



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

West Devon Borough Council

15 July 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

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

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.

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

CONTENTS

	Page
1.0 Introduction	5
- <i>Reason for the Audit</i>	5
- <i>Background and Scope of the Audit</i>	6
2.0 Executive Summary	9
3.0 Audit Findings	10
3.1 Organisation and Arrangements for Providing Statistical Monitoring Returns	10
3.2 Food Premises Database/Premises Profile	12
3.3 Reporting of Food Law Enforcement Activity	14
- <i>Inspections/Visits</i>	14
- <i>Enforcement Actions</i>	15
- <i>Food Sampling</i>	16
- <i>Complaints about Food/Food Premises</i>	16
3.4 Validation of Statistical Information	17
- <i>Internal Monitoring</i>	17
- <i>Third Party or Peer Review</i>	18
Action Plan for West Devon Borough Council	20
Annex: Glossary	21

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The report records the results of an audit of the statistical monitoring return arrangements of West Devon Borough Council. This report has been made publicly available on the Agency's website at www.food.gov.uk/enforcement. 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 West Devon 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 West Devon Borough Council was included within the audit programme because the Authority had validated its 2002 monitoring returns but subsequently provided additional information that moved the Authority out of the bottom 10% of authorities with low numbers of planned inspections achieved.

Background and Scope of the Audit

1.7 West Devon 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 covered West Devon Borough Council's arrangements for collecting, analysing and submitting monitoring data to the Agency on their food hygiene law enforcement activity. The audit examined all relevant areas of the monitoring form except Section 1 (documented procedures), but with a specific focus on Sections 2,3 and 6 (inspections, enforcement and sampling).

1.9 The on-site element of the audit took place at the Authority's offices at Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, Devon on 15 July 2004.

1.10 The audit assessed the Authority's conformance against the requirements of the Standard in relation to the 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 July 2004), 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

- 1.11 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.
- 1.12 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.
- 1.13 The Authority's food law enforcement service was provided by officers of the Environmental Health Section, within the Environmental Services Department of the Environment Directorate. The Environmental Health Service was split into 2 area teams (Tavistock and Okehampton) on a generic basis, with each officer responsible for all Service functions within their district.
- 1.14 The area teams were managed by 2 Principal Environmental Health Officers (PEHOs). A PEHO had overall responsibility for the food safety function. The additional total staff resource available for all Environmental Health duties comprised 4 EHOs, a Technical Officer (food sampling activities) and 1 part time food safety consultant (0.6 full time equivalent).

1.15 The Authority's Food Safety Service Plan provided the following details of the budgets for 'commercial enforcement services', which covered food safety, occupational health and safety and licensing activities. It was estimated that approximately 75% of this total budget would be allocated to food law enforcement.

Service budget	2003/2004	2002/2003	2001/2002
Commercial Services enforcement budget	£144,320	£131,489	£125,955
Estimated allocation for food safety law enforcement	£108,225	£98,617	£94,466

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 Overall, the Service's data recording, reporting and validation systems were reliable.
- 2.2 The Authority had installed new computer software in April 2003 and had a planned approach to the gradual inclusion of all food safety related enforcement activities onto the electronic database administration system. At the time of audit, the system's development was at an interim stage with only premises inspections fully transferred to the new database. Paper based records were still being used for collating some areas of information required by the monitoring returns to the Agency.
- 2.3 Audit checks on the database indicated that the Service had effective arrangements for ensuring that the food premises database was up to date and that information entered on the system relating to inspections was accurate. This data was also accurately reflected in the Authority's official monitoring returns.
- 2.4 A few minor discrepancies were identified in the returns relating to enforcement actions and food sampling, but in general, levels of activities currently collated from paper based records were accurately recorded and reported.
- 2.5 The Service had implemented effective arrangements for ensuring that accurate activity records were properly maintained. This was based on effective and efficient administrative back-up, which included dedicated and trained administration staff responsible for data input. The Service also carried out routine internal monitoring checks for anomalies both before and after information provided by enforcement officers was entered onto the system.

3.0 Audit Findings

3.1 Organisation and Arrangements for Providing Statistical Monitoring Returns

- 3.1.1 The Service maintained an electronic food premises database that was capable of providing the information required by the Agency's official monitoring returns. The system utilised commercially available software designed for the purposes of local authority environmental health services and which included modules specific to food safety law enforcement activities.
- 3.1.2 The database was utilised to record all relevant food safety work other than sampling and formal enforcement. These activities were recorded in hardcopy files.
- 3.1.3 The current software had been operational since April 2003. The food law enforcement data held on the previous database was reviewed and 'cleaned' prior to being electronically transferred to the new system. Software updates and upgrades were provided by on-line support direct from the provider.
- 3.1.4 The Authority participated in a customer technical support scheme operated by the software provider. This included 6 monthly visits from the provider's technical support staff and ensured the availability of a help-line, regular monitoring and maintenance of the system and the supply of software updates. The Service also attended meetings of a User-Group with other authorities operating the same software.
- 3.1.5 The food law enforcement component of the database was managed by the PEHO with responsibility for food safety, in liaison with the Environmental Services Administrative Officer (ESAO), who had overall responsibility for the Departmental system.
- 3.1.6 Officers' use of the system was controlled through password entry and restricted access levels. The ESAO alone was authorised to delete food premises inspections from the system. Additionally, the Service's Administrative Officer (AO) could close and delete food premises.
- 3.1.7 The Administrative Team entered all data provided by the Service's enforcement officers on the system. The enforcement officers were able to make 'free text' comments on the database to provide additional details against the activities and actions entered by the Administrative Team.

- 3.1.8 All relevant officers had attended a series of training sessions appropriate to their level of access and use organised by the software provider. The general training sessions had been attended at the time the software was installed and these had been followed up with further training and update briefings at subsequent Team Meetings.
- 3.1.9 The PEHO and the AO were responsible for collecting and analysing the data for the monitoring returns. This currently entailed downloading inspection data from the electronic database and manually collating information relating to other relevant activities from hardcopy records. This data was then transposed onto the electronic monitoring returns forms.
- 3.1.10 The PEHO had final responsibility for ensuring that the electronic monitoring forms were completed accurately and for signing-off the data prior to its submission to the Agency.
- 3.1.11 The database was backed up on a daily basis by the Authority's IT Department, with additional periodic monthly and annual back-ups of consolidated data. The data records were held in secure off-site storage.

3.2 Food Premises Database/Premises Profile

3.2.1 The Service had implemented a documented '*Procedure to Maintain an Accurate and Up To Date Food Premises Database*'. This procedure set out a range of measures to ensure that the system contained a complete premises profile from the date of its installation and for a continuing process of regular updates and checks to be maintained thereafter:

- Officers visited all commercial premises held on the Authority's current Business Rate list. Any relevant food businesses were registered and entered onto the database;
- Officers proactively confirm and update business registration details during visits, inspections and when travelling around the areas of the Borough for which they are responsible;
- Data input restricted to trained Administrative Team officers. The accuracy of information provided by enforcement officers monitored and checked prior to data entry and electronic data management reports run from the system on a routine and ad hoc basis to check for anomalies;
- Cross-referencing the business database with other sources of information received by the Service, such as planning applications, the local press and the local Tourist Association Annual Guide.

3.2.2 A further set of revised documented procedures provided guidance to the Administrative Team on the entering data for all relevant activities and included reference to the appropriate codes to be used.

3.2.3 The auditors were advised that the Service were attempting to set up an arrangement with food standards law enforcement officers at the County Council to ensure a reciprocal exchange of lists identifying changes to relevant premises.

3.2.4 A range of checks carried out during the audit tested the accuracy of the Service's food business premises database. These indicated that the premises entries on the system were up to date and that 12 food businesses checked specifically for this purpose were entered on the database and all were included in the Service's inspection programme.

3.2.5 The Authority's Food Safety Service Plan for 2004/2005 had not been drafted at the time of the audit. The Service Plan for 2003/2004 did not include a food premises profile by business type. The Authority's annual return for 2004/2005 showed the following premises profile by business type:

Premise Type	Number in Borough
Primary producers	7
Slaughterhouses	10
Manufacturers/processors	24
Packers	3
Importers/exporters	1
Distributors/transporters	11
Retailers	130
Restaurants and other caterers	418
Materials and articles manufacturers & suppliers	0
Manufacturers mainly selling by retail	29
TOTAL	633

Recommendation

3.2.6 The Authority should:

Ensure that the Food Safety Service Plan 2004/2005 is developed in full accordance with the Service Planning Guidance and that it includes the premises profile by business type. [The Standard – 3.1]

3.3 Reporting of Food Law Enforcement Activity

Inspections/Visits

- 3.3.1 The Authority's businesses' risk profile as of April each year forms the basis for the annual premises inspection programmes and it is this data that is reported to the Agency in the annual monitoring returns. The Service Plan 2003/2004 set out the premises risk profile and this is shown below together with the corresponding profile submitted by the Authority in its 2003/2004 annual return to the Agency:

Risk category	Numbers of premises	
	Service Plan	Monitoring return
A	5	5
B	46	43
C	357	341
D	63	58
E	114	99
F	51	40
Premises outside the programme	0	0
Unrated premises	0	0
Total	636	586

NB: *The data for food law enforcement activity quoted in this audit report, and/or submitted to the Agency by the Authority on the monitoring returns since 2002, had not been validated at the time of audit.*

- 3.3.2 The discrepancy between the 2 sets of figures arose because Members did not approve the Service Plan 2003/2004 until January 2004 and the data was derived from the system on different dates. The risk profile provided in the Service Plan did not, therefore, reflect the profile at the commencement of the financial year. However, the figures provided in the annual returns to the Agency were properly derived from the system to reflect the position as of April 2003.
- 3.3.3 The Service confirmed that all registered food businesses were included in the Authority's inspection programme and the nil return for unrated premises (ie new businesses due a first inspection) was accurate as of April 2003. Subsequent quarterly returns showed that 4 new businesses were inspected during the year and properly recorded.

- 3.3.4 A range of database management reports relating to recent inspection activity were run from the system during the audit and the Service's records of actual inspection activity were compared with the Authority's monitoring returns over comparable periods. No significant anomalies or discrepancies were identified.
- 3.3.5 The Authority was included within the audit programme because the Authority had validated 3 of the 4 quarterly monitoring returns for 2002/2003, but later provided additional information that apparently moved the Authority out of the bottom 10% of authorities with low numbers of planned inspections. However, the Service had been unable to submit the quarterly return for January-March 2003 when due because the new database was being installed at that time and the required information was temporally unavailable. The Authority notified the Agency of these circumstances and subsequently provided the quarterly return once the transfer of inspection data to the new database had been completed. When all 4 quarters returns were received by the Agency, the total figures for the year confirmed that the Authority was not amongst the bottom 10% of authorities in terms of food hygiene inspection levels.

Enforcement Actions

- 3.3.6 The Service had retained paper files for recording formal enforcement actions at the time of audit, pending further development of the database, although any written warnings issued to proprietors following inspections were required to be entered on the electronic system.
- 3.3.7 All inspection reports examined, that contained warnings of legal contraventions, had been entered on the database and were 'tagged' with the appropriate identifying code. These were accurately represented in the monitoring returns.
- 3.3.8 All formal enforcement actions carried out and completed by the Service over the period examined had been reported in the returns, other than 1 food seizure carried out in November 2003. The auditors were informed that this action had not been overlooked - the case had yet to be concluded and had entailed liaison with the County Council Trading Standards colleagues who were considering further formal enforcement action. The Service had intended to report the seizure once the outcome was known.
- 3.3.9 There was also a discrepancy relating to 2 formal cautions issued in respect of 1 business/premises. These had been inaccurately recorded in the returns as relating to 2 premises.

Food Sampling

- 3.3.10 Database checks of the level of food sampling recorded internally against those in the Authority's quarterly monitoring returns showed some apparent under-reporting. The Authority had also omitted to report the number of premises from which the samples had been taken in all of its quarterly returns for 2003/2004.

Complaints about Food/Food Premises

- 3.3.11 All food and food premises complaints received by the Service were accurately reported in the Authority's returns for all quarters examined during the audit.

Recommendation

- 3.3.12 The Authority should:

Ensure that the monitoring data currently compiled from hardcopy records (such as enforcement actions and food sampling) are collated accurately and verified prior to their submission.

[The Standard – 6.4]

3.4 Validation of Statistical Information

Internal Monitoring

- 3.4.1 The Service's *'Procedure for Food Hygiene Inspections'* included a section that set out the arrangements for ensuring effective 'Administration and Monitoring' of inspection related activity. These included:
- Use of standardised forms for capturing data about the businesses and inspection details;
 - Restriction of data inputting to trained Administrative Team officers. Enforcement officers were authorised only to make 'free text' entries on the system;
 - All inspection forms, letters and notices to be forwarded to the PEHO, together with the relevant premises files, for checking. Any discrepancies and anomalies to be raised with the appropriate officer and recorded. Each inspection report to be signed by the PEHO to confirm that it has been checked;
 - Following inspection, any proposed reduction in a businesses' risk rating from risk categories 'A' and 'B' to be authorised by the PEHO. Similarly, any inspections undertaken by an officer with the ordinary certificate in food premises inspection that result in a proposed elevation of the risk rating to high risk also required authorisation by the PEHO;
- 3.4.2 A range of premises files were examined during the audit. These provided clear evidence of documented internal monitoring activity and corrective actions.
- 3.4.3 The auditors were informed that a new procedure had recently been implemented to address problems in identifying and collating laboratory reports on unsatisfactory food samples. The new arrangement ensured that the PEHO received copies of all sampling reports and these were documented on a central register. This register was now used as the basis for completing the relevant sections of the monitoring returns.
- 3.4.4 The PEHO collated inspection activity data on a quarterly basis and prepared reports on the Service's performance against the Authority's local performance indicators for inspection levels.

3.4.5 The Service's documented procedures also required the PEHO and AO to routinely run various management reports from the system to check for any anomalies and discrepancies in the data.

Third Party or Peer Review

3.4.6 The Authority participated in the food law enforcement authorities' regional Inter Authority Audit (IAA) Scheme. Four audits of the Authority had been carried out to date in a rolling programme of partial audits. These had covered enforcement; officer authorisations; food complaints and infectious disease investigations. The protocol for these audits requires the authorities to develop an action plan to address any recommendations raised.

3.4.7 The Authority had also been subject to an IAA related to occupational health and safety law enforcement which had examined the accuracy of the Service's electronic database, the arrangements for data input and the checks carried out.

3.4.8 In January 2004, the Council's auditors examined the food safety database *'to test key controls and to ensure that they operate effectively'*. The stated objectives of this audit were to ensure:

- Adherence to management policies, directions and statutory requirements;
- That the Council maintains an accurate list of all properties which are involved in food handling;
- That adequate procedures are in place to ensure that all outlets are inspected on a regular and timely basis;
- That procedures are in place to ensure that any recommendations made by the Council to improve the standards of food safety are followed up;
- Staff training is adequate;
- Procedures reflect the guidance on EU and UK regulations on food safety;
- The adequacy and reliability of management information.

3.4.9 This Council's auditors found that, overall, the relevant procedures and controls on the database were adequate, that the system operated effectively and there were sufficient safeguards to protect the data from corruption. The database provided management information that was adequate and reliable for internal monitoring purposes. All 12 key control objectives examined by the audit, including the 7 listed above, were found to have been met in full.

Auditors: **John Questier**
 Ron Cheesman

Food Standards Agency

Local Authority Enforcement Division

Action Plan for West Devon Borough Council

Audit date: 15 July 2004

IMPROVEMENTS	BY (DATE)	TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	COMMENTS
Service Plan to be reviewed to ensure it accords with the guidance and that it includes premises profile and is submitted to members for approval.	31/12/04	3.2.6 Ensure that the Food Safety Service Plan 2004/2005 is developed in full accordance with the Service Planning Guidance and that it includes the premises profile by business type. [The Standard – 3.1]	Target date to coincide with Environment and Health Committee.
Process for compiling and collating hardcopy records has changed in that central registers of sample results and enforcement actions are now kept which are simple to verify prior to submission.	Completed	3.3.12 Ensure that the monitoring data currently compiled from hardcopy records (such as enforcement actions and food sampling) are collated accurately and verified prior to their submission. [The Standard – 6.4]	<p>Future service plans and improvement programmes will review the viability of moving from hardcopy records to computer records.</p> <p>The council is currently considering tenders for the provision of a corporate Document Management System for implementation in April 2005.</p>

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"> • 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.
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"> • 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.
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.