PrimusGFS v3.2 and Produce Safety Rule (PSR) Benchmark

NOTE: This template does not include provisions that may be relevant to determining compliance (e.g., definitions, exemptions). *The provisions related to agricultural water (subpart B-112.12, subpart E, and subpart N-112.151) are included for completeness. Subpart M corresponding to sprouts was not included.

PART 112—STANDARDS FOR THE GROWING, HARVESTING, PACKING, AND HOLDING OF PRODUCE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION	PSR Reference	PGFS Q# Reference v3.2	Question	Expectations	Audit Module
Subpart B—General Requirements					
§ 112.11 What general requirements apply to persons who are subject to this part?					
You must take appropriate measures to minimize the risk of serious adverse health consequences or death from the use of, or exposure to, covered produce, including those measures reasonably necessary to prevent the introduction of known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into covered produce, and to provide reasonable assurances that the produce is not adulterated under section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act on account of such hazards.	§ 112.11	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5

§ 112.12 Are there any alternatives to the requirements established in this part? *					
(a) You may establish alternatives to certain specific requirements of subpart E of this part, as specified in § 112.49, provided that you satisfy the requirements of paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section. (b) You may establish and use an alternative to any of the requirements specified in paragraph (a) of this section, provided you have adequate scientific data or information to support a conclusion that the alternative would provide the same level of public health protection as the applicable requirement established in this part, and would not increase the likelihood that your covered produce will be adulterated under section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in light of your covered produce, practices, and conditions. (c) Scientific data and information used to support an alternative to a requirement specified in paragraph (a) of this section may be developed by you, available in the scientific literature, or available to you through a third party. You must establish and maintain documentation of the scientific data and information on which you rely in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part. You are not required to notify or seek prior approval from FDA regarding your decision to establish or use an alternative under this section	§112.12(a) §112.12(b) §112.12(c)	2.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculationg water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	2
		3.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculating water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	3
		5.10.03	Has a documented risk assessment been performed to ensure that any food safety hazards relevant to facility location and adjacent land use are identified and controlled?	A documented risk assessment should be performed for the facility to identify and control any food safety hazards relevant to the facility location and adjacent land use (e.g., animal activity, industrial activity, waste, sewage and septic systems, water treatment sites (settling ponds, land applications, etc.) or any other potential sources of contamination). All national and local laws pertaining to land use and on-site water treatment systems should be followed. Where necessary, for waste water treatment areas, there should be applicable permits on file and evidence of regulatory and/or third party inspections. The risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually and when a significant facility location/adjacent land change occurs including flooding and earthquake events that may impact sewage or septic systems.	5
Subpart C—Personnel Qualifications and Training					
§ 112.21 What requirements apply regarding qualifications and training for personnel who handle (contact) covered produce or food contact surfaces?					

All of the following requirements apply regarding qualifications and training for personnel who handle (contact) covered produce or food contact surfaces: (a) All personnel (including temporary, part time, seasonal, and contracted personnel) who handle covered produce or food contact surfaces, or who are engaged in the supervision thereof, must receive adequate training, as appropriate to the person's duties, upon hiring, and periodically thereafter, at least once annually. (b) All personnel (including temporary, part time, seasonal, and contracted personnel) who handle covered produce or food contact surfaces, or who are engaged in the supervision thereof, must have a combination of education, training, and experience necessary to perform the person's assigned duties in a manner that ensures compliance with this part. (c) Training must be conducted in a manner that is easily understood by personnel being trained. (d) Training must be repeated as necessary and appropriate in light of observations or information indicating that personnel are not meeting standards established by FDA in subparts C through O of this part.	§ 112.21 (a) § 112.21 (b) § 112.21 (c) § 112.21 (d)	2.06.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	2
		2.06.03	Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	There should be records covering when workers are found not following food safety requirements. These records should also show corrective actions and evidence that retraining has occurred (where relevant).	2
		3.07.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	3
		3.07.04	Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	There should be records covering when workers are found not following food safety requirements. These records should also show corrective actions and evidence that retraining has occurred (where relevant).	3
		4.03.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	4
		4.03.04	Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	There should be records covering when workers are found not following food safety requirements. These records should also show corrective actions and evidence that retraining has occurred (where relevant).	4

		5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.02	Are there logs of ongoing worker food safety education training, including topics covered, attendees, etc.?	Ongoing worker training should cover at least GMP food safety hazards and relevant regulatory requirements and guidance. Training records should detail who has been trained, topics covered, trainer details, materials used and when the training occurred. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.03	Are there training logs for the sanitation workers, including best practices and chemical use details?	Sanitation training should ensure that the workers understand the importance of proper sanitation, cleaning efficacy, how to use the cleaning chemicals and how to understand Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures. Unless sanitation workers attend regular food safety trainings, sanitation training should also include elements of food safety training pertinent to sanitation operations (e.g., hand washing, restroom use, foreign material, etc.). Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given.	5
		5.15.05	Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	There should be records covering instances when workers are found not following food safety requirements. These records should also show corrective actions and evidence that retraining has occurred (where relevant).	5
§ 112.22 What minimum requirements apply for training personnel who conduct a covered activity?					
(a) At a minimum, all personnel who handle (contact) covered produce during covered activities or supervise the conduct of such activities must receive training that includes all of the following: (1) Principles of food hygiene and food safety; (2) The importance of health and personal hygiene for all personnel and visitors, including recognizing symptoms of a health condition that is reasonably likely to result in contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces with microorganisms of public health significance; and (3) The standards established by FDA in subparts C through O of this part that are applicable to the employee's job responsibilities.	§112.22(a) §112.22(a)(1) §112.22(a)(2) §112.22(a)(3) §112.22(b) §112.22(b)(1) §112.22(b)(2) §112.22(b)(3)	2.06.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	2
		3.07.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	3

		4.03.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	4
		3.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated on-site person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	3
		4.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented .This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	4
		5.10.05	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	5
		5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
(b) Persons who conduct harvest activities for covered produce must also receive training that includes all of the following: (1) Recognizing covered produce that must not be harvested, including covered produce that may be contaminated with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards; (2) Inspecting harvest containers and equipment to ensure that they are functioning properly, clean, and maintained so as not to become a source of contamination of covered produce with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards; and (3) Correcting problems with harvest containers or equipment, or reporting such problems to the supervisor (or other responsible party), as appropriate to the person's job responsibilities.	§112.22(b) §112.22(b)(1) §112.22(b)(2) §112.22(b)(3)	4.03.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	4
(c) At least one supervisor or responsible party for your farm must have successfully completed food safety training at least equivalent to that received under standardized curriculum recognized as adequate by the Food and Drug Administration.	§112.22(c)	2.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated on-site person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	2
§ 112.23 What requirements apply regarding supervisors?					

You must assign or identify personnel to supervise (or otherwise be responsible for) your operations to ensure compliance with the requirements of this part.	§ 112.23	2.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated on-site person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	2
		3.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated on-site person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	3
		4.01.01	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented .This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	4
		5.10.05	Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	There should be a designated person/persons responsible for the operation's food safety program. They should have documented formal training or trained by someone that has formal credentials that is documented. This training should meet all state and federal requirements.	5
§ 112.30 Under this subpart, what requirements apply regarding records?					
(a) You must establish and keep records required under this subpart in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part. (b) You must establish and keep records of training that document required training of personnel, including the date of training, topics covered, and the persons(s) trained.	§ 112.30(a) § 112.30(b)	2.06.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	2
		3.07.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	3

		4.03.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	4
		5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.02	Are there logs of ongoing worker food safety education training, including topics covered, attendees, etc.?	Ongoing worker training should cover at least GMP food safety hazards and relevant regulatory requirements and guidance. Training records should detail who has been trained, topics covered, trainer details, materials used and when the training occurred. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.03	Are there training logs for the sanitation workers, including best practices and chemical use details?	Sanitation training should ensure that the workers understand the importance of proper sanitation, cleaning efficacy, how to use the cleaning chemicals and how to understand Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures. Unless sanitation workers attend regular food safety trainings, sanitation training should also include elements of food safety training pertinent to sanitation operations (e.g., hand washing, restroom use, foreign material, etc.). Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given.	5
Subpart D—Health and Hygiene					
§ 112.31 What measures must I take to prevent ill or infected persons from contaminating covered produce with microorganisms of public health significance?					
(a) You must take measures to prevent contamination of covered produce and food contact surfaces with microorganisms of public health significance from any person with an applicable health condition (such as communicable illnesses that present a public health risk in the context of normal work duties, infection, open lesion, vomiting, or diarrhea). (b) The measures you must take to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section must include all of the following measures:	§112.31 (a) §112.31 (b) §112.31 (b)(1) §112.31 (b)(2)	2.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers and visitors should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	2

(1) Excluding any person from working in any operations that may result in contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces with microorganisms of public health significance when the person (by medical examination, the person's acknowledgement, or observation) is shown to have, or appears to have, an applicable health condition, until the person's health condition no longer presents a risk to public health; and (2) Instructing personnel to notify their supervisor(s) (or a responsible party) if they have, or if there is a reasonable possibility that they have an applicable health condition.		3.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	3
		4.01.02	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide.	4
		3.07.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	3
		4.03.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	4
		3.07.03	Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors can check procedure/policy but not the actual records).	There should be documented procedures that are communicated (e.g., worker signature on a training log) to food handlers, requiring them to report any cuts, grazes and/or any illnesses that might be a food safety cross contamination risk. Procedures to note return to work requirements for affected workers. Procedures should cover recording requirements, but auditors should not request to review records where countries have laws covering privacy/confidentiality of health records.	3

		4.03.03	Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors can check procedure/policy but not the actual records).	There should be documented procedures that are communicated (e.g., worker signature on a training log) to food handlers, requiring them to report any cuts, grazes and/or any illnesses that might be a food safety cross contamination risk. Procedures to note return to work requirements for affected workers. Procedures should cover recording requirements, but auditors should not request to review records where countries have laws covering privacy/confidentiality of health records.	4
		3.08.09	Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from signs of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	Workers who have exposed boils, sores, exposed infected wounds, foodborne illness or any other source of abnormal microbial contamination should not be allowed to work in contact with the product, packaging or food contact surfaces.	3
		4.04.08	Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from evidence of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	Workers who have exposed boils, sores, exposed infected wounds, foodborne illness or any other source of abnormal microbial contamination should not be allowed to work in contact with the product, packaging or food contact surfaces.	4
		5.15.06	Are visitors and contractors required to sign a log stating that they will comply with the operations' personal hygiene and health requirements?	All visitors and contractors should sign to say that they will abide by the company rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements (which they have reviewed before entering the food handling areas of the facility).	5
		5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.02	Are there logs of ongoing worker food safety education training, including topics covered, attendees, etc.?	Ongoing worker training should cover at least GMP food safety hazards and relevant regulatory requirements and guidance. Training records should detail who has been trained, topics covered, trainer details, materials used and when the training occurred. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
		5.15.03	Are there training logs for the sanitation workers, including best practices and chemical use details?	Sanitation training should ensure that the workers understand the importance of proper sanitation, cleaning efficacy, how to use the cleaning chemicals and how to understand Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures. Unless sanitation workers attend regular food safety trainings, sanitation training should also include elements of food safety training pertinent to sanitation operations (e.g., hand washing, restroom use, foreign material, etc.). Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given.	5
		5.15.04	Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and include return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors should check procedure/policy but not the actual records).	There should be documented procedures that are communicated (e.g., worker signature on a training log) to food handlers, requiring them to report any cuts, grazes and/or any illnesses that might be a food safety cross contamination risk. Procedures to note return to work requirements for affected workers. Procedures should cover recording requirements, but auditors should not request to review records where countries have laws covering privacy/confidentiality of health records.	5
		5.05.03	Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from signs of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	Workers who have exposed boils, sores, exposed infected wounds, foodborne illness or any other source of abnormal microbial contamination should not be allowed to work in contact with the product, packaging or food contact surfaces.	5

		2.06.01	Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	There should be a formal training program to inform workers of the current policies and requirements of the company regarding hygiene. Training should be in the language understood by the workers, and training type and intensity should reflect the risks associated with the products/processes. Frequency should be at the start of the season before starting work and then some topics covered at least quarterly, but ideally monthly. These trainings should cover food safety and hygiene policies and basic food safety and hygiene topics, the importance of detecting food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, all food safety or hygiene issues in which they are responsible, and correcting and reporting problems. Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given. Topics include, but not limited to, hand washing, protective clothing (where applicable), recognizing and reporting injury and illness, blood and bodily fluids, jewelry, dropped product, animal intrusion, food defense. There should be records of workers who have attended each session.	2
§ 112.32 What hygienic practices must personnel use?					
(a) Personnel who work in an operation in which covered produce or food contact surfaces are at risk of contamination with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards must use hygienic practices while on duty to the extent necessary to protect against such contamination. (b) The hygienic practices that personnel use to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section when handling (contacting) covered produce or food contact surfaces during a covered activity must include all of the following practices: (1) Maintaining adequate personal cleanliness to protect against contamination of covered produce and food contact surfaces; (2) Avoiding contact with animals other than working animals, and taking appropriate steps to minimize the likelihood of contamination of covered produce when in direct contact with working animals; (3) Washing hands thoroughly, including scrubbing with soap (or other effective surfactant) and running water that satisfies the requirements of § 112.44(a) (as applicable) for water used to wash hands, and drying hands thoroughly using single-service towels, sanitary towel service, electric hand dryers, or other adequate hand drying devices: (i) Before starting work; (ii) Before putting on gloves; (iii) After using the toilet; (iv) Upon return to the work station after any break or other absence from the work station; (v) As soon as practical after touching animals (including livestock and working animals), or any waste of animal origin; and (vi) At any other time when the hands may have become contaminated in a manner that is reasonably likely to lead to contamination of covered produce with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards; (4) If you choose to use gloves in handling covered produce or food contact surfaces, maintaining gloves in an intact and sanitary condition and replacing such gloves when no longer able to do so; (5) Removing or covering hand jewelry that cannot be adequately cleaned and sanitized during periods in which covered produce is manipulated by hand;	§ 112.32(a) § 112.32(b) § 112.32(b)(1) § 112.32(b)(2) § 112.32(b)(3) § 112.32(b)(3)(i) § 112.32(b)(3)(vi) § 112.32(b)(4) § 112.32(b)(5) § 112.32(b)(6)	2.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers and visitors should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	2
		3.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	3
		4.01.02	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide.	4
		3.02.12	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 3.02.13	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas. (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals)	3
		4.05.01	Is the harvest area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 4.05.02.	Animals can represent potential contamination to the harvesting area, to the crop, to the equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc.	4

and
(6) Not eating, chewing gum, or using tobacco products in an area used for a covered activity (however, drinking beverages is permitted in designated areas).

3.08.05	Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Worker conformance to hand washing and sanitizing procedures should be assessed as washing hands is the first step in avoiding food contamination. Workers should be observed washing their hands prior to beginning work, after breaks, after using the toilets, before putting on gloves, and whenever hands may have become a source of contamination (e.g., after eating, after using a handkerchief or tissue, smoking, drinking, etc.).	3
4.04.05	Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Worker conformance to hand washing and sanitizing procedures should be assessed as washing hands is the first step in avoiding food contamination. Workers should be observed washing their hands prior to beginning work, after breaks, after using the toilets, before putting on gloves, and whenever hands may have become a source of contamination (e.g., after eating, after using a handkerchief or tissue, smoking, drinking, etc.).	4
3.08.03c	Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	All hand washing facilities should be properly stocked with liquid non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	3
4.04.03c	Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	All hand washing facilities should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	4
3.08.04c	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations and water retests.	3
4.04.04c	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations and water retests.	4
3.08.10	Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	Workers are not observed wearing jewelry (including earrings, necklaces, bracelets, rings with stones, rings or studs in nose, lip and eyebrow, watches) in the facility. Plain wedding bands are the only exception. Other examples of foreign items maybe a source of foreign material contamination include studs, false finger nails and finger nail polish, false eye lashes, eye lash extensions and badges.	3
4.04.09	Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	Workers are not observed wearing jewelry (including earrings, ear gages, necklaces, bracelets, rings with stones, rings or studs in nose, lip and eyebrow, watches) in the growing area. Plain wedding bands are the only exception. Other examples of foreign items maybe a source of foreign material contamination include studs, false finger nails and finger nail polish, false eye lashes, eye lash extensions and badges.	4
3.08.13	Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Smoking, chewing tobacco, chewing gum, drinking and eating is permitted in designated areas that are away from growing and storage areas. Spitting should be prohibited in all areas. Smoking should not be permitted in eating and drinking areas.	3
4.04.11	Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Smoking, chewing tobacco, chewing gum, drinking and eating is permitted in designated areas that are away from growing and storage areas. Spitting should be prohibited in all areas. Smoking should not be permitted in eating and drinking areas.	4
5.15.06	Are visitors and contractors required to sign a log stating that they will comply with the operations' personal hygiene and health requirements?	All visitors and contractors should sign to say that they will abide by the company rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements (which they have reviewed before entering the food handling areas of the facility).	5

5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
5.15.02	Are there logs of ongoing worker food safety education training, including topics covered, attendees, etc.?	Ongoing worker training should cover at least GMP food safety hazards and relevant regulatory requirements and guidance. Training records should detail who has been trained, topics covered, trainer details, materials used and when the training occurred. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
5.15.03	Are there training logs for the sanitation workers, including best practices and chemical use details?	Sanitation training should ensure that the workers understand the importance of proper sanitation, cleaning efficacy, how to use the cleaning chemicals and how to understand Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures. Unless sanitation workers attend regular food safety trainings, sanitation training should also include elements of food safety training pertinent to sanitation operations (e.g., hand washing, restroom use, foreign material, etc.). Training logs should have a clearly defined topic(s) covered, trainer(s) and material(s) used/given.	5
5.15.04	Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and include return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors should check procedure/policy but not the actual records).	There should be documented procedures that are communicated (e.g., worker signature on a training log) to food handlers, requiring them to report any cuts, grazes and/or any illnesses that might be a food safety cross contamination risk. Procedures to note return to work requirements for affected workers. Procedures should cover recording requirements, but auditors should not request to review records where countries have laws covering privacy/confidentiality of health records.	5
5.05.03	Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from signs of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	Workers who have exposed boils, sores, exposed infected wounds, foodborne illness or any other source of abnormal microbial contamination should not be allowed to work in contact with the product, packaging or food contact surfaces.	5
5.05.06	Are all workers wearing protective outer garments suitable for the operation (e.g., appropriate clean clothes, smocks, aprons, sleeves, non-latex gloves)?	Outer garment policy should consider potential for cross contamination, customer requirements, production risk, product type, etc. Outer garment policy should consider potential for cross contamination, customer requirements, production risk, product type, etc. Outer garments include where applicable: smocks, aprons, sleeves, gloves, boots, etc. Workers should not wear personal clothes with sequins, pom-poms, fur, etc. No sleeveless tops without an over garment. Where dedicated protective clothing is not required/worn, it must be clear that outer street clothes are clean and not a potential source of contamination.	5
5.02.01	Are products or ingredients free of pests (e.g. insects, rodents, birds, reptiles, mammals) or any evidence of them? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Any evidence of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles or mammals, etc.) in products or ingredients are indicators of contamination, posing physical and microbiological hazards. Evidence of contamination constitutes an automatic failure of the audit. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
5.05.02	Are workers' fingernails clean, short and free of nail polish?	Fingernails can harbor dirt and debris and can be a source of cross contamination. Therefore, nails should be clean and short to reduce the risk of cross contamination. Fingernail polish and false nails should not be worn, even when gloves are worn.	5
5.02.03	Are plant and storage areas free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles, mammals) or any evidence of them?	Plant and storage areas should be free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles or mammals, etc.) to prevent possible physical or microbiological contamination.	5

		5.05.01	Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Worker conformance to hand washing and sanitizing procedures should be assessed as washing hands is the first step in avoiding food contamination. Workers should be observed washing their hands prior to beginning work, after breaks, after using the toilet, before putting on gloves, and whenever hands may have become a source of contamination (e.g., after eating, after using a handkerchief or tissue, smoking, drinking, etc.).	5
		5.04.11	Are hand washing stations in working order, have water of suitable temperature and pressure, adequately stocked (e.g. disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.) and restricted to hand washing purposes only?	Hand washing stations should be designated and used only for hand washing, have water of suitable temperature and pressure and be maintained in good working order with proper drainage. They should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located; hot air driers are acceptable if properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	5
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.05.05	Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	Workers are not observed wearing jewelry (including earrings, ear gauges, necklaces, bracelets, rings with stones, rings or studs in nose, lip and eyebrow, watches) in the facility. Plain wedding bands are the only exception. Other examples of foreign items may be a source of foreign material contamination include studs, false eye lashes, eye lash extensions, etc.	5
		5.05.10	Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Smoking, chewing tobacco, chewing gum, drinking and eating is permitted in designated areas that are away from production and storage areas. Spitting should be prohibited in all areas. Smoking should not be permitted in eating and drinking areas. Drinking is not permitted near the production line.	5
		4.04.14	Are all workers wearing protective outer garments suitable for the operation (e.g. appropriate clean clothes, smocks, aprons, sleeves and non-latex gloves)?	Workers should not wear personal clothes with sequins, pom-poms, fur, etc. No sleeveless tops without an over garment. Where dedicated protective clothing is not required/worn, it must be clear that outer street clothes are clean and not a potential source of contamination. If required, the policy should consider customer requirements, production risk, product type, etc.	4
(b) The hygienic practices that personnel use to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section when handling (contacting) covered produce or food contact surfaces during a covered activity must include all of the following practices: (2) Avoiding contact with animals other than working animals, and taking appropriate steps to minimize the likelihood of contamination of covered produce when in direct contact with working animals;	§ 112.32(b) § 112.32(b)(2)	2.02.10	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 2.02.11.	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the field equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals).	2

(a) Personnel who work in an operation in which covered produce or food contact surfaces are at risk of contamination with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards must use hygienic practices while on duty to the extent necessary to protect against such contamination. (b) The hygienic practices that personnel use to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section when handling (contacting) covered produce or food contact surfaces during a covered activity must include all of the following practices: (3) Washing hands thoroughly, including scrubbing with soap (or other effective surfactant) and running water that satisfies the requirements of § 112.44(a) (as applicable) for water used to wash hands, and drying hands thoroughly using single-service towels, sanitary towel service, electric hand dryers, or other adequate hand drying devices: (i) Before starting work; (ii) Before putting on gloves; (iii) After using the toilet; (iv) Upon return to the work station after any break or other absence from the work station; (v) As soon as practical after touching animals (including livestock and working animals), or any waste of animal origin; and (vi) At any other time when the hands may have become contaminated in a manner that is reasonably likely to lead to contamination of covered produce with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards;	§ 112.32(a) § 112.32(b) § 112.32(b)(3) § 112.32(b)(3)(i) § 112.32(b)(3)(vi) § 112.32(b)(4) § 112.32(b)(5) § 112.32(b)(6)	2.07.05	Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Worker conformance to hand washing and sanitizing procedures should be assessed as washing hands is the first step in avoiding food contamination. Workers should be observed washing their hands prior to beginning work, after breaks, after using the toilets, before putting on gloves, and whenever hands may have become a source of contamination (e.g., after eating, after using a handkerchief or tissue, smoking, drinking, etc.).	2
(b) The hygienic practices that personnel use to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section when handling (contacting) covered produce or food contact surfaces during a covered activity must include all of the following practices: (5) Removing or covering hand jewelry that cannot be adequately cleaned and sanitized during periods in which covered produce is manipulated by hand; and	§ 112.32(b) § 112.32(b)(5)	2.07.07	Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	Workers are not observed wearing jewelry (including earrings, ear gages, necklaces, bracelets, rings with stones, rings or studs in nose, lip and eyebrow, watches) in the growing area. Plain wedding bands are the only exception. Other examples of foreign items maybe a source of foreign material contamination include studs, false finger nails and finger nail polish, false eye lashes, eye lash extensions and badges.	2
		2.07.09	Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Smoking, chewing tobacco, chewing gum, drinking and eating is permitted in designated areas that are away from growing and storage areas. Spitting should be prohibited in all areas. Smoking should not be permitted in eating and drinking areas.	2
§ 112.33 What measures must I take to prevent visitors from contaminating covered produce and food contact surfaces with microorganisms of public health significance?					
(a) You must make visitors aware of policies and procedures to protect covered produce and food contact surfaces from contamination by people and take all steps reasonably necessary to ensure that visitors comply with such policies and procedures.	§ 112.33 (a)	2.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers and visitors should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	2
		3.01.03	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	3

4.01.02	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to	4
3.08.01	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Toilet facilities should be available to all workers and visitors, while work is actively occurring. At least one toilet per 20 workers should be provided, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. Toilet facility placement should be within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. A 5 minute drive is not acceptable while work is actively occurring with groups of three or more workers. Where there are two or less workers present (e.g., spray activities, irrigation check) and workers have transportation that is immediately available to toilets within a 5 minute drive, it is acceptable to score as total compliance. Automatic failure if there are insufficient or inadequate toilet facilities. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
4.04.01	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Toilet facilities should be available to all workers and visitors, while work is actively occurring. At least one toilet per 20 workers should be provided, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. Toilet facility placement should be within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. A 5 minute drive is not acceptable, while harvesting is actively occurring with groups of three or more workers. Where there are two or less workers present and workers have transportation that is immediately available to toilets within a 5 minute drive, it is acceptable to score as total compliance. Automatic failure if there are insufficient or inadequate toilet facilities. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	4
3.08.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
4.04.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	4
5.15.01	Are there records of new worker food safety (GMP) orientation training (with topics covered and attendees) and are all workers required to sign the company's food safety hygiene and health policy?	All new workers (including workers in departments such as production, storage, maintenance, etc.) should be GMP trained on employment in the language understood by the workers, with records of this training being maintained. Training should include the importance of recognizing food safety and/or hygiene issues with co-workers and visitors, correcting problems and reporting problems to a supervisor. All workers should be issued a list of GMP rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide by the company's food safety policy rules regarding personal hygiene/GMPs and health requirements. Training provided and associated records should meet local and national regulations.	5
5.04.12	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location and are they adequately stocked (e.g. toilet paper, disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.)?	At least one stall per 15 workers. Toilet facilities are available to all workers and visitors and should not open directly into production or storage areas. Restrooms should be stocked with toilet paper, unscented/non-perfumed soap and towels.	5

		5.04.10	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage?	Enough stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 10 people on site) and be available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system for food establishments. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities area and lunchroom area. For operations packing or processing items, stations should be accessible from the to production areas.	5
(b) You must make toilet and handwashing facilities accessible to visitors.	§ 112.33 (b)	2.07.01	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Toilet facilities should be available to all workers and visitors, while work is actively occurring. At least one toilet per 20 workers should be provided, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. Toilet facility placement should be within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. A 5 minute drive is not acceptable, while farm work is actively occurring with groups of three or more workers. Where there are two or less workers present (e.g., spray activities, irrigation check) and workers have transportation that is immediately available to toilets within a 5 minute drive, it is acceptable to score as total compliance. Automatic failure if there are insufficient or inadequate toilet facilities. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.07.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and be available to all workers and visitors while work is actively occurring. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.07.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and be available to all workers and visitors while work is actively occurring. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
Subpart E—Agricultural Water *					
§ 112.41 What requirements apply to the quality of agricultural water?					
All agricultural water must be safe and of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use.	§ 112.41	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4

		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
§ 112.42 What requirements apply to my agricultural water sources, water distribution system, and pooling of water?					
(a) At the beginning of a growing season, as appropriate, but at least once annually, you must inspect all of your agricultural water systems, to the extent they are under your control (including water sources, water distribution systems, facilities, and equipment), to identify conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces in light of your covered produce, practices, and conditions, including consideration of the following: (1) The nature of each agricultural water source (for example, ground water or surface water); (2) The extent of your control over each agricultural water source; (3) The degree of protection of each agricultural water source; (4) Use of adjacent and nearby land; and (5) The likelihood of introduction of known or reasonably foreseeable hazards to agricultural water by another user of agricultural water before the water reaches your covered farm.	§112.42(a) §112.42(a)(1) §112.42(a)(2) §112.42(a)(3) §112.42(a)(4) §112.42(a)(5)	2.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculationg water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	2
		2.09.02f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.03f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.04f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.05f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.06f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.02	Is well water used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2
		2.09.03	Is non-flowing surface water (e.g., pond, reservoir, watershed) used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2

		2.09.04	Is open flowing surface water used in the operation? (e.g., river, canal, ditch)	Water sourced from canals, rivers, ditches or other open flowing surface water systems may carry more of a risk for contamination than closed water sources. For surface waters, consider the impact of storm events on irrigation practices. Bacterial loads in surface water are generally much higher than other sources, and caution should be exercised when using these waters for irrigation. Information gathering question.	2
		2.09.05	Is reclaimed water used in the operation? Note, this refers to wastewater that has gone through a treatment process.	Information gathering question. Reclaimed water should be treated with adequate disinfection systems and tested frequently, ideally under the direction of a water reclamation authority or other management body. Reclaimed water should be subject to applicable local and national regulations and standards including World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines for the safe use of wastewater, excreta and greywater in agriculture. Prior to using this water for agricultural purposes, growers should check with regulatory bodies to determine the appropriate parameters and tolerances to be used.	2
		2.09.06	Is tail water (run-off water including hydroponics) used in the operation?	Tail water return systems, including hydroponics, catch spilled or runoff water and pump the water back to the top of the field. Information gathering question.	2
		3.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculating water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	3
		3.10.01f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.02f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.03f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.04f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3

		3.10.05f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.06f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.01	Is municipal/district water used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	3
		3.10.02	Is well water used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	3
		3.10.03	Is non-flowing surface water (e.g., pond, reservoir, watershed) used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	3
		3.10.04	Is open flowing surface water (e.g., river, canal, ditch) used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	3
		3.10.05	Is reclaimed water used in the operation? Note, this refers to wastewater that has gone through a treatment process.	Information gathering question. Reclaimed water should be treated with adequate disinfection systems and tested frequently, ideally under the direction of a water reclamation authority or other management body. Reclaimed water should be subject to applicable local and national regulations and standards including World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines for the safe use of wastewater, excreta and greywater in agriculture. Prior to using this water for agricultural purposes, growers should check with regulatory bodies to determine the appropriate parameters and tolerances to be used.	3
		3.10.06	Is tail water (run-off water including hydroponics) used in the operation?	Information gathering question. Tail water return systems, including hydroponics, catch spilled or runoff water and pump the water back to the top of the field/growing area.	3
		5.10.03	Has a documented risk assessment been performed to ensure that any food safety hazards relevant to facility location and adjacent land use are identified and controlled?	A documented risk assessment should be performed for the facility to identify and control any food safety hazards relevant to the facility location and adjacent land use (e.g., animal activity, industrial activity, waste, sewage and septic systems, water treatment sites (settling ponds, land applications, etc.) or any other potential sources of contamination). All national and local laws pertaining to land use and on-site water treatment systems should be followed. Where necessary, for waste water treatment areas, there should be applicable permits on file and evidence of regulatory and/or third party inspections. The risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually and when a significant facility location/adjacent land change occurs including flooding and earthquake events that may impact sewage or septic systems.	5
		2.09.01f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
(a) At the beginning of a growing season, as appropriate, but at least once annually, you must inspect all of your agricultural water systems, to the extent they are under your control (including water sources, water distribution systems, facilities, and equipment), to identify conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces in light of your covered produce, practices, and conditions, including consideration	§112.42(a) §112.42(a)(1)	2.09.01	Is municipal/district water used in the growing operation?	Information gathering question.	2
		2.09.02	Is well water used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2
		2.09.03	Is non-flowing surface water (e.g., pond, reservoir, watershed) used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2
		2.09.04	Is open flowing surface water used in the operation? (e.g., river, canal, ditch)	Water sourced from canals, rivers, ditches or other open flowing surface water systems may carry more of a risk for contamination than closed water sources. For surface waters, consider the impact of storm events on irrigation practices. Bacterial loads in surface water are generally much higher than other sources, and caution should be exercised when using these waters for irrigation. Information gathering question.	2

of the following: (1) The nature of each agricultural water source (for example,		2.09.05	Is reclaimed water used in the operation? Note, this refers to wastewater that has gone through a treatment process.	Information gathering question. Reclaimed water should be treated with adequate disinfection systems and tested frequently, ideally under the direction of a water reclamation authority or other management body. Reclaimed water should be subject to applicable local and national regulations and standards including World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines for the safe use of wastewater, excreta and greywater in agriculture. Prior to using this water for agricultural purposes, growers should check with regulatory bodies to determine the appropriate parameters and tolerances to be used.	2
		2.09.07	Is dryland farming used in the growing operation	Crop production that relies only on rainfall. Information gathering question.	2
(b) You must adequately maintain all agricultural water distribution systems to the extent they are under your control as necessary and appropriate to prevent the water distribution system from being a source of contamination to covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, or water sources, including by regularly inspecting and adequately storing all equipment used in the system.	§ 112.42(b)	2.02.06	Are control measures being implemented for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires, etc. (i.e. out of the mud, stacked to prevent pest harborage, away from the growing area)?	Incorrectly stored pallets and equipment can provide areas for pest harborage and/or cross contamination. Equipment should be stored at least 4" (10 cm) off the ground. Growers should check the stored equipment (e.g., irrigation pipes) periodically to ensure that it has not become a pest harborage area or dirty due to rains. Inventory checks should occur in order to ensure that these storage areas do not become full of unnecessary items.	2
		3.02.07	Are control measures being implemented for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires etc. (i.e. out of the mud, stacked to prevent pest harborage, away from the building perimeter)?	Incorrectly stored pallets and equipment can provide areas for pest harborage and/or cross contamination. Equipment should be stored at least 4" (10 cm) off the ground and at least 24" (61 cm) away from the building perimeter. Workers should check the stored equipment (e.g., irrigation pipes) periodically to ensure that it has not become a pest harborage area or dirty due to rains. Inventory checks should occur in order to ensure that these storage areas do not become full of unnecessary items. Outside storage areas should be within the scope of the pest control program.	3
		3.10.07	Are there backflow prevention devices on all main lines, including where chemical, fertilizer and pesticide applications are made?	Water systems should be fitted with backflow prevention devices to prevent contamination of the water supply. Main water lines should be fitted with back-flow protection for the incoming water (no matter what the source). Individual water lines should be fitted with backflow protection where practical.	3
		3.10.08	If the operation stores water (tank, cistern, container), is the storage container well maintained?	Container should be structurally sound with no evidence of damage or rust, no vegetation growing on or in the container. The base of the container should be free from debris and weeds. Access lids are properly secured and any vents, overflow and drains are screened. Air gaps are present and should be at least twice the diameter of the water supply inlet and not be less than 25 mm (1 inch).	3
		2.09.08	Are there backflow prevention devices on all main lines, including where chemical, fertilizer and pesticide applications are made?	Water systems should be fitted with backflow prevention devices to prevent contamination of the water supply. Main water lines should be fitted with back-flow protection for the incoming water (no matter what the source). Individual water lines should be fitted with backflow protection where practical.	2
		2.09.09	If the operation stores water (tank, cistern, container), is the storage container well maintained?	Container should be structurally sound with no evidence of damage or rust, no vegetation growing on or in the container. The base of the container should be free from debris and weeds. Access lids are properly secured and any vents, overflow and drains are screened. Air gaps are present and should be at least twice the diameter of the water supply inlet and not be less than 25 mm (1 inch).	2
		2.09.07	Is dryland farming used in the growing operation	Crop production that relies only on rainfall. Information gathering question.	2
(b) You must adequately maintain all agricultural water distribution systems to the extent they are under your control as necessary and appropriate to prevent the water distribution system from being a source of contamination to covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, or water sources, including by regularly inspecting and adequately storing all equipment used in the system. (c) You must adequately maintain all agricultural	§ 112.42(b) § 112.42(c)	2.09.01f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.02f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2

water sources to the extent they are under your control (such as wells). Such maintenance includes regularly inspecting each source to identify any conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces; correcting any significant deficiencies (e.g., repairs to well cap, well casing, sanitary seals, piping tanks and treatment equipment, and control of cross-connections); and keeping the source free of debris, trash, domesticated animals, and other possible sources of contamination of covered produce to the extent practicable and appropriate under the circumstances.

2.09.03f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
2.09.04f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
2.09.05f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
2.09.06f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
2.09.02	Is well water used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2
2.09.03	Is non-flowing surface water (e.g., pond, reservoir, watershed) used in the operation?	Information gathering question.	2
2.09.04	Is open flowing surface water used in the operation? (e.g., river, canal, ditch)	Water sourced from canals, rivers, ditches or other open flowing surface water systems may carry more of a risk for contamination than closed water sources. For surface waters, consider the impact of storm events on irrigation practices. Bacterial loads in surface water are generally much higher than other sources, and caution should be exercised when using these waters for irrigation. Information gathering question.	2
2.09.05	Is reclaimed water used in the operation? Note, this refers to wastewater that has gone through a treatment process.	Information gathering question. Reclaimed water should be treated with adequate disinfection systems and tested frequently, ideally under the direction of a water reclamation authority or other management body. Reclaimed water should be subject to applicable local and national regulations and standards including World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines for the safe use of wastewater, excreta and greywater in agriculture. Prior to using this water for agricultural purposes, growers should check with regulatory bodies to determine the appropriate parameters and tolerances to be used.	2
2.09.06	Is tail water (run-off water including hydroponics) used in the operation?	Tail water return systems, including hydroponics, catch spilled or runoff water and pump the water back to the top of the field. Information gathering question.	2
3.10.01f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
3.10.02f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
3.10.03f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
3.10.04f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3

		3.10.05f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.06f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
(d) As necessary and appropriate, you must implement measures reasonably necessary to reduce the potential for contamination of covered produce with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards as a result of contact of covered produce with pooled water. For example, such measures may include using protective barriers or staking to keep covered produce from touching the ground or using an alternative irrigation method.	§ 112.42(d)	2.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventive measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventive measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead, flood or furrow irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	2
		3.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventative measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	3
§ 112.43 What requirements apply to treating agricultural water?					
(a) When agricultural water is treated in accordance with §112.45: (1) Any method you use to treat agricultural water (such as with physical treatment, including using a pesticide device as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); EPA-registered antimicrobial pesticide product; or other suitable method) must be effective to make the water safe and of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use and/or meet the relevant microbial quality criteria in § 112.44, as applicable. (2) You must deliver any treatment of agricultural water in a manner to ensure that the treated water is consistently safe and of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use and/or consistently meets the relevant microbial quality criteria in § 112.44, as applicable. (b) You must monitor any treatment of agricultural water at a frequency adequate to ensure that the treated water is consistently safe and of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use and/or consistently meets the relevant microbial quality criteria in § 112.44, as applicable.	§112.43(a) §112.43(a)(1) §112.43(a)(2) §112.43(b)	2.09.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2

2.09.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
3.10.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3

		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.14a	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single-pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems and changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks) and for pH and monitoring water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty or when switching products. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature paramenters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc.	4
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.11.03	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems, changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks, flumes, hydro vacuums, hydro coolers, etc.) and for monitoring pH and water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty and ideally when switching product types. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature parameters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine	5
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5

§ 112.44 What specific microbial quality criteria apply to agricultural water used for certain intended uses?					
(a) When you use agricultural water for any one or more of these following purposes, you must ensure there is no detectable generic Escherichia coli (E. coli) in 100 milliliters (mL) of agricultural water, and you must not use untreated surface water for any of these purposes: (2) Applied in any manner that directly contacts covered produce during or after harvest activities (for example, water that is applied to covered produce for washing or cooling activities, and water that is applied to harvested crops to prevent dehydration before cooling), including when used to make ice that directly contacts covered produce during or after harvest activities;" (3) Used to contact food contact surfaces, or to make ice that will contact food contact surfaces; and" (4) Used for washing hands during and after harvest activities.	§112.44(a) §112.44(a)(2) §112.44(a)(3) §112.44(a)(4)	5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
(a) When you use agricultural water for any one or more of these following purposes, you must ensure there is no detectable generic Escherichia coli (E. coli) in 100 milliliters (mL) of agricultural water, and you must not use untreated surface water for any of these purposes: (b) When you use agricultural water during growing activities for covered produce (other than sprouts) using a direct water application method, the following criteria apply (unless you establish and use alternative criteria in accordance with § 112.49): (1) A geometric mean (GM) of your agricultural water samples of 126 or less colony forming units (CFU) of generic E. coli per 100 mL of water (GM is a measure of the central tendency of your water quality distribution); and (2) A statistical threshold value (STV) of your agricultural water samples of 410 or less CFU of generic E. coli per 100 mL of water (STV is a measure of variability of your water quality distribution, derived as a model-based calculation approximating the 90th percentile using the lognormal distribution).	§112.44(a) §112.44(b) §112.44(b)(1) §112.44(b)(2)	2.09.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		4.05.06b	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms and Generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella < detection limits or Negative-zero tolerance).	4
§ 112.45 What measures must I take if my agricultural water does not meet the requirements of § 112.41 or § 112.44?					

(a) If you have determined or have reason to believe that your agricultural water is not safe or of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use as required under § 112.41 and/or if your agricultural water does not meet the microbial quality criterion for the specified purposes as required under § 112.44(a), you must immediately discontinue that use(s), and before you may use the water source and/or distribution system again for the intended use(s), you must either: (1) Re-inspect the entire affected agricultural water system to the extent it is under your control, identify any conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces, make necessary changes, and take adequate measures to determine if your changes were effective and, as applicable, adequately ensure that your agricultural water meets the microbial quality criterion in § 112.44(a); or (2) Treat the water in accordance with the requirements of § 112.43."	§112.45(a) §112.45(a)(1) §112.45(a)(2)	5.16.08	Are there records of corrective actions taken after unsuitable testing results that describe the steps taken, responsibility for taking those steps, and actions taken to ensure that the cause of contamination has been identified and corrected?	There should be documented evidence that corrective actions have been taken when required and were adequate for the specific situation, including the disposition of any impacted product (if applicable).	5
(a) If you have determined or have reason to believe that your agricultural water is not safe or of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use as required under § 112.41 and/or if your agricultural water does not meet the microbial quality criterion for the specified purposes as required under § 112.44(a), you must immediately discontinue that use(s), and before you may use the water source and/or distribution system again for the intended use(s), you must either: (1) Re-inspect the entire affected agricultural water system to the extent it is under your control, identify any conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces, make necessary changes, and take adequate measures to determine if your changes were effective and, as applicable, adequately ensure that your agricultural water meets the microbial quality criterion in § 112.44(a); or	§112.45(a) §112.45(a)(1)	2.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventive measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventive measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead, flood or furrow irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	2
(a) If you have determined or have reason to believe that your agricultural water is not safe or of adequate sanitary quality for its intended use as required under § 112.41 and/or if your agricultural water does not meet the microbial quality criterion for the specified purposes as required under § 112.44(a), you must immediately discontinue that use(s), and before you may use the water source and/or distribution system again for the intended use(s), you must either: (2) Treat the water in accordance with the requirements of § 112.43."	§112.45(a) §112.45(a)(2)	2.09.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2

(b) If you have determined that your agricultural water does not meet the microbial quality criteria (or any alternative microbial quality criteria, if applicable) required under § 112.44(b), as soon as practicable and no later than the following year, you must discontinue that use, unless you either: (1) Apply a time interval(s) (in days) and/or a (calculated) log reduction by: (i) Applying a time interval between last irrigation and harvest using either: (A) A microbial die-off rate of 0.5 log per day to achieve a (calculated) log reduction of your geometric mean (GM) and statistical threshold value (STV) to meet the microbial quality criteria in § 112.44(b) (or any alternative microbial criteria, if applicable), but no greater than a maximum time interval of 4 consecutive days; or" (B) An alternative microbial die-off rate and any accompanying maximum time interval, in accordance with § 112.49; and/or" (ii) Applying a time interval between harvest and end of storage using an appropriate microbial die-off rate between harvest and end of storage, and/or applying a (calculated) log reduction using appropriate microbial removal rates during activities such as commercial washing, to meet the microbial quality criteria in § 112.44(b) (or any alternative microbial criteria, if applicable), and any accompanying maximum time interval or log reduction, provided you have adequate supporting scientific data and information; (2) Re-inspect the entire affected agricultural water system to the extent it is under your control, identify any conditions that are reasonably likely to introduce known or reasonably foreseeable hazards into or onto covered produce or food contact surfaces, make necessary changes, and take adequate measures to determine if your changes were effective and adequately ensure that your agricultural water meets the microbial quality criteria in § 112.44(b) (or any alternative microbial criteria, if applicable); or (3) Treat the water in accordance with the requirements of § 112.43.	§ 112.45(b) § 112.45(b)(1) § 112.45(b)(1)(i) § 112.45(b)(1)(i)(A) § 112.45(b)(1)(i)(B) § 112.45(b)(1)(ii) § 112.45(b)(2) § 112.45(b)(3)	2.09.01c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.08	Are there records of corrective actions taken after unsuitable testing results that describe the steps taken, responsibility for taking those steps, and actions taken to ensure that the cause of contamination has been identified and corrected?	There should be documented evidence that corrective actions have been taken when required and were adequate for the specific situation, including the disposition of any impacted product (if applicable).	5
		2.09.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2

2.09.06d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
2.09.02c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
2.09.03c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
2.09.04c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
2.09.05c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
2.09.06c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	2
2.09.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2

4.05.14a	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single-pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems and changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks) and for pH and monitoring water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty or when switching products. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature paramenters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc.	4
4.05.06a	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water results, but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	4
4.04.04b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures, not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water testing results, but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	4
3.10.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3

3.10.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventative measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	3
3.10.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.06	Is tail water (run-off water including hydroponics) used in the operation?	Information gathering question. Tail water return systems, including hydroponics, catch spilled or runoff water and pump the water back to the top of the field/growing area.	3
3.10.01c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.02c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.03c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.04c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.05c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.06c	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Written procedures (SOPs) should exist covering corrective measures not only for the discovery of unsuitable or abnormal water test results but also as a preparation on how to handle such findings.	3
3.10.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3

		3.10.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
§ 112.46 How often must I test agricultural water that is subject to the requirements of § 112.44?					
(a) There is no requirement to test any agricultural water that is subject to the requirements of § 112.44 when: (1) You receive water from a Public Water System, as defined under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)regulations, 40 CFR part 141, that furnishes water that meets the microbial requirements under those regulations or under the regulations of a State (as defined in 40 CFR 141.2) approved to administer the SDWA public water supply program, and you have Public Water System results or certificates of compliance that demonstrate that the water meets that requirement; (2) You receive water from a public water supply that furnishes water that meets the microbial quality requirement described in § 112.44(a), and you have public water system results or certificates of compliance that demonstrate that the water meets that requirement; or (3) You treat water in accordance with the requirements of § 112.43.	§ 112.46(a) § 112.46(a)(1) § 112.46(a)(2) § 112.46(a)(3)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

		2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, you must take the following steps for each source of water used for purposes that are subject to the requirements of § 112.44(b): (1) Conduct an initial survey to develop a microbial water quality profile of the agricultural water source. (i) The initial survey must be conducted: (A) For an untreated surface water source, by taking a minimum total of 20 samples of agricultural water	§ 112.46 (b) § 112.46 (b)(1) § 112.46 (b)(1) (i) § 112.46 (b)(1) (i) (A) § 112.46 (b)(1) (i) (B) § 112.46 (b)(1)(ii) § 112.46 (b)(1)(iii) § 112.46 (b)(2) § 112.46 (b)(2)(i) § 112.46 (b)(2)(i)(A)	2.09.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2

(or an alternative testing frequency that you establish and use, in accordance with § 112.49) over a minimum period of 2 years, but not greater than 4 years.	§ 112.46 (b)(2)(i)(B) § 112.46 (b)(2)(ii) § 112.46 (b)(2)(iii) § 112.46 (b)(2)(iii) (A)
(B) For an untreated ground water source, by taking a minimum total of four samples of agricultural water during the growing season or over a period of 1 year.	§ 112.46 (b)(2)(iii) (B) § 112.46 (b)(2)(iv) § 112.46 (b)(3) § 112.46 (b)(3)(i)
(ii) The samples of agricultural water must be representative of your use of the water and must be collected as close in time as practicable to, but prior to, harvest. The microbial water quality profile initially consists of the geometric mean (GM) and the statistical threshold value (STV) of generic Escherichia coli (E. coli) (colony forming units (CFU) per 100 milliliter (mL)) calculated using this data set. You must determine the appropriate way(s) in which the water may be used based on your microbial water quality profile in accordance with § 112.45(b).	§ 112.46 (b)(3)(i) (A) § 112.46 (b)(3)(i) (B) § 112.46 (b)(3)(ii)
(iii) You must update the microbial water quality profile annually as required under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, and otherwise required under paragraph (b)(3) of this section.	
(2) Conduct an annual survey to update the microbial water quality profile of your agricultural water.	
(i) After the initial survey described in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, you must test the water annually to update your existing microbial water quality profile to confirm that the way(s) in which the water is used continues to be appropriate. You must analyze:	
(A) For an untreated surface water source, a minimum number of five samples per year (or an alternative testing frequency that you establish and use, in accordance with § 112.49).	
(B) For an untreated ground water source, a minimum of one sample per year.	
(ii) The samples of agricultural water must be representative of your use of the water and must be collected as close in time as practicable to, but prior to, harvest.	
(iii) To update the microbial water quality profile, you must calculate revised GM and STV values using your current annual survey data, combined with your most recent initial or annual survey data from within the previous 4 years, to make up a rolling data set of:	
(A) At least 20 samples for untreated surface water sources; and	
(B) At least 4 samples for untreated ground water sources.	
(iv) You must modify your water use, as appropriate, based on the revised GM and STV values in your updated microbial water quality profile in accordance with § 112.45(b).	
(3) If you have determined or have reason to believe that your microbial water quality profile no longer represents the quality of your water (for example, if there are significant changes in adjacent land use that are reasonably likely to adversely affect the quality of your water source), you must develop a	

2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

quality of your water source), you must develop a new microbial water quality profile reflective of the time period at which you believe your microbial water quality profile changed.
(i) To develop a new microbial water quality profile, you must calculate new GM and STV values using your current annual survey data (if taken after the time of the change), combined with new data, to make up a data set of:
(A) At least 20 samples for untreated surface water sources; and
(B) At least 4 samples for untreated ground water sources.
(ii) You must modify your water use based on the new GM and STV values in your new microbial water quality profile in accordance with § 112.45(b).

2.09.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
2.09.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
2.09.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
2.09.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
2.09.06d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2

3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
3.10.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3

		3.10.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
(c) If you use untreated ground water for the purposes that are subject to the requirements of § 112.44(a), you must initially test the microbial quality of each source of the untreated ground water at least four times during the growing season or over a period of 1 year, using a minimum total of four samples collected to be representative of the intended use(s). Based on these results, you must determine whether the water can be used for that purpose, in accordance with § 112.45(a). If your four initial sample results meet the microbial quality criteria of § 112.44(a), you may test once annually thereafter, using a minimum of one sample collected to be representative of the intended use(s). You must resume testing at least four times per growing season or year if any annual test fails to meet the microbial quality criteria in § 112.44(a).	§ 112.46 (c)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

		2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4

		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4

		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
§ 112.47 Who must perform the tests required under § 112.46 and what methods must be used?					
(a) You may meet the requirements related to agricultural water testing required under § 112.46 using: (1) Test results from your agricultural water source(s) performed by you, or by a person or entity acting on your behalf; or (2) Data collected by a third party or parties, provided the water source(s) sampled by the third party or parties adequately represent your agricultural water source(s) and all other applicable requirements of this part are met." (b) Agricultural water samples must be aseptically collected and tested using a method as set forth in § 112.151.	§ 112.47(a)(1) § 112.47(a)(2) § 112.47(b)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1
		2.09.01b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2
		2.09.02b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2
		2.09.03b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2
		2.09.04b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2
		2.09.05b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2

		2.09.06b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the field, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	2
		3.10.01b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
		3.10.02b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
		3.10.03b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
		3.10.04b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
		3.10.05b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
		3.10.06b	Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	There should be documented procedures in place detailing how water samples are taken in the growing area, including stating how samples should be identified i.e. clearly naming the location that the sample was taken, the water source and the date (this is important in order to be able to calculate geometric means). Samples should be taken at a point as close to the point of use as possible where water contacts the crop, so as to test both the water source and the water distribution system.	3
§ 112.48 What measures must I take for water that I use during harvest, packing, and holding activities for covered produce?					

(a) You must manage the water as necessary, including by establishing and following water-change schedules for recirculated water, to maintain its safety and adequate sanitary quality and minimize the potential for contamination of covered produce and food contact surfaces with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards (for example, hazards that may be introduced into the water from soil adhering to the covered produce).	§ 112.48(a)	5.11.03	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems, changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks, flumes, hydro vacuums, hydro coolers, etc.) and for monitoring pH and water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty and ideally when switching product types. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature parameters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc. See 5.13.03, 5.13.04 and 5.13.05 for record keeping expectations.	5
		4.05.14a	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single-pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems and changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks) and for pH and monitoring water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty or when switching products. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature paramenters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc.	4
(b) You must visually monitor the quality of water that you use during harvest, packing, and holding activities for covered produce (for example, water used for washing covered produce in dump tanks, flumes, or wash tanks, and water used for cooling covered produce in hydrocoolers) for buildup of organic material (such as soil and plant debris).	§ 112.48(b)	5.13.05	Are there records of monitoring for build-up of organic material (turbidity) and changing of recirculated and batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks, flumes, hydro vacuums, hydro coolers, etc.)?	There should be records of visual monitoring and/or testing and changing of recirculated and batch water systems. Frequency is at least daily, when it is dirty and ideally when changing products. Water may be used for longer if a validated regeneration system (e.g., a water pasteurization/filtration system) is being used.	5
		4.05.14c	Are there records of monitoring for build-up of organic material (turbidity) and changing of recirculated and batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks, flumes, hydro vacuums, hydro coolers, etc.)?	There should be records of visual monitoring, testing and changing of recirculated and batch water systems and water temperature checks (where relevant) during use. Water should be changed at least daily and when it is dirty and when switching products. Frequency of water changing is at least daily.	4
(c) You must maintain and monitor the temperature of water at a temperature that is appropriate for the commodity and operation (considering the time and depth of submersion) and is adequate to minimize the potential for infiltration of microorganisms of public health significance into covered produce.	§ 112.48(c)	5.11.03	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems, changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks, flumes, hydro vacuums, hydro coolers, etc.) and for monitoring pH and water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty and ideally when switching product types. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature parameters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc. See 5.13.03, 5.13.04 and 5.13.05 for record keeping expectations.	5

		4.05.14a	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single-pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems and changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks) and for pH and monitoring water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty or when switching products. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature paramenters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc.	4
§ 112.49 What alternatives may I establish and use in lieu of the requirements of this subpart?					
Provided you satisfy the requirements of § 112.12, you may establish and use one or more of the following alternatives: (a) An alternative microbial quality criterion (or criteria) using an appropriate indicator of fecal contamination, in lieu of the microbial quality criteria in § 112.44(b); (b) An alternative microbial die-off rate and an accompanying maximum time interval, in lieu of the microbial die-off rate and maximum time interval in § 112.45(b)(1)(i); (c) An alternative minimum number of samples used in the initial survey for an untreated surface water source, in lieu of the minimum number of samples required under §112.46(b)(1)(i)(A); and (d) An alternative minimum number of samples used in the annual survey for an untreated surface water source, in lieu of the minimum number of samples required under §112.46(b)(2)(i)(A).	§ 112.49(a) § 112.49(b) § 112.49(c) § 112.49(d)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
§ 112.50 Under this subpart, what requirements apply regarding records?					
(a) You must establish and keep records required under this subpart in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part. (b) You must establish and keep the following records: (1) The findings of the inspection of your agricultural water system in accordance with the requirements of § 112.42(a);	§ 112.50(a) § 112.50(b) § 112.50(b)(1)	2.09.01f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.02f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.03f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.04f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.05f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2
		2.09.06f	Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences, (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	2

		3.10.01f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.02f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.03f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.04f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.05f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		3.10.06f	Are there records for periodic visual inspection of the water source with corrective actions (where necessary)?	"Records" may include calendar books with commentary regarding what was checked, the condition, unusual occurrences (e.g. issues regarding well cap, well casing, seals, piping tanks, treatment equipment, cross connections, trash, animal presence, pooled water, etc.), and any action taken.	3
		5.10.03	Has a documented risk assessment been performed to ensure that any food safety hazards relevant to facility location and adjacent land use are identified and controlled?	A documented risk assessment should be performed for the facility to identify and control any food safety hazards relevant to the facility location and adjacent land use (e.g., animal activity, industrial activity, waste, sewage and septic systems, water treatment sites (settling ponds, land applications, etc.) or any other potential sources of contamination). All national and local laws pertaining to land use and on-site water treatment systems should be followed. Where necessary, for waste water treatment areas, there should be applicable permits on file and evidence of regulatory and/or third party inspections. The risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually and when a significant facility location/adjacent land change occurs including flooding and earthquake events that may impact sewage or septic systems.	5
(a) You must establish and keep records required under this subpart in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part. (b) You must establish and keep the following records: (2) Documentation of the results of all analytical tests conducted on agricultural water for purposes of compliance with this subpart;	§ 112.50(a) § 112.50(b) § 112.50(b)(2)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
(3) Scientific data or information you rely on to support the adequacy of a method used to satisfy the requirements of § 112.43(a)(1) and (2);	§ 112.50(b)(3)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1
(4) Documentation of the results of water treatment monitoring under § 112.43(b);	§ 112.50(b)(4)	2.09.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatment (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results, and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2

2.09.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
2.09.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
3.10.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
3.10.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3

		3.10.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well "shocking" should be recorded.	3
		4.05.14a	Are there specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the monitoring of anti-microbial parameters in single-pass and/or recirculated/batch water systems and changing of recirculated/batch water systems (e.g., dump tanks) and for pH and monitoring water temperature (if applicable)?	Product contact water systems should have SOPs that that describe how they are managed, including the water change frequency (recirculated/batch water systems), anti-microbial(s) used, pH monitoring (if required), their concentration(s). monitoring method(s) and frequency and corrective action procedures. The anti-microbial monitoring frequency should be sufficient to demonstrate the required concentration is maintained throughout the time the system is operated. Methods and monitoring procedures for measuring build-up of organic material (soil and plant debris) in recirculated and batch water systems should be described. Water should be changed when it is dirty or when switching products. If product(s) immersed in water are known to be susceptible to infiltration, the SOP should include water and product temperature paramenters and monitoring frequency. There should be sufficient validation to support the anti-microbial concentration used, the water changing frequency (if less than daily) and water testing frequency. Measuring total chlorine is not acceptable for recycled/batch water systems. For chlorine systems, the concentration should be ≥10ppm free chlorine. Lower concentrations should be properly justified with supporting documents, rationale and evidence. Other anti-microbials include peracetic acid, chlorine dioxide, etc.	4
		5.13.04	Are there records (with corrective actions) that show anti-microbial (e.g., free chlorine, peroxyacetic acid) strength testing of product contact water and ice solutions prior to start up and throughout the production runs?	Product contact water and ice production systems using anti-microbial agents should have records showing that the strength of the solution is within stated parameters. Recirculated/batch water systems should be checked by measuring the "free anti-microbial" as opposed to bound microbial (i.e., testing for free chlorine as opposed total chlorine); pH should be measured when using hypochlorite (5.13.03). Where out of specification results are recorded, there should be corrective action records, including root cause analysis and preventive actions (where relevant).	5
		4.05.14b	Are there records (with corrective actions) that show anti-microbial (e.g. free chlorine, peroxyacetic acid) strength testing of wash water prior to start up and throughout the run?	Water systems using anti-microbial agents should have records showing that the strength of the solution is within stated parameters. For "single pass" systems, this should be every batch of anti-microbial solution that is mixed. Recirculated/batch water systems should be checked hourly by measuring the "free anti-microbial" as opposed to bound microbial (e.g., testing for free chlorine as opposed total chlorine). Re-circulated/ batch water systems using chlorine should have records showing the pH is controlled. Where out of specification results are recorded, there should be corrective action records, including root cause analysis and preventive actions (where relevant).	4
(5) Scientific data or information you rely on to support the microbial die-off or removal rate(s) that you used to determine the time interval (in days) between harvest and end of storage, including other activities such as commercial washing, as applicable, used to achieve the calculated log reduction of generic Escherichia coli (E. coli), in accordance with § 112.45(b)(1)(ii);	§ 112.50(b)(5)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

		2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
(6) Documentation of actions you take in accordance with § 112.45. With respect to any time interval or (calculated) log reduction applied in accordance with § 112.45(b)(1)(i) and/or (ii), such documentation must include the specific time interval or log reduction applied, how the time interval or log reduction was determined, and the dates of corresponding activities such as the dates of last irrigation and harvest, the dates of harvest and end of storage, and/or the dates of activities such as commercial washing);	§ 112.50(b)(6)	2.09.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5

		5.16.08	Are there records of corrective actions taken after unsuitable testing results that describe the steps taken, responsibility for taking those steps, and actions taken to ensure that the cause of contamination has been identified and corrected?	There should be documented evidence that corrective actions have been taken when required and were adequate for the specific situation, including the disposition of any impacted product (if applicable).	5
		2.09.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2

		2.09.06d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	2
		2.09.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2

		2.09.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		2.09.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	2
		3.10.01d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		3.10.02d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		3.10.03d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3

		3.10.04d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		3.10.05d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		3.10.06d	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For generic E. coli (unless more stringent guidelines/laws in existence) <126MPN (or CFU)/100mL (rolling geometric mean n=5) and <235MPN (or CFU)/100mL for any single sample. Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions that prevent or mitigate product contamination, including investigations, water retests, and if required, crop testing (E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella - zero tolerance). Failure to take corrective actions, prevent or mitigate product contamination when there is evidence of high levels or an upward trend of E. coli may result in an automatic failure of the audit. For farms or indoor agriculture operations following the FDA's Produce Safety Rule, the operation needs to ensure they are meeting the requirements for samples to calculate the Geometric Mean (GM) and Statistical Threshold (STV).	3
		3.10.01e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.02e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3

		3.10.03e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.04e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.05e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.10.06e	Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Where any water treatment is performed at the source (e.g., well, canal, holding tank) this should be monitored. The strength of anti-microbial chemicals should be checked using an appropriate method for the anti-microbial in use (e.g., chemical reaction based test, test probe, or as recommended by the disinfectant supplier). If using an anti-microbial treatment system (e.g. chlorination), there should be monitoring logs completed on at least a daily basis when the system is being used. Any well “shocking” should be recorded.	3
		3.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventative measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	3

		2.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventive measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventive measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead, flood or furrow irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	2
(7) Annual documentation of the results or certificates of compliance from a public water system required under § 112.46(a)(1) or (2), if applicable;	§ 112.50(b)(7)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

		2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5

(8) Scientific data or information you rely on to support any alternative that you establish and use in accordance with § 112.49; and	§ 112.50(b)(8)	2.09.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		2.09.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2

2.09.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
3.10.01a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.02a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.03a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
3.10.04a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3

		3.10.05a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		3.10.06a	Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical. At least one sample per distribution system is required. If there are multiple sampling points in a distribution system, then samples are taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). For farm and indoor agriculture operations, one sample per water source is collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples are taken at least monthly during use of the water source. A less frequent testing is acceptable if supported by a valid documented risk assessment although there should be at least one water test per season. Where there are more stringent federal, national or local requirements, these requirements should be followed. A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		4.04.04	Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli testing should occur on a routine basis. All water sources used for hand washing throughout the harvesting season should be tested. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly, ideally monthly. Water samples should be taken from as close to the point of use as is practical e.g. hand wash spigot/faucet. If there are multiple hand wash units, then samples should be taken from a different location each test (randomize or rotate locations). If there are multiple sources for hand wash water, testing should also account for each source used.	4
		4.05.06	Are there records of microbial testing for water used for postharvest product contact (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading packing tables and harvest tools) showing that there is no detectable total coliforms and generic E. coli in the water?	All water sources that are used for postharvest contact with the edible portion of a crop (e.g., washing, re-hydrating) and product contact surfaces (e.g., cleaning grading or packing tables and harvest tools) should be tested on a routine basis. One sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use and then at least quarterly thereafter, or at a frequency relative to the associated risks. For commodities under the Leafy Greens Marketing Agreement, one sample per water source should be collected and tested prior to use if >60 days since the last test of the water source. Additional samples shall be collected at intervals of no less than 18 hrs. and at least monthly during use. Results of water testing for total coliforms and E. coli should meet the US EPA drinking water microbiological specification. For total coliforms and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). If out of specification results are detected, then full details of corrective actions should be noted, including investigations and water retests.	4
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		5.16.05	Are there records of microbiological tests on ice used in the facility (either produced in-house or purchased) and does testing meet the program requirements?	Testing ice helps check both the water microbial potability and ice equipment hygiene. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
(9) Any analytical methods you use in lieu of the method that is incorporated by reference in § 112.151(a).	§ 112.50(b)(9)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1
Subpart F—Biological Soil Amendments of Animal Origin and Human Waste					

§ 112.51 What requirements apply for determining the status of a biological soil amendment of animal origin?					
(a) A biological soil amendment of animal origin is treated if it has been processed to completion to adequately reduce microorganisms of public health significance in accordance with the requirements of § 112.54, or, in the case of an agricultural tea, the biological materials of animal origin used to make the tea have been so processed, the water used to make the tea is not untreated surface water, and the water used to make the tea has no detectable generic Escherichia coli (E. coli) in 100 milliliters (mL) of water.	§ 112.51(a)	2.08.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, "bio fertilizers") and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	2
		3.09.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, "bio fertilizers") and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	3
(b) A biological soil amendment of animal origin is untreated if it: (1) Has not been processed to completion in accordance with the requirements of § 112.54, or in the case of an agricultural tea, the biological materials of animal origin used to make the tea have not been so processed, or the water used to make the tea is untreated surface water, or the water used to make the tea has detectable generic E. coli in 100 mL of water; (2) Has become contaminated after treatment; (3) Has been recombined with an untreated biological soil amendment of animal origin; (4) Is or contains a component that is untreated waste that you know or have reason to believe is contaminated with a hazard or has been associated with foodborne illness; or (5) Is an agricultural tea made with biological materials of animal origin that contains an agricultural tea additive.	§ 112.51(b) § 112.51(b)(1) § 112.51(b)(2) § 112.51(b)(3) § 112.51(b)(4) § 112.51(b)(5)	2.08.03	Is untreated animal manure used as an input (e.g., raw manure &/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure, green waste, non-thermally treated animal manure)? Information gathering question.	Untreated animal manure refers to manure that is raw and has not gone through a treatment process. Examples include raw manure and/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure and/or green waste or non-thermally treated animal manure. Untreated animal manure should not be used in indoor growing operations or where prohibited under best management practices. Information gathering question.	2

		3.09.03	Is untreated animal manure used as an input (e.g., raw manure &/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure, green waste, non-thermally treated animal manure)? Information gathering question.	Untreated animal manure refers to manure that is raw and has not gone through a treatment process. Examples include raw manure and/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure and/or green waste or non-thermally treated animal manure. Untreated animal manure should not be used in indoor growing operations or where prohibited under best management practices. Information gathering question.	3
§ 112.52 How must I handle, convey, and store biological soil amendments of animal origin?					
(a) You must handle, convey and store any biological soil amendment of animal origin in a manner and location such that it does not become a potential source of contamination to covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, water sources, water distribution systems, and other soil amendments. Agricultural teas that are biological soil amendments of animal origin may be used in water distribution systems provided that all other requirements of this rule are met. (b) You must handle, convey and store any treated biological soil amendment of animal origin in a manner and location that minimizes the risk of it becoming contaminated by an untreated or in-process biological soil amendment of animal origin. (c) You must handle, convey, and store any biological soil amendment of animal origin that you know or have reason to believe may have become contaminated as if it was untreated.	§ 112.52(a) § 112.52(b) § 112.52(c)	2.02.08	Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Soil, substrates and fertilizer (e.g., compost, compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc.) are stored in a manner to prevent contamination to the growing areas, product, or water sources. Containers should be structurally sound and not a source of runoff or contamination. There should be appropriate and effective barriers, coverings, soil berms, pits or lagoons to divert or collect potential run-off or threats from wind, as applicable. A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.02.10	Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Soil, substrates and fertilizer (e.g., compost, compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc.) are stored in a manner to prevent contamination to the growing areas, product, or water sources. Containers should be structurally sound and not a source of runoff or contamination. There should be appropriate and effective barriers, coverings, soil berms, pits or lagoons to divert or collect potential run-off or threats from wind, as applicable. A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		3.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculating water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	3

		2.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculationg water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	2
		2.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventive measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventive measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead, flood or furrow irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	2
		3.02.03a	If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	For any risks identified in the assessment, the operation should detail what practice is being done to minimize identified risk/hazard, how to measure/monitor the effectiveness of the practice, how often to measure, and how it is verified and recorded. There should be documented evidence/validation that corrective actions and/or preventative measures have been taken when any risk was identified and were adequate for the specific situation. If overhead irrigation is used, there needs to be examples of how the operation is minimizing the risk.	3
		2.04.03a	Where present, have physical measures been taken to secure untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land?	Mitigating measures should include a buffer area of approximately 400 ft. (122 m) from the edge of the crop which may increase or decrease depending on the risk variables e.g. topography (uphill from the crop or downhill from the crop). Other measures may include tarping systems, physical barriers, fences, ditches, etc. Implementing systems to redirect run off that may contain untreated manure, compost, or biosolids.	2
§ 112.53 What prohibitions apply regarding use of human waste?					
You may not use human waste for growing covered produce, except sewage sludge biosolids used in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR part 503, subpart D, or equivalent regulatory requirements.	§ 112.53	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3

		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
§ 112.54 What treatment processes are acceptable for a biological soil amendment of animal origin that I apply in the growing of covered produce?					
(a) A scientifically valid controlled physical process (e.g., thermal), chemical process (e.g., high alkaline pH), biological process (e.g., composting), or a combination of scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical and/or biological processes that has been validated to satisfy the microbial standard in § 112.55 (a) Listeria monocytogenes (L. monocytogenes), Salmonella species, and E. coli O157:H7; or (b) A scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical, or biological process, or a combination of scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical, and/or biological processes, that has been validated to satisfy the microbial standard in § 112.55(b) for Salmonella species and fecal coliforms. Examples of scientifically valid controlled biological (e.g., composting) processes that meet the microbial standard in § 112.55(b) include: (1) Static composting that maintains aerobic (i.e., oxygenated) conditions at a minimum of 131 °F (55 °C) for 3 consecutive days and is followed by adequate curing; and (2) Turned composting that maintains aerobic conditions at a minimum of 131 °F (55 °C) for 15 days (which do not have to be consecutive), with a minimum of five turnings, and is followed by adequate curing.	§ 112.54(a) § 112.54(b) § 112.54(b)(1) § 112.54(b)(2)	2.08.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, “bio fertilizers”) and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	2

		3.09.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, "bio fertilizers") and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	3
§ 112.55 What microbial standards apply to the treatment processes in § 112.54?					
The following microbial standards apply to the treatment processes in § 112.54 as set forth in that section. (a) For L. monocytogenes, Salmonella species, and E. coli O157:H7, the relevant standards in the table in this paragraph (a); or For the microorganism- - The microbial standard is: (1) L. monocytogenes - Not detected using a method that can detect one colony forming unit (CFU) per 5 gram (or milliliter, if liquid is being sampled) analytical portion." (2) Salmonella species -Not detected using a method that can detect three most probable numbers (MPN) per 4 grams (or milliliter, if liquid is being sampled) of total solids." (3) E. coli O157:H7 -Not detected using a method that can detect 0.3 MPN per 1 gram (or milliliter, if liquid is being sampled) analytical portion. (b) Salmonella species are not detected using a method that can detect three MPN Salmonella species per 4 grams of total solids (dry weight basis); and less than 1,000 MPN fecal coliforms per gram of total solids (dry weight basis).	§ 112.55(a) § 112.55(a)(1) § 112.55(a)(2) § 112.55(a)(3) § 112.55(b)	2.08.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, "bio fertilizers") and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	2
		3.09.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, "bio fertilizers") and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	3
§ 112.56 What application requirements and minimum application intervals apply to biological soil amendments of animal origin?					

(a) You must apply the biological soil amendments of animal origin specified in the first column of the table in this paragraph (a) in accordance with the application requirements specified in the second column of the table in this paragraph (a) and the minimum application intervals specified in the third column of the table in this paragraph (a).	§ 112.56(a)				
If the biological soil amendment of animal origin is — Then the biological soil amendment of animal origin must be applied — And then the minimum application interval is — (1) (i) Untreated - In a manner that does not contact covered produce during application and minimizes the potential for contact with covered produce after application - [Reserved]. (ii) Untreated - In a manner that does not contact covered produce during or after application - 0 days (2) Treated by a scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical, or biological process, or combination of scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical, and/or biological processes, in accordance with the requirements of § 112.54(b) to meet the microbial standard in § 112.55(b). - In a manner that minimizes the potential for contact with covered produce during and after application. - 0 days (3) Treated by a scientifically valid controlled physical, chemical, or biological process, or combination of scientifically valid controlled standard in § 112.55(a). - In any manner (i.e., no restrictions) - 0 days.	§ 112.56(a)(1)(ii) § 112.56(a)(2) § 112.56(a)(3)	2.08.02b	Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Records should be legible and at least detail date of application, type of fertilizer, amount, method of application (drip, bulk, etc.), where it was applied and operator name. There should be sufficient identification information in the records that would make it possible to trace an application back to the site if needed. There should be an interval between application and harvest of at least 45 days for non-synthetic crop treatments and compost, and an interval of at least 120 days (but ideally 9 months) for untreated animal manure. The applications should be incorporated into the soil prior to planting or bud burst for tree crops.	2
		3.09.02b	Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Records should be legible and at least detail date of application, type of fertilizer, amount, method of application (drip, bulk, etc.), where it was applied and operator name. There should be sufficient identification information in the records that would make it possible to trace an application back to the site if needed. There should be an interval between application and harvest of at least 45 days for non-synthetic crop treatments and compost, and an interval of at least 120 days (but ideally 9 months) for untreated animal manure.	3

§ 112.60 Under this subpart, what requirements apply regarding records?					
(a) You must establish and keep records required under this subpart in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part.	§ 112.60(a)				
(b) For any biological soil amendment of animal origin you use, you must establish and keep the following records:	§ 112.60(b)	2.08.02	Is compost produced from animal derived materials used as an input? Information gathering question.	This question is specifically targeting compost produced from raw animal manures, as opposed to green waste. Information gathering question.	2
		2.08.03	Is untreated animal manure used as an input (e.g., raw manure &/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure, green waste, non-thermally treated animal manure)? Information gathering question.	Untreated animal manure refers to manure that is raw and has not gone through a treatment process. Examples include raw manure and/or uncomposted, incompletely composted animal manure and/or green waste or non-thermally treated animal manure. Untreated animal manure should not be used in indoor growing operations or where prohibited under best management practices. Information gathering question.	2
(2) For a treated biological soil amendment of animal origin you produce for your own covered farm(s), documentation that process controls (for example, time, temperature, and turnings) were achieved.	§ 112.60(b)(2)	2.08.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, “bio fertilizers”) and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	2
		3.09.02b	Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Records should be legible and at least detail date of application, type of fertilizer, amount, method of application (drip, bulk, etc.), where it was applied and operator name. There should be sufficient identification information in the records that would make it possible to trace an application back to the site if needed. There should be an interval between application and harvest of at least 45 days for non-synthetic crop treatments and compost, and an interval of at least 120 days (but ideally 9 months) for untreated animal manure.	3
(1) For a treated biological soil amendment of animal origin you receive from a third party, documentation (such as a Certificate of Conformance) at least annually that: (i) The process used to treat the biological soil amendment of animal origin is a scientifically valid process that has been carried out with appropriate process monitoring; and (ii) The biological soil amendment of animal origin has been handled, conveyed and stored in a manner and location to minimize the risk of contamination by an untreated or in process biological soil amendment of animal origin; and	§ 112.60(b)(1) § 112.60(b)(1)(i) § 112.60(b)(1)(ii)	2.08.02d	Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA) from the supplier(s) that cover pathogen testing (plus any other legally/best practice required testing) and does the grower have relevant letters of guarantee regarding supplier SOPs and logs?	Certificates of analysis should be available for each lot (containing animal materials) used. As a minimum, microbial testing should include Salmonella spp., Listeria monocytogenes and E. coli O157:H7 for non-synthetic crop treatments (e.g., compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, “bio fertilizers”) and for animal-based compost, using approved sampling and testing methods (e.g., AOAC and an accredited laboratory). Where legally allowed, a reduced sampling rate is possible if the material is produced by the auditee (e.g. mushroom growing operations with in-house compost production) and has been through a physical/chemical/biological process to inactivate human pathogens and the auditee has validation study documentation that shows that the material is safe and proper process control records (e.g., time/temperature records and calibration records, such as, temperature probe) are maintained and available during the audit. Validation studies must be applicable to the situation at hand and care should be taken not to over extrapolate. All local and national legislation should also be followed. The grower should have proof that compost suppliers have cross contamination SOPs and temperature/turning logs.	2
		3.09.02b	Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Records should be legible and at least detail date of application, type of fertilizer, amount, method of application (drip, bulk, etc.), where it was applied and operator name. There should be sufficient identification information in the records that would make it possible to trace an application back to the site if needed. There should be an interval between application and harvest of at least 45 days for non-synthetic crop treatments and compost, and an interval of at least 120 days (but ideally 9 months) for untreated animal manure.	3

		3.02.10	Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Soil, substrates and fertilizer (e.g., compost, compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc.) are stored in a manner to prevent contamination to the growing areas, product, or water sources. Containers should be structurally sound and not a source of runoff or contamination. There should be appropriate and effective barriers, coverings, soil berms, pits or lagoons to divert or collect potential run-off or threats from wind, as applicable. A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		3.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculating water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	3
		2.02.08	Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Soil, substrates and fertilizer (e.g., compost, compost teas, fish emulsions, fish meal, blood meal, bio-fertilizers, etc.) are stored in a manner to prevent contamination to the growing areas, product, or water sources. Containers should be structurally sound and not a source of runoff or contamination. There should be appropriate and effective barriers, coverings, soil berms, pits or lagoons to divert or collect potential run-off or threats from wind, as applicable. A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		2.04.03a	Where present, have physical measures been taken to secure untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land?	Mitigating measures should include a buffer area of approximately 400 ft. (122 m) from the edge of the crop which may increase or decrease depending on the risk variables e.g. topography (uphill from the crop or downhill from the crop). Other measures may include tarping systems, physical barriers, fences, ditches, etc. Implementing systems to redirect run off that may contain untreated manure, compost, or biosolids.	2
Subpart I—Domesticated and Wild Animals					
§ 112.81 How do the requirements of this subpart apply to areas where covered activities take place?					

(a) The requirements of this subpart apply when a covered activity takes place in an outdoor area or a partially enclosed building and when, under the circumstances, there is a reasonable probability that animals will contaminate covered produce. (b) The requirements of this subpart do not apply: (1) When a covered activity takes place in a fully-enclosed building; or (2) To fish used in aquaculture operations.	§ 112.81(a) § 112.81(b) § 112.81(b)(1) § 112.81(b)(2)				
§ 112.83 What requirements apply regarding grazing animals, working animals, and animal intrusion?					
(a) You must take the steps set forth in paragraph (b) of this section if under the circumstances there is a reasonable probability that grazing animals, working animals, or animal intrusion will contaminate covered produce. (b) You must: (1) Assess the relevant areas used for a covered activity for evidence of potential contamination of covered produce as needed during the growing season (based on your covered produce; your practices and conditions; and your observations and experience); and	§ 112.83(b)(1)	2.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculationg water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	2
		2.02.10	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 2.02.11.	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the field equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals).	2
		3.02.12	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 3.02.13	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas. (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals)	3

		3.02.12a	Is the audited area free from any evidence of animal fecal matter? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Fecal matter is a potential contaminant to the product being grown. Produce that has come into direct contact with fecal matter is not to be harvested. A "no harvest zone" of approximately 5ft (1.5 m) radius should be implemented unless or until adequate mitigation measures have been considered. If evidence of fecal matter is found, a food safety risk assessment should be conducted by qualified worker and include appropriate corrective and preventative actions. Consideration of the maturity stage and type of crop involved is required. Any evidence of human fecal matter in the growing area is an automatic failure. Any evidence of human fecal matter in the growing area is an automatic failure (scored in 3.02.13).	3
		4.02.02	Are there records of pre-harvest inspections and do they show that the current block (or coded area) is cleared for harvest? If there are no pre-harvest inspections got to 4.02.03.	A pre-harvest block inspection should have been performed no more than 7 days prior to harvest and if harvesting is occurring, it should show if there are any harvesting restrictions, etc. (e.g. evidence of animal intrusion, changes in weather conditions or weather events, pesticide application events) The harvest crew might not have a copy of the actual inspection, but they should have a document indicating which blocks have been inspected and cleared for harvest. If there are no pre-harvest inspections, go to 4.02.03.	4
(2) If significant evidence of potential contamination is found (such as observation of animals, animal excreta or crop destruction), you must evaluate whether the covered produce can be harvested in accordance with the requirements of § 112.112 and take measures reasonably necessary during growing to assist you later during harvest when you must identify, and not harvest, covered produce that is reasonably likely to be contaminated with a known or reasonably foreseeable hazard.	§ 112.83(b)(2)	2.02.10a	Is the audited area free from any evidence of animal fecal matter? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Fecal matter is a potential contaminant to the product being grown. Produce that has come into direct contact with fecal matter is not to be harvested. A "no harvest zone" of approximately 5ft (1.5 m) radius should be implemented unless or until adequate mitigation measures have been considered. If evidence of fecal matter is found, a food safety risk assessment should be conducted by qualified worker and include appropriate corrective and preventative actions. Consideration of the maturity stage and type of crop involved is required. Any evidence of human fecal matter in the growing area is an automatic failure (scored under 2.02.11).	2
		4.02.02a	Where pre-harvest inspections have discovered issues, have buffer zones been clearly identified, and at the time of the audit, are those buffer zones being respected?	Where pre-harvest inspections have discovered issues (e.g., flooding, animal intrusion issues) buffer zones should be implemented (e.g., 30ft (9.1m) from flooded areas, 5ft (1.5m) from evidence of pest activity). Use larger buffer zones if national and local laws are more stringent.	4
Subpart K—Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding Activities					
§ 112.111 What measures must I take if I grow, harvest, pack or hold both covered and excluded produce?					

If you grow, harvest, pack or hold produce that is not covered in this part (i.e., excluded produce in accordance with § 112.2) and also conduct such activities on covered produce, and the excluded produce is not grown, harvested, packed or held in accordance with this part, you must take measures during these covered activities, as applicable, to: (a) Keep covered produce separate from excluded produce (except when covered produce and excluded produce are placed in the same container for distribution); and (b) Adequately clean and sanitize, as necessary, any food contact surfaces that contact excluded produce before using such food contact surfaces for covered activities on covered produce.	§ 112.111(a) § 112.111(b)				
§ 112.112 What measures must I take immediately prior to and during harvest activities?					
You must take all measures reasonably necessary to identify, and not harvest, covered produce that is reasonably likely to be contaminated with a known or reasonably foreseeable hazard, including steps to identify and not harvest covered produce that is visibly contaminated with animal excreta. At a minimum, identifying and not harvesting covered produce that is reasonably likely to be contaminated with animal excreta or that is visibly contaminated with animal excreta requires a visual assessment of the growing area and all covered produce to be harvested, regardless of the harvest method used.	§ 112.112	4.02.02	Are there records of pre-harvest inspections and do they show that the current block (or coded area) is cleared for harvest? If there are no pre-harvest inspections got to 4.02.03.	A pre-harvest block inspection should have been performed no more than 7 days prior to harvest and if harvesting is occurring, it should show if there are any harvesting restrictions, etc. (e.g. evidence of animal intrusion, changes in weather conditions or weather events, pesticide application events) The harvest crew might not have a copy of the actual inspection, but they should have a document indicating which blocks have been inspected and cleared for harvest. If there are no pre-harvest inspections, go to 4.02.03.	4
		4.02.02a	Where pre-harvest inspections have discovered issues, have buffer zones been clearly identified, and at the time of the audit, are those buffer zones being respected?	Where pre-harvest inspections have discovered issues (e.g., flooding, animal intrusion issues) buffer zones should be implemented (e.g., 30ft (9.1m) from flooded areas, 5ft (1.5m) from evidence of pest activity). Use larger buffer zones if national and local laws are more stringent.	4
		4.05.01a	Is the harvest area free from any evidence of animal fecal matter? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Fecal matter is a potential contaminant to the product being grown. Produce that has come into direct contact with fecal material is not to be harvested. A "no harvest zone" approximately 5ft (1.5 m) radius should be implemented unless or until adequate mitigation measures have been considered. If evidence of fecal matter is found, a food safety assessment should be conducted by qualified workers. Consideration of the maturity stage and type of crop involved is required. Any evidence of human fecal matter in the growing area is an automatic failure (score under 4.05.02).	4
§ 112.113 How must I handle harvested covered produce during covered activities?					
You must handle harvested covered produce during covered activities in a manner that protects against contamination with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards—for example, by avoiding, to the degree practicable, contact of cut surfaces of harvested produce with soil.	§ 112.113	4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
§ 112.114 What requirements apply to dropped covered produce?					
You must not distribute dropped covered produce. Dropped covered produce is covered produce that drops to the ground before harvest. Dropped covered produce does not include root crops that grow underground (such as carrots), crops that grow on the ground (such as cantaloupe), or produce that is intentionally dropped to the ground as part of harvesting (such as almonds).	§ 112.114	4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4

		4.01.02	Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	There should be written food safety policy rules regarding worker and visitor personal hygiene, GAPs and health requirements. The policy should cover the rules related to hygiene and health (e.g., hand washing, eating/drinking, smoking, specific clothing rules, foreign material issues, cuts/wounds, illness rules, etc.), no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals and/or fecal matter in the growing and/or storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. All workers should be issued a list of rules in the relevant languages and confirm by signing they understand and agree to abide.	4
§ 112.115 What measures must I take when packaging covered produce?					
You must package covered produce in a manner that prevents the formation of Clostridium botulinum toxin if such toxin is a known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (such as for mushrooms).	§ 112.115	4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
§ 112.116 What measures must I take when using food- packing (including food packaging) material?					
(a) You must use food-packing material that is adequate for its intended use, which includes being: (1) Cleanable or designed for single use; and (2) Unlikely to support growth or transfer of bacteria. (b) If you reuse food-packing material, you must take adequate steps to ensure that food contact surfaces are clean, such as by cleaning food-packing containers or using a clean liner.	§ 112.116(a) § 112.116(a)(1) § 112.116(a)(2) § 112.116(b)	4.05.08a	Is packing material (e.g., cartons, bags, clamshells, sacks, RPCs) intended for carrying product used for that purpose only?	All containers intended for product should not be used for any other purpose besides product storage.	4
		4.05.11a	Does the design and condition of re-usable containers (e.g., smooth surfaces, smooth weld seams, nontoxic materials, no wood, no fabric) facilitate effective cleaning and maintenance?	All re-useable containers (e.g., totes, bins, buckets, etc.) should be made of easy to clean, smooth seamed materials that do not flake or oxidize. Efforts should be made to eliminate wooden surfaces because of its porous nature.	4
		4.05.11c	Are there written cleaning and sanitation procedures (Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures) for the reusable containers that includes the frequency of cleaning and sanitizing, and the procedures used including chemical use details?	Re-usable containers should be cleaned and sanitized on a regularly scheduled basis, based on written Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs). The program should state the frequency of cleaning and sanitizing, detail what, who, how and when, including chemical details (name, dilution/strength), and cleaning verification procedures.	4
Subpart L—Equipment, Tools, Buildings, and Sanitation					
§ 112.121 What equipment and tools are subject to the requirements of this subpart?					
(a) You must use equipment and tools that are of adequate design, construction, and workmanship to enable them to be adequately cleaned and properly maintained; and	§ 112.123(a)	5.06.03	Does food contact equipment design, placement, and condition (e.g., smooth surfaces, smooth weld seams, non-toxic materials, corrosion-resistant, no wood or other absorbent materials) facilitate effective cleaning and maintenance?	Equipment should be made of appropriate materials that can be easily cleaned and maintained, that are not porous or toxic and can withstand the cleaning process. Equipment should be designed to allow access and easy cleaning (without hollow areas, cleanable design, smooth welds).	5
		4.05.13a	Are food contact machinery surfaces free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust and other unhygienic materials (e.g., tape, string, cardboard, etc.)?	Food contact surfaces on machinery should be free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust, and/or unhygienic materials, as they can pose foreign material and/or microbiological hazards. Food contact surfaces should be made of non-toxic, non-porous materials. Surfaces should be maintained in good condition.	4
		4.05.12a	Does the design and condition of harvest tools (e.g., smooth surfaces, smooth weld seams, nontoxic materials, no wood, no fabric) facilitate effective cleaning and maintenance?	To prevent foreign contamination issues, harvest tools (e.g., knives, coring rings, etc.) should be constructed of easy to clean materials. Tools should be shard free, and smooth seamed so that they do not have the ability to flake or oxidize.	4

(b) Equipment and tools must be: (1) Installed and maintained as to facilitate cleaning of the equipment and of all adjacent spaces; and (2) Stored and maintained to protect covered produce from being contaminated with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards and to prevent the equipment and tools from attracting and harboring pests.	§ 112.123(b)(1) § 112.123(b)(2)	4.05.12c	Is there a tool accountability, storage and control program for knives and similar cutting hand tools used in the harvest area when not in use?	There should be an accountability, storage and control program in place for knives and similar cutting hand tools to identify potential product contamination. Tool accountability should include the inspection of the cutting surfaces for wear and tear, as well as a tool inventory check at the start and end of each shift. Workers should not be taking tools, such as knives, from the work area and should be required to use knife scabbards that can easily be cleaned i.e. non-porous. Leather scabbards should not be used.	4
(b) Equipment and tools must be: (1) Installed and maintained as to facilitate cleaning of the equipment and of all adjacent spaces; and (2) Stored and maintained to protect covered produce from being contaminated with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards and to prevent the equipment and tools from attracting and harboring pests.	§ 112.123(b) § 112.123(b)(1) § 112.123(b)(2)	5.06.03	Does food contact equipment design, placement, and condition (e.g., smooth surfaces, smooth weld seams, non-toxic materials, corrosion-resistant, no wood or other absorbent materials) facilitate effective cleaning and maintenance?	Equipment should be made of appropriate materials that can be easily cleaned and maintained, that are not porous or toxic and can withstand the cleaning process. Equipment should be designed to allow access and easy cleaning (without hollow areas, cleanable design, smooth welds).	5
		5.13.07	Is there a tool accountability program for knives and similar cutting hand tools used in the production area?	There should be an accountability program in place for knives and similar cutting hand tools to identify potential product contamination. Tool accountability to include inspection of the cutting surfaces for wear and tear as well as a tool inventory at the start and end of each shift. Tools should remain on site when not in use.	5
		4.05.13a	Are food contact machinery surfaces free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust and other unhygienic materials (e.g., tape, string, cardboard, etc.)?	Food contact surfaces on machinery should be free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust, and/or unhygienic materials, as they can pose foreign material and/or microbiological hazards. Food contact surfaces should be made of non-toxic, non-porous materials. Surfaces should be maintained in good condition.	4
(b) Equipment and tools must be (2) Stored and maintained to protect covered produce from being contaminated with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards and to prevent the equipment and tools from attracting and harboring pests.	§ 112.123(b) § 112.123(b)(2)	5.09.15	Are control measures being implemented for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires, etc. (i.e. out of the mud, pipe ends capped, stacked to prevent pest harborage, away from the building perimeter)?	Incorrectly stored pallets and equipment can provide areas for pest harborage and/or cross contamination. Equipment should be stored at least 4" (10 cm) off the ground and at least 24" (61 cm) away from the building perimeter. Workers should check the stored equipment periodically to ensure that it has not become a pest harborage area or dirty due to rains. Inventory checks should occur in order to ensure that these storage areas do not become full of unnecessary items. Outside storage areas should be within the scope of the pest control program	5
(c) Seams on food contact surfaces of equipment and tools that you use must be either smoothly bonded, or maintained to minimize accumulation of dirt, filth, food particles, and organic material and thus minimize the opportunity for harborage or growth of microorganisms.	§ 112.123(c)	5.06.01	Are food contact equipment surfaces free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust and other unhygienic materials (e.g., tape, string, cardboard, etc.)?	Food contact surfaces on equipment should not have flaking paint, corrosion, rust and/or unhygienic materials, as they can pose foreign material and/or microbiological hazards. Food contact surfaces should be made of non-toxic, non-porous materials. Surfaces should be maintained in good condition.	5
		4.05.13a	Are food contact machinery surfaces free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust and other unhygienic materials (e.g., tape, string, cardboard, etc.)?	Food contact surfaces on machinery should be free of flaking paint, corrosion, rust, and/or unhygienic materials, as they can pose foreign material and/or microbiological hazards. Food contact surfaces should be made of non-toxic, non-porous materials. Surfaces should be maintained in good condition.	4
		4.05.12a	Does the design and condition of harvest tools (e.g., smooth surfaces, smooth weld seams, nontoxic materials, no wood, no fabric) facilitate effective cleaning and maintenance?	To prevent foreign contamination issues, harvest tools (e.g., knives, coring rings, etc.) should be constructed of easy to clean materials. Tools should be shard free, and smooth seamed so that they do not have the ability to flake or oxidize.	4
		5.07.09	Are maintenance tools that are used in the production and storage areas of the facility clean, sanitary and corrosion free?	Tools that are used for repairing equipment in the production and storage areas should be appropriately stored to ensure they do not pose a risk of direct or indirect contamination when in production or and storage areas, clean, free of corrosion and in good working for order i.e. fit for their intended use.	5
(d)(1) You must inspect, maintain, and clean and, when necessary and appropriate, sanitize all food contact surfaces of equipment and tools used in covered activities as frequently as reasonably necessary to protect against contamination of covered produce.	§ 112.123(d)(1) § 112.123(d)(2)	4.05.13j	Are cleaning and sanitation logs on file for harvest machinery that show what was done, when, by who and detail strength testing of anti-microbial solution used to sanitize surfaces?	Sanitation logs should include: date, list of areas/equipment that were cleaned and sanitized, sanitizer strength tests, and the individual accountable who signed-off for each task completed.	4
		4.05.13d	Are non-food contact machinery surfaces clean?	Unsanitary non-food contact surfaces can indirectly lead to contamination of the product. Food debris, bio films, excessive dust, etc., should be cleaned off equipment.	4

(2) You must maintain and clean all non-food-contact surfaces of equipment and tools subject to this subpart used during harvesting, packing, and holding as frequently as reasonably necessary to protect against contamination of covered produce.		5.13.08	Is there a pre-operation inspection log?	Pre-operation inspections should identify potential problems with the facility, workers or equipment that should be corrected prior to starting production. These inspections and corrective actions should be recorded, and where an operation has multiple shifts, there should be pre-operational inspections for each shift.	5
		4.02.03	Is there a pre-operation inspection log?	Pre-operation inspections should identify potential problems with the harvesting operation, including equipment hygiene, tool hygiene, and worker hygiene. These inspections and corrective actions should be recorded.	4
(e) If you use equipment such as pallets, forklifts, tractors, and vehicles such that they are intended to, or likely to, contact covered produce, you must do so in a manner that minimizes the potential for contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards.	§ 112.123(e)	5.08.13	Are internal transport vehicles (e.g., forklifts, bobcats, pallet jacks, carts, floor cleaners, etc.), clean, do not emit toxic fumes and are being used in a sanitary manner?	Internal transport vehicles (e.g., forklifts, bobcats, pallet jacks, carts, floor cleaners, etc.) should be part of the sanitation program, maintained clean and not allowed to be a vector of cross contamination. Vehicles used in food areas should not be gasoline or diesel powered. Propane (LPG) powered vehicles are acceptable, while electric powered are ideal.	5
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed	5
		5.09.16	Are pallets inspected to separate and replace dirty or broken pallets, and broken or dirty pallets are not in use?	Broken or split pallets can cause a physical hazard. Dirt, mud, food debris, chemical residues and other contaminants on the pallets can cause a microbial contamination.	5
		4.05.13f	Is machinery designed and used properly to minimize product contamination (e.g., drip pans utilized, dedicated tractor pathways)?	Overhead contamination from materials such as hydraulic fluid can result in product and packaging contamination, and therefore, equipment should be fitted with catch pans. Dedicated tractor pathways should also be used to minimize product contamination.	4
		4.07.01	Are the vehicles loading and transporting fresh produce from growing area to facility limited to this function only, maintained in proper condition, and adequate for the purpose?	Vehicles loading and transporting product should be limited to this function only and should be adequate for transporting produce. Vehicles should be part of the sanitation program, in a good state of repair, clean, odor free, free from personal items, and free from chemical and microbiological contamination. If loads are tied down, tarps, belts, ropes, etc., should also be in good working order, without contamination risk to product.	4
§ 112.124 What requirements apply to instruments and controls used to measure, regulate, or record?					
Instruments or controls you use to measure, regulate, or record temperatures, hydrogen-ion concentration (pH), sanitizer efficacy or other conditions, in order to control or prevent the growth of microorganisms of public health significance, must be:	§ 112.124				
(a) Accurate and precise as necessary and appropriate in keeping with their purpose; (b) Adequately maintained; and (c) Adequate in number for their designated uses.	§ 112.124(a) § 112.124(b) § 112.124(c)	1.04.04	Are there documented calibration and/or accuracy verification procedures for measuring and monitoring devices used in the operations that are related to the safety of the product?	Equipment used for measuring and monitoring processes related to food safety should be identified (i.e., catalog, roster, list) and SOPs should be available. Scales/weight or volume measuring devices (e.g. for pesticide measurement) should have verification of accuracy and/or calibration regularly to ensure correct and accurate operation, where relevant to food safety. Calibration procedures should be traceable to a national or international standard or method, should describe the frequency of testing, the testing method and the acceptable range of variation. Corrective actions should be detailed when applicable. Legal requirements, manufacturer recommendations, best practice and experience of equipment drift help to determine the frequency.	1
		1.01.05	Is there documented management verification review of the entire food safety management system at least every 12 months, including an evaluation of resources, and are there records of changes made?	There should be written verification of the entire food safety management system including the HACCP system and FDA FSMA Preventive Controls Systems (if applicable to the operation) at planned intervals (minimum every 12 months) and there should be evidence that senior management is involved in the review (e.g. signatures, meeting minutes) to ensure its continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness and that they are continuing to support and invest in adequate food safety resources (e.g., equipment, services, supplies, personnel training, worker staffing levels, customer requirements/specifications, etc.) and to building and maintaining a proactive and committed food safety culture. The review should determine the need for changes and the changes made should be documented. The documented review should meet any national or local legislative requirements.	1

		1.04.05	Are calibration and/or accuracy verification records maintained and are they consistent with the requirements outlined in the SOP(s) for instruments and measuring devices requiring calibration?	Calibration and/or accuracy verification records should be available for all applicable equipment and should consider at least equipment identification, date, frequency of testing, testing method, result (variation), and corrective actions. Both internal (where the company checks the equipment for themselves) and external (where equipment is sent away, or an outside specialist company comes on site and checks the equipment in situ) calibrations should be documented and on file. Proof of calibration includes records, invoices and on machines labels. Where an external service is used, procedures, licenses and/or certifications are acceptable.	1
§ 112.125 What requirements apply to equipment that is subject to this subpart used in the transport of covered produce?					
Equipment that is subject to this subpart that you use to transport covered produce must be: (a) Adequately clean before use in transporting covered produce; and (b) Adequate for use in transporting covered produce.	§ 112.125(a) § 112.125(b)	5.08.14	Are shipping trucks clean and in good condition?	Unsanitary (e.g., unclean, damaged insulation, etc.) shipping trucks could be a growth niche for bacteria and a foreign material hazard.	5
		5.13.02	Are there inspection logs on incoming trailers (and other forms of transport) for rodents and insects, cleanliness, holes and temperature control of the trailer (for food requiring temperature control for safety and/or as required per buyer specifications)?	Incoming trailer (and other forms of transport, e.g., rail cargo carriages) checks for product and packaging should ensure that the trailer was clean, odor free, pest free and in good repair (e.g., no damaged insulation). Inspection records when receiving food materials that are temperature controlled for safety reasons should show that the transport temperature control equipment was working properly, temperature settings were set correctly, product was received at the required temperature and that were no signs of temperature abuse in transit. The receivers should be aware and follow any special documented instructions and specifications communicated by the shipper/supplier of the materials.	5
		4.07.01	Are the vehicles loading and transporting fresh produce from growing area to facility limited to this function only, maintained in proper condition, and adequate for the purpose?	Vehicles loading and transporting product should be limited to this function only and should be adequate for transporting produce. Vehicles should be part of the sanitation program, in a good state of repair, clean, odor free, free from personal items, and free from chemical and microbiological contamination. If loads are tied down, tarps, belts, ropes, etc., should also be in good working order, without contamination risk to product.	4
§ 112.126 What requirements apply to my buildings?					
(1) Buildings must be suitable in size, construction, and design to facilitate maintenance and sanitary operations for covered activities to reduce the potential for contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards. Buildings must:	§ 112.126 (a)(1)	5.03.01	Does the facility layout ensure separation of ingredients (including ice), products, and packaging stored to prevent cross contamination (this includes iced product pallets stored above pallets of product without adequate protection as well as any allergen cross contamination issues)?	All raw materials, products and packaging should be stored off the floor (i.e. on racks, pallets, shelves, etc.). Materials should be properly protected during storage to prevent contamination (e.g., away from chemicals, battery chargers, etc.). Raw materials, finished product and packaging materials should be stored in separate areas to prevent cross contamination. When separate room storage is not possible, the auditor should assess the risks, especially with respect to cross contamination. Special attention should be given to ice storage and where relevant allergen storage.	5
		5.04.01	Does the process flow, facility layout, worker control, utensil control, internal vehicle use, etc. ensure that finished (processed) products are not contaminated by raw (unprocessed) products?	Incoming raw materials should not be a source of contamination to work-in-progress and/or finished goods. Raw product should not be allowed to touch processed product; production (product handling) areas should be physically separated from storage areas. Raw product handlers should not contaminate finished/processed product - clear controls required. Separate coded utensils required for finished/processed products relative to raw products. Utensils, cleaning implements, internal vehicles etc. should not be vectors for cross contamination	5
		5.09.11	Are exterior walls free of holes to exclude pests, and are pipes, vents, and air ducts designed and protected in order to prevent pest entry (e.g., by using fine mesh)?	Walls should be free of holes, crevices and cracks to prevent pest infestations. If pipe holes are needed, they should be protected to avoid pest entry. Vents and air ducts should also be protected. Mesh size should be no greater than 1/8 inch (3 mm) to limit insect entry.	5
		5.09.12	Are interior walls and ceilings free of cracks and crevices to prevent pest harborage and allow proper sanitation?	It is important to keep the building in good repair to prevent the intrusion of pests. Damaged walls are difficult to clean and the exposed foam or polystyrene insulation can be a foreign material risk. Ceiling should be free from evidence of roof leaks (stains), holes or other damage, false ceilings are clean and accessible.	5
		5.09.08	Are closed doors and windows to the outside pest-proof?	Doors, windows, louvers and screens should be maintained, doors should fit tightly with a maximum allowable gap of 1/8 inch (3 mm). Special attention should be given to the maintenance of weather strips. Air curtains are acceptable, provided they are operating properly. Personnel doors to the outside should be loaded so that they close properly.	5

		5.09.03	Has the facility eliminated the use of wooden items or surfaces?	Wood is a porous material and can harbor bacteria. It cannot be cleaned or sanitized effectively. Wooden materials can also splinter and pose a risk of physical contamination. Wet and high humidity areas should not be constructed of wood.	5
		5.09.04	Is there adequate lighting in the production and storage areas?	Proper lighting is necessary for inspection and sanitation procedures to take place. This includes all areas where food is examined, manufactured, processed, packed, or held and where equipment or utensils are cleaned, maintenance areas, restrooms, etc.	5
		5.09.10	Are dock load levelers and buffers/shelters maintained in good condition, pest proof and debris free?	Product debris can attract pests to the area. Gaskets (weather strips) around load levelers should fit tightly to prevent pest entry. This question is applicable only when dock doors have been installed.	5
(ii) Permit proper precautions to be taken to reduce the potential for contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, or packing materials with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards. The potential for contamination must be reduced by effective design including the separation of operations in which contamination is likely to occur, by one or more of the following means: Location, time, partition, enclosed systems, or other effective means; and	§ 112.126 (a)(1)(ii)	5.03.01	Does the facility layout ensure separation of ingredients (including ice), products, and packaging stored to prevent cross contamination (this includes iced product pallets stored above pallets of product without adequate protection as well as any allergen cross contamination issues)?	All raw materials, products and packaging should be stored off the floor (i.e. on racks, pallets, shelves, etc.). Materials should be properly protected during storage to prevent contamination (e.g., away from chemicals, battery chargers, etc.). Raw materials, finished product and packaging materials should be stored in separate areas to prevent cross contamination. When separate room storage is not possible, the auditor should assess the risks, especially with respect to cross contamination. Special attention should be given to ice storage and where relevant allergen storage.	5
		5.04.01	Does the process flow, facility layout, worker control, utensil control, internal vehicle use, etc. ensure that finished (processed) products are not contaminated by raw (unprocessed) products?	Incoming raw materials should not be a source of contamination to work-in-progress and/or finished goods. Raw product should not be allowed to touch processed product; production (product handling) areas should be physically separated from storage areas. Raw product handlers should not contaminate finished/processed product - clear controls required. Separate coded utensils required for finished/processed products relative to raw products. Utensils, cleaning implements, internal vehicles etc. should not be vectors for cross contamination	5
		5.10.02	Is there a facility floor plan showing the layout of the building, production areas, storage areas, water sources and fixtures, layout of equipment and traffic flow patterns?	There should be a facility floor plan(s) (map, drawing) indicating production areas, storage areas, water fixtures and drainage, layout of equipment and traffic flow patterns of equipment and workers. The flow pattern for food products, waste material, workers and equipment should prevent raw materials and waste from coming in contact with the finished product. Flow is ideally in one direction and follows a logical sequence from raw material handling to finished product storage.	5
		5.04.04	Where facilities are not completely enclosed, are there measures in place to mitigate potential hazards?	Production areas are enclosed (walls and roof) with doors either closed or pest protected in some way (e.g., strip curtains, air curtains, speed doors, etc.) or other mitigating measures (e.g. equipment cleaned prior to use, covering equipment, no product storage, etc.); auditor discretion applies. Walls can be solid, fine mesh or any other pest proof material, with openings that should be no greater than 1/8 inch (3 mm) or smaller. N/A if facilities are fully enclosed.	5
		5.03.02	Is the facility's use restricted to the storage of food products?	To avoid any adulteration or possible cross contamination from other items, only essential products, packaging, chemicals and equipment should be stored in the facility.	5
		5.03.03	Are rejected or on hold materials clearly identified and separated from other materials?	Rejected or on hold materials should be kept separate and identified from other materials to avoid accidental use or shipping. Make sure that the pallet or rejected product is properly marked i.e. date item was placed on hold, reason and name of the person placing the item on hold. A separate area also helps ensure that there are no accidental uses or shipping of on hold materials.	5
		5.09.20	Where there is an on-site laboratory, is it completely enclosed and separated from production and storage areas?	On-site laboratories should not be a source of possible contamination. Pathogen analysis should ideally be contracted to an external testing laboratory. Any facility doing on-site testing which includes an “enrichment step” is covered under this question. N/A if there is no on-site laboratory.	5
(2) You must provide adequate drainage in all areas where normal operations release or discharge water or other liquid waste on the ground or floor of the building.	§ 112.126 (a)(2)	5.09.07	Are the floor drains where they are needed for drainage and cleanup?	Drains should be constructed and located in such a manner that they provide adequate drainage in all areas where floors are subject to flood-type cleaning or where normal operations release or discharge water or other liquid waste on the floor. Drains should flow from processed to raw to avoid contamination in processing plants. Facilities that are washing product should have adequate drainage. Discharge water from sinks should not run directly onto the floor. Not applicable in dry facilities with no drains.	5
		5.08.03	Are floor drains covered, do they appear clean, free from odors, in good repair, and flow in a manner that prevents contamination (e.g., from high to low risk areas, from high risk directly to drain system)?	Floor drains should flow in a manner that prevents contamination, be cleaned on a frequent basis (daily in wet facilities) to remove residues, prevent growth of harmful bacteria and allow for proper drainage. Drains should be covered, and sides and bases should be made of a smooth material that does not trap debris.	5

(b) You must implement measures to prevent contamination of your covered produce and food contact surfaces in your buildings, as appropriate, considering the potential for such contamination through: (1) Floors, walls, ceilings, fixtures, ducts, or pipes; and	§ 112.126 (b) § 112.126 (b)(1)	5.09.06	Are floor surfaces in good condition, with no standing water, no debris trapping cracks and are they easy to clean?	Floor surfaces should be impervious to water, non-absorbent, clean easily and resist to wear and corrosion. Exposed aggregate is hard to clean and will get progressively worse. Floors should be free of wide and/or deep cracks.	5
		5.09.12	Are interior walls and ceilings free of cracks and crevices to prevent pest harborage and allow proper sanitation?	It is important to keep the building in good repair to prevent the intrusion of pests. Damaged walls are difficult to clean and the exposed foam or polystyrene insulation can be a foreign material risk. Ceiling should be free from evidence of roof leaks (stains), holes or other damage, false ceilings are clean and accessible.	5
		5.09.11	Are exterior walls free of holes to exclude pests, and are pipes, vents, and air ducts designed and protected in order to prevent pest entry (e.g., by using fine mesh)?	Walls should be free of holes, crevices and cracks to prevent pest infestations. If pipe holes are needed, they should be protected to avoid pest entry. Vents and air ducts should also be protected. Mesh size should be no greater than 1/8 inch (3 mm) to limit insect entry.	5
		5.09.05	Is ventilation adequate to control dust, condensation, odors and vapors?	Ventilation systems (cooling, heating and air handling) should be sufficient to control condensation, mold, dust, odors and vapors so that conditions do not exist where raw materials, work in progress, ingredients or packaging materials may be contaminated. Ventilation equipment should be balanced to provide an adequate air exchange rate to prevent condensation on walls, ceilings or other surfaces in production areas. Ideally, positive air pressure is employed in processing operations.	5
(b) You must implement measures to prevent contamination of your covered produce and food contact surfaces in your buildings, as appropriate, considering the potential for such contamination through: (2) Drip or condensate.	§ 112.126 (b) § 112.126 (b)(2)	5.04.02	Are all exposed materials (product, packaging, etc.) protected from overhead contamination (e.g. ladders, motors, condensation, lubricants, walkways, loose panels, degrading insulation, etc.)?	Ceilings and/or any overhead fixtures above storage are free from condensation or dust. Ladders or walkways (catwalks) above exposed product or packaging material have kick plates at least 3.5 inches (8 cm) high and are covered in some way that protects the product or food contact surfaces underneath. Drips or condensate (e.g., from roof, fixtures, ducts, pipes, etc.) should not contaminate food, food contact surfaces or packaging material. Adequate measures should be in place to protect from condensate.	5
§ 112.127 What requirements apply regarding domesticated animals in and around a fully-enclosed building?					
(a) You must take reasonable precautions to prevent contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, and food-packing materials in fully enclosed buildings with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards from domesticated animals by: (1) Excluding domesticated animals from fully-enclosed buildings where covered produce, food contact surfaces, or food-packing material is exposed; or (2) Separating domesticated animals in a fully enclosed building from an area where a covered activity is conducted on covered produce by location, time, or partition. (b) Guard or guide dogs may be allowed in some areas of a fully enclosed building if the presence of the dogs is unlikely to result in contamination of produce, food contact surfaces, or food-packing materials.	§ 112.127(a) § 112.127(a)(1) § 112.127(a)(2) § 112.127(b)	5.02.03	Are plant and storage areas free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles, mammals) or any evidence of them?	Plant and storage areas should be free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles or mammals, etc.) to prevent possible physical or microbiological contamination.	5
		5.02.04	Is the area outside the facility free of evidence of pest activity?	All areas should be free of recurring/existing external pest activity. Evidence (e.g., activity/tracks, feces) of rodents, animals (e.g., dogs and/or birds) in active areas outside the facility is an indication of a pest pressure on the whole building. All possible measures should be taken to avoid attracting pests to the facility perimeter.	5
§ 112.128 What requirements apply regarding pest control in buildings?					
(a) You must take those measures reasonably necessary to protect covered produce, food contact surfaces, and food- packing materials from contamination by pests in buildings, including routine monitoring for pests as necessary and appropriate. (b) For fully-enclosed buildings, you must take measures to exclude pests from your buildings. (c) For partially-enclosed buildings, you must take measures to prevent pests from becoming established in your buildings (such as by use of screens or by monitoring for the presence of pests and removing them when present).	§ 112.128(a) § 112.128(b) § 112.128(c)	5.02.05	Is there an effective pest control program in place? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	There should be an effective, proactive pest control program (in-house or contracted) to control rodents (also insects, reptiles and birds where necessary) and prevent infestation. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
		5.09.12	Are interior walls and ceilings free of cracks and crevices to prevent pest harborage and allow proper sanitation?	It is important to keep the building in good repair to prevent the intrusion of pests. Damaged walls are difficult to clean and the exposed foam or polystyrene insulation can be a foreign material risk. Ceiling should be free from evidence of roof leaks (stains), holes or other damage, false ceilings are clean and accessible.	5
		5.09.11	Are exterior walls free of holes to exclude pests, and are pipes, vents, and air ducts designed and protected in order to prevent pest entry (e.g., by using fine mesh)?	Walls should be free of holes, crevices and cracks to prevent pest infestations. If pipe holes are needed, they should be protected to avoid pest entry. Vents and air ducts should also be protected. Mesh size should be no greater than 1/8 inch (3 mm) to limit insect entry.	5

(a) You must take those measures reasonably necessary to protect covered produce, food contact surfaces, and food- packing materials from contamination by pests in buildings, including routine monitoring for pests as necessary and appropriate. (c) For partially-enclosed buildings, you must take measures to prevent pests from becoming established in your buildings (such as by use of screens or by monitoring for the presence of pests	§ 112.128(a) § 112.128(c)	5.04.04	Where facilities are not completely enclosed, are there measures in place to mitigate potential hazards?	Production areas are enclosed (walls and roof) with doors either closed or pest protected in some way (e.g., strip curtains, air curtains, speed doors, etc.) or other mitigating measures (e.g. equipment cleaned prior to use, covering equipment, no product storage, etc.); auditor discretion applies. Walls can be solid, fine mesh or any other pest proof material, with openings that should be no greater than 1/8 inch (3 mm) or smaller. N/A if facilities are fully enclosed.	5
§ 112.129 What requirements apply to toilet facilities?					
All of the following requirements apply to toilet facilities: (a) You must provide personnel with adequate, readily accessible toilet facilities, including toilet facilities readily accessible to growing areas during harvesting activities.	§ 112.129(a)	4.04.01	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Toilet facilities should be available to all workers and visitors, while work is actively occurring. At least one toilet per 20 workers should be provided, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. Toilet facility placement should be within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located, or if more stringent, as per prevailing national/local guidelines. A 5 minute drive is not acceptable, while harvesting is actively occurring with groups of three or more workers. Where there are two or less workers present and workers have transportation that is immediately available to toilets within a 5 minute drive, it is acceptable to score as total compliance. Automatic failure if there are insufficient or inadequate toilet facilities. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	4
		5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		5.04.10	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage?	Enough stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 10 people on site) and be available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system for food establishments. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities area and lunchroom area. For operations packing or processing items, stations should be accessible from the to production areas.	5
All of the following requirements apply to toilet facilities: (b) Your toilet facilities must be designed, located, and maintained to: (1) Prevent contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, water sources, and water distribution systems with human waste; (2) Be directly accessible for servicing, be serviced and cleaned at a frequency sufficient to ensure suitability of use, and be kept supplied with toilet paper; and (3) Provide for the sanitary disposal of waste and toilet paper.	§ 112.129(b) § 112.129(b)(1) § 112.129(b)(2) § 112.129(b)(3)	4.04.01a	Are toilet facilities in a suitable location to prevent contamination to the product, packaging, equipment, and growing areas?	Placement of toilet facilities should be in a suitable location to prevent contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water sources, and growing areas. Consideration should be given when portable units are used that they are not parked (if on trailers) too close to the edge of the crop and have a minimum 15 ft (4.5 m) buffer distance in the event of a spill or leak. If pit toilets are used, consider proximity to crop and water sources.	4
		5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		5.04.12	Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location and are they adequately stocked (e.g. toilet paper, disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.)?	At least one stall per 15 workers. Toilet facilities are available to all workers and visitors and should not open directly into production or storage areas. Restrooms should be stocked with toilet paper, unscented/non-perfumed soap and towels.	5
		4.04.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	4
		4.04.01c	Are toilet facilities constructed of materials that are easy to clean?	Toilet facilities should be constructed of non-porous materials that are easy to clean and sanitize. The floors, walls, ceiling, partitions and doors should be made of a finish that can be easily cleaned.	4
		4.04.01f	Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	If toilets have waste holding tanks, they should be emptied, pumped, and cleaned in a manner to avoid contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area(s). Equipment used in emptying/pumping must be in good working order. A documented procedure should exist and include a response plan for major leaks or spills, including indicating where pumped waste is disposed of and requiring communication to the designated person(s) responsible for the food safety program regarding the actions taken when a major leak or spill occurred.	4

		4.04.01g	Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Toilet facilities and hand washing stations should be cleaned and sanitized on a regular basis. Servicing records (either contracted or in-house) should be available for review showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet/placed in the holding tank (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	4
		4.04.01e	Are toilet facilities supplied with toilet paper and is the toilet paper maintained properly (e.g., toilet paper rolls are not stored on the floor or in the urinals)?	Toilet paper should be provided in a suitable holder in each toilet facility. Toilet paper should be maintained properly (e.g., toilet paper rolls are not stored on the floor or in the urinals).	4
All of the following requirements apply to toilet facilities: (c) During growing activities that take place in a fully- enclosed building, and during covered harvesting, packing, or holding activities, you must provide a hand-washing station in sufficiently close proximity to toilet facilities to make it practical for persons who use the toilet facility to wash their hands.	§ 112.129(c)	4.04.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	4
		2.07.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and be available to all workers and visitors while work is actively occurring. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.08.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		5.04.10	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage?	Enough stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 10 people on site) and be available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system for food establishments. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities area and lunchroom area. For operations packing or processing items, stations should be accessible from the to production areas.	5
§ 112.130 What requirements apply for hand-washing facilities?					
All of the following requirements apply to hand-washing facilities: (a) You must provide personnel with adequate, readily accessible handwashing facilities during growing activities that take place in a fully enclosed building, and during covered harvest, packing, or holding activities.	§ 112.130(a)	4.04.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and within 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	4
		2.07.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and be available to all workers and visitors while work is actively occurring. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	2
		3.08.03	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	An adequate number of hand washing stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 20 people on site), and available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system. Hand washing stations should be visible and located within close proximity of toilet facilities and lunchrooms and 1/4 mile or 5 minutes walking distance of where workers are located. A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	3
		5.04.10	Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage?	Enough stations, in working order, should be provided to ensure efficient worker flow (1 per 10 people on site) and be available to all workers and visitors. Hands free is an optimum system for food establishments. Hand washing stations should be located within close proximity of toilet facilities area and lunchroom area. For operations packing or processing items, stations should be accessible from the to production areas.	5

All of the following requirements apply to hand-washing facilities: (b) Your hand-washing facilities must be furnished with: (1) Soap (or other effective surfactant); (2) Running water that satisfies the requirements of § 112.44(a) for water used to wash hands; and (3) Adequate drying devices (such as single service towels, sanitary towel service, or electric hand dryers).	§ 112.130(b) § 112.130(b)(1) § 112.130(b)(2) § 112.130(b)(3)	4.04.03c	Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	All hand washing facilities should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	4
		2.07.03c	Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	All hand washing facilities should be properly stocked with liquid non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	2
		2.07.04c	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations and water retests.	2
		3.08.03c	Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	All hand washing facilities should be properly stocked with liquid non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	3
		3.08.04c	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations and water retests.	3
		5.04.11	Are hand washing stations in working order, have water of suitable temperature and pressure, adequately stocked (e.g. disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.) and restricted to hand washing purposes only?	Hand washing stations should be designated and used only for hand washing, have water of suitable temperature and pressure and be maintained in good working order with proper drainage. They should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located; hot air driers are acceptable if properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	5
		5.16.04	Are there records of microbiological tests on water used in the facility (sampled from within the facility) and does the testing meet the program requirements?	Testing of facility water should be performed on a routine basis to assure it meets the microbial requirements of potable water. Water samples should be taken from within the facility, in order to assess pipes and tanks (a city water result does not take into account the operations pipes and fittings). Well water should (in addition) be tested at source. Testing frequency should be related to the risk assessment of the production. Testing should meet written program requirements (5.16.01).	5
		4.04.03d	In the event of running out of toilet materials (e.g., water, soap, toilet tissue, hand paper towels), are there extra supplies readily available so that toilets can be restocked quickly?	Extra stock of fresh water, soap, toilet paper and paper towels, etc. should be readily available in the event that replenishment is needed while harvesting is occurring.	4
		4.04.04c	If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	For total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli, there should be negative or < detection limit (MPN or CFU/100mL). Where thresholds have been exceeded, there should be recorded corrective actions, including investigations and water retests.	4
All of the following requirements apply to hand-washing facilities: (c) You must provide for appropriate disposal of waste (for example, waste water and used single-service towels) associated with a hand-washing facility and take appropriate measures to prevent waste water from a handwashing facility from contaminating covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, and agricultural water distribution systems with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards.	§ 112.130(c)	4.04.03a	Are the hand wash stations designed and maintained properly (e.g., ability to capture or control rinse water to prevent contamination onto product, packaging, and growing area, free of clogged drains, etc.)?	Hand wash stations should be free of clogged drains, designed and maintained properly to capture or control rinse water that could cause contamination onto product, packaging, equipment, and growing area(s).	4
		2.07.03a	Are the hand wash stations designed and maintained properly (e.g., ability to capture or control rinse water to prevent contamination onto product, packaging, and growing area, free of clogged drains, etc.)?	Hand wash stations should be free of clogged drains, designed and maintained properly to capture or control rinse water that could cause contamination onto product, packaging, equipment and growing area(s).	2
		2.07.12	Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	There should be adequate measures for trash disposal so that the growing and storage areas are not contaminated. Containers (e.g. dumpsters, cans) should be available and placed in suitable locations for the disposal of waste and trash e.g. near hand wash stations.	2
		3.08.03a	Are hand washing stations in working order (no leaks, free of clogged drains, etc.) and restricted to hand washing purposes only?	Hand washing stations should be used only for hand washing and be maintained in good working order with proper drainage or designed to capture rinse water.	3
		3.08.16	Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	There should be adequate measures for trash disposal so that the growing and storage areas are not contaminated. Containers (e.g. dumpsters, cans) should be available and placed in suitable locations for the disposal of waste and trash, e.g. near toilets.	3

		5.04.11	Are hand washing stations in working order, have water of suitable temperature and pressure, adequately stocked (e.g. disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.) and restricted to hand washing purposes only?	Hand washing stations should be designated and used only for hand washing, have water of suitable temperature and pressure and be maintained in good working order with proper drainage. They should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located; hot air driers are acceptable if properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	5
		5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		4.04.19	Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	There should be adequate measures for trash disposal so that the growing, harvesting and storage areas are not contaminated. Containers (e.g., dumpsters, cans) should be available and placed in suitable locations for the disposal of waste and trash.	4
All of the following requirements apply to hand-washing facilities: (d) You may not use antiseptic hand rubs as a substitute for soap (or other effective surfactant) and water.	§ 112.130(d)	4.04.06	Are secondary hand sanitation stations (e.g., hand dips, gels or spray stations) adequate in number and location, and are the stations maintained properly?	Secondary hand sanitation is required for items that may be "ready-to-eat" (e.g., herbs, tomatoes, edible flowers, etc.). Secondary hand sanitizers are optional for root vegetable crops or a commodity that requires cooking prior to eating. Secondary hand sanitation (hand dips, gels or sprays) does not replace hand washing requirements (lack surfactant qualities). Secondary hand sanitation stations should be unscented/non-perfumed, have 60% to 95% ethanol or isopropanol and should be located near hand washing and other easily accessible areas. Hand dips (if used) should contain a food grade sanitizer at a determined concentration. Refer to hand sanitizer manufacturer label for dilutions. Hand dips should be regularly monitored (recorded anti-microbial strength checks) to ensure their effectiveness with corrective actions recorded (e.g. dip solution replenishment and anti-microbial additions). Hand gel / spray stations should be well stocked and tested regularly to ensure they are at the required strength - checks should be recorded. The auditor should check that gel pack type stations are stocked and have the auditee check the strength of anti-microbial chemicals in hand dips. Strength checks do not need to be performed for commercially purchased sanitizers that have been purchased already mixed.	4
		5.04.13	Are secondary hand sanitation stations adequate in number and location, and are the stations maintained properly?	Secondary hand sanitation is required for items that may be potentially "ready-to-eat" (e.g., herbs, tomatoes, edible flowers, etc.). Secondary hand sanitation (hand dips, gels or sprays) does not replace hand washing requirements (lack surfactant qualities). Secondary hand sanitation stations should be unscented/non-perfumed, have 60% to 95% ethanol or isopropanol and conveniently located in traffic zones but should not be obstructive. Units are ideally touch-free. Strength checks do not need to be performed for commercially purchased sanitizers that have been purchased already mixed.	5
§ 112.131 What must I do to control and dispose of sewage?					
All of the following requirements apply for the control and disposal of sewage: (a) You must dispose of sewage into an adequate sewage or septic system or through other adequate means. (b) You must maintain sewage and septic systems in a manner that prevents contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, and agricultural water distribution systems with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards. (c) You must manage and dispose of leakages or spills of human waste in a manner that prevents contamination of covered produce, and prevents or minimizes contamination of food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, or agricultural water distribution systems. (d) After a significant event (such as flooding or an earthquake) that could negatively impact a sewage or septic system, you must take appropriate steps to ensure that sewage and septic systems continue to	§ 112.131(a) § 112.131(b) § 112.131(c) § 112.131(d)	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3

ensure that sewage and septic systems continue to operate in a manner that does not contaminate covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, or agricultural water distribution systems.		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
All of the following requirements apply for the control and disposal of sewage: (a) You must dispose of sewage into an adequate sewage or septic system or through other adequate means.	§ 112.131(a)	5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		2.07.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	2
		2.07.01g	Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Toilet facilities and hand washing stations should be cleaned and sanitized on a regular basis. Servicing records (either contracted or in-house) should be available for review showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet/placed in the holding tank (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	2
		3.08.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	3
		3.08.01g	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Toilet facilities and hand washing stations should be cleaned and sanitized on a regular basis. Servicing records (either contracted or in-house) should be available for review showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet/placed in the holding tank (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	3
		4.04.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	4
		4.04.01g	Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Toilet facilities and hand washing stations should be cleaned and sanitized on a regular basis. Servicing records (either contracted or in-house) should be available for review showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet/placed in the holding tank (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	4
All of the following requirements apply for the control and disposal of sewage: (b) You must maintain sewage and septic systems in a manner that prevents contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, and agricultural water distribution systems with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards.	§ 112.131(b)	5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		2.07.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	2

		3.08.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	3
		4.04.01b	Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Toilet facilities should be free from cracks and leaks and any waste holding tanks from toilets must be designed and maintained properly to prevent contamination. Waste holding tanks should be free of leaks, cracks and constructed of durable materials (e.g. plastic) that will not degrade or decompose (no wood). Each toilet should be ventilated to outside air. Pit toilets cannot be considered to be properly designed to prevent contamination.	4
All of the following requirements apply for the control and disposal of sewage: (c) You must manage and dispose of leakages or spills of human waste in a manner that prevents contamination of covered produce, and prevents or minimizes contamination of food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, or agricultural water distribution systems.	§ 112.131 ©	4.04.01f	Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	If toilets have waste holding tanks, they should be emptied, pumped, and cleaned in a manner to avoid contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area(s). Equipment used in emptying/pumping must be in good working order. A documented procedure should exist and include a response plan for major leaks or spills, including indicating where pumped waste is disposed of and requiring communication to the designated person(s) responsible for the food safety program regarding the actions taken when a major leak or spill occurred.	4
		2.07.01f	Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	If toilets have waste holding tanks, they should be emptied, pumped, and cleaned in a manner to avoid contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area(s). Equipment used in emptying/pumping must be in good working order. A documented procedure should exist and should include a response plan for major leaks or spills, including indicating where pumped waste is disposed of and requiring communication to the designated person(s) responsible for the food safety program regarding the actions taken when a major leak or spill occured.	2
		3.08.01f	Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	If toilets have waste holding tanks, they should be emptied, pumped, and cleaned in a manner to avoid contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area(s). Equipment used in emptying/pumping must be in good working order. A documented procedure should exist and include a response plan for major leaks or spills, including indicating where pumped waste is disposed of and requiring communication to the designated person(s) responsible for the food safety program regarding the actions taken when a major leak or spill occurred.	3
All of the following requirements apply for the control and disposal of sewage: (d) After a significant event (such as flooding or an earthquake) that could negatively impact a sewage or septic system, you must take appropriate steps to ensure that sewage and septic systems continue to operate in a manner that does not contaminate covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, or agricultural water distribution systems.	§ 112.131(d)	2.03.04c	If septic or sewage systems adjacent to the growing area were affected by the flood waters, is there a documented inspection after flooding to ensure they are functioning properly and are not a source of contamination?	There should be records of inspecting the sewage/septic systems after flooding, showing that they are functioning properly and are not a source of contamination (e.g. overflow).	2
		3.02.03	Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	A documented risk assessment of the growing area, each water source and surrounding areas should be performed prior to the first seasonal planting and at least annually, and when any changes are made to the growing area, water sources and adjacent land. This should detail known or reasonable foreseeable risks/hazards, the specific microbial, chemical and physical risks and their severity and likelihood of occurring in the following areas: previous use of the growing area, adjacent land use (e.g., CAFO), water source risks from animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, water capture, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, cross connections, recirculating water, sewage and septic systems, etc. (chemical hazards e.g. heavy metals, perchlorate, etc., and microbial hazards e.g. pathogenic E. coli), water use, fertilizers, crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and tools used for harvest, storage, transportation, topography of the land for runoff (% slope, soil type), prevailing weather conditions or weather events. and any other applicable areas. Farms and indoor agriculture operations following the CA or AZ LGMA should reference current metrics e.g., a buffer zone of approximately 1,200 ft. (365m) for CAFO's with >1,000 head or 1 mile (1609m) for 80,000 head CAFO, which may increase or decrease after assessing the risks, determining, and deploying mitigation measures.	3

		5.10.03	Has a documented risk assessment been performed to ensure that any food safety hazards relevant to facility location and adjacent land use are identified and controlled?	A documented risk assessment should be performed for the facility to identify and control any food safety hazards relevant to the facility location and adjacent land use (e.g., animal activity, industrial activity, waste, sewage and septic systems, water treatment sites (settling ponds, land applications, etc.) or any other potential sources of contamination). All national and local laws pertaining to land use and on-site water treatment systems should be followed. Where necessary, for waste water treatment areas, there should be applicable permits on file and evidence of regulatory and/or third party inspections. The risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually and when a significant facility location/adjacent land change occurs including flooding and earthquake events that may impact sewage or septic systems.	5
§ 112.132 What must I do to control and dispose of trash, litter, and waste in areas used for covered activities?					
All of the following requirements apply to the control and disposal of trash, litter, and waste in areas used for covered activities: (a) You must convey, store, and dispose of trash, litter and waste to: (1) Minimize the potential for trash, litter, or waste to attract or harbor pests; and (2) Protect against contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, and agricultural water distribution systems with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards. (b) You must adequately operate systems for waste treatment and disposal so that they do not constitute a potential source of contamination in areas used for a covered activity.	§ 112.132(a) § 112.132(a)(1) § 112.132(a)(2) § 112.132(b)	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5

		2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
(a) You must convey, store, and dispose of trash, litter and waste to: (1) Minimize the potential for trash, litter, or waste to attract or harbor pests; and	§ 112.132(a) § 112.132(a)(1)	2.02.05	Is the exterior area immediately outside the growing area, including roads, yards and parking areas, free of litter, weeds and standing water?	Litter, waste, refuse, uncut weeds or grass and standing water within the immediate vicinity of the growing area may constitute an attractant or breeding place for rodents, insects or other pests, as well as microorganisms that may cause contamination.	2
		3.02.09	Are outside garbage receptacles and dumpsters kept covered or closed?	All dumpsters and garbage receptacles should have a cover and be kept covered to prevent the attraction of insects, rodents and other pests. Fine mesh lids are acceptable. Just having the lids is not acceptable i.e. when not in use, the dumpsters and garbage receptacles should be closed. Dumpsters that are only used for dry non-food waste (e.g., paper, cardboard, etc.) are exempt from this requirement.	3
		3.08.16	Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	There should be adequate measures for trash disposal so that the growing and storage areas are not contaminated. Containers (e.g. dumpsters, cans) should be available and placed in suitable locations for the disposal of waste and trash, e.g. near toilets.	3
		4.04.19	Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	There should be adequate measures for trash disposal so that the growing, harvesting and storage areas are not contaminated. Containers (e.g., dumpsters, cans) should be available and placed in suitable locations for the disposal of waste and trash.	4

		3.02.08	Is the area around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area clean?	The dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be located away from facility entrances, where traffic flow may be a source of cross contamination. The area around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be maintained in a clean condition. There should not be any spillage on the ground. There should not be any standing water or liquid seepage around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area and there should not be any foul odor present. The dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be cleaned on a regular basis.	3
		2.02.07	Are garbage receptacles and dumpsters kept covered or closed?	All dumpsters and garbage receptacles should have a cover and be kept covered to prevent the attraction of insects, rodents and other pests. Fine mesh lids are acceptable. Just having the lids is not acceptable i.e. when not in use, the dumpsters and garbage receptacles should be closed. Dumpsters that are only used for dry non-food waste (e.g., paper, cardboard, etc.) are exempt from this requirement.	2
		5.08.02	Are waste and garbage frequently removed from production and storage areas?	Waste and garbage must be removed on a frequent basis to prevent attraction of pests, reduce cross contamination, reduce bad odors and maintain a sanitary environment.	5
(a) You must convey, store, and dispose of trash, litter and waste to: (2) Protect against contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, and agricultural water distribution systems with known or reasonably foreseeable hazards.	§ 112.132(a) § 112.132(a)(2)	5.09.17	Is the area around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area clean?	The dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be located away from facility entrances, where traffic flow may be a source of cross contamination. The area around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be maintained in a clean condition. There should not be any spillage on the ground. There should not be any standing water or liquid seepage around the dumpster/cull truck/trash area and there should not be any foul odor present. The dumpster/cull truck/trash area should be cleaned on a regular basis.	5
		5.09.19	Are all water lines protected against back siphonage?	Back siphonage protection prevents potable water from coming into contact with unsafe water and potential contamination of the distribution system.	5
(b) You must adequately operate systems for waste treatment and disposal so that they do not constitute a potential source of contamination in areas used for a covered activity.	§ 112.132(b)	5.10.03	Has a documented risk assessment been performed to ensure that any food safety hazards relevant to facility location and adjacent land use are identified and controlled?	A documented risk assessment should be performed for the facility to identify and control any food safety hazards relevant to the facility location and adjacent land use (e.g., animal activity, industrial activity, waste, sewage and septic systems, water treatment sites (settling ponds, land applications, etc.) or any other potential sources of contamination). All national and local laws pertaining to land use and on-site water treatment systems should be followed. Where necessary, for waste water treatment areas, there should be applicable permits on file and evidence of regulatory and/or third party inspections. The risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually and when a significant facility location/adjacent land change occurs including flooding and earthquake events that may impact sewage or septic systems.	5
§ 112.133 What requirements apply to plumbing?					
The plumbing must be of an adequate size and design and be adequately installed and maintained to: (a) Distribute water under pressure as needed, in sufficient quantities, in all areas where used for covered activities, for sanitary operations, or for hand-washing and toilet facilities; (b) Properly convey sewage and liquid disposable waste; (c) Avoid being a source of contamination to covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, or agricultural water sources; and (d) Not allow backflow from, or cross connection between, piping systems that discharge waste water or sewage and piping systems that carry water used for a covered activity, for sanitary operations, or for use in hand-washing facilities.	§ 112.133(a) § 112.133(b) § 112.133(c) § 112.133(d)	2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		2.09.08	Are there backflow prevention devices on all main lines, including where chemical, fertilizer and pesticide applications are made?	Water systems should be fitted with backflow prevention devices to prevent contamination of the water supply. Main water lines should be fitted with back-flow protection for the incoming water (no matter what the source). Individual water lines should be fitted with backflow protection where practical.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3

		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5
		2.05.04	Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	2
		3.05.10	Are raw materials (e.g. seeds, transplants, soil, media), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw materials, finished goods, food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	3
		4.05.09	Is the crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	The crop, harvested product, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Other examples might include glass, trash/litter, motor oil in products, etc. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	4
		5.03.04	Are raw products, work in progress, ingredients (including water and ice), finished goods and food contact packaging within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Raw products, work in progress, ingredients, finished goods, and food contact packaging and food contact surfaces should be free from spoilage, adulteration and/or gross contamination (21 CFR 110.3g, 21 CFR 117.3). If legislation exists, then the contamination should be viewed against this legislation (e.g., USDA Grading Standards often include decay tolerances). Spoilage and adulteration would include any physical, chemical or biological contamination including blood and bodily fluids. Measures should be taken to prevent any known or reasonably foreseeable hazard (e.g., Clostridium botulinum in mushrooms). Ice should be made from potable water. This question is designed to allow an auditor to halt an audit when finding gross contamination issues. ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	5

		5.10.04	Is there a current certificate of inspection (or similar record) for backflow prevention assemblies on water lines into the facility?	There should be a backflow prevention device on main water lines entering the facility. There should be a record provided by a trained inspector verifying the proper operation of the principle backflow prevention system on an annual basis (unless there is a stated expiration on the certificate). This question is not applicable if the facility has no water supply.	5
		5.04.11	Are hand washing stations in working order, have water of suitable temperature and pressure, adequately stocked (e.g. disposable towels, unscented soap, etc.) and restricted to hand washing purposes only?	Hand washing stations should be designated and used only for hand washing, have water of suitable temperature and pressure and be maintained in good working order with proper drainage. They should be properly stocked with liquid unscented/non-perfumed, neutral or antiseptic soap. Single use paper towels should be used and units properly located; hot air driers are acceptable if properly located. There should be an adequate stock of soap and paper towels.	5
		5.09.19	Are all water lines protected against back siphonage?	Back siphonage protection prevents potable water from coming into contact with unsafe water and potential contamination of the distribution system.	5
		5.08.10	Are toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean?	Toilet facilities should be cleaned and sanitized at least daily. Soiled tissue should be flushed down the toilet (not placed in trash cans and/or on the floor).	5
		5.10.02	Is there a facility floor plan showing the layout of the building, production areas, storage areas, water sources and fixtures, layout of equipment and traffic flow patterns?	There should be a facility floor plan(s) (map, drawing) indicating production areas, storage areas, water fixtures and drainage, layout of equipment and traffic flow patterns of equipment and workers. The flow pattern for food products, waste material, workers and equipment should prevent raw materials and waste from coming in contact with the finished product. Flow is ideally in one direction and follows a logical sequence from raw material handling to finished product storage.	5
§ 112.134 What must I do to control animal excreta and litter from domesticated animals that are under my control?					
(a) If you have domesticated animals, to prevent contamination of covered produce, food contact surfaces, areas used for a covered activity, agricultural water sources, or agricultural water distribution systems with animal waste, you must: (1) Adequately control their excreta and litter; and (2) Maintain a system for control of animal excreta and litter. (b) [Reserved]	§ 112.134(a) § 112.134(a)(1) § 112.134(a)(2)	5.02.03	Are plant and storage areas free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles, mammals) or any evidence of them?	Plant and storage areas should be free of pests (e.g., insects, rodents, birds, reptiles or mammals, etc.) to prevent possible physical or microbiological contamination.	5
		2.02.10	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 2.02.11.	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the field equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals).	2
		3.02.12	Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 3.02.13	Animals can represent potential contamination to the growing area, to the crop, to the equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc. Note: This includes any packaging or storage areas. (e.g., equipment, agronomic inputs, chemicals)	3

		4.05.01	Is the harvest area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 4.05.02.	Animals can represent potential contamination to the harvesting area, to the crop, to the equipment, etc., and therefore, should not be present in the operations. Evidence of animal presence can include tracks, fecal matter, feathers, etc.	4
§ 112.140 Under this subpart, what requirements apply regarding records?					
(a) You must establish and keep records required under this subpart in accordance with the requirements of subpart O of this part. (b) You must establish and keep documentation of the date and method of cleaning and sanitizing of equipment subject to this subpart used in: (1) Growing operations for sprouts; and (2) Covered harvesting, packing, or holding activities.	§ 112.140(a) § 112.140(b) § 112.140(b)(1) § 112.140(b)(2)	5.14.05	Are there written cleaning and sanitation procedures (Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures) for the facility and all equipment?	The facility areas (floors, walls, overheads, etc.), all equipment (food contact, non-food contact, cooling equipment, etc.), internal transport vehicles and in-house owned trailers should be cleaned and sanitized on a regularly scheduled basis, based on written Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs). There should be SSOPs covering the cleaning and sanitizing operations noted in the master sanitation schedule. SSOPs should also be created for dry cleaning operations (where applicable). Procedures should detail what, who, how and when, including chemical details, solution temperature, water pressure, dwell times, any disassembly/reassembly instructions and cleaning verification procedures.	5
		5.14.06	Are cleaning and sanitation logs on file that show what was done, when and by who?	Sanitation logs should be on file that cover all areas of the facility (e.g., production areas, storage areas, break areas, restrooms, maintenance, etc.), detailing walls, floors, overhead and all equipment (e.g., production equipment (food contact and non-food contact), pallet jacks, forklifts, carts, floor scrubbers, trash cans, cooling equipment, lift trucks, company owned trailers, etc.). Logs should include: date, list of areas/equipment that were cleaned and sanitized, and the individual accountable who signed-off for each completed task. Logs should be consistent with the master sanitation schedule.	5
		4.05.12d	Are there written cleaning and sanitation procedures (Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures) for harvest tools that includes the frequency of cleaning and sanitizing, and the procedures used including chemical use details?	Harvest tools should be cleaned and sanitized on a regularly scheduled basis, based on written Sanitation Standard Operating Procedures (SSOPs). The program should state the frequency of cleaning and sanitizing, detail what, who, how and when, including chemical details (name, dilution/strength), and cleaning verification procedures.	4
		4.05.12e	Are cleaning and sanitation logs on file for harvest tools that show what was done, when, by who and detail strength testing of anti-microbial solution used to sanitize surfaces?	Sanitation logs should include: date, list of areas/equipment that were cleaned and sanitized, sanitizer strength tests, and the individual accountable who signed-off for each task completed.	4
Subpart N—Analytical Methods *					
§ 112.151 What methods must I use to test the quality of water to satisfy the requirements of § 112.46?					
You must test the quality of water using: (a) The method of analysis published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), ''Method 1603: Escherichia coli (E. coli) in Water by Membrane Filtration Using Modified membrane-Thermo-tolerant Escherichia coli Agar (Modified mTEC), EPA–821– R–09–007),'' December, 2009. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. You may obtain a copy from EPA, Office of Water (4303T), 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20460. You may inspect a copy at FDA's Main Library, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 2, Third Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993, 301–796– 2039, or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_	§ 112.151(a) § 112.151(b)(1) § 112.151(b)(2)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1
		1.06.01	Is there a written procedure detailing how suppliers and service providers are evaluated, approved, and include the ongoing verification activities including monitoring? Note that supply chain preventive controls and supply-chain-applied controls are also mentioned in Module 7.	The procedure for evaluation, approval and on-going verification, including monitoring of suppliers, on-site service providers and outsourced service providers should include the indicators to be considered for decision making (including food safety hazards), exceptions and the elements the providers should comply with to make sure they meet the defined specifications. This procedure should include monitoring requirements in order to remain approved, and methods for suspending and un-approving suppliers and service providers including product design and development (new products, changes to product or manufacturing processes). See also Modules 6 & 7 (where applicable). The procedure should also detail what is needed (minimum requirements) in the case of working with a supplier in an emergency situation that has not yet been approved including requiring approval from named management is justified and documented.	1

federal _regulations/ibr_locations.html; or (b)(1) A scientifically valid method that is at least equivalent to the method of analysis in § 112.151(a) in accuracy, precision, and sensitivity; or (2) For any other indicator of fecal contamination you may test for pursuant to § 112.49(a), a scientifically valid method.		1.06.03	Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	There should be written, detailed, up-to-date specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services (including when exceptions will be allowed) that have an effect on food safety, addressing the required Good Agricultural Practices and/or Good Manufacturing Practices. Documented specifications should be easily accessible to workers. The specifications should be reviewed at least annually.	1
		1.06.04	Does the organization have documented evidence to ensure that all incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site and outsourced service suppliers comply with the approval requirements and that all supplier verification activities (including monitoring) are being followed, as defined in the supplier approval procedure?	The organization should have the required documentation for approved suppliers to ensure that they are complying with the established supplier/service provider approval procedures, contracts, specifications, regulatory requirements and best practice guidelines. Supplier verification documents should demonstrate that the ongoing approval requirements detailed in 1.06.01 are being met (e.g., third party food safety audits, certificates of analysis, reviews of supplier records, etc.).	1
§ 112.152 What methods must I use to test the growing, harvesting, packing, and holding environment for Listeria species or L. monocytogenes to satisfy the requirements of § 112.144(a)?					
You must test the growing, harvesting, packing, and holding environment for Listeria species or L. monocytogenes using: (a) The method of analysis described in ''Testing Methodology for Listeria species or L. monocytogenes in Environmental Samples,'' Version 1, October 2015, U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 5. You may obtain a copy from, and/or inspect a copy at, the Division of Produce Safety, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN), U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740, 240– 402–1600; FDA's Main Library, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 2, Third Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993, 301–796–2039; http://www.fda.gov/fsma; or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal _regulation/ibr_locations.html; or (b) A scientifically valid method that is at least equivalent to the method of analysis in § 112.152(a) in accuracy, precision, and sensitivity.	§ 112.152(a) § 112.152(b)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1
		1.06.01	Is there a written procedure detailing how suppliers and service providers are evaluated, approved, and include the ongoing verification activities including monitoring? Note that supply chain preventive controls and supply-chain-applied controls are also mentioned in Module 7.	The procedure for evaluation, approval and on-going verification, including monitoring of suppliers, on-site service providers and outsourced service providers should include the indicators to be considered for decision making (including food safety hazards), exceptions and the elements the providers should comply with to make sure they meet the defined specifications. This procedure should include monitoring requirements in order to remain approved, and methods for suspending and un-approving suppliers and service providers including product design and development (new products, changes to product or manufacturing processes). See also Modules 6 & 7 (where applicable). The procedure should also detail what is needed (minimum requirements) in the case of working with a supplier in an emergency situation that has not yet been approved including requiring approval from named management is justified and documented.	1
		1.06.03	Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	There should be written, detailed, up-to-date specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services (including when exceptions will be allowed) that have an effect on food safety, addressing the required Good Agricultural Practices and/or Good Manufacturing Practices. Documented specifications should be easily accessible to workers. The specifications should be reviewed at least annually.	1
		1.06.04	Does the organization have documented evidence to ensure that all incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site and outsourced service suppliers comply with the approval requirements and that all supplier verification activities (including monitoring) are being followed, as defined in the supplier approval procedure?	The organization should have the required documentation for approved suppliers to ensure that they are complying with the established supplier/service provider approval procedures, contracts, specifications, regulatory requirements and best practice guidelines. Supplier verification documents should demonstrate that the ongoing approval requirements detailed in 1.06.01 are being met (e.g., third party food safety audits, certificates of analysis, reviews of supplier records, etc.).	1
§ 112.153 What methods must I use to test spent sprout irrigation water (or sprouts) from each production batch of sprouts for pathogens to satisfy the requirements of § 112.144(b) and (c)?					
You must test spent sprout irrigation water (or sprouts) from each production batch for pathogens using: (a) For E. coli O157:H7, Salmonella species: (1) The method of analysis described in ''Testing Methodologies for E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella species in Spent Sprout Irrigation Water (or Sprouts),'' Version 1, October 2015, U.S. Food and	§ 112.153(a) § 112.153(a)(1) § 112.153(a)(2) § 112.153(b)	1.06.05	Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Food safety related testing that is performed by laboratory service providers should be done by currently permitted, licensed and/or accredited laboratories for the scope(s) of work being carried out. Examples of these licenses and accreditations include ISO 17025 accreditations or equivalent, national and local regulations in the country of production, etc. Documented evidence of these licenses and/or accreditations should be available.	1

Drug Administration. The Director of the Federal Register approves this incorporation by reference in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 5. You may obtain a copy from, and/or inspect a copy at, the Division of Produce Safety, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN), Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740, 240–402–1600; FDA's Main Library, 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 2, Third Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20993, 301–796–2039; http://www.fda.gov/fsma; or at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). For information on the availability of this material at NARA, call 202–741–6030, or go to: http://www.archives.gov/federal_register/code_of_federal _regulation/ibr_locations.html; or (2) A scientifically valid method that is at least equivalent to the method of analysis in § 112.153(a)(1) in accuracy, precision, and sensitivity; and (b) For any other pathogen(s) meeting the criteria in § 112.144(c), a scientifically valid method.		1.06.01	Is there a written procedure detailing how suppliers and service providers are evaluated, approved, and include the ongoing verification activities including monitoring? Note that supply chain preventive controls and supply-chain-applied controls are also mentioned in Module 7.	The procedure for evaluation, approval and on-going verification, including monitoring of suppliers, on-site service providers and outsourced service providers should include the indicators to be considered for decision making (including food safety hazards), exceptions and the elements the providers should comply with to make sure they meet the defined specifications. This procedure should include monitoring requirements in order to remain approved, and methods for suspending and un-approving suppliers and service providers including product design and development (new products, changes to product or manufacturing processes). See also Modules 6 & 7 (where applicable). The procedure should also detail what is needed (minimum requirements) in the case of working with a supplier in an emergency situation that has not yet been approved including requiring approval from named management is justified and documented.	1
		1.06.03	Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	There should be written, detailed, up-to-date specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services (including when exceptions will be allowed) that have an effect on food safety, addressing the required Good Agricultural Practices and/or Good Manufacturing Practices. Documented specifications should be easily accessible to workers. The specifications should be reviewed at least annually.	1
		1.06.04	Does the organization have documented evidence to ensure that all incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site and outsourced service suppliers comply with the approval requirements and that all supplier verification activities (including monitoring) are being followed, as defined in the supplier approval procedure?	The organization should have the required documentation for approved suppliers to ensure that they are complying with the established supplier/service provider approval procedures, contracts, specifications, regulatory requirements and best practice guidelines. Supplier verification documents should demonstrate that the ongoing approval requirements detailed in 1.06.01 are being met (e.g., third party food safety audits, certificates of analysis, reviews of supplier records, etc.).	1
Subpart O—Records					
§ 112.161 What general requirements apply to records required under this part?					
(b) Records required under §§ 112.7(b) 112.30(b) 112.50(b)(2), (4), and (6), 112.60(b)(2), 112.140(b)(1) and (2), and 112.150(b)(1), (4), and (6), must be reviewed, dated, and signed, within a reasonable time after the records are made, by a supervisor or responsible party.	§ 112.161(b)	1.02.05	Are all records and test results that can have an impact on the food safety program verified by a qualified person independent of the individual(s) completing the records?	Records and test results should be reviewed and signed off by a qualified person within 7 days. The verifier is independent of the individual completing the record(s), understands the purpose of the verification and understands what they need to review on the record(s) before they sign (i.e. evidence of training). If any issues are detected, corrective actions should be recorded.	1
§ 112.162 Where must I store records?					
(a) Offsite storage of records is permitted if such records can be retrieved and provided onsite within 24 hours of request for official review. (b) Electronic records are considered to be onsite at your farm if they are accessible from an onsite location at your farm.	§ 112.162(a) § 112.162(b)	1.02.04	Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	All food safety records and documents should be stored following an organized and consistent method, to allow for quick retrieval of records. This will aid in the detection of issues, the isolation of problems, and the identification of trends where attention is needed. Records should be accessible, even if the operation is seasonal. Data on computers must be easily retrievable.	1
		1.02.03	Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?	Both paper and electronic documents and records that are part of the food safety program (e.g., procedures, policies, training records, testing results, monitoring records, etc.), should be stored securely and backed up in the case of electronic files. In the case of paper files, they should be generated using ink (not pencil), and if changes are made to records after initial entry, changes should be clearly legible and tracked, avoiding the use of corrective fluid. For electronic records, there should be access control and a back up of all files. When electronic records are amended, they should show what was amended, by whom and when (editing history). Records should be legible and accurate.	1
§ 112.163 May I use existing records to satisfy the requirements of this part?					

(a) Existing records (e.g., records that are kept to comply with other Federal, State, or local regulations, or for any other reason) do not need to be duplicated if they contain all of the required information and satisfy the requirements of this part. Existing records may be supplemented as necessary to include all of the required information and satisfy the requirements of this part. (b) The information required by this part does not need to be kept in one set of records. If existing records contain some of the required information, any new information required by this part may be kept either separately or combined with the existing records.	§ 112.163(a) § 112.163(b)	1.02.04	Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	All food safety records and documents should be stored following an organized and consistent method, to allow for quick retrieval of records. This will aid in the detection of issues, the isolation of problems, and the identification of trends where attention is needed. Records should be accessible, even if the operation is seasonal. Data on computers must be easily retrievable.	1
§ 112.164 How long must I keep records?					
(a)(1) You must keep records required by this part for at least 2 years past the date the record was created. (2) Records that a farm relies on during the 3-year period preceding the applicable calendar year to satisfy the criteria for a qualified exemption, in accordance with §§ 112.5 and 112.7, must be retained as long as necessary to support the farm's status during the applicable calendar year. (b) Records that relate to the general adequacy of the equipment or processes or records that relate to analyses, sampling, or action plans being used by a farm, including the results of scientific studies, tests, and evaluations, must be retained at the farm for at least 2 years after the use of such equipment or processes, or records related to analyses, sampling, or action plans, is discontinued.	§ 112.164(a)(1) § 112.164(a)(2) § 112.164(b)	1.02.02	Is there a documented and implemented procedure that requires all records to be stored for a minimum period of 24 months (or greater if legally required) or for at least the shelf life of the product if it is greater than 24 months?	There should be a written procedure in place requiring that all food safety related records (including any test results) be retained for a minimum of 24 months, regardless of the product(s) shelf-life. Food safety records for product(s) with a shelf-life beyond 24 months should be retained for at least the shelf-life of the product. Organizations are expected to follow any regulatory or legal requirements for food safety related record(s) retention beyond the 24 month minimum requirement stated here.	1
§ 112.165 What formats are acceptable for the records I keep?					
You must keep records as: (a) Original records; b) True copies (such as photocopies, pictures, scanned copies, microfilm, microfiche, or other accurate reproductions of the original records); or (c) Electronic records. Records that are established or maintained to satisfy the requirements of this part and that meet the definition of electronic records in § 11.3(b)(6) of this chapter are exempt from the requirements of part 11 of this chapter. Records that satisfy the requirements of this part, but that also are required under other applicable statutory provisions or regulations, remain subject to part 11 of this chapter	§ 112.165(a) § 112.165(b) § 112.165(c)	1.02.03	Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?	Both paper and electronic documents and records that are part of the food safety program (e.g., procedures, policies, training records, testing results, monitoring records, etc.), should be stored securely and backed up in the case of electronic files. In the case of paper files, they should be generated using ink (not pencil), and if changes are made to records after initial entry, changes should be clearly legible and tracked, avoiding the use of corrective fluid. For electronic records, there should be access control and a back up of all files. When electronic records are amended, they should show what was amended, by whom and when (editing history). Records should be legible and accurate.	1
§ 112.166 What requirements apply for making records available and accessible to FDA?					

(a) You must have all records required under this part readily available and accessible during the retention period for inspection and copying by FDA upon oral or written request, except that you have 24 hours to obtain records you keep offsite and make them available and accessible to FDA for inspection and copying. (b) If you use electronic techniques to keep records, or to keep true copies of records, or if you use reduction techniques such as microfilm to keep true copies of records, you must provide the records to FDA in a format in which they are accessible and legible." (c) If your farm is closed for a prolonged period, the records may be transferred to some other reasonably accessible location but must be returned to your farm within 24 hours for official review upon request."	§ 112.166(a) § 112.166(b) § 112.166(c)	1.04.02	Are there written procedures for handling regulatory inspections?	Written procedures for handling food safety related regulatory inspections are available for workers to follow when regulatory agencies inspect the operation. Regulatory agencies could be Health Departments, State enforcement organizations, etc. (e.g., US: USDA/FDA, Canada: CFIA, Chile: Ministerio de Agricultura/SAG, Mexico: SAGARPA). The procedures should include at a minimum, rules for always accompanying inspections, identified meeting space, rules on taking samples and taking photographs, how to follow-up after the inspection, corrective action requirements, etc. This policy should be communicated to key personnel including the receptionists, field/plant workers and crew/line supervisors. Inspection policies must not contravene bio-terrorism laws and restrict access to documents that have been covered by these laws.	1
		1.02.04	Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	All food safety records and documents should be stored following an organized and consistent method, to allow for quick retrieval of records. This will aid in the detection of issues, the isolation of problems, and the identification of trends where attention is needed. Records should be accessible, even if the operation is seasonal. Data on computers must be easily retrievable.	1
		1.02.03	Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?	Both paper and electronic documents and records that are part of the food safety program (e.g., procedures, policies, training records, testing results, monitoring records, etc.), should be stored securely and backed up in the case of electronic files. In the case of paper files, they should be generated using ink (not pencil), and if changes are made to records after initial entry, changes should be clearly legible and tracked, avoiding the use of corrective fluid. For electronic records, there should be access control and a back up of all files. When electronic records are amended, they should show what was amended, by whom and when (editing history). Records should be legible and accurate.	1
§ 112.167 Can records that I provide to FDA be disclosed to persons outside of FDA?					
Records obtained by FDA in accordance with this part are subject to the disclosure requirements under part 20 of this chapter.	§ 112.167	1.04.02	Are there written procedures for handling regulatory inspections?	Written procedures for handling food safety related regulatory inspections are available for workers to follow when regulatory agencies inspect the operation. Regulatory agencies could be Health Departments, State enforcement organizations, etc. (e.g., US: USDA/FDA, Canada: CFIA, Chile: Ministerio de Agricultura/SAG, Mexico: SAGARPA). The procedures should include at a minimum, rules for always accompanying inspections, identified meeting space, rules on taking samples and taking photographs, how to follow-up after the inspection, corrective action requirements, etc. This policy should be communicated to key personnel including the receptionists, field/plant workers and crew/line supervisors. Inspection policies must not contravene bio-terrorism laws and restrict access to documents that have been covered by these laws.	1