tasks. At the same time it gives the managers a better view of their own process and more opportunity to adjust it to prevent safety defects.

To produce this documentation, all industry managers must learn about the options and methods for making their processes safer, which they do not have to do if the inspector appears to be the only one responsible for finding defects. Therefore, while the proposal contains increased paperwork burden, it is balanced by a reduction in the number of face-to-face contacts between management and the inspector that are required to assure the process is being controlled, so that the opportunity for better control is accompanied by an increase in productivity for both inspectors and managers.

In order not to increase the paperwork burden unnecessarily, the Agency has not required that plans be submitted for prior approval. In addition, the Agency is considering changing some existing prior approval programs, which would further reduce the paperwork burden on

As part of establishments' sanitation requirements, each establishment would develop and maintain an SOP that would be used by inspection personnel in performing verification tasks. The SOP's would specify the cleaning and sanitizing procedures for all equipment and facilities involved in the production of every product. As part of the SOP, establishment employees(s) would record results of daily sanitation checks on a checklist at the frequencies stated in the SOP. The checklist would include both preoperational sanitation checks and operational sanitation checks. This checklist would be made available to Program employees, upon request.

As part of the time and temperature requirements, establishments would develop, implement, and place on file a written plan to meet the time and temperature requirements. The plan would include the establishments designated control points where temperatures would be measured; monitoring procedures; how recordkeeping activities would be performed; standards for control points (e.g., cooling rate, holding temperature, and shipping temperature); corrective actions; and, when applicable, the name of the processing authority.

Establishment employees would also have to maintain records that report the maximum temperature of carcasses and raw meat and poultry products throughout the establishment's operations on a daily basis with the frequency of monitoring based on the establishment's size and type of operation. These records would be

required to be maintained on file for 6 months after the temperature measurement, and the records would be made available to Program employees, upon request. Additionally, the shipping establishment would be required to record the date and time of shipment of product on the waybill, running slip, conductor's card, shipper's certificate, or any other such papers accompanying the shipment.

As part of microbiological testing, each establishment would develop written procedures outlining specimen collection and handling. An establishment may test the specimens in their own laboratory or in a commercial/ contract laboratory. Either an internal or external QA/QC program with check sample analysis would be required. QA/ QC records must be available to Program employees, upon request.

The laboratory would supply the results on a daily basis to the establishment. The establishment would be responsible for entering the results daily into a statistical process control chart. The data and chart would be available for review by the Inspector in

Charge upon request.

The establishment would notify the Inspector in Charge if the results of the testing exceed the process control limits. In such instances, a complete review by the establishment of the production process would be required. A written report of the evaluation, including the reason for process failure and proposed corrective actions, would be submitted to the Inspector in Charge within 14 days from the day the process exceeded the limits. This report would be updated on a weekly basis until the process is in control.

For the implementation of HACCP, the establishment would maintain on file the name and a brief resume of the HACCP-trained individual(s) who participates in the hazard analysis and subsequent development of the HACCP plans. Establishments would develop written HACCP plans that include: Identification of the processing step(s) presents hazard(s); identification and description of the CCP for each identified hazard; specification of the critical limit which may not be exceeded at the CCP, and, if appropriate, a target limit; description of the monitoring procedure or device to be used; description of the corrective action to be taken if the limit is exceeded; description of the records which would be generated and maintained regarding this CCP; and description of the establishment verification activities and the frequency at which they are to be conducted. Critical limits which are currently a part

of FSIS regulations or other requirements must be included.

Establishments would keep records for measurements during slaughter and processing, corrective actions, verification check results, and related activities that contain the identity of the product, the product code or slaughter production lot, and the date the record was made. The information would be recorded at the time that it is observed, and the record would be signed by the operator or observer.

The HACCP records would be reviewed by an establishment employee other than the one who produced the record, before the product is distributed in commerce. If a HACCP-trained individual is on-site, that person should be this second reviewer. The reviewer would sign the records. Lastly, HACCP records generated by the processor would be retained on site for at least 1 year and either on site or in a nearby location for an additional two years.

The paperwork and recordkeeping requirements contained in this proposed rule have been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.). Send written comments to: Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for FSIS, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503, and to the Clearance Officer, Room 404-W, Administration Building, Washington, DC 20250.

Imports and Exports

The proposed rules will affect importers and exporters of meat and poultry to the U.S. The inspection statutes require that imported product be produced under an inspection system that is equivalent to the U.S. inspection system. The equivalence of a country's system must be established by the United States before product can be exported to the United States. The notion of equivalence has been clarified under the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures. Under the WTO all members have an obligation to apply the principle of equivalence on importing countries. Equivalence determinations are based on scientific evidence and risk assessment methodologies.

In light of the WTO emphasis on the use of science to determine equivalence, a number of countries are moving toward implementation of HACCP

HACCP and the related near-term initiatives proposed in this document represent science-based regulation.