Electronic Auditing: iAuditor and its use in the Poultry Industry
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Why Make Audits Electronic?

• Technology has advanced
  – Many industries are now adopting

• Easy to use

• Fast uploading

• Safe and effective
  – If used properly

• Can be used on virtually any device
Electronic Devices

I. Apple
   i. iPhone
   ii. iPad

II. Android
   i. Smart Phone
   ii. Tablet
Device Tutorials


How to use iAuditor for Turkey Welfare Auditing
Samsung Galaxy Note 10.1 2014 Edition
Turkey Welfare Audit Developed by: Brooke Bartz
Updated: 06 - 26 - 2014

How to use iAuditor for Turkey Welfare Auditing
Apple iPad Air, 2014 Edition
Turkey Welfare Audit Developed by: Brooke Bartz
Updated: 06 - 26 - 2014
Software

I. Dropbox

II. SharePlus Lite and SharePlus

III. iAuditor
Dropbox

I. Store Information
   i. Pictures, Microsoft documents, PDF
   ii. From apps and webpages

II. Share Information
   i. Send link through e-mail
   ii. Available on devices and desktop computer
SharePlus Lite and SharePlus

I. Store Information
   i. Pictures, Microsoft documents, PDF
   ii. Portal to webpages

II. Password Protected
   i. Available on devices and desktop computer
iAuditor and SafetyCloud

I. Auditing Program
   i. 100% electronic

   ii. Storage Available
       • SafetyCloud
       • http://www.safetyculture.io/legal/privacy-policy

   iii. Exporting and Printing Options

   iv. 30-day Free Trial
Features of iAuditor

I. Dashboard
i. Can be accessed by device (including desktop)
ii. Summaries audits
iii. Access to completed audits
Features of iAuditor

Dashboard Online at:
Features of SafetyCloud

I. Dashboard
   I. Verify devices on account that are in use
   II. Store completed data

II. Analytics
   I. Verify audits
   II. Monitor scores
   III. View trends

III. Templates
   I. Create new templates
   II. Update and repair old templates

IV. Audits
   i. View completed audits
   ii. Complete audits from desktop computer
Creating Templates in iAuditor

Drag and Drop Option
Creating Templates in iAuditor

Types of Questions

- Basic
  - Category
  - Question
  - More
- Address
- Multiple Choice
- Checkbox
- Signature
- Date Time
- Slider
- Drawing
- Switch
- Photo
- Text
- Information
- Text - Single Line

- Advanced
  - Dynamic Field
  - Smart Field
Creating Templates in iAuditor

Adding into Template
Completing Audits in iAuditor

Choose Audit

Example Template for AMI Conference
Template used for demonstrations

Jun 26, 2014

Unnamed Template

Jun 3, 2014

Animal Welfare Audit - updated 3-10-2014
Turkey Slaughter Welfare

May 30, 2014

Turkey Welfare Audit
Turkey Slaughter Welfare 04-28-2014

Apr 24, 2014

Animal Welfare Audit - updated 04-23-2014
Turkey Slaughter-Welfare

Apr 23, 2014

Complete

Turkey Welfare Audit

Start Audit

Sharing

Description
Turkey Slaughter Welfare 04-28-2014

Labels (0)

Export

Turkey Welfare Audit

Export Audit

Sharing

Document Number: 000012
Template: Turkey Welfare Audit
Owned by: Brooke Bartz
Last edited by: Brooke Bartz
Status: Completed
Started: 6/27/14, 9:30 AM
Updated: 6/30/14, 1:12 PM
Completed: 6/27/14, 10:11 AM
Score: 2,327 / 2,331
Score %: 100%
Elapsed Time: 39m 13s

Labels (0)
iAuditor Output

Exporting Options:

- PDF
- DOCX (Word)
- iAuditor Template
- CSV
- JSON
- XML
- WebDAV Upload
## NTF vs. Kraft Turkey Welfare Audit

### Audit Scoring and Comparison

#### NTF Turkey Audit Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catching and Transport</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Percentage of Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving (Herding)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooping</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage Density</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Repair</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Accommodation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch Crew Training</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.53 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportional Percentage of Slaughter Audit: **36.83 %**

#### Kraft Turkey Audit Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Criteria Number</th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
<th>Percentage of Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plant Documentation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pre-Processing Live Hold Area</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Live Birds in DOA Bin</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>12.16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Live Dock Processing</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>14.51 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportional Percentage of Slaughter Audit: **33.02 %**
NTF vs. Kraft Turkey Welfare Audit

Audit Scoring and Comparison

NTF Turkey Audit Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Percentage of Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard Holding Times</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Training</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Ventilation in Holding Area</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Wings Antemortem</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Shackling</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Stun</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Kill</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.53 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportional Percentage of Slaughter Audit: 63.16 %

Kraft Turkey Audit Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Criteria Number</th>
<th>Total Points Possible</th>
<th>Percentage of Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Shackling Efficacy</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Acts of Abuse (1)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>18.04 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stunning Efficacy</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>11.37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bleed-Out and Scalding</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13.73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Line Speed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Acts of Abuse (2)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>18.04 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportional Percentage of Slaughter Audit: 66.99 %
I. Turkey Welfare Audit
   i. Point allocations
   ii. Percentage
   iii. View trends
Contents

Signature Verification

Follow-Up Action

Audit is complete. Document ending time and complete any follow-up procedures that must be done at this time.

Audit Concluded At:
Tap to select a date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun Sep 26</td>
<td>10 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon Sep 29</td>
<td>11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed Sep 24</td>
<td>9 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri Sep 26</td>
<td>11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu Sep 25</td>
<td>10 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document is complete and the information contained within this turkey welfare report is correct according to my knowledge and training for performing this audit in accordance with Kraft Foods Group expectations. I also understand the information within this document is confidential and will not discuss any information within the document to unauthorized personnel unless legally obligated to. (Signature Required, Tap Pen at Right)

Signature

Enter name of signee

9/27/14

New Follow-up Action

Title
Shackling

Description

New trainee, two mis-shackled birds in a row. Needs additional training.

Category
Tap to edit

Priority
Medium (3)

Date due
Sep 27, 2014, 2:00 PM

Audit
Turkey Welfare Audit

Item

Cancel  Save
Core Criteria 7: Stunning Efficacy

Score 100 turkeys during the specified shift.

Scoring Guidelines:
Stunned Correctly: Animal is completely insensitive to pain. No signs of returning to sensibility seen.
Ineffective Stun: Animal shows some type of response associated with returning to consciousness.

Things to look for during audit that indicate a proper stun
1) No corneal reflex
2) No spontaneous blinking
3) No rhythmic breathing
4) No righting reflex

*Wing flapping should not be used as the primary sign of sensibility. Although this can be associated with returning to sensibility, other signs outlined above must be used to determine the true state if the bird.


Any willful act of abuse/egregious act grounds as an automatic failure an in need of immediate corrective action.

Willful acts include but are not limited to:
1. Shackling a severely injured bird
2. Lifting a bird solely by its feathers
3. Hitting or beating an animal
4. Any other handling techniques other than what is listed in the DPS training document

Any willful acts observed?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Next Section
No Ambiguity

Core Criteria 1: Plant Transportation Policy

1. Plant has written animal welfare policy for animals once they have been received into the plant:
   - Yes
   - No

2. Mechanisms are in place to minimize travel time to facility:
   - Yes
   - No

3. Emergency plans in place for animals in transit:
   - Yes
   - No

4. Availability of acceptable euthanasia tools for turkeys:
   - Yes
   - No

5. Maintenance records for euthanasia equipment, proper storage, and employee documentation of training for euthanasia are available:
   - Yes
   - No

Pictures for ID

Core Criteria 2: Trailers in Pre-Processing Holding Area

Five individual trailers will be audited at random at the live animal holding docks and the overall scores of the five trailers will be combined for overall scoring.

Temperature at Trailer Holding Docks (Thermometers are mounted by Dock 8 & Dock 26):
Tap here to edit
## Contents

**Unloading Dock**

1. Trailer has been properly driven into the live bay to ensure ease during unloading:
   - Yes
   - No

2. Proper lighting for unloading turkeys is used:
   - Yes
   - No

3. Adequate staff available for receiving/shackling turkeys:
   - Yes
   - No

4. Proper sized shackles are used for the size of the turkeys:
   - Yes
   - No

5. Calming tools are used to keep turkeys from becoming stressed (i.e. quieting belts, curtains, etc.)
   - Yes
   - No

6. Total Number of DOAs on Trailer (count number of turkeys in DOA bin located on the front of the truck after truck is completely unloaded):
   Tap here to edit

**Pre-Processing Live Holding Area**

1) Trailer Number and Dock: (example: 213, 12)
   Tap here to edit

   - The temperature is: (select a choice)
     Tap to select a response

   - 1. Trailer loaded at proper density depending on weather conditions:
     - Yes
     - No

   - 2. Coops are in good repair (i.e. No sharp edges, broken latches, etc.):
     - Yes
     - No

   - 3. Stocking density allows turkeys to be in a single layer:
     - Yes
     - No

   - 4. Are all animals properly loaded in coops (i.e. No wings, feet, beaks, etc. caught in hinged doors):
     - Yes
     - No

Kraft Foods Group, Inc.
Contents

Multiple Choice

Select from the options below:
- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday

Drawing Function

Feet in front of bar

production chain

proper bird orientation
Contents

Media Uploading and Annotation
Resources and Time Management

I. Resources
   i. Purchasing device
      • $500 - $1,000
   ii. Access to power
   iii. Wireless internet connection

II. Initial Template Set-Up
   i. Moderately time consuming
      • Each question is setup individually
   ii. Development
      • Allow 2-3 weeks to complete audit setup
   iii. Testing and updating
      • Allow 2-3 weeks to walk through audit on-site
Disadvantages of Electronic Auditing

I. Change in Management Style
   i. Initial training
   ii. Electronic updates and continued change

II. Record Keeping
   i. Need to print out audit after completed

III. Charging and General Care
Advantages of Electronic Auditing

I. Synch with Wi-Fi to Multiple Devices

II. Ideal in Adverse Weather Conditions
   i. Waterproof cases
   ii. No wet paper or pens that won’t work

III. Easy to Use – Even in Difficult Areas

IV. Easy Uploading
   i. Automatic Scoring

V. Efficient
   I. Complete audits quicker
   II. Save on external device (USB drive, if Android)
Electronic Auditing in Field Applications

I. Currently used at Slaughter Facility

II. Could be used On-Farm
   i. Management tool:
      • Vaccines, movements, euthanasia
      • Paperwork in one location

III. Large versus Small Operations
Further Questions?

Brooke M. Bartz
Graduate Student; Poultry Science- NCSU
brookebartz13@gmail.com
bmbartz@ncsu.edu