

## Proposed Changes Instructions and Sample Templates

1. Identify the section of 9 CFR that a change is being proposed as well as the heading for that section.

§145.42 Participation

2. Copy the section onto a blank sheet of paper.

### § 145.42 Participation.

(a) Participating turkey flocks, and the eggs and poults produced from them, shall comply with the applicable general provisions of subpart A of this part and the special provisions of this subpart D.

(b) Hatching eggs shall be fumigated in accordance with part 147 of this subchapter or otherwise sanitized.

(c) Any nutritive material provided to poults must be free of the avian pathogens that are officially represented in the Plan disease classifications listed in §145.10.

3. Begin by striking through the wording you wish to remove and then type in any wording that you wish to add. Any word or words that are added should be underlined.

### § 145.42 Participation.\*\*\*\*\*

(a) Participating turkey flocks, and the eggs and poults produced from them, shall comply with the applicable general provisions of subpart A of this part and the special provisions of this subpart D.

(b) Hatching eggs ~~shall should be nest clean. They may~~ be fumigated in accordance with part 147 of this subchapter or otherwise sanitized.

(c) Any nutritive material provided to poults must be free of the avian pathogens that are officially represented in the Plan disease classifications listed in §145.10.

4. Any proposed change to the provisions must be accompanied with a justification for the change. The justification can be one statement or a short paragraph that explains the reason for the change.

#### **Reason**

In the 2010 NPIP conference Subparts B, C, G and H changed their requirements for hatching eggs to remove the requirement that they “shall be fumigated” to “may be fumigated” and changed the NPIP Provisions language to read as the proposal above. With the continued restrictions from OSHA and concerns related to staff safety with fumigation the Subpart D Turkey Breeding Flocks want to make the similar NPIP Provisions proposal change.

5. After the reason or justification list the sponsor, name of the person, who is proposing the change as well as the company/university/agency/etc. that the person works for or is representing.

#### **Sponsor**

Dr. John Doe  
Turkey Happy Farms, Inc

## SAMPLE TEMPLATE--EXAMPLE ONLY

### § 146.11 Inspections.

(a) Each participating slaughter plant shall be audited at least once annually or a sufficient number of times each year to satisfy the Official State Agency that the participating slaughter plant is in compliance with the provisions of this part. The yearly audit will consist of an evaluation of 2 weeks' worth of records, selected at random, of the following data:

(1) The actual flock slaughter date for each flock. This information must come from a verifiable source. Verifiable sources include electronic record systems that have oversight from the Department's Grain Inspectors, Packers and Stockyards Administration or Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) documents such as FSIS Form 9061-2.

(2) Laboratory test results for each flock slaughtered with the sample collection date and test result. The test must be NPIP-approved and performed in an authorized laboratory of the NPIP.

(b) A flock will be considered to be ~~not~~ conforming to protocol if it meets the requirements as described in § 146.33 (a), § 146.43 (a) or § 146.53 (a). ~~there are no test results available, if samples from the flock were not collected and tested within 21 days prior to slaughter, or if the test results for the flocks were not returned prior to movement to slaughter.~~

(c) Two or more flocks that are found to be not conforming to protocol in the yearly audit for a slaughter plant shall be cause for a deficiency rating for that plant. However, if the root cause for the deficiency was identified, corrected, and documented, the plant will be eligible for an immediate reevaluation of 2 additional weeks' worth of records, again selected at random. If no more than one missed flock is identified in this reevaluation, the plant will be considered in compliance and no further action will be required. Plants found to be deficient must provide a written corrective action plan to the auditor within 2 weeks of receipt of the deficiency rating. A follow up audit on the information in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section will occur within 90 days from the receipt of the corrective action plan. Slaughter plants will retain their classification and may continue to use the Plan emblem in §146.9(a) during this process. A failure on the follow up audit may result in disbarment from participation according to the procedures in §146.12.

(d) On-site inspections of any participating flocks and premises will be conducted if a State Inspector determines that a breach of testing has occurred for the Plan programs for which the flocks are certified.

(e) The official H5/H7 LPAI testing records of all participating flocks and slaughter plants shall be examined annually by a State Inspector. Official H5/H7 LPAI testing records shall be maintained for 3 years.

#### Reason:

A problem was created in the § 146.11 language by a proposed change in 2012 NPIP conference. The proposed change inadvertently combined all the different allowed testing requirements for each Subpart 146C, 146D and 146E participating slaughter plants into only one limited set of testing requirements. It also inadvertently contradicted the requirement allowing for testing at the slaughter plant on a shift basis. This proposal will undo the inadvertently created problems and correct and improve the language to allow each Subpart 146C Meat-Type Chicken Slaughter Plants, 146D Meat-Type Turkey Slaughter Plants and 146E Commercial Waterfowl and Commercial Upland Game Bird Slaughter Plants to have and set their own testing requirements for their Subpart independent of each other. Moreover, by referring to each appropriate NPIP Provisions Subpart number it allows for future changes to the testing requirements by each Subpart 146C, 146D or 146E without having to change any language in the § 146.11 Inspections section.

#### Sponsor:

Paul Wm. Brennan  
Indiana State Poultry Association

**SAMPLE TEMPLATE -- EXAMPLE ONLY**

**Subpart A - Blood Testing Procedures**

**(6) Standard test procedures for mycoplasma.**

**(a) Serum plate agglutination test.**

(1) The serum plate agglutination test for mycoplasma is conducted ~~by contacting and mixing 0.02 ml of test serum with 0.03 ml of serum plate antigen on a glass at room temperature. The standard procedure is:~~ as below, or as per USDA licensed manufactures' directions, if different.

(i) Allow antigen and test serums to warm up to room temperature before use.

(ii) Dispense test serums in 0.02 ml amounts with a pipette or standardized loop (rinsed between samples) to 1.5 inch squares on a ruled glass plate. Limit the number of samples (no more than 25) to be set up at one time according to the speed of the operator. Serum should not dry out before being mixed with antigen.

(iii) Dispense 0.03 ml of antigen beside the test serum on each square. Hold antigen dispensing bottle vertically.

(iv) Mix the serum and antigen, using a multimixing device if large numbers are to be run at one time.

(v) Rotate the plate for 5 seconds. At the end of the first minute, rotate the plate again for 5 seconds and read 55 seconds later.

(2) A positive reaction is characterized by the formation of definite clumps, usually starting at the periphery of the mixture. Most samples that are highly positive will react well within the 2-minute test period. Reactions thereafter should be considered negative, although partial agglutination at 3 and 5 minutes may warrant further retesting. High-quality antigen contacted with negative serum will usually dry up on the plate without visible clumping. Whenever samples are run, the antigen should be tested against known positive and negative control serums. Standard reference antigens and negative and positive titered sera are available from the National Veterinary Services Laboratories (NVSL), P.O. Box 884, Ames, Iowa 50010. Positive and negative control sera are also available commercially.

(3) Since it is difficult to measure uniform amounts of serum with a calibrated loop, this technique should not be used in conducting an official test.

**Reason:** USDA licensed antigens for the serum plate agglutination test are tested and released by specific methods as listed in the outline of production and the product insert (instructions) which are approved by the USDA. Changes to these instructions are considered off label use and cannot be suggested as they may reduce sensitivity and or cause false results. The proposal will enable NPIP labs to be in compliance with this testing protocol while achieving the most consistent and accurate results.

**Sponsor:** Doug Warner  
Charles River Avian Vaccine Services