

East African Medical Journal Vol. 89 No. 12 December 2012

HYGIENE PRACTICES IN URBAN RESTAURANTS AND CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTING FOOD SAFETY AND HAZARD ANALYSIS CRITICAL CONTROL POINTS (HACCP) PROGRAMMES IN THIKA TOWN, KENYA

R. K. Muinde, Dip LM., H.Dip CA., Msc. H.T. (Food Safety), Lecturer, Department of Food science and Technology, C. Kiinyukia Bsc, Msc, PhD, Senior Lecturer, Department of Intromid, P. O. Box 62000-00100, Nairobi, G.O, Rombo, Bsc, Post Grad; Dip Ed, Msc, PhD, Senior Lecturer, M. A. Muoki, Bed, Msc, Tht fellow, Department of Foods, Nutrition and Dietetics, Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844 Nairobi

Requests for reprints to: R. K. Muinde, Department of Food science and Technology,

HYGIENE PRACTICES IN URBAN RESTAURANTS AND CHALLENGES TO IMPLEMENTING FOOD SAFETY AND HAZARD ANALYSIS CRITICAL CONTROL POINTS (HACCP) PROGRAMMES IN THIKA TOWN, KENYA

R. K. MUINDE, C. KIINYUKIA, G. O. ROMBO and M. A. MUOKI

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To determine the microbial load in food, examination of safety measures and possibility of implementing an Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) system.

Design: The target population for this study consisted of restaurants owners in Thika Municipality (n=30). Simple random samples of restaurants were selected on a systematic sampling method of microbial analysis in cooked, non-cooked, raw food and water sanitation in the selected restaurants.

Subjects: Two hundred and ninety eight restaurants within Thika Municipality were selected. Of these, 30 were sampled for microbiological testing.

Results: From the study, 221 (74%) of the restaurants were ready to eat establishments where food was prepared early enough to hold and only 77 (26%) of the total restaurants, customers made an order of food they wanted. 118 (63%) of the restaurant operators/staff had knowledge on quality control on food safety measures, 24 (8%) of the restaurants applied these knowledge while 256 (86%) of the restaurants staff showed that food contains ingredients that were hazard if poorly handled. 238 (80%) of the resultants used weighing and sorting of food materials, 45 (15%) used preservation methods and the rest used dry foods as critical control points on food safety measures.

Conclusions: The study showed that there was need for implementation of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) system to enhance food safety. Knowledge of HACCP was very low with 89 (30%) of the restaurants applying some of quality measures to the food production process systems. There was contamination with Coliforms, *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* microbial though at very low level. The means of Coliforms, *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* microbial in sampled food were 9.7×10^3 CFU/gm, 8.2×10^3 CFU/gm and 5.4×10^3 CFU/gm respectively with Coliforms taking the highest mean.

INTRODUCTION

Food safety plays a significant role in the economic and health development of any nation by safe guarding the nation's health, enhancing bi-lateral and international trade, the production, consumption, distribution and consumption of safe food (1). Despite all these, there seems to be few quality control systems to safe guard against food related illness.

In developing countries some food borne diseases may be fatal while others can lead to expensive medical care. The magnitude of food borne diseases is illustrated by various statistics (2). Illness from food related diseases outnumber illness from all other environmental factors combined. Over 66% of food-borne illnesses are caused by bacterial pathogens (3).

Over the world, incidences of diarrhoeal diseases

alone have been estimated to be 400 million cases per year, which indicates a serious underlying food safety problem (3). In Kenya, incidences of food borne illnesses reported from 1997 to 2003 were 1,492,690 cases that caused 604 deaths (4). In the year 2004, there were 11,849 reported cases. In Thika District Hospital, diarrhoea, intestinal worms and typhoid are among the top ten leading causes of hospitalisation (5).

While these statistics point to the possible hazards of poor food safety guidelines, research shows that the food safety regulations and risk management measures in developing countries are not wellimplemented (6). Dhamija attributes this to lack of understanding of the regulations and measures for the food industry by consumers and other stakeholders in the society.

FAO/WHO (7) main objective is to ensure nutritional and safe food for all people at all times for

productive and healthy life. Food service operators have a major responsibility since their actions can affect the health of many people. Food-borne diseases are major public health problem estimated to affect up to 10% or more of the population in the industrialised countries (8). Food and water-borne diseases in the developing countries are prevalent and epidemiological examinations have indicated large proportions of food-borne diseases which result from poor food sanitation and unhygienic handling of foods in restaurants and other eating outlets (9).

Urban populations in Kenya comprise some 20% of people concentrated in six rapidly expanding cities and large towns (10). Nearly 50% of the Kenya urban populations live in unplanned low quality settlements poor infrastructure and health service. In developing countries, it has been suggested that lack of knowledge and skills on the good manufacturing practices (GMPs), have contributed to poor hygienic practices in food service establishments. Studies on food safety have led to health administrative departments taking the evaluation of food safety and hygienic practices of food establishments (11). These reports show that about 80% of all diseases and more than 113 of all deaths in developing countries are caused by contaminated food and water (12). This study therefore attempted to establish whether the scenario is the same in Thika District.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP) has been endorsed by the National Academy of Sciences, the Codex Alimentarius Commission which is an international food standard setting organization, and the National Advisory Committee on microbiological criteria for foods (13). The systems are available for designing programme to assist food firms in producing foods that are safe to consume (14). The biggest advantage of HACCP over the other systems is that it pre-empts all the activities in the food process thus reducing risks in food-borne diseases. According to Taber (15), the hazard of any material is determined by its chemical, physical and biological properties.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP), a system for ensuring food safety, was developed in 1971 in a cooperative effort by the United States Army Natick Laboratories, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Pillsbury Company (16). The system was endorsed as an effective and rational means of assuring food safety from harvest to consumption. Preventing problems from occurring is the basis of the HACCP system. It is termed superior to all the conventional food microbiological quality control procedures in the market because it only addresses significant food safety hazards.

The system employs to meet the stated goals, include hazard analysis, identification of Critical Control Points, establishing critical limits, monitoring procedures, corrective actions, verification procedures

and record keeping and documentation. When organising and setting up HACCP programme, all steps are important and necessary for the assurance of a safe, high quality finished product(s) (17). An estimated value in 20 years of HACCP-program benefits ranged from \$1.9 to \$171.8 billion dollars in 1995. These were mainly cost saving benefits, in terms of lives saved (18).

The Ministry of Health and major local authorities have put very few policies in place to ensure that the risk of disease communication is contained and food safety is enhanced (19). For instance, they have tended to rely on legislation that seeks to provide a framework for food safety inspection which, unlike a HACCP system, is not proactive and preventive. The Foods, Drugs and Chemical Substance Act, cap 242 of Kenya, may not provide an adequate supervisory framework for food establishments that clearly need to improve on their efforts to enhance product quality (12).

This may be as a result of inadequate food safety inspections and controls by the government agencies and lack of awareness and participation by stakeholders such as consumers, NGO's, print and electronic media publications that would otherwise facilitate the understanding of food safety. The importance of investigating the possibility of introducing a HACCP system of monitoring and evaluating food safety, in urban restaurants, was clear from their role in the food chain in large urban populations.

Reports from Thika Municipal council office indicate that there are about 298 formal restaurants in Thika Town, which offer meals to urban dwellers (5). They recommend that food establishments embrace safe food chains so that the outbreak of food-borne diseases or illnesses may not be transmitted within the town or to the rural areas where most of the workers live. This suggests that there was need to explore the possibility of restaurants embracing food safety systems, based on the HACCP principles that have been successfully applied in food service operations and are universally accepted by government agencies, trade associations and the food industry around the world. HACCP system is proactive and it can predict possibility of food poisoning or contamination. It has food safety control system that has simple control features which ensure immediate corrective action, cost effective and can be applied to all food operations.

Perhaps the introduction of a HACCP system could improve and reduce the incidence of food poisoning in urban restaurants. It can also aid inspection by regulatory authorities and promote international trade by increasing confidence in food safety. It provides a more specific and critical approach to the control of microbiological hazards in foods than that provided by traditional inspection and quality control approaches (20).

The research question for this is: whether the HACCP

system on food safety are adopted in the restaurants and if not what measure are taken to ensure that food consumed in urban restaurants, meets the required safety standards.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methodology used in this study involved combination of descriptive and quantitative research and included the use of descriptive analysis, chi-square, simple regression and correlation as data processing methods.

The target population was 298 restaurants within Thika Municipality. For microbial testing, 30 restaurants, approximately 10 % of the total population were stratified into hotels and formal restaurants. Data were collected through open ended questionnaires schedules and observations.

A series of in- depth interviews were conducted through owners /staff, customers and public health officers. Questionnaire was developed based on research question and literature review. The questionnaire was divided into several sections. The first section was designed to gather information about personal characteristics of respondent. The second section was designed to measure the knowledge of quality control systems while the last part covered the receipt of food material, storage, preparation, production and services.

The validity and reliability of the questionnaire were conducted through a pilot study in areas outside the study but in restaurants using the HACCP systems. The reliability coefficient was determined by test-retest technique.

RESULTS

The results of demographic statistics showed that 65% of respondent were male while female were 35%. The reason was that male workers are more flexible to work and didn't have complicated social living styles as their female counterparts. In order to find the perception of respondents about their education background, 44 % had college education, 22% secondary level and 26% post secondary education and therefore formal education was relatively high among the staff interviewed in Thika restaurants, however 44% of the respondents were most likely aware of HACCP system. The staff working in the restaurants, 60% didn't have basic formal training relevant to food production, while 40% were trained in catering, Table 1.

Still on Table 1, the designation of staff in the restaurants showed that 30% managed their restaurants, while 37% were ran by hired managers, Head cooks were 26% and cooks 8%.

Among the respondents, 40% knew quality control strategies with little or no application, when

60% had no understanding of any quality control. As can be seen 10% left food not covered or well stored, 60% stored them in high temperature and only 30% in cold temperatures. The perception of respondent in information on quality control was displayed. 92% of the public health office disseminates information on quality control but with no specific way to improve food safety standards while the council provide 8% of this information. On the application of quality control, 92% used sorting and weighing as quality control measures while 8% were cooking food with no specific monitoring of time and temperature.

On type of establishment, 74% had food ready for consumption while 26% were prepared on orders from customers and therefore these showed that there was need to enhance food safety in all premises for better health. In relation to the preservation methods, 70% used refrigeration, dry storage 15%, while the used freezer. The total restaurant that received food materials in bulk were 20%, while 80% received in small quantities from the suppliers. This implied that most of the restaurants did not have adequate storage facilities. Most of the restaurants which received perishables food such as meats, vegetables and milk etc from the supplier /market were 92% and those who received non-perishable (dry foods) materials were 8%, meaning that details of the material specifications on quality and quantity were in place Table 2.

Inferential statistics were used with calculation of mean, range and standard deviation. The microbial loads of food in raw, non cooked and cooked foods samples were calculated with total Coliform counts ranged from 1.5×10^2 CFU/g to 8.9×10^3 CFU/g with the highest mean of 9.7×10^3 CFU/gm, *S. Aureus* counts varied from 1.3×10^2 CFU/g to 6.3×10^3 CFU/g with the highest mean of 5.4×10^3 CFU/gm and the counts of *E.coli* ranging from 1.6×10^1 CFU/g to 9.2×10^2 CFU/g with the highest mean of 8.2×10^3 CFU/gm. The treated water supplied by the municipality contributed to the highest number of bacterial counts with a mean of Aerial Plate Count of 4.7×10^3 CFU/mi. The average bacterial counts were relatively low and this was an indication that hygiene practices in Thika restaurants are not of high quality and therefore the need to enhance food safety standard through the application of HACCP safety systems Table 3, 4 and 5 respectively. All the samples in the study showed Coliforms and *E. coli* counts which could be a reflection of the inadequate hygiene and sanitary standards prevailing at different stages of food production process. raw cooked The chi -square test carried out shows that there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between safety control measures applied and microbial loads of food consumed in this study (test statistic=2.73, tabulated= dfl, 0.05=3.841), while a relationship existed between the awareness of SSOP by restaurant workers and microbial loads of

food consumed in the restaurants (test statistic=19.28, tabulated=dlf, 0.05=3.841) Table 6 and 7.

Table 8 shows the result for simple regression analysis. There was significant relationship on the perception of respondent awareness of SSOP by workers and microbial loads of foods consumed in restaurants. The results indicate that 35% of the variance in awareness of SSOP by worker can be used to explain microbial loads of foods. The unhygienic

habits of some of the personnel involved in the actual preparation may have led to contamination from the hands to the work-places or vice versa. The variable "awareness of SSOP by workers" (Beta coefficient: 0.350, sig.:0.007) determines the microbial load in the food consumed. The samples counted revealed that the products are capable of inducing outbreaks of staphylococcal food poisoning if poorly handled.

Table 1
Demographic profile of respondents

| Demographic variable | Number | Percentage, n=30 |
|----------------------|--------|------------------|
| Sex | | |
| Male | 11 | 65 |
| Female | 19 | 35 |
| Education | | |
| Primary | 1 | 4 |
| Secondary | 7 | 22 |
| Post secondary | 8 | 26 |
| College | 13 | 44 |
| Others | 1 | 4 |
| Training | | |
| Trained | 12 | 40 |
| Untrained | 18 | 60 |
| Designation | | |
| Owners | 9 | 30 |
| Managers | 11 | 37 |
| Head cook | 8 | 26 |
| Cook | 2 | 8 |

Table 2
HACCP Quality systems

| HACCP variable | Number | Percentage, 11=30 |
|--|---------------|--------------------------|
| Understanding of QC strategy | | |
| Knew | 12 | 40 |
| Don't know | 18 | 60 |
| Storage methods | | |
| High temperature | 18 | 60 |
| Cold temperature | 9 | 30 |
| No precaution | 3 | 10 |
| Source of QC information | | |
| Public health staff | 28 | 92 |
| Council staff | 2 | 8 |
| Application of QC strategy | | |
| Receiving | 28 | 92 |
| Kitchen | 2 | 8 |
| Type of food establishment | | |
| Not prepared | 8 | 26 |
| Already prepared | 22 | 74 |
| Preservation methods | | |
| Dry storage | 5 | 15 |
| Freezing | 5 | 15 |
| Refrigeration | 20 | 70 |
| Reception perishable | | |
| Bulle reception | 6 | 20 |
| Small quantity | 24 | 80 |
| Reception perishable & non perishable | | |
| Perishable foods | 28 | 92 |
| Non-perishable | 2 | 8 |

Table 3
Bacterial counts in the cooked food samples

| Food Type | Mean | A P C Range | SD | Mean | S.aurells Range | SD | Mean | E . c o l i Range | SD |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Beef stew | 4.2×10^3 | 1.5×10^2 | 2.4×10^2 | 3.1×10^1 | 3.3×10^2 | 0.1210 | 3.8×10^2 | 7.6×10^3 | 0.3121 |
| | | 6.0×10^3 | | | | | | | |
| Cooked vegetable | 3.3×10^3 | 2.0×10^3 | 0.7630 | 2.0×10^2 | 3.1×10^2 | 3.7×10^3 | 2.6×10^2 | 3.3×10^2 | 0.612 |
| | | 5.3×10^4 | | | | | | | |
| Nyama choma | 5.8×10^3 | 4.5×10^2 | 0.6710 | 4.5×10^2 | 6.3×10^1 | 2.6×10^4 | 2.6×10^3 | 1.6×10^1 | 0.5600 |
| | | 3.8×10^3 | | | | | | | |
| Chips | 3.0×10^3 | 1.8×10^1 | 0.651 | 4.1×10^3 | 2.0×10^2 | 6.8×10^3 | 4.3×10^3 | 2.3×10^2 | 0.7761 |
| | | 5.0×10^3 | | | | | | | |
| Bhajia | 4.0×10^3 | 1.7×10^1 | 0.875 | 4.6×10^2 | 2.0×10^2 | 6.1×10^3 | 4.5×10^2 | 9.2×10^2 | 0.6765 |
| | | 6.3×10^3 | | | | | | | |
| Githeri | 4.2×10^2 | 3.8×10^2 | 0.8761 | 3.5×10^2 | 1.5×10^2 | 6.8×10^3 | 3.2×10^2 | 3.2×10^2 | 0.5530 |
| | | 4.6×10^3 | | | | | | | |

Table 4
Bacterial counts in the non-cooked food samples (CFU/gm)

| Variable | Mean | APC Range | SD | Mean | S.aurells Range | SD | Mean | E.coli Range | SD |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Personnel | 4.2×10^3 | 2.3×10^3 | 0.871 | 3.4×10^2 | 1.3×10^1 | 0.671 | 8.2×10^3 | 3.2×10^2 | 0.6512 |
| | | 6.7×10^4 | | | | | | | |
| Workplace | 9.7×10^3 | 5.3×10^2 | 0.7612 | 3.8×10^2 | 2.3×10^2 | 5.3×10^3 | 7.6×10^2 | 6.7×10^2 | 0.8127 |
| | | 12.3×10^4 | | | | | | | |
| | | 3.7×10^2 | | | 5.2×10^1 | | | 1.8×10^1 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Water (ml) | 4.7×10^3 | 5.7×10^3 | 0.5051 | 2.6×10^3 | 3.0×10^4 | 0.6151 | 4.8×10^2 | 7.9×10^3 | 0.6055 |
| Plate | 4.1×10^3 | 1.7×10^1 | 0.6021 | 3.5×10^3 | 1.6×10^1 | 0.8021 | 2.6×10^2 | 2.6×10^3 | 0.5060 |

Table 5
Bacterial counts in the raw food samples (CFU/gm)

| Food Type | Mean | A P C SD | Mean | S.aurells SD | Mean | E . c o l i SD | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|--------|--|-----------------------------|--|--------|
| | | Range | | Range | | Range | |
| Kacumbari | 4.0×10^4 | 1.5×10^3 6.5×10^4 | 0.5005 | 4.5×10^2 4.3×10^2 | 4.6×10^1 0.6172 | 2.6×10^2 6.5×10^3 | 0.7112 |
| Vegetable salad | 3.3×10^4 | 3.0×10^3 3.6×10^4 | 0.7721 | 3.4×10^4 5.2×10^4 | 1.5×10^3 0.6991 | 2.8×10^2 7.6×10^3 | 0.9821 |
| Fruit salad | 2.0×10^3 | 8.9×10^2 4.0×10^3 | 0.7112 | 2.2×10^2 4.8×10^2 | 2.4×10^1 0.7721 | 2.3×10^2 3.1×10^3 | 0.9231 |
| Passion fruit | 2.2×10^3 | 1.2×10^1 2.3×10^3 | 0.4451 | 5.4×10^2 9.4×10^3 | 2.6×10^1 0.5561 | 1.8×10^1 5.6×10^3 | 0.8732 |
| Fresh meat | 5.2×10^4 | 2.5×10^3 5.4×10^4 | 0.3242 | 3.4×10^3 7.3×10^3 | 3.4×10^2 0.2343 | 2.8×10^1 6.3×10^2 | 0.9182 |
| Coleslaw salad | 2.6×10^4 | 1.6×10^3 3.6×10^4 | 0.5423 | 3.5×10^3 3.8×10^3 | 3.8×10^2 0.5421 | 2.2×10^2 3.7×10^3 | 0.8723 |
| Chef's salad | 3.1×10^3 | 2.1×10^1 6.1×10^3 | 0.3425 | 2.5×10^3 3.5×10^3 | 1.5×10^2 0.6787 | 2.8×10^1 6.0×10^2 | 0.8001 |

Table 6
Safety control measures and Microbial loads of foods

| Cell | O_i | λ_i | $O_i - \lambda_i$ | $(O_i - \lambda_i)^2$ | $\frac{O_i - \lambda_i}{\lambda_i}$ |
|------|-------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1,1 | 8 | 10.2 | -2.2 | 4.84 | 0.47 |
| 1,2 | 10 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 4.84 | 0.62 |
| 2,1 | 9 | 6.8 | 2.2 | 4.84 | 0.71 |
| 2,2 | 3 | 5.2 | -2.2 | 4.84 | 0.93 |

$(\chi^2_c) = 2.73$, at the 95% confidence level and a degree of freedom = $(2-1)(2-1) = 1$, $\chi^2_a = 3.841$

Table 7
Awareness of SSOP and Microbial loads of foods

| Cell | O_i | λ_i | $O_i - \lambda_i$ | $(O_i - \lambda_i)^2$ | $\frac{O_i - \lambda_i}{\lambda_i}$ |
|------|-------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1,1 | 1 | 7 | -6 | 36 | 5.14 |
| 1,2 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 36 | 5.14 |
| 2,1 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 36 | 4.5 |
| 2,2 | 2 | 8 | -6 | 36 | 4.5 |

$(\chi^2_c) = 19.28$, at the 95% confidence level and a degree of freedom = $(2-1)(2-1) = 1$, $\chi^2_a = 3.841$

Table 8
Simple Regression analysis (MICRNDEX as dependent variable)

| | Un-standardised Coefficients | | Standardised Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------|------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| Model | B | Std. error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | .228 | .094 | | 2.429 | .018 |
| SSOPNDEX | .412 | .146 | .350 | 2.822 | .007 |

$R^2 = 0.353$, $Y = 0.350x$.

DISCUSSION

All the restaurants had been issued with food trade licenses from the Municipal Public Health Authorities. Just a few knew HACCP as a strategy of quality control and it was either the owner or managers were implementing the strategy at one point or the other in their establishments. Sorting and weighing of raw food materials after reception is a major critical control point and this study showed that about 60% applied them and therefore contamination was most like to occur.

On preservation of perishable foods, 75% of the restaurants applied it as a critical point. Proper food storage after preparation was fairly done and quite evident in most premises because this was stored in very high temperatures. This contradicts a study done in some cities in some developed countries, which

found that most people who ate food prepared in the eating premises were served with cold foods which led to food poisoning. This study demonstrated that all samples had contamination load according to the total coliform count and the presence of other bacteria. Lengthy gaps between preparation and consumption of foodstuffs and lack of attention to the essential temperature required for cooking foods are among the most common causes of food contamination.

Maintenance of general hygiene standards in most premises was not well-observed similar to studies done in Nairobi, which showed that 70% of most restaurants were below the required hygiene standards. Most of the liquid and solid waste was fairly managed. Availability of hot water was lacking in some restaurants and therefore, cleaning of crockery and utensils was poorly done. Similar study was done in China which showed that some customers

had food poisoning after been served with poorly washed equipment in a restaurant (21, 22).

Similar information was sourced from Kenya Bureau of Standards which has a standardized mark of quality of products. It is necessary to use HACCP system in restaurants for prevention of food-borne diseases. In the study, 894 samples were examined and showed that the implementation of the HACCP system together with training in personnel hygiene lowered aerobic plate counts.

The water in all the restaurants is supplied by the municipal council through ground piped water which sometimes can be contaminated due to sewerage pipe bursting in some occasions. It is recommended that any water for human consumption must not contain more than 3×10^1 CFU/ml and none should be of faecal contaminated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my employer, JKUAT through the Catering manager who gave me flexible arrangement to complete my studies. I also thank the chief technician, Food Science Department, JKUAT who assisted me in laboratory work. Appreciation goes to the chief Public Health Officer, Thika Municipality, for his moral and logistical support. Special thanks to my family members who played an indispensable role in ensuring the success of this study.

REFERENCES

1. WHO, (2000): Food-borne diseases: A focus on health. WHO, Geneva, 24.
2. Snyder, O.P (1992): HACCP - An Industry food safety self - control program - part iv. Dairy Food, Environmental. *Sanitation*, 12:230 -235.
3. Bryan F.L., (1992): Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point Evaluation. A guide to identifying hazards and assessing risks associated with food preparation and storage-Geneva, 1211.
4. GoK (2005): Ministry of Health Annual Medical Report (805).
5. GoK (2005): District survey office, Ministry of lands, Nairobi, Kenya.
6. Dhamija O.P., (1979): A manual of food export quality, Food for Export. FAO Food and Nutrition paper No. 14/6.
7. FAO/WHO (2002): Sharing information on national experiences in the general field of risk management (paper submitted by the delegation of France) Global forum of food safety regulators (Agenda item 4.4) 1- 4.
8. Staurt A. S.,(2002): Intergrated approaches to the Management of food safety throughout the food chain. FAO/WHO. Global forum of food safety regulators. (Agenda item 4.2b) G.f01110
9. WHO (2005): Guidance on Regulatory Assessment of HACCP. WHO/IFSF/05.5.
10. WHO/GoK (2005): Strategies for implementing HACCP in small and less developed business WHO/ SDE/PHEIFOS/05. 7.
11. Food Codex Alimentarius Commission (1995 a, b). International Harmonisation of Food Safety and Labelling Standards.
12. Taber R.W, (1993): Haccp in small companies benefit or burden? *Food Control* 12: 217-222.
13. Corlett, D. A., Jr., (1998): HACCP User's Manual. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Press.
14. Rosander, A., (1990): Application of Quality Control in the Service Industries. Milwaukee: American Society for Quality Control.
15. Crutchfield *et al.* (1997): Tracing the costs, Benefits of improvements in Food Safety / AER- 791. Economic Research Service/SDA.
16. GoK (1999): National Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Policy. Workshop proceedings July 28th - 30th, vol. 11.
17. WHO (2004): Food Safety - a worldwide public health Issue. WHO, Geneva, 1-3.
18. Bernard A, (2002). An industry perspective on Assessment of HACCP in the United States. National Food Processors Association, USA/IZVZ/OO. 968.
19. Amref, Kenya, (1982): Food borne Disease Outbreaks Surveillance. Nairobi: Government Printer. 54-60.
20. Viera, E (1999): Elementary Food Science 4th Edition Maryland: Aspen Publishers, Inc. Gaithersburg.
21. Ndungu, N.K (2002): Assessment on Implementation of HACCP as a Strategy for Quality Control in Food Establishments; Food Science and Inspection, (2001 -2002). Nairobi: Kenya Medical College (IUPublished).
23. Thorner, M., (1983); Quality Control in Food Service. Westport, Connecticut: AVI Publishing C
*Corresponding author - 0723161865