



# LPA QA Program

## (Incorporating Cattlecare and Flockcare)

### Core Module

### Internal Audit Report and Checklist

The **Internal Audit Report** should be used by the producer to ensure all relevant requirements of the LPA QA Standards are met **prior** to engaging an auditor for an accreditation audit and/or annual surveillance audits.

The Internal Audit Report should be used to reflect the internal audit activities and if required, multiple reports may be used to cover the activities used in the checklist

#### ***How to Use Internal Audit Report and Checklist***

**Example 1:**

A complete internal audit is conducted of all the elements at the same time, and the producer completes a single Internal Audit Report. The producer uses the attached checklist to show what the audit covered. A Corrective Action Report (CAR) form is completed for each identified non-conformance.

**Example 2:**

Internal audit activities are completed over several sessions; the producer completes an Internal Audit Report for each session. The producer uses the attached checklist to show what the audits covered (ie a single checklist is used to show all elements of the standard are reviewed over a number of sessions). A Corrective Action Report (CAR) form is completed for each identified non-conformance.



# CORRECTIVE ACTION REPORT (CAR)

*Copy this form if more than one CAR is identified during each audit session*

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Corrective Action Report No:</b>	
<b>Area/Activity:</b>		
<b>Details of the Incident or Non-Compliance:</b> (what happened?)		
<b>Incident or Non-Compliance Review:</b> (What was the cause?)		
<b>Corrective action:</b> (what will be done to rectify the situation?)		
Name:	Date:	Signed:
<b>Verification of corrective action and comments:</b> (has the action above been taken?)		
Name:	Close out date:	Signed:
<b>Preventive action:</b> (what action will be taken to prevent the same thing happening again?)		
Verified by: Name	Date:	Signed:

# LPA QA Internal Audit Checklist

## FOOD SAFETY MODULE

<b>ELEMENT FS1: PROPERTY RISK ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On Farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risk of livestock being exposed to sites that are unacceptably contaminated with organochlorine or other persistent chemicals.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>FS1.1</b>	<b>All potentially contaminated sites have been identified.</b>		
<b>FS1.2</b>	<b>All identified sites are managed to restrict access of livestock to prevent exposure and contamination.</b>		
<b>FS1.3</b>	<b>Potentially exposed animals are identified and managed in a manner to minimise the risk of contamination of livestock intended for human consumption in accordance with relevant legal requirements.</b>		

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>FS1.1</b> Has the enterprise completed a risk assessment to identify if there are any sites on your property that may have been contaminated with organochlorines or other persistent chemicals with the potential to result in unacceptable chemical residues in livestock?				
<b>FS1.2</b> Has the risk assessment process considered prior land use including agricultural activities, old dip sites, old rubbish sites, treatment of power poles, adjacent enterprise activities and the relevance of any existing contamination to each current livestock and agricultural activity undertaken?				
<b>FS1.3</b> Are sufficient records available to enable the enterprise to demonstrate the process undertaken to complete the risk assessment? This might include (where appropriate) letters from relevant authorities or soil test results				
<b>FS1.4</b> Does the risk assessment adequately relate to the enterprise's current activities including any changes to activities over time such as lotfeeding?				
<b>FS1.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all contaminated sites/facilities been identified and recorded, for example location of old dip sites on a farm map?				
<b>FS1.6</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that contaminated sites are responsibly managed eg. Can livestock gain access to any contaminated sites and if so, have management practices been put in place to stop this occurring?				
<b>FS1.7</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that any persistent chemicals on the farm are stored and disposed of in a manner to prevent risk of exposure to livestock eg chemicals are stored in a secure manner? Where available, producers should utilise industry programs such as ChemClear and DrumMuster to dispose of unwanted chemicals and empty chemical containers				
<b>FS1.8</b> Where a feedlot is on-site, can the enterprise demonstrate that the risk assessment conducted is sufficient to ensure that the feedlot is not established on a contaminated site (eg. soils test or animal fat test results)? <i>Note: A feedlot is defined as a confined yard area with watering and feeding facilities where cattle are completely hand or mechanically fed for the purposes of production.</i>				

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>FS1.9</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that sufficient records are maintained to enable traceability of livestock exposed to chemical residues?  For example records could include: Exposure date; Animal ID, ID Method, description of contaminant to which the livestock were exposed, WHP/ESI and date eligible for sale.				
<b>FS1.10</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>FS2 SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENTS</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>OUTCOME: On Farm systems have been implemented to ensure that animal treatments are stored and administered in a safe and responsible manner to minimise the risk of chemical residues and physical hazards in livestock intended for human consumption.</b>	
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>		
<b>FS2.1</b>	<b>Animal treatments are administered only by trained and competent staff in accordance with label and/or written veterinary directions and relevant legal requirements.</b>	
<b>FS2.2</b>	<b>Chemicals are stored securely in accordance with label/manufacturers' directions, to prevent exposure to livestock.</b>	
<b>FS2.3</b>	<b>Sufficient systems &amp; records are maintained to enable, the traceability of the status of treated livestock, including introduced livestock, with respect to relevant WHP/ESI to be demonstrated.</b>	
<b>FS2.4</b>	<b>Sufficient records and systems are maintained to enable the traceability of livestock that may have been exposed to physical contaminants.</b>	

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>PC FS2.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all veterinary chemical application and handling is conducted by trained and competent persons eg persons applying or handling chemicals either hold or are under the supervision of a person/s with a chemical user's certificate?				
<b>PC FS2.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the intended use, application method and dose rates of veterinary chemicals are understood prior to use eg. by ensuring that chemical labels are read prior to use and that chemicals are applied in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?				
<b>PC FS2.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that equipment used to administer or measure veterinary chemicals delivers the correct dose eg equipment is calibrated and checked for operational efficiency prior to use and thoroughly cleaned after use?				
<b>PC FS2.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that only approved veterinary chemicals are used to ensure that livestock receive the appropriate treatment eg chemicals are approved by the national chemical registration body (APVMA)?				
<b>PC FS2.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all chemicals are used in accordance with label directions eg. where chemicals are used in an extra-label manner that written directions are available from the veterinarian?				
<b>PC FS2.6</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the administration site of all veterinary chemical injections takes into consideration the relative value of the meat cut eg. injections are administered into the neck region unless they are site specific?				
<b>PC FS2.7</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that injection site damage is minimised in all livestock eg ensuring that no more than 10 ml of intramuscular injection is administered in any one site, with the exception of those that are site specific?				

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>PC FS2.8</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that adverse reactions to chemicals are monitored to minimise the risk of unknown chemical residues eg adverse reactions of livestock to veterinary chemical treatments are recorded?				
<b>PC FS2.9</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that sufficient records of veterinary chemical treatments are maintained to ensure that the treatment status of livestock can be evaluated prior to shipment? For example records could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Treatment date</li> <li>- Animal/mob ID</li> <li>- Chemical/drug used</li> <li>- Dosage</li> <li>- Withholding Period (WHP) and/or Export Slaughter Interval (ESI)</li> <li>- Date of expiry of the WHP and/or ESI</li> <li>- Batch Number and Expiry Date</li> </ul>				
<b>PC FS2.10</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock knowingly exposed to physical contaminants are permanently identified to maintain traceability eg in the event that a broken needle remains in an animal after treatment, that the animal is permanently identified?				
<b>PC FS2.11</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a current WHP and/or ESI chart is available for reference when completing treatment records?				
<b>PC FS2.12</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that management practices minimise the risk of providing incorrect information at point of sale in relation to chemical status of livestock eg. treated livestock and/or animals all treated and/or contaminated livestock are identified and/or segregated for the duration of the WHP and/or ESI and records are available to demonstrate that all livestock of unknown residue status are identified and evaluated?				
<b>PC FS2.13</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where WHP and/or ESI information is not available on a chemical label, that additional enquiries are made with the chemical manufacturer, Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) and/or other relevant authority, to determine the WHP and/or ESI that needs to be applied to that chemical?				
<b>PC FS2.14</b> Where livestock are sold by direct consignment, can the enterprise demonstrate that the WHP and ESI status of treated livestock is provided to the purchaser to ensure that livestock are not processed for human consumption whilst within a WHP/ESI eg where livestock are sold by direct consignment to another producer whilst within a WHP and/or ESI, the buyer should be advised in writing details of the treatment, the relevant WHP and/or ESI and the date on which the WHP and/or ESI expires. The NVD can be used for this purpose.				
<b>PC FS2.15</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where cattle have been transported and require tick treatment to cross tick lines, that treatment information is provided to the receiver of the livestock to minimise the risk of unknown chemical residues eg the purchaser is advised of treatment details in writing including WHP/ESI periods?				
<b>PC FS2.16</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all veterinary chemicals are stored securely (the minimum definition of secure is childproof) and according to manufacturer's directions?				
<b>PC FS2.17</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>FS3 FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On Farm systems have been implemented to manage the exposure of livestock to foods containing unacceptable chemical contamination to minimise the risk of chemical residues in livestock and to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock intended for human consumption.</b>		

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:	
<b>FS3.1</b>	<b>Agricultural chemicals are applied to fodder crops, grain and pasture only by trained and competent staff in accordance with label directions and/or relevant approvals in accordance with relevant legal requirements.</b>
<b>FS3.2</b>	<b>Chemicals are stored securely in accordance with label/manufacturers directions, to prevent exposure to livestock.</b>
<b>FS3.3</b>	<b>Exposure of animals to fodder crops, grain and pasture, and introduced stock feed that have been treated with or exposed to agricultural chemicals is managed to minimise the risk of unacceptable chemical residues in livestock for human consumption.</b>
<b>FS3.4</b>	<b>Sufficient records are maintained to enable the traceability of the status of fodder crops, grain and pasture, and introduced stock feed intended to be fed to livestock with respect to relevant WHP/ESI from slaughter or grazing/harvest as applicable and to enable the correct/controlled use of chemicals to be demonstrated.</b>
<b>FS3.5</b>	<b>Sufficient records are maintained to enable the traceability of the status of exposed livestock, including introduced livestock, with respect to relevant WHP/ESI or other contaminants.</b>
<b>FS3.6</b>	<b>Exposure of animals to stock feed is managed to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock, with the exception of approved exemptions.</b>

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>FS3.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that treated paddock areas and any contaminated sites/facilities been identified and recorded, for example location of old rubbish sites on a farm map?				
<b>FS3.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all agricultural chemical application and handling is conducted by trained and competent persons eg. persons applying or handling chemicals either hold or are under the supervision of a person/s with a chemical user's certificate?				
<b>FS3.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that equipment used to apply or measure agricultural chemicals delivers the correct application rate eg. equipment is calibrated and checked for operational efficiency prior to use and thoroughly cleaned after use?				
<b>FS3.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that only approved agricultural chemicals are used for the treatment of pasture, crops, fodder and grain to ensure that livestock are not exposed to unacceptable chemical residues eg. chemicals are approved by the national chemical registration body (APVMA)?				
<b>FS3.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that agricultural chemicals are used in accordance with label directions eg. • according to label directions;• below label rates where permitted by relevant legislation; or • under off-label permits issued by the Australian Pesticide & Veterinary Medicines Authority (AP&VMA)?				
<b>FS3.6</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where WHP and/or ESI information is not available on a chemical label, that additional enquiries are made with the chemical manufacturer, Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) and/or other relevant authority, to determine the WHP and/or ESI that needs to be applied to that chemical?				
<b>FS3.7</b> Does the enterprise maintain sufficient records of agricultural chemical treatments (including spray drift) to ensure that the chemical residue status of pastures. crops and post-harvest product and facilities can be evaluated prior to exposure to livestock. For example records could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treatment date</li> <li>• Location/Size/Quantity of feed treated</li> <li>• Chemical used - type and quantity</li> <li>• Application rate and method</li> <li>• Withholding period</li> <li>• Name of person conducting treatment</li> </ul>				

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>FS3.8</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all introduced stockfeed is evaluated for chemical residue risk prior to feeding to livestock eg. does the enterprise require all introduced stockfeeds to be accompanied by a Commodity Vendor Declaration (CVD) or other statement indicating that that the risk of spray drift contamination and/or the risk of OC contaminated soil has been addressed?				
<b>FS3.9</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that records of introduced stockfeeds are maintained to enable traceback in the event that chemical residues are detected in the introduced feed? eg. records enabling traceback include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date received</li> <li>• Stockfeed description</li> <li>• Supplier/origin</li> <li>• Residue analysis (if obtained)</li> <li>• Mobs fed and</li> <li>• Period of feeding</li> </ul>				
<b>FS3.10</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that stockfeeds of known unacceptable chemical contaminants (above APVMA standards) are not fed to livestock? This may include test analysis results of stockfeeds if appropriate.				
<b>FS3.11</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock do not have access to paddocks treated with chemicals prior to the expiry of the grazing withholding period eg. is a system in place of securing treated paddocks and identifying treated paddocks with signs?				
<b>FS3.12</b> Can the enterprise show that in the event that livestock have accessed treated paddocks that they are managed to address risk of residue contamination eg. by meeting the relevant withholding period (WHP) or Export Slaughter Interval (ESI) period?				
<b>FS3.13</b> Does the enterprise have a system in place for ensuring that withholding periods are observed where storage facilities and/or post-harvest product have been treated with insecticides, fungicides or other chemicals prior to feeding to livestock? For example this may be achieved by ensuring that facilities and treated product is identified by signage.				
<b>FS3.14</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that sufficient records are maintained to enable traceability of livestock exposed to chemical residues. For example records could include: Exposure date; Animal ID, ID Method, description of contaminant to which the livestock were exposed, WHP/ESI and date eligible for sale.				
<b>FS3.15</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that ruminant livestock are not fed or have access to feed containing animal products with the exception of exemptions that may be applied from time to time by statutory authorities? Current exemptions include tallow, gelatin, milk and milk products of Australian origin. This may be achieved by ensuring that the enterprise does not purchase product that may contain animal products or by keeping records of feed fed to other species.				
<b>FS3.16</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all agricultural chemicals are stored securely (the minimum definition of secure is childproof) and according to manufacturer's directions?				
<b>FS3.17</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>FS4 PREPARATION FOR DISPATCH OF LIVESTOCK</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On Farm systems have been implemented to ensure that the selected livestock are fit for transport and that the risk of stress and contamination of livestock during assembly and transport is minimised.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>FS4.1</b>	<b>Only animals that are in a condition fit for travel are selected, to minimise potential disease and/or contamination related to transport conditions.</b>		
<b>FS4.2</b>	<b>On farm assembly practices and transport arrangements are managed to minimise the risk of stress and contamination of animals.</b>		

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>FS4.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the risk of stress associated with transport is minimised by ensuring that only those livestock that are fit for travel are transported?				
<b>FS4.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the potential for contamination of livestock is minimised during transport? This may be achieved by implementing the following practices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensuring that the construction of upper decks minimises soiling of cattle on lower decks;</li> <li>ensuring that decks are as clean as practicable before loading;</li> <li>ensuring that Cattle destined for slaughter are subjected to a minimum six (6) hour pre-consignment curfew, unless specified otherwise by the customer;</li> <li>ensuring that Sheep/Goats destined for slaughter are subjected to a minimum twelve (12) hour dry curfew, unless specified otherwise by the customer?</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Consideration should also be given to transport requirements as outlined in the Model Code of Practice Welfare of Animals: Land Transport of Cattle and/or Sheep as applicable.</i></p>				
<b>FS4.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that transporters are selected to minimise stress during transport eg. preference is given to the engagement of livestock transport operators that transport livestock in accordance with recognised quality assurance programs?				
<b>FS4.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that feedback/complaints from processors/purchasers in relation to excessive soiling of livestock are investigated to prevent reoccurrence? This might include records of feedback/complaints and details of steps implemented to address the issue.				
<b>FS4.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>FS5 LIVESTOCK TRANSACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented to enable traceability of the current status of all livestock with respect to treatment or exposure to relevant food safety hazards for all livestock movements between livestock production enterprises including to slaughter and live export.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>FS5.1</b>	<b>All livestock transactions and movements including between properties (Property Identification Codes) are accompanied by a current, correctly completed LPA National Vendor Declaration (NVD).</b>		
<b>FS5.2</b>	<b>Sufficient records are maintained to enable the declarations on an accompanying LPA NVD concerning the food safety related status of livestock introduced to and dispatched from the property to be reconciled with the livestock traceability system adopted.</b>		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>FS 5.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all introduced livestock transactions and movements are accompanied by a correctly and fully completed LPA NVD to enable the traceability of the status of livestock in relation to chemical residue and disease (Food Safety hazards) by retaining records of NVDs?				
<b>FS 5.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all LPA NVDs are completed accurately and signed to ensure the integrity of the paddock to plate food safety chain. This can be achieved through the retention of records and being able to accurately complete NVDs?				
<b>FS 5.3.</b> Are sufficient records maintained to enable the enterprise to demonstrate the traceability of stock purchased/introduced onto the property with respect to chemical treatment status? Records should include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date of purchase/introduction</li> <li>• Vendor's name and address or property identification code (PIC)</li> <li>• Description of livestock (number, age, sex, management group)</li> <li>• Name of selling agent and sale (if purchased at through an agent)</li> </ul>				
<b>FS 5.4</b> Are sufficient records maintained to enable the enterprise to demonstrate that stock dispatched for sale or slaughter can be traced that include the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of livestock (number, age, sex)</li> <li>• Transaction date</li> <li>• Name of purchaser/selling agent</li> <li>• Name of transport operator and vehicle registration</li> </ul>				
<b>FS 5.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the current food safety status of livestock, in regards to chemical residues and the ruminant feed ban, is reviewed prior to sale or slaughter enabling traceability				
<b>FS 5.6.</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate where livestock have been sold within a WHP/ESI, that the buyer was advised in writing of the corresponding WHP/ESI and the associated date that the WHP/ESI will elapse? For example retained LPA NVDs or written correspondence.				
<b>FS7.7</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock traceability system adopted identifies all livestock that have been exposed to chemical residues? Identification may be individual or mob based systems. NLIS is an example of a suitable identification system.				
<b>FS 5.8</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

# SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT MODULE

<b>SM1 TRAINING</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	On farm systems have been implemented that enable staff to be adequately trained to ensure they have the appropriate skills and knowledge to competently perform the duties required of them by the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards.		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>SM1.1</b>	Job descriptions and responsibilities for all staff members are documented.		
<b>SM1.2</b>	All staff have appropriate training in the requirements of the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards and other relevant industry code of practice requirements and that suitable records of this training are maintained.		
<b>SM1.3</b>	Staff involved in the supervision of the use of farm chemicals have sufficient skills and knowledge to ensure their safe and responsible use and have undertaken recognised chemical user training equivalent to level 3 competency units; “Prepare and Apply Chemicals” and “Transport, Handle and Store Chemicals”.		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	YES	NO	N/A	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>SM1.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that job responsibilities of staff, including family members working on the property/in the business are documented?				
<b>SM1.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that it has provided training, including on the job training, to staff in the areas of their responsibility including relevant industry Codes of Practice?				
<b>SM1.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that it has maintained records of staff training?				
<b>SM1.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all staff involved in the supervision of the use of farm chemicals have undertaken recognised chemical user training equivalent to level 3 competency units; “Prepare and Apply Chemicals” and “Transport, Handle and Store Chemicals or equivalent?”				
<b>SM1.5</b> Does the enterprise maintain a register of staff authorised to use farm chemicals including clearly defined limits to their authorisation?				
<b>SM1.6</b> Does the enterprise display a register of staff authorised to use farm chemicals in the farm chemical storage area?				
<b>SM1.7</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>SM2 INTERNAL AUDITING AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented that ensure periodic internal audits are performed to review ongoing compliance of the enterprise's activities to the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards and that appropriate corrective and preventative actions are undertaken when non-conformances are identified.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>SM2.1</b>	<b>Internal audits are performed on procedures, records and property facilities at least once per annum.</b>		
<b>SM2.2</b>	<b>Internal audit/Inspection reports are documented.</b>		
<b>SM2.3</b>	<b>Identified non-conformances and opportunities for improvement (including complaints) are documented and reviewed and details of corrective actions recorded.</b>		
<b>SM2.4</b>	<b>Preventative action is taken to prevent any similar problem occurring.</b>		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>SM2.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that periodic internal audits of all activities, records and procedures covered by the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards are conducted at least once per annum?				
<b>SM2.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that an Internal Audit Report is completed for each internal audit activity?				
<b>SM2.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that non-conformances and opportunities for improvement are documented when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A defect or mistake is identified during an internal audit, or by an external auditor/assessor?</li> <li>• A defect or mistake is identified during routine on-farm activities, which cannot be rectified that day?</li> <li>• A complaint is received in relation to the enterprise's product and/or production practices? (For example where a complaint is received from a customer (processor) in relation to bruising and hide damage.)</li> <li>• An adverse reaction to a chemical or an unexpected treatment failure has occurred?</li> <li>• Product is identified as being potentially contaminated?</li> </ul>				
<b>SM2.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the records of non-conformances and/or opportunities for improvement include the following information, thereby providing a mechanism for continuous improvement? Note: a Corrective Action Report (CAR) form can be used for this purpose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A description of the problem?</li> <li>• What caused the problem?</li> <li>• What can be done to fix the problem?</li> <li>• Verification that the problem has been fixed and where applicable.</li> </ul>				
<b>SM2.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a customer (purchaser) is notified when product that has been sold is identified as being contaminated or potentially contaminated and are records of that notification maintained?				
<b>SM2.6</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>SM3 QUALITY RECORDS</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented that ensure records are kept that provide documented evidence of the enterprise's compliance to the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards and that these records are presented in a format that is easily reviewed.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>SM3.1</b>	<b>Complete, legible and accurate records are maintained and retained for a sufficient period of time to facilitate historical reference.</b>		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>SM3.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that legible records and documentation as referred to in the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards is maintained?				
<b>SM3.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that quality records are retained for the period of time specified on the Record Register?				
<b>SM3.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>SM4 DOCUMENT CONTROL</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems ensure that all documents relevant to the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards are controlled enabling the review of their currency so that out of date or superseded documents are withdrawn and replaced with the new version.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>SM4.1</b>	<b>All quality system documentation is controlled to ensure that only current documents are in use.</b>		
<b>SM4.2</b>	<b>All documentation in use by the enterprise accurately reflects current management practices and procedures.</b>		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>SM4.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a list of all controlled documents is maintained which identifies the documents issue date, the number of documents in circulation and where they are stored?				
<b>SM4.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the list of controlled documents includes details of the Modules of the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards to which they are accredited?				
<b>SM4.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that out of date copies of documents are removed and replaced with current issues?				
<b>SM4.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

**SM5 CHEMICAL INVENTORY**

Date Element Audited:

**OUTCOME:** On farm systems ensure that an accurate inventory of all chemicals purchased and stored on the enterprise is maintained at all times.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:**

**SM5.1** Sufficient records are maintained to enable the traceability of the purchase, storage, handling and disposal of chemicals.

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<p><b>SM5.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a record keeping (farm chemical inventory) system is maintained that provides information on chemical purchases, use and disposals and that the following records are maintained for all chemicals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• date received;</li> <li>• batch number;</li> <li>• place of purchase;</li> <li>• name of chemical;</li> <li>• quantity; and</li> <li>• date of manufacture or expiry date if provided?</li> </ul>				
<p><b>SM5.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the accuracy of the inventory is reviewed by conducting physical stocktakes on annual basis for agricultural chemicals and every six months for veterinary chemicals and that any products with illegible labels, expired use-by dates, and leaking or corroded containers are no longer useable are identified and segregated for subsequent disposal? Where available, producers should utilise industry programs such as ChemClear and DrumMuster to dispose of unwanted chemicals and empty chemical containers. Records should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the date of the stocktake;</li> <li>• the name of the person/s who carried out the stocktake;</li> </ul>				
<p><b>SM5.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that records of chemical disposal are maintained in a Farm Chemicals Inventory or equivalent system including details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• chemicals that have been disposed;</li> <li>• the method of disposal; and</li> <li>• name of the person/s who carried out or supervised the disposal of chemicals.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>SM5.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?</p>				

# LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT MODULE

<b>LM1 LIVESTOCK HUSBANDRY AND PRESENTATION</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented to demonstrate that husbandry practices ensure livestock are presented for sale or slaughter in a manner that minimises damage to carcase, hide and skin quality attributes.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>LM1.1</b>	<b>Livestock husbandry and management practices minimise the risk of bruising, hide and skin damage with consideration to husbandry practices such as horn length, vaccination sites, brand application, mulesing and grass seed contamination.</b>		

<i>Checklist Items</i>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<i>Audit Comment</i>
<b>LM1.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the use of electric prodders, flappers and coaxing aids are used sparingly and that lengths of heavy plastic pipe, lengths of timber or steel posts are not used as coaxing aids?				
<b>LM1.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that lead shot is not used as an aid to mustering, or any other purpose connected with livestock?				
<b>LM1.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that dogs are controlled at all times and muzzled if necessary to eliminate carcase and skin damage caused by excessive force and/or dog bites?				
<b>CATTLE</b>				
<b>LM1.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that calves are dehorned before 12 months of age, or, if sold before 12 months of age, that dehorning takes place at least one month prior to sale (Where calves are less than six months old, unmarked and sold as part of a "cow with calf at foot" unit the requirement to dehorn prior to sale is waived)?				
<b>LM1.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the maximum allowable regrowth on previously dehorned animals is no greater than 10cm, and blunt or flat on the end and that where otherwise, that the animal is not be eligible to be sold as conforming product?				
<b>LM1.6.</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that fire brands and freeze brands are as small as possible and positioned close to the centre line of the body consistent with State/Territory regulations, and in the case of butt brands that these are placed close to the tail head?				
<b>LM1.7</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where fire branding is required, that it is conducted at least three (3) weeks before cattle are transported for sale or slaughter or if less than three weeks, that the purchaser is notified in writing?				
<b>SHEEP</b>				
<b>LM1.8</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where mulesing is carried out on sheep that it is kept as light as possible to help minimise carcase adhesions and tearing during hide pulling?				
<b>LM1.9</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all sheep bred on the property to be held beyond 12 months of age, and introduced sheep purchased prior to their second shearing, are vaccinated for CLA according to recognised industry guidelines unless it is possible to demonstrate that the incidence of CLA in sheep raised on the property is less than 5%? Such demonstration shall consist of a written statement from a processor that a slaughter sample of at least 50 adult sheep has been examined, and the incidence of CLA was found to be less than 5%.				
<b>LM1.10</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate strategies are implemented to minimise damage to skins and meat by grass seeds?				
<b>LM1.11</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where wool brands, raddles and other markers are used, that they are applied where damage to wool is minimal (e.g. on ears and head) and only				

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
products which are fully scourable and registered for such use are used?				
<b>LM1.12</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that sheep and lambs being prepared for transportation are not lifted or pulled by their wool?				
<b>LM1.13</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate procedures are implemented to minimise dags, faeces and urine stain on sheep or lambs consigned for sale or slaughter?				
<b>LM1.14</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>LM2 LIVESTOCK HANDLING FACILITIES</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that livestock handling and loading activities minimise livestock injury, bruising and hide damage.</b>	
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>		
<b>LM2.1</b>	<b>Livestock handling facilities are constructed and maintained to assist handling and minimise livestock injury, bruising, hide and skin damage.</b>	
<b>LM2.2</b>	<b>Livestock handling activities are conducted by competent staff.</b>	

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>LM2.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock yards, handling and loading facilities are designed, constructed and maintained in a manner so as to prevent livestock slipping, minimise bruising, injury to livestock and hide/skin contamination with mud and faeces?				
<b>LM2.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that yards are maintained in accordance with the following principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>laneways and yards shall be free of protruding objects likely to cause injury or bruising;</li> <li>loading ramps shall be wide enough to allow for the hips of adult animals;</li> <li>filler boards or flaps shall be used to cover any gap between the loading ramp and the floor of the stock crate;</li> <li>inner rails shall be smooth, with no sharp projections in rails, posts, gateways, or holding yards which may injure animals;</li> <li>watering facilities shall be provided in pens where animals are likely to be held for more than 24 hours;</li> <li>yards, gates and handling equipment shall be maintained in good repair;</li> <li>chronic boggy areas shall be filled with gravel if permanent solution to the problem is not possible, or temporary yards used.</li> </ul>				
<b>LM2.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that yards are managed to minimise contamination with dust?				
<b>LM2.4</b> Does the enterprise undertake a detailed inspection of all livestock handling yards at least once per annum?				
<b>LM2.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>LM3 LIVESTOCK TRANSPORT</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that the risk of injury, bruising, hide and skin damage during transportation of stock is minimised.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>LM3.1</b>	<b>Stock crates utilised for transporting livestock are designed and maintained to prevent injury and bruising to livestock during loading, unloading and transport activities.</b>		
<b>LM3.2</b>	<b>Livestock transport operators utilised by an enterprise are competent and comply with relevant legislation and industry codes of practice.</b>		
<b>LM3.3</b>	<b>Livestock loading densities, food and water allowances and rest stops (including visual inspections) are appropriate for the type and class of animal being transported, seasonal conditions and required transport journey.</b>		

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>LM3.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that stock crates are inspected prior to loading to ensure the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That decks on the stock crate are free of sharp edges or projections capable of injuring animals;</li> <li>• Side rails are designed to prevent animals placing their legs and heads between them;</li> <li>• Stock crate floors shall be of non-slip material without holes large enough to injure hooves or legs;</li> <li>• Hinges and latches of stock crate gates/gateways shall not project onto the path of animals.</li> <li>• Deck-height design of multi-deck stock crates is sufficient to allow animals to stand upright without contacting overhead structures;</li> <li>• Safety devices are in place to restrain livestock once loading gate is opened?</li> </ul>				
<b>LM3.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that stocking densities take into consideration truck weight limits and that loading density is adjusted and ventilation increased in periods of hot weather?				
<b>LM3.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that transport service providers (including producers transporting own livestock) operate in accordance with the principles of relevant codes of practice including the Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals: Land Transport?				
<b>LM3.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock are segregated during transport to ensure like animal types are transported together? For example horned cattle are segregated from de-horned (polled), bulls segregated from cows/heifers and/or in accordance with customer requirements?				
<b>LM3.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that where livestock are not able to be segregated in accordance with customer requirements that the customer is notified?				
<b>LM3.6</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>LM4 ANIMAL WELFARE</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	On farm systems have been implemented to ensure the welfare of livestock is not compromised whilst within the control of persons responsible for their care and well being, and to ensure that prompt and appropriate remedial action is taken when required.		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>LM4.1</b>	A Duty of Care statement shall be developed to demonstrate management commitment to the welfare of animals.		
<b>LM4.2</b>	The Duty of Care statement shall describe actions that will be carried out to ensure that the welfare of livestock is maintained at all times.		
<b>LM4.3</b>	<b>CATTLE</b> A current copy of the Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals: Cattle shall be kept as a reference and staff involved with cattle husbandry shall be familiar with its contents.		
<b>LM4.4</b>	<b>SHEEP</b> A current copy of the Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals: Sheep shall be kept as a reference and staff involved with sheep husbandry shall be familiar with its contents.		

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>LM4.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a Animal Welfare Duty of care Statement has been developed to show the commitment of management to animal welfare?				
<b>LM4.2</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that the designated management actions within the Duty of Care Statement are implemented to ensure that the undertakings of the Duty of Care Statement are met?				
<b>LM4.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that a copy of the current Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals (Cattle) is on hand?				
<b>LM4.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that all staff involved with livestock (Cattle) husbandry are familiar with the contents and requirements of the Code of Practice?				
<b>LM4.5</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and performance indicators for this element have been met?				

<b>LM5 ACCREDITED LIVESTOCK</b>		<b>Date Element Audited:</b>	
<b>OUTCOME:</b>	<b>On farm systems have been implemented to demonstrate that all livestock sold as being produced in accordance with the LPA On-Farm Quality Assurance Standards meet defined eligibility criteria.</b>		
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:</b>			
<b>LM5.1</b>	<b>All livestock sold as conforming product originated from the LPA QA accredited property meet the defined criteria.</b>		
<b>LM5.2</b>	<b>Livestock identification system implemented on the property maintains the traceability of the conforming product status of livestock at all times.</b>		
<b>LM5.3</b>	<b>Management records of the eligibility status of conforming product are maintained</b>		

<b>Checklist Items</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Audit Comment</b>
<b>Conforming Product Eligibility Criteria</b>  <b>CATTLE</b> (a) cattle are purchased from a Cattlecare accredited property as conforming product; or (b) cattle are purchased from a non-Cattlecare accredited property and have been held on the accredited Cattlecare property for a minimum of 42 days where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they were accompanied by an LPA NVD; and</li> <li>• the answer to Question 5 of the LPA NVD was "No"; or</li> <li>• the property T status classification is identified on the LPA NVD or a statement has been obtained from the appropriate state authority responsible for the management of the NORM program that there is sufficient information available on a "T1" listed property or a particular consignment of cattle derived from a "T1" property to allow any test requirement to be waived.</li> </ul> <b>SHEEP</b> (d) sheep have been held on the property for a period exceeding 100 days, and have been vaccinated for CLA according to industry recognised guidelines; or (e) sheep are purchased from an accredited Flockcare property as conforming product.				
<b>LM5.1</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that introduced livestock are identified within seven (7) days of arrival onto the property?				
<b>LM5.2</b> Are sufficient records maintained to enable the enterprise to demonstrate the traceability of stock purchased/introduced onto the property with respect to the Cattlecare and/or Flockcare accreditation status of the property of origin?				
<b>LM5.3</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that cattle bred on the property are identified no later than weaning?				
<b>LM5.4</b> Can the enterprise demonstrate that sheep bred on the property that are held beyond 12 months of age are permanently identified?				

END