



Livestock Production
Assurance

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION ASSURANCE

– Level 1 On Farm Assurance

APPROVED STANDARDS

2025









© 2025 Integrity Systems Company Limited
Copyright protects this publication. Except for purposes by the Copyright Act,
reproduction by whatever means is prohibited without prior written permission of
Integrity Systems Company Limited.

CONTENTS

1.0 STANDARDS	3
2.0 REQUIREMENTS.....	4
MODULE 1. – PROPERTY RISK ASSESSMENT.....	4
MODULE 2. – SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENT	4
MODULE 3. – FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS	5
MODULE 4. – PREPARATION FOR DISPATCH OF LIVESTOCK	6
MODULE 5. – LIVESTOCK TRANSACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS	6
MODULE 6. – BIOSECURITY.....	6
MODULE 7. – ANIMAL WELFARE.....	7
MODULE 8. – HARVESTED RANGELAND GOATS	7
FOOTNOTES	8
APPENDIX 1 - PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST	9
MODULE 1. – PROPERTY RISK ASSESSMENT.....	9
MODULE 2. – SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENTS.....	10
MODULE 3. – FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS	11
MODULE 4. – PREPARATION FOR DISPATCH OF LIVESTOCK	13
MODULE 5. – LIVESTOCK TRANSACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS	14
MODULE 6. – BIOSECURITY.....	15
MODULE 7. – ANIMAL WELFARE	16
MODULE 8. – HARVESTED RANGELAND GOATS	16

1.0 STANDARDS

The *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Food Assurance* program comprises **seven (7) standard modules** and **one (1) voluntary module**. Each module describes the **outcomes** that an accredited property must meet to maintain accreditation in the program.

MODULE	OUTCOMES
1 Property Risk Assessment 	On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risk of livestock intended for human consumption being exposed to sites or sources of unacceptable contamination arising from organochlorine or other persistent chemicals, pathogens from recycled water or potentially injurious physical contaminants.
2 Safe And Responsible Animal Treatments 	On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that animal treatments are administered in a safe and responsible manner to minimise the risk of chemical residues and physical hazards in livestock intended for human consumption.
3 Fodder Crop, Grain and Pasture Treatments and Stock Foods 	On farm systems have been implemented to manage the exposure of livestock to foods containing unacceptable chemical contamination to minimise the risk of chemical residues in livestock and to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock intended for human consumption.
4 Preparation For Dispatch Of Livestock 	On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that the selected livestock are fit for transport and that the risk of stress and contamination of livestock during assembly and transport is minimised.
5 Livestock Transactions And Movements 	A system has been implemented to enable traceability of the current status of all livestock with respect to treatment or exposure to relevant food safety hazards for all livestock movements between livestock production enterprises including to slaughter and live export.
6 Biosecurity 	On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risks of the introduction of infectious diseases to livestock production properties and the risks of the spread of disease.
7 Animal welfare 	On farm systems have been implemented to ensure the management of livestock is consistent with the requirements of the <i>Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines</i> , as amended from time to time (Standards and Guidelines).
8 Harvested Rangeland Goats 	A system has been implemented to ensure movements of harvested rangeland goats are able to be traced from capture through to slaughter without being NLIS identified utilising the Harvested Rangeland Goat National Vendor Declaration.

2.0 REQUIREMENTS

To demonstrate conformity with the required outcomes of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance program*, an enterprise must achieve conformity to the requirements in each module.

MODULE 1. - PROPERTY RISK ASSESSMENT

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risk of livestock intended for human consumption being exposed to sites or sources of unacceptable contamination arising from organochlorine or other persistent chemicals, pathogens from recycled water or potentially injurious physical contaminants.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. All sites and sources of potential contamination have been identified in relation to:
 - a. chemicals; and
 - b. potentially injurious physical contaminants; and
 - c. recycled water¹ (cattle enterprises only)
2. All identified sites and sources of potential contamination are managed to restrict access of livestock to prevent exposure and contamination.
3. Potentially exposed animals shall be identified and managed in a manner to minimise the risk of contamination of meat intended for human consumption in accordance with relevant legal requirements.

MODULE 2. – SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENT

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that animal treatments are stored and administered in a safe and responsible manner to minimise the risk of chemical residues and physical hazards in livestock intended for human consumption.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. Animal treatments, including Hormonal Growth Promotants (HGP), are administered only by trained and competent staff in accordance with label and/or written veterinary directions and relevant legal requirements.
2. Chemicals are stored securely to in accordance with label/manufacturers' directions, to prevent exposure to livestock.
3. Sufficient records are maintained to enable, the traceability of the status of treated livestock, including introduced livestock, with respect to relevant WHP/ESI and/or presence of broken needles and to enable the correct/controlled use of chemicals to be demonstrated.
4. Accredited producers using HGPs in livestock must ensure that:
 - a. The application of HGPs is in accordance with statutory requirements including that treated livestock are permanently identified by a triangular ear punch and traceable; and
 - b. Full records of the use of HGPs are maintained.





MODULE 3. – FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to manage the exposure of livestock to foods containing unacceptable chemical contamination to minimise the risk of chemical residues in livestock and to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock intended for human consumption.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. Agricultural chemicals are applied to fodder crops, grain and pasture only by trained and competent staff² in accordance with label directions and/or relevant approvals in accordance with relevant legal requirements.
2. Chemicals are stored securely in accordance with label/manufacturers' directions, to prevent exposure to livestock.
3. Exposure of animals to fodder crops, grain and pasture, and introduced stock feed that have been treated with or exposed to agricultural chemicals, including any commodities classified as Alternate Feedstuff, is managed to minimise the risk of unacceptable chemical residues in livestock for human consumption. Sufficient records are maintained to enable the traceability of the status of exposed livestock, including introduced livestock, with respect to relevant WHP/ESI.
4. Exposure of animals to stock feed is managed to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock, with the exception of approved exemptions.
5. Sufficient records are maintained to enable the traceability of the status of fodder crops, grain and pasture, and introduced stock feed, including any commodities classified as Alternate Feedstuff, intended to be fed to livestock with respect to relevant WHP/ESI from slaughter or grazing/harvest as applicable and to enable the correct/controlled use of chemicals to be demonstrated.
6. Accredited producers acquiring Alternate Feedstuff must ensure that the use of Alternate Feedstuff is in accordance with the table below:

Alternate Feedstuff	Requirements for use
Cotton trash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. prior to each despatch of cotton trash from the supplying gin or cotton trash storage, an <i>Alternate Feedstuff (Cotton Trash) Declaration</i> is completed by the Accredited Producer and provided to LPA administration within 7 days of signing; b. a completed 'By-product Vendor Declaration' or equivalent delivery documentation is sourced from the supplying gin for the cotton trash; c. Livestock that have had, or may have had, access to cotton trash are grazed on clean feed for 60 days (Clean Feed Period) prior to dispatch for slaughter; d. movements of any livestock from the property within the Clean Feed Period are registered on the NLIS database by the accredited producer within 1 day; e. Livestock moving to another PIC prior to the completion of the Clean Feed Period are declared on the LPA NVD; f. the commencement of the Clean Feed Period is verified by an authorised auditor and is arranged by the accredited producer at the accredited producers' own cost; g. written verification is provided to LPA administration of the commencement of the Clean Feed Period and a list of the devices attached to livestock that have been verified to be grazing on clean feed; h. a management plan is in place to ensure the production system prevents access to cotton trash for the Clean Feed Period; and i. signed <i>Alternate Feedstuff (Cotton Trash) Declarations</i> are retained for a minimum of three years.

MODULE 4. – PREPARATION FOR DISPATCH OF LIVESTOCK

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that the selected livestock are fit for transport and that the risk of stress and contamination of livestock during assembly and transport is minimised.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. Only animals that are in a condition fit for travel are selected, to minimise potential disease and/or contamination related to transport conditions.
2. On farm assembly practices and transport arrangements are managed to minimise the risk of stress and contamination of animals.
3. Management practices ensure that minimum requirements for the fitness for travel of calves destined for sale or slaughter are in accordance with the Declarations made on the Bobby Calf LPA NVD at all times.

MODULE 5. – LIVESTOCK TRANSACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS

OUTCOME: A system has been implemented to enable traceability of the current status of all livestock with respect to treatment or exposure to relevant food safety hazards for all livestock movements between livestock production enterprises including to slaughter and live export.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. All livestock transactions and movements including between properties (Property Identification Codes) are accompanied by a current, correctly completed LPA National Vendor Declaration (NVD).
2. Sufficient records are maintained to enable the declarations on an accompanying LPA NVD concerning the food safety related status and HGP treatment of livestock introduced to and dispatched from the property to be reconciled with the livestock traceability system adopted.
3. Livestock must be NLIS Identified in accordance with relevant statutory requirements at all times.
4. The NLIS database shall be updated for all livestock introduced onto an LPA-accredited PIC within 2 days of their arrival onto the PIC.

MODULE 6. – BIOSECURITY

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risks of the introduction of infectious diseases to livestock production properties and the risks of the spread of disease.

REQUIREMENTS:

1. Each Property Identification Code (PIC) must have a Farm Biosecurity Plan that covers each of the following as a minimum:
 - a. Manage and record the introduction and movement of livestock in a way that minimises the risk of introducing or spreading infectious disease;
 - b. Where reasonable and practical, control people, equipment and vehicles entering the property to minimise the potential for property contamination and, if possible, keep a record of such movements onto the property; and
 - c. Prevent and control animal diseases on farm by regularly monitoring and managing livestock health.

MODULE 7. – ANIMAL WELFARE

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure the management of livestock is consistent with the requirements of the Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines³, as amended from time to time (Standards⁴ and Guidelines).

REQUIREMENTS:

1. The Property Identification Code (PIC) representative or person responsible for the management of livestock have accessible as a reference a current copy of the Standards and Guidelines for cattle, sheep and/or goats (as applicable), and are familiar with the content of the Standards and Guidelines.
2. The Property Identification Code (PIC) representative or person responsible for the management of livestock have successfully completed training in relation to the Standards and Guidelines through LPA Learning or an equivalent training program.
3. The Property Identification Code (PIC) representative or person responsible for the management of livestock have trained their staff (where relevant) in a manner consistent with the Standards and Guidelines.
4. The LPA Accredited Producer shall have a documented Animal Welfare Management Plan that demonstrates how the relevant Australian Animal Welfare Standards are being met on farm.

MODULE 8. – HARVESTED RANGELAND GOATS

OUTCOME: A system has been implemented to ensure movements of harvested rangeland goats are able to be traced from capture through to slaughter without being NLIS identified utilising the Harvested Rangeland Goat National Vendor Declaration.

REQUIREMENTS:

This module of LPA is only applicable to LPA Accredited Goat Producers who have approval from their relevant State or Territory to manage harvested rangeland goats.

1. Accredited Producers shall ensure that harvested rangeland goats are only:
 - a. captured from a wild state;
 - b. have not been born as a result of a managed breeding program; and
 - c. have not been subjected to any animal husbandry procedure or treatment.
2. Accredited Producers and Registered Goat Depots shall ensure only harvested rangeland goats are moved without being NLIS identified where they are being moved from the property of capture directly to either:
 - a. a processor for slaughter; or
 - b. one Registered Goat Depot.
3. Accredited Producers and Registered Goat Depots shall ensure all harvested rangeland goat movements are accompanied by a current, correctly completed Harvested Rangeland Goat LPA NVD.

NOTE: All movement of farmed or managed goats must be NLIS identified and accompanied by a current, correctly completed LPA NVD for Goats as per Module 5 – Livestock Transactions and movements.
4. Accredited Producers shall ensure that goats which have been captured as harvested rangeland goats are NLIS identified and accompanied by a current, correctly completed LPA NVD as per Module 5 – Livestock Transactions and Movements where they are being:
 - a. moved to another property;
 - b. moving via more than one Registered Goat Depot
 - c. consigned to a feedlot; or
 - d. managed in any way including in a breeding program or subjected to any animal husbandry procedure or treatment.
5. Accredited Producers operating as a Registered Goat Depot shall:
 - a. Have a letter from a goat meat processor indicating that the Registered Goat Depot is or will be a supplier of goats on a commercial basis;
 - b. ensure harvested rangeland goats are only received from an Accredited Producer in the Harvested Rangeland Goat module and accompanied with a fully completed Harvested Rangeland Goat LPA NVD;
 - c. only hold harvested rangeland goats at the depot for up to 10 days before moving directly to an abattoir for slaughter.
 - d. record harvested rangeland goat movements in the NLIS Database as a mob-based movement within 2 days of the goats arriving at or leaving the depot.
 - e. Ensure that any goats moved from one depot to another depot, saleyard, property or to export are tagged with a pink post-breeder NLIS device embossed with the depot PIC if they were originally moved to the depot untagged.
 - f. Ensure that if untagged goats are retained in a depot for longer than 10 days, they are tagged with a pink post-breeder NLIS device embossed with the depot PIC before being moved from the depot.

FOOTNOTES:

1. Recycled water refers to water recycled from sewage or other water sources containing human faecal material and supplied from a wastewater treatment plant under an agreement. This excludes on-farm household greywater and septic systems or stormwater. The use or accidental exposure of cattle to inadequately treated recycled water needs to be managed to minimise the risk of beef measles (*C. bovis*) infection in cattle.
2. Persons responsible for the use of chemicals must be able to demonstrate at audit a level of competency equivalent to the Level 3 competencies of “Preparation and Application of Chemicals”; and the “Transport, Handling and Storage of Chemicals” under the Australian Quality Training Framework as amended from time to time (AQTF).
3. The *Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines* can be accessed from the LPA website (<https://www.integritysystems.com.au/on-farm-assurance/animal-welfare>).
4. Animal Welfare Standards (being part of the Standards and Guidelines) will be law or equivalent in each State or Territory.



APPENDIX 1 - PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 1. 'Property Risk Assessment' of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 1. - PROPERTY RISK ASSESSMENT

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risk of livestock intended for human consumption being exposed to sites and sources of unacceptable contamination with organochlorine or other persistent chemicals, pathogens from recycled water⁴ or potentially injurious physical contaminants.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Has the enterprise completed a documented risk assessment to:
 - a. identify if there are any sites (or other potential sources) on the property that may have been contaminated with organochlorines or other persistent chemicals with the potential to result in unacceptable chemical residues in livestock?; and
 - b. identify any sources of potentially injurious physical contamination of livestock?; and
 - c. identify the use or accidental exposure of cattle to inadequately treated recycled water⁴ to minimise the risk of beef measles (*C. bovis*) infection?
2. Has the risk assessment process considered prior land use including agricultural activities, old dip sites, old rubbish sites, treatment of power poles, adjacent enterprise activities and the relevance of any existing contamination to each current livestock and agricultural activity undertaken?
3. Are sufficient records available to enable the enterprise to demonstrate the process undertaken to complete the risk assessment? This might include (where appropriate) letters from relevant authorities, soil test results or recycled water supply agreements i.e. waste water treatment plant audit result verifying the recycled water is fit for pasture irrigation.
4. Does the risk assessment adequately relate to the enterprise's current activities including any changes to activities over time such as lotfeeding?
5. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all contaminated sites/facilities been identified and recorded e.g. location of old dip sites on a farm map?
6. Can the enterprise demonstrate that contaminated sites and other potential sources of persistent chemicals are responsibly managed e.g. can livestock gain access to any contaminated sites and if so, have management practices been put in place to stop this occurring?
7. Can the enterprise demonstrate that any persistent chemicals on the farm are stored and disposed of in a manner to prevent risk of exposure to livestock e.g. chemicals are stored in a secure manner?
8. Where a feedlot is on-site, can the enterprise demonstrate that the risk assessment conducted is sufficient to ensure that the feedlot is not established on a contaminated site (e.g. soils test or animal fat test results)?
9. Can the enterprise demonstrate that management practices have been implemented to minimise the risk of physical contamination of livestock from any identified sources?
10. Can the enterprise demonstrate that management practices have been implemented to identify and manage livestock exposed to either residues or to sources of potentially injurious physical contaminants in meat intended for human consumption in accordance with relevant legal requirements?
11. Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and requirements for this module have been met?
12. Where recycled water⁴ is used to irrigate pasture or supplement drinking water for cattle the enterprise demonstrates:
 - a. the recycled water has had an adequate treatment to ensure there is either a:
 - i. Log Reduction Value (LRV) of 4.0 in *T. saginata* egg concentration; or
 - ii. LRV of 3.0 and fresh drinking water is provided to cattle?
 - b. cattle exposed to recycled water that has not had an adequate treatment as per point a) are identified, traceable and declared as exposed on NVDs?
 - c. the level of treatment for the recycled water is documented within a supply agreement (or similar) with the wastewater treatment plant and is made available for review to the auditor or LPA administration on request.

The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 2. 'Safe and Responsible Animal Treatments' of *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 2. - SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENTS

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that animal treatments are stored and administered in a safe and responsible manner to minimise the risk of chemical residues and physical hazards in livestock intended for human consumption.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all veterinary chemical application and handling is conducted by trained and competent persons e.g. persons applying or handling chemicals either hold or are under the supervision of a person/s with a current veterinary chemical user's certificate?
2. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the intended use, application method and dose rates of veterinary chemicals are understood prior to use e.g. by ensuring that chemical labels are read prior to use and that chemicals are applied in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?
3. Can the enterprise demonstrate that equipment used to administer or measure veterinary chemicals delivers the correct dose eg equipment is calibrated and checked for operational efficiency prior to use and thoroughly cleaned after use?
4. Can the enterprise demonstrate that only approved veterinary chemicals are used to ensure that livestock receive the appropriate treatment e.g. chemicals are approved by the national chemical registration body (APVMA)?
5. Can the enterprise demonstrate that veterinary chemicals are stored securely in accordance with label directions and exposure of livestock is prevented?
6. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all chemicals are used in accordance with label directions e.g. where chemicals are used in an extra-label manner that written directions are available from the veterinarian?
7. Can the enterprise demonstrate that management systems are in place to prevent cross – contamination between treated and non-treated animals (e.g. cross contamination through urine or milk)?
8. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the administration site of all veterinary chemical injections takes into consideration the relative value of the meat cut e.g. injections are administered into the neck region unless they are site specific?
9. Can the enterprise demonstrate that injection site damage is minimised in all livestock eg ensuring that no more than 10 ml of intramuscular injection is administered in any one site, with the exception of those that are site specific?
10. Can the enterprise demonstrate that adverse reactions to chemicals are monitored to minimise the risk of unknown chemical residues e.g. adverse reactions of livestock to veterinary chemical treatments are recorded?
11. Can the enterprise demonstrate that sufficient records of veterinary chemical treatments (including HGP's) are maintained to ensure that the treatment status of livestock can be evaluated prior to shipment? For example records could include:
 - Treatment date
 - Animal/mob ID
 - Chemical/drug used
 - Dosage
 - Withholding Period (WHP) and/or Export Slaughter Interval (ESI)
 - Date of expiry of the WHP and/or ESI
 - Batch Number and Expiry Date
12. Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock knowingly exposed to physical contaminants are permanently identified to maintain traceability e.g. in the event that a broken needle remains in an animal after treatment, that the animal is permanently identified?
13. Can the enterprise demonstrate that a current WHP and/or ESI chart is available for reference when completing treatment records?
14. Can the enterprise demonstrate that management practices minimise the risk of providing incorrect information at point of sale in relation to chemical status of livestock e.g. treated livestock and/or animals all treated and/or contaminated livestock are identified and/or segregated for the duration of the WHP and/or ESI and records are available to demonstrate that all livestock of unknown residue status are identified and evaluated?

MODULE 2. - SAFE AND RESPONSIBLE ANIMAL TREATMENTS (continued)

15. Can the enterprise demonstrate that where WHP and/or ESI information is not available on a chemical label, that additional enquiries are made with the chemical manufacturer, Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) and/or other relevant authority, to determine the WHP and/or ESI that needs to be applied to that chemical?
16. Where livestock are sold by direct consignment, can the enterprise demonstrate that the WHP and ESI status of treated livestock is provided to the purchaser to ensure that livestock are not processed for human consumption whilst within a WHP/ESI eg where livestock are sold by direct consignment to another producer whilst within a WHP and/or ESI, the buyer should be advised in writing details of the treatment, the relevant WHP and/or ESI and the date on which the WHP and/or ESI expires. The LPA NVD can be used for this purpose.
17. Can the enterprise demonstrate that where **cattle** have been transported and require tick treatment to cross tick lines, that treatment information is provided to the receiver of the livestock to minimise the risk of unknown chemical residues eg the purchaser is advised of treatment details in writing including WHP/ESI periods?
18. Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and requirements for this module have been met?

The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 3. 'Fodder Crops, Grain and Pasture Treatments and Stockfoods' of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 3. – FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to manage the exposure of livestock to foods containing unacceptable chemical contamination to minimise the risk of chemical residues in livestock and to eliminate the risk of animal products being fed to ruminant livestock intended for human consumption.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Can the enterprise demonstrate that treated paddock areas and any contaminated sites/facilities have been identified and recorded e.g. location of old rubbish sites on a farm map?
2. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all agricultural chemical application and handling is conducted by trained and competent persons e.g. persons applying or handling chemicals either hold or are under the supervision of a person/s with a current agricultural chemical user's certificate?
3. Can the enterprise demonstrate that equipment used to apply or measure agricultural chemicals delivers the correct application rate e.g. equipment is calibrated and checked for operational efficiency prior to use and thoroughly cleaned after use?
4. Can the enterprise demonstrate that only approved agricultural chemicals are used for the treatment of pasture, crops, fodder and grain to ensure that livestock are not exposed to unacceptable chemical residues e.g. chemicals are approved by the national chemical registration body (APVMA)?
5. Can the enterprise demonstrate that agricultural chemicals are stored securely in accordance with label directions and exposure of livestock is prevented?
6. Can the enterprise demonstrate that agricultural chemicals are used in accordance with label directions e.g.
 - below label rates where permitted by relevant legislation; or
 - under off-label permits issued by the Australian Pesticide & Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA)?
7. Can the enterprise demonstrate that where WHP and/or ESI information is not available on a chemical label, that additional enquiries are made with the chemical manufacturer, Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA) and/or other relevant authority, to determine the WHP and/or ESI that needs to be applied to that chemical?
8. Does the enterprise maintain sufficient records of agricultural chemical treatments (including spray drift) to ensure that the chemical residue status of pastures, crops and post-harvest product and facilities can be evaluated prior to exposure to livestock. For example records could include:
 - Treatment date
 - Location/size/quantity of feed treated
 - Chemical used - type and quantity
 - Application rate and method
 - Withholding period
 - Name of person conducting treatment

MODULE 3. – FODDER CROP, GRAIN AND PASTURE TREATMENTS AND STOCK FOODS (continued)

9. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all introduced stockfeed is evaluated for chemical residue risk prior to feeding to livestock e.g. does the enterprise require all introduced stockfeeds to be accompanied by a Commodity Vendor Declaration (CVD) or other statement indicating that the risk of spray drift contamination and/or the risk of OC contaminated soil has been addressed?
10. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the requirements for use of any Alternate Feedstuff have been adhered to?
11. Can the enterprise demonstrate that records of introduced stockfeeds are maintained to enable traceback in the event that chemical residues are detected in the introduced feed e.g. records enabling traceback include:
 - Date received
 - Stockfeed description
 - Supplier/origin
 - Residue analysis (if obtained)?
12. Can the enterprise demonstrate that stockfeeds of known unacceptable chemical contaminants (above APVMA standards) are not fed to livestock? This may include test analysis results of stockfeeds if appropriate.
13. Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock do not have access to paddocks treated with chemicals prior to the expiry of the withhold from graze period e.g. is a system in place of securing treated paddocks and identifying treated paddocks with signs?
14. Can the enterprise show that in the event that livestock have accessed treated paddocks that they are managed to address risk of residue contamination e.g. by meeting the relevant withholding period (WHP) or Export Slaughter Interval (ESI) period?
15. Does the enterprise have a system in place for ensuring that withholding periods are observed where storage facilities and/or post-harvest product have been treated with fungicides, insecticides, fungicides or other chemicals prior to feeding to livestock? This may be achieved by ensuring that facilities and treated product is identified by signage.
16. Can the enterprise demonstrate that ruminant livestock are not fed or have access to feed containing animal products with the exception of exemptions that may be applied from time to time by statutory authorities. Current exemptions include tallow, gelatin, milk and milk products of Australian origin. This may be achieved by ensuring that the enterprise does not purchase product that may contain animal products or by keeping records of feed fed to other species.
17. Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and requirements for this module have been met?



The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 4. 'Preparation for Dispatch of Livestock' of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 4. – PREPARATION FOR DISPATCH OF LIVESTOCK

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure that the selected livestock are fit for transport and that the risk of stress and contamination of livestock during assembly and transport is minimised.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the risk of stress associated with transport is minimised by ensuring that only those livestock that are fit for travel are transported?
2. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the potential for contamination of livestock is minimised during transport? This may be achieved by implementing the following practices:
 - ensuring that the construction of upper decks minimises soiling of cattle on lower decks;
 - ensuring that decks are as clean as practicable before loading;
 - are livestock adequately prepared for transport? Obtain confirmation in writing from transporter or customer (abattoir operator) about any requirements. Feed curfew time should be the minimum necessary to manage the risk of contamination during transport and ensure welfare during the journey.
3. Can the enterprise demonstrate that transporters are selected to minimise stress during transport e.g. preference is given to the engagement of livestock transport companies that transport livestock in accordance with a recognised quality assurance program such as Truckcare?
4. Can the enterprise demonstrate that feedback/complaints from processors/purchasers in relation to excessive soiling of livestock are investigated to prevent reoccurrence? This might include records of feedback/complaints and details of steps implemented to address the issue.
5. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all calves described on Bobby Calf LPA NVDs have been prepared for transport in accordance with the following provisions at all times: Calves must: (a) be between 5 and 30 days of age; (b) be protected from cold and heat; (c) be in good health, alert and able to rise from a lying position; (d) be adequately fed milk or milk replacer on the farm within 6 hours of transport; and (e) be prepared and transported to ensure delivery in less than 18 hours from last feed with no more than 12 hours spent on transports. Note: The above requirements are as stated on the BC0411 version of the Bobby Calf NVD.
6. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the record management system is auditable and identifies the calves were last fed within 6 hours of transport unless the journey is: (a) between rearing properties; and (b) is less than 6 hours' duration?
7. Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and requirements for this module have been met?



The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 5. 'Livestock Transactions and Movements' of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 5. – LIVESTOCK TRANSACTIONS AND MOVEMENTS

OUTCOME: A system has been implemented to enable traceability of the current status of all livestock with respect to treatment or exposure to relevant food safety hazards for all livestock movements between livestock production enterprises including to slaughter and live export.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all introduced livestock transactions and movements are accompanied by a **correctly** and **fully** completed LPA NVD to enable the traceability of the status of livestock in relation to chemical residue, injurious physical contaminants, HGP treatments and/or disease (Food Safety hazards) by retaining records of LPA NVDs?
2. Can the enterprise demonstrate that all LPA NVDs are completed accurately and signed to ensure the integrity of the paddock to plate food safety chain? This can be achieved through the retention of records and being able to accurately complete NVDs.
3. Are sufficient records maintained to enable the enterprise to demonstrate the traceability of stock purchased/introduced onto the property with respect to chemical treatment and/or injurious physical contaminant status? Records should include the following information:
 - Date of purchase/introduction
 - Vendor's name and address or property identification code (PIC)
 - Description of livestock (number, age, sex)
 - Name of selling agent and sale (if purchased at auction)
4. Are sufficient records maintained to enable the enterprise to demonstrate that stock dispatched for sale or slaughter can be traced that include the following information:
 - Description of livestock (number, age, sex)
 - Transaction date
 - Name of purchaser/selling agent
 - Name of transport operator and vehicle registration
5. Can the enterprise demonstrate that the status of livestock, in regards to chemical residues, injurious physical contaminants, HGP treatments and/or the ruminant feed ban, is reviewed prior to sale or slaughter enabling the accurate completion of LPA NVDs and traceability of the current food safety status of livestock?
6. Can the enterprise demonstrate that where livestock are known to have been exposed to potentially injurious physical contaminants that the livestock buyer is advised in writing of the status of the livestock?
7. Can the enterprise demonstrate where livestock have been sold within a WHP/ESI, that the buyer was advised in writing of the applicable WHP/ESI and clear for slaughter date? For example retained LPA NVDs or written correspondence?
8. Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock traceability system adopted identifies all livestock that have been exposed to chemical residues, injurious physical contaminants, HGP treatments and/or other food safety hazards? Identification may be individual or mob based systems. NLIS is an example of a suitable identification system?
9. Can the enterprise demonstrate that livestock are NLIS identified in accordance with statutory requirements at all times (e.g. NLIS Business Rules)?
10. Can the enterprise demonstrate through other procedures or practices that outcomes and requirements for this module have been met?



The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 6. 'Biosecurity' of the *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 6. – BIOSECURITY

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to minimise the risks of the introduction of infectious diseases to livestock production properties and the risks of the spread of disease.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Does the Property Identification Code (PIC) have a documented Farm Biosecurity Plan?
2. Do all livestock movements onto the PIC have a known health status – that is, are livestock coming onto the property accompanied by a Livestock Health Statement/Declaration or equivalent?
3. Are all introduced livestock inspected for signs of ill health or disease on arrival at the property and kept in isolation for a minimum period of time?
4. Are livestock inspected regularly for ill health and/or disease, and is appropriate action undertaken in response where necessary?
5. Is the risk of livestock straying onto or away from the property minimised?
6. Are systems in place to ensure a veterinary practitioner or animal health officer is notified if an unusual disease, illness or mortality is observed?
7. Where reasonable and practical, are the movements of people, vehicles and equipment entering your property controlled and, where possible, recorded?
8. Do you maintain any other procedures or practices that contribute to minimising the risk and/or spread of disease?

The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 7. 'Animal Welfare' of *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 7. – ANIMAL WELFARE

OUTCOME: On farm systems have been implemented to ensure the management of livestock is consistent with the requirements of the *Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines*³, as amended from time to time (Standards⁴ and Guidelines).

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Is a copy of the current version of the '*Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines*' for cattle, sheep or goats (as applicable to your property) accessible as a reference³?
2. Has the Property Identification Code (PIC) representative or person responsible for the management of livestock successfully completed training in relation to the Standards and Guidelines through LPA Learning or an equivalent training program?
3. Are staff involved in animal husbandry familiar with the content of the current version of the Standards and Guidelines for cattle, sheep and/or goats (as applicable)?
4. Do you maintain any other procedures or practices that contribute to improved animal welfare outcomes in your operation?
5. Does the LPA Accredited Producer have a documented Animal Welfare Management Plan?

The following **Performance Checklist** identifies a number of activities that will assist in meeting the Requirements for Module 8. 'Harvested Rangeland Goats' of *Livestock Production Assurance - Level 1 On Farm Assurance* program.

MODULE 8. – HARVESTED RANGELAND GOATS

OUTCOME: A system has been implemented to ensure movements of Harvested Rangeland Goats are able to be traced from capture through to slaughter without being NLIS identified utilising the Harvested Rangeland Goat National Vendor Declaration.

PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST:

1. Does the LPA Accredited Producer have approval from their relevant State or Territory to manage harvested rangeland goats?
2. Has the LPA Accredited Producer sent goats on a HRG LPA NVD that are only:
 - a. captured from a wild state;
 - b. have not been born as a result of a managed breeding program; and
 - c. have not been subjected to any animal husbandry procedure or treatment?
3. Has the LPA Accredited Producer ensured only harvested rangeland goats are moved without being NLIS identified where they are being moved from the property of capture directly to either a processor for slaughter or to one registered goat depot?
4. Does the producer have a procedure in place to manage goats captured as harvested rangeland goats that become managed goats?
5. Does the producer understand that harvested goats must be NLIS identified and accompanied by a current, correctly completed LPA NVD as per Module 5 – Livestock Transactions and Movements where they are being:
 - a. moved to another property;
 - b. moving via more than one registered goat depot
 - c. consigned to a feedlot; or
 - d. managed in any way including in a breeding program or subjected to any animal husbandry procedure or treatment?
6. Have all harvested rangeland goat movements been accompanied by a current, correctly completed Harvested Rangeland Goat LPA NVD?



Livestock Production
Assurance

NEED TO KNOW MORE?

Access and download:

LPA rules, checklists, record templates and factsheets at
integritysystems.com.au/lpa

Email: lpa@integritysystems.com.au

Call Integrity Systems Customer Service on 1800 683 111