

Document Control Information

Public Protection Partnership

Bracknell Forest
West Berkshire
Wokingham

Title: Public Protection Partnership **Food Safety Service Plan 2017 18**
Date: March 2017

Version: 1

Classification: Internal, public

Authors: Rosalynd Gater Team Manager Commercial

Quality Assurance: Sean Murphy PPP Service Manager

Version	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	March 2017	drafting by RG
2	May 2017	RG

**Environmental Health
Bracknell Forest, West Berkshire and Wokingham Food Safety Service Plan
2017 18**

Contents

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND TO SERVICE

- Service Purpose
- Service Structure
- Commercial Team Staffing (April 2017).....
- Service Budgets/Resources
- Key Service Partners and Partnerships.....
- Securing Action by Relevant Duty Holders.....
- Government Approach – Regulatory Delivery part of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.....

SECTION 2: CURRENT DELIVERY AND PERFORMANCE.....

- Food Inspections – Key Drivers.....
- Food Inspection Programme
- New Food Businesses
- Food Insp Due 2017 18
- Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS).....
- Zero / One Score Project.....
- Food Compliance Data Results.....
- Food Inspections
- Outdoor events
- Revisits
- Enforcement Action
- Food Service Requests
- Control and Investigation of Outbreaks and Food Related Infectious Disease

Food Sampling.....

Primary Authority

Promotional and Educational Work

Healthy Eating

Food Safety Incidents.....

Quality Management Systems.....

SECTION 3: BERKSHIRE COMPARISON AND RISK ASSESSMENT ON FOOD SERVICE

 Risk of a Reduced Food Enforcement Service / Reduced Targets For Food Inspections

SECTION 4: OUR SERVICE PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES & TARGETS 2017-18

 Service priorities 2017 18 update

SECTION 5: PLANS FOR MEETING STATUTORY/ REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

 Work Plan for 2017-18.....

APPENDICES

 Appendix 1: Financial Information

 Appendix 2: Risk register.....

 Appendix 3: National Picture for Food Safety and the work of the team

 National Picture for Food Safety and the work of the team

 FSA Regulating our Future

It is a requirement that Local Authorities produce a Service Plan each year, the format of which is contained within the Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Control by Local Authorities.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND TO SERVICE

<i>Service Purpose</i>
<i>Food Hygiene Service Aims and Objectives</i> To ensure that the risks of illness and injury through poor food safety and hygiene are minimised, and to increase consumer and business

awareness of food safety, hygiene and healthy eating. This is achieved by monitoring businesses through risk-based inspections and sampling and by taking appropriate and timely action in response to food related issues, and through liaison and awareness campaigns with food businesses and consumers to provide best advice in relation to good practice and legal compliance.

Scope of the Commercial Team Service

The staff within the team deal with all food safety related matters including programmed inspections, reactive inspections, food complaints, food hazard warnings and food related illness. Other food safety issues are dealt with by other agencies e.g. Food Standard Agency. There are also a number of approved premises which are manufacturers eg cheese makers, premises which manufacture meat products and fish products. The team also enforces Health & Safety in all Local Authority enforced premises and Smokefree Legislation. The team are also taking an active role in the public health agenda.

Shared Services

On 9th January 2017 Public Protection Partnership was formed, this is a shared service provided by Bracknell Forest Council, West Berkshire Council and Wokingham Borough Council. As such this service plan will cover the work of the 3 Council areas.

Food Hygiene Quality objectives

- To ensure as far as practicable that food produced and sold within the Boroughs is safe and fit to eat.
- To advise businesses on their legal responsibilities and educate all of our customers on food issues.

Public Protection Partnership

VISION

To protect and support residents and legitimate business through the successful use of information and intelligence, delivering safe and healthy neighbourhoods.

MISSION

The purpose of the service is to: -

- Give people information so they can make informed decisions and understand their rights and responsibilities.
- Create an atmosphere where legitimate and compliant businesses can thrive and not have their interests undermined by those who choose not to comply.

- Preserve the health, wellbeing and safety of the communities we serve.

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

In advance of the first Public Protection Partnership Control Strategy (to be published April 2018), officers have produced an initial list of priorities to maintain a 'business as usual' approach for residents, businesses and Members.

Year 1 Priorities

- Community Protection
- Protecting and Improving Health
- Protection of the Environment
- Supporting Prosperity and Economic Growth
- Effective and Improving Service Delivery

The Role of the Commercial Team with regard to the Strategic Priorities – Food and Public Health;

Community Protection	The main role of the team is to ensure that food businesses and premises for which we are the enforcing authority for health and safety are compliant with the legislation; the purpose of this legislation is to protect people.
Protecting and Improving Health	Our role within Infectious Disease Control meets this requirement; and our public health role including Eat Out Eat Well and the Good Food Challenge, and enforcement of smokefree legislation.
Protection of the Environment	Enforcing within food premises in connection with waste disposal; both commercial rubbish, food waste and drainage.
Supporting Prosperity and Economic Growth	We enforce the legislation consistently in all premises ensuring that businesses are not economically advantaged by non compliance. We work with new businesses to ensure that are aware of what they need to do, and what they do not need to do, to comply. We work with the most non compliant food businesses in an educative role to ensure they improve their hygiene rating and therefore increase their customer base.
Effective and Improving Service Delivery	Working on Quality Management Systems to ensure the service is consistent and streamlines; feedback from businesses; ethos of continuous improvement.

Public Health

As of 1st April 2013, local authorities across the country took on direct responsibility for public health from the NHS. This means that the Council leads the transformation and integration of local health and social care services to improve health and wellbeing for the people of Bracknell, West Berkshire and Wokingham. This provides new opportunities, allowing us to focus on improving the health and well-being of our population through all our activities. A Health and Well-Being Strategy has been developed and consulted on with an overarching aim of adding years to life and life to years. The strategy identifies a number of key priorities

- giving every child the best start in life;
- promoting a healthy district;
- addressing childhood obesity;
- supporting those over 40 years old to address lifestyle choices detrimental to their health;
- promoting independence and supporting older people to manage their chronic conditions

The transition meant the movement of a small team of public health professionals into the authority who will champion healthy working through the local authority and GP commissioners to integrate health and social care -preventing ill health, protecting against threats to public health and tackling inequalities in health.

During the year we worked with the Public Health Team across West Berkshire and Wokingham to launch the 'Workplace Wellbeing Charter' across Wokingham and West Berks, it is an award for businesses which has been developed by PHE. One element of the award is healthy eating.

Service Structure

Commercial Team Staffing (April 2017)

Category of staff	Acceptable Food Related Qualification	Number of Officers in post April 2016	Number of Officers in post April 2017	Full Time Equivalent for carrying out food enforcement (70%)	Full Time Equivalent carrying out H&S Enforcement (30%)
Commercial Team Manager	BSc in Environmental Health MSc in Environmental Health Diploma in Environmental Health	0.81 Plus BFBC equivalent	0.81	0.6 Strategic Management	0.21 Strategic Management

		0.2 FTE = 1FTE total			
Principal Environmental Health Officer	BSc in Environmental Health MSc in Environmental Health Diploma in Environmental Health	1 Plus BFBC equivalent 1 FTE = 2 FTE total	1	0.6 operational management 0.2 food project	0.2 operational management
Senior/Environmental Health Officers	BSc in Environmental Health MSc in Environmental Health Diploma in Environmental Health	7 (equates to 5.99 FTE Plus 4 FTE BFBC = 9.99 FTE total	7 (equates to 5.8 FTE Plus 3 FTE BFBC = 8.8 FTE total (1FTE maternity leave back June 2017)	6.2	2.6
Senior Food Safety Officer	EHRB Higher Certificate NEBOSH certificate/Diploma	1	1	0.80	0.20
Technical Officer	Holds Higher Certificate in food inspections; Currently working towards registration with CIEH	1	1	1; Carries out non official intervention work only	0
Total		15.09 FTE	12.61 FTE		

Staff Development Plan and FSA Code of Practice competency assessment

- All staff are subject to a formal appraisal each year with interim monthly review meetings.
- Part of this appraisal process is the development of a training needs analysis for staff.
- Food officers must complete a competency matrix (FSA COP) which provides evidence of their competency in 19 areas.
- The Lead Officer is required to evidence these 19 areas and a further 13.
- A matrix of the training needs of the team is compiled.
- 20 Hrs of 'Continuing Professional Development' (CPD) training is provided for all staff operating under the Code of Practice.
- Each officer is responsible for keeping a record of training undertaken and maintaining their own CPD records.

Service Budgets/Resources

Totals for 2017- 18

Revenue: £18,460 est
Fee income: £18,240 est
Capital: Nil

Staffing Allocation for food – 8 FTE's operational food safety enforcement (equates to 13,024 officer hours) (1FTE = 220 days)

Food Safety Activity	No of Hours (approx)
Inspections	3775
Service Requests	4700
Re visits	420
Samples	532
ID's and Outbreaks	600
Promotional work	60
Project work (on line sales, mobiles, brokers)	111
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme – running scheme	780
Zero and One Rated Project	300
Outdoor events	55
Eat out eat well award	80
QMS review and update	600
Audits and action plan implementation	100
Investigations and Formal Action*	220
Training (CPD and mandatory internal)	610
Primary Authority	400
Meetings (team and Dept)	1000
Duty Officer Days	1770
Total	16,000 hr

The staffing allocation for food safety is 13,024 officer hours; plus, for the projects above, 0.2 management time (325hrs) (PEHO) = 13,350hrs.

As we prioritise food safety we can take some H&S allocated hours into this plan = 1,000 hrs. This will be reflected in reduced H&S enforcement in the Commercial Team H&S Service Plan

* This is an estimate based on the experiences of previous years, investigations and prosecutions can vary considerably in complexity and therefore officer hours.

Key Service Partners and Partnerships

- Berkshire Environmental Health Managers: Berkshire local authorities, to coordinate sub-group activities, and promote good practice.
- Public Health England: advice and information, including liaison with the Consultant in Communicable Disease Control
- Food Standards Agency: target setting, audit and advisory role for LAs
- Berkshire Food Safety Liaison Group: consistency of approach and the exchange of good practice
- Berkshire Infectious Disease Control Liaison Group
- Berkshire Sampling Group

Securing Action by Relevant Duty Holders

All of our inspection activity and enforcement action is carried out in accordance with the West Berkshire Enforcement Policy; and associated procedural guidelines in the Quality Management System.

Government Approach – Regulatory Delivery part of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy

Regulators' Code 2014 Better Regulation Delivery Office

This applies to all the work mentioned in the plan – details can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulators-code>

SECTION 2: CURRENT DELIVERY AND PERFORMANCE

Food premises types located within the borough as of the End March 2017:

Type of Premises	No. of Premises Bracknell Forest	No. of Premises West Berkshire	No. of Premises Wokingham
Producers	45	8	11
Manufacturers/ Packers	3	30	22
Importers/exporters	6	4	2
Retailers	162	205	165
Restaurants / Caterers	894	728	520
Distributors		24	5
Care Establishments / childminders	Inc caterers	171	200
Educative Establishments	Inc caterers	86	72
Total No. of Food Premises	1119	1256	997

Food Inspections – Key Drivers

- Minimum frequency of inspection set out in the Food Standards Agency Code of Practice which is determined by the officers' risk rating of the premises at inspection.
- The Code of Practice also permits alternative enforcement strategies to replace the physical inspection of low risk premises. We undertake a system in which low risk food premises (E rated) are sent a self assessment questionnaire to check whether risks have increased and how they are managing those risks. Inspection visits are made where there are non-returns of questionnaires or where the questionnaire returned shows an increased risk.
- Due to staffing levels we will look to reduce the inspection time at D premises. We will carry out a partial inspection visit, which will consist of a revisit and an examination of the highest risk activity as well as establishing that there have been no other changes. This should reduce officer time at each inspection; however it will take time for the FSO in set up.

Food Inspection Programme

2016 – 17

In terms of programmed food inspections carried out the following was achieved in 2016-17

- 100% in Wokingham
- 100% in West Berkshire
- 95% in Bracknell

The actual number of food inspections carried out over the past three years are as follows;

	Actual number of Food Inspections carried out			Actual number of Alternative Interventions on E premises carried out in Food Premises		
	Bracknell Forest	West Berkshire	Wokingham	Bracknell Forest	West Berkshire	Wokingham
2014/15	325	589	370	132	67	97
2015/16	236	443	360	130	135	95
2016/17	438	592	437	95	89	89

New Food Businesses

We carry out inspections of new food businesses.

	2015 16 Number of Food Business opening	2015 16 Number of food businesses which closed	2016 17 Number of Food Business opening	2016 17 Number of food businesses which closed
Bracknell	35	7	38	10
West Berks	118	155	140	187
Wokingham	114	96	118	132

We aim to inspect all new food businesses within 28 days of the notified date of opening.

The businesses closing are not necessarily those that are due for an inspection in the year.

Food Inspections now due 2017 18

The food safety programme of inspections for this year are set out below:

2017 18 inspections due							
Risk Category	A (2 visits required)	B	C	D	E	Unrated (predicted est)	Totals
Bracknell	3 (6)	32	110	43	171	125	487
West Berkshire	4 (8)	30	126	151	150	175	640
Wokingham	1 (2)	33	108	147	137	125	552
TOTAL	16	95	344	341	458	425	1,679

There are in addition 39 overdue inspections which we will need to complete in 2017 18 (3xB, 2xC, 6xD and 28xE) – this will take approx 48 hours.

There are 160 premises which have been rating using a questionnaire. These will need a formal visit at some point. Estimated time 320 hours.

The resources to carry out the 2017 18 inspections are calculated from the table below:

Risk Rating	No. of Premises Due 2017 18	Estimated time per inspection ¹	Estimate of time needed to deliver all inspections (hours)
A	8 (16)	5hrs	80 hrs
B	95	4hrs	380 hrs
C	344	3hrs	1032hrs
D (partial insp visit)	341	1hrs ²	341hrs

		0.5 hr	170 hrs
E (Alternative enforcement strategy)	458	0.5 hr 1hr ³	229 hrs 115 hrs
New Premises ⁴	425	2.5hrs	1,060 hrs
Totals	1733		3,4807 hrs Plus 48 hrs for outstanding insp Plus 320 hours to regularise Q insp TOTAL – 3775 hours

¹ Includes time for travel, pre-inspection preparation, inspection, and preparation of report.

² Categories D will have a partial inspection visit this should reduce the time spent by the officer by half on previous years. There is an addition time of 0.5hrs by Regulatory Support Officer in pre inspection work per premises

³ Categories E will be inspected using an alternative enforcement strategy. If we assume 25% (approx. 115) will not respond or will respond unsatisfactorily and will therefore require an inspection then there is a resource implication of 105 hours which has been included above.

⁴ New premises are those who will register with us in 2017 18 and will require an inspection.

Should a premises operate outside working hours we will inspect them when they are operating.

For mobile traders we will inspect the mobile van when they are operating.

Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS)

The scheme, along with officer's enforcement visits to premises, encourages food business operators to work to improve their food hygiene practices and so improve their rating. The food business are given a window sticker and encouraged to display these at the entrance to their premises. Display is not yet mandatory but the FSA are looking at bringing in legislation to make it so. The changes to the number of premises at each level as a comparison between the launch start of April 2016 and April 2017 is demonstrated below.

Star Rating	Number premises at start April 2016 (Percentage)			Number premises at start April 2017 (Percentage)		
	Bracknell	West	Wokingham	Bracknell	West	Wokingham

		Berkshire			Berkshire	
	To be inserted	687 (68%)	561 (67%)	360 (61%)	798 (70%)	598 (66%)
	To be inserted	195 (19%)	130 (15%)	145 (25%)	179 (16%)	124 (14%)
	To be inserted	84 (8%)	49 (6%)	53 (9%)	78 (7%)	42 (5%)
	To be inserted	27 (2.7%)	13 (1.5%)	15 (2%)	21 (1.8%)	10 (1%)
	To be inserted	10 (0.99%)	8 (0.95%)	17 (2%)	17 (1.7%)	16 (2.6%)
	To be inserted	1 (0.09%)	5 (0.12%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The percentage of premises in each rating will constantly be changing as each premises rating is automatically updated onto the site 28 days after the inspection date. The delay of 28 days has been set as the officer has 14 days to inform the business of their rating (and to prepare the report) and then there is a 21 day appeal period.

Zero / One Score Project

An officer works with these premises throughout the year using educative visits where specific food hygiene topics are discussed and made relevant to the business. The officer then carries out a full risk rating inspection when the business is ready (i.e. when the premises has demonstrated that any changes they have made are sustainable and they have operated to that level for a number of months) or by the next inspection due date.

This project has been extremely successful in raising the hygiene standards in the premises with the lowest score rating as 95% of the premises which remained open, benefited from the interventions i.e. showed marked improvements in food hygiene.

	Score at April 2016	Score following project March 2017
Wokingham	Zero score - 3 premises	2 premises ceased trading 1 premises 5 score
	1 score – 9 premises	2 premises ceased trading 1 premises remained 1 score 3 premises 2 score 3 premises 4 score
West Berks	Zero score – 2 premises	1 premises seasonal close 1 premises 3 score
	1 score – 19 premises	6 premises ceased trading 1 premises 2 score 5 premises 3 score 5 premises 4 score 2 premises 5 score

Overall only 3% of premises did not increase their score; 33% ceased trading and 9% achieved the highest 5 score rating. 80% of the premises which remained trading fell into the Broadly Compliant category following the intervention.

With the nature of the turnover of food businesses and the fact that any business can have internal factors which can have a huge bearing on its rating e.g. a new manager, new processes, financial troubles leading to cutting corners etc, which if not managed can mean the premises becomes

a higher risk and therefore a lower score. Therefore, unfortunately there will always be a percentage of premises as zeros and ones, although these will not normally be the same premises.

Bracknell Forest have run a similar scheme for poor performers and all will now take part in the Zero / One Score project.

It has been decided that a Performance Indicator for the team this year will focus on ensuring that premises with zero and one score raise their standards by their next Inspection / audit intervention to broadly compliant (see next section below for definition). The target is 75%

Food Compliance Data Results

The ‘Broadly compliant’ figure is used by the FSA as a performance indicator for LA food enforcement service it is also used in house. It is the percentage of our food premises which are broadly compliant with food legislation at inspection visits. It is determined by the risk rating the officer gives after inspection which is in line with the FSA code of Practice. A score of 10 or less in hygiene practices, structural matters, and confidence in management equates to broadly compliant.

The performance indicator target set is 90%.

	March 2014	March 2015	March 2016	March 2017
Bracknell Broadly Compliant	92.50%	92%	90.47%	85%
West Berkshire Broadly Compliant	89%	93%	93%	96%
Wokingham Broadly Compliant	96%	96%	96%	96%

*This figure includes premises which are newly opened and not yet inspected; in the FSA definition of ‘broadly compliant’ they say that such a premises is to be counted as a non-compliant premises.

Nationally the average broadly compliant figure for the UK in 2015 16 was 93.5%. An increase of 0.5% on the previous year.

The Bracknell figure has been taken from the formal return to the FSA (LAEMS), we will work on this figure over the year both to verify the figure and to raise it.

Outdoor events

In addition to the normal programmed inspections we also visit many outdoor events to advise and enforce on Food Safety issues.

These events include the Henley Regatta, the Henley Festival, The Rewind Festival, Marvelous Festival, the Newbury Showground and Newbury Racecourse events.

We estimate that enforcement activity at these events equates to 25 person days which is 185 hours. The reason we attend is due to the high number of visitors and the amount of publicity that accompanies these events and so any food poisoning outbreak would be disastrous. The breakdown for the time spent is approximately 30:70 food : H&S; therefore in this service plan 55.5 **hours** is noted.

Revisits

Year	No. of Revisits		
	Bracknell	West Berkshire	Wokingham
2014 / 15	8	28	45
2015/ 16	13	36	48
2016/ 17	16	57	63

A revisit is a follow up visit to an inspection to ensure that remedial work identified as necessary has been carried out. It is to be carried out where the premises are not broadly compliant. To be more efficient we use a self certification system for premises where the breach is less severe.

Revisits are carried out following approximately 10% of inspections; it is estimated that approximately 140 will be carried out in 2017 18 ; the time implication will be 420 **hours**.

Enforcement Action

There are a number of enforcement options available to officers ranging from verbal advice through to prosecution. Enforcement actions taken over the previous three years are detailed below.

	14/15			15/16			16/17		
	Bracknell	West Berks	Wokingham	Bracknell	West Berks	Wokingham	Bracknell	West Berks	Wokingham
No. of Hygiene improvement notices served	3	0	1	2	15	4	0	3	0
No. of Hygiene emergency prohibition notices served	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No. of prosecutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
No of simple cautions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detention notices	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voluntary Closures	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	4	0

The resource implication of formal action can be significant. An estimation of 50 hours can be put per premises where there is no simple caution or prosecution taken. This figure will rise should a simple caution or prosecution be taken and the work on the service plan would be revised. There were 3 premises this year est approximately 2 weeks each which is 222 hours.

In 2016-17 the service investigated an infestation of cockroaches at a convenience store in West Berkshire; Following prosecution the owner pleaded guilty and received £6,000 fine with costs awarded of £3,100.

Food Service Requests

We receive food related service requests and complaints some of which relate to foods produced outside our area. All are investigated and we take action as appropriate. Set out below are the numbers of service requests received.

Service requests can range from complaints about the cleanliness of a premises to consumers finding a foreign body in the food they are eating. We also get general enquiries from businesses and consumers and queries about food hygiene training. Average of 3 hours each – 4,700 hours.

Period	Food Safety		
	Bracknell	West Berkshire	Wokingham
2014 / 15	840	535	471
2015 /16	787	337	304
2016 17	671	441	455

Control and Investigation of Outbreaks and Food Related Infectious Disease

We respond to notifications of food related illness which are emailed to us daily from the Health Protection Unit of Public Health England. Outbreaks and cases of disease are investigated and where necessary the Consultant in Communicable Disease Control is involved. The purpose is to control the spread of disease and to isolate the source so that we can take the appropriate action. There is a Joint Infectious Disease Incident Plan for Berkshire that was produced in conjunction with the Health Protection Unit and the other 5 local authorities which can be activated on a 24 hour basis. We work with Public Health England to investigate cases of infectious disease.

One officer from each area monitors trends and possible connections between cases.

Infectious Disease Notifications

Period	Notifications		
	Bracknell	West Berkshire	Wokingham
2014 /15	253	205	274
2015/16	272	186	229
2016/17	207	214	237

The resource implication is dependent on the type of food poisoning.

On average the resource is **600 hours**.

Detail in the figures reflects the national trend in that Campylobacter is the most common form of food poisoning.

To protect the public we respond immediately to all cases of E.Coli, Legionellosis, Salmonellas, Typhoid Fever and Hepatitis A.

Following the Single cases protocol (an agreement between Environmental Health Teams in Local Authorities of the Thames Valley and Thames Valley Public Health England Centre guiding the roles and responsibilities in follow up of single cases of gastrointestinal disease) we work with PHE to investigate where their intelligence leads to a local food source. Where there is suspected Salmonella or Campylobacter we sent out questionnaires and investigate where necessary.

The Single Case Protocol has been revised this year to take effect from 1 April 2017 and there is a small shift of work to Las from PHE. As this relates to single cases only there is a view that the workload shouldn't increase however this will be monitored by PPP.

We also receive calls from members of the public who experience symptoms of food poisoning and often implicate a food premises. We investigate these and always advise that the people visit their GP and submit a sample so that a diagnosis can be made.

Many cases of vomiting and diarrhoea which are reported to us are diagnosed during the investigation as norovirus. This virus can commonly be spread by contact with those who are ill and via surfaces including food and so we take a role in preventing the spread and in investigating the source.

It is not uncommon for outbreaks to involve 100s of people ill and such an outbreak can take a lot of officer time.

Food Sampling

Sampling of foodstuffs and cloths and swabbing of surfaces and equipment are carried out as national and local projects. In addition samples are taken in response to problems observed during routine inspections and as a result of service requests from the public.

Period	Food Hygiene		
	Bracknell	West Berkshire	Wokingham
2014/15	17	72	84
2015/16	12	39	40
2016/17	6	74 (17 of these from approved premises)	140 (78 of these from approved premises)

The time implication for sampling is approximately 2 days per month per authority – 532 hrs.

Food Safety Incidents

Food Hazard Warnings are received via the FSA in box and are actioned in accordance with the Code of Practice. We also have a procedure in place to notify the Food Standards Agency should we become aware of any serious localised incident or a wider food safety problem.

Primary Authority

The **Regulatory Enforcement & Sanctions Act 2008** introduced the **Primary Authority Principle**, placing a particular responsibility upon local authorities to provide information, advice and support to local businesses that operate in more than one local authority area.

The Act seeks to secure national co-operation and consistency of regulatory enforcement by setting up a 'Primary Authority'; which came into effect April 2009. There is provision for local authorities to charge for this service and consideration needs to be given to how this requirement can be managed.

The PPP have Primary Authority arrangement with Prezzo and HiPP, Bracknell with Waitrose.

This has a large time implication however we charge for our time at a cost recovery rate.

The time implication is estimated at **400 hours**.

Promotional and Educational Work

We concentrate efforts on statutory functions as the team is not resourced to carry out additional work.

We will however shift resources into non-statutory work but only where carrying out this work can result in a reduction in the amount of statutory work required.

No more than **60 hours** will be spent on general promotional work during 2017 18.

One area that we have worked on and this will continue is the communication and implementation of the FSA guidance document on controlling cross contamination and reducing the risk of E coli 0157. This document tightens the controls and will have effects on those businesses who handle raw food (eg meat, non prepared vegetables, raw milk, etc) and ready to eat foods. We will promote this at each inspection (our inspection record sheet reflects this) and ensure that premises are complying. In addition we will be promoting the revised Safer Food Better Business packs at each inspection as these have been written to take account of the E coli guidance.

The main promotional activity is running of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme. Each month the resource will be approximately 15 hours (file monitoring dealing with review requests and work on the website) giving a total of 780 **hours**. The benefits of this scheme in encouraging increased compliance will outweigh the time implications in its running and the monitoring is in line with our QMS procedures based on FSA COP.

In 2016/17 we will also carry out work based on new documents produced by the FSA, food mobiles, listeria in high risk settings and food brokers. This will take 111 hours.

PUBLIC HEALTH ROLE OF THE COMMERCIAL TEAM

Healthy Eating

The prevalence of obesity among adults has increased sharply during the 1990s and early 2000s. The proportion who were categorised as obese (BMI 30kg/m² or over) increased from 13.2% of men in 1993 to 24.3% in 2014 and from 16.4% of women in 1993 to 26.8% in 2014 (Health Survey for England). In addition 9.5% of boys and 8.7% of girls (all children 9.1%) in Reception year (aged 4-5 years) and 20.7% of boys and 17.4% of girls (all children 19.1%) in Year 6 (aged 10-11 years) are also classified as obese according to the British 1990 population monitoring definition of obesity (≥ 95 th centile) (National Child Measurement Programme 2014/15). By 2050 obesity is predicted to affect 60% of adult men, 50% of adult women and 25% of children (Foresight 2007).

Obesity is associated with a range of health problems including type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancer. The resulting NHS costs attributable to overweight and obesity are projected to reach £9.7 billion by 2050, with wider costs to society estimated to reach £49.9 billion per year (Foresight 2007). These factors combine to make the prevention of obesity a major public health challenge.

Knowing the principles of eating healthily is important but if the range of food available does not reflect these principles it is not possible to make a choice. Additionally if individuals are not aware of what constitutes healthy eating they cannot be expected to incorporate it into their everyday diet.

As we have an involvement with all food businesses in the Borough the Commercial team are very well placed to assist in the introduction of healthier options in catering premises.

The eat out eat well award is a free award scheme for caterers which is already well established in Surrey County Council and will continue to be developed across the PPP area.

We launched the Eat out eat well scheme in May 2012 however take up amongst food businesses is slow and we are not resourced as a team to spend much time in its promotion.



The aim of this award is to increase awareness and knowledge of healthier food options amongst both consumers and food business operators and to highlight businesses that make it easier for their customers to have a healthier diet.

It rewards businesses that use healthy ingredients and incorporate better preparation practices to provide healthier food across the menu and who promote healthy eating, and those who make it easier for consumers to find healthier food choices when eating out or taking away. In addition businesses can go one step further by clearly identifying items on their menu and/or within the food display area that meet the standards in the conditions for achieving the award.

The award is open to all types of establishments that cater for the general public, including takeaways, cafes, sandwich shops, and restaurants.

It is not intended to apply to premises that cater for individuals with specific dietary requirements. These include care homes for older people, state schools and nurseries where there are already guidelines or measures in place to improve the healthiness of food available. However, the award is open to establishments such as private schools where there is no requirement to adhere to national guidelines.

The award has three levels – Bronze, Silver, and Gold, and is symbolised by an apple logo in the shape of a heart.

The level of award is based on a scoring system that takes into account the type of food on offer, cooking methods, and how caterers promote it to their customers. To obtain a Gold Award, key members of staff will need to undertake some form of accredited or recognised training in nutrition.

In 2017 18 we will undertake a more targeted project involving a sector of food premises to see if this increases the profile of the award. We will spend 80 hours on this.

Good Food Challenge

We have received funding from the Public Health Team in West Berkshire to run a series of healthy eating workshops with year 3 pupils in primary schools. This funding will be used to back fill inspection time of officers

Food Hygiene Training for the Public

Due to low take up of this service over recent years due to increasing reliance on line training, leading to an income loss in the region of £9k we will no longer provide this service.

Quality Management Systems

We are looking to integrate the best systems of all three partner authorities to produce a fully integrated QMS

We are working towards an external accreditation for the service.

Part of our QMS system includes the procedures for monitoring the quality of the work carried out.

COM M P003	Internal Monitoring Food	This included quality checks on inspections and SRs
COM M P008	Accuracy of Food Hygiene Inspection Recording	This ensures accurate data entry and subsequent correct FHRS display

Risk of a Reduced Food Enforcement Service / Reduced Targets For Food Inspections

Description	Service Level Comment	Consequences if no or reduced service.
Food safety service requests	Responding to all service requests and complaints from business and individuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statutory function (Regulation (EC) 882/2004); FSA COP • Poor hygiene in premises could be missed. • Food hazards could be overlooked.

	<p>about food, food premises, food hygiene etc. 2 day first response and 15 resolution as target.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We use investigations to prevent similar occurrences • Direct impact on food hygiene and food quality and therefore, public health and consumer protection. • Increasing service request numbers and infectious disease notifications. • Increasing pest population in the Council areas. • Missed opportunities to take formal enforcement action against premises. • Increased complaints of inequality from businesses within the community towards us as the enforcing authority. • Poor public perception of service and increase in complaints about the service and ombudsman complaints. • FSA monitor to ensure service carried out to standard in COP; sanction can remove service and charge Council for running of service. • Reduction in staffing can lead to reduction in monitoring activity with officers leading to a failure to comply with FSA COP Competency and Authorisation of officers.
<p>Routine inspections of food premises.</p>	<p>Undertake routine, planned inspections of premises based on current risk assessment criteria set by Food Standards Agency COP</p> <p>Undertake initial assessment of all new food businesses regardless of risk. Provide consumers with information relating to hygiene standards. Inspections within 28 days of opening or due date</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statutory function (Regulation (EC) 882/2004); FSA COP • Poor hygiene standards in individual premises and standards for district generally would drop. • As food hazards are not detected there will be a direct impact on personal and public health and consumer protection. • Reduction in inspections can affect the accuracy of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme which will undermine the system and will give the consumer incorrect information on the standards of the premises. • Also removes the ability of the consumer in making an informed choice of where to eat • Can mislead the consumer as the information on FHRS will not be maintained up to date ie a 5 score may no longer be 5.. • In addition the fact that all inspection data is published along with the last inspection date premises not receiving an inspection will be in the public domain. • There will be an impact on the Broadly Compliant figure (percentage of premises which meet satisfactory compliance for the manufacture, preparation and sale of food) which is used by the FSA and is a Performance Indicator. • There will be an effect on the performance indicator to Inspect new food businesses within 28 days of notified date of trading commencement which helps to encourage new businesses.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing service request numbers and infectious disease notifications. • Increasing pest population in the Council areas. • Missed opportunities to take formal enforcement action against premises. • Increased complaints of inequality from businesses within the community against the council as an enforcing authority. • Poor public perception of service and increase in complaints about the service and ombudsman complaints. • FSA monitor to ensure service carries out the food inspection to the service level set down in the FSA Code of practice which details frequency of inspection and that work is carried out to the standard in COP; sanction can remove service and charge Council for running of service. • Reduction in staffing can lead to reduction in monitoring activity with officers leading to a failure to comply with FSA COP Competency and Authorisation of officers. • Not inspecting the lower risk premises can also lead to an inaccurate database, it is in the COP that the LA database remains accurate. • In addition low risk premises can change hands and management and can become high risk and without an inspection regime this would be missed leading to public safety issues.
<p>Food hygiene education and communication</p>	<p>Education of food handlers and those in food business carried out as part of our inspection and advice programme. This extends into wider public health matters e.g. EOEW.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low levels of food hygiene understanding amongst food handlers and food businesses can have a direct impact on personal health of consumers (e.g. rise in food poisoning) and public health generally. • Removing the ability for informed choices in healthy eating. • Increased enforcement resource need as adequate training for FBO's is a legal obligation. • Income consequence if courses are not attended. • On the negative side there are other providers in this field and they offer on line courses which the businesses appear to prefer. • The courses run are not at capacity and therefore the income target is not met. • There are administrative costs in running the service and overtime costs for officers delivering the training.

<p>Communicable Disease Control</p>	<p>Investigation of food borne infections including food poisoning and suspected food poisonings as per SLA with PHE This also includes water borne e.g. Legionnaires</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statutory function (Regulation (EC) 882/2004); It is in legislation that we assist the CCDC (Consultant in Communicable Disease Control) at Public Health England in disease management and investigation. • Offences not detected or prevented. • On going issues not detected leading to public health risk; this can lead to multiple fatalities in the cases of legionnaires, E Coli 0157 for example. • Missed opportunities to take formal enforcement action against premises. • Poor public perception of service and increase in complaints about the service and ombudsman complaints. • FSA monitor to ensure service carries out their duties to the service level set down in the FSA Code of practice; sanction can remove service and charge Council for running of service.
<p>Sampling</p>	<p>Samples taken as part of active investigations, surveillance and verification of food safety management systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of a statutory function. • Sale of food harmful to human health. • Offences not detected or prevented. • Longer term detrimental effect on public health. • Routine sampling can inform about the hygiene of the premises. • Formal sampling can be used as evidence in formal action. • Unsatisfactory sample results can be a useful tool to demonstrate to the business the consequences of poor practices and hygiene and can have an educative role in changing attitudes. • The introduction of the FSA COP Competency Framework (April 2016) means that in order to take a 'sample' and record it as such for the purposes of the formal return the officer must be an authorised officer ie meet the baseline qualification and be registered with CIEH. This will have changes as at the minute informal routine sampling is undertaken by 2 offices who are working towards registration with CIEH.

From data extrapolated from D risk rated premises over the last 2 years (2014 – 16) it can be seen that;

Rating before inspection	Rating after inspection			
	B	C	D	E
D (389 premises)	11 3%)	60 (16%)	296 (76%)	22 (5%)

While the majority did remain as a 'D' rated premises after inspection nearly 20% were rated higher ie deemed by inspecting officers as more of a risk to public health.

Looking at consumer complaints made against those premises over the 2 years there were 83 complaints made; that is 21% of those premises had a food hygiene complaint made against them. This shows that although they can be lower risk premises they can still have issues which the customer deems as problematic.

Any changes to the way in which we carry out food inspections may be covered under the FSA review 'Regulating our Future'.

For these reasons we still see it as a priority to carry out 100% of the inspections due in the year. However, this year we have had to look at ways to reduce inspection time due to reduced staffing levels and more premises with PPP. Therefore, as has been detailed, all D visits will be by partial inspection.

SECTION 4: OUR SERVICE PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES & TARGETS 2017 18

A key component of the FSA's strategic commitment to playing its part in achieving "food we can trust" is an effective, robust and proportionate system of ensuring that food businesses comply with the regulations put in place to protect consumers' interests.

In January 2016 the FSA Board agreed that the FSA should engage with key stakeholders to begin the process of designing a new approach to supporting regulatory compliance.

The FSA state that they are not approaching this fundamental rethink by starting with the status quo and seeking incremental change. They are starting with the best system they can aspire to, and then planning how we collectively take steps to achieve it. It will demand ongoing change within the FSA as well as in business and local authorities.

More detail is contained within appendix 4.

Service priorities 2017 18 update

- Successfully integrate the 3 Council services PPP for Commercial Team
- Respond to requests for service in good time
- Maintain services based on risk
- Work to attain QMS accreditation
- Achieve our performance indicators
- Continue to review and increase enforcement effectiveness, processes and procedures
- Successful retention of staff
- Development of income generating initiatives
- Continue to carry out Food Hygiene Rating award scheme
- Carry out work on the healthy eating agenda; Eat out eat well award;

SECTION 5: PLANS FOR MEETING STATUTORY/ REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Work Plan for 2017 18

Targets must specific, measurable, include a responsible officer.

No.	Key Target	Start Date (beginning of)	Target	Responsible Officer (s)	Budget implication (if any)	Commentary
1	Successful merge of the 3 LAs Commercial Teams	April 2017		RG	Officer time	Ensure processes and procedures are combined
2	Programmed Food Hygiene Inspections (including outdoor events)	Throughout the year		All (RG to lead)	Officer time	As programmed and using alternative enforcement strategies
3	Ensure that FHRS is maintained accurately	Throughout the year		PEHO / (All to assist)	Officer time;	Maintain FHRS database by uploading inspection details every 2 weeks and maintaining quality checks on data entry
4	Monitor to ensure that all premises are risk rated	Throughout the year		PEHO	Officer time	File monitoring to ensure the FHRS ratings are fair and consistent

	consistently				
5	Zero and low one rated project	Throughout the year	PEHO	Officer time	To provide assistance to the poorest performing premises to increase compliance
6	Infectious Diseases	Throughout the year	SFSO / EHO	Officer time	Consider all notifications of Infectious Disease and action accordingly
7	Food related Service Requests	Throughout the year	All	Officer time	As allocated to officers
8	Partnership working across Berkshire	Throughout the year	RG	Officer time	Attend regional working groups Carry out work in group work plan
9	Participate in local regional and national sampling programmes	Throughout the year	PEHO	Officer time	Deliver on sampling plan
10	Eat out eat well award	Throughout the year	RG	Officer time;	promote the Eat out eat well award for healthier options in catering premises, concentrate on a specific sector
11	Imported Food Control	Throughout the year	All	Officer time	To include checks as part of routine inspections and document findings
12	Ensure through the appraisal system that staff are trained and competent	Throughout the year	All (RG)	Officer time; training costs	Comply with WBC Appraisal policy Arrange and attend training
13	Implement the FSA COP competency requirement for officers	April 2016	All (RG)	Officer time; training costs	Ensure QMS reflects the requirement. Officers to fill in self assessment TM / PEHO to review and implement a training plan
14	Food mobiles & FHRS	Throughout the year	EHO	Officer time;	To ensure that the food mobiles we have on our database and uploaded to FHRS meet the requirements of the Brand

					Standard(carry forward form 2016 17)
15	Food Brokers	Throughout the year	EHO	Officer time;	To identify the food brokers and ensure they meet the requirements brought in by the new FSA guidance (carry forward form 2016 17)
16	On line Food Premises	2 nd Q	S / EHO	Officer time;	To identify the premises with on line foods and ensure they meet the requirements brought in by the new FSA guidance
17	Eat out eat well award	Throughout the year	RG	Officer time;	promote the Eat out eat well award for healthier options in catering premises, concentrate on a specific sector
18	Good Food Challenge	Throughout the year	RG	Officer time; funded by West Berks PH team	Promote healthy eating in year 3 primary schools in West Berks

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Financial Information

There are no revenue implications.

Appendix 2: Risk register

This is covered in the Commercial Risk Register which is reviewed monthly Author: Rosalyn Gater Commercial TM; and in the Service Risk Register author Paul Anstey/ Sean Murphy.

Appendix 3: National Picture for Food Safety and the work of the team

National Picture for Food Safety and the work of the team	
LBRO has now been rebranded as the Better Regulation Delivery Office (BRDO). Better Regulation Delivery Office became part of Regulatory Delivery in March 2016. – See https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-regulatory-outcomes-for-england for more information.	
The work of the team supports these Priority Regulatory Outcomes in the following ways;	
Priority 1: Support economic growth, especially in small businesses, by ensuring a fair, responsible and competitive trading environment	
Priority Regulatory Outcomes	Work of the Commercial Team
The burden of regulation remains a significant concern for UK businesses and needs to be addressed at both national and local level. The regulatory system as a whole, and local regulators individually, should tailor their approaches to support businesses into compliance in a way that meets their needs	Food premises are inspected according to risk; the full range of inspection interventions are utilised including partial inspections and self assessment for the low risk premises. Educative approach used with zero and one rated premises to give them the information and encouragement to improve.
Businesses want proportionate and consistent enforcement, which is targeted at non-compliant businesses, ensuring a fairer playing field for the businesses that do invest in compliance.	Formal enforcement is taken where other techniques have failed and where it can be seen that the business will not respond to non formal methods. Thus it is targeted at premises who wilfully disregard the legislation. All businesses are given a report following the inspection which clearly states the area where they are not meeting the requirements and gives recommendations on how to improve. All food businesses are subject to inspection and all are inspected when due.

Priority 3: Improve quality of life and wellbeing by ensuring clean and safe neighbourhoods	
37% of residents surveyed across England think that rubbish or litter lying around is a very big or fairly big problem in their local area	Food waste and the outside bin area forms a part of all food inspections and we respond to service requests on food waste and related problems.
Priority 4: Help people to live healthier lives by preventing ill health and harm and promoting public health	
Preventing ill health requires an ambitious strategy and innovative techniques to help people take responsibility for their own health. Reducing health inequalities requires a focus on the health behaviours of smoking, alcohol consumption, obesity and unhealthy nutrition. Regulatory services have an important and unique contribution to make to preventing ill health and harm and reducing health inequalities.	The team plays a lead role in infectious disease control and in control of food borne illnesses by routine inspections of food premises and by investigating food borne illness. The team have launched the Eat Out Eat Well award to promote healthier options in food premises. There is also the provision of healthier eating and nutrition courses. This award is free and available to all caterers (with the exception of those where there is a more specific nutritional requirement).
In England today, over a fifth of the adult population smokes – 8.8 million people. Smoking is one of the most significant factors underlying health inequalities and life expectancy and as such, a key focus of improving public health.	At all food inspections the team ensures that the premises are complying with smokefree legislation which prohibits smoking in enclosed and partially enclosed premises.
In 2008-2009, there were 24.8 million working days lost overall in England, 20.6 million of these were due to work related ill health and 4.1 million due to workplace injury. GPs are more likely to see people suffering from work related stress, musculoskeletal disorders, skin or respiratory disease than any other work-related reason.	This is a key role for the team as we enforce health and safety legislation in addition to food hygiene legislation. The West Berkshire and Wokingham Health and Safety Enforcement Service Plan contains more detail.
Priority 5: Ensure a safe, healthy and sustainable food chain for the benefits of consumers and the rural economy	
Currently, about half of the food consumed in the UK is imported. The Government believes that more needs to be done to support	This is the main role of the team – and the Service aims and objectives of the team support this; to ensure that risks of illness and injury through poor food

<p>the farming industry and encourage sustainable food production here in the UK. To support the farming industry, it is important to ensure a safe, healthy and sustainable food chain that benefits consumers and the rural economy. Enforcement of food safety law ensures that food purchases are produced, transported and sold in line with requirements and ultimately, that food is safe to eat. Delivery of food safety and consumer protection across the food chain is shared by a number of agencies and delivery partners, including local authorities, the Food Standards Agency, DEFRA and Animal Health.</p>	<p>safety and hygiene are minimised, and to increase consumer and business awareness of food safety, hygiene, healthy eating and sustainable procurement practices. This is achieved by monitoring businesses through risk-based inspections and sampling and by taking appropriate and timely action in response to food related issues, and through liaison and awareness campaigns with food businesses and consumers to provide best advice in relation to good practice and legal compliance.</p>
<p>Poor diet is recognised as one of the main causes of ill-health and premature death. It has been estimated that approximately one third of deaths from heart disease and a quarter of deaths from cancer can be attributed to poor diet. The public health implications of poor diets are becoming more significant.</p>	<p>The Eat out eat well award and work in the public health field supports this.</p>
<p>The consumption of unsafe or unfit food can give rise to food borne disease. During 2008-9, approximately 80,000 food premises were rated as non-compliant with food safety legislation at a level that exposes consumers to risk.</p>	<p>To prevent the consumption of unsafe or unfit food is one of the main role of the team.</p>
<p>Food borne disease is a major cause of illness in the UK and imposes a significant burden on individuals, healthcare services and the economy. It is estimated that each year in the UK around 1 million people suffer a food related illness, which leads to 20,000 people receiving hospital treatment and 500 deaths each year from food borne disease.</p> <p>The cost to the economy of food borne disease is estimated to be in the order of £1.5 billion per annum, due to loss of production, health care costs and damage to business. This does not include the costs of major incidents and food scares.</p>	<p>To control food borne disease is one of the main roles of the team.</p>

This clearly shows the importance which the Government has set on the work of the team and the priorities which the local authority should be

investing in.

The Government has, for a number of years, pursued a programme of wide-ranging regulatory reform based, initially, on the recommendations of the 'Hampton' report (2005) whose remit was to reduce unnecessary burdens on businesses. The Government's aim is to work towards a vision of a regulatory system that is based around risk and proportionality.

The Regulatory Enforcement & Sanctions Act 2008 is an important step forward in delivering this vision, and will significantly impact on all local authority regulatory services, and in particular Health and Safety and Food Safety Enforcement.

The Act introduced the **Primary Authority Principle**, placing a particular responsibility upon local authorities to provide information, advice and support to local businesses that operate in more than one local authority area.

The Act seeks to secure national co-operation and consistency of regulatory enforcement by setting up a 'Primary Authority'; which came into effect April 2009; again this is likely to impact across the range of regulatory services and in particular, Food Safety enforcement. There is provision for local authorities to charge for this service and consideration needs to be given to how this requirement can be managed.

Appendix 4: The Future for Food Safety

FSA Regulating our Future

In early 2016 the FSA took the decision to revisit the review into the food regulatory service delivery model.

A key component of the FSA's strategic commitment to playing its part in achieving "food we can trust" is an effective, robust and proportionate system of ensuring that food businesses comply with the regulations put in place to protect consumers' interests.

In January 2016 the Board discussed this, reaffirmed its commitment to the protection of consumers' interests as the central driver of any new system, and agreed that the FSA should engage with key stakeholders to begin the process of designing a new approach to supporting regulatory compliance.

The FSA's 2015-20 strategy focuses on the role that the FSA plays in delivering "food we can trust" and recognises the critical importance of working in partnership with others to protect consumers' interests in relation to food.

The FSA state that they are not approaching this fundamental rethink by starting with the status quo and seeking incremental change. They are starting with the best system they can aspire to, and then planning how we collectively take steps to achieve it. It will demand ongoing change within the FSA as well as in business and local authorities.

Within this overall, high level vision, which will take several years to fully design and deliver, there are some priorities and more immediate

requirements. The design of delivery options needs to identify new ways of deriving assurance, and better enforcement of official controls. The FSA say it must propel them and businesses towards better use of new technology, and be compatible with consumer empowerment through increased transparency.

Where there are immediate incremental improvements that can be made to consumer protection, they will make them as part of their business as usual activities, but the objective of this programme is to define and then deliver a new regulatory blueprint for a food industry unrecognisable from the one that existed when the current system was designed.

There are a number of Principles which the FSA adopt and these will remain the basis for the model following review;

Businesses are responsible for producing food that is safe and what it says it is, and should be able to demonstrate that they do so. Consumers have a right to information to help them make informed choices about the food they buy – businesses have a responsibility to be transparent and honest in their provision of that information

This is a fundamental principle of food law. We need to help businesses understand what is required of them, and make sure they're doing what they need to, so consumers can be confident about the food they eat. Businesses need to recognise this responsibility, and demonstrate to us and consumers that they meet it.

Business transparency across a wide range of consumer interests in relation to food is essential in building and maintaining confidence in the industry. Consumers should be able to make informed choices based on the things that matter to them – and businesses need to enable that.

FSA and regulatory partners' decisions should be tailored, proportionate and based on a clear picture of UK food businesses

There is enormous variation in food businesses, in their size, the type of food they produce, the processes they use and their attitude to food safety and authenticity. They will need different levels of support, and different levels of scrutiny. One size will not fit all so we will be considering how to segment businesses – and to do that, we will need good quality, up to date information about them.

The regulator should take into account all available sources of information

There is a wealth of information concerning food businesses that we could be using to build our picture of business behaviour. This can include data industry collects about itself from its own audits and checks, and information from other sources, such as consumers and other regulators. Once we're confident we can rely on these, we should focus our efforts on filling the gaps rather than repeating the work of others. Large businesses with experience of using a range of food data sources have a leadership role to play, in sharing safety and authenticity related insights they gain.

Businesses doing the right thing for consumers should be recognised; action will be taken against those that do not

Many businesses want to produce food that is safe and what it says it is, and do so. They know that consumer confidence in the whole industry is crucial, so are as keen as we are to drive out those who put that confidence at risk. Businesses who put consumers at risk, either deliberately or negligently, need to know that there will be consequences, while businesses who demonstrate to us that they are transparent and prioritise food safety and authenticity will benefit from reduced regulator scrutiny.

We are open to using a range of tools to encourage business behaviour change, including reputational recognition and sanctions.

Businesses should meet the costs of regulation, which should be no more than they need to be UK food is some of the safest in the world, and UK businesses benefit from consumers (in home and domestic markets) trusting the food they produce. The industry tells us they value a strong, independent regulator. We believe that the regulatory regime should be as cost-effective as possible, for example by working with others and using a range of sources of information. Industry should meet that cost, with those requiring the greatest regulatory intervention/attention contributing the most.

As can be seen there will be far reaching changes to the food service but as yet we do not know what those will be and how it will affect the Public Protection Partnership.

ACRONYMS

AES	Alternative Enforcement Strategy
BIS	Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
COM TM	Commercial Team Manager
EHRB	Environmental Health Registration Board
EOEW	Eat out eat well rating scheme
FSA	Food Standards Agency
FSMS	Food Safety Management System
FHRS	Food Hygiene Rating Scheme
HoCS	Head of Corporate Services
IDs	Infectious Diseases
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LAEMS	Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System
NEBOSH	The National Examination Board in Occupational Safety and Health
PA	Paul Anstey PPP Manager
PEHO	Principal Environmental Health Officer
PPP	Public Protection Partnership
RH/RG	Rosalynd Gater (Hale) (Commercial Team Manager)
S/EHO	Senior / Environmental Health Officer
SEHA	Senior Environmental Health Assistant
SFBB	Safer Food, Better Business
SFSO	Senior Food Safety Officer
SM	Sean Murphy PPP Manager
SMEs	Small and Medium Sized Enterprises