		Organisation Details						
Organisation	n	General Mills, Inc.						
Registered Legal Name (if d			NA	<u>. </u>			+	
Site Registration N			NA NA				=	
Address	10111001		54 S Michigan A	ve			1	
City			Buffalo, New Yo				7	
Postcode			14203				7	
Country			United States				7	
Client Represen	tative	Craig Siebert	E-mail	craiç	ı.siebert@gen	mills.com		
Site Food Safety Tea	am Leader	Craig Siebert	E-mail	craiç	ı.siebert@gen	mills.com]	
			_					
CB Name and Lo		SGS United Kingdom Ltd						
Accreditation B		UKAS]					
Audit Langua	ge	English						
A 194 T		0 - 111 1		1				
Audit Type		Surveillance - Ann						
Audit Complex	xity	Standalone	9					
Additional Standards include	ded in this audit							
				ı				
Audit Team								.
Auditor Number	First Name	Last Name	Role	FCC	Date	Hours	Minutes	
588	Karen	Javier	Lead auditor		15/01/2020			
588	Karen	Javier	Lead auditor		16/01/2020			
116	Eunice	Quak	Lead auditor			8		
116	Eunice	Quak	Lead auditor		22/07/2020	8		
								l
Deviation from audit plan?		No						
Deviation from Audit Plannin	g Matrix?	No						
		To determine the CO			-f.4 - 10	t and the decision of the	4	
		To determine conformity of the	management system	i, or parts	of it with audi	criteria and i	เร:	
Audit Objectiv	/es	- ability to ensure applicable	e statutory, regulatory	and cont	ractual require	ements are m	et.	
riddii Objeciii		- effectiveness to ensure th						
		- ability to identify as applica				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	•	
		ISO22000:2018, relevant PRP	<u> </u>			ufacturing) a	nd FSSC a	dditional requirements
A 1'' O''		The defined processes and doo						
Audit Criteri	d	Statutory/regulatory requiremen						
		Customer requirements (as app						
		Head office activities as follows						
		(including service providers); de						
Audit Scope	Э	selection, customer complaints	-	_				
		measures, food fraud and food	defence, labels, inte	mai audits				ereals packaged for retail
		development.			Site. The	wanulacture	or Pull Ce	sicals packaged for retail
		and bulk.						

Select Food Chain	Category and Sector

Exclusions

Scope verified?

Select Food Chain Category	and Sector							
CI CII CIII	✓ CIV	DI DIIa DIIb	<u>□</u>	□ GII	□ I			
Food Sector(s)	CIV						
Number of FTE	290	Number of shifts	1	Number of employee per shift	290 290	Number of HACCP studies	1	
Total time on-site (in hours)		1	6					
Deviation from planed audit t	ime?	No						

No

Yes

Previous audit details

Audit Type		Recertification	n				
Start Date	7/5/2019	End Date	9/5/2019				
Non-conformances raised at	previous audit						
have been closed?		Yes	No non-conformances raised for the head office at previous audit.				
Please decribe any changes :	since the	Generally, no significant chan	ges noted within the	ast twelve months for activities facilitated by the head office except that the			
previous audit		orgnaization has elated to transfer certification of all sites to SGS. site: no significant					
		change in term of process and OPRP. New Plant Manager and HR Manager joined on 2020. Organization chart was found					
				updated.			

Executive Summary

Executive Summary							
Audit Summary	Head office activities w	ere generally found to be in compliance with FSSC Ver 5 requirements. Site: The site has					
	implementedrobust PPR, HACCP program as intended. HACCP and PRP were established, implemented and executed as per						
	General Mill standard and FSMS. Robust verification program such as EMP, sanitation, calibration were implemented to verify the						
	effectiveness of system. Staffs were found competent to carry out the task. This is transfer audit from AIB. Total 5 findings were						
	raised in this audit.						
Please confirm that the audit objectives have	Yes						
been fulfilled	165						

Number of nonconformities

Critical Nonconformities	0
Major Nonconformities	0
Minor Nonconformities	Site: 5

Audit Recommendation Certification maintained

Summarise any recalls or withdrawals since the last audit:

Corporate: There were two reported recalls that occurred over the last twelve months: January 2019 – Gold Medal Unbleached Flour# 5 – Salmonella and September 2019 – Gold Medal Unbleached Flour# 5 06Sep2020 – E. coli. Recall procedures were executed as per FDA guidelines and effectiveness was reviewed during the audit. Previous certification body was also notified. Recovery is 100%. site: No recall or withdrawal reported.

Legal compliance evaluation, statutory, regulatory and other requirements:

Scientific and regulatory affairs handled by General Mills Inc.'s Innovation, Technology and Quality division. All regions of distribution, manufcature and sale have been taken into account. Site registration and compliance are to be further verified during individual site audits. site: FSMA, FDA Bioterrorism

Use of logos

Corporate and Site: The organization does not use the FSSC logo or certification mark in any form.

Key processing steps and Control measures:

During the audit the control of the following key processing steps and operational prerequisite programs (oPRPs) and CCP(s) were verified. All oPRPs and CCP's should be

Control measure	Short description (process step)	Food safety hazards to be controlled	Monitoring procedure and critical limit	Verified during audit
OPRP (Metal detector control point)	Metal detector (bagging) for cereal retail packing line 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 Puff and Chex bulk pack	metallic foreign hazard	Control limit for line 6, 9, 10, 11, 12: 1.5mm Ferrous, 2mm non ferrous, 2.4 mm SS. 1.5mm Fe, 2 mm NO Fe, All packing line 2mm SS, 1.2mm Fe, 1.5mm Non Fe Frequency: every 4 hours (twice per shift)Corrective action: hold till last	
OPPR (Bar code scanner control point)	packing line 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15	incorrect label (allergen)or	Frequency: every start up	Yes
	pasiting into 6, 6, 6, 10, 11, 12, 10	miori, oct idao i (dinoi gori) or		

Checklist	Section_nr	Section	Summary
	Section_nr		convenient meals, yagurt, ice cream and pet food intended for either retail or institutional distribution. The company has defined its purpose as to serve the world by making food people love. The company is 150 years old serving 100+ markets globally with net sales of about 16.9 B in 2019. There are 38,000 employees worldwide and is also considered as the second largest natural and organic manufacturer in the U.S. Identification of internal and external issues as well as needs and expectations of interested parties is handled by the organization's corporate communications team. Documented information retained on company Sharepoint. Interested parties include customers, consumers, employees, regulatory bodies, vendors, welfare groups and competitors among others. Internal and external issues looked into at the time of visit include those in relation to food safety and labour relations. Company position on these issues have been identified as well as relevant parties involved. (Reference document: Policy 1 – Product Regulatory Compliance) Site: Context of the organization Covered in HQ. Internal & external issue Covered in HQ. Action plan captured on section 6. Interested parties: Covered in HQ. Source of information identified in register of relevant parties P410 issue 1. Among the parties and source of information identified included legal (GMI legal affair), competitors (consumer insight site), Food fraud (GMI global security, food fraud prevention plan) Scope of certification: Scope was defined in HACCP program. The site produce Ready to eat Puff Cereals packaged for retail and bulk. Running 24 hours. Product produced included Cherlos, Honey Nut Cheerios, Banana nut. Total 4 processing lines. 8 for bagging line and 2 for bulk loading. HACCP studies: 1.
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	4	Context of the organization	The ITO Global CIF - Food Safety and Quality is headed by Iodi Renson, EVD Chief Innovation and Technology with Mark
			The ITQ Global CIE – Food Safety and Quality is headed by Jodi Benson, EVP Chief Innovation and Technology with Mark Fryling as the Vice President. They head a group of quality directors handling the following activities: Labelling and Regulatory Compliance, External Quality Management (Raw Materials and Packaging Materials), External Supply Chain (Co-Manufacturers), Food Safety Center of Excellence (Internal Audits, Sanitation, Hazard, Regulatory Compliance, Zero Lost Culture). For each segment of the business, quality directors are also assigned for meals, cereals and snacks, baking, dairy. On the corporate level, the following functions are also assigned: Raw Material Managers – ensure food safety and quality of raw materials, vendor management, inspection, approval and ongoing; Product Managers – ensure food safety and quality in all products in the business and acts as liason to all other functions; Specifications and Labelling – manage raw material and finished product specifications, ensure accurate labelling of finished products, Manufacturing roles were also defined as follows: FSQ Managers – manage all food safety, quality and regulatory operations within a manufacturing facility, manage quality engineers; Contract FSQ Managers – ensure all food safety, quality and regulatory operations for any contract plants, FSQ liason to contract plants; Quality Engineers – manage execution of FSQ programs within the facility, process, packaging raw materials and sensory. As per corporate policy, the organization shall ensures its products will meet or exceed all laws governing food safety, quality, labelling, manufacturing, distribution and sale. The policy has been signed by Mark Fryling, Vice President, ITQ Food Safety and Quality and was last revised March 1, 2018. Review is being conducted every three years. (Reference: CP 7 Food Safety and Regulatory Matters). The policy is available on Sharepoint and is communicated to site employees through the leadership team (e.g. policy calls, meetings, trainings). Site
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems		Leadership	Manager, Food Safety & Quality Manager and etc.
			defense assessment. Further, the head office (through the VCOE group) manages the food safety management system risk grid calibration based on the results of internal audit, external audit, microbiology and regulatory. A GMI Facility Risk Ranking Tool has been developed. Opportunities are considered as plant controllable risk and used to build improvement targets. Note that the risk ranking tool have been revised recently and 2020 has been considered as a baseline year. At the site level, a FSRA (Food Safety Regulatory Assessment) scorecard is being maintained. This is composed of three components: Self-assessment: inspections, verification, environmental monitoring, 4 Quarter Risk Reduction Plan and External Events (plant controllable events) such as recalls, withdrawals, results of audits, regulatory, etc. Objectives are monitored quarterly based on fiscal year. F2020 (June 2019 to May 2020) Corporate Scorecard for ITQ Food Safety and Quality as follows: 1. Zero recalls, financial impact of recalls below 5.3 MM USD 2. Zelant Risk Grid Improvement — Deploy risk grid across global finished product supply chain and establish baseline for future reduction 3. Zelf Supplier risk reduction for global ingredients 4. Zero loss culture — food safety, quality, culture, behavior 7. Zero loss culture — food safety, quality, culture, behavior 7. Zero loss culture — food safety, quality, culture, behavior 7. Zero loss culture — food safety, quality, culture, behavior 7. Zero loss culture — food Safety Regulatory Assessment) scorecard is being maintained. This is composed of three components: 1. Zero f-assessment: inspections, verification, environmental monitoring. 2. Zero Quarter Risk Reduction Plan 3. Zexternal Events (plant controllable events) such as recalls, withdrawals, results of audits, regulatory, etc. **Maximum points is 5. This tool has been made to assess how sites are able to manage these food safety risks.
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	6	Planning	- Use of this tool as well as the lisk reduction plants to be verified during the site dualt.
			Control of externally provided processes, products or services - Supplier management is a head office controlled function. An initial assessment on the material and supplying location through documentation is performed. Supplier surveys are sent out and assessment is made on the following parameters: regulatory compliance, product control, recall and traceability, third party audit, GMP and sanitation, transportation, product identity and labelling. HACCP, allergens, microbiological controls, thermal processing, ingredients, packaging and premiums, pesticide management, physical hazard detection and control, food defense, process controls, training and quality management. Third party audits and report are also sought as well as a copy of the supplier's process flow diagram/ CCP Matrix/ food safety plan and allergen plan. Most vendors are GFSI certificated (food contact suppliers) as the organization has a preference for these schemes. Supplier audits are completed based on site assessment made based on the material risk, facility risk and brand exposure. Once audits are completed, corrective actions are expected to be completed by the supplier. 3lo days are provided to suppliers for submit their responses. Maintenance audits range between 1 to 5 years based on risk assessment. As for supplier approvals in case of emergency, supplier are to provide the following information: Ingredient supplier survey and packaging survey, allergen statement, program, HACCP/ Food Safety Plan details, most recent third party audits, EMP review. The External Quality Management Director provides the final approval. Approved list of suppliers have been set-up in the system and accessible through Global PLM system. The same information is passed on to external manufacturers. Supplier nonconformances are tracked through the site as they are the receiving facilities. Sampled supplier documentation and qualification for the following: Ingredient Supplier 1 (Existing) – Milk Powders – Last audit was Nov 16, 2017. Supplier was audited De
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	7	Support	service between facilities. The laboratory has a valid ISO 17025 Accreditation valid until June 30, 2021. Warehousing - All

			was completed September 2017. Latest sign off was made for Michelle Sandy dated January 2, 2019. FSSC LAC was
			completed in 2008. Audit frequency is based on the risk grid. Latest audit plan was updated Nov 13, 2019. Head office audits consists of the following stages: Stage 1 – programs and documentation and Stage 2 – physical inspection of the
			plant and record review. Nonconformances classified as per G-GAP as of June 1, 2018 1. Dritical finding — corrective action due to 30 days, food safety or regulatory condition leading to likely contamination
			2. Pinding — corrective action due to 30 days, does not reach critical finding status but can lead to it 3. Observation — no formal corrective action needed
			All corrective actions are managed through G-GAP on which the lead auditor verifies. Plant submits the root cause analysis, action plans and evidences of actions. Verification is conducted on the next audit. All repeat findings are to be escalated to senior leadership team. Sampled VCOE audits conducted: Murf – October 2019, Winnipeg – August 2019. Sites are to
			manage their own internal audit programmes for both FSSC and GM policies and standards audit. An internal audit and verification schedule template is made available by the head office outlining all FSSC and GM policies and standards for
			sites to use. However, sites can opt to use their own templates as well as audit report formats. Corrective actions are documented using the corrective action tool.
			Management Review - Head office (ITQ) has last conducted its management review Spring of 2019 in connection with OGSM meetings. Each site is to hold their own management review. Sites usually conduct their management review at
			least annually. However, as per head office, the expectation for sites is that food safety and regulatory program verification shall occur on an annual basis and that annual gap analysis performed by the facility for the development of the 4Q Risk Management Plan. Site: 9.1.2 Analysis and evaluation
			Analysis was conducted on complaint case which further classified the complaint to reason, number of case. No significant trend was sighted. Data was compiled for EMP.
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	9	Performance evaluation	
			Each site is expected to execute continual improvements activities based on the results of the food safety regulatory assessment. S <u>ite:</u> During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NA05) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	10	Improvement	
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	10	Improvement	assessment. S <u>ite</u> : During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving.
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10	Improvement Construction and layout of buildings	assessment. S <u>ite</u> : During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed.
	10		assessment. S <u>ite:</u> During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking
	10		assessment. S <u>ite:</u> During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NA05) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse
	10 4		assessment. S <u>ite:</u> During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NA05) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at
	10		assessment. S ite: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. •Eor packaging hazard analysis, there is no pres
	10 4		assessment. S <u>ite</u> : During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain.
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10	Construction and layout of buildings	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NA05) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **Por packaging hazard analysis, there is no pres
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10	Construction and layout of buildings	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is row or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **Bor packaging hazard analysis, there is no pres
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4	Construction and layout of buildings	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAOS) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Worehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **For packaging hazard analysis, there is no pre
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface rement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is row or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. *For packaging hazard analysis, there is no pres
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 5	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace	assessment. S te: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAOS) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk ingredient such as out flour, bran, corn starch were received from roil car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Celling, well, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced celling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface exement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is row or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **For packaging hazard analysis, there is no prescribed template but all sites should all have it. *
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process.Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system) drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. The process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **Por packaging hazard analysis, there is no presc
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy	assessment. Site: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. Ther process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface connected in same building dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. *For packaging hazard analysis, there is n
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy	assessment. Sites During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prainie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from roil car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tonker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk kagging system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Celling, woll, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in some building was constructed of metal enforced celling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface centent floor. Loading dock was sceled at bottom. At certain floor, there was gloss window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated stoffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with corton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hozard is raw or as received, if COA is required, if allergen is present or may contain. **Bo packaging hazard analysis, there is no prescribed template but all sites should all have it. **P
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy Waste disposal	assessment. Size During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAOS) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process. Bulk Ingredient such as oat flour, bran, corn starch were received from roil car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient vereived from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. There process was in enclosed vessel and piping system. There was total 9 floors in processing building. Bagging is was located at floor 2. Ceiling, wall, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete woll, and smooth surface coment floor. Loading dock was scaled at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with corton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is row or as received, if CoA is required in floory should match. No specified format fo process flow diagrams. **Barards associate
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy Waste disposal	assessment. 5 tigs: During an-site, nan-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was setablished on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffolo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process Bulk ingredient such as oat flour, bran, carn starch were received from rail car, fiquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from track. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system), drying and cooked product was transferred to bagging (Puff, Chex system) or bulk bagging system. There was so tale of 90 fors in processing bulliding. Bagging level located in same building mass constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced ceiling, partial metal and partial concrete wall, and smooth surface cement floor. Loading dack was seeled at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Pockaging hazard analysis, there is no prescribed template but all sites should all have it. **Porpockaging hazard analysis, the
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10 4 7	Construction and layout of buildings Layout of premises and workspace Utilities – air, water, energy Waste disposal	assessment. 5 tig.: During on-site, non-conformance finished goods were held electronically in warehouse management system. On hold report (NAO5) was verified by auditor. Red Prairie database was used to manage the inventory. No history of OPRP deviation. Auditor verified hold 70652 (metal). Product (214 cases) was disposed. Continuous project such as chemical control, Sanitation program were roll out as part of the action from risk management plan. Building was established on 1940s. The plant was located near Buffalo river and closed to train track due to bulk ingredient receiving. Building was fenced and enclosed to prevent external contamination. No vegetation at surrounding. Parking are was paved and located at another side of building. Near by company was cement manufacturer and ADM. No standing water observed. The plant was based on vertical process Bulk ingredient such as oat flaur, bran, carn storch were received from rail car, liquid ingredient was received through bulk tanker, minor ingredient received from truck. Ingredients were mixed and transferred to cooking (North, South, Oat, Chex system) of bulk bagging system. There was toal 9 floors in processing bulding. Bagging line was located at floor 2. Celling, well, floor were constructed with concrete and painted. Certain production floor was epoxy coated. Warehouse connected in same building was constructed of metal enforced celling, partial metal and partial concrete wink and smooth surface element floor. Loading dock was sealed at bottom. At certain floor, there was glass window. Lighting was shielded at all floor. Dedicated staffs were work in respective area and inside control room. Ingredient was protected with carton and rards identified, these are further identified whether the hazard is room or as received, if COA is required, if ollergen is present or may contain. **Por packaging hazard analysis, there is no prescribed template but all sites should all have it. **Process flow diagrams.** **Process flow diagrams.** **Bozards posociated

			inspection, chemical control, CCTV. Loading dock was closed when no activity. In addition, operators were trained on food
			The site was found with clear boundary and fencing. Control measure in place such as visitor control, trailer, bulk tanker
			The site registered with FDA Bioterrorism with no. XXXXXXX 1708. It was renewed by corporate team.
			mitigation action plan, emergency contacts, facility profile and food defense members. Vernon site:Food Defense plan was reviewed on Feb 5 2020. FDA plan builder was used which based on 3 elements. Each process was given a score. Only score above 26 require action plan. All process was scored below 26.
			the food defense assessment review annually. Head office also conducts the review annually during VCOE audits. The site is to document the facility food defense team, training, policies and procedures that support personnel, food safety and physical security and incident response programs and procedures. Each facility is to have their own self-assessment, risk
			Sites are prescribed to use the FDA Food Defense Builder for the food defense assessment. Sites are expected to conduct
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.2	Product labelling	(based on gluten free claim policy, it is below 20ppm)Test result dated The label was approved in Eclip system.
ESSC 22002 A HIV: 12	2.5.2	Due doubt lab allies	Lucky Charm (for Canada Market). Both Lucky Charm and Corn Chex contain nutrition fact, ingredient list and recipe. Domestic Puff product contain gluten free claim such as Cheerios Orginal. It was tested on every batch which below 5ppm.
			Ingredient declaration with allergen information in place such as contain oat ingredient for Canadian product. Example:
			Manager. Finished product testing would be available depending on the risk assessment. All customer labels for private brands or food service are also managed through the same process. Site:Site able to access Eclips system for latest artwork.
			material number on the packaging. Final step is the barcode scanner. Plant Label Verification summaries all label information that sites would need to know. Finished product testing protocol is followed by the sites as per Product
			Information and Product System (ECLIPS) is used by the sites. As the new packaging arrives in the facility, the site compares the information declaration versus the approved keyline (pdf version of approved packaging). The site also verifies the base
			per ingredient claims and certification report. Further verified through Medallion Labs – Aug 22, 2019 – 12 boxes 22AUG2019 – Gluten average 2.2 ppm Ridascreen Total Gluten R47041. An Electronic Comprehensive Labelling
			whole grain oats, sugar, corn syrup, corn starch, salt, trisdodium, natural flavor, Vitamin E, added to preserve freshness, etc. Contains: Coconut. Gluten Free Claim was made for this product. All ingredients have been marked as gluten free as
			report can also be generated. Associated formulas and nutrition information are also linked to Interspec. Label information for a cereal product (Cheerios) was sampled for this visit. BMN Series 33628101, 3388634101. Ingredients:
			determine which are used, restrictions, allergens, addition and grouping, component label settings. An ingredient allergen
			The labelling and regulatory compliance group is in charge of managing all product labelling requirements. The site uses a system called Interspec to generate labels. Ingredients used are prepopulated on the system and will allow the site to
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.1	Management of services	conducted by Medallion lab.
			have to utilized local laboratories which are ISO 17025 accredited as expected by the head office. <u>site</u> : Environmental pathogen sample was sent to Siliker. (biological test was accredited with ISO17025, valid till Mar 31 2022). Gluten test was
			shared service between facilities. The laboratory has a valid ISO 17025 Accreditation valid until June 30, 2021. Medallion Laboratories also set-up internal reference materials for sites to use. However, due to geographical location, sites would
			Global PLM or Interspec for sites to refer to. Testing is usually outsourced to an external provider. The sites can opt to send samples for analysis to Medallion Laboratories which is a part of General Mills Inc.'s external phasing business and is a
			Sites do not typically have full service laboratories and have limited testing capabilities. Accredited methods indicated in
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	17 18	Product information/consumer awareness Food defense, biovigilance and bioterrorism	The label was approved in Eclip system. Refer FSSC additional requirement 2.5.3
			Lucky Charm (for Canada Market). Both Lucky Charm and Corn Chex contain nutrition fact, ingredient list and recipe. Domestic Puff product contain gluten free claim such as Cheerios Orginal. It was tested on every batch. Test result dated
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	16	Warehousing	Ingredient declaration with allergen information in place such as contain oat ingredient for Canadian product. Example:
ISO/TS 22002 1/2000 Food Manufacturing	16	Warehousing	recorded. Auditor verified on-site on dock 15 and 22. Trailer inspection was not filled on-time. Refer minor.
			Finished goods transferred to approved distribution centre. The DC was managed by corporate team. Trailer inspection was conducted and completed for records dated May 18 2020, May 10 2020, May 17 2020, and May 9 2020. Seal no. was
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	15	Product recall procedures	Refer FSSC section 8.9.5.
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	13 14	Personnel hygiene and employee facilities Rework	entrance and hallway. Auditor been asked on travel history. No violation was observed during site tour. The plant do not have rework practice.
			to work inside the plant. Staff need to report if with illness symptom. Temperature screening was required for staff, visitor and contractor. Covid 19 symptom reminder was posted on the wall at hallway and communicated through TV screen at
			Staff observed wearing clean uniform wtih press stud fastening. Hard hat, Hair net and beard net, safety toe were required
			Rest room equipped with hand washing and hand soap. Sanitizer was provided at entrance of plant.
			Break room was fully equipped with refrigerator, coffee maker, vending machine, and microwave. No catering in this site. Break room away from production.
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	12	Pest control	approved. Broak room was fully equipped with refrigerator, self-complete wording machine, and microvage. No extering in this site.
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	12	Pest control	control device was tracked by bar code sticker. MSDS and label were maintained. Example: Contract. It was EPA
			report on June, May were verified. Tin cat, pheromone trap, bait station were randomly verified and found as per mapping. Trend report from April to June 2020 was verified. Door was closed when no operation and building was sound. Pest
			training. Verified Shelli and Andy. PY75 used for fumigation at bagging line. Multi catch Tin cat (131) and pheromone trap(17) were serviced on weekly. Bait station (49 units) was serviced monthly.No pest activity sighted on-site. Service
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	11	Cleaning and sanitizing	Pest control was managed by in-house certified team. There were 4 people in the team. 3 were certified and 1 under
			Environmental monitoring program was implemented to monitor the hygienic. CIP verification was based on monthly. Records on Feb to April 2020 (coliform, APC) was verified. No new validation as the CIP system was not changed. In addition, cleaning verification was done by team leader, QE and lab technician.
			established. Records on first week of Mar and June 2020. Cautic is used during short run of CIP. Full CIP is run on end of run or changeover. Approved cleaning agent used acid Quorum red , Cosmic K. were used. Concentration check was performed.
			MSS schedule was established with defined cleaning frequency. Cleaning for Bagging line 10, 6, 8, 9 were verified on Mar, May 2020 and records on April 12 2020. CIP was implemented for Vitamin system (North, South, Oat). SOP was
			In general, cleanliness of ceral plant was found acceptable.
			used after cleaning. Facility cleaning for puff system was verified April 12 2020 during shut down.
			SSOP for packing line was established which defined responsibility, tool, color code policy, cleaning step. Sanitize wipe was
			apply for upstream process such as slurry. Dry cleaning was applied after the product was dried. Cleaning tool was hang at dedicated location
			Color coding was implemented for cleaning tool. White for food contact. Blue for non-food contact. Wet cleaning was
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	10	Measures for prevention of cross contamination	
			9th). No broken glass was observed. All ceiling lighting and machine lighting were shielded. Allergen control-refer to FSSC section 2.5.6
			hygiene condition of plant. Annual glass audit was conducted on April 12 2020 and May 12 2020. Example: packing line, processing building (3th, 6th,
			Product was transferred through enclosed system and went through high drying process. There was foot sanitizer powder on entrance. Sifter oat flour was checked twice per month. Verified Mar and May 2020. EMP program in place to monitor
			upstream process. Bulk liquid passed through magnet and strainer. The magnet for oat flour, corn starch were checked before unloading. Record on May 5-6 2020 was verified.
			Monitoring was conducted twice per shift. No deviation found. In addition, metal detector and magnet were installed in
			Metal detector was identified as CP for both retail and bulk bagging system. Auditor verified on-site on packing line 6 & 8.

ESSC 22000 Additional Requirements	2.5.4	Food Fraud mitigation	Food fraud/ vulnerability assessment is managed by the head office's Food Fraud Mitigation Team. Global Food Fraud Prevention Plan was last revised March, 2019. Food Fraud Initial Screening is made through horizon scanning which involves reviewing external media reports, peer reviewed journal publications, regulatory documents, internal discussions with legal and corporate security. Food Fraud Vulnerability Assessment is made through SSAFE tool listing fifty question which cover opportunity, motivation, and control measures to food fraud. Horizon scanning strategy includes the following information sources: RASFF alerts, USFDA recall notifications and organic certifications, selerant email alerts, EU knowledge center for food fraud and quality, trello food fraud databse, Europol, Food track Inc., scopus alerts of peer reviewed journals related to food fraud. The food fraud team collects relevant information and reviewed periodically over the course of the year. Latest review dated Jan 6, 2020 for horizon scanning. Group of raw materials are ranked according to reported incidents. Groups are categorized as follows: fish, food, meat, peanuts, nuts, seeds, spices, oil, honey, fruit, milk, grains, seafood, Vulnerability scale is based on likelihood and consequence. Generally, raw materials handled by the
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.4	Food Fraud mitigation	site are on a manageable to very low risk due to robust supplier management programs.
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.5	Logo use	The site does not use the FSSC logo or certification mark in any form.
			Oat is common allergen (for Canada market). No allergenic material was used. Staff lunch box was placed inside break room which away from production floor. Allergen control plan defined allergen control through supplier program, label approval, identification based on hazard analysis, cleaning, label verification, allergen training. Barcode verification was
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.6	Management of allergens (Only for categories C, E, FI, G, I & K)	identified as control point to confirm correct label are used.
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.7	Environmental monitoring (Only for categories C, I & K)	Salmonella & listeria EMP program SOP-Q-061 rev 5 defined that zone 2, 3, 4 were sampled for monitoring. Location such as Penthouse, 1st-10 floor, basement. The area was defined as primary pathogen concern, basic GMP, non production area. Frequency: month, quarterly. Target: Salmonella with monthly sampling size around 23 swabs. If positive result, escalation plan should be adhered for additional sampling after re-clean, root cause analysis and corrective action. Verified testing result on Mar and June 2020. Total sample was 106 for monthly sampling. Result was negative. No positive case on year 2020. Auditor verified positive case on Sept and Nov 2019. 3 consecutive negative was obtained. Sample was sent to Silliker. Data analysis was trended on year 2018 to 2020.
FSSC 22000 - Additional Requirements	2.5.8	Formulation of products (Only for category D)	NA .

Checklist	Section	Clause	Requirement	Conform	Grade	Finding details	Remark	Acceptance date
						1.Validation report dated Jan 14 2020 for line 8 form was not completely filled on pass column. 2.Carton Metal detector control point (OPRP)		
ISO 22000:2018 - Food Safety Management Systems	Operation	8.5	Hazard control	No	Minor	check was not documented as it was not functioning since one month ago. Bagging Metal detector was in use. (line 10)		4/8/2020
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	Equipment suitability, cleaning and maintenance	8.6	Preventive and corrective maintenance	No	Minor	Work order for james cooker #2, #4(knife drive) were not documented on Mar and May. (frequency was monthly).		4/8/2020
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	Personnel hygiene and employee facilities	13.2	Personnel hygiene facilities and toilets	No	Minor	Hand wash not hand free at packging line. (Chex system line 10) Outbound trailer inspection		4/8/2020
ISO/TS 22002-1:2009 - Food Manufacturing	Warehousing	16.2	Warehousing requirements	No	Minor	(dock 15 +22) were not evidently documented eventhough the container almost fully loaded.		4/8/2020