



**Food
Standards
Agency**
food.gov.uk

Food Standards Agency in Northern Ireland

Budget 2011-2015 Savings Delivery Plan

Introduction

The Food Standards Agency in NI (FSA in NI) forms part of the UK wide Food Standards Agency, a non-ministerial Government department. The main purpose of the Agency is: 'to protect public health from risks which may arise in connection with the consumption of food, and otherwise to protect the interests of consumers in relation to food'.

During the 2008-2011 budgetary period the FSA in NI made efficiency savings totalling £1,317k. These savings were made against administration, local authority funding and meat hygiene official controls.

As part of the Budget 2010 savings programme, the Department of Finance & Personnel (DFP) have required the FSA to make further savings totalling £949k over the 2011-2015 budgetary period. This is to help achieve the aggregate target for NI departments. The FSA plan to make these savings against meat hygiene official controls.

This will be achieved through delivering greater efficiency in the costs of official controls from further reduction of our own costs and collaborative working with DARD and the industry; and a phased introduction of full cost recovery except for those establishments categorized as low throughput.

1. Title of Savings Measure

Department	Food Standards Agency
Savings Measure	Meat Hygiene Inspection
Senior Responsible Officer	Gerry McCurdy

2. Forecast of Savings Accruing from Savings Measure (£000's)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Admin				
Resource	95	190	285	379
Total	95	190	285	379

3. Summary of Savings Measure.

Provide summary details of the savings measure including supporting evidence for the forecast level of savings.

In November 2009 the FSA decided that the gap between the costs and the income from meat hygiene official controls should be closed. The FSA's decision was one of principle. The shortfall is, in effect, a subsidy to the industry. As the regulator of the industry the FSA does not believe it should be providing a subsidy.

On 10 November 2010 the FSA launched its consultation on removing the subsidy met by the taxpayer. This consultation closed on 1 February 2011. The consultation set out proposals for moving towards full cost recovery of delivering meat hygiene official controls in approved slaughterhouses, cutting plants and game handling establishments. The proposals are introduced with a number of measures and commitments: the option of phased introduction of full cost recovery (except for those establishments categorised as low throughput); delivering greater efficiency in the costs of official controls, from further reduction of our own costs and collaborative working with DARD and the industry; and continued effort to influence reform of European Union official control requirements.

4. Impact on Frontline Services of Savings Measure.

Will the savings measure have an impact on the standard of public services provided to the public?	Yes/No
If yes, provide a clear justification as well as any mitigating actions.	

5. Timetable for Actions to Deliver Savings.

Action	Target Date	Outcome
FSA Board meets to agree on proposals for charging for meat hygiene official controls.	May 2011	
Delivering greater efficiency in the costs of official controls from further reduction of our own costs and collaborative working with industry.	April 2011- March 2015	
Phased introduction of full cost recovery (except for those establishments categorised as low throughput)	April 2012- March 2015	

6. Summary of Implementation Costs for Savings Measure.

Please provide details of any implementation costs and how they will be funded.
No implementation costs have been identified.

7. Key risks and interdependencies to implementation of Savings Measure and details of contingencies.

Key risks	Probability of risk occurring (1-5)*	Impact of risk (1-5)*	Contingent Action(s)
FSA Board does not endorse / Ministerial agreement across the four countries is not reached	1	2	If the FSA are forced to abandon the potential increase in charges, alternative methods of achieving the efficiencies will have to be considered.
Major food incidents requiring extra resource to carry out additional meat hygiene official controls	4	3	If considerable additional DARD ¹ and FSA resource is required to deal with a major food incident, then alternative methods of achieving the efficiencies will have to be considered.
European legislation changes in a way that increases regulatory requirement	4	3	If considerable additional DARD ¹ VPHU ² resource is required to facilitate increased regulatory requirement, then alternative methods of achieving the efficiencies will have to be considered.
Potential Impact on other departments and public bodies.			Mitigating Action(s)

* 1 is the highest and 5 the least

¹Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

²Veterinary Public Health Unit

8. Summary of assessment of potential impact in respect of Equality, Good Relations and Sustainable Development as well as details of any mitigating actions.

Impact	Mitigating Action(s)
N/A	