

**Report on the Audit of Local Authority Food Law
Service Assessment of Food Businesses'
Food Safety Management System (FSMS)**

Runnymede Borough Council
18-19 May 2010



Foreword

Audits of local authorities' food law enforcement services are part of the Food Standards Agency's arrangements to improve consumer protection and confidence in relation to food. These arrangements recognise that the enforcement of UK food 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 Environmental Health and Trading Standards Services. The Agency's website contains enforcement activity data for all UK local authorities and can be found at: www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring.

The attached audit report examines the Local Authority's Food Law Enforcement Service. The assessment includes the local arrangements in place for officer authorisation and training, inspections of food businesses and internal monitoring. The audit scope was developed specifically to address Recommendations 9 and 15 of the Public Inquiry Report¹ into the 2005 E. coli outbreak at Bridgend, Wales. The programme focused on the local authority's training provision to ensure that all officers who check Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) and HACCP based plans, including those responsible for overseeing the work of those officers, have the necessary knowledge and skills. Also, that existing inspection arrangements and processes to assess and enforce HACCP related food safety requirements in food businesses are adequate, risk based, and able to effect any changes necessary to secure improvements.

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 Local Authority Food Law Enforcement and is available on the Agency's website at: www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring. 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.

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 all the devolved countries comprising the UK.

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

¹ <http://wales.gov.uk/ecolidocs/3008707/reporten.pdf?skip=1&lang=en>

CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 Introduction	4
<i>Reason for the Audit</i>	4
<i>Scope of the Audit</i>	4
<i>Background</i>	5
2.0 Executive Summary	6
3.0 Audit Findings	
3.1 Organisation and Management	8
- <i>Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning</i>	8
- <i>Documented Policies and Procedures</i>	9
- <i>Officer Authorisations</i>	9
3.2 Food Premises Inspections	11
- <i>Verification Visit to a Food Premises</i>	13
3.3 Enforcement	14
3.4 Internal Monitoring and Third Party or Peer Review	16
- <i>Internal Monitoring</i>	16
- <i>Food and Food Premises Complaints</i>	17
- <i>Food Sampling</i>	17
- <i>Third Party or Peer Review</i>	17
Annexe A - Action Plan for Runnymede Borough Council	19
Annexe B - Audit Approach/Methodology	22
Annexe C – Glossary	24

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report records the results of an audit at Runnymede Borough 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 food premises inspections, enforcement activities and internal monitoring. The report has been made available on the Agency's website at:
www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports.
Hard copies are available from the Food Standards Agency's Local Authority Audit and Liaison Division at Aviation House, 125 Kingsway, London WC2B 6NH, Tel: 020 7276 8428.

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 Runnymede Borough Council was undertaken under section 12(4) of the Act as part of the Food Standards Agency's annual audit programme.
- 1.3 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 by the Agency and was representative of a geographical mix of 25 Councils selected across England.

Scope of the Audit

- 1.4 The audit examined Runnymede Borough Council's arrangements for food premises inspections and internal monitoring with regard to food hygiene law enforcement, with particular emphasis on officer competencies in assessing food safety management systems based on HACCP principles. 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.
- 1.5 Assurance was sought that key 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 Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, Surrey on 18-19 May 2010.

Background

- 1.6 Runnymede Borough Council is located in north-west Surrey. It has a population of around 83,400 and covers some 30 square miles. The Authority's administrative centre is based in Addlestone. Although it has a number of light industries, Runnymede is predominantly residential and is bordered by the rivers Thames and Wey, and is bisected by the M5 running north-south and the M3 running east-west.
- 1.7 There are approximately 761 food premises in the district. The majority of food businesses comprise small to medium catering and retail enterprises. There were no establishments in the Authority's area which required approval under Regulation (EC) No. 853/2004.
- 1.8 The Commercial Team, as one of four teams within the Environmental Protection Division, was responsible for enforcing food hygiene legislation in the Borough. The team was also responsible for health and safety enforcement, infectious diseases, water supplies and animal welfare licensing.
- 1.9 Enforcement of food standards and animal feeding stuffs legislation was the responsibility of the Surrey County Council Trading Standards Department and outside the scope of service of the Commercial team.
- 1.10 The profile of Runnymede Borough Council's food businesses on 31 March 2009 as reported to the Agency in the most recent official monitoring returns, was as follows:

Type of food premises	Number
Primary Producers	1
Importers/Exporters	0
Distributors/Transporters	1
Manufacturers/Packers	1
Retailers	127
Restaurant/Caterers	631
Total number of food premises	761

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 A generic Service Plan 2009/2010 had been developed for the Environmental Protection Division with a supplementary annex incorporating additional food service details for the Commercial Team. The Service Plan was broadly in line with Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement. However, it should be expanded to include more detail on staff resources required to deliver the food law enforcement service with regard to the demands on the food service. Annual reviews of performance of the Service should include measures taken to address any variances in meeting Service Plans and any required areas of improvement.
- 2.2 Although there was no formal system in place for document control, documented policies and procedures had been developed for the majority of food law enforcement activities, which were reviewed on an annual and ad hoc basis. Documents were stored on a shared computer drive for staff access and the Authority was currently reviewing methods for protecting these documents.
- 2.3 The Authority had developed and implemented a documented procedure for the Authorisation of Officers, which included a means for assessing officer competency. Officers were appropriately qualified and authorised. Individual training needs were identified annually through a staff appraisal process. It was not evident in all cases that Officers had achieved 10 hours Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training required by the Food Law Code of Practice (FLCoP).
- 2.4 The Authority had developed and implemented a Food Hygiene Intervention (Inspection) Procedure. This would benefit from being expanded or a new procedure developed to cover the specific requirements for the approval and inspection of approved establishments, any alternative enforcement strategies for low risk premises, and clear guidance for officers on the validation and verification of food safety management systems (FSMS). The document should also be reviewed to address the need to undertake revisits at food businesses that fail to comply with significant statutory requirements.
- 2.5 File and database checks confirmed that the Authority was generally implementing an effective food premises inspection programme across all risk categories, and within the timeframes and minimum frequencies specified by the FLCoP. However, there were no appropriate aides-memoire in use for officers to record detailed findings during inspections. The use of an aide-memoire would provide essential fundamental data necessary to inform subsequent inspections, a graduated approach to enforcement, and permit effective internal monitoring. Auditors were unable to confirm whether appropriate inspections, interventions and follow-up actions were being carried out, or if risk ratings were accurate.

- 2.6 File and database checks confirmed that in all cases examined, food and food business complaints were effectively investigated and followed up. Outcomes were communicated to all relevant parties in a timely manner.
- 2.7 The Authority had a documented sampling procedure, policy, and sampling programme. There was clear evidence that the Authority was actively participating in both local and national sampling programmes, with particular emphasis on locally produced high risk food. Database and record checks showed that in all cases of unsatisfactory sample results the Authority had taken appropriate follow-up actions including revisits, resampling and comprehensive advisory letters.
- 2.8 The Authority had developed a generic enforcement policy, and a food enforcement policy which was generally in accordance with centrally issued guidance. File checks on formal enforcement confirmed that actions taken had been justified and, with the exception of voluntary closure procedures, were generally taken in accordance with the Authority's enforcement policy and centrally issued guidance.
- 2.9 File checks of hygiene improvement notices showed that the Authority had issued the notices in appropriate circumstances, and timely revisits had taken place. However follow-up actions had not always been taken in accordance with the FLCoP and the Authority's own procedures.
- 2.10 The Authority had developed a documented internal monitoring procedure which included the majority of food law enforcement activities. There was evidence of quantitative monitoring of food enforcement as well as day to day qualitative monitoring through ongoing discussions within the team. The monitoring procedure should be reviewed and extended to better reflect the monitoring being carried out in practice and to include appropriate record keeping arrangements covering the full range of enforcement activities.
- 2.11 The Authority was due to participate in the forthcoming Surrey Food Liaison Group Inter-Authority Audit scheme focused on training and authorisation of officers, inspections and internal monitoring.

3.0 Audit Findings

3.1 Organisation and Management

Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning

3.1.1 The Authority had developed an Environmental Protection Service Plan 2009/2010 for all four teams in the Environmental Protection Division. This was supplemented with an annexe incorporating more detail about the food service. The Plan had been agreed by the Leisure and Environment Committee on 18 June 2009.

3.1.2 The Service Plan was linked into the Authority's corporate planning process and its aims and objectives were as follows:

- *'To ensure that Runnymede residents and businesses live and operate in, as far as is possible, a safe, health and pollution free environment.*
- *To meet statutory responsibilities in a cost effective and responsible manner in accordance with Council policies, legislation, and centrally issued guidance.*
- *To encourage best practice and publish advice in relation to any of the Division's areas of responsibility.*
- *To carry out enforcement responsibilities as laid down in the Environmental Protection Division Enforcement policy and the Enforcement Concordat.*
- *To undertake discretionary duties as determined by the Council to promote the protection, safety and well being of residents and businesses within Runnymede'.*

3.1.3 The Plan was broadly in line with Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement, and figures for food establishments provided in the official monitoring return made by the Authority to the Agency in 2008/2009 were generally consistent with the Service Plan.

3.14 However, the Plan would benefit from further development to include a comparison of full time equivalent staff (FTE) available against those needed to deliver all aspects of the Service, and any extra demands on the food safety service, for example, large scale events, seasonal activities etc. The annual review of performance of food activities did not include any measures taken to address variances from a previous Service Plan, for example, work undertaken with the registration and alternative enforcement strategies for childminders, or any required areas for improvement.

Recommendation

3.1.5 The Authority should:

- (i) Further develop the Service Plan to include all the information specified in the Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement.
- (ii) The Service Plan should be reviewed to include measures taken to address variances in meeting the Service Plan and any required areas for improvement.

[The Standard – 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3]

3.1.6 The annual budget for the Commercial Team to deliver food law enforcement work in 2008/2009 was stated in the Service Plan as £161,183.

3.1.7 The returns made to the Food Standards Agency under the Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System (LAEMS) for 2008/2009 stated that there were 1.42 FTE professional posts allocated to food law enforcement. However, the information provided by the Authority to the auditors prior to the visit indicated that there were 2.0 FTE professional staff. The Authority needs to reflect this statistic accurately in future returns.

Documented Policies and Procedures

3.1.8 Although there was no formal system for document control, auditors noted evidence of an effective rolling programme for annual and ad hoc reviews of documented policies and procedures. With minor exceptions, policies and procedures had been developed for each of the enforcement activities covered by the Standard in the Framework Agreement.

3.1.9 The Authority had developed a system of storing documented policies and procedures on a shared computer drive which staff could readily access. Master copies were held by the Principal Environmental Health Officer (PEHO). Methods of protecting documents were currently being reviewed by the Authority.

Officer Authorisations

3.1.10 The Director of Technical Services had delegated powers to authorise officers to carry out functions relating to food safety. The PEHO was responsible for recommending the level of authorisation to the Director using a 'baseline assessment form' which took account of officers' qualifications, knowledge and standards of competence.

Authorisation documents contained the full range of food law enforcement legislation and the Authority was able to demonstrate that officers were appropriately qualified and authorised.

- 3.1.11 Individual training needs were determined through an annual appraisal scheme. It was clear that training opportunities were available to officers but there were insufficient records maintained to confirm whether all officers had achieved the minimum 10 hours relevant training based on the principles of continuing professional development.
- 3.1.12 In addition, there was no mechanism in place to draw individual and team training needs into a documented training programme. This process could assist the Authority in regularly reviewing officer training to ensure all officers received adequate refresher training where necessary, particularly in relation to 'Safer food, better business' (SFBB) and HACCP, specialist processes, and formal actions.
- 3.1.13 File checks showed that the Authority had not in all cases maintained records of authorised officers' qualifications and training certificates as required by the FLCoP.

Recommendations

3.1.14 The Authority should:

Ensure that all Authorised Officers receive appropriate levels of relevant training and that records are maintained of relevant qualifications, training and experience of each authorised officer in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice. [The Standard – 5.4 and 5.5]

3.2 Food Premises Inspections

- 3.2.1 The Authority had developed and implemented the 'Food Hygiene Intervention (Inspection) Procedural Guidance' for officers on the carrying out of food hygiene inspections. The document included a cross reference to information on Regulation (EC) No. 852/2004 on the Hygiene of Foodstuffs Annex II (General hygiene requirements for FBOs) as an inspection prompt for officers, with information about the planning of inspections, inspection procedures, and enforcement actions.
- 3.2.2 The document would benefit from being expanded or a new document developed to include:
- Clear guidance on the effective assessment of food safety management system (FSMS) based on HACCP principles;
 - Procedures covering inspections and interventions at approved establishments;
 - Alternative enforcement strategies for low risk premises, for example childminders;
 - A revision of the policy on revisits at food businesses that fail to comply with significant statutory requirements, in accordance with the FLCoP.
- 3.2.3 In accordance with the Authority's documented policy on follow-up visits, revisits were generally only undertaken to check compliance with notices or where imminent legal action was being considered. However, revisits to check whether remedial actions had been taken by FBOs were not always undertaken where significant non-compliance with statutory requirements had been identified during inspections.

Recommendation

3.2.4 The Authority should:

- (i) Review and expand its documented inspection procedures for the full range of inspections/interventions carried out, to include the effective assessment of food safety managements system, and to address the need to undertake revisits at food businesses that fail to comply with significant statutory requirements.
- (ii) Ensure that revisits following interventions are undertaken where appropriate in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and centrally issued guidance.

[The Standard – 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4]

- 3.2.5 Although the scope of the audit did not include a detailed examination of the Authority's database management system, it was evident that the Authority was generally implementing an effective food premises inspection programme across all risk categories. Database reports relating to inspections were readily produced upon request and these indicated that food premises interventions were generally being undertaken at the minimum frequencies specified in Annexe 5 of the FLCoP.
- 3.2.6 Following the publication of the Pennington Inquiry Report, the 'Food Premises Inspection Report' to be left after every inspection at all food businesses had been revised. The report included a section on 'any justification required for risk rating given' as well as a section for monitoring when a premises had been given a lower risk rating, reduced from high risk categories A or B.
- 3.2.7 File checks demonstrated that a summary 'Food Hygiene Inspection Report' had been left with the FBO in all cases examined, and where follow-up letters had been sent there had been a clear differentiation between legal requirements and recommendations. However, it was observed that there was not always an indication of time scales on letters or reports for FBOs to achieve compliance.
- 3.2.8 From the food premises files and database records examined, auditors noted that officers were not keeping adequate records about the size, scale or nature of the business or sufficient information to demonstrate the basis of officers' assessments of business compliance with legislative requirements, or to provide an indication of the basis of the allocation of premises risk ratings. It was therefore not possible from available records to confirm whether appropriate inspections, interventions and follow-up actions were being carried out, or if risk ratings were accurate.
- 3.2.9 Where non compliances were identified, officers sent detailed letters to FBOs confirming the inspection findings. However, where no letters were sent, the only available records of the inspection were those contained in officers' notebooks, brief database entries and the summary report forms provided to the FBOs after each inspection.
- 3.2.10 The Authority would benefit from producing appropriate aides-memoire to assist officers in keeping more detailed records of inspection findings, including a verification of structural compliance, assessment of HACCP based food safety management systems, and to ensure that a full business compliance history had been recorded. This would provide the essential basis necessary to inform subsequent inspections, to facilitate a graduated approach to enforcement, and to enable effective internal monitoring.

Recommendation

3.2.11 The Authority should:

Ensure that records, observations and data obtained during the course of inspections, particularly in relation to the verification of structural compliance and HACCP based food safety management systems include sufficient detail to demonstrate whether the compliance history of the premises and systems has been comprehensively assessed to legally prescribed standards. All records shall be kept for at least 6 years. [The Standard - 16.1 and 16.2]

Verification Visit to a Food Premises

- 3.2.12 During the audit, a verification visit was undertaken to a local butcher's shop with an officer from the Authority, who had carried out the last food hygiene intervention of the premises. The main objective of the verification visit was to assess the effectiveness of the Authority's assessment of food business compliance with food law requirements. The specific assessments included the conduct of the preliminary interview of the FBO by the officer, the general hygiene checks to verify compliance with the structure and hygiene practice requirements and checks carried out by the officer to verify compliance with HACCP based procedures.
- 3.2.13 The auditor's visit confirmed that the officer had carried out a detailed inspection and been able to adequately assess HACCP compliance, including the identification and appraisal of critical control points, the FBO's ability to verify and monitor the system and the maintenance of HACCP related documents and records. However, as there were no inspection records other than by exception reporting in inspection letters, and minimal data on the database, the information recorded of the officer's assessment of HACCP and training of food handlers was limited.

3.3 Enforcement

- 3.3.1 The Authority had developed a generic Environmental Protection Enforcement Policy which was in accordance with centrally issued guidance and had been approved by the Leisure and Environment Committee on 14 January 2010.
- 3.3.2 A Food Safety Enforcement Procedure had also been developed to provide guidance to officers on formal enforcement options relating specifically to food safety legislation. 'Work Instruction' procedures for enforcement actions supported the Food Safety Enforcement Procedure and together the documents covered the full range of formal food law enforcement actions.
- 3.3.3 Checks on file records for three hygiene improvement notices (HIN) served confirmed that in each case this had been the appropriate course of action. The notices had been drafted in accordance with centrally issued guidance and signed by correctly authorised officers. Officers had carried out timely checks to confirm compliance, however, there was no evidence from the files examined to show that officers had confirmed to FBOs in writing that works had been satisfactorily completed in accordance with centrally issued guidance and the Authority's own procedures. There was no evidence of internal monitoring of the HINs on the files.
- 3.3.4 Two separate voluntary closures of food businesses had been agreed by the Service with food business proprietors. Although, from the file evidence, both closures were the appropriate course of action, officers had not undertaken the voluntary closures in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice or the Authority's own written procedures. At one premises, there was no signed voluntary closure agreement by the FBO. At another, a letter was sent subsequent to the premises closing and reopening with no evidence that voluntary closure documentation had been used.

Recommendation

3.3.5 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that actions following the service of hygiene improvement notices are taken in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority's own enforcement policy.
- (ii) Ensure that formal enforcement actions including voluntary closures are undertaken in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority's own enforcement policy.

[The Standard – 15.2 and 15.3]

3.3.6 Two prosecution files and three simple caution files were examined. It was clear from the files that in all cases, the formal action which had been taken was appropriate. The prosecutions and cautions had been carried out in a timely manner and evidence had been effectively collected and presented. The simple cautions had been administered in accordance with Home Office Circular 16/2008. In all cases there was also evidence that the Authority's enforcement policy had been considered as part of the decision making process.

3.4 Internal Monitoring and Third Party or Peer Review

Internal Monitoring

- 3.4.1 The Service had developed an 'Internal Monitoring Food Safety Procedural Guidance' Document which covered the majority of food law enforcement activities and included an internal monitoring schedule for these activities. Auditors felt that the document should be reviewed to better reflect the internal monitoring being carried out in practice.
- 3.4.2 Auditors understood that the small team worked closely, with frequent day to day discussions about the enforcement activities being carried out. In this way, officers and the PEHO were aware of the main aspects of each other's work. It was evident that quantitative performance monitoring against inspection targets was carried out within the team.
- 3.4.3 Although there were no records of any qualitative monitoring undertaken, auditors were informed of the following informal internal qualitative monitoring arrangements carried out at the Authority:
- All letters and correspondence with FBOs (for example food premises inspections reports, statutory notices) were checked by the PEHO;
 - The PEHO accompanied officers on inspections when they required a further opinion or there was a likelihood of formal enforcement action, though this was not formally recorded;
 - Regular team meetings were held with minutes of meetings recorded.

Recommendation

3.4.4 The Authority should:

- (i) Review, revise and fully implement its internal monitoring procedure in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and centrally issued guidance.
- (ii) Ensure appropriate records of monitoring are maintained, including any corrective actions.

[The Standard – 19.1 and 19.3]

Food and Food Premises Complaints

- 3.4.5 The Authority had developed and implemented a food complaint procedure for the investigation of food complaints. The procedure would benefit from being expanded to include details on the investigation of complaints relating to food premises. The records for complaint investigations examined confirmed that complaints were appropriately investigated, follow-up action had been taken as necessary and records were found to be complete and accurate in accordance with the policy and centrally issued guidance. There was no evidence of internal monitoring of the complaints examined.

Food Sampling

- 3.4.6 The Authority had developed and implemented a food sampling policy, procedural guidance and a sampling programme for the current financial year with emphasis on locally produced high risk foods. They were also actively participating in both national and local sampling programmes. The Authority took a proactive role in the LACORS survey of sampling at butchers shops in 2009. It was evident that a high level of appropriately targeted sampling was being carried out. Food and environmental sampling was also being undertaken as an effective adjunct to business inspections.
- 3.4.7 Audit checks of five unsatisfactory sample results were carried out, including both for food and environmental swabs. File checks showed that in all cases appropriate detailed database records had been maintained, and appropriate and timely follow-up actions had been taken, including visits to resample and comprehensive advisory letters sent to FBOs. However, there was no evidence of internal monitoring of sampling activities on the files.

Third Party or Peer Review

- 3.4.8 Auditors were informed that the Authority intended to participate in the Surrey Food Liaison Group proposed Inter-Authority Audit scheme which was planned to take place between September 2010 and March 2011, focusing on training and authorisation of officers, inspections and internal monitoring. Protocols and checklists had been developed based on the Agency audit scheme and one of the officers from the Authority, who was the Chair of the Surrey Food Liaison Group, had been actively involved in the preparation of the scheme.
- 3.4.9 In October 2008, the Authority took part in a consistency training exercise organised by the Surrey Food Liaison Group. The survey could be completed anonymously online and covered questions on approval legislation as well as some real life case scenarios for risk rating and follow-up action decisions.

Auditors: **Jane Tait**

Christina Walder

Food Standards Agency

Local Authority Audit and Liaison Division

Action Plan for Runnymede Borough Council

Audit date: 18-19 May 2010

TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	BY (DATE)	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	ACTION TAKEN TO DATE
3.1.5(i) Further develop the Service Plan to include all the information specified in the Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement.	01/05/11	The authority to revert to production of individual service plan for the Food Safety service dropped in favour of combined EH service plan after 2005. Plan will address all information specified in the Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement.	Target date takes in to account production of next years Service Plans.
3.1.5(ii) The Service Plan should be reviewed to include measures taken to address variances in meeting the Service Plan and any required areas for improvement. [The Standard – 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3]	01/05/11	Plan will be reviewed to include measures taken to address variances in meeting the Service Plan and any required areas for improvement.	
3.1.14 Ensure that all Authorised Officers receive appropriate levels of relevant training and that records are maintained of relevant qualifications, training and experience of each authorised officer in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice. [The Standard – 5.4 and 5.5]	Completed	Full records for all officers now maintained. Officers given guidance on recording all relevant training activities	
3.2.4(i) Review and expand documented inspection procedures for the full range of inspections/interventions carried out, to include the effective assessment of FSMS, and to address the need to undertake revisits at	Completed	New documented procedure drawn up and implemented covering POAO approvals July 2010.	Existing documented inspection procedure reviewed and expanded in line with recommendation. Officers informed.

TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	BY (DATE)	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	ACTION TAKEN TO DATE
<p>food businesses that fail to comply with significant statutory requirements.</p> <p>3.2.4(ii) Ensure that revisits following interventions are undertaken where appropriate in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and centrally issued guidance. [The Standard – 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4]</p>	Completed	Revisits now included in expanded documented procedures and to be undertaken in respect of 3.2.4(i) above.	
<p>3.2.11 Ensure that records, observations and data obtained during the course of inspections, particularly in relation to the verification of structural compliance and HACCP based food safety management systems include sufficient detail to demonstrate whether the compliance history of the premises and systems has been comprehensively assessed to legally prescribed standards. All records shall be kept for at least 6 years. [The Standard - 16.1 and 16.2]</p>	Ongoing	New aides-memoire produced and implemented to cover requirement.	In use from July 2010
<p>3.3.5(i) Ensure that actions following the service of Hygiene Improvement Notices are taken in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority's own enforcement policy.</p>	Completed	Monitoring of this requirement now part of new internal monitoring procedure to address 3.4.4(i) below	Officers briefed on requirement following FSA audit.
<p>3.3.5(ii) Ensure that formal enforcement actions including voluntary closures are undertaken in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice, centrally issued guidance and the Authority's own enforcement policy. [The Standard – 15.2 and 15.3]</p>	On-going	Monitoring of this requirement now part of new internal monitoring procedure to address 3.4.4(i) below. Officers to be briefed.	
<p>3.4.4(i) Review, revise and fully implement its internal monitoring procedure in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and centrally issued guidance.</p>	01/07/10	Internal monitoring procedure reviewed, revised and expanded in accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and centrally issued guidance.	Officers provided with updated procedure and records of monitoring being maintained.

TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	BY (DATE)	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	ACTION TAKEN TO DATE
3.4.4(ii) Ensure appropriate records of monitoring are maintained, including any corrective actions. [The Standard – 19.1 and 19.3]	01/07/10	Records of monitoring and corrective actions to be maintained in accordance with revised monitoring procedure.	

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

- Environmental Protection Service Plan 2009/2010 and supplementary Annexe A
- Authorisation of Food Law Enforcement Officers July 2009
- Environmental Protection Enforcement Policy, Food Safety Enforcement Procedure July 2009 and associated enforcement work instructions.
- Food Hygiene Intervention(Inspection) Procedural guidance July 2008
- Food Premises Inspection Report
- Food Complaint procedure July 2009
- Food Sampling Policy, Procedural Guidance July 2009 and Programmes 2009/2010 and 2010/2011
- Internal Monitoring Food Safety Procedural Guidance July 2009
- Commercial Team Meeting Minutes; 2 March 2009, 8 September 2009, and 15 March 2010
- Surrey Food Liaison and General Health Promotion Study Group Meeting Minutes; 6 May 2009, 13 August 2009, and 5 November 2009,
- Briefing note to Surrey Environmental Health Managers Group Proposal for Surrey FLG Inter Authority Audit May 2010.

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

- General food premises inspection records
- Food complaint records
- Food sampling records
- Formal enforcement records.

(3) Officer interviews – the following officers were interviewed:

- Audit Liaison Officer
- Environmental Health Officer
- Senior Environmental Health Technician.

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

(4) 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, having particular specific regard to LA checks on FBO compliance with HACCP based food management systems.

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.
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 geographic area and situated within a County Council whose responsibilities include food hygiene enforcement.
E. coli	<i>Escherichia coli</i> microorganism, the presence of which is used as an indicator of faecal contamination of food or water. <i>E. coli</i> 0157:H7 is a serious food borne pathogen.
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 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 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 law enforcement.</p> <p>The Monitoring Scheme requires local authorities to submit quarterly returns 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 law enforcement services of local authorities against the criteria set out in the Standard.</p>
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 enforcement.

HACCP		Hazard Analysis 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.
OCD returns		Returns on local food law enforcement activities required to be made to the European Union under the Official Control of Foodstuffs Directive.
Regulators' Code	Compliance	Statutory Code to promote efficient and effective approaches to regulatory inspection and enforcement which improve regulatory outcomes without imposing unnecessary burdens on businesses.
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.
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 (TSO)	Officer	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.