

Response template for consultation on the review of the Food Law Code of Practice for the Food Hygiene and Food Standards Delivery Models (Wales)



Responses to this consultation are required by **23:59 on 19 May 2025**. Please state in your response whether you are responding as a private individual or on behalf of an organisation/company (including details of any stakeholders your organisation represents).

Completed consultation response forms should be emailed to CodeReviewResponses@food.gov.uk.

Name: _____

Organisation: _____

Email: _____

Country: [Choose an item.](#)

Questions in relation to Proposals 1 to 8:

Question 1a. In relation to proposal 1, an updated risk-based approach to the prioritisation and timescales for undertaking initial official controls of new food establishments:

Do you consider that the approach will provide CAs with the ability to deploy current resources more effectively? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which requires further consideration, and why).

Question 1b. In relation to proposal 1, an updated risk-based approach to the prioritisation and timescales for undertaking initial official controls of new food establishments:

If responding on behalf of a CA, how long would you estimate it would take, from a food hygiene perspective to desktop assess a new food business establishment?

Question 1c. In relation to proposal 1, an updated risk-based approach to the prioritisation and timescales for undertaking initial official controls of new food establishments:

Would you agree or disagree with the approach that is being proposed for timescales provided for initial controls of all food establishments.

Question 1d. In relation to proposal 1, an updated risk-based approach to the prioritisation and timescales for undertaking initial official controls of new food establishments:

Timescales for due official controls will remain, as currently, at 28 days, for all establishments. Do you agree or disagree with keeping the timescales for undertaking due official controls at 28 days? If not, why not?

Question 2a. In relation to proposal 2 for introducing flexibilities as to the methods and techniques of official controls, including the use of remote official controls, as described under proposal 2:

Do you consider that the flexibilities will enable CAs to deploy current resources more effectively? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why).

Question 2b. In relation to proposal 2 for introducing flexibilities as to the methods and techniques of official controls, including the use of remote official controls, as described under proposal 2:

if responding on behalf of a CA, would you, if implemented, utilise this flexibility and authorise officers, if competent, to undertake additional activities? If not, why not?

Question 2c. In relation to proposal 2 for introducing flexibilities as to the methods and techniques of official controls, including the use of remote official controls, as described under proposal 2:

It is proposed that intervention risk scores can be changed using official controls other than inspection or audit. Do you consider that the FHRs rating could also be updated based on a wider range of methods and techniques, as long as sufficient evidence was gathered to justify the revision? If not, why not?

Question 2d. In relation to proposal 2 for introducing flexibilities as to the methods and techniques of official controls, including the use of remote official controls, as described under proposal 2:

If responding on behalf of a CA, would the proposed widening of the methods and techniques that can be used to update an intervention risk score impact on how data is uploaded from your MIS to the FHRs portal? If so, please provide details of the potential impact.

Question 3a. In relation to proposal 3, extending the flexibilities as to who can undertake official controls and other official activities:

Do you consider that the flexibilities will enable CAs to deploy resources more effectively? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why).

Question 3b. In relation to proposal 3, extending the flexibilities as to who can undertake official controls and other official activities:

If responding on behalf of a CA, would you, if implemented, utilise this flexibility and authorise officers, if competent, to undertake additional activities, and if so, how many officers would you anticipate authorising? If not, why not?

Question 4. In relation to proposal 4, a clarification in approach to interventions at category E establishments, do you consider that the proposed approach will provide clarity and

consistency in the frequency of official controls at these establishments? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why).

Question 5. Do you agree that the proposed changes to the food standards intervention rating scheme will provide LAs with the ability to deploy current resources more effectively by improving the way in which the levels of risk and compliance associated with a food business are assessed? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the new model which require further consideration, and why).

Question 6. Do you agree that the proposed frequencies for official controls, specified in the decision matrix, within the new food standards intervention rating scheme are appropriate based on the levels of risk and compliance associated with the food business? If not, please identify any concerns you have with the proposed frequencies

Question 7. Following the outcome of the consultation, if the food standards delivery model is to be included in the Code, the FSA will be in a position to provide support in the same way that has been provided during the rollout in England and Northern Ireland. There is an intention to include a transition period for Welsh LAs. Bearing in mind the works to MIS providers have been undertaken for LAs in England and Northern Ireland do you feel with training and support from the FSA a 6-month transition is sufficient?

Question 8. In relation to the proposed changes to the amount of training and CPD that officers undertake on an annual basis, do you consider that the approach will provide CAs with greater flexibility to determine appropriate levels of CPD and training that officers undertake? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why).

Question 9a. In relation to proposal 8 - other amendments which provide clarity, improve consistency and keep pace with current practices:

Do you consider that the examples of where the additional score of 22 for vulnerable risk groups would not be used, provides further clarity and will improve consistency in the application of the score? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why)

Question 9b. In relation to proposal 8 - other amendments which provide clarity, improve consistency and keep pace with current practices:

Do you consider that moving the guidance on parts two and three of the food hygiene intervention rating scheme from the Statutory Guidance to the PG will improve clarity as to where the guidance can be found? If not, why not? (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why)

Question 9c. In relation to proposal 8 - other amendments which provide clarity, improve consistency and keep pace with current practices:

Do you have any objections to the inclusion of the following qualifications within the Code:

- **Trading Standards Professional Apprenticeship with the food module as an appropriate qualification for food standards**
- **Trading Standards Professional Apprenticeship with the animal feed module as an appropriate qualification for food hygiene at the level of primary production**
- **Degree in Environmental Health awarded by the Dublin Institute of Technology (awarded from June 2012 onwards)**
- **Degree in Environmental Health awarded by the Technological University Dublin**

Question 10. If you do have any objections, please provide reasons for these. (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why)

Question 11. Do you consider that the amendments to the terminology in the Code and PG has improved clarity and consistency between the documents? If not, why not? (Please specify which sections and any aspects of the proposal that require further consideration, and why)

Question 12. Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove references to the Competency Framework from the Code but retain references to it in the PG to enable the revised approach to competency assessment as set out in the draft Code. Please describe the main reasons for your answer. (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why)

Question 13. Do you agree or disagree with the removal of references to the PG and Framework Agreement from the Code? Please describe the main reasons for your answer. (Please specify any aspects of the proposal which require further consideration, and why)

Question 14. Does the layout/presentation of the proposed revisions to the Code facilitate consistent interpretation? If not, how could they be improved?

Question 15. In relation to impacts:

Question 15a.

Do you agree or disagree with our assessment of the impacts on CAs and our assumptions on familiarisation and training resulting from the proposed changes to the Code? Please describe the main reasons for your answer.

Question 15b. In relation to impacts:

Do you agree or disagree with our assessment of the impacts on CAs in relation to changes to procedures? Please describe the main reasons for your answer.

Question 15c. In relation to impacts:

If responding on behalf of a CA, how long would you estimate that it will take to update local policies and procedures if the proposals were implemented? If providing an estimate, please explain which proposal (or proposals) it relates to.

Question 15d. In relation to impacts:

Do you foresee any other impacts from the implementation of the main proposals detailed beyond those we have identified? Where possible, please explain your views, which proposal (or proposals) they relate to, and provide quantifiable evidence (for example, costs associated with updating your administration systems, existing procedures, the benefits of greater flexibility to allocate staff to activities.)

Question 15e. In relation to impacts:

Do you foresee any challenges with the implementation of the proposals under consultation? If yes, please outline what these challenges are and what, if any, solutions we should consider?

Thank you on behalf of the Food Standards Agency for participating in our consultation of the review of the Food Law Code of Practice.