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Validation – What does it mean?

Obtaining and evaluating scientific and technical evidence that a control measure, combination of control measures, or the food safety plan as a whole, when properly implemented,

is capable of effectively controlling the identified hazards.
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

- All team members and their qualification
- Target pathogens and target log reductions (include Hazard Analysis)
- Process description (line, process step equipment, process capability, sensor calibration)
- Product Description (product groups recipe variabilities)
- Experimental Design (sample / inoculum preparation, transport, introduction and retrieval from process, laboratory and methods)
- Study Results (log reductions achieved under which process conditions)
- Conclusions (final outcome, summary, recommendations / design of future monitoring / alarms / corrective actions)

The report shall be available at the site(s) as part of their Food Safety Management.
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

➢ All team members and their qualification
Many firms utilize **in-house experts for process establishment**. FDA does not have any formal means of evaluating or accepting PA’s or their competency.

For both LACF and FSMA based regulations, qualified individuals must complete standardized training (BPCS for LACF; FSPCA for FSMA regulated products). FSPCA also permits one to be a qualified individual if they are “otherwise qualified through job experience…”.

**IFTPS** (Institute for Thermal Processing Specialists) Definition: An **individual, or group, expert in the development, implementation and evaluation of thermal and/or aseptic processes**. The **areas of competency** listed below provide a functional description of areas of practice, but are by no means inclusive or exclusive:…

**ABC recognized process authorities: process_authorities.pdf (almonds.com)** – for almonds only

**Food Processing Authorities Directory – Association of Food and Drug Officials (afdo.org)**

Note: List not exhaustive, only listing externals, but not recognized thermal process authorities within companies – **pay attention to field of expertise !!**
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

➢ Target pathogens and target log reductions (include Hazard Analysis)

Common Issues in Validations

😊 Inappropriate target pathogen for validated products / process
😊 log reduction not defined during experimental design
How do you identify your target pathogen(s)?

**Target Pathogen(s) – BE SPECIFIC !!!**

- HACCP Study – hazard analysis (also consider intended use)
- Epidemiological information
- Surveys, published literature (on prevalence, occurrence)

---

**Table 5**: Levels of Salmonella in positive samples of some types of naturally contaminated low water activity foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Where collected</th>
<th>Sample size (g)</th>
<th>Salmonella levels (MPN/g)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almond, raw kernel</td>
<td>Processor receiving, California, 100 g x 1 and 3 each: 25 g, 2.5 g, 0.35 g</td>
<td>96 samples: 0.0044 to 0.15; four samples: 0.00080, 0.00080, 0.00096, 0.0034; 10 samples: 0.002 to 0.032</td>
<td>Bansal et al., 2010; Danyliuk et al., 2007; Lambertini et al., 2012, Harris, unpubl. (2013 data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil nut</td>
<td>Retail, UK</td>
<td>10 g x 10</td>
<td>Two samples: 0.23, 0.09</td>
<td>Little et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ceylan et al, 2021
How many log reductions are sufficient to control the biological hazard??

Look at
➢ Prevalence rates and quantitative levels at initial stage
➢ Exposure assessments
   (including infective / harmful dosage, consumption pattern)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Target organism</th>
<th>Process parameter/criteria</th>
<th>Performance criterion</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat and meat products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermented dry</td>
<td>Any validated process</td>
<td><em>Escherichia coli</em> O157:H7</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5-log</td>
<td>USDA, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sausage containing beef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooked beef, roast</td>
<td>Lethality process which must</td>
<td><em>Salmonella</em></td>
<td>Shorter holding times for</td>
<td>6.5- or 7.0-log</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations, 2009b,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beef, and cooked</td>
<td>include a cooking step</td>
<td></td>
<td>temperatures ≥145°F (62.8°C). For example, 85 or 91 s at 140°F (60°C) or equivalent. Longer holding time for temperatures ≤145°F (62.8°C). For example, 23 to 24 min at 137°F (58.4°C) or equivalent. Inactivation target is considered to be reached instantly at temperatures ≥158°F (70°C).</td>
<td>reduction</td>
<td>Chapter III, Subchapter A, Part 318, Subpart A: Entry into Official Establishments: Reinspections and Preparation of Products. Section 318.17; FSIS, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corned beef products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Meat and poultry           | Heating process                | *Salmonella, E. coli* O157:H7 for products containing beef | ND                         | 5-log reduction      | FSIS, 2014 |
| jerky                      |                                |                 |                            |                        |            |

Source: Ceylan et al, 2021
Low-Acid canned food regulations / guidelines: “12D *Clostridium botulinum* cook”, FDA 21 CFR 108 (USA)

Milk Pasteurization: Codex Alimentarius (CAC/RCP 57-2004) CODE OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE FOR MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS „The application of heat to milk and liquid milk products aimed at reducing the number of any pathogenic micro-organisms to a level at which they do not constitute a significant health hazard.” „As *C. burnettii* is the most heat-resistant non-sporulating pathogen likely to be present in milk, pasteurization is designed to achieve at least a 5 log reduction of *C. burnettii* in whole milk (4% milkfat).”

Almond Processing (USA): 7 CFR 981.442 USDA (minimum 4-log reduction of *Salmonella* bacteria in almonds)


Juice Processing (USA): Guidance for Industry: Juice HACCP Hazards and Controls Guidance (The 5-log pathogen reduction requirement in 21 CFR 120.24.)


Meat Processing: USA - FSIS 64 FR 732, UK – ACMSF
Further Literature

Issues To Consider When Setting Intervention Targets with Limited Data for Low-Moisture Food Commodities: A Peanut Case Study

(Schaffner et al.; 2013; JFP 76(2): 360-369)

compare various assumptions about prevalence and concentration and how they are combined. The discussions made clear that data and risk models developed for other low-moisture foods like almonds and pistachios may be applicable to peanuts. Workshop participants were comfortable with the use of a 5-log reduction for controlling risk in products like peanuts when the level of contamination of the raw ingredients is low (<1 CFU/g) and the process well controlled, even when limited data are available. The relevant stakeholders from the food safety community may eventually conclude that as additional data, generally supportive of the effectiveness of a 5-log reduction, based on both a consideration of microbiological risk assessment concepts and the past use of such a requirement to protect public health.
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

- Process description (line, process step equipment, process capability, sensor calibration)

Common Issues in Validations

- Process information not complete
- Process variabilities not considered
- Validation conditions / equipment / process not described in validation report
- “Worst-case” scenarios missed
Choosing a control measure...Cocoa Production

- Raw cocoa beans
  - Pre-cleaning
  - Debacterisation
    - Steam
  - Roasting
    - Breaking & Winnowing
- Breaking & Winnowing
- Drying
  - Raw cocoa nibs
    - Alcalization
      - Steam Water
    - Roasting
      - Grinding
        - Cocoa Liquor
          - Pressing
            - Cocoa Butter
            - Cocoa Powder
Process related facts

Is it…

**Described:** relevant critical parameters described and values / limits described

**Controlled:** Limits are met – confirmed by monitoring and verification activities 
corrections / corrective actions defined and followed

**Reproducible:** Trend Analysis shows no drift

**Examples of parameters to be considered:**

- **Moisture** (Steam, Water additions)
- **Time** (Speed, Type of material flow – laminar – turbulent)
- **Temperature** (even distribution / cold spots)
- **Pressure / Gas / Irradiation**
- **Weight and potential others** (instrument specific)
„exact same process and product“

Cooking ≠ Dry Roasting – different critical parameters

Heat ≠ Other technologies – different target microorganisms

Batch ≠ Continuous process – start-up, end of run, ingoing material

Feed meal ≠ cocoa husks
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

➢ Product Description (product groups recipe variabilities)

Common Issues in Validations

😀 Validation product not described in validation report (variability of physical / chemical characteristics)
😊 “Worst-case” scenarios missed
Heat resistance Comparison of various bacterial pathogens

Heat resistance of *Salmonella* depends on water activity / moisture of the materials to be heat-treated.

**Examples:**

*Salmonella* Senftenberg in raw milk
D-value at 67.5° C: 0.046 min = 2.76 sec

*Salmonella* Senftenberg in chocolate
D-value at 70° C: min. 440 min

Source: Ceylan et al, 2021
How good to you know your product(s) ?

**Physical Product Characteristics and their variability:**
- Composition: Moisture / pH / Fat / Protein / Sugar / Salt / Preservatives
- Density / Size / Surface
- Initial Form (e.g. raw or pre-processed)
- Final Form (e.g. pieces, whole, pastes)
- Initial ingoing temperature

**Intended usage:**
- Ready-to-Eat
- Ready-to-Heat
- Ready-to-Cook…

**Markets:**
- Normal Healthy Population
- Special Groups:
  - Hospitals
  - Infant
  - YOPI…

Source: heilpraxis.net
Source: 24mantra.com
Source: heilpraxis.net
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

- Experimental Design (sample / inoculum preparation, transport, introduction and retrieval from process, laboratory and methods)

Common Issues in Validations

😊 Test Methodology not described in enough detail
Surrogate Stability on cocoa nibs

...because it needs to be shipped long ways
Laboratories and Methods

Validated & trained

| 1  | →  | Enumeration of Enterococcus faecium on Treated Cocoa Nibs |

1.1  →  Purpose and Scope

This method is used for the enumeration of Enterococcus faecium present on cocoa nibs, by counting colonies growing on a solid medium after aerobic incubation of plates at appropriate temperature and time.

The inoculated cocoa nibs have been treated to ensure a total viable mesophilic plate count (TVC) of $<10^2$ cfu/g of background flora. These are called “treated nibs”.
Validation Report

Shall include (or reference)

➢ Study Results (log reductions achieved under which process conditions)
➢ Conclusions (final outcome, summary, recommendations / design of future monitoring / alarms / corrective actions)

Common Issues in Validations

😊 Not enough samples / replicates tested
😊 No rationale provided for conclusions drawn
Calculation of log reduction

Table 13: Example of calculation with initial inoculum approximately 8 log CFU/g and targeting 5-log reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replicate</th>
<th>$N_0$</th>
<th>$N_F$</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Deterministic</th>
<th>Minimal reduction case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 5.04 | 4.73
SD: 0.14 | 0.16

Source: Ceylan et al, 2021

Deterministic = calculating mean reductions

Minimal Reduction Case (MRC) = worst case approach (lowest log reduction achieved within all data)
Samples and Replicates

Required number depends on system variability

➢ Higher variability requires more replicates and samples

Replicates – independent trials
Samples – within one run/batch

Variability is commonly higher between replicates.

Recommendation: minimum 3 replicates and 2-10 samples
Conclusions

➢ Validation successful or not
➢ Critical parameters and their limits
➢ Define corrective actions in case of deviation
Going further…

Timing:
- Production
- Significant Upgrade / Change in process

Validation:
- Routine Performance Monitoring
- Significant Upgrade / Change in process /
Thank You very much for your Attention !!
IAFP webinar 1st of December:
Process validations to meet FSMA requirements: Validation report

Validation sterilisation ofi cocoa lines

Michiel Kokken
Head of Regulatory and Scientific Affairs Cocoa
Agenda

Project phases validation study
- Phase 1, Determination heat kinetics salmonella and surrogate
- Phase 2, Validation of sterilisation lines
- Reporting: Certificate of validation/ validation report
- Reports evaluation
- Communication
Phase 1, determination heat kinetics salmonella and surrogate

1. Determination of D- and Z-values of pathogen in cocoa matrix/ determination surrogate

- Partners:

- Scope: Cocoa nib (high moisture/low moisture), cocoa beans, cocoa liquor, cocoa cake/powder, cocoa butter

- Determination of target pathogen based on hazard analyses

- Cocktail of Salmonella Oranienburg, Salmonella Senftenberg, Salmonella typhimurium selected

- Innocation of nib/beans → same ‘resistency’ as in raw nib/beans

- Determining D and Z-values of Salmonella cocktail in matrix

- Determine surrogate → more heat resistant than the salmonella cocktail in the matrix
Phase 2, validation of sterilisation lines

Process validation for different sterilisation lines and different cocoa matrices

- Partner: Novolyze
- Scope: Cocoa nib/ cocoa beans/ cocoa liquor/ cocoa cake/ powder/ cocoa butter
  - Determine method of process validation in matrix
  - Determine worst case conditions of the cocoa sterilisation line with regards to recipe
  - Execute validation
Phase 1 results example cocoa beans

Design of experiment

The work for a product at 7% moisture was done in compliance with the following test parameters:

Test parameters
Cocoa beans

Salmonella:
S. Oranienburg TH-SAL 570 FDA collection
S. Typhimurium TH-SAL 453 FDA collection
S. Senftenberg DSM 10062 DSMZ collection

SurroNov®18 and SurroNov®19

85°C / 0-7.5-15-22.5-30 min
90°C / 0-5-10-15-20min
95°C / 0-4-8-12-16min
Phase 1 results example cocoa beans

The results at 7% moisture are presented below:

*Figure 3: Inactivation curves at 3 temperatures for SurroNov® and Salmonella at 7% moisture*
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines

1. Cocoa nibs low moisture
2. Cocoa nibs high moisture
3. Cocoa beans
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines

Technical comparison of the nib high moisture lines → no one size fits all approach for validation in the line possible
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines
Example continuous screw sterilisation
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines
Example continuous screw sterilisation

1st prototype transport vessel ➔ too weak didn’t “survive” the screw

2nd prototype transport vessel and grid for taking out the ball after heat treatment, entry point
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines
Example roaster validation

Figure 2: Placement of the samples and probes inside the roaster
Validation target:
For instance minimum 6-log reduction of surrogate (in comparison with the relevant target pathogen)

Determination of worst case conditions of the line:
- Temperature (minimum)
- time (minimum)
- Moisture addition (minimum)
- Capacity (maximum)

Comparison of heat profile generated by fixed temperature sensor with temperature sensor placed during validation study at different places in the roaster to showcase the variability of the roaster
### 5.3 MICROBIOLOGICAL SAMPLE RESULTS AND LOG REDUCTION CALCULATION

#### Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines

**Example roaster validation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Trial #1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-processed samples (NPS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Trial #2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-processed samples (NPS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Trial #3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-processed samples (NPS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>CFU/g</strong></td>
<td><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sample ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>CFU/g</strong></td>
<td><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sample ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>CFU/g</strong></td>
<td><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSA-1</td>
<td>800000000</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>NPSB-1</td>
<td>540000000</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>NPSC-2</td>
<td>705000000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSA-3</td>
<td>640000000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NPSB-2</td>
<td>353000000</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>NPSC-3</td>
<td>430000000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSA-4</td>
<td>633000000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NPSB-3</td>
<td>440000000</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>NPSC-4</td>
<td>853000000</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSA-5</td>
<td>606000000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NPSB-4</td>
<td>666000000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>NPSC-5</td>
<td>860000000</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average and standard deviation for trial #1:

- **8.8 ± 0.1**

Average and standard deviation for trial #2:

- **8.7 ± 0.1**

Average and standard deviation for trial #3:

- **8.8 ± 0.2**

---

#### Trial #1: Processed samples (PS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sample ID</strong></th>
<th><strong>CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log reduction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSA-1</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-4</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-5</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-6</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-7</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-8</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-9</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-11</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-12</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-13</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-14</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average concentration:

- **1.27 ± 0.54**

Minimum log reduction:

- **6.2**

---

#### Trial #2: Processed samples (PS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sample ID</strong></th>
<th><strong>CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log reduction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSB-1</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-2</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-3</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-4</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-5</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-6</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-7</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-8</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-9</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-11</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-13</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-14</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB-15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average concentration:

- **1.27 ± 0.54**

Minimum log reduction:

- **6.2**

---

#### Trial #3: Processed samples (PS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sample ID</strong></th>
<th><strong>CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log CFU/g</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log reduction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC-2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-4</td>
<td>&lt; 100</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-5</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-6</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-7</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-8</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-9</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-11</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-12</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-13</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-14</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC-15</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 1.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average concentration:

- **1.27 ± 0.54**

Minimum log reduction:

- **6.2**
Phase 2: Approach validation sterilisation lines
Example roaster validation
Reporting of Validation studies

Certificate of validation

- 3rd party validation certificate
- Validation target
- Surrogate used
- Equipment identification
- Plant location
- Matrix information
- Validation date
- Reference to the report
CERTIFICATE OF VALIDATION

Olam Cocoa Processing Ghana Limited

The following parameters have been validated to achieve a 6-log reduction of *Salmonella* using SurroNov® 18 (*E. faecium*) as a surrogate organism.

*Salmonella used at the lab scale:* Cocktail of *S. Oranienburg*, *S. Typhimurium* and *S. Senftenberg*

*Equipment Identification:* Bühler Bart Tornado 10500RS

*Equipment Location:* Olam Cocoa Processing Ghana Limited, P.O. Box KS 1966, Kumasi, Plot7-9, Kaase Industrial Area, Ghana

*Tested Food Product:* Cocoa nibs

*Date of the Validation Trials:* June 2, 2021

*Tested Parameter:* Worst case conditions of Time and Temperature for the system and moisture for the product.

Laure Pujol
Project Manager

For more information about the methodological items and perimeter of Novolyze’s missions, please refer to the complete validation report N°E-34_REPORT_Olam Kumasi_#30196272
Reporting of Validation studies

Validation report

- Product for validation (including validation target
- Proces for validation
- Validation methodology (surrogate selection/ materials and methods/ trial configuration/ process monitoring/ sample strategy/ analytical work)
- Results (thermal results/ matrix controls and microbial sample results)
- Conclusion
- Recommendations
Validation Report

VALIDATION REPORT
Evaluation of the Microbial Lethality of a reactor for Salmonella in cocoa beans
May 13, 2021

Prepared for:
Olam cocoa Deutschland GmbH
Sillerstraße 15-23
Mannheim, 68159
Germany

Prepared by:
Priscilla Piller
Project Manager
Date: May 13, 2021

Reviewed by:
Laure Pujol, PhD
Project Manager
Date: May 13, 2021
# Validation Report

**Table 2: Project team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Validation Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novolyze</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laure Pujol, PhD</td>
<td>Scientific Project Manager</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginie Pignard</td>
<td>Laboratory Technician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre-Olivier Beal</td>
<td>Contract Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olam cocoa Deutschland GmbH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michiel Kokken</td>
<td>European Quality Manager</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene ter Laak</td>
<td>R&amp;D Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Rommel</td>
<td>Project- Process Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasquale De Tullio</td>
<td>Project- Process Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validation team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rodenas-Garcia</td>
<td>Quality Manager Mannheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Schymetzko</td>
<td>Technical Support / Fitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Heeschen</td>
<td>Production Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-Rene Meyer</td>
<td>Technical Support / Fitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Dollheimer</td>
<td>Laboratory assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 PRODUCT TO VALIDATE

The product to validate was cocoa beans. Product specifications are presented in Table below.

Table 3: Product specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cocoa beans</th>
<th>Pre-process</th>
<th>After process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture Content (%)</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td>&gt;7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log TPC (log CFU/g)</td>
<td>2.0 to 5.5</td>
<td>&lt;1.0±0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the level of the background microflora can be naturally high and was not determined before the trials, an overlay enumeration protocol was used (one layer of non-selective media and one layer of selective media).
3 PROCESS TO VALIDATE

3.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Type of Process: Batch, steam reactor
Manufacturer - Model: Lehmann KS-2000S
Olam Process Identification: L2

The system consisted of a batch reactor where the beans are loaded from the top of the system and discharged at the bottom of the system. The maximum capacity of the system is . Once the beans are loaded, the pressure is applied. The current CCP parameters is bar for

![Figure 1: Schematic view of the process](image)

Figure 1: Schematic view of the process

![Figure 2: Pictures of the reactor](images)

Figure 2: Pictures of the reactor
Surrogate selection:
SurroNov® 19 is a dry, ready-to-use version of Enterococcus faecium and is widely documented as suitable. Appropriateness for surrogate vs Salmonella in cocoa beans established reference REPORT_Olam cocoa beans _#27942189_v1”
Validation Report

5.7 SAMPLING STRATEGY AND LETHALITY EVALUATION

Two types of inoculated samples were recovered from the trials in order to evaluate the lethality of the system:

- **Non-processed Samples (NPS):** These samples correspond to product inoculated with SurroNov® but non-processed through the system. These samples were used as non-treated controls to estimate the log reduction reached during the trial.
- **Processed Samples (PS):** These samples correspond to product inoculated with SurroNov® and processed through the system. These samples were used as treated controls to estimate the log reduction reached during the trials.

Lethality evaluation was performed by comparing the surrogate counts in the NPS and PS samples. The difference accounts for the microbial log reduction level achieved. A minimum and an average log reduction were calculated.

In addition, other types of analytical controls:

- **Matrix Control Samples (MC):** These samples correspond to product used for the inoculation.
- **Non-Inoculated and Non-Treated Control Samples (NINTC):** These samples correspond to non-inoculated product before distribution in the process.
- **Non-Inoculated and Treated Control Samples (NITC):** These samples correspond to non-inoculated product after processing.
Validation Report

Results section:
- Thermal mapping / pressure control
- Micro results

Log calculations

**Table 7: Compliance achieved during the in-plant validation trials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target log reduction</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>7.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trial 1</td>
<td>Trial 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant NPS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliant NPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NPS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% compliant NPS</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant PS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliant PS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% compliant PS</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the Non-Processed Samples (NPS°) were compliant to assess a potential 6-log microbial reduction. Inoculation of the cocoa beans with SurroNov° was homogeneous with an average concentration at 8.7±0.1-log CFU/g.
8 CONCLUSION

Results obtained during in-plant validation trials confirmed that the evaluated system can achieve, in the tested conditions, a minimum 6-log reduction for the surrogate microorganism and for *Salmonella* by correlation in a consistent and repeatable manner despite the variability of the temperature inside the reactor.
9 RECOMMENDATIONS

Novolyze recommends the following additional food safety measures:

- Monitoring: The processing parameters should be continuously monitored. Whenever possible, a real-time monitoring procedure should be in place in order to trigger faster corrective actions.
- Verification: Further verification activities should be performed on a periodic basis in order to make sure that the process is still capable to achieve the target microbial reduction. Verification items can include (non-limitative): review of the critical parameters (process, product), thermal mapping, microbiological testing, audits etc. If needed, Novolyze can help you design further verification procedures for this system.
- Revalidation: A standard practice in the industry is to proceed with a new validation in the following cases:
  - If the processing configuration becomes less favorable for pathogen reduction (e.g. lower temperature, higher fat content of the product etc.)
  - Any modification of the design of the equipment which may affect the heat penetration to the product
  - At least every three years
Report evaluation

Validation report

- Process authority writes the validation report and certificate:
- --> it is however the company’s responsibility to verify and approve the certificate
- --> this shall be reviewed and approved both from the technical / scientific team within the company as well as from validation team (typically headed by the Quality /Food safety manager, could be same team as HACCP team) at the site to assure consistency with the quality and food safety documentation kept on site and consistency with other validation reports within the company.
Communication

Harmonized communication internally and externally

Staff involved in communication of the validation program of the company understands the setup and the background of the validation program to ensure consistent communication to customers/authorities.

Non exclusive list of key functions /teams within a company are Quality and Food Safety managers/HACCP team members/ customer technical support teams/ global quality teams involved in communication.

- Quality/ Food safety managers need to understand the validation strategy of the company and also understand and can explain the content of the reports.

- Validation reports when setup as described are suitable to explain the details of the validation during audits.

Technical/ scientific team and the processing authority for complex enquiries.
Thank you

www.ofi.com
Contact Information

• Anett Winkler          anett_winkler@cargill.com
• Michiel Bokken        michiel.kokken@olamnet.com
• Laure Pujol           laure.pujol@novolyze.com
Join us for these upcoming webinars:

December 8  Why Quantification? The Road to Revolutionizing Food Safety

January 26, 2022  Practical Guidance for Validation Studies: From Start to Finish

More information can be found at
https://www.foodprotection.org/events-meetings/webinars/
This webinar is being recorded and will be available for access by IAFP members at www.foodprotection.org within one week.

Not a Member? We encourage you to join today.
For more information go to:
www.FoodProtection.org/membership/

All IAFP webinars are supported by the IAFP Foundation with no charge to participants.

Please consider making a donation to the IAFP Foundation so we can continue to provide quality information to food safety professionals.