United States Department of Agriculture
Food Safety and Inspection Service
Washington, D.C. 20250

FEB 8 2002

Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza
Head of the Official Inspection Service
of Animal Origin Products (SIOPOA)
Servicio Nacional De Sanidad Agropecuria (SENASA)
Boulevard Miraflores
Avenida La Fao
Tegucigalpa, M.D.C.
Honduras

Dear Dr. Mendoza:

Enclosed is a copy of the Final report of the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) June 11-18, 2001, audit of Honduras' meat inspection system. We received Dr. Francisco Rodas' January 28, 2002, letter regarding comments on the Draft Final report of the same audit. We have incorporated this letter into the Final report as Attachment "G."

During this audit, the FSIS auditor reported that the Honduras' meat inspection system was essentially meeting U.S. import requirements. However, the FSIS auditor did raise concerns regarding the following two findings at Establishment 12:

- Containers of meat products produced for export to the United States were not properly identified as U.S. product nor segregated from Honduras' domestic product.
- Floors, freezer doors, and carcass rails were in need of repair.

We understand that the Government of Honduras is in agreement with the FSIS audit findings, and that the deficiencies will be adequately addressed and corrected. We appreciate your thorough review of the FSIS audit findings and assurances that meat products exported to the United States meet U.S. import requirements.

If I can provide you further assistance regarding the FSIS audit, please contact me at telephone number 202-720-3781, facsimile number 202-690-4040, or email address (sally.stratmoen@fsis.usda.gov).

Sincerely,

Sally Stratmoen

Sally Stratmoen, Chief
Equivalence Section
International Policy Staff
Office of Policy, Program Development
and Evaluation

Enclosure

cc: Frank Coolidge, Counselor, American Embassy, Guatemala City, Guatemala
Benjamin Zapata, Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Honduras
Sally Stratmoen, Chief, EPS, IPS, OPPDE
Steve McDermott, EPS, IPS, OPPDE
Donald Smart, Director, Review Staff, OFO
Amy Winton, State Department
Country File (Audit: FY 2001)

FSIS:OPPDE:IPS:ES:SMCDERMOTT:bw:2/7/02:690-0297:2/6/02:Honduras Audit Report

United States Department of Agriculture
Food Safety And Inspection Service
Technical Service Center
Suite 300, Landmark Center
1299 Farnam Street
Omaha, NE 68102

AUDIT REPORT FOR HONDURAS
JUNE 11 THROUGH JUNE 18, 2001

INTRODUCTION

Background

This report reflects information that was obtained during an audit of the Honduran meat inspection system from June 11 through June 18, 2001. Two establishments were certified to export meat to the United States; both were audited. Both establishments were conducting beef slaughter and boning operations.

The last audit of the Honduran meat inspection system was conducted in March 2000. The same two establishments were audited: both were acceptable. The following major concerns were identified at that time:

1. Fecal contamination and hair was found on ready-to-ship beef tails in one establishment,
2. Ready-to-ship beef esophagi in one establishment had not been completely split,
3. Product destined for export in one establishment was not differentiated from product for domestic use,
4. Product-contact equipment was contaminated through being placed on a floor,
5. Samples for *Salmonella* species sampling were not random in one establishment,
6. Critical limits had not been established for one critical control point in one establishment, and were too general in the other establishment.

At the time of this audit, Honduras was eligible to export meat products to the United States. A restriction was in place that pork must be cooked to be eligible; only beef products were being exported to the U.S. There were no meat exports to the U.S. during calendar year 2000. From January 1 through May 31, 2001, Honduras exported 637,200 lbs. of beef products to the U.S. One lot (44,400 lbs., or 6.9%) was rejected at the U.S. port of entry for processing defects.

PROTOCOL

This on-site audit was conducted in four parts. One part involved visits with Honduran national meat inspection officials to discuss oversight programs and practices, including enforcement activities. The second was conducted by on-site visits to establishments and the third was the visits to the farms where livestock are raised and fed. The fourth was a visit to a laboratory performing analytical testing of field samples for the national residue testing program and the culturing of field samples for the presence of microbiological contamination with *Salmonella* species.

Honduras's program effectiveness was assessed by evaluating five areas of risk: (1) sanitation controls, including the implementation and operation of Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs), (2) animal disease controls, (3) residue controls, (4) slaughter/ processing controls, including the implementation and operation of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) systems and the *E. coli* testing program, and (5) enforcement controls, including the testing program for *Salmonella* species.

During the on-site establishment visits, the auditor evaluated the nature, extent, and degree to which findings impacted on food safety and public health, as well as overall program delivery. The auditor also determined if establishment and inspection system controls were in place. Establishments that do not have effective controls in place to prevent, detect and eliminate product contamination/adulteration are considered unacceptable and therefore ineligible to export products to the U.S., and are delisted accordingly by the country's meat inspection officials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Summary

Effective inspection system controls were found to be in place in both establishments. Details of the audit findings, including compliance with HACCP, SSOPs, and testing programs for *Salmonella* and generic *E. coli* are discussed later in this report.

As stated above, the concerns that had been identified during the last audit of the Honduran meat inspection system, conducted in March 2000, were the following:

1. *Fecal contamination and hair was found on ready-to-ship beef tails.* This had been corrected.
2. *Ready-to-ship beef esophagi in one establishment had not been completely split.* This had been corrected.
3. *Product destined for export in one establishment was not differentiated from product for domestic use.* This was again found in one establishment: it was a repeat deficiency.
4. *Product-contact equipment was contaminated through being placed on a floor.* This had been corrected.
5. *Samples for Salmonella sampling were not random in one establishment.* This had been corrected.
6. *Critical limits had not been established for one critical control point in one establishment, and were too general in the other establishment.* This had been corrected.

Entrance Meeting

On June 11, 2001, an entrance meeting was held at the Tegucigalpa offices of the Honduran National Service of Animal and Plant Health (SENASA), and was attended by Dr. Pedro Mendoza, Chief of Official Inspection Service of Animal Products (SIOPOA); Dr. Francisco

Ordonez, Regional Supervisor of SIOPOA; Dr. Pedro Barahona, Chief of the Meat Section of SIOPOA; Dr. Max Rivera, Director of National Residue Laboratory (ANEDEC); Mr. Raul Saybe, Chief of the Dairy Section of SIOPOA; Mr.Rafael Navarro Paz, interpreter; and Dr. Suresh P. Singh, International Audit Staff Officer, FSIS. Topics of discussion included the following:

1. Compliance and enforcement,

2. Training programs for inspection service employees,

3. Various requests from International Policy Division, e.g. species verification, a residue questionnaire sent to all countries exporting meat to the U.S., microbiological testing programs, and laboratory responsibilities,

4. Details of on-site visits to establishments, a farm, and a feed mill and of records audits, and

5. Details of the daily itinerary.

Headquarters Audit

There had been no changes in the organizational structure or upper levels of inspection staffing since the last U.S. audit of the Honduran inspection system in March 2000.

To gain an accurate overview of the effectiveness of inspection controls, FSIS requested that the audits of the individual establishments be led by the inspection officials who normally conduct the periodic reviews for compliance with U.S. specifications. The FSIS auditor (hereinafter called "the Auditor") observed and evaluated the process.

Since there were only two certified establishments, both establishments were visited and the records were audited. The records audits focused primarily on food safety hazards and included the following:

- Internal review reports,
- Supervisory visits to establishments that were seeking certification to export to the U.S.,
- Training records for inspectors and laboratory personnel,
- Label approval records such as generic labels,
- New laws and implementation documents such as regulations, notices, directives and guidelines,
- Sampling and laboratory analyses for residues,
- Pathogen reduction and other food safety initiatives such as SSOPs, HACCP programs, generic *E. coli* testing and *Salmonella* species testing,
- Sanitation, slaughter and processing inspection procedures and standards,
- Control of products from livestock with conditions such as tuberculosis, cysticercosis, etc., and of inedible and condemned materials,

- Export product inspection and control, including export certificates, and
- Enforcement records, including examples of criminal prosecution, consumer complaints, recalls, seizure and control of noncompliant product, and withholding, suspending, or withdrawing inspection services from or delisting an establishment that is certified to export product to the United States.

No concerns arose as a result of the examination of these documents.

Government Oversight

All inspection veterinarians and inspectors in establishments certified by Honduras as eligible to export meat products to the United States were full-time SENASA employees, receiving no remuneration from either industry or establishment personnel.

Establishment Audits

The two certified establishments (Establishment numbers 4 and 12) that were certified to export meat and meat products to the United States at the time were audited. Both establishments were visited for on-site audits. In both of the establishments, both SENASA inspection system controls and establishment system controls were in place to prevent, detect and control contamination and adulteration of products.

Laboratory Audits

During the laboratory audit, emphasis was placed on the application of procedures and standards that were equivalent to U.S. requirements. Information about the following risk areas was also collected:

1. Government oversight of accredited, approved, and private laboratories.
2. Intra-laboratory quality assurance procedures, including sample handling.
3. Methodology.

The Residue National Laboratory (ANEDEC) in Tegucigalpa was audited on June 18, 2001. Except as noted below, effective controls were in place for sample handling and frequency, timely analysis, data reporting, tissue matrices for analysis, equipment operation and printouts, minimum detection levels, recovery frequency, percent recoveries, and corrective actions. The methods used for the analyses were acceptable. No compositing of samples was done (this was not a deficiency).

Honduras's microbiological testing for *Salmonella* species was being performed in government laboratories. One of these, the Laboratorio Nacional De Analsis De Residuos Quimicos y Microbiologicos (LANAR) was audited. The auditor determined that the system met the criteria established for the use of government laboratories under FSIS's Pathogen Reduction/HACCP rule. These criteria are:

1. The laboratory was accredited/approved by the government.
2. The laboratory had properly trained personnel, suitable facilities and equipment, a written quality assurance program, and reporting and record-keeping capabilities.
3. Results of analyses were being reported simultaneously to the government and to the establishments.

Establishment Operations by Establishment Number

Both establishments 4 and 12 were conducting beef slaughter and boning operations.

SANITATION CONTROLS

Based on the on-site audits of the establishments, Honduras's inspection system had controls in place for water potability, chlorination procedures, back-siphonage prevention, hand-washing facilities, sanitizers, pest control, temperature, lighting, operations and inspectors' work space, ventilation, over-product ceilings and equipment, dry storage areas, ante-mortem facilities, welfare facilities, outside premises, personal dress, habits, and hygiene procedures, cross-contamination prevention equipment sanitizing, product handling and transportation, maintenance, pre-operational and operational sanitation, and waste disposal.

Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs)

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for SSOPs were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment A).

The SSOPs were found to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements.

Product Handling and Storage

In establishment 12, boxed product destined for U.S. export was not marked as such and was not segregated from product for the domestic market. This was a repeat finding from the previous FSIS audit in March 2000. The establishment management the deficiency and gave assurances that product for export to the U.S. would be henceforth stored separately from product intended for domestic consumption.

Maintenance

There were several instances of neglected maintenance: some floors were broken and in need of repair; freezer doors were damaged, and rust was observed on rails in carcass coolers. The establishment management agreed to schedule the needed repairs promptly.

ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROLS

Honduras's inspection system had controls in place to ensure adequate animal identification, ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection procedures and dispositions, condemned and restricted product control, and procedures for sanitary handling of returned and rework product.

There were reported to have been no outbreaks of animal diseases with public-health significance since the previous U.S. audit.

RESIDUE CONTROLS

Honduras's National Residue Testing Plan for 2000 was being followed, and was on schedule. The Honduran inspection system had adequate controls in place to ensure compliance with sampling and reporting procedures, storage and use of chemicals, and control of veterinary pharmaceuticals and feed additives. A beef cattle farm, a feed mill, and a veterinary drug and vaccine store were visited during this audit to collect information and data regarding animal husbandry practices.

The Auditor verified that Honduras's responses to an in-depth questionnaire regarding residue controls, sent to all countries exporting meat to the United States, were still valid.

SLAUGHTER/PROCESSING CONTROLS

The Honduran inspection system had controls in place to ensure adequate humane handling and slaughter, packaging materials, label approvals, inspector monitoring, and processing (boning and cutting) equipment and records.

HACCP Implementation

All establishments approved to export meat products to the U.S. are required to have developed and implemented a Hazard Analysis – Critical Control Point (HACCP) system. Each of these systems was evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment B).

The HACCP programs were found to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements.

Testing for Generic *E. coli*

Honduras had adopted the FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing with the following equivalent different requirements:

1. SAMPLE COLLECTOR. Government takes samples.

   - There is a clearly written sampling plan with instruction for sample collection and processing that will be universally followed.

   - The government has a means of ensuring that sample collection activities are appropriate.

   - The government uses the test results to verify establishment slaughter, processing and dressing controls for fecal contamination.

2. LABORATORIES. Government laboratories.

   - The laboratories have properly trained personnel, suitable facilities and equipment, a written quality assurance program, and reporting and record keeping facilities.

   - Results of analyses including all permanently recorded data and summaries are reported promptly to the establishment.

Both of the establishments audited were required to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing, and were audited and evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment C).

The *E. coli* testing programs were found to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements, with the exception that the location for carcass sampling for generic *E. coli* was not specified in the written procedure. Establishment management officials gave assurances that this would be corrected promptly.

ENFORCEMENT CONTROLS

Inspection System Controls

The SENASA inspection system controls [ante-and post-mortem inspection procedures and dispositions; control of restricted product and inspection samples; control and disposition of dead; dying; diseased or disabled animals; boneless meat reinspection; shipment security, including shipment between establishments; monitoring and verification of establishment programs and controls (including the taking and documentation of corrective actions under HACCP plans); inspection supervision and documentation; the importation of only eligible livestock or poultry from other countries (i.e.; only from eligible countries and certified establishments within those countries); and the importation of only eligible meat or poultry products from other countries for further processing] were in place and effective in ensuring that products produced by the establishment were wholesome, unadulterated, and properly labeled. In addition, adequate controls were found to be in place for security items, shipment security, and products entering the establishments from outside sources.

Testing for *Salmonella* Species

Both establishments were required to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* testing, and were evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment D).

Honduras had adopted the FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* species testing. The *Salmonella* species testing programs were found to meet the basic FSIS regulatory requirements.

Species Verification

At the time of this audit, Honduras was not exempt from the species verification requirement. The auditor verified that species verification was being conducted in accordance with FSIS requirements.

MONTHLY REVIEWS

These reviews were being performed by the Honduran equivalent of Circuit Supervisors. All were veterinarians. Dr. Francisco Ordonez was in charge of these reviews.

The internal review program was applied equally to both export and non-export establishments. Internal review visits were announced in advance and were conducted by individuals, at least once monthly, and sometimes more often. The records of audited establishments were kept in the inspection offices of the individual establishments.

In the event that an establishment is found, during one of these internal reviews, to be out of compliance with U.S. requirements, and is delisted for U.S. export, before it may again qualify for eligibility to be reinstated, a supervisor is empowered to conduct an in-depth review, and the results are reported to SENASA for evaluation; they formulate a plan for corrective actions and preventive measures to be completed before relistment.

After observing the internal reviewers' activities in the field, the auditor was confident in their professionalism, thoroughness, and knowledge of U.S. requirements, and in the effectiveness of Honduras's internal review program as a whole.

Enforcement Activities

On February 15, 2000, new laws were enacted to combine domestic and export rules. Enforcement cases were handled by SENASA.

Exit Meetings

An exit meeting was conducted in Tegucigalpa on June 18, 2001. The Honduran participants were; Dr. Francisco Rodas, Sub-Director of SENASA; Dr. Perdo Mendoza, Chief of SIOPOA; Dr. Max Rivera, Director of the ANEDEC Laboratory; Mr. Rafael Navarro Paz, interpreter; and Dr. Suresh P. Singh, International Audit Staff Officer, FSIS. The following topics were discussed:

1. The results of the on-site audits. The Honduran officials gave assurances that the inspection service officials in the field would monitor the establishments to ensure that the deficiencies found would be adequately addressed and corrected.

2. The results of the laboratory audit: the findings were satisfactory.

3. Information on the training program for inspection personnel was provided.

CONCLUSION

The inspection system of Honduras was found to have effective controls to ensure that product destined for export to the United States was produced under conditions equivalent to those which FSIS requires in domestic establishments. Two establishments were audited: both were acceptable. The deficiencies encountered during the on-site establishment audits were adequately addressed to the auditor's satisfaction.

Dr. Suresh P. Singh (signed) Dr. Suresh P. Singh
International Audit Staff Officer

ATTACHMENTS

A. Data collection instrument for SSOPs
B. Data collection instrument for HACCP programs
C. Data collection instrument for generic *E. coli* testing.
D. Data collection instrument for *Salmonella* species testing
E. Laboratory Audit Forms
F. Individual Foreign Establishment Audit Forms
G. Written Foreign Country's Response to the Draft Final Audit Report

Attachment A

Data Collection Instrument for SSOPs

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for SSOPs were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument contained the following statements:

1. The establishment has a written SSOP program.
2. The procedure addresses pre-operational sanitation.
3. The procedure addresses operational sanitation.
4. The pre-operational procedures address (at a minimum) the cleaning of food-contact surfaces of facilities, equipment, and utensils.
5. The procedure indicates the frequency of the tasks.
6. The procedure identifies the individuals responsible for implementing and maintaining the activities.
7. The records of these procedures and any corrective action taken are being maintained on a daily basis.
8. The procedure is dated and signed by the person with overall on-site authority.

The results of these evaluations were as follows:

Est. #	1.Written program addressed	2. Pre-op sanitation addressed	3. Oper. sanitation addressed	4. Contact surfaces addressed	5. Fre-quency addressed	6. Respons-ible indiv. identified	7. Docu-mentation done daily	8. Dated and signed
4	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Attachment B

Data Collection Instrument for HACCP Programs

Each of the establishments approved to export meat products to the U.S. was required to have developed and implemented a Hazard Analysis – Critical Control Point (HACCP) system. Each of these systems was evaluated according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument included the following statements:

1. The establishment has a flow chart that describes the process steps and product flow.
2. The establishment had conducted a hazard analysis.
3. The analysis includes food safety hazards likely to occur.
4. The analysis includes the intended use of or the consumers of the finished product(s).
5. There is a written HACCP plan for each product where the hazard analysis revealed one or more food safety hazard(s) reasonably likely to occur.
6. All hazards identified in the analysis are included in the HACCP plan; the plan lists a CCP for each food safety hazard identified.
7. The HACCP plan specifies critical limits, monitoring procedures, and the monitoring frequency performed for each CCP.
8. The plan describes corrective actions taken when a critical limit is exceeded.
9. The HACCP plan was validated using multiple monitoring results.
10. The HACCP plan lists the establishment's procedures to verify that the plan is being effectively implemented and functioning and the frequency for these procedures.
11. The HACCP plan's record-keeping system documents the monitoring of CCPs and/or includes records with actual values and observations.
12. The HACCP plan is dated and signed by a responsible establishment official.

The results of these evaluations were as follows:

Est. #	1. Flow diagram	2. Hazard analysis conducted	3. All hazards identified	4. Use & users included	5. Plan for each hazard	6. CCPs for all hazards	7. Monitoring is specified	8. Corr. actions are described	9. Plan validated	10.Adequate verific. procedures	11.Adequate documentation	12. Dated and signed
4	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Attachment C

Data Collection Instrument for Generic *E. coli* Testing

Each establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument contained the following statements:

1. The establishment has a written procedure for testing for generic *E. coli.*
2. The procedure designates the employee(s) responsible to collect the samples.
3. The procedure designates the establishment location for sample collecting.
4. The sample collection is done on the predominant species being slaughtered.
5. The sampling is done at the frequency specified in the procedure.
6. The proper carcass site(s) and/or collection methodology (sponge or excision) is being used for sampling.
7. The carcass selection is following the random method specified in the procedure or is being taken randomly.
8. The laboratory is analyzing the sample using an AOAC Official Method or an equivalent method.
9. The results of the tests are being recorded on a process control chart showing the most recent test results.
10. The test results are being maintained for at least 12 months.

Est. #	1.Written procedure	2. Sampler designated	3.Sampling location given	4. Predomin. species sampled	5. Sampling at the req'd freq.	6. Proper site or method	7. Sampling is random	8. Using AOAC method	9. Chart or graph of results	10. Results are kept at least 1 yr
4	√	√	no	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Attachment D

Data Collection Instrument for *Salmonella* testing

Each slaughter establishment was evaluated to determine if the basic FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* testing were met, according to the criteria employed in the U.S. domestic inspection program. The data collection instrument included the following statements:

1. Salmonella testing is being done in this establishment.

2. Carcasses are being sampled.

3. Ground product is being sampled.

4. The samples are being taken randomly.

5. The proper carcass site(s) and/or collection of proper product (carcass or ground) are being used for sampling.

6. Establishments in violation are not being allowed to continue operations.

The results of these evaluations were as follows:

Est. #	*1. Testing as required*	*2. Carcasses are sampled*	3. Ground product is sampled	4. Samples are taken randomly	5. Proper site and/or proper prod.	6. Violative est's stop operations
4	√	√	N/A	√	√	√
12	√	√	N/A	√	√	√

.

Attachment C-1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN COUNTRY LABORATORY REVIEW

REVIEW DATE	NAME OF FOREIGN LABORATORY
06-18-2001	Laboratorio Nacional De Analysis De Residuos

FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY	CITY & COUNTRY	ADDRESS OF LABORATORY
SENASA	Tegucigalpa,Honduras	P.O.3416,Tegucigalpa, Honduras

NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr.S. P. Singh	Dr. Max Alexix Rivera

	Residue Code/Name ▶			100	200	300	400	500	800	902	SPV				
SAMPLING PROCEDURES	REVIEW ITEMS	ITEM #	EVALUATION CODE												
	Sample Handling	01		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Sampling Frequency	02		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Timely Analyses	03		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Compositing Procedure	04		O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O				
	Interpret Comp Data	05		O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O				
	Data Reporting	06		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES	Acceptable Method	07	EVALUATION CODE	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Correct Tissue(s)	08		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Equipment Operation	09		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Instrument Printouts	10		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES	Minimum Detection Levels	11	EVALUATION CODE	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Recovery Frequency	12		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Percent Recovery	13		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Check Sample Frequency	14		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	All analyst w/Check Samples	15		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	Corrective Actions	16		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
	International Check Samples	17		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A				
REVIEW PROCEDURES	Corrected Prior Deficiencies	18	EVAL. CODE	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O				
OTHER REVIEW		19	EVAL. CODE												
		20													

SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER: Arvil P. Singh Ph.D.

DATE: 6/18/2001

Designed on FormFlow Software

USDA

United States Department of Agriculture

Food Safety And Inspection Service

Technical Service Center

Suite 300, Landmark Center
1299 Farnam Street
Omaha, NE 68102

Microbiology Laboratory Audit

General

Name & location of lab: *Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agropecuaria, Laboratorio de Residuos y Microbiologico (SENASA); Tegucigalpa, Honduras*

Private or gov't lab? *Government*

How & when was accreditation obtained? *Accreditation Authority of Belgium, 1998*

How & how often is accreditation maintained? *Ministry of Economic Affairs Accreditation Department, at least once per year*

When and how is payment for analysis provided? *By establishments, customers, and clients (WHEN NOT ANSWERED)*

Are results released before payment is received? *Yes*

What are the qualifications of the analyst(s) performing the individual tasks within a method?

NOT ANSWERED

What are the qualifications of the direct supervisor of the analyst(s)?

NOT ANSWERED

Methodology for HACCP *Salmonella* samples (regulatory labs)

Does this lab analyze HACCP *Salmonella* samples? *Yes*

How are HACCP *Salmonella* samples received & recorded?. *Some samples are mailed; some are delivered by the clients. HOW RECORDED NOT ANSWERED*

Are HACCP *Salmonella* samples analyzed on the day of receipt? *No. Analysis may take up to one week to complete.*

What method(s) is used for HACCP *Salmonella* samples? *The FSIS method.*

Is it a qualitative method (i.e. +/- result)? *Yes*

Are HACCP ground beef samples analyzed for *Salmonella*? N/A

What is the size of the ground beef test portion? N/A

What buffer (and what volume) is used for:

Sponge samples for *Salmonella*? *Buffered Peptone Water*

VOLUME NOT ANSWERED

Poultry rinsates for *Salmonella*? N/A

Salmonella ground beef sample homogenates? *N/A*

What is the formulation of the Buffered Peptone Water used?

NOT ANSWERED

What analytical controls are used for *Salmonella* analyses (i.e. control cultures, etc.)?

NOT ANSWERED: Dr. Singh changed the question to a statement: "Analytical controls are employed for each set of samples." and added "YES."

Are they employed for each sample set?

NOT ANSWERED

How are HACCP *Salmonella* results expressed? *Positive or negative.*

How are HACCP *Salmonella* results recorded?: *Log book.*

How and to whom are HACCP *Salmonella* results reported? *By mail to establishment management*

Are "check" samples periodically used to test the proficiency of the lab and analysts for *Salmonella* testing?

1. For individual analysts or for the lab as a whole?
2. What species/strains are used?
3. How many samples are analyzed and how often?.
4. Are both inoculated and uninoculated samples provided to analysts for the proficiency testing?.
5. How many colony-forming units (cfu) per gram are inoculated into the proficiency samples provided to analysts?.

NOT ANSWERED. Dr. Singh answered "YES" to the question and deleted the 5 detailed questions unanswered.

<u>Methodology for HACCP generic *E. coli* samples (in-plant or other private labs)</u>

Does this lab analyze HACCP generic *E. coli* samples? *Yes*

How are HACCP *E. coli* samples received & recorded? *Samples are collected by the establishment and sent to the laboratory.*

Are HACCP *E. coli* samples analyzed on the day of receipt? *Yes*

What method is used for HACCP generic *E. coli* samples? *AOAC*

Is it a quantitative method? *Yes*

What buffer (and what volume) is used for:

E. coli sponge samples? *Buffered Peptone Water*

Poultry rinsates for generic *E. coli*? *N/A*

What analytical controls are used?

NOT ANSWERED. Dr. Singh changed the question to "Are analytical controls employed for each sample set?" and added "YES."

Are they employed for each sample set? *Yes*

How are HACCP *E. coli* results calculated and/or expressed? *CFU/cm*^{2}

HOW CALCULATED NOT ANSWERED

How are *E. coli* results recorded? *Log books*

How and to whom are HACCP *E. coli* results reported? *By mail to establishment management and government inspection authorities*

Are "check" samples periodically used to test the proficiency of the lab and analysts for generic *E. coli* testing?

1. For individual analysts or for the lab as a whole?
2. What species/strains are used?
3. How many samples are analyzed and how often?
4. Are both inoculated and uninoculated samples provided to analysts for the proficiency testing?
5. How many colony-forming units (cfu) per gram are inoculated into the proficiency samples provided to analysts?

Dr. Singh answered "Yes" to the question and deleted the 5 detailed questions unanswered.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY / COUNTRY
06-12-01	0004-Empacdora Rancho Lorenzo	Catacamas / Honduras

NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION
Dr.S. P. Singh	Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza	[X] Acceptable [ ] Acceptable/ Re-review [ ] Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)
A = Acceptable M = Marginally Acceptable U = Unacceptable N = Not Reviewed O = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 A
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 A	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 A
Hand washing facilities	04 A	**(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM**		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	Processing schedules	61 A
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62 A
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 A	Processing records	63 A
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 A
Pest control monitoring	09 A	**2. DISEASE CONTROL**		Filling procedures	65 A
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66 A
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 A	Interim container handling	67 A
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 A
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 A
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 A
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control -- inspection	71 A
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 A	**5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL**	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	**3. RESIDUE CONTROL**		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas *(inside)*	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76 A
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 A
Outside premises	24 A	**4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL**		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	SSOPs	82 A
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A	HACCP	83 A
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 A		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY / COUNTRY
	06-12-01	0004-Empacdora Rancho Lorenzo	CITY: Catacamas COUNTRY: Honduras

NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION
Dr.S. P. Singh	Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza	[X] Acceptable [ ] Acceptable/ Re-review [ ] Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY
06-14-01	0012, Empacadora Continental	San Pedro Sula
		COUNTRY: Honduras

NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION
Dr.S. P. Singh	Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza	[X] Acceptable [ ] Acceptable/ Re-review [ ] Unacceptable

CODES (Give an appropriate code for each review item listed below)
A = Acceptable **M** = Marginally Acceptable **U** = Unacceptable **N** = Not Reviewed **O** = Does not apply

1. CONTAMINATION CONTROL		Cross contamination prevention	28 A	Formulations	55 O
(a) BASIC ESTABLISHMENT FACILITIES		Equipment Sanitizing	29 A	Packaging materials	56 A
Water potability records	01 A	Product handling and storage	30 U	Laboratory confirmation	57 A
Chlorination procedures	02 A	Product reconditioning	31 A	Label approvals	58 A
Back siphonage prevention	03 A	Product transportation	32 A	Special label claims	59 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	**(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM**		Inspector monitoring	60 O
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 M	Processing schedules	61 O
Establishments separation	06 A	Preoperational sanitation	34 A	Processing equipment	62 O
Pest --no evidence	07 A	Operational sanitation	35 A	Processing records	63 O
Pest control program	08 A	Waste disposal	36 A	Empty can inspection	64 O
Pest control monitoring	09 A	**2. DISEASE CONTROL**		Filling procedures	65 O
Temperature control	10 A	Animal identification	37 A	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 A	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 A	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 A	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 A	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 A	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 A	**5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL**	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 A	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 A	Inspector verification	73 A
Over-product equipment	18 A	**3. RESIDUE CONTROL**		Export certificates	74 A
Product contact equipment	19 A	Residue program compliance	46 A	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas *(inside)*	20 M	Sampling procedures	47 A	Inspection supervision	76 A
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 A	Control of security items	77 A
Antemortem facilities	22 A	Approval of chemicals, etc.	49 A	Shipment security	78 A
Welfare facilities	23 A	Storage and use of chemicals	50 A	Species verification	79 A
Outside premises	24 A	**4. PROCESSED PRODUCT CONTROL**		"Equal to" status	80 A
(c) PRODUCT PROTECTION & HANDLING		Pre-boning trim	51 A	Imports	81 A
Personal dress and habits	25 A	Boneless meat reinspection	52 A	SSOPs	82 A
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 A	HACCP	83 A
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY / COUNTRY
	06-14-01	0012, Empacadora Continental	San Pedro Sula / Honduras

NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL	EVALUATION
Dr.S. P. Singh	Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza	[X] Acceptable [ ] Acceptable/ Re-review [ ] Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

30 Boxed product destined for U.S. export was not marked as such and was not segregated from product for the domestic market. This was a repeat finding from the previous FSIS audit in March 2000. The establishment management acknowledged the deficiency and gave assurances that product for export to the U.S. would be henceforth stored separately from product intended for domestic consumption.

20/33 There were several instances of neglected maintenance: some floors were broken and in need of repair; freezer doors were damaged, and rust was observed on rails in carcass coolers. The establishment management agreed to schedule the needed repairs promptly.

Attachment G

SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y GANADERIA

SERVICIO NACIONAL DE SANIDAD AGROPECUARIA
(SENASA)

PRODUCIENDO MAS CONSERVAREMOS LA PAZ

Note-DGS-043-2002

Tegucigalpa, M.D.C.
January 28, 2002

Dr.
Sally Stratmoen
Chief, Equivalence Section
International Policy Staff
Office of Policy, Program Development
And Evaluation
USDA-FSIS

Dear Dr. Stratmoen:

In relation to your final report on the auditing carried out from June 11 to 18, 2001 to our country's Inspection System by Dr. Suresh P. Singh, International Audit Staff Officer, FSIS, I am pleased to inform you that after analyzing it we are totally in accordance with your conclusions, and therefore, we do not have any comment to add to such report.

I take this opportunity to greet you and thank you for all the support you have given us.

For any future communication, please contact Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza, Head of the Official Inspection Service of animal Origin Products (SIOPOA), to telephone (504)239-7089 and Fax (504)231-0786.

Sincerely,

Dr. Francisco Rodas Ch.
SENASA's General Director

Cc: Mr. Frank Coolidge / Agricultural Advisor, U.S. Embassy, Guatemala
Dr. Nidia Garcia / Technical Unit, Division of Animal Health
Dr. Pedro Alexis Mendoza / Head of the SIOPOA Department
File