



---

# **Report on the Food Law Enforcement Service's Arrangements for Providing Statistical Monitoring Returns**

Colchester Borough Council

7 May 2004

## 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 their Environmental Health and Trading Standards Services.

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/role/framework/](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/role/framework/).

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.

This audit was carried out as part of a programme of 20 audits that specifically examined local authority arrangements for providing statistical monitoring data on their food law enforcement activity to the Agency.

This data is required under the Agency's Framework Agreement with local authorities (LAs), and is collated and submitted by LAs using the Agency's electronic monitoring form. LAs use a variety of software systems to compile the statistical data, ranging from complex generic database systems that can export the data electronically to the monitoring form, to bespoke software packages designed by individual authorities. The purpose of the data submitted by local authorities is to enable the Agency to monitor food law enforcement activity, identify enforcement trends to inform policy development, and to identify those authorities that may need help and support to make improvements. The Agency is also responsible for collecting returns from all United Kingdom food authorities and arranging for the summary data to be submitted to the European Commission (EC). The EC uses this information to ensure that foodstuffs are subjected to appropriate controls across the European Union.

In order to ensure that the data provided by LAs for 2002 was robust, Agency officials carried out a major validation exercise in autumn 2003. This was followed up by further correspondence with a large number of LAs in December 2003. It was clear from the correspondence and additional feedback that many LAs were experiencing significant difficulties in providing accurate returns. In view of concerns about this, the Food Standards Agency Board agreed an action

plan in February 2004, which included the need for a focused audit programme. The audits examined the arrangements in place to provide enforcement activity data and explored reasons for the variable quality and timeliness of the returns. The audits also sought LA views on the monitoring data requirements and the need for changes to the current system.

The attached audit report examines the Local Authority's arrangements for collecting, validating and submitting data to the Agency. The report also contains an action plan, prepared by the Authority, to address the audit findings.

The Agency's website contains enforcement activity data for all UK local authorities and can be found at:

[www.food.gov.uk/enforcement](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement)

A summary report of the findings of the focused audit programme on statistical monitoring return arrangements, as well as the 20 individual audit reports, will be made available on the Agency's website at [www.food.gov.uk/enforcement](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement).

For assistance, a glossary of technical terms used within the audit report can be found in the Annex to this report.

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	5
-Reason for the Audit	5
-Background and Scope of the Audit	6
<b>2.0 Executive Summary</b>	8
<b>3.0 Audit Findings</b>	9
<b>3.1 Organisation and Arrangements for Providing Statistical Monitoring Returns</b>	9
<b>3.2 Food Premises Database/Premises Profile</b>	10
<b>3.3 Reporting of Food Law Enforcement Activity</b>	13
-Inspections/Visits	13
-Enforcement Actions	15
-Food Sampling	15
-Complaints about Food/Food Premises	16
<b>3.4 Validation of Statistical Information</b>	17
-Internal Monitoring	17
-Third Party or Peer Review	18
<b>Action Plan for Colchester Borough Council</b>	20
<b>Annex: Glossary</b>	22

## **1. Introduction**

1.1 The report records the results of an audit of the statistical monitoring return arrangements of Colchester Borough Council. This report has been made publicly available on the Agency's website at [www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/audits/](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/audits/). Hard copies are available from the Food Standards Agency's Local Authority Enforcement Division at Aviation House, 125 Kingsway, London WC2B 6NH, Tel: 020 7276 8434.

### ***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. This audit of Colchester Borough Council was undertaken under section 12(4) of the Act as part of the Food Standards Agency's annual audit programme.

1.3 Analysis of monitoring data provided by local authorities for 2002 and evidence gained from audits of food law enforcement services conducted by the Agency indicated that there were wide variations in the quality of the information provided. A validation exercise carried out in autumn 2003 highlighted problems over reliability, accuracy and timeliness of local authority (LA) data. Further correspondence with LAs where data raised issues of concern, and additional feedback from LAs generally, confirmed that many authorities were experiencing significant difficulties in providing accurate returns. The Agency acknowledged the seriousness of the situation and in February 2004, the Agency's Board agreed an action plan to address the problem. This included a commitment to carry out focused audits of some local authorities.

1.4 A programme of focused audits of 20 local authorities was developed to examine the arrangements in place to provide enforcement activity data and to explore the reasons for the variable quality and timeliness of the returns. The audits also sought LA views on the monitoring data requirements and the need for changes to the current system.

1.5 The selection of local authorities for inclusion in this audit programme was based on the following criteria:

- local authorities which changed their figures both in the validation exercise and after the Agency's letter in December 2003;
- local authorities which validated their figures as correct but subsequently changed them after the Agency's letter in December 2003;

- local authorities whose amended December figures moved them from the “bottom 10%” to the “top 10%”;
- local authorities reporting more than 100% inspections achieved;
- local authorities reporting precisely 100% figures;
- local authorities reporting no or few high risk premises for either food standards or risk category A for food hygiene premises.

1.6 Colchester Borough Council was included within the audit programme on the basis of its food hygiene premises inspection data, which reported that over 100% of those inspections planned were achieved.

### ***Background and Scope of the Audit***

1.7 Colchester Borough is a district council with responsibility for food hygiene law enforcement. The Authority had no responsibility for food standards or feeding stuffs law enforcement activity.

1.8 The audit assessed the Authority’s conformance against the requirements of the Standard in relation to their arrangements for collecting, validating and submitting monitoring data to the Agency on their food hygiene law enforcement activity. The Standard was adopted by the Food Standards Agency Board on 21 September 2000, (amended March 2002), and forms part of the Agency’s Framework Agreement with local authorities. The Framework Agreement can be found on the Agency’s website at:  
[www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/role/framework/](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/role/framework/).

1.9 The audit examined all relevant areas of the monitoring form except Section 1 (documented procedures), but had a specific focus on Sections 2, 3 and 6 (inspections, enforcement and food sampling). The on-site element of the audit took place at the Authority’s office at the Town Hall, High Street, Colchester on 7 May 2004.

1.10 The audit also afforded the opportunity for discussion with officers involved in the collection and submission of monitoring data to the Agency, with the aim of exploring trends and gaining opinions to inform Agency policy. A set of structured questions was developed to seek views and information on areas such as:

- the local arrangements and responsibilities in relation to monitoring data;
- the local approach to record keeping and computer data entry;
- the process for compiling and submitting the monitoring return;
- the process for validating the accuracy of data;
- problems or difficulties experienced with the provision of data to the Agency, or with the validation exercise;

- suggestions for improvements to the monitoring system.
- 1.11 The information gained from the structured questions will be incorporated into a summary report on the focused audit programme which will be published on the Agency's website at: [www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/](http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/).
- 1.12 Food Hygiene law enforcement was carried out by officers of The Food and Safety Team which was part of the Planning and Protection Group. The Service's key areas of work included inspections of commercial premises for the purposes of food hygiene and health and safety at work.
- 1.13 The draft Food and Safety Service Business Plan 2004/2005 estimated that the gross expenditure for the Food and Safety service was £499,000. The total staff allocation for food safety was 5.9 full time equivalents (FTEs).

## 2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Authority used a computerised database system for recording all food law enforcement activity and for compiling monitoring returns to the Agency.
- 2.2 It appeared that the database system was capable of providing all of the information required by the monitoring returns. However, incorrect coding, problems with data entry and errors in report configurations resulted in inaccuracies within the returns. In particular, some premises had not been included in the planned inspection programme because of coding errors. Recording inspections of these premises during the year resulted in returns showing that more than 100% of inspections planned had been achieved.
- 2.3 The Authority had not routinely checked or validated data entered on the monitoring returns prior to submission to the Agency. However, the Authority recognised the need to introduce systems to ensure the thorough checking and validation of data held on the database and entered on the monitoring forms, to ensure that accurate returns are submitted to the Agency.
- 2.4 Arrangements were in place to ensure that the database was up to date and backed up regularly. Access to the database system was password protected to prevent corruption of data in relation to the entry and deletion of premises. However, the password system required review to ensure that general data entry was restricted to competent staff.

### **3. Audit Findings**

#### **3.1 Organisation and Arrangements for Providing Statistical Monitoring Returns**

3.1.1 The Service had an electronic database system that was capable of providing the information required by the Agency's official monitoring returns. The auditors were advised that standard database reports, configured specifically to meet the requirements of the Agency's monitoring return, were run automatically for each quarter and for the yearly return. The monitoring data was then manually copied to the Agency's electronic form, as the software was not capable of exporting the data directly.

3.1.2 The Systems Manager was responsible for checking the configurations for monitoring return reports, whereas the Environmental Health Manager had overall responsibility for collecting and analysing monitoring data and for the completion and submission of the electronic monitoring form to the Agency.

3.1.3 The Service operated a password system to protect the security of the database. Access for creating or deleting premises records was restricted to trained administrative staff. The auditors were informed that, in practice, only 2 trained officers inputted data and updated the system. However, this arrangement was not reflected in the existing level of password protection and all officers could access the system for the purpose of updating service requests or inspection data.

3.1.4 The auditors were advised that data was backed up on a daily basis, with appropriate secure off-site storage arrangements in place.

#### *Recommendation*

3.1.5 The Authority should:

Review the existing security measures to ensure that the risk of corruption to the database is minimised and the loss of stored information prevented. [The Standard – 6.5]

## **3.2 Food Premises Database/Premises Profile**

- 3.2.1 The Service had a documented procedure on updating the premises database, which included the recording of changes noted by officers from observation or inspection. The Authority had also produced 2 detailed work instructions for updating and deleting premises records.
- 3.2.2 Information on food premises was obtained from the business rates team, although no formal protocol had been devised for the transfer of data. The auditors were also advised that the Service had established liaison arrangements with their Planning Department and were notified regularly of new and approved planning applications relating to food premises.
- 3.2.3 The database contained all 11 premises chosen at random by the auditors from a local business directory.
- 3.2.4 The auditors were informed that closed premises were monitored every year to check whether they had reopened. However, the Authority had identified that some premises had been miscoded. This had created confusion between newly opened, unrated premises which should be included in the planned inspection programme, and premises which had ceased trading which were to be monitored annually, but not included in the planned programme.
- 3.2.5 A database report listing a total of 51 premises that had ceased trading between October and December 2003, was produced by the Authority during the audit. For the same quarter, the Authority's monitoring return to the Agency reported that a total of 18 premises, out of those programmed for inspection during that year, had ceased trading.
- 3.2.6 The Authority had become aware that a considerable number of food manufacturers had been incorrectly coded on the database which resulted in an under-reporting of manufacturers on the Agency's return and in the Service's Food Law Enforcement Service Plan 2003/2004. The problem was not resolved before the submission of the quarterly return for January-March 2004 which showed 41 manufacturers, whereas a database report run during the audit, listed 120 manufacturers in the Authority's area.
- 3.2.7 The figures in the 2003/2004 yearly monitoring return to the Agency and in the 2003/2004 Service plan reported zero manufacturers mainly selling by retail. The auditors were advised that this was incorrect and would be rectified as part of a coding review of food manufacturers.

3.2.8 The following premises profiles were provided by the Authority in the Food Law Enforcement Service Plan for 2003/2004, and the corresponding yearly monitoring return:

Premises Type	Number in Borough (Service Plan as at April 03)	Number in Borough (Monitoring Return as at August 03)
Primary Producers	11	7
Slaughterhouses	0	0
Manufacturers/Processors	65	29
Packers	2	2
Importers/Exporters	0	0
Distributors/Transporters	34	30
Retailers	295	268
Restaurants and other Caterers	774	714
Material and Articles Manufacturers and Suppliers	0	0
Manufacturers Mainly Selling by Retail	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,181</b>	<b>1,050</b>

**NB.** The data on food law enforcement activity for 2003/2004, submitted by the Authority to the Agency in monitoring returns and quoted in this report, had not been subject to the Agency's validation exercise at the time of the audit.

3.2.9 The auditors were informed that the Service Plan figures were obtained from counting premises which had a programmed food inspection date. The figures submitted to the Agency were produced by a separate report, specifically configured for the monitoring return, which counted premises that had a food main activity code. Moreover, when responding to the Agency's autumn 2003 validation exercise, the Authority found that 208 food premises were wrongly coded with a non-food main activity code. These had now been re-coded and a report listing all food premises run for the audit, produced a total of 1,323. The auditors were advised that the variances between the premises profiles would, in future, be reconciled and the 2004/2005 monitoring returns and Service Plan would contain the corrected premises profile.

*Recommendation*

3.2.10 The Authority should:

Ensure that an accurate food premises profile is maintained on the database to facilitate the provision of accurate statistical monitoring returns to the Agency and to enable service planning.

[The Standard – 6.4 & 11.1]

### 3.3 Reporting of Food Law Enforcement Activity

#### Inspections/Visits

3.3.1 The Food Law Enforcement Service Plan for 2003/2004 reported the following risk profile for food premises as at 1 April 2003. The same risk profile had been submitted by the Authority in the 2003/2004 yearly monitoring return.

Risk Rating	No. of premises	No. of inspections
A	3	6
B	100	100
C	542	399
D	206	92
E	160	67
F	39	5
UNRATED	40	?
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>669</b>

3.3.2 The Food Law Enforcement Service Plan did not detail the food premises inspection programme for 2003/2004 by risk rating category of premises, but contained a statement that '*The number of premises has remained reasonably constant for several years and this results in about 725 inspections per year.*' The above table includes the Authority's inspection programme for 2003/2004, as reported in the 2003 yearly monitoring return to the Agency.

3.3.3 It was unclear from information obtained during the audit, whether the 40 premises reported as unrated were included in the planned inspection programme. The Authority was also unable to confirm whether inspections not carried out in the year in which they were due, were included in the following year's planned inspection programme.

3.3.4 The records relating to 5 food hygiene inspections were examined. All premises were found to be correctly risk assessed, with inspection details accurately recorded both on file records and on the database.

3.3.5 The draft Food and Safety Business Plan 2004-2005 contained the Service's performance indicators, including the percentage of food premises inspected. The following table shows a comparison of the performance indicators in the Business Plan and the inspection figures for 2003/2004 reported to the Agency in the monitoring returns:

	<b>Service Business Plan targets for food hygiene planned inspection programme 2003/2004</b>	<b>Service Business Plan achieved figures for food hygiene planned inspection programme 2003/2004</b>	<b>Achieved inspection figures reported in returns to the Agency for food hygiene planned inspection programme 2003/2004</b>
<b>% of high risk premises inspections achieved</b>	100	100	88
<b>% of low risk premises inspections achieved</b>	60	94	75

3.3.6 Doubts about the reported achieved numbers for inspections were further confirmed by a database report produced during the audit, which listed a total of 25 food premises where inspections programmed for 2003/2004 were still overdue. The total included 7 high risk premises.

3.3.7 The 208 wrongly coded premises identified in 2003 as a result of the Agency's validation exercise, had not been included in the planned inspection programme for 2002/2003, as reported to the Agency. However food hygiene inspections for these premises were due in 2002/2003 and were carried out. These were subsequently reported to the Agency in the quarterly returns as planned inspections that had been completed. As a result the Authority reported over 100% planned inspections achieved, which was the reason the Authority was included in this focused audit programme.

3.3.8 Revisit figures reported to the Agency for October-December 2003 included 33 revisits following planned inspections out of a total of 41 revisits. Database reports relating to revisits carried out during the same time period, were produced during the audit in 2 different formats, highlighting the following inconsistencies:

- A report that sorted the data by usage code and scheduled event date produced a record of 39 revisits;
- A report that sorted data by premises code produced a list of 59 revisits.

- 3.3.9 Neither of the above reports differentiated between revisits following planned inspections and other revisits. After carrying out additional checks during the audit, the Authority confirmed that the correct figures for this time period were 79 revisits following planned inspections and 6 revisits following other enforcement activity.
- 3.3.10 The Authority had reported that 27 advisory and sampling visits had been carried out in 2003/2004. The auditors were advised that these figures did not reflect the true level of activity, and that the reasons for the under-reporting would be investigated and any problems corrected.

### **Enforcement Actions**

- 3.3.11 The Authority had reported to the Agency that 12 food premises had been subject to written warnings during 2003/2004. The auditors were advised that the actual number should have been significantly higher, but due to errors in coding by officers and subsequent data entry, only a small proportion of written warnings had been recorded on the database. This was confirmed by file checks carried out during the audit which found that out of 4 inspection reports containing legal contraventions, 3 had not been recorded as written warnings.
- 3.3.12 One formal caution had been issued by the Authority in the last 2 years. This was correctly recorded on the database and reported to the Agency in the relevant monitoring return.
- 3.3.13 The Authority had reported to the Agency that improvement notices relating to 2 premises had been served in 2003/2004. Database records for the same time period produced by the Authority indicated that improvement notices had been served in relation to 9 premises. Out of records relating to 5 improvement notices that were examined during the audit, 4 notices had been properly recorded on the database and revisits to check compliance had also been properly recorded.

### **Food Sampling**

- 3.3.14 The October-December 2003 monitoring return submitted by the Authority reported that 135 formal food samples and no informal samples had been taken. A database report produced during the audit of all food samples taken in the same quarter listed 173 formal samples and one informal. Ten of these, however, appeared to relate to water samples from swimming pools. Auditors were further advised that checks on the configuration of the monitoring return database report revealed that sampling data related to shellfish and shellfish water sampling was not being included, but that this would be corrected.

## Complaints about Food/Food Premises

3.3.15 A database report on complaints produced during the audit, listed 17 complaints about hygiene of premises and no food complaints for October-December 2003. However, 1 complaint about hygiene of premises had been reported on the comparable monitoring return to the Agency. The auditors were informed that food complaints had not been appropriately coded and therefore would not have been picked up by relevant reports.

### *Recommendations*

3.3.16 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that an accurate breakdown of the planned food inspection programme is reported in the statistical monitoring returns to the Agency and that this is reflected in the Food Service Plan. [The Standard – 3.1 & 6.4]
- (ii) Ensure that any food hygiene inspections not carried out in the year in which they were due, are included within the subsequent year's planned inspection programme. [The Standard – 3.3 & 7.1]
- (iii) Ensure that unrated food premises are included in the planned food hygiene inspection programme. [The Standard – 7.1]
- (iv) Review the coding systems used to identify food premises and to record inspections and visits, to ensure that all relevant database records are accurate. [The Standard – 16.1]
- (v) Ensure that the computer database is configured, managed and operated in a way that enables the Authority to provide accurate statistical monitoring returns to the Agency. [The Standard – 6.4]

### **3.4 Validation of Statistical Information**

#### **Internal Monitoring**

- 3.4.1 The Service had developed and implemented a quality management system, which had received ISO 9001:2000 certification. The documented Quality Policy included a planned programme of internal quality audits covering all the Service's systems and procedures. However, the internal quality audits did not include checks on the database or data entry.
- 3.4.2 The auditors were informed that in practice the following internal monitoring activity was being undertaken:
- Accompanied visits and monitoring checks on follow-up actions and file records were being carried out with officers. However, these checks did not routinely include the verification of data entered on the database;
  - Recent checks carried out by the Environmental Health Manager confirmed that written warnings had not been recorded in all cases where legal contraventions had been included within inspection reports;
  - Database reports were run monthly to monitor the progress of the planned food premises inspection programme and the level of activity relating to sampling, complaints and infectious disease investigations. This information was collated and used for service planning. However, the data was not compared to the reports produced by the database for the monitoring returns to the Agency;
  - The Systems Manager ran periodic database reports to identify outstanding visits due, and officer actions that had not been closed or recorded correctly on the database;
  - The auditors were informed that the Service was requesting additional information from the software provider regarding report configurations, in order to establish which data was being collected for each enforcement activity included in the monitoring return, to enable the identification of errors in coding, data entry or data compilation.
- 3.4.3 There had historically been no systems in place to validate the data before it was transferred on to the monitoring form, and the auditors were informed that the manual data transfer had been the source of some errors in the returns submitted. However, the auditors were

informed that additional checks had been introduced from April 2004. These were in the form of separate database reports, which were run in parallel to the automatic monitoring return reports, to confirm the accuracy of the data.

### **Third Party or Peer Review**

- 3.4.4 The Authority was audited in 2002 as part of an Essex Inter Authority Audit scheme. The scope of the audit did not specifically include the database, however quality monitoring issues were addressed in the report under 'Key areas for improvement'. These included an absence of any system to ensure that food registration forms sent out by the Service were returned. This issue had now been addressed by the introduction of a spreadsheet monitoring system.
- 3.4.5 An external audit of the Service carried out in 2001 recommended that proactive action be taken to exchange information with the Business Rates Section for the purpose of identifying unregistered food premises. Although no formal protocol for data exchange had been introduced, the auditors were advised that the Service was now regularly receiving premises information from the Business Rates Section.

#### *Recommendation*

- 3.4.6 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that internal monitoring is undertaken to validate monitoring data collected for monitoring returns and that checks are undertaken for transcription errors before the statistical monitoring returns are submitted to the Agency.  
[The Standard - 19.1 & 19.2]
  - (ii) Further develop the documented monitoring procedure to reflect the qualitative and quantitative measures taken to monitor the accuracy of the database and to validate the data submitted to the Agency in the monitoring returns.  
[The Standard – 19.1 & 19.2]

**Auditors:**     **Christina Walder**  
                      Mark Davis  
                      Paul Stubbington

Food Standards Agency

Local Authority Enforcement Division

## Action Plan for Colchester Borough Council

Audit date: 7 May 2004

<b>IMPROVEMENTS</b>	<b>BY (DATE)</b>	<b>TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Two officers to be changed to 'read access' only. Update training for all team.	Completed	3.1.5 Review the existing security measures to ensure that the risk of corruption to the database is minimised and the loss of stored information prevented. [The Standard – 6.5]	Officers' access changed. Update training completed on 21/07/04.
Database checked. All properties now allocated correct codes. Reported profile will always be from database software system reports.	Completed	3.2.10 Ensure that an accurate food premises profile is maintained on the database to facilitate the provision of accurate statistical monitoring returns to the Agency and to enable service planning. [The Standard – 6.4 & 11.1]	Regular exception reports being run to identify missing codes etc.
Check data base for mismatches and wrong coding. Use database software system figures for Food Service Plan.	Completed	3.3.16(i) Ensure that an accurate breakdown of the planned food inspection programme is reported in the statistical monitoring returns to the Agency and that this is reflected in the Food Service Plan. [The Standard – 3.1 & 6.4]	Accurate breakdown of the planned food hygiene inspection programme included in 2004/2005 yearly return to the Agency and in 2004/2005 Food Service Plan.
Change tagging criteria for annual programme.	Completed	3.3.16(ii) Ensure that any food hygiene inspections not carried out in the year in which they were due, are included within the subsequent year's planned inspection programme. [The Standard – 3.3 & 7.1]	Tagging criteria amended in relation to the food hygiene inspection programme.
Tagging process to be checked and changed as needed.	Completed	3.3.16(iii) Ensure that unrated food premises are included in the planned food hygiene inspection programme. [The Standard – 7.1]	2004/2005 food hygiene inspection programme includes unrated premises.

Officers to be retrained in coding. Administrative assistant to be advised on coding notes left on inspection sheets.	Completed	3.3.16(iv) Review the coding systems used to identify food premises and to record inspections and visits, to ensure that all relevant database records are accurate. [The Standard – 16.1]	Code notes and procedures added to users guide on database software system.
Database searches to be developed to cross check software system automatic monitoring return reports.	Completed	3.3.16(v) Ensure that the computer database is configured, managed and operated in a way that enables the Authority to provide accurate statistical monitoring returns to the Agency. [The Standard – 6.4]	Have tested cross-checking and confirmed data in relation to Q2 return 2004. Some minor adjustments made to data before submission.
Where data is transcribed, cross checking is carried out by second officer before sending or hard copy is sent by mail.	Completed	3.4.6(i) Ensure that internal monitoring is undertaken to validate monitoring data collected for monitoring returns and that checks are undertaken for transcription errors before the statistical monitoring returns are submitted to the Agency. [The Standard - 19.1 & 19.2]	
Following satisfactory testing documented procedures to be produced.	31/10/2004	3.4.6(ii) Further develop the documented monitoring procedure to reflect the qualitative and quantitative measures taken to monitor the accuracy of the database and to validate the data submitted to the Agency in the monitoring returns. [The Standard – 19.1 & 19.2]	First testing completed. Minor adjustments made as a result of monthly testing. Full check will be made on Q3, 2004 return.

## Glossary

Agricultural Analyst	A person, holding the prescribed qualifications, who is formally appointed by a local authority to analyse feeding stuffs samples.
Approved premises	Food manufacturing premises that has been approved by the local authority, within the context of specific legislation, and issued a unique identification code relevant in national and/or international trade.
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.
Best Value	A Government policy which seeks to improve local government performance in the delivery of services to local communities – from education and care for the elderly through to environmental health and road maintenance. Best Value aims to ensure that the cost and quality of these services are of a level acceptable to local people by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increasing the role of local people in deciding the priorities for local government services</li> <li>• improving the way authorities manage and review their business</li> <li>• building on the experience and expertise of staff.</li> </ul>
Border Inspection Post	Point of entry into the UK from non-EU countries for products of animal origin.
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.
Enforcement Concordat	Government guidance setting out principles and procedures of good enforcement which local authorities may adopt. Developed in consultation with businesses, local and central government, consumer groups and other interested parties. It sets out what businesses and others being regulated can expect from enforcement officers.
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 Examiner	A person holding the prescribed qualifications who undertakes microbiological analysis on behalf of the local authority.
Food Hazard Warnings	This is a system operated by the Food Standards Agency to alert the public and local authorities to national or regional problems concerning the safety of 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"> <li>• Food Law Enforcement Standard</li> <li>• Service Planning Guidance</li> <li>• Monitoring Scheme</li> <li>• Audit Scheme</li> </ul> <p>The <b>Standard</b> and the <b>Service Planning Guidance</b> set out the Agency's expectations on the planning and delivery of food law enforcement.</p> <p>The <b>Monitoring Scheme</b> 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 <b>Audit Scheme</b> 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 Equivalent (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.
Home Authority	An authority where the relevant decision making base of an enterprise is located and which has taken on the responsibility of advising that business on food safety/food standards issues. Acts as the central contact point for other enforcing authorities' enquiries with regard to that company's food related policies and procedures.

Improvement notice	A notice served by an Authorised Officer of the local authority under Section 10 of the Food Safety Act 1990, requiring the proprietor of a food business to carry out suitable works to ensure that the business complies with the requirements of food hygiene or food processing legislation.
Inter Authority Auditing	A system whereby local authorities might audit each others' food law enforcement services against an agreed quality standard.
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.
Monitoring/OCD returns	Returns on local food law enforcement activities required to be made to the European Union under the Official Control of Foodstuffs Directive.
Originating Authority	An authority in whose area a business produces or packages goods or services and for which the Authority acts as a central contact point for other enforcing authorities' enquiries in relation to the those products
Port Health Authority	A local authority within whose boundaries there is a point of entry into the UK for imported foods.
Premises outside the inspection programme	Food premises that have been assessed as having no inspectable risk and are therefore not included in the food hygiene or food standards inspection programmes.
Public Analyst	An officer, holding the prescribed qualifications, who is formally appointed by the local authority to carry out chemical analysis of food samples.
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 Officer (TSO)	Officer employed by the local authority who, amongst other responsibilities, may enforce food standards and feeding stuffs legislation.
Unitary Authority	A local authority in which the County and District Council functions are combined, examples being Metropolitan District/Borough Councils, and London Boroughs. A Unitary Authority's responsibilities will include food hygiene, food standards and feeding stuffs enforcement.
Unrated premises	Food premises which have not yet been inspected to allocate a risk rating. These are often premises that have recently opened or are about to open.