

FINAL AUDIT REPORT

Operation Type: Farm
Audit Report Summary

CB Registration No. PA-PGFS-17192-7
PrimusGFS ID #294604 - Cert:4
Audited by Primus Auditing Operations

PrimusGFS Version 3.2
[Ver en Español](#)

Organization:	Strahm Farms INC Contact(s): Eric Strahm Address: 2605 Holt Rd 92250 Location: Holtville, California, United States Phone Number: 7609600713												
Operation:	Holt 104 Contact(s): Eric Strahm Location: Verde School Rd & Enz Road Holtville, California 92250, United States												
Shipper:	Pacific Sales Company												
Operation Type:	Farm												
Audit Type:	Announced Audit												
Audit Executive Summary:	The field is dedicated to production under organic principles, which is irrigated by furrow using canal water, depending on the crop and stage. No treatment is carried out on the irrigation water, and it is tested during the period of use. Application of crop protection chemicals is done by an outside contractor and there are no chemical storage areas on site. The ranch was audited as part of the group of ranches owned by the company, so the report was made based on documents (records and analysis), randomly chosen and SOPs reviewed during the audit as well as practices observed in the field during the tour												
Date Documentation Review Started:	02 Feb 2023 08:00												
Date Documentation Review Finished:	02 Feb 2023 11:00												
Total Amount of Time on the Documentation Review:	3.00 Hours												
Date Visual Inspection Started:	02 Feb 2023 11:00												
Date Visual Inspection Finished:	02 Feb 2023 12:45												
Total Amount of Time on Visual Inspection:	1.75 Hours												
Addendum(s) included in the audit:	Not Applicable												
Product(s) observed during audit:	Cantaloupe Melons												
Similar product(s)/process(es) not observed:	None												
Product(s) applied for but not observed:	None												
Auditor:	Evelyn Ramirez (Primus Auditing Operations)												
Preliminary Audit Score:	95%												
Final Audit Score:	98%												
Certificate Valid From:	14 Mar 2023 To 13 Mar 2024												
GPS Coordinates:	<table><thead><tr><th>Latitude</th><th>Longitude</th><th></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>32° 43' 35"</td><td>115° 19' 42"</td><td rowspan="3"> Click here to see map</td></tr><tr><td>32° 43' 48"</td><td>115° 19' 42"</td></tr><tr><td>32° 43' 35"</td><td>115° 19' 19"</td></tr></tbody></table>			Latitude	Longitude		32° 43' 35"	115° 19' 42"	 Click here to see map	32° 43' 48"	115° 19' 42"	32° 43' 35"	115° 19' 19"
Latitude	Longitude												
32° 43' 35"	115° 19' 42"	 Click here to see map											
32° 43' 48"	115° 19' 42"												
32° 43' 35"	115° 19' 19"												

Which input(s) are used in the growing operation?

Subcategory Name	Description
Inorganic Fertilizers	e.g., ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, chemically synthesized urea, etc.

Which water source(s) is/are used in the growing operation?

Open Flowing Surface Water	What is this water source used for?	Irrigation
	What type of irrigation is used?	Drip, Furrow irrigation
	Does the water come in contact with the edible portion of the crop?	No
	Which product grouping is this water source used for?	Cucurbit Fruit

Information related to the audited operation

What is the maximum number of workers during peak season?	12	Is work being performed at the time of the audit?	No
Adjacent Land:	crops	What work is being performed?	
Operation Size:	74 Acres	Are toilets available at the time of the audit?	Portable Toilet
Cultural Methods	Conventional		

Product information for each product

Product Group/Product Name	Observed Product	Seasonality	Country of destination for product
Cantaloupe Melons	Observed on the day of audit	From: December To: June	United States

AUDIT SCORING SUMMARY	Pre-Corrective Action Review		Post-Corrective Action Review	
Food Safety Management System Requirements	Score:	238	Score:	238
	Possible Points:	238	Possible Points:	238
	Percent Score:	100%	Percent Score:	100%
Module 2 - Farm	Score:	545	Score:	565
	Possible Points:	579	Possible Points:	579
	Percent Score:	94%	Percent Score:	97%
TOTAL	Score:	783	Score:	803
	Possible Points:	817	Possible Points:	817
	Percent Score:	95%	Percent Score:	98%

Non-Conformance Summary By Count	Pre-Corrective Action Non-Conformances	Post-Corrective Action Non-Conformances
Food Safety Management System Requirements	0	0
Module 2 - Farm	4	2
TOTAL	4	2

SECTIONS:

Food Safety Management System Requirements	Module 2 - Farm
Management System	General
Control of Documents and Records	Site
Procedures and Corrective Actions	Ground History
Internal and External Inspections	Adjacent Land Use
Release of Items/Product	Inspection
Supplier Monitoring/Control	Training
Traceability and Recall	Field Worker Hygiene (Applies to on-the-farm workers, not the harvesting workers)
Food Defense	Inorganic Fertilizers
	Open Flowing Surface Water
	Pesticide Usage

FSMS	Management System	
1.01.01	<p>Question: Is there a documented food safety policy detailing the company's commitment to food safety?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The food safety commitment is signed by the owners (dated 2.1.23). It includes the objectives of the company reflecting the ongoing commitment with Food Safety. The policy is posted in a public place.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5</p> <p>Points Scored: 5</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>

1.01.02	Question: Is there an organizational chart showing all management and workers who are involved in food safety related activities and documentation (job descriptions) detailing their food safety responsibilities?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is an organizational chart showing positions, reporting structure, alternates and responsibilities at the documents named "Food Safety Organizational Chart" (dated 11.1.19) and "Job Descriptions".	
1.01.03	Question: Is there a food safety committee and are there logs of food safety meetings with topics covered and attendees?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is an active food safety committee at the operation responsible for the maintenance and development of the operation. Logs of meeting addressing food safety topics are kept in place, indicating the names and signatures and missing members. Meetings are performed at least quarterly during growing season. Last ones are dated 1.24.23, 11.2.22 and 7.26.22 (season nov-april)	
1.01.04	Question: Is there a training management system in place that shows what types of training are required for various job roles of specific workers, including who has been trained, when they were trained, which trainings they still need to take, and a training schedule?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The company has a system in place that shows the personnel is being trained according to the job roles at food safety. Records show the type of training, the date and name and signature of the person who was trained. Information is at "Employee Food Safety Topic Calendar".	
1.01.05	Question: Is there documented management verification review of the entire food safety management system at least every 12 months, including an evaluation of resources, and are there records of changes made?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is a management verification of the entire food safety management and it was reviewed by senior management. Records included internal and external audits, customer complaints, NUOCA, organizational chart, SOPs, approved supplier program, worker training review, recall program and similar. Last revision was done on 1.21.23, named "Management Review Log"	
1.01.06	Question: Where specific industry guidelines or best practices exist for the crop and/or product, does the operation have a current copy of the document?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There current electronic copy of the GFS v3.2 guidelines was available for review, also the LGMA.	
FSMS Control of Documents and Records		
1.02.01	Question: Is there a written document control procedure (including document control register/record) describing how documents will be maintained, updated and replaced?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is a record of all documents being used, when they were issued and updated with the current version. The document "Document Control Procedures", indicates the person responsible, how documents are to be written, coded and approved, how documents are updated, and how changes are identified and recorded. It also indicates how the inadvertent use of obsolete documents is prevented.	
1.02.02	Question: Is there a documented and implemented procedure that requires all records to be stored for a minimum period of 24 months (or greater if legally required) or for at least the shelf life of the product if it is greater than 24 months?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. At "Document Control Procedures", indicates that all documents related to food safety are retained for 3 years.	
1.02.03	Question: Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The documentation regarding procedures and records was observed in binders and computers under the responsibility of the grower.	

1.02.04	Question: Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All documents are kept in a designated area and they can be retrieved readily. Records are very well organized.	
1.02.05	Question: Are all records and test results that can have an impact on the food safety program verified by a qualified person independent of the individual(s) completing the records?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Records and test results were verified by a qualified person.	
FSMS Procedures and Corrective Actions		
1.03.01	Question: Is there a written and standardized procedure for creating Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and their content?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The document "SOP Instructions" describes how to write SOPs for the FS activities related to GAP. The document details what is to be done, how is to be done, how often, by whom, what recordings are required and immediate CA.	
1.03.02	Question: Are the written procedures available to relevant users and is a master copy maintained in a central file?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Original format was maintained in the company's office and there is a binder with all the procedures available for all workers as well.	
1.03.03	Question: Is there a documented corrective action procedure that describes the basic requirements for handling all non-conformances affecting food safety?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The document named "Corrective Actions SOP" indicates how the company manages corrective actions including the review of the non-conformance, the determination of the cause, corrective actions and preventive actions and the follow-up validation to ensure actions taken have solved the problem.	
1.03.04	Question: Is there an incident reporting system, also known as a Notice(s) of Unusual Occurrence and Corrective Actions Log (NUOCA) ?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. NUOCA log available. Still no NUOCAs have occurred according to the verbal confirmation from the responsible.	
FSMS Internal and External Inspections		
1.04.01	Question: Is there a documented procedure for how internal audits are to be performed at the operations, including frequency and covering all processes impacting food safety and the related documents and records?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The internal audits procedures named "GAP Internal Audit Policy" and " GAP Internal Field Audit Inspections SOP" indicates the frequency of the internal audits and the person responsible for conducting them. FSMS and GAP is done annually using the GFS checklist.	
1.04.02	Question: Are there written procedures for handling regulatory inspections?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The procedure named "State or Federal Regulatory Food/Drug Inspections Policy" indicates how regulatory inspections are going to be handled, rules on taking samples and taking photographs, how to follow-up after the inspection, corrective action requirements, etc.	

1.04.03	Question: Are there records of regulatory inspections and/or contracted inspections, company responses and corrective actions, if any?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Records from last GFS audits in place along with the CAs. No regulatory inspections have occurred this year according to verbal confirmation from the responsible.	
1.04.04	Question: Are there documented calibration and/or accuracy verification procedures for measuring and monitoring devices used in the operations that are related to the safety of the product?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The calibration for in house equipment use for application of fertilizers was on site. The chemicals are applied buy an external contractor (Chaparral). Their documentation regarding equipment calibration was also on file.	
1.04.05	Question: Are calibration and/or accuracy verification records maintained and are they consistent with the requirements outlined in the SOP(s) for instruments and measuring devices requiring calibration?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The information for the calibration of the fertilizer application equipment id done once per season, and the information regarding this practice is recorded at "Shark Injection Calibration Worksheet" . Last calibration was done 12.28.22. The information regarding the calibration performed by the contractor (Chaparral) to their equipment was also on file.	

FSMS Release of Items/Product		
1.05.01	Question: Is there a documented product release procedure available?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. The grower only have authority over the growing activities and not the harvesting activities.	
1.05.02	Question: Are there records of product releases kept on file?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. Refer to 1.05.02.	
1.05.03	Question: Is there a documented procedure for handling on hold and rejected items?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. A documented procedure for handling on hold and rejected items named "Hold and Release of Raw Products" explains how products that have either been rejected or placed on hold should be handled.	
1.05.04	Question: Are there records of the handling of on hold and rejected items kept on file?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. No issues have occurred the past twelve months. Log is available. The score is not affected.	
1.05.05	Question: Is there a documented procedure for dealing with customer and buyer food safety complaints/feedback along with records and company responses, including corrective actions?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is a documented procedure detailing how to handle food safety and food quality complaints and feedback (Customer Complaint SOP). No complaints have being received this year according to the responsible verbal confirmation.	

FSMS Supplier Monitoring/Control		
----------------------------------	--	--

1.06.01	Question: Is there a written procedure detailing how suppliers and service providers are evaluated, approved, and include the ongoing verification activities including monitoring? Note that supply chain preventive controls and supply-chain-applied controls are also mentioned in Module 7.	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The documents named "Supplier Approval and Monitoring" included the indicators to be considered for decision making, monitoring requirements in order to remain approved, and methods for suspending and un-approving suppliers and service providers.	
1.06.02	Question: Is there a list of approved suppliers and service providers including justification for use of any emergency (temporary) suppliers or providers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is a list of approved suppliers of materials and services. The list included laboratories, labor contractor, seeds, crop inputs, among others.	
1.06.03	Question: Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There are written, detailed, up-to-date specifications for all incoming products, materials and services provided on-site that have an effect on food safety. Specifications are reviewed annually. The information is part of the procedure "Supplier Approval and Monitoring".	
1.06.04	Question: Does the organization have documented evidence to ensure that all incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site and outsourced service suppliers comply with the approval requirements and that all supplier verification activities (including monitoring) are being followed, as defined in the supplier approval procedure?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Supplier verification documents are in place and includes third party audit certificates, letters of guarantee, SOPs and other documents according with the service or material provided. Documentation was reviewed for different contractors and products during the GAP document revision (Chaparral, Dune, Bull Enterprises, among others).	
1.06.05	Question: Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Water tests are performed by laboratories with current licenses and accreditations for the methods used. For example IEH ISO/IEC 17025:2017, #AT-1555, 7.6.23 for water testing.	

FSMS Traceability and Recall		
1.07.01	Question: Is there a document that indicates how the company product tracking system works, thereby enabling trace back and trace forward to occur in the event of a potential recall issue?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The document "Product Tracking System" demonstrates the product tracking system that is used by the operation and is able to trace back and forward practices done at the field and product harvested.	
1.07.02	Question: Does the organization have a documented recall program including procedures, recall team roles and contact details, external contact listings, requirement for recall effectiveness checks, explanation of different recall classes and handling of recalled product?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The written procedure "Recall Plan Procedure" was available for review during the audit, describing how to perform a product recall, recall team details, referral to customer and supplier contact details, class of recalls, etc.	
1.07.03	Question: Is testing of recall procedures (including traceback) performed and documented at least every six months, and the company can demonstrate the ability to trace materials (one step forward, one step back) effectively?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Documentation from last exercise done 1.17.23 include copies of records that support the trace back scenario (records from field and records from harvest). All product was found (lot BC222L05) and the exercise was done within 2 hours.	

FSMS Food Defense		
--------------------------	--	--

1.08.01	Question: Is there a written food fraud vulnerability assessment (FFVA) and protection plan for all types of fraud, including all incoming and outgoing products?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The information is part of the document "Food Defense Assessment", dated 11.1.19, and it takes into account the contractor and suppliers and the way the company is handling those risk found on the assessment.	
1.08.02	Question: Is there a written food defense vulnerability assessment and food defense plan based on the risks associated with the operation?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The operation have a documented food defense plan that outlines the organization's security controls based on a written food defense vulnerability assessment of risks associated with the operations GAP. It includes growing area, personnel, visitors, contractors, water sources, among others.	
1.08.03	Question: Are records associated with the food defense plan and its procedures being maintained, including monitoring, corrective action and verification records (where appropriate)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The log to record events is in place.	
1.08.04	Question: Is there a current list of emergency contact phone numbers for management, law enforcement and appropriate regulatory agencies?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The operation have a current list of emergency contact phone numbers available for management, law enforcement and appropriate regulatory agencies. This information is found as part of the recall plan.	
1.08.05	Question: Are visitors and contractors to the company operations required to adhere to food defense procedures?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All visitors and contractors are required to abide by the operation's food defense policies, including wearing appropriate identification. Policy is clearly stated in relevant languages.	
FARM General		
2.01.01	Question: Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Training on PSA for the Food grower (#70380, 3.21.19) was on file.	
2.01.02	Question: If the operation is growing under organic principles, is there written documentation of current certification by an accredited organic certification organization?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The operation is under organic principles (NOP ID-5561002698, issued 8.10.22)	
2.01.03	Question: Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The document named "Farm, Harvest, Supplier, Employee Hygiene and Food Safety Guidelines" cover the rules related to hygiene and health, no infants and toddlers allowed in the growing area, what to do in the case of evidence of animals or fecal matter in the growing and storage areas, and what to do in the case of dropped product, and if the product comes into contact with blood or other bodily fluids. The policy is written in relevant languages.	
FARM Site		

2.02.01	Question: Is there a map that accurately shows all aspects of the operation, including water sources and fixtures used to deliver water used in the operation?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The map provided does represent the growing operations observed during the audit. It also indicates the location of the water source, adjacent land features, presence of yards, among others.	
2.02.02	Question: Are growing areas adequately identified or coded to enable trace back and trace forward in the event of a recall?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Records of the practices done including fertilization, chemical application, compost application (if used) among others are done following the lot identification.	
2.02.03	Question: Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The documented "Hazard Analysis of Growing Locations" (9.20.22) is done annually and it included water source, adjacent land, inputs, workers, environment, among others. It also included the specific B, C and P risk, it's severity and likelihood.	
2.02.03a	Question: If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. For risks identified in the assessment, the operation details what practice is being done to minimize the identified risk.	
2.02.04	Question: Are the necessary food defense controls implemented in the operation?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Food defense controls are implemented at the operation. For example signage to prevent trespassing.	
2.02.05	Question: Is the exterior area immediately outside the growing area, including roads, yards and parking areas, free of litter, weeds and standing water?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The exterior area immediately outside the growing area, including roads, yards and parking areas are free of litter, weeds and standing water.	
2.02.06	Question: Are control measures being implemented for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires, etc. (i.e. out of the mud, stacked to prevent pest harborage, away from the growing area)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. No pallets, tires or any other kind of equipment is stored. The ranches are very clean and organized.	
2.02.07	Question: Are garbage receptacles and dumpsters kept covered or closed?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All dumpsters and garbage receptacles have a cover and are kept covered to prevent the attraction of insects, rodents and other pests.	
2.02.08	Question: Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. None is stored at the fields. Inputs are bought as needed.	

2.02.09	Question: Where there are fill stations for fuel or pesticides, is it evident that the location and/or use is not a risk of contamination to the product, water sources, growing areas, equipment, packaging materials, etc.?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. None is stored at the growing areas.	
2.02.10	Question: Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 2.02.11.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The area was free from animal presence and activity. No tracks, feathers, hair or similar were seen during the audit.	
2.02.10a	Question: Is the audited area free from any evidence of animal fecal matter? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.02.11	Question: Is the audited area free from any evidence of human fecal matter? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The audited area was free from any evidence of human fecal matter during the audit.	
2.02.12	Question: Is the audited area free of evidence of infants and toddlers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The audited area was free of evidence of infants and toddlers.	

FARM	Ground History
-------------	-----------------------

2.03.01	Question: Were growing area(s) used for growing food crops for consumption last season?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	Auditor Comments: Yes. A letter for management was available during the audit stating that land has only being used for agricultural functions.	
2.03.02	Question: Has the growing area(s) been used for any non-agricultural functions? If No, go to 2.03.03.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. Only agricultural functions at the growing area.	
2.03.02a	Question: If the growing area been used previously for non-agricultural functions, have soil tests been conducted showing soil was negative or within an appropriate regulatory agency's approved limits for contaminants?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.03	Question: Has the growing area(s) been used for animal husbandry or grazing land for animals in the last 12 months? If No, go to 2.03.04.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The land was not used previously for animal husbandry or grazing land for livestock.	
2.03.03a	Question: If the land was used previously for animal husbandry or grazing land for livestock, has a risk assessment been performed?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

2.03.04	Question: Has flooding from uncontrolled causes occurred on the growing area(s) since the previous growth cycle? If No, go to 2.04.01.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. Flooding from uncontrolled causes has not occurred on the growing area since the previous growth cycle.	
2.03.04a	Question: If the growing area(s) and product was affected from the flood waters, is there documented evidence of a risk assessment and that corrective measures were taken to affected land and product?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.04b	Question: Have soil tests been conducted on the flooded area(s) showing the soil was negative or within an appropriate regulatory agency's approved limits for contaminants?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.04c	Question: If septic or sewage systems adjacent to the growing area were affected by the flood waters, is there a documented inspection after flooding to ensure they are functioning properly and are not a source of contamination?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

FARM Adjacent Land Use		
2.04.01	Question: Is the adjacent land to the growing area a possible source of contamination from intensive livestock production (e.g., feedlots, dairy operations, poultry houses, meat rendering operation)? If No, go to 2.04.02.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. There were no CAFOs or similar in the adjacent land.	
2.04.01a	Question: Where there is intensive livestock production on the adjacent land, have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate this possible contamination source onto the growing area (e.g., buffer areas, physical barriers, foundation, fences, ditches, etc.)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.02	Question: Is there evidence of domestic animals and/or wild animals (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) in proximity to the growing operation? If No, go to 2.04.03.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. No animals observed at the moment of the audit.	
2.04.02a	Question: Where there are domestic and/or wild animals (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) have physical measures been put in place to restrain the animals and their waste from entering the growing area (e.g., vegetative strips, windbreaks, physical barriers, berms, fences, diversion ditches)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.03	Question: Are untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land? If No, go to 2.04.04.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. Untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment were not present on adjacent land during the audit.	
2.04.03a	Question: Where present, have physical measures been taken to secure untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

2.04.03b	Question: If biosolids are stored and/or applied on adjacent land, has the adjacent landowner supplied paperwork confirming the biosolids meet prevailing guidelines, governmental, or local standards?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.04	Question: Is the growing area situated in a higher risk location where contamination could occur from nearby operations or functions (e.g., leach fields, runoff or potential flooding from sewers, toilet systems, industrial facilities, labor camps, etc.)? If No, go to 2.04.05.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The growing area was not situated in a higher risk location.	
2.04.04a	Question: Where the growing area is situated in a higher risk location, have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate risks related to nearby operations?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.05	Question: Are there any other potential risks in the adjacent land that could potentially lead to contamination of the growing area?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. None observed at the moment of the audit.	
2.04.05a	Question: Have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate risks related to nearby operations?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. Refer to 2.04.05	
2.04.06	Question: Is there evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land to the audited area? If No, go to 2.05.01.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. There was no evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land to the audited area.	
2.04.06a	Question: Where there is evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land, are there adequate controls in place to mitigate risk (e.g., access controls (barriers), distance from the growing area and equipment, crop type and maturity, land condition, etc.)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
FARM		
Inspection		
2.05.01	Question: Is there documented evidence of the internal audits performed, detailing findings and corrective actions?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Audits covering growing area, worker amenities, external areas, worker practices, water sources, inputs using, portable toilets units among others were on file. Responses were justified. Date, responsible are indicated. For example, last one is dated 1.19.23 (module 1), and 9.18.22 for Mesa 3-41 and 12.29.22 for Holt 104 for the module 2.	
2.05.02	Question: Are there chemical inventory logs for chemicals, including pesticides and fertilizers?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. Chemicals and fertilizers are only bought as needed. None is stored according to verbal confirmation from the responsible.	
2.05.03	Question: Are all chemicals (pesticides, sanitizers, detergents, lubricants, etc.) stored securely, safely and are they labeled correctly?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. Chemicals and fertilizers are only bought as needed. None is stored according to verbal confirmation from the responsible.	

2.05.04	Question: Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The crop was free from adulteration at the time of the inspection.	

FARM	Training
-------------	-----------------

2.06.01	Question: Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Training for the workers is in place. It is done once per season or as needed. Records were on file showing topics, attendants, trainer, dates and times. For example on 9.23.22 (8 persons), 1.12.23 (14 workers).	

2.06.02	Question: Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering from any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors can check procedure/policy but not actual records).	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The policies are part of the "GAP Blood Borne Illness Accident Policy".	

2.06.03	Question: Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Verbal confirmation from the responsible.	

FARM	Field Worker Hygiene (Applies to on-the-farm workers, not the harvesting workers)
-------------	--

2.07.01	Question: Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There are portable toilet units in different areas of the ranches so they are available for different workers at the field, and each crew also have their own available.	

2.07.01a	Question: Are toilet facilities in a suitable location to prevent contamination to product, packaging, equipment, and growing areas?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The toilets were away from growing areas and water sources. No contamination risks observed.	

2.07.01b	Question: Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Toilets randomly inspected were free from cracks or leaks.	

2.07.01c	Question: Are toilet facilities constructed of materials that are easy to clean?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Non porous plastic material is used at the units.	

2.07.01d	Question: Are the toilet facility materials constructed of a light color allowing easy evaluation of cleaning performance?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Light color, evaluation of cleaning is easily done.	

2.07.01e	Question: Are toilet facilities supplied with toilet paper and is the toilet paper maintained properly (e.g., toilet paper rolls are not stored on the floor or in the urinals)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Several randomly units were inspected in different ranches and they were properly maintained.	
2.07.01f	Question: Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The procedures, licenses and records were part of the documentation of the external contractor "Jett Harvest Labor".	
2.07.01g	Question: Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Units were tidy, records were posted at each unit and they were properly stocked with soap, water, paper towels, among others.	
2.07.02	Question: Is hand washing signage posted appropriately?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. At the door.	
2.07.03	Question: Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There are portable toilet units with their respective hand washing stations in different areas of the ranches so they are available for different workers at the field (1 unit per 12 workers), and each crew also have their own available.	
2.07.03a	Question: Are the hand wash stations designed and maintained properly (e.g., ability to capture or control rinse water to prevent contamination onto product, packaging, and growing area, free of clogged drains, etc.)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. They are design and maintained properly. Drainings were not clogged, rinsed water is captured.	
2.07.03b	Question: Are hand wash stations clearly visible (e.g., situated outside the toilet facility) and easily accessible to workers?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. They are situated outside the toilet facility.	
2.07.03c	Question: Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Fragrance free soap and paper towels available.	

2.07.04	Question: Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0 Score: Non-Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: No. There were no water test available for the handwashing Spigot/ Faucet at the moment of the audit.						
	<div> <div> Auditee Comments: Prime Ag Sanitation samples the water from the spigot/faucet of their portable toilets. I've attached their SOPs (page 7 and 8 detail procedure and what to do incase of abnormal result.) On the water sample, page 3 "PT 206" indicates that it is from Portable Toilet #206. </div> <div>View Files</div> </div> <table> <tr> <td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Test now on file </td><td>Yes</td><td> Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 New Score: Total Compliance </td></tr> </table>			CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Test now on file	Yes
	CA Accepted?						
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Test now on file	Yes	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 New Score: Total Compliance					
2.07.04a	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols, which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3 Score: Major Deficiency					
	Auditor Comments: Major. Sampling SOP does not refer to handwashing station sampling (way lo label it for example). Also the frequency and units to be tested is not indicated.						
	<div> Auditee Comments: </div> <table> <tr> <td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted. </td><td> Pending Verification Next Audit </td><td> Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3 </td></tr> </table>			CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted.	Pending Verification Next Audit
	CA Accepted?						
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted.	Pending Verification Next Audit	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3					
2.07.04b	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3 Score: Major Deficiency					
	Auditor Comments: Major. Written procedures does not include corrective actions to be performed in case of an abnormal result for a handwashing station, either the preventive corrective actions in preparation for such results.						
	<div> Auditee Comments: </div> <table> <tr> <td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted. </td><td> Pending Verification Next Audit </td><td> Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3 </td></tr> </table>			CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted.	Pending Verification Next Audit
	CA Accepted?						
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No Documented evidence of CA was submitted.	Pending Verification Next Audit	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 3					
2.07.04c	Question: If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A					
	Auditor Comments: NA. There are no water test available for the auditor to evaluate this question. Please refer to 2.07.04.						
2.07.05	Question: Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A					
	Auditor Comments: NA. The practice was not observed during the audit.						

2.07.06	Question: Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from signs of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. No issues observed regarding this concern.	
2.07.07	Question: Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. No workers seen using jewelry at the moment of the inspection.	
2.07.08	Question: Are worker personal items being stored appropriately (i.e. not in the growing area(s) or material storage area(s))?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. No personal items at the growing areas observed.	
2.07.09	Question: Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The policy is part of the company GAPs and no issues were observed during the field inspection.	
2.07.10	Question: Is fresh potable drinking water readily accessible to workers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes.	
2.07.10a	Question: Are single use cups provided (unless a drinking fountain is used) and made available near the drinking water?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes.	
2.07.11	Question: Are first aid kits adequately stocked and readily available?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Available and adequately stock. Products were not expired.	
2.07.12	Question: Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Placed adequately and covered.	
2.07.13	Question: Are any potential foreign material issues (e.g., metal, glass, plastic) controlled?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. No potential issues observed at the moment of the audit.	
FARM		
Inorganic Fertilizers		
2.08.06	Question: Are inorganic fertilizers used as an input (e.g., ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, chemically synthesized urea, etc.)? Information gathering question.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	Auditor Comments: Yes.	

2.08.06a	Question: Is fertilizer being used where the country regulations/guidelines ban the use of such materials (e.g., Californian Leafy Green Commodity Specific Guidelines)? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There were no issues observed at the inspection or document revision.	
2.08.06b	Question: Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The fertilizer records were registered in the "Activities Pesticide and Fertilizer Application" with all the required information.	
2.08.06c	Question: Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA), specifications, product label or other documents available for review provided by the supplier stating the components of the material?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Letter of guarantee was given by Dune concerning inert materials and heavy metals (1.10.23).	
FARM Open Flowing Surface Water		
2.09.04a	Question: Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Water test done on the sprinklers or at the canal (depending on the crop or stage the type or irrigation), on a bi monthly or more frequent during the season (after planting). Testing is done for E. Coli by IEH. For example 10.5.22 (Yaz 271759), 10.24.22 (YAZ 272813), 12.21.22 YAZ285618, 1.5.23 YAZ290241,	
2.09.04b	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Procedures are part of the document Microbial Analysis of Agricultural Water SOP.	
2.09.04c	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal results were part of the document LGMA Assessing Pre-Harvest water Quality". It indicates to stop using the water, do root cause analysis and implement corrective actions according to the issue found.	
2.09.04d	Question: If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. According to the water tests reviewed and oral confirmation from the responsible, no abnormal results have been detected. The score is not affected.	
2.09.04e	Question: Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: NA. Water treatment is not performed.	

2.09.04f	Question: Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0 Score: Non-Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: No. There were no records of periodic visual inspections.						
	<div> <div> Auditee Comments: At the time of audit, we had done one visual inspection of the water source, but this did not qualify as "periodic inspection" since it was only once. We are now committed to visually inspection the water source monthly, and more frequently as needed. The water source is always inspected prior to planting during risk evaluation, and pre-harvest in addition to these other inspections. </div> <div>View Files</div> </div> <table> <tr> <td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Records of now available </td><td>Yes</td><td> Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 New Score: Total Compliance </td></tr> </table>			CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Records of now available	Yes
	CA Accepted?						
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Accepted. Records of now available	Yes	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 New Score: Total Compliance					
2.09.07	Question: Is dryland farming used in the growing operation	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No					
	Auditor Comments: No.						
2.09.08	Question: Are there backflow prevention devices on all main lines, including where chemical, fertilizer and pesticide applications are made?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: Yes						
2.09.09	Question: If the operation stores water (tank, cistern, container), is the storage container well maintained?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A					
	Auditor Comments: NA. No water is stored.						
FARM							
Pesticide Usage							
2.10.01	Question: Are there up-to-date records of all pesticides applied during the growth cycle? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Records of all crop protection products applied during the growing cycle were documented at the contractor invoice with all the required information and at the "Notice of Spray Applications".						
2.10.02	Question: Are all pesticides applied during the growth cycle authorized/registered by the authority/government of the country of production? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Product applied are register in US.						
2.10.03	Question: Are all pesticides used during the growth cycle applied as recommended/directed in the label? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance					
	Auditor Comments: Yes. According to the randomly chose records reviewed during the inspection, crop protection materials were applied following their label instructions. Reviewed application done at Mesa 3-34 (onions), done 12.1.22, Silencer thru Chemigation.						

2.10.04	Question: Where harvesting is restricted by pre-harvest intervals, are required pre-harvest intervals on product labels, national (e.g., EPA) registration and any federal, state or local regulations and guidelines being adhered to? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The auditor randomly chose some applications to confirm this practice. No issues observed. For example Prowl and Goal applied on 12.29.22 with a PHI of 60days. Not harvested yet and Silencer applied at 3-34 on 12.1.22 with a PHI of 14 days. Not harvested either. Few applications are done during the season according to verbal confirmation of the grower, therefore, few records were available.	
2.10.05	Question: Where products are destined for export, is there information for pesticide Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) compliance considering country of destination, target crop(s), and active ingredients applied?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. Products were not destined for export. The score is not affected.	
2.10.06	Question: Where products are destined for export, is there evidence that Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) of the intended markets are?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. Products were not destined for export. The score is not affected.	
2.10.07	Question: Is there a documented procedure for the pesticide applications, considering mixing and loading, applying, and equipment cleaning?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The procedure was part of the documentation on file from the contractor "Chaparral".	
2.10.08	Question: Is there documentation that shows the individual(s) making decisions for pesticide applications is competent?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Decisions for crop protection applications were given by a PCA #128055.	
2.10.09	Question: Is there documentation that shows that individuals who handle pesticide materials are trained and are under the supervision of a trained person?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. "Chaparral" workers are trained at least annually or have current license according to documentation available during the audit.	