



FOOD
STANDARDS
AGENCY

WALES

ASiantaeth
Safonau
Bwyd

CYMRU

Report on the Food Law Enforcement Service

Monmouthshire County Council

9 - 13 August 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 feedingstuffs is largely the responsibility of local authorities. These local authority regulatory functions are principally delivered through their Environmental Health and Trading Standards Services.

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

Agency audits assess local authorities' conformance against the Food Law Enforcement Standard "The Standard", which was published by the Agency as part of the Framework Agreement on Local Authority Food Law Enforcement and is available on the Agency's website.

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.

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

CONTENTS

		Page
1	Introduction	4
	Reason for the Audit	4
	Scope of the Audit	4
	Background	4
2	Executive Summary	6
	Audit Findings	
3	Organisation and Management	8
4	Review and Updating of Documented Policies and Procedures	12
5	Authorised Officers	13
6	Facilities and Equipment	17
7	Food and Feedingstuffs Premises Inspections	19
8	Food, Feedingstuffs and Food Premises Complaints	25
9	Home Authority Principle	26
10	Advice to Business	27
11	Food and Feedingstuffs Premises Database	28
12	Food and Feedingstuffs Inspection and Sampling	30
13	Control and Investigation of Outbreaks and Food Related Infectious Disease	32
14	Food Safety Incidents	34
15	Enforcement	35
16	Records and Inspection Reports	37
17	Complaints About the Service	39
18	Liaison with Other Organisations	40
19	Internal Monitoring	41
20	Third Party or Peer Review	42
21	Food and Feedingstuffs Safety and Standards Promotion	43
	Annex	
A.	Glossary	44

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report records the results of the audit under the headings of the Food Standards Agency Food Law Enforcement Standard and has been made publicly available on the Agency's website. Hard copies are available from the Food Standards Agency Library at Aviation House, 125 Kingsway, London WC2B 6NH, Tel: 020 7276 8181. These are subject to a reproduction and handling fee of £7.50 plus £1.50 postage and packing.

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. The audit of the food service at Monmouthshire County Council was undertaken under Section 12(4) of the Act as part of the Food Standards Agency's annual audit programme.
- 1.3 The Authority was audited as part of the Food Standards Agency Wales programme of full audits of all 22 Welsh local authorities.

Scope of the Audit

- 1.4 The audit covered Monmouthshire's food hygiene, food standards and animal feedingstuffs law enforcement service. The on-site element of the audit took place at the Authority's offices at Abergavenny, Chepstow and Cwmbran between the 9 - 13 August 2004.
- 1.5 The audit assessed the Authority's conformance against the Standard, using audit protocols FSA/AP3/1 - FSA/AP21/1. The Standard was adopted by the Food Standards Agency Board on 21 September 2000, (amended July 2004), and forms part of the Agency's Framework Agreement with local authorities. The Framework Agreement and the audit protocols can be found on the Agency's website.

Background

- 1.6 Monmouthshire County Council is a Welsh Unitary Authority, covering an area of approximately 330 square miles in the South East of Wales.
- 1.7 The principal population centres are the towns of Abergavenny, Caldicot, Chepstow, Monmouth, Raglan and Usk. The remainder of the area is essentially rural in character.
- 1.8 The resident population is approximately 85,000, although visitors increase this number substantially during holiday periods.

- 1.9 The Community Protection Division, part of the Authority's Environment Directorate, had responsibility for food and feedingstuffs law enforcement and for the investigation and control of cases and outbreaks of food poisoning and communicable disease.
- 1.10 The Environmental Health Service was responsible for food hygiene and food standards enforcement. The Trading Standards Service was responsible for feedingstuffs law enforcement.
- 1.11 Services were provided from a network of area offices that were open to the public between 08.45 and 17.00 Monday to Thursday, and until 16.30 on Friday. Officers also worked outside normal office hours to inspect businesses that opened during the evening or at weekends.
- 1.12 A corporate standby arrangement existed to deal with emergencies, although there was no specific out-of-hours service for Environmental Health or Trading Standards.
- 1.13 The Authority identified in its Service Plan that the following activity was proposed during 2004 – 2005:

Enforcement Activity	No. of Premises
Food hygiene inspections (A-C)	596
Microbiological food samples	275
Food standards inspections	326
Food standards samples	50

2 Executive Summary

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | The Authority was carrying out a range of activities and had achieved its target of 100% of food hygiene inspections in 2003 - 2004. It was developing a range of advice to businesses and had volunteered to take on the role of Home Authority to Farmers Markets in Wales. |
| 2.2 | There was concern that the Authority had inappropriately authorised a number of officers to carry out some duties, specifically food standards and the inspection seizure and detention of food, that were not in accordance with qualification requirements. |
| 2.3 | The Authority had identified some necessary improvements to its food law enforcement service in its Service Delivery Plan. Whilst the Authority had not drawn up all policies and procedures required it was recognised that progress had been made. Their further development should assist in improving service delivery. |

2.4 The Authority's Key Areas for Improvement

Authorised Officers

The Authority had appointed Authorised Officers under the Food Safety Act 1990 who did not have qualifications that were appropriate to the range of enforcement activities that they had been authorised to conduct. This compromised the ability of the Authority to conduct appropriate inspections and risk ratings of food businesses in the area. The Authority had not sought to establish whether their qualifications and experience were equivalent to those specified in Food Safety Act Codes of Practice. There was no documented training plan, some officers had not received the continuous development training required, and training records did not include sufficient information to determine whether training needs and continuous development requirements had been met.

Feedingstuffs Enforcement

There was no evidence that the Authority had undertaken any significant animal feedingstuffs enforcement activity since current legislation was first introduced in 1998. The Authority must take steps to identify businesses and premises that should be approved or registered but are not, devise and implement an appropriate inspection and sampling programme, and maintain suitable records.

Butcher Shop Licensing

The Authority had issued butcher shop licences to businesses that did not comply with the requirements of the Food Safety (General Food Hygiene) Regulations 1995. Some of these businesses had also been presented with awards for their hygiene standards. Butchers shop licences can only be issued to businesses that comply with the Regulations.

Food Hygiene and Food Standards Inspection Records

Records of food hygiene inspections, particularly those relating to inspections under the Food Safety (General Food Hygiene) Regulations 1995, and records of food standards inspections, lacked detail and were insufficient to provide the accurate business history that is required for subsequent inspections. Detailed records are fundamental because they not only help to inform enforcement actions, but also enable effective monitoring of enforcement activity.

Audit Findings

3 Organisation and Management

3.1 The Authority operated a Cabinet style of local government. The Cabinet Member for the Environment had responsibility for the portfolio which included Environmental Health and Public Protection.

3.2 The Authority's Constitution included a Scheme of Delegation and Appointment, by which certain of the Authority's functions were delegated to officers.

3.3 Officers in the Environmental Health team had responsibility for the Authority's food hygiene and food standards enforcement duties. The Trading Standards team had responsibility for feedingstuffs enforcement.

3.4 The Authority reviewed and developed its Corporate Improvement Plan each year as part of the Wales Programme for Improvement.

3.5 The Environment Chapter of the Improvement Plan identified the Directorate's role in helping to achieve the Authority's corporate priorities under the headings:

- Health and Well Being;
- Local Economic Development;
- A Better Environment;
- Lifelong Learning; and
- Safer and Stronger Communities.

3.6 The Improvement Plan included information about how the Authority performed against its targets for the previous two years, and set out its targets for 2004 - 2005. The performance indicators relevant to food and feedingstuffs enforcement for 2004 - 2005 were:

- Percentage of food premises inspections that should have been carried out, that were carried out for:
 - high risk premises;
 - other premises;
- Score against the checklist of enforcement best practice for Environmental Health / Trading Standards;
- Percentage of visits to Trading Standards High, Medium and Low risk premises based on risk assessment;
- Trading Standards response time for complaints.

3.7 The Authority estimated that it had met its target of carrying out 100% of all food hygiene inspections that were due to be carried out during 2003 - 2004. However, a report that was produced during the

course of the audit revealed that more than 40 inspections in the current year's programme were overdue, and that a number of premises did not have next programmed food hygiene inspection dates.

- 3.8 The performance target for planned food hygiene inspections of high-risk premises remained at 100% in the 2004 - 2005 Improvement Plan, although the target for food hygiene inspections of "other" premises was no longer included as a result of the change in the National Assembly for Wales performance indicators.
- 3.9 The previous year's Improvement Plan identified a number of new aims and objectives for 2003 - 2004, two of which were to "Examine Our Enforcement Functions", and to "Improve Departmental Training and Development" as these had been identified as "high risk issues following the whole authority assessment".
- 3.10 The outcome of the enforcement functions examination was a report entitled "Enforcement Review Baseline Study Report" that identified 19 enforcement functions that were the responsibility of the Environment Directorate. These included "food safety", "animal health and welfare", which included feedingstuffs, and "Trading Standards".
- 3.11 The 19 enforcement functions were assessed against a set of criteria in order to identify those that were at greatest risk. Food safety, animal health and welfare, and Trading Standards were not amongst those that were identified as being at greatest risk.
- 3.12 The 2004 - 2005 Food Safety Service Plan set out how the Authority planned to address its food law enforcement, communicable disease, and food poisoning duties and responsibilities. Duties and responsibilities relating to feedingstuffs law enforcement were not addressed in this Service Plan, apart from a statement of the number of registered and Approved Premises.
- 3.13 It was noted that the Authority had combined feedingstuffs law enforcement with animal health and welfare for service planning purposes and included it in their DEFRA Framework Agreement.
- 3.14 The Authority reported in their pre-audit documentation that the 2004 - 2005 Food Safety Service Plan would be reported to the Cabinet for approval on 10th June 2004 although this had been delayed.
- 3.15 It was noted that the Service Plan did not indicate how the Authority proposed to address variances from the previous year including overdue food standards inspections, feedingstuffs inspections, and feedingstuffs sampling.

- 3.16 The Environmental Health Department annual review of performance for 2003 - 2004 was detailed in the 2004 - 2005 Delivery and Development Plan. This identified a number of areas for improvement that were directly related to food law enforcement and the control of communicable disease and food poisoning, including:
- Food standards training for staff;
 - Re-focusing priorities on the Public Health Agenda;
 - Alternative enforcement methods for low risk food premises.
- 3.17 The Animal Health and Welfare Delivery and Development Plan made limited reference to feedingstuffs law enforcement but did not identify variances from the previous year's activity.
- 3.18 The Service Plan included a summary of the food hygiene and food standards inspection programmes and the respective premises risk profiles, although the numbers of programmed inspections, and details of premises to be inspected, were not consistent.
- 3.19 The Authority indicated that 4.2 FTE officers were available to deal with food hygiene and standards enforcement against a stated number required in the Service Plan of 5.5, a shortfall of 1.3 FTE. The number of officers available to deal with feedingstuffs enforcement was 0.2 FTE, although the number required was not stated.
- 3.20 The overall level of expenditure in providing the food hygiene and standards enforcement service in 2003 - 2004 was £139,460. However, the trend of growth or reduction in real terms, the detailed breakdown set out in the Framework Agreement, and the equivalent figures for feedingstuffs were not stated.

Recommendations

- 3.21 The Authority should:
- (i) Revise and implement its Service Delivery Plan so that it satisfies all of the criteria set out in the Service Planning Guidance in Chapter 1 of The Framework Agreement. [The Standard – 3.1]
 - (ii) Ensure that the performance review includes feedingstuffs activity and that it is documented and submitted for appropriate member review. [The Standard – 3.2]
 - (iii) Address all variances in meeting the Service Delivery Plan in the service arrangements for the following year. [The Standard – 3.3]

4 Review and Updating of Documented Policies and Procedures

- 4.1 The Authority did not have a procedure for controlling documentation, and had not completed the documentation of its policies and procedures for all the enforcement activities covered by The Standard. A number of procedures had been in effect for some time but had not all been reviewed at regular intervals.
- 4.2 Online access to the LACORS website and to documentation on the Authority's Intranet was available to officers at the area offices, and current versions of legislation, centrally issued guidance, and the Authority's own documentation and procedures were generally available.
- 4.3 It was noted, however, that some copies of Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and the Code of Practice No.16 Update Supplement that were in use at the time of the audit were superseded versions.

Recommendations

- 4.4 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that all documented policies and procedures for the enforcement activities covered by The Standard are reviewed at regular intervals, and whenever there are changes to legislation or centrally issued guidance. [The Standard – 4.1]
 - (ii) Set up maintain and implement a control system for all documentation and ensure that up to date copies of documentation are available at all relevant locations and to all relevant staff and that superseded documents are removed from use. [The Standard – 4.2]

5 Authorised Officers

- 5.1 The Authority's Constitution delegated the power to appoint Authorised Officers under the Food Safety Act and Inspectors under the Agriculture Act to the Director and to the Director's deputy. The Director also had power to authorise any other officer to exercise this appointment function, and the Chief Executive also had a general power to exercise a delegated responsibility.
- 5.2 The delegated power to appoint Authorised Officers under the Food Safety Act only extended to officers in the Environmental Health Team, and the power to appoint Inspectors under the Agriculture Act applied only to officers in the Trading Standards Team.
- 5.3 The same delegated powers also enabled:
- Appointment of the Authority's Public Analyst;
 - Granting, refusing, revoking, and suspending butcher shop licences;
 - Granting, refusing, amending, suspending and revoking establishment approvals under product-specific food hygiene regulations;
 - Enforcement of Regulations made under the European Communities Act 1972.
- 5.4 The duty to appoint the Authority's Agricultural Analyst and Deputy under the Agriculture Act 1970, and the power to administer Formal Cautions in the name of the Authority did not appear to have been delegated to officers.
- 5.5 It was noted that the Authority's Constitution included references to legislation that had been repealed.
- 5.6 The Director of Environment, the Director's deputy, and the Chief Executive had the necessary delegated powers under the Constitution to appoint Authorised Officers and Inspectors under the Food Safety Act 1990 and the Agriculture Act 1970 respectively. The Director had signed all of the officer authorisation documents that were seen at the time of audit.
- 5.7 The Authority had a documented procedure for the Authorisation of Officers, although it only applied to the Food Safety Act 1990. There was no documented procedure that applied to the authorisation of officers under the Agriculture Act 1970 or under Regulations made under the European Communities Act 1972.

- 5.8 The documented procedure stated that the Environmental Health Manager would determine the appropriate level of authorisation of staff, including short term or agency staff, having regard to:
- Qualifications;
 - Experience in food safety and/or food standards work;
 - The principal accountabilities as described in the job description.
- 5.9 Authorisation criteria had been established to define the qualification and experience requirements that had to be met for officers to be authorised to exercise the various food safety and standards enforcement powers of Authorised Officers under the Food Safety Act.
- 5.10 The documented procedure did not indicate how the structured training and competence requirements of the Food Safety Act Codes of Practice relating to the appointment and authorisation of new officers would be addressed and assessed, and there were no records of the competence assessment and structured training of such staff.
- 5.11 The Policy for Food Hygiene Inspections stated that the Environmental Health Manager would conduct the assessments of competence. The policy also included sections on the qualifications and responsibilities of Authorised Officers.
- 5.12 Copies of key qualification certificates for some officers who had been authorised under the Food Safety Act were unavailable. These included one officer in the Environmental Health Team, and all of the officers who held such authorisations in the Trading Standards Team.
- 5.13 It was noted that responsibility for food standards law enforcement had passed from the Trading Standards Team to the Environmental Health Team in 2002 but that officer authorisations had not been updated accordingly.
- 5.14 A number of officers who had been authorised under the Food Safety Act did not have the necessary qualifications for the range of enforcement powers they had been authorised to exercise. The Authority erroneously believed that these officers had equivalent qualifications, as provided for in Food Safety Act Code of Practice No.19, but had nevertheless failed to approach the Food Standards Agency in respect of this matter.
- 5.15 Officers had been issued with documents confirming their appointments and the scope of their authority. It was noted,

however, that the authorisations of some officers did not meet the corresponding criteria in the documented procedure. It was also noted that officers in the Public Health team, who did not have any responsibilities for enforcing the Food Safety Act, had nonetheless been authorised under the Act.

- 5.16 Officers in the Trading Standards Team held generic authorisation documents that included the Food Safety Act 1990. They had not been updated to reflect the fact that the officers in question were no longer responsible for enforcing food law.
- 5.17 Officers in the Environmental Health Team had not been authorised to take action under Regulations made under the European Communities Act 1972 in relation to products of animal origin, including imported food and animal by-products etc.
- 5.18 Lead officers had been appointed who had responsibility for the enforcement of food hygiene, food standards and feedingstuffs legislation. However, incomplete training and qualification records meant it was not possible to verify that these officers had the specialist knowledge, training and qualifications required for appointment.
- 5.19 Inspection and other records indicated that some officers had acted beyond the scope of their authorisations.
- 5.20 The Environmental Health Training Policy and Procedure stated that each officer who was authorised to undertake food inspections would complete at least 10 hours of training per year related to food. There was no equivalent training policy or procedure for Trading Standards.
- 5.21 Under the Training Policy and Procedure, officers maintained their own training records and forwarded them to the Environmental Health Manager at the end of each year. This did not enable the Authority to monitor whether officers were maintaining the required levels of appropriate training during the course of the year.
- 5.22 There was no documented training programme for the Environmental Health Team or for the Trading Standards Team, although there was a corporate personal review and development scheme.
- 5.23 There was no evidence that officers had received any specific training in the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE), the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (RIPA), or the Criminal Procedures and Investigations Act.
- 5.24 Records of training that had been undertaken demonstrated that at least 6 officers in the Commercial Team had not received the

minimum 10 hours continuing development training per year in the 2 years prior to the audit.

5.25 Training records that were available did not generally include the course content and objectives, the duration of the training, or an assessment of the training that had been undertaken.

5.26 The number of Authorised Officers that had been appointed to undertake the Authority's duties and responsibilities to enforce the Food Safety Act 1990 and Regulations made under it was less than the number that the Authority had estimated were required.

Recommendations

5.27 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that the authorisation of officers is based on their qualifications, experience and competence, in accordance with the relevant Food Safety Act Code of Practice and expand its documented procedure to include the authorisation of its feedingstuffs enforcement officers. [The Standard – 5.1]
- (ii) Ensure that officers appointed to have lead responsibility for food hygiene, standards and feedingstuffs legislation have appropriate specialist knowledge. [The Standard – 5.2]
- (iii) Ensure it has appointed a sufficient number of authorised officers to fulfil the programme set out in its Service Delivery Plan, and that officers have suitable qualifications, training, and experience consistent with their authorisation and duties in accordance with the relevant Food Safety Act Code of Practice. [The Standard – 5.3]
- (iv) Ensure that there is a documented training programme for all authorised officers and that officers receive the required minimum amount of training each year. [The Standard – 5.4]
- (v) Ensure that training of Authorised Officers includes all relevant aspects of enforcement practice and legal matters, and that training records include the objectives and content of courses, and the duration and any assessment of training that has been undertaken. [The Standard – 5.4]
- (vi) Ensure that records of relevant academic or other qualifications of each authorised officer and appropriate support staff are maintained in accordance with the relevant Food Safety Act Code of Practice. [The Standard – 5.5]

6 Facilities and Equipment

- 6.1 The Authority had made available the necessary facilities and equipment to permit all activities associated with the service to be carried out.
- 6.2 A documented Procedure to Check the Accuracy of Food Temperature Measuring Systems had been set up and introduced in December 2003 to ensure that food temperature measuring equipment was properly maintained and calibrated. The procedure did not indicate the action to be taken when equipment was found to be defective.
- 6.3 The documented procedure specified that annual checks were to be made on food temperature measuring equipment against a reference thermometer that was calibrated annually by the manufacturer.
- 6.4 The procedure did not require the accuracy to be checked between annual checks, or before or after the equipment was used.
- 6.5 The documented procedure had not been fully implemented.
- 6.6 The Authority's data management systems were considered capable of providing the information required by the Food Standards Agency at the time of audit, although a lack of training in the writing of database reports created difficulties in producing the information required.
- 6.7 The auditors also identified issues relating to the way in which the systems were being operated that affected the Authority's ability to supply the Food Standards Agency with the information it required.
- 6.8 There was no documented procedure to minimise the risk of corruption or loss of information held on the databases. The food poisoning and communicable disease database had been lost after the desktop computer on which it was stored was replaced. The recording of food poisoning and communicable disease cases had been transferred to the networked departmental database to avoid this happening again.
- 6.9 A corporate IT security policy controlled access to, and the use of data on, the Authority's corporate network.
- 6.10 Daily backups of the departmental database system were taken by the corporate Information Systems Team and stored at a remote location.

Recommendations

6.11 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that the documented procedure to check the accuracy of food temperature measuring systems is properly implemented, and specify the action to be taken when equipment is found to be defective, and the method for checking the accuracy of temperature monitoring equipment. [The Standard – 6.2]
- (ii) Ensure that the computer software system is operated in such a way so that it is able to provide required information to the Agency. [The Standard – 6.4]
- (iii) Ensure that the database is operated in such a way as to provide information required by the Agency. [The Standard – 6.4]

7 Food and Feedingstuffs Premises Inspections

Food Hygiene

- 7.1 The Authority's Food Safety Service Plan for 2004 - 2005 stated that it was responsible for conducting food hygiene inspections at a total of 1140 food businesses in its area. The food hygiene risk-rating profile was not given in the Service Plan although the number of programmed inspections due to be conducted during the year in each risk-rating category was indicated as follows:

Risk rating	Inspection Frequency	Programmed Inspections
A	6 months	32
B	12 months	96
C	18 months	359
D	24 months	37
E	36 months	69
F	60 months	3
Total		596

- 7.2 The Service Plan stated that the Authority did not plan to conduct programmed inspections of businesses with a D, E or F risk-rating for food hygiene that were due to be conducted during the year. However, this was contradicted in other documentation that was produced during the course of the audit.
- 7.3 The Authority had a "Policy for Food Hygiene Inspections" that applied to inspections conducted under the general food hygiene regulations.
- 7.4 The Policy did not indicate the basis on which the planned food hygiene inspection programme was established, how inspections would be allocated, or how adherence to the planned inspection would be monitored.
- 7.5 There was no documented policy, procedure or standard inspection forms covering the inspection of approved establishments under product-specific food hygiene regulations.
- 7.6 The Service Plan stated that the Authority had conducted 100% of all food hygiene inspections that were due to be carried out during the previous year. A report that was produced during the audit indicated that food hygiene inspections of 40 food businesses were overdue, of which 29 were in risk categories A-C.
- 7.7 It was also noted that 26 food premises on the Authority's database had not been risk-rated for food hygiene and had not been included in the planned food hygiene inspection programme.

- 7.8 An examination of 10 general and 6 Approved Premises inspection histories of food businesses that had been inspected in the year prior to the audit indicated that food hygiene inspections had been conducted at the minimum frequency required by Food Safety Act Code of Practice No.9.
- 7.9 The food hygiene inspection policy included a commercial premises inspection report record sheet that had been in use since April 2003. A copy was left with the proprietor at the conclusion of an inspection.
- 7.10 There was no documented procedure for the inspection and licensing of butchers' shops, although a standard inspection form was in use that covered all aspects of the application, inspection, assessment, and determination of the application. The Authority had issued licences to 16 butchers' shops.
- 7.11 An examination of 11 files relating to licensed butchers' shops found that records were generally adequate, although in 2 cases there was insufficient evidence on file to indicate whether a full assessment of compliance with the Food Safety (General Food Hygiene) Regulations had been undertaken.
- 7.12 It was also noted that butchers shop licences had been issued at the same time as letters detailing numerous and significant contraventions of the Food Safety (General Food Hygiene) Regulations. One licence had been issued subject to conditions, which was not in accordance with the Regulations.
- 7.13 Post-inspection letters had been sent in all cases although there had been a delay of more than 2 months in 2 cases. Inspection notes and other inspection data that had been recorded by officers at the time of inspection were generally legible and retrievable.

Recommendations

- 7.14 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that food hygiene inspections are undertaken at the relevant frequency, as determined by Food Safety Act Code of Practice No. 9. [The Standard – 7.1]
 - (ii) Ensure that food premises are inspected in accordance with the relevant legislation, Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance, and in accordance with the Authority's relevant policies and procedures. [The Standard – 7.2]
 - (iii) Assess the compliance of premises and systems in their area to legally prescribed standards. [The Standard – 7.3]
 - (iv) Set up, maintain and implement documented inspection procedures for butcher shops and premises subject to product-specific food hygiene regulations. [The Standard – 7.4]
 - (v) Ensure that observations made and/or data obtained during an inspection are recorded in a timely manner and are retrievable. [The Standard – 7.5]

Food Standards

7.15 The 2004 - 2005 Service Plan stated that 1140 food establishments in the Authority's area were liable for inspection but indicated that only 326 had been risk-rated for food standards. This suggested that the Authority had not conducted food standards risk-assessments of approximately 814 food businesses. However, this did not accord with a list of 1136 premises in which the Authority enforced food standards legislation that was produced during the audit. Of these 1136 premises, 93 did not have a food standards risk rating, although the Service Plan stated that "premises are rated in line with CoP 8". The profile of the 326 businesses that were included in the Service Plan was as follows:

Risk Group	Inspection Frequency	Total Premises
High	12 months	0
Medium	24 months	295
Low	60 months	31
Totals		326

7.16 The Service Plan did not include any detail on the planned food standards inspection programme, but it did state that 87% of food

standards inspections that were due to be conducted during 2003 - 2004 had been completed.

- 7.17 The Authority did not have a documented policy or procedure relating to the conduct of food standards inspections and did not have a standard inspection checklist for food standards inspections that met the requirements of Food Safety Act Code of Practice No.8.
- 7.18 The Delivery and Development Plan for 2004 - 2005, which reviewed the previous year's achievements and performance and identified priorities for the year ahead, did not include food standards enforcement.
- 7.19 There was little evidence on file or on the database that the Authority had been conducting any significant food standards enforcement activity. A report produced during the audit revealed that food standards inspections of 39 food businesses were overdue of which 15 were medium risk and 24 low risk.
- 7.20 Ninety three food businesses that had been included in the food standards inspection programme did not have a risk-rating for food standards, and 57 businesses that had been risk-rated had no next inspection date. Furthermore, a large number of other food businesses had been omitted from the food standards inspection programme. There were inconsistencies in the application of the risk scores and the Authority had not been carrying out food standards inspections at the minimum frequency required by Food Safety Act Code of Practice No. 8.
- 7.21 The only food businesses for which there was any record of significant recent activity in relation to food standards enforcement were manufacturers.
- 7.22 Food standards inspection histories of 12 food businesses that had been reported by the Authority as having been inspected in the year prior to the audit were examined. In only 3 cases was there any evidence that there had been food standards enforcement activity in relation to the business prior to the recent inspection.
- 7.23 In most cases the only evidence that a food standards inspection had taken place was a completed risk-rating sheet and a date entry on the computer database. There was generally no record of the scope of the inspection, the persons seen during the inspection, or the outcome.

Recommendations

- 7.24 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that food standards inspections are undertaken at the relevant frequency, as determined by Food Safety Act Code of Practice No. 8. [The Standard – 7.1]
 - (ii) Ensure that food premises are inspected in accordance with the relevant legislation, Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance, and in accordance with the Authority's relevant policies and procedures. [The Standard – 7.2]
 - (iii) Assess the compliance of premises and systems in their area to legally prescribed standards. [The Standard – 7.3]
 - (iv) Set up, maintain and implement documented inspection procedures for premises subject to food standards legislation. [The Standard – 7.4]
 - (v) Ensure that observations made and/or data obtained during an inspection are recorded in a timely manner and are retrievable. [The Standard – 7.5]

Feedingstuffs

- 7.25 The 2004 - 2005 Service Plan stated that the Authority had "approved, licensed or registered" 103 feedingstuffs premises under the Feedingstuffs (Establishments and Intermediaries) Regulations 1998. The Authority also stated in pre-audit documentation that none of the 1800 farms in the area had been risk-assessed in relation to feedingstuffs.
- 7.26 The Authority had produced a leaflet for farmers and planned to utilise the resource of Animal Health Officers to distribute these to farmers and to obtain information to update the register of on farm mixing activity.
- 7.27 The Authority did not have a documented feedingstuffs inspection procedure, and stated that no feedingstuffs inspections had been carried out at registered or Approved establishments.
- 7.28 The Authority was not addressing its feedingstuffs enforcement responsibilities.

Recommendations

- 7.29 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that feedingstuffs inspections are undertaken at the frequency determined by the relevant risk rating. [The Standard – 7.1]
 - (ii) Ensure feedingstuffs premises are inspected in accordance with the relevant legislation, centrally issued guidance, and in accordance with the Authority's relevant policies and procedures. [The Standard – 7.2]
 - (iii) Assess the compliance of premises and systems in their area to legally prescribed standards. [The Standard – 7.3]
 - (iv) Set up, maintain and implement documented inspection procedures for premises subject to feedingstuffs legislation. [The Standard – 7.4]
 - (v) Ensure that observations made and/or data obtained during an inspection are recorded in a timely manner and are retrievable. [The Standard – 7.5]

8 Food, Feedingstuffs and Food Premises Complaints

- 8.1 The Authority had a documented procedure for the investigation of food hygiene and food standards complaints. There were also a number of standard documents that facilitated the systematic investigation of food complaints. These included a food complaint investigation sheet, an interview record, and a set of standard letters.
- 8.2 An information sheet had recently been introduced to explain the complaint investigation process to consumers and to provide information about likely time scales and possible outcomes.
- 8.3 There was no documented procedure that applied to complaints about food premises or feedingstuffs.
- 8.4 The records of 10 food safety complaints and 9 food standards complaints were examined. Appropriate investigations had been undertaken and action taken within relevant time scales. However, in the case of 3 food standards complaints liaison with Home or Originating Authorities had not been conducted in accordance with the documented procedure.
- 8.5 The Authority had not received any complaints relating to feedingstuffs in the 12 months prior to the audit.

Recommendations

- 8.6 The Authority should:
- (i) Expand and implement its documented procedure for dealing with feedingstuffs complaints and complaints about food premises. [The Standard – 8.1]
 - (ii) Ensure that documented procedures for the investigation of food standards complaints are fully implemented. [The Standard – 8.2]

9 Home Authority Principle

- 9.1 The Authority had not formally adopted the Home Authority Principle but the 2004 - 2005 Food Safety Service Plan stated that the Authority "recognises the Home Authority Principle and has informal agreements with all producers within the County for food standards issues". There were 20 businesses for which the Authority acted informally as Home Authority.
- 9.2 Documented procedures confirmed that contact with Home and Originating Authorities was part of the Authority's enforcement process.
- 9.3 The Authority had provisionally agreed to become Home Authority for Farmers Markets in Wales and planned to develop this role during 2004 - 2005.
- 9.4 Officers had online access to the LACORS database and were able to identify Home and Originating Authorities for businesses outside the Authority's area, and relevant contacts in other local authorities. The LACORS Home Authority database included 18 food businesses and 1 feedingstuffs business for which the Authority acted as Home Authority. The database entries had recently been updated
- 9.5 Records that were examined demonstrated that the Authority generally implemented the Home Authority Principle and responded to requests for information from other authorities.

10 Advice to Business

10.1 The Authority was helping local food businesses to comply with the law and had provided advice and information on a range of food hygiene, food standards and feedingstuffs issues. These included:

- Food safety guidance for village hall users;
- Feedingstuffs guidance and record sheets;
- Food labelling guidance on QUID (Quantitative ingredient declarations);
- Labelling of sandwiches;
- General food labelling;
- Advice on the design, construction and layout of food premises;
- Information for butchers on the Beef Labelling Regulations;
- Guidance on the preparation and use of cleaning schedules;
- Hazard analysis self-help guidance for caterers.

10.2 There was evidence that advice was available on request and routinely given during the course of inspections.

10.3 The Authority had also established a customer feedback procedure that would help to inform its service planning process, and help to shape, focus, and improve its service in the future.

10.4 The Authority had met with representatives of farmers markets in Wales and volunteered to offer advice and support in an arrangement based upon the Home Authority Principle.

11 Food and Feedingstuffs Premises Database

- 11.1 The Environment Department used an electronic data management and information system to hold details of the food and feedingstuffs premises in its area.
- 11.2 The Authority had a documented corporate IT Security Policy and an Internet and e-mail Policy, but there was no documented procedure for ensuring that the Environment Department's database was accurate and up to date.
- 11.3 The System Administrator had responsibility for creating database user accounts and passwords, and setting user security levels.
- 11.4 A number of database reports were requested during the course of the audit to check the operation of the database and the accuracy of the data. These reports included full lists of food premises for food hygiene and food standards, overdue food hygiene and food standards inspections, premises in different food hygiene risk categories, food premises records with no next inspection dates, and premises that had been excluded from the inspection programme.
- 11.5 These reports indicated that the database was not being operated in such a way that the accuracy of the data recorded could be relied upon.
- 11.6 Reports of food premises that did not have a food standards risk rating were produced by the Authority prior to the audit and during the audit. The reports listed 45 premises in the pre-audit report and 93 in the report produced.
- 11.7 Fifteen food premises in the Authority's area were selected at random from the local business directory. All had been entered onto the database and included in the food hygiene and food standards inspection programme, and 12 had been registered.

Recommendations

11.8 The Authority should:

- (i) Set up, maintain and implement a documented procedure to ensure that the food and feedingstuffs premises database is accurate and up to date. [The Standard – 11.2]
- (ii) Conduct a comprehensive review of the database to identify defects in its operation and in the accuracy of the data, and implement corrective action. [The Standard – 11.1]

12 Food and Feedingstuffs Inspection and Sampling

- 12.1 The Authority's Environmental Health Enforcement Policy stated that the detention and seizure of food were enforcement options that Authorised Officers would use in appropriate circumstances. The voluntary surrender of food was not mentioned in this policy as an enforcement option.
- 12.2 There was also a "Policy for Food Safety Enforcement" which included the options to seize, detain, or accept the voluntary surrender of food.
- 12.3 Both policy documents included detailed, although different procedures for the detention and seizure of food. There was no documented procedure for the voluntary surrender of food.
- 12.4 There had been no seizures, detentions or voluntary surrenders of food in the two years prior to the audit.
- 12.5 The Authority's documented Food Sampling Policy stated that informal and formal food sampling would focus on foodstuffs that were produced in the Authority's area. The policy set out the circumstances in which food samples would be taken, which included participation in co-ordinated national, regional and local surveys.
- 12.6 The Authority had an annual Food Sampling Programme for food hygiene and food standards samples, and there was evidence of participation in a range of food sampling activity targeted at a variety of locally produced and manufactured products, and participation in co-ordinated regional and national surveys.
- 12.7 The Authority did not have a feedingstuffs sampling policy, procedure or programme, and had not conducted any recent feedingstuffs sampling.
- 12.8 Two reports that were produced by the Authority as part of the pre-audit documentation listed a total of 288 food hygiene samples and 34 food standards samples that had been taken during the last six months of 2003 - 2004.
- 12.9 The laboratories that the Authority used for the examination and analysis of food and feedingstuffs samples were accredited and on the list of Official Laboratories that the UK Government had notified to the European Commission.
- 12.10 The Authority was unable to produce evidence that it had formally appointed an Agricultural Analyst and a Public Analyst.

Food Hygiene

- 12.11 Records of 10 food hygiene samples were examined. Three of the samples were complaint samples which had been miscoded on the database. The remaining 7 samples had been taken in accordance with the food hygiene sampling programme.
- 12.12 Details of samples and results had been recorded on the database, Home and Originating Authorities had been contacted where necessary and unsatisfactory results had been followed-up with appropriate advice, inspections, and further sampling.

Food Standards and Feedingstuffs

- 12.13 Records of 3 food standards samples were examined. Businesses had been notified that samples had been taken and unsatisfactory results had been appropriately followed-up.
- 12.14 There was no evidence that the Authority had undertaken any feedingstuffs sampling activity during 2003 - 2004 or 2004 - 2005.

Recommendations

- 12.15 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that food and feedingstuffs are inspected in accordance with relevant legislation, Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance, to ensure that food and feedingstuffs meet legally prescribed standards. [The Standard – 12.1]
 - (ii) Review its documented procedures for the inspection of food and expand it to include the inspection of feedingstuffs. [The Standard – 12.3]
 - (iii) Ensure that a documented sampling policy and programme is set up, maintained and implemented in relation to feedingstuffs sampling. [The Standard – 12.4]
 - (iv) Review and update the Authority's Public and Agricultural Analyst appointments taking account of all relevant legal requirements of the Food Safety Act 1990, associated Codes of Practice and the Agriculture Act 1970. [The Standard – 12.8]

13 Control and Investigation of Outbreaks and Food Related Infectious Disease

- 13.1 The Authority had a documented "Major Food Poisoning Outbreak Plan" (the OCP) based on a model produced by an All-Wales Working Group in 1999, that had been drawn-up with other interested parties. The Authority was unable to demonstrate that the OCP had been formally adopted.
- 13.2 The OCP had last been reviewed in June 2003 and was in need of updating at the time of audit as it contained a number of out-of-date references. It was noted that the Authority was awaiting the release of an updated model plan that was being developed by the DPPW Communicable Disease Technical Panel.
- 13.3 The OCP stated that it would be tested by means of a simulation exercise at least every 2 years in the event of the plan not having been activated during that period, but there was also no evidence that this had been done.
- 13.4 The Authority also utilised the South East Wales "Practice Notes for the Investigation of Cases or Outbreaks of Legionnaire's Disease", and had a "Protocol for Dealing with Outbreaks of Viral Gastroenteritis".
- 13.5 The Authority reported that there had been 4 outbreaks of communicable disease in the area in the 2 years prior to the audit. These had all been confirmed or suspected outbreaks of viral infection. Although these were not food-related outbreaks they had nonetheless been investigated broadly in accordance with the documented procedures.
- 13.6 Documented procedures for the investigation of sporadic cases included the South East Wales "Procedure for the Investigation of Sporadic Cases of E. coli O157" and the Authority's procedures for the "Investigation of Sporadic Cases of Food Poisoning" and "Investigation of Sporadic Cases of Cryptosporidiosis".
- 13.7 The Authority had also produced a series of advice leaflets on a wide range of communicable infections.
- 13.8 Records relating to outbreaks and sporadic cases of communicable disease were only available for the 2 year period prior to the audit.
- 13.9 Twelve investigations of sporadic case notifications were examined during the audit. There was no evidence of any action being taken in 2 cases and 2 other records were for the same case. The remaining records were generally insufficient to determine whether a thorough

investigation had been undertaken in accordance with the Authority's documented procedure.

Recommendations

13.10 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that its documented OCP and other procedures are regularly reviewed, updated, and tested if necessary, in association with other relevant stakeholders. [The Standard – 13.1]
- (ii) Ensure that its documented procedure for dealing with sporadic cases of food-related infection is fully implemented by officers when conducting investigations and appropriate records kept. [The Standard – 13.2]
- (iii) Ensure that all records relating to the control and investigation of outbreaks and food related infectious disease are kept for 6 years. [The Standard – 13.3]

14 Food Safety Incidents

- 14.1 The Authority had a documented procedure dated December 2003 entitled "Enforcement of the Food Safety Act 1990 Food Hazard Warnings".
- 14.2 The procedure set out the arrangements for responding to Food Hazard Warnings (FHWs) issued by the Food Standards Agency and for notifying relevant food safety incidents that were identified within the Authority's area.
- 14.3 The procedure also included up-to-date contact details for the Food Standards Agency Wales but did not indicate how the Authority would ensure a timely response to incidents that occurred outside the Department's normal working hours.
- 14.4 It was stated that the Authority subscribed to an out-of-hours emergency service operated by a neighbouring authority and had supplied contact details of key Environmental Health staff as part of that arrangement.
- 14.5 A standard FHW record sheet and an update log were included in the documented procedure to ensure that FHWs and Food Safety Incidents were dealt with systematically. The procedure stated that records would be kept for one year.
- 14.6 The Authority had a computer system that was capable of receiving FHWs, and the documented procedure stated that FHWs were received by e-mail by the Commercial Team EHOs and the Environmental Health Manager.
- 14.7 An examination of the Authority's records of FHWs issued in the 18 months prior to the audit demonstrated that all those selected had been received and appropriately actioned in accordance with Food Standards Agency advice. Responses and outcomes had been documented, and local publicity had been issued in appropriate cases.

Recommendations

- 14.8 The Authority should:
- Expand its documented procedure to include out of hours contact arrangements. [The Standard – 14.1]

15 Enforcement

- 15.1 The Authority had a documented "Environmental Health Enforcement Policy" and a separate "Policy for Food Safety Enforcement" that included the guiding principles of proportionality, consistency, transparency and accountability of the Enforcement Concordat.
- 15.2 Neither of the two Enforcement Policies had been approved by the relevant Member forum.
- 15.3 There was no Enforcement Policy that applied to feedingstuffs law enforcement.

Food Hygiene

- 15.4 The Authority had a documented "Policy for the Prosecution of Food Safety Offences" and a "Prosecution Protocol" for Trading Standards. There were also documented procedures for the Service of Improvement Notices generally, and specifically for the service of Improvement Notices for non-conformance with Regulation 4(3) of the Food Safety (General Food Hygiene) Regulations
- 15.5 The Authority reported in pre-audit documentation that it had undertaken the following enforcement action in relation to food hygiene matters in the 2 years preceding the audit:
- 3 Prosecutions;
 - 1 Formal caution;
 - 21 Improvement Notices.
- 15.6 Records of 3 prosecutions, 1 formal caution and 8 Improvement Notices were examined and checked against official guidance, the Authority's enforcement policy documents, and the Authority's other documented procedures.
- 15.7 The prosecutions had been authorised by the Authority's Head of Democracy and Legal Services, who had the necessary delegated power to do so. However, the Authority was unable to demonstrate that the power to issue formal cautions had been delegated to officers.
- 15.8 Standard format officer reports provided documentary evidence that the Authority's Enforcement Policy had been considered in the decision to prosecute and to issue the formal caution, all of which had been undertaken without undue delay and under the correct legislation. Records were insufficient to demonstrate, however, that the requirements of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act had been met in full.

- 15.9 Officers who had served Improvement Notices had been correctly authorised, and notices had been served in appropriate circumstances. However, in 4 cases there was no evidence on file to demonstrate how the Notices had been served.

Food Standards and Feedingstuffs

- 15.10 The Authority had not initiated any formal enforcement action in relation to food standards or feedingstuffs in the 2 years preceding the audit.

Recommendations

- 15.11 The Authority should:
- (i) Ensure that the relevant Member forum approves a documented Enforcement Policy covering food hygiene, food standards and feedingstuffs enforcement. [The Standard – 15.1]
 - (ii) Ensure that the power to administer Formal Cautions in the name of the Authority has been formally delegated to appropriate officers. [The Standard – 15.2]
 - (iii) Ensure that food law enforcement is carried out in accordance with relevant Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance. [The Standard – 15.3]

16 Records and Inspection Reports

16.1 Records of premises where the Authority had food and feedingstuffs law enforcement responsibilities were maintained in the Environment Department's computerised data management and information system and in hard copy files.

16.2 Records relating to premises that had been used as food or feedingstuffs businesses for at least 6 years had not all been retained for that period.

Food Hygiene

16.3 Records of premises that were subject to the Food Safety (General) Food Hygiene Regulations 1995 and Approved Premises did not generally include sufficient information to demonstrate the scope of inspections that had been carried out and the recent history of the business concerned.

16.4 Records in relation to the licensing of butchers' shops were comprehensive and well maintained.

16.5 Post-inspection correspondence reflected the requirements of Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance, although the differentiation between legal requirements and recommendations was not always clear.

16.6 Records relating to food hygiene samples were generally comprehensive and well maintained.

Food Standards

16.7 Records relating to food standards inspections were insufficient to determine whether appropriate inspections had been carried out.

16.8 Food standards inspection forms had only been partially completed in a number of cases, and the information that was recorded was insufficient to meet the requirements of Food Safety Act Code of Practice No.8.

16.9 Food standards sample records were generally well maintained.

Feedingstuffs

16.10 The Authority had not carried out any feedingstuffs premises inspections or taken any feedingstuffs samples in the 2 years prior to the audit.

Recommendations

16.11 The Authority should:

- (i) Ensure that premises records include reports of all inspections and visits, assessments of compliance with legal requirements, risk-rating assessments, results of samples and details of follow-up, details of complaints, informal and formal action, copies of applications and decisions relating to registration, approval and licensing. [The Standard – 16.1].
- (ii) Ensure that all records are kept for 6 years. [The Standard – 16.2].

17 Complaints about the Service

- 17.1 The Authority had established a "Corporate Customer Feedback Policy" that enabled members of the community and others affected by the services the Authority provided and the way it provided them, to make their views known. A summary was made available in leaflet format from civic buildings and on the Authority's Internet website.
- 17.2 A standard paragraph explaining the recipient's right to lodge an informal "appeal" was included in all correspondence relating to food and feedingstuffs law enforcement.
- 17.3 There had been no formal complaints against either the Environmental Health Service or the Trading Standards Service in relation to food or feedingstuffs law enforcement in the two years preceding the audit.

18 Liaison with Other Organisations

18.1 The Authority had liaison arrangements with neighbouring authorities and other appropriate bodies aimed at facilitating consistent enforcement. These included participation in the:

- South East Wales Food Safety Task Group;
- Greater Gwent Food Group;
- South East Wales Communicable Disease Task Group.

18.2 Minutes of liaison group meetings were available, and these confirmed that appropriate service representatives attended meetings regularly.

18.3 It was also noted that the Authority had seconded a Senior Environmental Health Officer to the local Health Board for 2 days per week to develop healthy workplaces initiatives. The Authority had subsequently taken these initiatives into account in its service development and planning processes.

18.4 The Authority also had liaison arrangements with:

- Monmouthshire School Dinners Pilot;
- Food Standards Agency Wales;
- Other local authorities;
- The Health Authority and successor bodies;
- Local colleges and other training providers;
- Farmers' Markets in Wales.

19 Internal Monitoring

- 19.1 The Authority had established a documented internal monitoring procedure that applied to food hygiene inspections.
- 19.2 There was evidence that internal monitoring of food hygiene and food standards enforcement activities had recently increased. Activity included qualitative and quantitative aspects such as:
- Service user questionnaires;
 - File reviews;
 - Personal reviews;
 - Performance monitoring;
 - Team meetings;
 - File and document checks;
 - Correspondence monitoring;
 - Internal training.
- 19.3 Commercial Team meetings took place on average every 10 weeks, and minutes showed that a variety of food law enforcement activities were discussed.
- 19.4 The Commercial Team had also undertaken a risk assessment consistency exercise.
- 19.5 The audit demonstrated, however, that internal monitoring had historically not been sufficient to ensure that the Authority was meeting its obligations and duties in relation to The Standard, relevant Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance.
- 19.6 The Trading Standards Team conducted regular Customer and Business Satisfaction Surveys, but there was no internal monitoring procedure that applied to feedingstuffs enforcement activities.

Recommendations

- 19.7 The Authority should:
- (i) Set up, maintain and implement documented internal monitoring procedures for food standards and feedingstuffs in accordance with all relevant Food Safety Act Codes of Practice and centrally issued guidance. [The Standard – 19.1]
 - (ii) Verify conformance with The Standard, relevant legislation, relevant Food Safety Act Codes of Practice, relevant centrally issued guidance, and its own documented policies and procedures in relation to all aspects of the service. [The Standard – 19.2]

20 Third Party or Peer Review

- 20.1 The Environmental Health Commercial Team had participated in the all-Wales Food Hygiene inter-Authority document review and compliance audit in 1999.
- 20.2 The Commercial Team expressed an interest in participating in any similar exercises arising in the future.

21 Food and Feedingstuffs Safety and Standards Promotion

21.1 The Authority demonstrated a commitment to food safety promotion.

21.2 The Environmental Health and Trading Standards services participated in a range of promotional activities and had plans for further work in this area. Activities included:

- Food safety week;
- "Safe and Sound" roadshow;
- Food hygiene awards;
- School meals project;
- Young consumer of the year;
- Educational talks.

21.3 The Authority had also issued press releases to publicise the service which were used by local newspapers in articles and news items.

Recommendations

21.4 The Authority should:

Ensure that it expands its promotional activities to include feedingstuffs. [The Standard – 21.1]

Auditors: Jane Davies
Rob Wilkins
Lindsay Horth
Tony Wheale

Food Standards Agency Wales
11th Floor Southgate House
Wood Street
Cardiff
CF10 1EW

ANNEX A

Glossary

Agricultural Analyst	A person, holding the prescribed qualifications, who is formally appointed by a local authority to analyse feedingstuffs 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 *	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• increasing the role of local people in deciding the priorities for local government services• improving the way authorities manage and review their business• building on the experience and expertise of staff. <p>* In Wales this has recently been replaced by the Wales Programme for Improvement</p>
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.
Environmental Health Officer (EHO)	Officer employed by the local authority to enforce food safety legislation.
Feedingstuffs	Term used in legislation to describe 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"> • Food Law Enforcement Standard • Service Planning Guidance • Monitoring Scheme • Audit Scheme <p>The Standard and the Service Planning Guidance set out the Agency's expectations on the planning and delivery of food law enforcement.</p> <p>The Monitoring Scheme requires local authorities to submit quarterly returns to the Agency on their food enforcement activities i.e. numbers of inspections, samples and prosecutions.</p> <p>Under the Audit Scheme the Food Standards Agency will be conducting audits of the food law enforcement services of local authorities against the criteria set out in the Standard.</p>
Full Time 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.
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.
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 food hygiene 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 feedingstuffs legislation.

Trading Standards
Officer (TSO)

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

Unitary Authority

A local authority in which all the functions are combined, examples being Welsh Authorities and London Boroughs. A Unitary Authority's responsibilities will include food hygiene, food standards and feedingstuffs enforcement.