



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food Safety
and Inspection
Service

Washington, D.C.
20250

Dr. Luis F. Salas
Chief, Department of Meat Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
Post Office Box 10094
1000 San Jose, Costa Rica

MAY 14 2001

Dear Dr. Salas:

The Food Safety and Inspection Service conducted an on-site audit of Costa Rica's meat inspection system from September 6 through 15, 2000. Enclosed is a copy of the final audit report.

If you have any questions regarding the audit or need additional information, please contact Mr. Richard Brown, Acting Chief, Equivalence Section, International Policy Staff. His telephone number is 202-720-6400 and his fax number is 202-690-7990.

Sincerely,

Karen Stuck, Acting Director
International Policy Staff
Office of Policy, Program Development
and Evaluation

Enclosure



AUDIT REPORT FOR COSTA RICA SEPTEMBER 6 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 15, 2000

INTRODUCTION

Background

This report reflects information that was obtained during an audit of Costa Rica's meat inspection system from September 6 through September 15, 2000. All four establishments certified to export meat to the United States were audited. Three of these were slaughter establishments and one conducting processing operations.

The last audit of the Costa Rica meat inspection system was conducted in September 1999. Three establishments were audited and two were acceptable and one was recommended for re-review.

The principal concerns with Costa Rica's meat inspection system at the time of 1999 audit were the following:

- Costa Rica's inspection personnel were not performing the required records and process verification procedures to determine the implementation, effectiveness, and maintenance of the establishment's Sanitation Standard Operating Procedure (SSOP)/ equivalent programs.
- The SSOP did not include walls, overhead equipment, and ceilings in the slaughter, boning room, and offal room.
- Establishment 10 did not have adequate written procedures for testing for generic *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*); the procedure failed to designate the establishment location for sample collection and *E. coli* test results were not being recorded using statistical process control chart.
- There was also inadequate implementation of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) plan.

All above concerns and deficiencies had been addressed and corrected.

During calendar year 2000 (up to August 31st), Costa Rica exported 15, 807, 277 pounds of fresh beef and beef products, beef edible organs, and beef processed products to the U.S. Port-of-entry (POE), rejections were 171, 160 pounds for processing defects, miscellaneous defects, contamination, pathological defects, and transportation damage and missing shipping marks.

PROTOCOL

This on-site audit was conducted in four parts. One part involved visits with Costa Rica's national meat inspection officials to discuss oversight programs and practices, including enforcement and compliance activities. The second entailed an audit of records in the meat inspection offices of the facilities of the on-site visits. The third was conducted by on-site visits to establishments. The fourth was a visit to two laboratories, one performing analytical testing of

field samples for the national residue testing program, and the other culturing field samples for the presence of microbiological contamination with *Salmonella* and *E. coli*. The Costa Rica uses government laboratories for microbiological testing.

Program effectiveness determinations focused on 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. Costa Rica's inspection system was assessed by evaluating these five risk areas.

During all 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 all four establishments audited. Details of audit findings and observations, including compliance with HACCP, SSOPs, and testing programs for *Salmonella* and generic *E. coli* are discussed later in this report.

Entrance Meeting

On September 6, 2000, an entrance meeting was held at U.S. Embassy, Costa Rica at San Jose, and was attended by Mr. Allan Harpsky, Agriculture Attaché; Victor Emilio Gonzalez; Agriculture Specialist of Foreign Agriculture Service, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA); Dr. Luis Frederico Salas, Chief, Meat Inspection Division; Dr. Byron Gurdian, Veterinarian Staff Officer and Interpreter, Meat Inspection Division of Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia, Direccion de Salud Animal, (MAGDSA) of Costa Rica and Dr. Suresh Singh, International Audit Staff Officer of the Technical Service Center, Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS). Topics of discussion included the following:

1. Travel arrangements and itinerary within Costa Rica.
2. Briefing on status of recent correspondence between FSIS and MAGDSA.
3. Refused Entry products from establishment 12, notifications and import inspection criterias in boneless beef.

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 Costa Rica inspection system in September 1999. To gain an

accurate overview of the effectiveness of inspection controls, FSIS requested that the audits of the individual establishments be led by the supervisory 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.

The auditor conducted a review of inspection system documents pertaining to the establishments. This records review was conducted at the establishments during on site visits. The records review focused primarily on food safety hazards and included the following:

- Internal review reports and compliance check/list
- Supervisory visits to establishments that were certified to export to the U. S.
- Training records for inspectors
- Label approval records such as generic labels, and animal raising claims.
- 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* 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 and veterinary coverage
- Export product inspection and control including export certificates.

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

Government Oversight

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

Establishment Audits

Four establishments were certified to export meat products to the United States at the time this audit was conducted. All four establishments were visited for on-site audits. In all establishments visited, both Costa Rica 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 audits, 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. Intra-laboratory quality assurance procedures, including sample handling.
2. Methodology.

The Government (MAGDSA), Costa Rica Residues Laboratory in San Jose was audited on September 13, 2000. Effective controls were in place for sample handling and frequency, timely analysis, data reporting, tissue matrices for analysis, equipment operation, print outs, minimum detection levels, recovery frequency, percent recoveries, and corrective actions. The methods used for the analyses were acceptable.

Costa Rica's microbiological testing for *Salmonella* and *E. coli* was being performed in government laboratories and the procedures and methodology were acceptable.

Establishment Operations by Establishment Number

The following operations were being conducted in the four establishments:

Beef slaughter, cutting, and boning - three establishments (0008, 0010, 0012)
Beef patty production – one establishment (0019)

SANITATION CONTROLS

Based on the on-site audits of establishments, Costa Rica's inspection system had controls in place for water potability, hand washing facilities, sanitizers, pest control program, temperature control, lighting, and ventilation. Basic establishment facilities, condition of facilities and equipment, product protection and handling and establishment sanitation programs were acceptable.

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.

Cross-Contamination

1. Cross contamination was observed on a few beef carcasses in establishment 12; carcasses were touching the metal platform after the final wash. Veterinary officials took corrective actions by moving the metal platform.
2. Liver and hearts were being cleaned in a tray without drain for dirty water in the edible organ room of establishment 8. Veterinary officials and establishment officials discussed and agreed to replace the tray.
3. Carcasses in a cooler were very close to floor. Potential for cross contamination with floor for large carcasses were observed in the carcass cooler in establishment 8. Veterinary officials and, establishment officials discussed this issue and corrective action will be taken.

Product Handling and Storage

No deficiency was observed in this area.

Personnel Hygiene and Practices

In all establishments, employees were observed to follow good personnel hygiene practices.

ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROLS

Costa Rica'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. This is of special interest to all those with a stake in Costa Rica's animal production industries.

RESIDUE CONTROLS

Costa Rica's National Residue Testing Plan for 2000 was being followed, and was on schedule. The Costa Rica inspection system had adequate controls in place to ensure compliance with sampling and reporting procedures and storage and use of chemicals.

SLAUGHTER/PROCESSING CONTROLS

Except as noted below, the Costa Rica's inspection system had controls in place to ensure adequate product protection and processed product controls.

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 and met FSIS requirements. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment B).

Testing for Generic *E. coli*

Costa Rica has adopted the FSIS regulatory requirements for generic *E. coli* testing. All 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 for generic *E. coli* testing with the exception of the following equivalent measures:

1. **SAMPLE COLLECTOR:** Government takes samples.
 - There is a clearly written sampling plan with instruction for sample collection and processing that is being 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 method is a quantitative method of analysis.
- The method is approved by the AOAC International .

ENFORCEMENT CONTROLS

Inspection System Controls

The Costa Rica 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 re-inspection, shipment security, including shipment between establishments, prevention of commingling of product intended for export to the United States with domestic product, monitoring and verification of establishment programs and controls (including 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

All of the establishments audited 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 and criteria used in the equivalency determination. The data collection instrument used accompanies this report (Attachment D).

The Costa Rica has adopted the FSIS regulatory requirements for *Salmonella* testing.

Species Verification Testing

At the time of this audit, Costa Rica was not exempt from the species verification testing requirements. During the audit the auditor verified that species verification testing was being conducted in accordance with FSIS requirements at the central government laboratory.

Monthly Reviews

The National Meat Inspection Officials were performing the monthly in-depth reviews and audits. In the event that an establishment is found, during one of these 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, the Chief Meat Inspection Officer is empowered to conduct an in-depth review, he formulates a plan for corrective actions and preventive measures.

Enforcement Activities

Meat Inspection officials carry out enforcement activities.

Chief, Meat Inspection Officer has the sole power to initiate all enforcement actions.

Exit Meeting

An exit meeting was conducted in San Jose on September 14, 2000. The Costa Rican participants were Dr. Victor Hugo Sancho, Sub Director, Animal Health; Dr. Luis Salas, Chief of Meat Inspection; Dr. Byron Gurdian, National Veterinary Officer, Meat Inspection; and Dr. Suresh Singh, International Audit Staff Officer of FSIS.

The following topics were discussed:

1. Audit findings and observations of the auditor as reported in the cross contamination section of this report.
2. Enforcement report of USDA and requested the same type of enforcement report from Costa Rican authorities.

CONCLUSION

The inspection system of Costa Rica 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. Four establishments were audited and all were acceptable. The deficiencies encountered during the on-site establishment audits were adequately addressed to the auditor's satisfaction.

Dr. Suresh P. Singh
International Audit Staff Officer

(signed) Dr. Suresh P. Singh

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Data collection instrument for SSOPs
- B. Data collection instrument for HACCP programs
- C. Data collection instrument for *E. coli* testing.
- D. Data collection instrument for *Salmonella* testing
- E. Laboratory audit forms
- F. Individual Foreign Establishment Audit Forms

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. Frequency addressed	6. Responsible indiv. Identified	7. Documentation done daily	8. Dated and signed
08	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

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.
2. The plan describes corrective actions taken when a critical limit is exceeded.
3. The HACCP plan was validated using multiple monitoring results.
4. 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
08	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
19	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

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 equivalent carcass site and collection methodology (Swab) 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 .
9. The results of the tests are not being recorded on a process control chart but on a table form 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. Predominant 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
08	√	√	√	√	no	√	√	√	√	√
10	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
19	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

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 equivalent carcass site and method is being used for sampling.
6. Establishments in violation are not being allowed to continue operations.

The results of these evaluations were as follows:

Est. #	<i>1. Testing as required</i>	<i>2. Carcasses are sampled</i>	3. Ground product is sampled	4. Samples are taken randomly	5. Proper site and/or proper prod.	6. Violative est's stop operations
08	√	√	N/A	√	√	√
10	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	√	√	N/A	√	√	√

FOREIGN COUNTRY LABORATORY REVIEW

FOREIGN GOV'T AGENCY
 Direccion de salud Animal

CITY & COUNTRY
 Heredia, Costa Rica

ADDRESS OF LABORATORY
 Lagunilla Berrea de Heredia, Lanaseve

NAME OF REVIEWER
 Dr.S.P.Singh

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
 Dr.Marietta Urena Brenes

Residue Code/Name			100	200	300	400	500	800	923	950	S/V			
SAMPLING PROCEDURES	REVIEW ITEMS	ITEM #												
	Sample Handling	01	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Sampling Frequency	02	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Timely Analyses	03	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Compositing Procedure	04	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O			
	Interpret Comp Data	05	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O			
	Data Reporting	06	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES	Acceptable Method	07	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Correct Tissue(s)	08	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Equipment Operation	09	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Instrument Printouts	10	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES	Minimum Detection Levels	11	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Recovery Frequency	12	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Percent Recovery	13	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Check Sample Frequency	14	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	All analyst w/Check Samples	15	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	Corrective Actions	16	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	International Check Samples	17	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ	Ⓟ			
REVIEW PROCEDURES	Corrected Prior Deficiencies	18	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
OTHER REVIEW FINDINGS		19												
		20												

SIGNATURE OF REVIEWER

S.P. Singh

DATE

9/13/2000



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food Safety
And Inspection
Service

Technical
Service
Center

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

Questions for Auditing Microbiology Laboratories

General: Date of Audit September 13, 2000

Name & location of lab: Food Microbiology Lab, Ministry of Agriculture, Costa Rica, and San Hose.

Private or gov't lab? -Govt.

How & when was accreditation obtained? From University of Costa Rica/Once yr.

How & how often is accreditation maintained? -All the time

When and how is payment for analysis provided? After results are submitted to establishments and govt.

Are results released before payment is received? -Yes

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

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

Methodology for HACCP *Salmonella* samples (regulatory labs)

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

How are HACCP *Salmonella* samples received & recorded? -Received by lab by mail or a special messenger and recorded in a logbook

Are HACCP *Salmonella* samples analyzed on the day of receipt? -Yes

What method(s) is used for HACCP *Salmonella* samples? -AOAC-and USDA

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:Peptone

Sponge samples for *Salmonella*?-yes

Poultry rinsates for *Salmonella*?-N/A

Salmonella ground beef sample homogenates?-N/A

What is the formulation of the Buffered Peptone Water you use?

-Standard Difco.

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

Control cultures

Are they employed for each sample set? -Yes

How is HACCP *Salmonella* results expressed? -Positive or negative

How are HACCP *Salmonella* results recorded: In logbooks

Data sheets/work sheets? -N/A

and/or Log books? -Yes

How and to whom are HACCP *Salmonella* results reported?

To Govt. Meat inspection Officials

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

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

Methodology for HACCP generic *E. coli* samples (Govt. labs, only)

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

YES

How are HACCP *E. coli* samples received & recorded? -Like Salmonella samples

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

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

Is it a quantitative method? -Yes

What buffer (and what volume) is used for: Peptone

E. coli sponge samples?-yes

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

What analytical controls are used?-Blank Sample

Are they employed for each sample set?-yes

How are HACCP *E. coli* results calculated and/or expressed?
Cfu/cm

How are *E. coli* results recorded:-IN chart form

Data sheets/work sheets?-no

Log books?-yes

How and to whom are HACCP *E. coli* results reported?
Establishment-QC and Govt.inspectors

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

6. For individual analysts or for the lab as a whole?-for the lab
7. What species/strains are used?-not known
8. How many samples are analyzed and how often?-32/day
9. Are both inoculated and uninoculated samples provided to analysts for the proficiency testing?-yes
10. How many colony-forming units (cfu) per gram are inoculated into the proficiency samples provided to analysts?-N/A

NOTE: IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS, FEEL FREE TO CALL EITHER VICTOR COOK OR BONNIE ROSE AT 202-501-6022.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE

09-09-2000

ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME

0008, Coopemontecillos, Montecillos

CITY

Alajuela

COUNTRY

Costa Rica

NAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. S.P. Singh

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian

EVALUATION

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 M	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 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 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(a) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	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		
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY
	09-12-2000	0008, Coopemontecillos, Montecillos	Alajuela
			COUNTRY
			Costa Rica
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION
Dr.S.P.Singh	Dr.Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

20M-Floor needs attention in the slaughter and boning rooms (Broken at several placeces -hard to clean and potential for stagnant water-Unhyginic).

M-28- a. Carcasses in a cooler very close to floor- Potential for cross contamination with floor for large carcasses.

b. Viscera: Liver and hearts were beeing cleaned with wash water-no drain for dirty water to escape from the tray.

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE
09-08-0000

ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME
0010, Procesoora Centro American de Carne

CITY
Liberia
COUNTRY
Costa Rica

NAME OF REVIEWER
Dr.S.P.Singh

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr.Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian

EVALUATION
 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 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 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	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		Filing 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 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		
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE
09-11-2000

ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME
0012, Central American Meat, SA(CAMSA)

CITY
Heredia
COUNTRY
Costa Rica

NAME OF REVIEWER
Dr. S.P. Singh

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL
Dr. Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian

EVALUATION

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 M	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 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 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
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 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		
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM (reverse)	REVIEW DATE	ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME	CITY
	09-11-2000	0012, Central American Meat,SA(CAMSA)	Heredia
			COUNTRY
			Costa Rica
NAME OF REVIEWER	NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL		EVALUATION
Dr.S.P.Singh	Dr.Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable/ Re-review <input type="checkbox"/> Unacceptable

COMMENTS:

28M-Forelegs of large carcasses touching the platform of the workers close to final wash.

M33-Floor in the Pre-chill room needs attention (Broken- at several places- hard to clean)

FOREIGN PLANT REVIEW FORM

REVIEW DATE

09-07-0000

ESTABLISHMENT NO. AND NAME

0019, Procesdora de Carne del Rey, SA

CITY

Heredia

COUNTRY

Costa Rica

NAME OF REVIEWER

Dr. S.P. Singh

NAME OF FOREIGN OFFICIAL

Dr. Luis Salas and Byron Gurdian

EVALUATION

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 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 O
Hand washing facilities	04 A	(d) ESTABLISHMENT SANITATION PROGRAM		Inspector monitoring	60 A
Sanitizers	05 A	Effective maintenance program	33 A	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 O	Container closure exam	66 O
Lighting	11 A	Antemortem inspec. procedures	38 O	Interim container handling	67 O
Operations work space	12 A	Antemortem dispositions	39 O	Post-processing handling	68 O
Inspector work space	13 A	Humane Slaughter	40 O	Incubation procedures	69 O
Ventilation	14 A	Postmortem inspec. procedures	41 O	Process. defect actions -- plant	70 O
Facilities approval	15 A	Postmortem dispositions	42 O	Processing control -- inspection	71 O
Equipment approval	16 A	Condemned product control	43 O	5. COMPLIANCE/ECON. FRAUD CONTROL	
(b) CONDITION OF FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		Restricted product control	44 O	Export product identification	72 A
Over-product ceilings	17 A	Returned and rework product	45 O	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 O	Single standard	75 A
Other product areas (inside)	20 A	Sampling procedures	47 O	Inspection supervision	76 A
Dry storage areas	21 A	Residue reporting procedures	48 O	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		
Personal hygiene practices	26 A	Ingredients identification	53 O		
Sanitary dressing procedures	27 A	Control of restricted ingredients	54 O		

Country Response Not Received