reduction, including meeting specified performance objectives, performance criteria and microbiological criteria;
- pasteurisation values or other heat processes should be validated for all heat treated chilled products in hermetically sealed containers so as to ensure that product safety is maintained to the end of shelf life, taking into account all preservation factors that may be present;
- unless the absence of trichinellae can be assured by testing or other means, process treatments for products containing striated muscle from affected animal species, either alone or in combination, should be sufficient to destroy *Trichinella* spp.;
- contamination with *L. monocytogenes* of heat treated / non-shelf stable and non-heat treated / shelf stable products should be prevented by use of SSOPs and GHPs that are subject to routine microbiological verification;
- dried products should be protected from environmental contamination and from reabsorption of moisture; and
- processes for products containing minced, comminuted or mechanically separated meat should have in-line magnets or other means of detecting contamination with metal fragments.

Where meat is packaged or wrapped:

- packaging material should be suitable for use, stored and used in a hygienic manner; and
- cases or cartons should have a suitable inner liner or other means of protecting the meat, except that the liner or other protection may not be required if pieces of meat, such as cuts, are individually wrapped before packing.

Where meat is placed in a room for freezing:

- meat that is not in cartons should be hung or placed on racks or trays in a manner that allows adequate circulation of air;
- meat that is not in cartons should be held in a manner whereby the potential for cross-contamination via dripping of liquids is prevented;
- cartons containing meat should be stacked so as to permit adequate circulation of air; and
- meat held on trays should be placed so as to avoid contact with the base of an upper tray.

[51] Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Low-Acid Canned Foods CAC/RCP 23-1979 (Rev. 1-1989).

Where meat is held in a freezer room or storage facility:

- the temperature of the meat should have been reduced to an acceptable level before placement;
- exposed meat must be stored in such a way that the hygiene cannot be compromised by the presence of packaged meat or packaging material;
- meat, whether in carcass form or in cartons, should not be stacked directly on the floor and should be positioned so that there is adequate air circulation;
- the freezer store should be operated and maintained under conditions appropriate to maintaining the safety and suitability of meat;
- temperatures should be continuously recorded and monitored; and
- adequate inventory control should be maintained.

152. Where raw meat is thawed for further processing, hygiene controls should be such that thawing will not result in growth of micro-organisms or the formation of toxins to the extent that they may constitute a risk to human health. Hygiene controls should include adequate drainage of liquid run-off.

153. The establishment operator should establish and implement a procedure for determining and validating the shelf life of manufactured meat and meat preparations.

154. In some circumstances ready-to-eat (RTE) products that do not meet microbiological performance objectives, performance criteria, process criteria, or microbiological criteria, may be re-processed, condemned or treated as inedible. Where appropriate, follow-up sampling should verify that re-processed ready-to-eat (RTE) products comply with regulatory microbiological requirements. When ready-to-eat (RTE) products have been contaminated subsequent to cooking and/or other preservation treatment with pathogens such that they could pose a risk to public health, the products should be reworked or condemned without compromise.

155. Where establishments are approved, registered and/or listed for different animal species, all operations must be controlled in terms of space or time so that there is no possibility of accidental mixing of meat from different slaughter species, and no mis-identification at the time of packaging.

9.8 HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTS OF ANIMALS DEEMED UNSAFE OR UNSUITABLE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

156. Special hygiene measures should be applied to operations involving parts of animals deemed unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption. These measures should prevent cross-contamination to other edible parts and meat, and prevent any possibility of substitution.

Parts of animals deemed unsafe or unsuitable for human consumption should be:

- placed without delay into specifically identified chutes, containers, trolleys, or other handling facilities;
- identified by means as appropriate to the type and end use of the tissue;
- in the case of condemned material, handled in rooms reserved for that purpose and conveyed in a secure manner to a place of disposal (e.g. rendering station).

9.9 SYSTEMS FOR REMOVING PRODUCTS THAT ARE IN CIRCULATION

157. Establishments should have adequate systems that enable removal of products that are in circulation. The competent authority should verify that the systems are adequate. The competent authority should be notified when an establishment operator removes product for public health reasons. Consumers and interested parties should be notified as appropriate in these cases.

158. Removal of product requires systems that are capable of:

- Withdrawal, where measures are applied by the establishment operator to prevent the distribution, display or offer of a product that is not safe or suitable for human consumption;
- Recall, where measures are applied to return unsafe or unsuitable product that has already been supplied or made available to consumers;
- Detention, where measures are applied by the competent authority to ensure that the product is not moved or tampered with pending a decision on its disposition; it includes storage by the establishment operator in accordance with instructions from the competent authority.

159. The particular systems that are enacted in the case of a removal will depend on the specific situation and the likely risks to human health.

160. Where removal of product is necessary, the amount of product involved may be more than that from a single production or sampled lot. The competent authority should verify to the extent practicable, that the establishment has taken all steps necessary to ensure all affected product or potentially affected product is included in the removal.

Product removal systems designed by the establishment operator should:

- Incorporate identification, management and operational procedures that facilitates the rapid and complete removal of implicated lots;
- Provide for records that facilitate trace-back to the origin of the problem;
- Provide for records that facilitate investigation of any processing inputs that may be implicated;
- Be reviewed and tested periodically; and
- Include provision for communication where appropriate to the competent authority, consumers and other interested stakeholders particularly where public health issues are involved.

10. ESTABLISHMENTS: MAINTENANCE AND SANITATION

161. The principles and guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section VI of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003).

10.1 PRINCIPLES OF MEAT HYGIENE APPLYING TO MAINTENANCE AND SANITATION OF ESTABLISHMENTS, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

i. Establishments, facilities and equipment should be maintained and sanitised in such a manner that contamination of meat is minimised to the greatest extent practicable.

ii. Documented programmes for effective and appropriate maintenance and sanitation should be in place (refer to 9.2.1).

iii. Monitoring of the effectiveness of maintenance and sanitation should be included as a basic component of meat hygiene programmes (refer to 9.2.1).

iv. Special sanitation requirements should be applied to the slaughter and dressing of animals that are condemned or designated as “suspects”.

10.2 MAINTENANCE AND SANITATION

162. Establishments, facilities and equipment should be kept in an appropriate state of repair and condition to facilitate all sanitation procedures and prevent contamination of meat, e.g., from metal shards, flaking plaster and chemical contaminants.

163. Sanitation standard operating procedures (SSOPs) should specify the scope of the cleaning programme, cleaning specifications, persons responsible, and monitoring and record keeping requirements.

Cleaning procedures and programmes should:

- be specified in SSOPs as appropriate to the circumstances;
- provide for removal and storage of waste;
- ensure that there is no consequential contamination of meat with detergents or sanitising agents, unless allowable under conditions of use; and
- be monitored for their effectiveness, e.g., organoleptic checks and microbiological sampling of meat contact surfaces, and be redesigned if and when necessary.

164. Particular cleaning programmes are required for equipment used in the slaughter and dressing of carcasses e.g., knives, saws, machine cutters, evisceration machines and flushing nozzles.

Such equipment should be:

- clean and sanitised before each new period of work;
- cleaned, and sanitised, by immersion in hot water or alternative methods, with appropriate frequency during and/or between periods of work;
- immediately cleaned and sanitised when coming into contact with abnormal or diseased tissue that may harbour food-borne pathogens; and
- stored in designated areas in such a manner that it will not become contaminated.

165. Containers and equipment should not pass from an “inedible” area to an “edible” area before being cleaned and sanitised.

166. Pest control programmes are an essential part of maintenance and sanitation and should follow GHP as described in the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene.[52]

In particular:

- the programme should be properly documented and verified by the establishment operator;
- treatment of areas, rooms, facilities and equipment, with an approved pesticide should be carried out according to the conditions of use; and
- pesticides and other pest control chemicals should be kept in secure storage, with access being limited to authorised persons.

11. PERSONAL HYGIENE

167. Slaughter and dressing of animals, and handling and inspection of meat, presents many opportunities for cross-contamination. Personal hygiene practices should prevent undue general contamination, and prevent cross-contamination with human pathogens that may cause food-borne disease. The guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section VII of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003).

[52] Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003) .

168. Persons moving from rooms or areas containing raw meat to rooms or areas used for meat preparations and manufactured meat (especially when these products are cooked) should thoroughly wash, change and/or sanitise their protective clothing as appropriate, and otherwise limit the possibility of cross-contamination to the lowest level practicable.

11.1 PERSONAL CLEANLINESS

169. Persons who come into direct or indirect contact with edible parts of animals or meat in the course of their work should maintain appropriate personal cleanliness and behaviour, and should not be clinically affected by communicable agents likely to be transmitted by meat.

Persons who come into direct or indirect contact with edible parts of animals or meat should:

- maintain an appropriate standard of personal cleanliness;
- wear protective clothing appropriate to the circumstances, and ensure that non-disposable protective clothing is cleaned before and during work;
- if wearing gloves during the slaughter and dressing of animals and the handling of meat, ensure that they are of an approved type for the particular activity, e.g., chain-mail stainless steel, synthetic fabric, latex, and they are used according to specifications, e.g., washing of hands before use, changing or sanitising gloves when contaminated;
- immediately wash and sanitise hands and protective clothing when there has been contact with abnormal animal parts that are likely to harbour food-borne pathogens;
- cover cuts and wounds with waterproof dressings; and
- store protective clothing and personal effects in locations that are separate from areas where meat may be present.

11.2 PERSONAL HEALTH STATUS

170. The establishment should maintain relevant personal health records of personnel.

Persons who come into direct or indirect contact with edible parts of animals or meat in the course of their work should:

- where necessary, have a medical examination prior to and during employment;
- not work while clinically affected by, or suspected to be carrying, communicable agents likely to be transmitted through meat; and
- be aware of and comply with reporting requirements to the establishment operator in respect of communicable agent.

12. TRANSPORTATION

171. The guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section VIII of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 3-1997, Amended 1999).

172. Due to the potential for growth of pathogenic and spoilage micro-organisms under conditions of inadequate temperature control, meat should be transported at temperatures that achieve safety and suitability objectives. Equipment for continuous monitoring and recording of temperatures should accompany transport vehicles and bulk containers wherever appropriate. Additionally, the conditions of transport should provide adequate protection from exogenous contamination and damage, and should minimise growth of pathogenic and spoilage micro-organisms.

173. If meat is inadvertently exposed to adverse temperature conditions or sources of contamination that may affect safety and suitability, an inspection should be carried out by a competent person before further transport or distribution is allowed.

13. PRODUCT INFORMATION AND CONSUMER AWARENESS

174. Appropriate product information and adequate knowledge of food hygiene is necessary to prevent mishandling at later stages in the food chain. Pre-packaged foods should be labelled with clear instructions to enable the next person in the food chain to handle, display, store and use the product safely. Principles and guidelines for product information and consumer awareness in the context of safety and suitability of meat are described in general terms in Section IX of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003).

175. The conditions of storage of meat preparations and manufactured meat should be clearly presented on the packaging.

176. Meat preparations and manufactured meat should, where appropriate, be specifically labelled so as to provide safe handling, refrigeration and storage instructions for consumers. Foods containing meat that have not received an adequate biocidal treatment for pathogens (e.g. containing raw meat, partially cooked meat, or products with secondary inhibitors) should be labelled with handling, refrigeration, storage, cooking and preparation statements that have been validated as sufficiently biocidal.

14. TRAINING

177. Adequate training of competent personnel is of fundamental importance in the production of meat that is safe and suitable for human consumption. The principles and guidelines presented in this section are supplemental to the objectives and guidelines in Section X of the Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev 4-2003).

14.1 PRINCIPLES OF TRAINING IN MEAT HYGIENE

Persons engaged in meat hygiene activities should be trained, and/or instructed to a required level of training, knowledge, skills, and ability. Training specified or recognised by the competent authority, should be:

i. appropriate to the activities and operations;

ii. proportional to the potential of the particular meat hygiene activity to impact on food-borne risks to human health;

iii. properly documented, including records of training programme delivery;

iv. verified as appropriate; and

v. subject to recognition by the competent authority where delivered by third parties.

14.2 TRAINING PROGRAMMES

Training programmes should:

- provide personnel with the training, knowledge, skills and ability to carry out specified meat hygiene tasks, e.g., post-mortem inspection, verification of statistical process control, HACCP;
- provide practical training to the extent required;
- where necessary, arrange for formal testing of personnel;
- ensure that personnel involved in supervisory roles have appropriate skills;
- recognise and build on professional qualifications; and

- provide for the continuing education of competent persons.

Annex I

RISK-BASED EVALUATION OF ORGANOLEPTIC POST-MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR MEAT

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Post-mortem meat inspection procedures are a set of food hygiene measures that are unique to the production of meat. Such procedures are regarded as a component of overall process control, which is defined as "all conditions and measures applied during the production process that are necessary to achieve safety and suitability of meat".

2. The General Principles of Food Hygiene state that "in deciding whether a (food control) requirement is necessary or appropriate, an assessment of the risk should be made, preferably within the framework of the HACCP approach". [53] Many long-standing post-mortem meat inspection procedures are often complex, labour-intensive, undifferentiated for different classes of slaughtered livestock, and poorly evaluated in terms of their relative contribution to reducing food-borne risks to public health. For these reasons, competent authorities in a number of countries are carrying out investigations into the scientific basis of current procedures.[54]

3. This Annex generally applies to the evaluation of routine on-line organoleptic inspection procedures. The performance of other inspection technologies, e.g. tissue imaging, relative to organoleptic procedures, may also be considered.

4. While risk-based evaluation of organoleptic post-mortem inspection procedures should be based on risk assessment for hazards of concern and development of performance objectives, currently few such risk assessments are available. In their absence, other sources of scientific knowledge on food-borne risks to human health e.g. human surveillance data, risk ranking processes, can be used to develop risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures.

5. The principles and guidelines presented in this Annex could also be adapted to evaluation of organoleptic post-mortem inspection procedures for determining the suitability of meat.

2. OBJECTIVES OF RISK-BASED POST-MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES FOR MEAT

6. A risk-based approach to post-mortem inspection for meat can achieve the following objectives:

- Determination of the level of consumer protection provided by specified post-mortem inspection procedures;
- Relative measurement of the contribution of post-mortem inspection to the overall level of control of hazards in meat (and risks to consumers), thereby allowing risk managers to allocate meat hygiene resources proportionate to their greatest benefit in reducing risk by preventing exposure to meat-borne hazards;
- Comparison of the effectiveness of different inspection procedures applied for the same purpose and in the same context, e.g. positive predictive value;
- Provision of information that allows appropriate evaluation of different risk management options e.g. regionalisation of inspection programmes, feasibility and comparative costs of different post-mortem inspection procedures, potential for cross-contamination;
- Full integration of post-mortem inspection procedures into a "production-to-consumption" approach to meat hygiene.

---

[53] Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003).

[54] Competent authorities have different approaches to defining the respective roles of industry and competent authority personnel in delivering meat hygiene activities, and this issue is not covered in this Annex.

3. RISK ANALYSIS

3.1. RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

7. Development and implementation of risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures should utilise a risk management framework.[55] The four components are: preliminary risk management activities, evaluation of risk management options, implementation of management decisions, and monitoring and review of decision taken. All components require effective risk communication among risk assessors, risk managers and other interested parties as necessary. Utilisation of a risk management framework is the subject of on-going work within the Codex system, and is described in a number of Codex documents.

3.2. RISK ASSESSMENT

8. If required, a risk assessment is commissioned during preliminary risk management activities. A risk assessment consists of four steps: hazard identification, hazard characterisation, exposure assessment, and risk characterisation. The output of this process should be qualitatively integrated with all other factors relating to post-mortem meat inspection to make risk management decisions on appropriate procedures for control of hazards.

9. In the ideal situation, risk estimates will be quantified in terms of risks to human health, and risk management decisions on an appropriate level of protection (ALOP) will dictate the nature and intensity of the post-mortem inspection procedures to be applied. However, risk assessment of microbiological hazards in meat is currently limited by a lack of quantitative risk assessment models. Nevertheless, appropriate assembly of scientific information and qualitative risk characterisation as to the probable impacts on human health can provide an objective basis for decision-making. In any case, risk management decisions will revolve around the acceptability of the likely human health impact of differences in hazard levels brought about by different inspection procedures.

4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RISK-BASED POST-MORTEM MEAT INSPECTION PROCEDURES

i. Risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures should be derived from the application of risk analysis principles.

ii. Development of risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures should:

- Involve application of a risk management framework;
- Include quantitative risk assessment where appropriate and practicable;
- Take into account all relevant information available from the food chain;
- Take into account disease prevalence;
- Take into account all relevant information from primary production and ante-mortem inspection of the animals.

iii. Inspection procedures should be evaluated for application within a specific context e.g. species and class of slaughtered animal, defined geographical region, defined animal husbandry system.

iv. Where different inspection procedures that have the same purpose and context are being evaluated:

- An objective basis for comparison of the level of control of hazards associated with these procedures, should be established;
- The efficacy of each inspection procedure in detecting abnormalities and visible contamination affecting the safety of meat should be taken into account;

[55] Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius. Codex Procedural Manual, 14th Edition.

- Other risk management factors should be taken into account as appropriate e.g. potential for inadvertent cross-contamination, feasibility, and practicality.

v. Where needed, representative and sufficiently large field trials should be undertaken to determine the performance attributes of specified inspection procedures e.g. sensitivity, specificity, and non-detection rates for abnormalities.

vi. Where appropriate, laboratory investigations should be designed to detect the range of hazards of possible public health importance that have been described in hazard identification.

vii. Routine application of post-mortem inspection procedures should not inadvertently increase cross-contamination with microbiological hazards.

viii. Irrespective of inspection delivery systems, the competent authority should be responsible for defining the role of personnel involved in post-mortem inspection procedures, and verifying that any risk-based regulatory requirements are met.

ix. Alternative inspection procedures (e.g. serology) may be utilised to complement post-mortem inspection, which might be reduced to visual inspection.

5. GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RISK-BASED POST-MORTEM INSPECTION PROCEDURES

5.1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE MEAT HYGIENE ISSUES

10. A hazard identification process should be undertaken to determine the likely range of hazards of public health significance that may be present in the abnormalities or visible contamination that are the target of the inspection procedure(s) being evaluated. Following this, field trials should be undertaken to determine the performance attributes of specified inspection procedures or new technologies relative to the hazards that may be present.

5.2. FIELD TRIALS

11. Once the likely range of hazards has been established, field trials may be an appropriate means to establish the prevalence of these hazards in the animal population, the potential exposure of consumers to these hazards and the potential impact of different inspection procedures on this exposure. Field trials should be carried out under competent authority supervision and employing competent personnel. The number of animals inspected by the inspection procedures under evaluation should give a statistically valid estimate of the detection rate of abnormalities achieved by specific post-mortem inspection procedures.

12. Sampling plans should be representative of the slaughter population, and cater for known biological variation in respect of the type and prevalence of abnormalities e.g. influence of animal age, geographical region, farming type and season. Different trial designs may be employed, depending on the prevalence of abnormalities in the slaughter population, and the logistics of detailed inspection.

13. Where different post-mortem inspection procedures are being compared: all procedures should be applied to the same animals, each inspection station should be designed to provide independent results, and the trial should include enough samples so as to allow definite conclusions as to the consequences of changing inspection procedures. The possibility of target tissues acting as “indicators” for detection of abnormalities in other tissues and/or disposition of other tissues may be included in the design of field trials. Detailed recording of trial results is necessary, including appropriate pathological descriptions of all abnormalities detected.

14. Laboratory investigations e.g. microbiological examination and histology, should be designed to identify the range of hazards of possible public health importance that have been identified in the hazard identification process. A representative number and range of samples should be taken from abnormalities, so as to confirm the outcome of the hazard identification process and provide as much information as possible on the prevalence (and concentration) of hazards in target tissue. Trial design should include representative surveying of the prevalence (and concentration) of hazards in target tissues that are organoleptically normal, so as to provide a comparison with the prevalence (and concentration) of hazards in those tissues that are organoleptically abnormal.

5.3 SENSITIVITY

15. An understanding of the level of consumer protection that is achieved by particular inspection procedures requires knowledge of the level of control of hazards that is attained by their application. The sensitivity of post-mortem inspection procedures should be determined to establish their contribution to achieving overall public health goals.

16. The sensitivity of a post-mortem inspection procedure is the probability of identifying bodies or parts thereof that contain grossly detectable abnormalities likely to contain hazards of concern.

17. The sensitivity of an inspection procedure e.g. visual inspection, palpation, and/or incision, should be determined within appropriate statistical limits established by the competent authority. The intended end-use of the target tissues has an important influence on the development of risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures. When selecting post-mortem inspection procedures, priority should be given to those procedures with high correlation between the detection of a specified abnormality and the presence of the hazard of concern.

5.4 RISK MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

18. Risk management decisions on the acceptability or otherwise of specified post-mortem inspection procedures will generally be based on the worst case of non-detection of abnormalities included in an appropriate statistical confidence interval. Decisions should take into account the comparative public health risks associated with:

- The prevalence (and concentration) of hazards in target tissues that are organoleptically abnormal;
- The prevalence (and concentration) of hazards in target tissues that are organoleptically normal;
- The overall prevalence (and concentration) of hazards being transmitted by all pathways throughout the production of meat.

19. In the general case, new or alternative inspection procedures should provide a level of consumer protection that is at least equivalent to that provided by existing procedures, unless there are strong mitigating factors that may influence a different risk management choice e.g. unacceptable introduction of new hazards, undue risks from occupational exposure.

20. Required regulatory outcomes for post-mortem inspection may include performance attributes expressed as limits on non-detection rates for particular abnormalities. Those performance attributes may be derived quantitatively from risk assessment models, or qualitatively from baseline surveys of current performance.

21. Where detailed information on the health status of slaughtered animals is available from primary production, risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures may be modified on a lot-by-lot basis, with the competent authority having responsibility for determining the frequency and extent of the procedures.

22. The competent authority should regularly analyse results of post-mortem inspection at both the establishment and national level, and provide appropriate feedback to establishments and other interested parties on the performance of risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures. The competent authority could consider an incentive for improving the system, e.g. recognition of performance, decreased farm inspection frequency, additional change of inspection procedures, etc.

23. The competent authority may change presentation requirements and the sequence of inspection procedures as a result of scientific evaluation of different post-mortem inspection procedures, and allow introduction of new inspection tools e.g. mirrors. Alternative technologies for detecting abnormalities e.g. tissue imaging, should be acceptable to the competent authority if validated as being as effective as current procedures.

Annex II

VERIFICATION OF PROCESS CONTROL OF MEAT HYGIENE BY MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Microbiological testing at specific points in the food chain is an important tool for verifying a risk-based approach to food safety. Specification of food safety microbiological outcomes establishes appropriate levels of consumer protection, while providing maximum flexibility to industry in terms of the detailed process control systems that are employed.

2. The General Principles of Food Hygiene[56] state that "in deciding whether a (food control) requirement is necessary or appropriate, an assessment of the risk should be made, preferably within the framework of the HACCP approach", and any microbiological specifications "should be based on sound scientific principles and state, where appropriate, procedures, analytical methods and action limits"[57]. Process control is defined as "all conditions and measures applied during the production process that are necessary to achieve safety and suitability of meat".

3. Where appropriate, microbiological performance objectives or performance criteria should be included in verification of process control.

4. As described in this Annex, microbiological performance objectives or performance criteria are different from microbiological criteria. The latter are used for judging the acceptability of a product or food lot.[58] Although not included in the scope of this Annex, microbiological testing of meat may also be used to assess suitability.

2. VERIFICATION OF PROCESS CONTROL BY MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING

5. A preventative, HACCP-based approach should be regarded as the most effective means of ensuring microbiological process control. Once process control has been validated, verification by microbiological testing can be important to assure that required food safety outcomes are being met on an on-going basis. Verification by microbiological testing for process control purposes should be implemented where meaningful in terms of consumer protection.

6. Verification of process control of meat by microbiological testing provides a tool for:

- Assessing the adequacy and efficacy of establishment process control in relation to faecal and other contamination;
- Assuring the level of control of specified hazards of public health importance;
- Facilitating development of process criteria at a specified step or combination of steps that achieve microbiological performance objectives or performance criteria;
- Identifying the need for review and redesign of HACCP plans;
- Objective comparison of the outcome of different process control systems in different situations;
- Provision of assurances by competent authorities.

---

[56] Recommended International Code of Practice General Principles of Food Hygiene (CAC/RCP 1-1969, Rev. 4-2003)

[57] Specifications for microbiological testing in relation to the outcome of SSOPs are not regarded as microbiological performance objectives or performance criteria for process control.

[58] Principles for the Establishment and Application of Microbiological Criteria for Foods. (CAC/GL 21-1997).

3. PRINCIPLES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING REQUIREMENTS

i. Establishment of microbiological testing requirements should take into account all information available throughout the food chain, including the health status of live animals relative to public health.

ii. Microbiological testing requirements should be: hazard-, product- and process-specific, reasonably achievable, and applied only at those points in the food chain specified. When validating the testing requirements, account should be taken of the likelihood of uneven distribution of micro-organisms in the sampled unit and the inherent variability of the analytical procedure.

iii. Microbiological testing requirements should be based on scientific analysis and advice, and, where sufficient data is available, developed from risk analysis. Where a food safety objective based on the required level of consumer protection has been established, the relationship between the food safety objective (FSO) and performance objectives (POs) or performance criteria (PCs) should be specified.

iv. The stringency of microbiological testing requirements should be proportional to human health risk.

v. In the absence of sufficient knowledge of risks to human health, microbiological testing requirements should initially be established from baseline surveys of current industry performance, and subsequently be modified as appropriate to reflect public health goals. Sampling plans for baseline surveys should be representative of the slaughter population, and cater for known biological variation in respect of hazards in the raw material supply e.g. influence of geographical region, farming type and season.

vi. Microbiological testing requirements should be based on micro-organisms that are indices of the presence of hazards to human health, or the pathogen itself, in the food specified.

vii. Establishment of microbiological testing requirements, including performance objectives or performance criteria should be the responsibility of competent authorities, in consultation with relevant interested parties, and may consist of guidelines or regulatory standards.

viii. The competent authority should verify compliance with microbiological testing requirements where they are specified in regulation e.g., microbiological statistical process control requirements, standards for *Salmonella* spp.

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAMME FOR VERIFICATION OF PROCESS CONTROL BY MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING

4.1 SPECIFICATIONS

7. A standardised random sampling plan should be developed, including specification of the process step, product, size and type of sample, time and date of sampling, collection methods and transport. Sampling and testing at multiple steps in the food chain may provide greater information on process control and allows for a more targeted response to non-compliance by the establishment and the competent authority.

8. Sampling of tissue may be destructive e.g. by excision, or non-destructive e.g. by swabbing or sponging. No method will recover all the flora present on the surface. As non-destructive sampling will recover only a proportion of those recovered by the destructive method, microbiological testing requirements specified in this manner should be established in relation to the type of sampling used.

9. For practical reasons, microbiological testing requirements are unlikely to be verified on an on-going basis as part of a HACCP plan. However, microbiological verification should be conducted with sufficient frequency to ensure effectiveness of any process criteria that are part of a HACCP plan. These criteria should be measurable in real time, will most likely constitute critical limits at critical control points in HACCP plans, and may be subject to microbiological verification as appropriate.

10. In the case of indicator micro-organisms e.g. generic *Escherichia coli*, Enterobacteriaciae and total viable counts (aerobic plate counts), the presence and / or concentration of these indicator organisms should reflect states or conditions that indicate process control or lack of process control. In the case of specific hazards[59] (e.g. *Salmonella* spp. on carcasses, *Listeria monocytogenes* in ready-to-eat products), the prevalence will generally be reflective of hazards arising pre-slaughter (e.g. *Salmonella* present on hides of incoming animals) and at specific steps during product processing.

11. The competent authority should provide flexibility in regulation so that the most effective verification systems can be established at the establishment level e.g. provision for alternative carcass sampling sites if an establishment can identify that they are equally as effective in assessing carcass contamination than those specified. Similarly, flexibility should be provided by the competent authority with regard to the number of units comprising the sample or testing against alternative indicator micro-organisms as long as the procedure can provide equivalent guarantees.

12. Alternative approaches to microbiological testing that are properly validated should be established where they offer practical advantages.

4.2. FREQUENCY OF SAMPLING

13. There is no single method for determining the frequency of sampling. For slaughter and dressing establishments frequency of sampling may be fixed in relation to the particular process or may be based on throughput of animals. In addition to ensuring randomness, variables to be taken into account at the establishment level include: source of raw materials, type and nature of the meat process, and volume of production.

14. Sampling frequency should be increased or decreased according to performance. Once results show that the HACCP-based procedures are providing a consistent level of acceptable performance, subsequent microbiological testing must be sufficient to ensure that process control is maintained.

4.3. LABORATORY ANALYSIS

15. Methods for detection and enumeration should be practical, accurate, reproducible, sensitive and selective. Only methods for which the reliability and reproducibility have been validated should be used. Inter-laboratory testing should be a feature of a microbiological verification programme. In cases of dispute, recognised reference methods should be used.

16. To allow meaningful analysis and to permit objective comparison of different control systems, methods for the computation of results should be specified, including handling of pooled/individual results, calculation of mean results (e.g. log means) from groups of samples from the same carcass or different carcasses.

4.4. REGULATORY APPLICATION

17. Regulatory requirements in terms of microbiological testing may be specified in several ways. For indicator organisms, two or three class attribute sampling plans that specify limits for numbers of micro-organisms (m and M) may be useful, in other situations variable sampling plans may be useful. Two class plans should be applied for pathogen criteria. Where requirements are set according to current industry performance, percentile values may be used e.g. 80^{th} percentile for m and 98^{th} percentile for M, a variety of statistical approaches can be used.

18. Effective systems should be in place for distribution and sharing of information from the establishment to all interested parties, as appropriate, so as to maintain and improve process control of meat.

---

[59] Ongoing work in CCFH and JEMRA with respect to foodborne pathogens should also be taken into account.

19. The competent authority should regularly analyse results at both the establishment and national level, and provide appropriate feedback to establishments and other interested parties.

20. Additional to verification of process control, the results of microbiological testing may be used to establish on-farm controls e.g. intensive measures to reduce the prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. in fattening pigs.

21. In situations of non-compliance with microbiological requirements, actions should be specified. Regulatory and/or establishment responses should be proportional to test results as well as the public health impact of specific pathogens. Where detailed information on the status in relation to public health, of animals destined for slaughter, is available from primary production, e.g. in the case of *Salmonella* spp. in fattening pigs and broiler chickens in some intensive production systems, responses in relation to process control at the establishment level, may include consideration of pre-slaughter levels of hazards.

22. The competent authority should consider microbiological results in conjunction with public health and other relevant information when taking regulatory action. Regulatory intervention and/or sanctions may be necessary when validated controls are not being properly implemented.

23. In cases of repeated non-compliance, the competent authority in addition to other actions, should require the establishment operator to review and revise the HACCP plan and may specify an increased sampling frequency to verify that the required level of process control is restored.