

Report on the Audit of Food Law Service Delivery and Food Business Compliance

Nottingham City Council
24-26 May 2016



Foreword

Audits of local authorities' feed and food law enforcement services are part of the Food Standards Agency's arrangements to improve consumer protection and confidence in relation to food and feed. These arrangements recognise that the enforcement of UK food and feed law relating to food safety, hygiene, composition, labelling, imported food and feeding stuffs is largely the responsibility of local authorities. These local authority regulatory functions are principally delivered through their Environmental Health and Trading Standards Services.

The attached audit report examines the Local Authority's Food Law Enforcement Service. The assessment includes the local arrangements in place for database management, inspections of food businesses and internal monitoring. It should be acknowledged that there will be considerable diversity in the way and manner in which local authorities may provide their food enforcement services reflecting local needs and priorities.

Agency audits assess local authorities' conformance against the Food Law Enforcement Standard ("The Standard"), which was published by the Agency as part of the Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Controls by Local Authorities and is available on the Agency's website at:
www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring.

The main aim of the audit scheme is to maintain and improve consumer protection and confidence by ensuring that local authorities are providing an effective food law enforcement service. The scheme also provides the opportunity to identify and disseminate good practice and provide information to inform Agency policy on food safety, standards and feeding stuffs. Parallel local authority audit schemes are implemented by the Agency's offices in Wales and Northern Ireland.

The report contains some statistical data, for example on the number of food premises inspections carried out annually. The Agency's website contains enforcement activity data for all UK local authorities and can be found at:
www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring.

For assistance, a glossary of technical terms used within the audit report can be found at Annex C.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	4
Reason for the Audit	4
Scope of the Audit	4
Background	5
2.0 Executive Summary	6
3.0 Audit Findings	7
3.1 Organisation and Management	7
Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning	7
Officer Authorisations and Training	8
3.2 Food Premises Database	10
3.3 Food Premises Interventions	10
Verification visit to a Food Premises	12
3.4 Enforcement	12
3.5 Internal Monitoring, Third Party or Peer Review	14
Internal Monitoring	14
Food and Food Premises Complaints	14
Records	15
Third Party or Peer Review	15
ANNEX A - Action Plan for Nottingham City Council	16
ANNEX B - Audit Approach/Methodology	19
ANNEX C - Glossary	20

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report records the results of an audit at Nottingham City Council with regard to food hygiene enforcement, under relevant headings of the Food Standards Agency Food Law Enforcement Standard. The audit focused on the Authority's arrangements for the management of the food premises database, food premises interventions, and internal monitoring. The report has been made publicly available on the Agency's website at www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports.

Hard copies are available from the FSA's Regulatory Delivery Division by email LAAudit@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk or phone 01904 232116.

Reason for the Audit

- 1.2 The power to set standards, monitor and audit local authority food law enforcement services was conferred on the Food Standards Agency by the Food Standards Act 1999 and the Official Feed and Food Controls (England) Regulations 2009. This audit of Nottingham City Council was undertaken under section 12(4) of the Act as part of the Food Standards Agency's annual audit programme.
- 1.3 Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, includes a requirement for competent authorities to carry out internal audits or to have external audits carried out. The purpose of these audits is to verify whether official controls relating to feed and food law are effectively implemented. To fulfil this requirement, the Food Standards Agency, as the central competent authority for feed and food law in the UK has established external audit arrangements. In developing these, the Agency has taken account of the European Commission guidance on how such audits should be conducted.¹
- 1.4 The Authority was included in the Food Standards Agency's programme of audits of local authority food law enforcement services, because it had not been audited in the past five years by the Agency.

Scope of the Audit

¹ Commission Decision of 29 September 2006 setting out the guidelines laying down criteria for the conduct of audits under Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls to verify compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (2006/677/EC)

- 1.5 The audit examined Nottingham City Council’s arrangements for food premises database management, food premises interventions and internal monitoring, with regard to food hygiene law enforcement. This included a reality check at a food business to assess the effectiveness of official controls implemented by the Authority at the food business premises and, more specifically, the checks carried out by the Authority’s officers to verify food business operator (FBO) compliance with legislative requirements. The scope of the audit also included an assessment of the Authority’s overall organisation and management, and the internal monitoring of other related food hygiene law enforcement activities.
- 1.6 Assurance was sought that key authority food hygiene law enforcement systems and arrangements were effective in supporting business compliance, and that local enforcement was managed and delivered effectively. The on-site element of the audit took place at the Authority’s office at Central Police Station, Byron House, Maid Marian Way, Nottingham, NG1 6HS on 24th -26th May 2016.

Background

- 1.7 Nottingham City Council is a Unitary Authority in the East Midlands and is one of England’s eight Core Cities. The city has a population of 305,700, with over 60,000 students at its two Universities. The City has a multi-ethnic population.
- 1.8 The Service is provided by food safety officers delivering official controls relating to both food hygiene, food standards and other environmental health disciplines including infectious disease and smoke free enforcement.
- 1.9 At the time of the audit there were 3064 food businesses in the Nottingham City Council area, mainly in the retail and catering sector. This also includes major establishments such as the hospitals, prison and manufacturers, who distribute products nationally, of which 12 were approved establishments and subject to (EC) 853/2004.
- 1.10 At the time of the audit the profile of Nottingham City Council’s food businesses was as follows:

Risk category	A	B	C	D	E	Unrated	Total
Number of businesses	9	74	417	1137	1307	120	3064

2.0 Executive Summary

2.1 The Authority was found to be delivering a range of food law enforcement activities in accordance with the statutory obligations placed on it as a competent food authority. These were generally delivered according to prescribed timescales by experienced professional staff. However, some improvements were identified to enable the Service to attain the required level of protection to consumers and in order to meet the requirements of the Framework Agreement and the Food Law Code of Practice (FLCoP). A summary of the main findings and key improvements necessary is set out below.

The Authority had developed a range of documented policies and procedures, all of which had been recently reviewed.

File checks carried out highlights that the Authority had generally taken appropriate action on any non-compliance found with a range of enforcement powers being used, which were appropriate in all files reviewed. Officers' inspection records generally contemporaneous, legible and retrievable.

2.2 Strengths:

Evidence showed the Authority had robust and effective outbreak investigation and control procedures in place. Records of an *Escherichia coli* outbreak investigation showed a prompt and comprehensive investigation with good partnership working with Public Health England, which protected public health and prevented further cases.

2.3 Key areas for improvement:

Service Planning: The Authority should ensure the Service Plan includes a clear comparison of the resources required to deliver the food law enforcement service fully in accordance with the FLCoP against the resources available.

Intervention Strategy: The Authority should devise and implement an intervention programme that ensures interventions are carried out at prescribed frequencies.

3.0 Audit Findings

3.1 Organisation and Management

Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning

- 3.1.1 The Authority had developed a Service Plan 2015/16 which included both food safety/hygiene and food standards enforcement. The performance review contained in the service plan had not been approved by either the relevant member forum or a delegated senior officer.
- 3.1.2 During the audit the authority provided a copy of the service plan for 2016/17 which had been discussed at the May 2016 portfolio holders meeting. The plan was generally in line with the Service Planning Guidance, as laid down in the Framework Agreement.
- 3.1.3 The Service Plan did not contain an estimation of the resources required to carry out all food law service activity to the standard prescribed by the FLCoP against the resources available. The absence of such information makes it difficult to quantify any resource shortfalls to senior managers and to Members. When determining the resources needed to provide the service it is important to set out in the plan all the activities of the food service including monitoring.
- 3.1.4 Authorised officers delivered a range of regulatory functions in addition to official food controls. At the time of the audit the number of full time equivalent staff (FTE's) engaged in the delivery of official food controls was confirmed as 8.7.
- 3.1.5 The hygiene interventions programme for 2016/17 was detailed in the Service Plan, and highlighted that the authority intends to inspect 100% of premises risk rated A-E. The plan highlighted a variance in meeting the targets of 2015/16 with a backlog of 901 inspections due to pressures of other work including a significant outbreak investigation.
- 3.1.6 Officers confirmed that the Authority was sufficiently resourced to inspect 100% of premises rated A to D in 2016/17. Although officers indicated that the Authority does not have resources to inspect 100% category E premises; however this had not been made clear in the Service Plan. Officers discussed a triage approach for the category E premises and discussed the benefit of reviewing the category E premises against this triage to assess how many premises there are that meet this criteria. This information could be included in the service plan in order to clearly communicate how many schools, catering, approved premises and nurseries etc. are in this category to the portfolio holder.

- 3.1.7 Auditors emphasised the flexibilities in the FLCoP around interventions. Officers explained their concerns of using AES due to the FHS and in response we highlighted that a significant number of category E premises may very well be exempt or excluded from FHS such as pharmacies and childminders. We also encouraged the authority to explore the various flexibilities for intervention selection when setting the intervention programme with the resources that are available.

Recommendation 1 - Service planning

[The Standard 3.1]

Ensure the Service Plan includes a clear comparison of the resources required to deliver the food law enforcement service fully in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice (FLCoP) against the resources available. The Service Plan should highlight the officers' assertion that the Authority does not have sufficient resources to inspect 100% of category E premises, thereby ensuring that this risk is fully communicated to the portfolio holder.

3.1.8 Reviewing and Updating of Documented Policies and Procedures

- 3.1.9 The Authority had developed a range of documented policies and procedures, all of which had been recently reviewed. The Service had an overarching "Food Safety Procedure Manual" which contained a matrix that detailed all amendments for all documentation relating to its enforcement activities. Each individual procedure was marked with date of issue and the last review date.

- 3.1.10 Auditors were advised that policies and procedures were reviewed annually as detailed in the service plan and whenever there was a change in legislation or guidance.

- 3.1.11 Documented policies and procedures were stored on a shared drive that could be accessed by all staff.

Officer Authorisations and Training

- 3.1.12 The Authority had developed a documented policy and procedure for the authorisation of officers of the food safety team. The procedure outlined the method for assessing officer qualification, experience and training required to be authorised at each level. This procedure to assess officer competency was comprehensive and pre-dated the competency

framework detailed in the FLCoP. The Authority was already aware that this procedure needed to be expanded to include the assessment process to demonstrate that the Authority has assessed the competence of the authorised officer/s in accordance with the Code of Practice.

- 3.1.13 The role of lead officer was shared amongst the members of the management team. Officers had started to make progress with completing the assessment of the relevant competencies set out in the FLCoP.
- 3.1.14 The authorisations of five officers of the Food Safety team were checked; all were appropriately authorised, based on their qualifications, experience and competency in line with the authorities authorisation development plan. This plan outlined the activities for which officers can be authorised in accordance with their qualification, experience and training. The authority kept records to show when officers had been deemed to have satisfactorily completed each stage of the development plan.
- 3.1.15 Officers individual authorisations detailed the specific sections and regulations that they were authorised under. However authorisations had omitted a couple of specific powers under the 2013 Food Hygiene Regulations. The Authority indicated that authorisations had been reviewed and approved by its legal team.
- 3.1.16 The authority had a corporate appraisal and performance system in place whereby officer development and training needs were assessed on an annual basis and assessed every 6 months, additionally all officers had monthly 1-1 meetings.
- 3.1.17 Training records examined demonstrated that officers had received ten hours of training as required by the FLCoP. Officers had made progress working towards the new competency requirements which came into force from April 2016.

Recommendation 2 - Authorisations and Training

[The Standard – 5.1]

Review the authorisation procedure to ensure it takes account of the defined competencies contained within the FLCoP 2015.

3.2 Food Premises Database

- 3.2.1 The team had a documented procedure for new businesses and database maintenance. The procedure would benefit from prescribing the frequencies that the authority actively locates new food premises.
- 3.2.2 Auditors were advised that a suite of monthly checks are carried out on the database and annually before the local authority enforcement monitoring (LAEMs) return to the FSA. The documented procedure would benefit from being expanded to detail the checks to ensure the accuracy and reliability of its database and information published on the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS) website.
- 3.2.3 A check on the database revealed a number of queries with risk ratings and intervention frequencies which were provided to the Authority to review. Also a check of the FHRS database by auditors prior to the on-site audit indicated a number of anomalies with FHRS scope codes and business types, details of which were shared with the audit liaison officer.
- 3.2.4 Prior to the audit the details of six premises were retrieved from an internet search. All premises were found to be correctly listed on the database and subject to the inspection programme. However two premises were unrated and had not been inspected within 28 days of registering.

3.3 Food Premises Interventions

- 3.3.1 The Authority had put in place a “food premises inspections/intervention” procedure, which covered both general food premises and approved establishments. The procedure was comprehensive and in accordance with the FLCoP, including reference to approved establishments, inspection preparation, revisit policy, HACCP and Primary Authorities.
- 3.3.2 An examination of four food premises files was carried out. Generally the businesses had been inspected at the frequencies required by the Code of Practice.

- 3.3.3 Officers had carried out inspections in accordance with the FLCoP and assessed the compliance of establishments and systems to the required standards.
- 3.3.4 Inspection reports had been left with the food business in all cases following the inspection and in most cases the authority had taken appropriate action on any non-compliance found. One food business with a poor understanding of hygiene and rated 1 for FHS was not revisited in line with the FLCoP and the authority's procedures.
- 3.3.5 Officers' inspection records were generally contemporaneous, legible and retrievable.
- 3.3.6 Interrogation of the food premises database during the audit showed that 37% of premises were overdue an intervention. Of the 1138 premises overdue their intervention, 150 were FLCoP risk category D rated, 773 were category E that had been carried over from previous years intervention programs, and 120 were unrated food premises. Where low risk premises are not subject to an intervention (an alternative enforcement strategy), there is a risk that a change FBO or in activities to high risk processes will not be detected.

Recommendation 3 - Interventions

[The Standard – 7.1]

Carry out interventions at the frequencies prescribed in the Food Law code of Practice.

- 3.3.7 The records of four approved establishments were reviewed. Records were generally well kept with the appropriate aide memoire used and all appropriate checks carried out by the officers during the intervention. However there were two occasions where the authority had granted premises full approval despite the establishment not being fully compliant with hygiene law. There were also two examples where applications for approval were not dealt with and determined promptly, and the outcome of the initial visit was not confirmed in writing. This led to one premises manufacturing product of animal origin (PoAO) without approval and marketing the product with an illegal approval number for several months. This was picked up by the officer on a routine inspection and dealt with appropriately.

Recommendation 4 – Interventions at Approved Establishments

[The Standard –7.2]

Approve establishments in accordance with the relevant legislation, the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority's policies and procedures.

Ensure that applications for approval are considered in a timely manner, and determined in writing.

Verification visit to a Food Premises

3.3.8 During the audit, a verification visit was undertaken with an officer from the Authority to a local pub that served food. The main objective of the visit was to assess the effectiveness of the Authority's assessment of food business compliance with food law requirements.

3.3.9 The officer had a good working relationship with the FBO and was able to demonstrate a detailed knowledge of food safety legislation and food safety management systems at the establishment.

3.4 Enforcement

3.4.1 The Authority had developed a documented Enforcement Policy which was in line with official guidance and supplemented by a set of service standards for the Community Protection Directorate which outlined the approach to enforcement.

3.4.2 The policy had been discussed at the relevant portfolio holders meeting on 1/12/15 and was currently awaiting formal sign off.

3.4.3 The authority had developed enforcement procedures for a number of enforcement sanctions, including Hygiene Improvement Notices, Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Notices, detention and seizure, which were in accordance with the relevant codes of practice and official guidance. The authority had not developed documented procedures for prosecutions and simple cautions, although officers had undertaken in-house training on how to put together a prosecution file, and the authority had developed a set of template documents and an example prosecution template file.

- 3.4.4 A number of enforcement records were reviewed. For the three voluntary closures checked, enforcement had been timely and the action taken had been appropriate. Two Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Notices were also checked. In all examples the notices had been appropriately served and appropriate follow up action undertaken.
- 3.4.5 Four Hygiene Improvement Notices (HINs) were checked and in every case their service had been the appropriate course of action and carried out in accordance with the FLCoP and the Authority's Enforcement Policy. Evidence of correct service was available for three of the HINs. In addition for three of the HINs there was no evidence that the officer had confirmed in writing to the food business operator that the notice had been complied with. On one notice that was checked the officer had extended the time limit of the notice following a request from the business, but had not repealed and re-issued the notice in accordance with the FLCoP and the Authority's documented procedure. On the basis of these findings it would be useful for some in house refresher training on notice administration.
- 3.4.6 Auditors reviewed one file where a detention notice had been served and found that the course of action was appropriate. The issue was appropriately reported to the Agency as a food incident.
- 3.4.7 Three prosecution files were reviewed, with one being a substantial prosecution relating to a significant E.coli outbreak which started mid-2014 and follow up action was still ongoing. Auditors noted that this had been a comprehensive and prompt investigation which had clearly protected public health, and had significantly impacted on the intervention programme. Auditors noted comprehensive prosecution files with a very good level of evidence gathering, carried out in accordance with the FLCoP and centrally issued guidance and in accordance with the Authority's enforcement policy. In addition auditors noted that officers investigated all reasonable lines of enquiry.

Recommendation 5 - Enforcement Actions

[The Standard15.3]

Ensure that enforcement action is carried out (service of notices) in accordance with legislation and the FLCoP. [See paragraphs 3.4.5]

3.5 Internal Monitoring, Third Party or Peer Review

Internal Monitoring

- 3.5.1 The inspection procedure highlighted the various quantitative and qualitative monitoring checks for this aspect. Qualitative checks included monthly file audits, paperwork review of the inspection of all approved premises and accompanied visits.
- 3.5.2 Both the authorisation procedure and inspection procedure made reference to monthly 1-1 meetings where a template 1-1 record was completed. This 1-1 record captured:
- Any joint inspections
 - Issues with performance
 - Four checks on inspection records including risk ratings, inspection report letters and notices
 - Four checks on service requests including actions appropriate and updated and documents attached to the database

Food and Food Premises Complaints

- 3.5.3 The authority had a documented food complaints policy and procedure, and a separate procedure for general service request/ complaints. The Authority may wish to consider expanding the procedure to detail the criteria for determining the most appropriate course of action to ensure a consistent approach amongst the team. This could also be used to filter out trivial or low risk complaints to free up officer resource.
- 3.5.4 Checks on five complaint files were carried out. Generally the Authority had investigated these in accordance with the FLCoP and had taken appropriate action in accordance with the Authority's enforcement policy.

Food Inspection and Sampling

- 3.5.5 The team had developed an appropriate documented food sampling policy & procedure and sampling programme. All were in accordance with the requirements of the Framework Agreement. The sampling programme was risk-based.
- 3.5.6 The Authority had appointed a Public Analyst in accordance with the relevant legal requirements and the FLCoP.

- 3.5.7 Four records of food samples were checked. The team had documented its response to and the outcome of each unsatisfactory sample checked and taken the appropriate action in all cases.

Records

- 3.5.8 Records were maintained in electronic format. In general, records were easily retrievable and up to date.

Third Party or Peer Review

- 3.5.9 Both the Service Plan and the Food Service Delivery Plan highlighted a commitment to participate in Inter Authority Audit (IAA) exercises.
- 3.5.10 The Authority had been subject to a focused IAA by the Nottinghamshire Food Liaison Group on the implementation of the FHRS and associated Brand Standard on 22/10/14. This audit highlighted several improvements to the Authority's delivery and implementation of the FHRS in accordance with the brand standard. The authority had recorded completion of the majority of the items on the action plan, with the exception of food premises interventions be carried out in a timely manner in accordance with the FLCoP, which the Authority had recorded that every effort is made to do so.
- 3.5.11 The Authority was regularly represented at the regional food liaison group and contributed to the consistent development of policy at regional level.

Auditors: Michael Bluff – Lead Auditor
Alun Barnes - Auditor

Food Standards Agency
Regulatory Delivery Division

ANNEX A - Action Plan for Nottingham City Council

Audit date: 24-26 May 2016

TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	BY (DATE)	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	ACTION TAKEN TO DATE
<p>Recommendation 1 - Service planning [The Standard 3.1]</p> <p>Ensure the Service Plan includes a clear comparison of the resources required to deliver the food law enforcement service fully in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice (FLCoP) against the resources available. The Service Plan should highlight the officers' assertion that the Authority does not have sufficient resources to inspect 100% of category E premises, thereby ensuring that this risk is fully communicated to the portfolio holder.</p>	30/9/2016	Amend current service plan to include clearer correlation between resources and expected inspection outcomes. Include an assessment of additional resources needed to bring inspection programme back to 100% completion level including category E.	Evaluation document developed of current team member capacity to carry out numbers of high risk interventions as first action to extrapolate to backlog inspections.
<p>Recommendation 2 - Authorisations and Training [The Standard – 5.1]</p> <p>Review the authorisation procedure to ensure it takes account of the defined competencies contained within the FLCoP 2015.</p>	1/12/16	<p>The authorisation process in place at the time of the audit preceded the FLCoP competency framework and was designed to facilitate a new officers and new qualified Officer's progression to full authorisation.</p> <p>This will be reviewed, with the purpose of ensuring that it dovetails in to the competency framework within the FLCoP.</p>	Discussion at Service Manager/PEHO level to review and plan amalgamation of authorisation/competency documents.
<p>Recommendation 3 – Interventions [The Standard – 7.1]</p> <p>Carry out interventions at the frequencies prescribed in the Food Law code of Practice.</p>	31/3/17	An alternative enforcement strategy will be developed to deal with E rated premises which do not fall within the scope of FHRS. The resource implications of inspecting all the remaining overdue Es is too great in 1 financial year.	<p>Alternative Enforcement telephone questionnaire form developed and to be trialled on non-FHRS premises from 18/7/16.</p> <p>Alternative enforcement method to be applied to ~ 240 non-FHRS</p>

	31/3/18	<p>E premises within FHRS scope to have Official Control inspections and brought back in to alignment by 31/3/18 through planned programme and targeting. (796 in total with 87 identified in priority 1 and 2).</p> <p>With regard to the overdue Ds, we are confident that all Ds will have been inspected by the end of the 2016/17 inspection programme.</p> <p>Regarding overdue high risk unrated premises, we are confident that all such premises which are in operation will have been inspected by the end of the 2016/17 inspection programme.</p>	<p>premises in priority by next inspection date – complete by 31/3/17 and additional 51 before 31/3/18.</p> <p>Prioritisation on the following basis;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Premises with a Usage Code indicating vulnerable groups 2. Premises with a Usage Code indicating potential for handling of higher risk foods 3. Premises with most overdue next inspection date <p>Three Food Safety Officers/EHOs to be contracted on 12 week agency basis to target overdue E premises to achieve approx. 450 before 31/3/17.</p> <p>Temporary fixed term Food Safety Officer appointed from May 2016 to March 2017 using recovered prosecution cost monies (compensating for officer time that was diverted away from inspections in 2015/16) from EIEC outbreak case. Appointed to focus solely on inspection work. Strong possibility of continuing through in to 2017/18 year using accrued funding.</p>
--	---------	---	---

<p>Recommendation 4 – Interventions at Approved Establishments [The Standard – 7.2]</p> <p>Approve establishments in accordance with the relevant legislation, the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority’s policies and procedures.</p> <p>Ensure that applications for approval are considered in a timely manner, and determined in writing.</p>	<p>30/9/16</p>	<p>In the past, applications for approval have been submitted long before the equipment to produce it has even been supplied. This has resulted in an informal visit to discuss what was actually being proposed. In future, we will ensure that any such applications are refused and the FBO advised to re-submit the application in due course.</p> <p>All duly submitted applications will be dealt with in a timely fashion. A clear record will be made to identify when a pre-approval visit has been undertaken and the outcome will be clearly communicated in writing with the applicant promptly.</p>	<p>Officers authorised for this level of work reminded of requirements and monitoring to take place at 1:1 meetings.</p> <p>Additional reminders at scheduled Food Practitioner meetings.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5 - Enforcement Actions [The Standard15.3]</p> <p>Ensure that enforcement action is carried out (service of notices) in accordance with legislation and the FLCoP. [See paragraphs 3.4.5]</p>	<p>30/9/16</p>	<p>Refresher training will be undertaken to remind all Officers authorised to serve Hygiene Improvement Notices of the need to confirm in writing when Notices have been complied with as well as the need to serve a new HIN, in the event that a request for an extension has been agreed with the FBO.</p>	<p>Reminder to officers about FLCoP stipulations with follow up at scheduled Food Practitioner meetings.</p>

ANNEX B - Audit Approach/Methodology

The audit was conducted using a variety of approaches and methodologies as follows:

(1) Examination of LA policies and procedures.

The following relevant LA policies, procedures and linked documents were examined before and during the audit:

(2) File reviews – the following LA file records were reviewed during the audit:

(3) Review of Database records:

- To review and assess the completeness of database records of food hygiene inspections, food and food premises complaint investigations, samples taken by the authority, formal enforcement and other activities and to verify consistency with file records
- To assess the completeness and accuracy of the food premises database

(4) Officer interviews – an Environmental Health Officer was interviewed.

Opinions and views raised during officer interviews remain confidential and are not referred to directly within the report.

(5) On-site verification check:

A verification visit was made with the Authority's officers to a local food business. The purpose of the visit was to verify the outcome of the last inspection carried out by the Local Authority and to assess the extent to which enforcement activities and decisions met the requirements of relevant legislation, the Food Law Code of Practice and official guidance.

ANNEX C - Glossary

Authorised officer	A suitably qualified officer who is authorised by the local authority to act on its behalf in, for example, the enforcement of legislation.
Broadly Compliant	An outcome measure which the Food Standard Agency has developed with local authorities to monitor the effectiveness of the regulatory service relating to food law. It is based on the risk rating scheme in the Food Law Code of Practice which is currently used by food law enforcement officers to assess premises which pose the greatest risk to consumers failing to comply with food law.
Codes of Practice	Government Codes of Practice issued under Section 40 of the Food Safety Act 1990 as guidance to local authorities on the enforcement of food legislation.
County Council	A local authority whose geographical area corresponds to the county and whose responsibilities include food standards and feeding stuffs enforcement.
District Council	A local authority of a smaller geographical area and situated within a County Council whose responsibilities include food hygiene enforcement.
E. coli O157	E.coli O157 belongs to the group of verotoxigenic E. coli (VTEC) bacteria which are a toxin-producing strain of Escherichia coli that occur naturally in the gastrointestinal tract of animals such as cattle and sheep, and are pathogenic to humans. E.coli O157 is the VTEC strain that has been most commonly implicated in human infection in the UK.
External Temporary Storage Facility (ETSF)	A warehouse (formerly known as an enhanced remote transit shed or ERTS) designated by HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), where goods are temporarily stored pending clearance by HMRC, and prior to release into free circulation.
Environmental Health Officer (EHO)	Officer employed by the local authority to enforce food safety legislation.

Feeding stuffs	Term used in legislation on feed mixes for farm animals and pet food.
Food hygiene	The legal requirements covering the safety and wholesomeness of food.
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS)	The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme provides information to the public about hygiene standards in catering and retail food establishments. It is run by local authorities in partnership with the Food Standards Agency. Businesses that fall within the scope of the scheme are given a 'hygiene rating' which shows how closely the business was meeting the requirements of food hygiene law at the time of inspection. The scheme also encourages businesses to improve hygiene standards.
Food Safety Management System	A written permanent procedure, or procedures, based on HACCP principles. It is structured so that this requirement can be applied flexibly and proportionately according to the size and nature of the food business.
Food standards	The legal requirements covering the quality, composition, labelling, presentation and advertising of food, and materials in contact with food.
Framework Agreement	<p>The Framework Agreement consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food and Feed Law Enforcement Standard • Service Planning Guidance • Monitoring Scheme • Audit Scheme <p>The Standard and the Service Planning Guidance set out the Agency's expectations on the planning and delivery of food and feed law enforcement.</p> <p>The Monitoring Scheme requires local authorities to submit yearly returns via LAEMS to the Agency on their food enforcement activities i.e. numbers of inspections, samples and prosecutions.</p> <p>Under the Audit Scheme the Food Standards Agency will be conducting audits of the food and</p>

	feed law enforcement services of local authorities against the criteria set out in the Standard.
Full Time Equivalents (FTE)	A figure which represents that part of an individual officer's time available to a particular role or set of duties. It reflects the fact that individuals may work part-time, or may have other responsibilities within the organisation not related to food and feed enforcement.
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point – a food safety management system used within food businesses to identify points in the production process where it is critical for food safety that the control measure is carried out correctly, thereby eliminating or reducing the hazard to a safe level.
LAEMS	Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System is an electronic system used by local authorities to report their food law enforcement activities to the Food Standards Agency.
Member forum	A local authority forum at which Council Members discuss and make decisions on food law enforcement services.
Metropolitan Authority	A local authority normally associated with a large urban conurbation in which the County and District Council functions are combined.
Risk rating	A system that rates food premises according to risk and determines how frequently those premises should be inspected. For example, high risk premises should be inspected at least every 6 months.
Safer food, better business (SFBB)	A food safety management system, developed by the Food Standards Agency to help small catering and retail businesses put in place food safety management procedures and comply with food hygiene regulations.
Service Plan	A document produced by a local authority setting out their plans on providing and delivering a food service to the local community.
Trading Standards	The Department within a local authority which

carries out, amongst other responsibilities, the enforcement of food standards and feeding stuffs legislation.

Trading Standards
Officer (TSO)

Officer employed by the local authority who, amongst other responsibilities, may enforce food standards and feeding stuffs legislation.

Unitary Authority

A local authority in which the County and District Council functions are combined, examples being Metropolitan District/Borough Councils, and London Boroughs. A Unitary Authority's responsibilities will include food hygiene, food standards and feeding stuffs enforcement.