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All enquiries in relation to this report should, in the first instance, be directed to:

Contact: Andrea Cranfield  
Food Standards Agency  
Address: 1st Floor, Foss House, Peasholme Green, York YO1 7PR  
Email: Andrea.cranfield@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

Enquiries will then be forwarded either within the FSA or to another Department or Agency as appropriate.
1. Overall effectiveness of controls

Results of main performance indicators

Below is the UK’s achievement against objectives in the following sectors, as set out in the Multi-Annual National Control Plan (MANCP) for the United Kingdom (UK). The achievements of the UK follow the strategic aims of the Competent Authorities responsible for delivering Official Controls.

Food and feed sectors

- **Food establishments** – at the close of 2016 all Local Authorities (LA) in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (NI) were operating the Food Hygiene Ratings Scheme (FHRS). All LAs in Scotland were operating the Food Hygiene Information Scheme (FHIS).
- FHRS information was available for approximately 470,000 food businesses which is an estimated 90% of businesses within scope of the scheme. This is a 3% increase on 2015 (87%). FHIS information was available for approximately 47,400 food businesses and is an estimated 89% of businesses within scope (46,000 food businesses in 2015 - an estimated 87% of businesses within scope). FHRS in Wales is mandatory, and was mandatory in NI from Oct 2016.
- **Meat establishments** – during the year 91% of slaughterhouses (with or without co-located cutting plants) and 98% of standalone cutting plants were either Good or Generally Satisfactory in terms of compliance.
- During 2016/17 eight slaughterhouses (with or without co-located cutting plants) received an audit rating of Urgent Improvement Necessary.
- **Directly affected trade** – during 2016/17 1028 unannounced inspections were completed in England and Wales and 43 were completed in NI. Food Standards Scotland (FSS) completed 107 unannounced inspections in Scotland.
- **Dairy hygiene** – approximately 65% of dairy hygiene inspection visits in England and Wales resulted in follow up checks. This resulted in the majority of non-compliances being satisfactorily resolved within agreed timescales. In England and Wales there has been a reduction of 1.4% in dairy farms and a 1.5% decrease in the number of inspections. In Scotland there has been a reduction of 4% in dairy farms but a 28% increase in the number of primary inspections carried out.
- **Egg production** – during the year there was a decrease in overall compliance rates in egg production establishments in England and Wales during the latter half of 2016/17 (79% in 2015/16 to 66% in 2016/17). This seems to be connected to premises that had other non-compliance issues such as overstocking and in some part due to housing of birds because of Avian Influenza restrictions. Whilst NI saw a significant increase in guidance letters issued, Scotland saw a significant decrease.
- **Shellfish hygiene** – there were a total of 5143 samples taken between January-December 2016. There were 2,733 Microbiological (E.coli) samples taken, one Chemical Sample, 1,323 Toxin Flesh samples and 1,086 Phytoplankton samples (similar to the number tested in 2015/16 - 5108).
• **Organic operators** – in 2016 a total of 544 unannounced visits took place compared to 1,058 in 2015. 6,401 announced visits were made to operators in 2016 compared to 6,118 in 2015. Defra is confident based on the audit and assessment of the UK organic Control Bodies that they have effective control mechanisms in place to ensure satisfactory implementation of the organic control measures.

• **Feed establishments** – In the second year of the new feed delivery model (2015/16) the FSA continued to see positive results, including 98.9% of planned feed inspections delivered and 97% of LAs engaged in the process. 100% of LAs have been engaged in the process of planning controls in 2016/17.

• Out of the total Approval and Scheduled inspections carried out by the Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD) in 2016, 6.1% of Commercial Feed Mills were fully compliant (5.1% in 2015), 24.3% of On-Farm Manufacturers were fully compliant (15.9% in 2015) and 30.3% of Distributors were fully compliant (31.7% in 2015)

• **Fish inspections** - In 2016 the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) carried out 1062 inspections of establishments where first sale fish is handled.

### Animal Health and welfare and plant health sectors

• **Exotic disease** – in GB, the Animal and Plant Agency (APHA) investigated 205 reports of suspected exotic diseases in 2016. In England, in December 2016, High Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N8 was detected in a turkey in Lincolnshire. In Scotland, Low Pathogenic Avian Influenza in a flock of broiler breeder chickens in Fife was detected in January. In addition, two cases of European Bat Lyssavirus were reported in Daubentons bat in England in August and September. All incidents were successfully resolved.

• **Zoonoses** - the Salmonella National Control Programme monitoring results for 2016 indicate that the levels of the regulated *Salmonella* serovars are well below the EU designated targets. In total for all poultry sectors, 3,278 poultry flocks were subject to annual routine official sampling.

• **Animal welfare** – in GB, overall welfare on-farm compliance was 95.1% (down 0.6% from 2015), for vehicle inspections (welfare during transport) was 99% (same as in 2015). In NI, overall compliance during welfare on-farm inspections was 90% (down 1% from 2015) and during transport 99% (same as 2015). In the UK, no serious welfare at slaughter non-compliances was found on farms. In 2016/17 there were 190 instances of welfare non-compliances in slaughterhouses categorised as critical in England and Wales. In September 2016 the FSA presented a Board paper which outlined its “Deter, Prevent, Detect, Enforce” animal welfare action plan.

• Defra continued to implement its long term strategy to gradually achieve officially TB free (OTF) status for the whole of England by 2038 through a comprehensive suite of measures aimed at tackling all sources of TB infection. This includes tighter cattle testing and movement controls, improving biosecurity on farm and when trading, badger vaccination and badger control in areas where badgers are an important factor in spreading disease to cattle. The strategy was endorsed by the European Commission

---

1 Poses a serious and imminent risk to animal welfare or one where avoidable pain, distress or suffering has been caused.
and received EU financial support as part of the UK TB Eradication Programme for 2016.

- **Bee health** – GB Bee Inspectors carried out an extensive surveillance programme visiting 6,300 apiaries and inspecting over 31,774 colonies across the UK. Recorded foulbrood disease remains stable, at relatively low levels.

- Bee Inspectors in England tackled the first UK outbreak of the invasive non-native species, the Asian Hornet. A nest was discovered and destroyed. No further hornets have been seen in the region. Surveillance is ongoing to monitor for further outbreaks.

- **Aquatic animal health** – the successful completion of the official control programme supported the maintenance of approved zone status for the UK for a number of serious diseases of fish and shellfish and contributed to the protection of our high aquatic animal health status. Compliance by aquaculture production businesses (APBs) was good, reflecting the effectiveness of the inspection programmes, and the prompt and consistent actions taken in event of non-compliance.

- In 2016 the Fish Health Inspectorate hosted a mission from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) on the UK’s aquatic animal health regulatory regime to facilitate the continuation of trade in live aquatic animals for retail of food under the trade agreement between the European Union and Canada. The mission was considered a success and initial indications from the CFIA officials was that the UK has a robust and thorough regulatory system in place. Of particular note the CFIA officials described the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas) quality management system as exemplary.

- **Plant health** – Targets for the inspection of the majority of controlled plant health material imported into England and Wales were met.

2. **Information and trends on controls**

**Significant developments in relation to main priorities and risk assessment criteria and main trends in intensity and type of controls**

- **Strategic planning** – the FSA strategic plan was refreshed in 2015. The plan for 2015-20 works towards food we can trust and was developed by looking at the future challenges facing the food supply, and what this could mean for FSA in terms of its role to protect public health, and consumers’ interest in relation to food. The strategic outcomes are that:
  - food is safe and what it says it is; and
  - Consumers can make informed choices about what to eat and have access to an affordable healthy diet, now and in the future.

The FSA strategic plan for 2015-20 can be found at the following link: [FSA Strategy 2015-20](#)

- The FSS Strategy to 2021 which out its vision to create a food and drink environment in Scotland that benefits, protects and is trusted by consumers. This establishes 6 strategic priorities:
  - Food is safe
  - Food is authentic
  - Consumers have healthier diets
  - Responsible food businesses flourish
- FSS is a trusted organisation
- FSS is efficient and effective

The plan can be found at the following link: FSS Strategy

- **Food Crime** – The National Food Crime Unit (NFCU) has seen a substantial increase in the volume of incoming intelligence, with 1100 new intelligence logs created in 2016/17. This includes information from partners, whistle blowers, concerned members of the public and from the Unit’s own intelligence development work. Some of this increase will be attributable to the launch, in June 2016, of the anonymous reporting hotline Food Crime Confidential.

- FSS established the Scottish Food Crime and Incidents Unit (SFCIU) in October 2015. In 2016 the Unit continued to provide leadership in the prevention, investigation, disruption and enforcement of Food Crime and in the management of Food Safety incidents nationally for Scotland.

- **Imported food** – A total of 797 consignments were tested under Regulation 669/2009 in 2016. The decrease in the number of consignments tested and related non-compliances in 2016 can be attributed to the move of some commodities previously listed under Regulation 669/2009 to stricter safeguard measures.

- **Food surveillance** – the percentage of LAs using the UK Food Surveillance System (UKFSS) increased from 70% in 2015/16 to 71% in 2016/17. A total of 47,386 samples were placed on UKFSS in 2016/17. In the last five years sampling activity has increased by 16%

- 76% of labelling checks reported via the UK Food Surveillance System (UKFSS) were non-compliant (1310 out of 1715) compared to 51% last year (3,355 out of 6,509). The level of labelling checks seen is highly likely to be a reflection of LAs activity in supporting the coming into force of the provisions of the EU Food Information to Consumers.

- **Animal health and welfare** – following the introduction of the new Welfare of Animals at Time of Killing (England) Regulation 2015 and The Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (Wales) Regulations 2014 the FSA ensured replacement of the old slaughter licences under Welfare of Animals (Slaughter or Killing) Regulations 1995 (WASK). During the period from October 2015 to March 2017 176 WATOK licences, 3737 Certificates of Competency and 1592 Temporary Certificates of Competence were issued. In NI, 45 Certificates of Competence and 25 temporary Certificates issued under the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations (NI) 2014.

- In Scotland, 315 Certificates of Competence were issued under the Welfare of Animals at Time of Killing (Scotland) Regulations 2012 between January and December 2016 as part of the ongoing work to replace the old WASK slaughter licences.

- In August 2016, APHA introduced an intelligence capability to work closely with the FSA NFCU and FSS, to create an intelligence function that is able to assess threats from “farm to fork”.

- Overall in the animal health and welfare sectors the intensity and the type of controls remained relatively consistent over the past five years.

- **Zoonoses** – on-going progress continued to be made in controlling *Salmonella* in the UK poultry sectors. A reducing contribution of *Salmonella* to the overall burden of food-borne zoonoses has been observed in the UK in recent years.

- **Plant health** – There was a 5% increase in the number of consignments declared and requiring control over the previous year (100,571 in 2016/17 compared to 95,153 in 2015/16). Pest findings are the main reasons for
notifications; in England and Wales, they account for 61% of all notifications. The number of non-compliances and notifications to the European Commission for England and Wales rose to 1,041 in 2016. 387 related to documentary infringements, 632 for pests and 22 for diseases.

- Forestry Commission (FC) - In 2016, the FC customer service standard target of inspecting 95% of imports of wood and wood products on the day of notification of landing, or the next working day, was met.

3. Trend analysis of non-compliance

Statement of overall trends in compliance

- Based on collected data the overall level of compliance in all sectors, as in the previous years, was satisfactory when assessed against expectations.
- In all sectors the intensity and types of controls have remained relatively consistent over the past five years.

Main types of non-compliance

Food and feed sectors

- Food hygiene and safety breaches
- Food labelling
- Feed quality assurance controls
- Imported food
- Food fraud

Animal health and animal welfare and Plant health sectors

- Business Operators: Record-keeping/documentation irregularities, accommodation hazards, staff training, feeding.
- Competent authorities: Inspection frequency.

Identified causes

- Criminal negligence
- Ignorance of the law
- Less stringent standards in third countries in the case of food imports
- Human error

4. Enforcement: action taken in cases of non-compliance

Statistics on enforcement/enforcement trends

- Food establishments – LA Enforcement Monitoring data (LAEMS) is published by the FSA, and can be found at the following link: food.gov.uk/enforcement/monitoring/laems/mon.databyyear
- The official 2016/17 data is due to be published in September 2017.
- Meat establishments – four establishments in England were refused approval in 2016/17. One of these establishments went into liquidation and the other three establishments were subsequently granted approval once the required improvements and remedial actions had been taken. No meat establishments
were refused in NI in 2016/17. In Scotland, two establishments were refused approval in 2016/17, one of these was subsequently granted approval following required improvements being taken.

- In meat establishments Remedial Action Notices (RANs) and Hygiene Improvement Notices (HINs) showed an upward trend. RANs increased by 53% in 2016/17 (from 113 in 2015/16 to 222 in 2016/17 - 17% decrease in 2015/16) and HINs increased by 32% (from 113 in 2015/16 to 173 in 2016/17 - 6% decrease in 2015/16).
- *Dairy hygiene* – in 2016/17 there was a significant difference in the number of enforcement actions undertaken in the UK. Written advice decreased by 14% from 433 in 2016/17 to 373 in 2016/17, HINs decreased by 29% from 41 in 2015/16 to 29 in 2015/16. From 2015/16 until 2016/17 there has been an overall 38% decrease in HINs, demonstrating increased compliance levels.
- *Animal By Products* - two establishments had serious major non-compliances. Corrective actions were taken to contain and address the immediate problem followed by longer term preventative actions.
- *Fish inspections* - in 2016, for establishments where first sale fish was handled, 12 verbal re-briefs and 3 Official Written Warnings were issued by the MMO for breaches of Fisheries Control Regulations.
- *Plant health* - During 2016 in England and Wales, the number of non-compliant actions fell to 1,041 from 1,256 during 2015, a decrease of 17%. The number of actions is significantly lower in comparison to the period 2011-2015, when there has been a relatively consistent level of non-compliance actions of between 1,100 and 1,400 actions per year.

**Fines imposed**

- In GB in 2016/17 a total of £32,900 fines were imposed for food hygiene and food safety breaches by the courts following prosecutions taken by the FSA.
- In NI, the total level of fines imposed for hygiene and standard offences amounted to £21,450 plus £11,995 costs.
- In England and Wales 21 penalty notices and 13 warning letters were issued in 2016 for incomplete compliance with the requirements of the Salmonella National Control Programme in laying chicken flocks. This financial penalty system is not used in Scotland and NI. The penalty notice data for the years 2012/16 indicates a broadly stable trend in operator non-compliance with a slight decrease in 2016.

**Convictions**

- In 2016/17 there were seven convictions in GB relating to meat establishments (five in 2015/16) and no convictions relating to dairy establishments (three in 2015/16). There were no convictions in NI (0 in 2015/16).
- FSA continues to undertake investigations and referrals to the Procurator Fiscal on behalf of FSS for an interim period following the establishment of FSS on 1 April 2015. In 2016/17 there were two FSS Formal Warnings issued.

---

2 30 penalty notices and 20 warning letters were issued in 2015; 22 penalty notices and 11 warning letters were issued in 2014; 28 penalty notices and 13 warning letters were issued in 2013; and 27 penalty notices and 16 warning letters were issued in 2012.
in Scotland to meat establishments. The formal warnings from FSS are preliminary matters and do not include any fiscal penalty.

- There were 71 prosecutions by LAs in NI for hygiene, safety and standards (57 Hygiene & 14 standards) with one imprisonment (26 in 2015)
- In 2016, there were 79 convictions\(^3\) achieved under the Animal Health Act 1981 and other animal health and welfare legislation by LAs in England and Wales 135 in 2016)
- There were no prosecutions in Scotland. Prosecution by DAERA for Animal Welfare (six) and Hygiene (three) offences one sentence of imprisonment of three months suspended for two years.

### 5. National Audit Systems

#### Food and feed sectors

- In England, during 2016/17 core and focused audits were carried out in 26 LAs and 12 revisits were undertaken. In Scotland during 2016/17 Capacity and Capability audits took place in four LAs and one follow up audit to a previous core audit was undertaken.
- Individual audit reports and related LA action plans are published on the FSA website. All reports can be found at: [food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports](http://food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports)
- In Scotland, audit reports and LA action plans are available on the FSS website at: [foodstandards.gov.scot/](http://foodstandards.gov.scot/)
- In the 2016 calendar year FSA Internal Audit completed and issued five audit reports in relation to Official Controls in England and Wales and 2 in Scotland on behalf of FSS. FSA Internal Audits also audit some official controls delivered by the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA) on behalf of the FSA in NI. Four of the five audits conducted in England and Wales also covered NI. These audits were designed to provide assurance to FSA and FSS management and Boards that enforcement was effective, consistent, risk-based and proportionate.
- Defra Internal Audit carried out three audits and two follow up audits.
- The VMD carried out audits of the sampling procedures and processes performed by the FSA, FSS, Marine Scotland and National Bee Unit. A list of recommendations has been produced which have been implemented. No evidence of significant failings was found.

#### Main summary of audit results

- LAs/DAERA Units – there were 312 recommendations arising from these audits. Most recommendations arose from the audit of service delivery and business compliance in England and food and feed law enforcement service in Wales. Internal Audits – there were 32 recommendations arising from the findings by the Internal Audit team. Overall the results were satisfactory.

#### Main actions taken

---

LAs/DAERA Units – recommendations were agreed by the appropriate authorities, corrective action plans agreed with ongoing audit verification checks and/or site visits carried out.

Internal Audits – as of March 2017, in England, Wales and NI, 25 out of the 32 (78%) corrective actions agreed with management in the five reports issued in 2016 in relation to England, Wales and NI were reported to have been implemented. the equivalent figures for 2016 were 16 out of 29 (55%).

Animal health and welfare sectors

- Nine full audits (three in England, two in Scotland, and four in NI) plus one follow-up review in Scotland were carried out covering animal health and welfare and plant health sectors. In addition, Wales conducted an overarching review of compliance with Regulation 882/2004 including assurance mapping exercise, the results of which were fed into an audit needs assessment.
- APHA has developed an assurance/audit programme to effectively monitor the delivery of Official Feed and Food Controls under Regulation 882/2004. In 2016, an internal audit was completed on Animal By –Product controls and achieved a moderate rating with five recommendations, all of which were accepted and have since been implemented. A programme of audits to cover high risk OFFC controls has been agreed for next year.
- Two audits relating to animal traceability of official food/feed controls were carried out by the Rural Payments Agency (RPA) Internal Audit in 2016.
- Scottish Government’s Internal Audit Division (SGIAD) carried out two audits of ‘discreet official controls areas’ (as per their five year audit strategy)

Main summary of audit results

- Seven recommendations were made
- Overall, the audit results were satisfactory.

Main actions taken

- The Defra audit programme was successfully completed, and action taken to address any issues raised
- All APHA recommendations were accepted and implemented
- All VMD recommendations have been implemented.

6. Resources

Significant developments in the allocation of funding for controls/control programmes and Control staff

Food and feed sectors

- FSS provided grant assistance to Scottish LAs via collaboration with Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland (REHIS) to assist in training of student/trainee Environmental Health Officers (EHOs).
- A new feed delivery model for regional delivery by LAs and central coordination by the FSA was put in place from 1 April 2015. The new delivery model continues to ensure ongoing support for the delivery of a risk based feed interventions programme which will guarantee funding reaches front-line
services, the food chain is protected and the required level of assurance is provided to consumers, industry and government. In Scotland, local delivery will be replaced by a regional delivery model with central co-ordination during 2017.

Animal health and welfare sectors

- No significant changes.

Plant health sector

- The FC has received additional resources for planned visits since 2013 to increase its inspections of wood packaging material associated with known high risk commodities. This funding continued in 2015/16 & 2016/17. As a result of the funding, in 2016/17, the FC:
  - continued to employ a Cross Border Plant Health Liaison Officer, a Project Support Officer and an Assistant Economist to assist in the additional inspection programmes, contingency planning and financial impact assessments
  - increased inspections of wood packaging material associated with known high risk commodities at ports, leading to increased detection of non-compliant wood packaging material
  - met the EU minimum target inspecting 15% of all imported consignments of eight stated commodity codes

Significant changes in the Laboratories Networks / National Reference Laboratories (NRLs)

- No significant changes.

7. Actions taken to improve performance of control activities

Organisation

- During 2016/17 the changes made during 2015/16 to better align core functions and delivery were embedded to strengthen FSA Operations. The Operations Assurance Division was expanded to increase focus on delivery of animal welfare official controls and business transformation and intervention.
- Food Standards Scotland (FSS) was established on 1 April 2015 as the national food body for Scotland, with responsibility for those central Government functions previously carried out by the FSA in Scotland, including food and feed safety and standards, nutrition, food labelling, and meat inspection policy and delivery. In October 2015 FSS established the SFCIU. SFCIU are working collaboratively with Animal Plant Health Agency over the next 12 months on a pilot project where SFCIU will be assisting APHA in their investigations in health and welfare.
- During 2016/17 the Organisational Reform project was implemented in APHA with the aim of creating a stronger Service Delivery Directorate to improve delivery and enable the directorate to better meet future challenges whilst maintaining resilience and readiness to respond to disease outbreaks.
The changes made to Service Delivery within APHA has simplified higher level management structures and enabled veterinary resource to be utilised more to ensure that delivery is fully supported. Clearly defined roles, instructions and matrix management routes allow for better performance and improved quality assurance of professional standards. These changes have enabled a three country model to be delivered enabling the business to reflect the demands of our three policy customers and the creation of a single England field delivery team has allowed for more consistency and oversight of performance. The creation of administrative Customer Service Centres has enabled APHA to deliver work across England and GB in a consistent and efficient way, removing regional and local variations, ensuring end user needs are met.

The formation of DAERA in May 2016 has paved the way for a more joined up working relationship with regard to animal diseases in the wild. DAERA is now the Competent Authority for fish health, aquaculture, inland fisheries and the environment.

Legislation

- During the period under report the UK Government introduced a number of amendments to the UK plant health forestry and potatoes legislation.
- An amendment to the Food Safety and Hygiene Regulations came into force on the 15 October 2016.

Procedures

- The FSS Annex 5 Review Project was officially launched on the 1 October 2016, with the commencement of a pilot, consisting of 10 LAs, with the purpose of testing the new model for 12 months, followed by a detailed analysis of the outcomes.
- Defra and FSA issued 32 Official Veterinary Surgeon (OVS) Notes covering a variety of subjects from safeguard measures for fishery products to changes in import conditions live animals and animal products.
- In 2016, APHA PHSI import and plant passporting processes were audited and re-accredited under ISO 17020.
- The National Bee Unit, part of the Animal and Plant Health Agency, achieved ISO 17020 accreditation for its inspectorate programme, awarded by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS). The ISO 17020 standard specifies the requirements for the competence of organisations performing inspections and the impartiality and consistency of their inspection activities.

Information systems

**Food and feed sectors**

- In 2016, the UK issued a total of 353 RASFF notifications, two of which were later withdrawn.
- The FSA has a dedicated Raw Drinking Milk (RDM) area on its website giving the risks on consumption of Raw Drinking Milk. The new RDM webpage was
launched on 26 January 2016. The sale of RDM for direct human consumption is prohibited in Scotland.

- In 2016 the MMO received 41 intelligence reports with information in relation to establishments handling first sale fish.

**Animal health and animal welfare and Plant health sectors**

- In 2016 the Cefas FHI introduced electronic collection of data during compliance and surveillance inspections of fish and shellfish farms across England and Wales using tablet technology (the FHIPad).

**Training**

**Food and feed sectors**

- During 2016, the FSA carried out various training for 199 officers including lead auditors, unannounced inspectors, and meat hygiene inspectors (13 received animal welfare training)
- During 2016/17, 133 courses were held and 2619 LA officers were trained in England.
- During 2016/17, the FSA in Wales funded 25 training courses for 629 LA officers.
- During 2016/17 FSS held a training course for 15 LA and three FSS staff on “Bivalve Purification Operations”
- During 2016/17 FSS held a training course for 11 LA and one FSS staff on “HACCP in Speciality Cheese making”
- During 2016/17 FSS held a LA Workshop, in partnership with the Scottish Food Enforcement Liaison Committee (SFELC) Risky Foods Working group, to update Scottish Officers on the SFELC guidance “Safe Service of Less Than Thoroughly Cooked Beef Burgers” Officers from 30 out of 32 LAs attended.
- During 2016/17 FSS held a “Food Enforcement Partnership Event”, in collaboration with the SFELC and the Society of Chief Officers of Environmental Health in Scotland (SOCOEHS). Representatives from 31 out of 32 Scottish LAs, SFELC, SOCOEHS and REHIS attended.
- During 2016/17 FSS held a launch event for the Scottish Food Law Code of Practice (annex 5) review. Officers from 31 out of 32 Scottish LAs attended.
- During 2016/17 FSS held a launch event for the implementation of the “Scottish National Database”. Officers from 28 out of 32 Scottish LAs attended.
- Between April 2016 and March 2017 12 classroom-based training courses were provided to 116 inland and Port Health officers in England, Wales and NI. This is a specialist area of food policy where restrictions change quarterly in accordance with latest intelligence and enforcement.
- In 2016 the MMO ran six training courses for Marine Enforcement Officers from the MMO, all of which related to fisheries compliance and enforcement.

**Animal health and animal welfare and Plant health sectors**

- Over 1278 APHA and DAERA veterinary and technical staff attended several induction and animal health and welfare training events.
Changes to UK Multi-Annual National Control Plan 2013 - 2018 (MANCP)

- The MANCP was extended to March 2018 in March 2016. The MANCP was also updated in 2016. The updated MANCP can be accessed at the following link: food.gov.uk/enforcement/regulation/europeleg/feedandfood/ncpuk

8. Actions taken to improve performance of Business Operators

Training

- In December 2016, the FSA published a guidance package on ‘Food Sold Online’
- In 2016, the FSA produced a library of free e-learning, guidance, posters, videos and tools to support the enforcement community and food industry to learn about the requirements of food labelling and how to comply with them.
- Guidance on the application of EU food hygiene law for the community and charity food provision was produced in March 2016
- Guidance to LAs on food brokers was produced in April 2016.

Safety, quality and information campaigns

- Rare burgers campaign - The FSA launched this communication activity on 25 August 2016 to coincide with National Burger Day and the Bank Holiday Weekend.
- Food waste campaign - The FSA focussed its annual Food Safety Week (4-10 July 2016) on raising awareness of food waste, and reminded consumers of the risks of eating food past its use-by-date and keeping the leftovers for longer than they should be kept.
- FSS ran a Scotland-wide marketing campaign, ‘Don’t let Pink Chicken spoil summer’ over the summer of 2016, focused on highlighting the issues of undercooked chicken and potential for campylobacter food poisoning when barbecuing. The campaign was aimed at those most at risk and/or less likely to undertake relevant food safety behaviours: a younger, more affluent and predominantly male audience.
- December 2016 saw a re-run of FSS’s successful festive food safety marketing campaign, ‘Food poisoning is the last thing on anyone’s list’ which this time focused on washing hands and not washing raw poultry.
- FSS also ran a healthy eating social marketing (behaviour change) campaign in September 2016. The campaign, ‘Change our Future’, was designed to shine a light on our unhealthy snacking culture and encourage parents and children to cut down on the volume of ‘discretionary’ foods they’re consuming on a daily basis, to help address Scotland’s obesity crisis and associated ill health. The campaign motivated 71% of the target audience to take action, and re-ran in March 2017.
- FSS also ran road shows and attended events across Scotland in 2016 to raise awareness amongst different audiences of food safety best practice, including the Royal Highland Show, Freshers’ Fairs and the Scottish Learning Festival.
• FSS ran waves two and three of its consumer tracking survey, ‘Food in Scotland’, and engaged directly with over 3000 individuals in market research.
• The UK Plant Health Information Portal went live in November 2016. This is a shared resource providing information about plant pests and diseases, including the assessments of risk undertaken by government. The data underpinning those assessments is included in the portal. planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk
• The Scottish Government published the Scottish Plant Health Strategy in Spring 2016

Guides to good practice

• In 2016 work continued on reviewing APHA guidance as part of the Defra Smarter Guidance Review project and transition to GOV.UK website. The aim of the project was to ensure Defra group content on GOV.UK meets customer needs including advice on how to request government services and comply with regulations. The focus was also on making guidance simpler, clearer and easier to understand.
• The Cefas FHI has continued to engage with other government agencies on improving working practices in a number of areas including with Natural England on habitats regulation assessments, the Environment Agency (EA) on response to disease outbreaks in wild aquatic animals, and FSA on contingency planning and support during emergencies.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

1.1 The UK MANCP covers the period April 2013 to March 2018. This document is published on the FSA website at: food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2015/13748/uk-multi-annual-national-control-plan

1.2 Each MANCP is prepared jointly by the Food Standards Agency (FSA), Food Standards Scotland (FSS), the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and its agencies, the Department of Health (DH), the Chemicals Regulation Division (CRD) of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), the Scottish Government Agriculture, Food and Rural Communities Directorate (SG AFRC), the Welsh Government Sustainable Futures (WG SF) and the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA). The plan satisfies the requirements of Regulation (EC) 882/2004 on official controls, and:

- describes the roles and responsibilities of the competent authorities and associated bodies responsible for official feed and food, animal health and animal welfare, and plant health controls;
- outlines how these authorities meet the requirements of Regulation (EC) 882/2004;
- provides an overview of how these authorities and other bodies work together to safeguard public and animal health;
- sets out the strategic objectives and planned control activities.

1.3 Regulation 882/2004 also requires Member States (MS) to produce annual reports on the implementation of their MANCP. This is the tenth annual report and has been prepared jointly by the departments and agencies mentioned above.

1.4 The scope of this report is consistent with that of the MANCP and covers control systems in the UK in respect of feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules, and plant health rules under Directive 2000/29/EC.

1.5 The Commission’s guidance on the content of annual reports on implementation of MANCPs has been taken into account.

---


1.6 It should be noted that in the UK much of the data on official controls and associated activities is collected on a financial year basis (1 April to 31 March) rather than a calendar year basis. Accordingly, financial year data is often used in this report rather than data for a calendar year. The period for data presented is shown throughout the report and every effort has been made to ensure the same period is used from year to year. Additionally, responsibility for many of the control activities covered is de-centralised and the collection, validation and analysis of data at the centre are major exercises, given the number of authorities involved. As a result, analysis of data for the financial year 2016/17 is not always possible. Where this is the case, data for the 2015/16 period has been reported and has been indicated where appropriate.

1.7 It should be noted that whilst each year care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the data provided there may be instances where the data reported in previous years has been subsequently amended. This is in order to take account of improved systems of reporting, or of data entries being received after publication of this report.

1.8 Whilst care has been taken to ensure that the web links contained in this report are correct at the time of publication and submission to the European Commission, changes may occur.

1.9 This tenth report gives details of:
- the effectiveness of controls, including information about trends on controls and non-compliance, and about enforcement measures;
- How audits were implemented and results of audits;
- changes in the allocation of funding, in laboratory networks and NRLs and;
- Actions taken to improve the performance of control bodies and of business operators.
CHAPTER 2
EFFECTIVENESS OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS

Official controls in the food and feed sectors

FSA Operations

2.1 During the year 2016/17 the FSA Board was updated on Operational activity through the FSA Resource and Performance Update at the FSA Business Committee. The Resource and Performance updates can be accessed at the following links:

- Resource and Performance update September 2016 2016/17 Quarter one results and forecast
- Resource and Performance update November 2016 2016/17 Quarter two results and forecast
- Resource and Performance update March 2017 2016/17 Quarter three results and forecast
- Resource and Performance update June 2017 2016/17 Quarter four results and forecast

FSS Operations

2.2 A performance reporting system for updating the FSS Board has been developed. The first annual report on performance was presented in October 2016. Further information on the FSS Board can be accessed here: foodstandards.gov.scot/about-us/who-we-are/board/board-meetings.

UK Local Authority (LA) food law enforcement

2.3 LAEMS is published by the FSA. At the time of writing this report interim 2016/17 information on food law enforcement is available at the following link: food.gov.uk/enforcement/monitoring/laems/mondatabyyear. This will be updated once the official LAEMS data is published in September 2017.

Meat hygiene

FSA

2.4 In 2016/17 the FSA delivered official controls in 1015 approved meat establishments in England and Wales with DAERA providing official controls in 54 approved meat establishments in NI. As at 31 March 2017 this included:

- 292 slaughterhouses in England and Wales and 19 in NI
- 48 game handling establishments in England and Wales and 3 in NI

Approved establishments may carry out more than one function
• 895 cutting plants (including market stalls) in England and Wales and 32 standalone cutting plants in NI

2.5 During the year FSA Operations and DAERA continued carrying out inspections to approved meat establishments on an unannounced basis.

2.6 In addition internal audit arrangements were carried out by the FSA Internal Audit team and gave management and the FSA Board assurance that delivery of official controls was efficient and effective across a range of approved meat establishments. In NI, parallel audits were carried out by FSA.

FSS

2.7 In 2016/17 FSS delivered official controls in 1028 approved meat establishments in Scotland. As at 31 March 2017 this included:

• 30 Slaughterhouses
• 15 Game Handling Establishments
• 72 Cutting Plants

Approval of meat establishments

2.8 For the period 2016/17, across the UK the FSA/FSS received 286 applications for approval or approval related activity (249 in 2015/16).

![No. of approval applications received by FSA/FSS during 2016/17](image)

2.9 In 2016/17, the split of approval activity/outcomes in the UK in comparison with 2015/16 can be demonstrated as follows:

---

8 Approved establishments may carry out more than one function
Refusals

2.10 Four establishments in England were refused approval in 2016/17. One of these establishments went into liquidation and the other three establishments were subsequently granted approval once the required improvements and remedial actions had been taken.

2.11 In Scotland, two establishments were refused in 2016/17. One was subsequently granted approval once improvements had been actioned.

FBO audits in meat establishments

2.12 2016/17 represented the second full year of data from a new style audit system introduced by FSA and FSS from August 2014.

2.13 Official controls for meat in NI are delivered by DAERA. Although audit functions are carried out using a slightly different delivery model in NI, the policy is the same across the UK. Audits of FBOs in NI are carried out by a small team of DAERA OVs dedicated to that work area.

2.14 Where non-compliances are recorded against specific questions, these are categorised as minor, major or critical, depending on the nature and severity of the non-compliance. The number of non-compliances in all sections provides the outcome of the audit, which are:

- Good
- Generally satisfactory
- Improvement necessary
- Urgent improvement necessary.

Audit outcomes determine audit frequencies. Those businesses achieving good standards now benefit from less frequent audits.

2.15 The following graphs provide a breakdown of the proportion of UK businesses in each audit outcome based on the latest full FBO audits as at 31 March 2017:
2.16 The above data represents 1,120 full audits for the UK that were completed in the 2016/17 financial year. The data should be considered in the context that any establishments that were conditionally approved will not be subject to
audit until full approval was obtained. Also slaughterhouses with or without a co-located cutting plant that had received a good rating in 2015/16 would not be subject to another audit for 18 months. Those businesses achieving good standards now benefit from less frequent audits. The following audit frequencies apply to slaughterhouse/co-located cutting plants and approved game handling establishments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit outcome</th>
<th>Follow up partial audit</th>
<th>Full audit frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfactory</td>
<td>1 interim visit</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>Within 1 month</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>Within 1 month</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.17 An exception to the above timescales is if the establishment is approved for exporting to third countries in which case the maximum frequency until the next audit would be 12 rather than 18 months.

2.18 Standalone cutting plants do not have routine official attendance; they therefore have the following frequencies in place for full and partial audits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Outcome</th>
<th>Follow up partial audit</th>
<th>Minimum number of unannounced inspections during interim audit period</th>
<th>Full audit frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfactory</td>
<td>1 interim visit</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>Within 1 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>Within 1 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.19 At the end of March 2017 93% of slaughterhouses (with or without co-located cutting plants) and 88% of standalone cutting plants were at least generally satisfactory in terms of compliance.

2.20 Since January 2017, establishments achieving two consecutive Good outcomes are entitled to an extended audit frequency (EAF) as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended audit frequencies for slaughterhouses / co-located cutting plants and approved game handling establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good / Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extended audit frequencies for standalone cutting plants and cold stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit outcome</th>
<th>Follow up partial audit</th>
<th>Minimum number of unannounced inspections during interim audit period</th>
<th>Current full audit frequency</th>
<th>Extended audit frequency</th>
<th>Minimum number of unannounced inspections during interim audit period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good / Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urgent Improvement Necessary**

2.21 Audit outcomes are based on an assessment across all areas providing a reliable indicator on standards. The FSA and FSS publish audit outcomes for all FSA and FSS approved meat establishments.

2.22 During 2016/17 six slaughterhouses (with or without co-located cutting plants) and two standalone cutting plants received an audit outcome of Urgent Improvement Necessary; however as at 31 March 2017 there were two slaughterhouses (with or without co-located cutting plants) and no standalone cutting plants still had this rating. The intervention protocol seeks improvements in compliance through education, advice and enforcement action.


**Unannounced inspections in cutting plants**

2.24 Unannounced inspections (UAIs) by official auxiliaries in standalone cutting plants also take place between scheduled audits, with follow-up visits where enforcement action or monitoring is considered necessary. While FSS carry out similar visit schedules they deploy trained Meat Hygiene Inspectors to undertake unannounced inspections in non-RTE establishments. Official Veterinarians (OVs) carry out UAIs in all RTE establishments.

2.25 During 2016/17 1028 unannounced inspections were completed in England and Wales and 43 were completed in NI. FSS completed 107 unannounced inspections in Scotland between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2017

**Enforcement**

2.26 The following graph shows the numbers and types of enforcements served by the FSA and FSS in slaughterhouses/game handling establishments and cutting plants in the UK over the last five years:

---

9 [food.gov.uk/business-industry/meat/audit/intervention-protocol](http://food.gov.uk/business-industry/meat/audit/intervention-protocol)
2.27  The above shows an upward trend in the enforcement action taken throughout the UK. The above shows the results for the UK cumulatively. For enforcement action in Scotland notices are served under Food Hygiene (Scotland) Regulations 2006. In addition to those enforcement actions highlighted above FSS also have Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Notices, of which in 2016/17 none were served.

**FSA - Specified Risk Material (SRM) controls**

2.28  Since March 2014, the relaxation on Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathies (BSE) testing requirements within the UK has continued.

2.29  During 2016/17, 100% inspection of bovine and ovine carcases for SRM removal at slaughterhouses was carried out. Verification and audit of FBO processes for removal, storage, staining and disposal of SRM was carried out in authorised slaughterhouses and cutting plants on a risk-based frequency. The following graph shows SRM breaches referred for investigation in the UK for the last five years. Two referrals for investigation at one plant, were submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service, and resulted in a conviction.
There were no SRM breaches in NI in 2016/17.

2.30 During 2016/17 DAERA were successful in their application for NI to be considered as a BSE negligible risk region. The OIE decision was ratified at their meeting in May 2017. A Commission proposal has been drafted for the agreement of the other 27 MS.

FSS - Specified Risk Material (SRM) controls

2.31 During 2016/17, 100% inspection of bovine and ovine carcases for SRM removal at Scottish slaughterhouses was carried out. Eight SRM breaches were referred for investigation and appropriate enforcement actions were taken. Verification and audit of FBO processes for removal, storage, staining and disposal of SRM was carried out in authorised slaughterhouses and cutting plants on a risk-based frequency.

Milk production hygiene

2.32 The number of milk production holdings as at 31 March 2017 in the UK is shown in the tables below. The table also sets out the combined number of primary and secondary inspections (which took place as a result of non-compliance issues highlighted from the primary inspection) in 2016/17. Approximately 65% of visits in in England and Wales resulted in follow up checks, either via digital evidence of compliance provided by the holding, or physical visit by an FSA inspector. This resulted in the majority of non-compliances being satisfactorily resolved within agreed timescales.
England and Wales

2.33 The FSA has direct responsibility for delivery of dairy hygiene inspections in milk production holdings in England and Wales. There has been a decrease in the number of dairy farms in England and Wales over the year (1.4%). There is a high percentage of Assured Dairy Farms (ADF) in England and Wales (91%) giving those establishments a 10 year visit frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of milk production holdings / milk processing establishments</td>
<td>9471</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>13774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of primary inspections</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of secondary inspections</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSS

2.34 In Scotland inspections in milk production holdings are carried out by 32 individual LAs. Over the past year, the number of dairy farms in Scotland has reduced by 4%. Dairy farms are subject to inspection, there has been a 28% increase in the number of such inspections.
2.35 In NI inspections in milk production holdings and liquid milk processing establishments are carried out by DAERA. In NI Quality assured farms represent approximately 50% of the total number of farms (currently 1623 out of 3,251 at April 2017).

Summary

2.36 The number of inspections and the extent to which problems were resolved after secondary inspection indicated that controls were effective throughout the UK.

2.37 A compliance rating system was developed and introduced in 2015, based on inspection outcomes; this provides improved management information and distinguishes further the actual significance of any non-compliance identified in relation to the risk for public health, and results in the establishments being given one of four compliance ratings.
2.38 The main non-compliances noted related to failure to maintain hygiene standards – cleanliness of doors, walls and floors in the dairy, equipment cleanliness and cleanliness of roofs and walls in the milking parlour.

2.39 All Raw Drinking Milk (RDM) producers are subject to six monthly inspection visits and quarterly sampling and testing (cows) or LA sampling checks (other species) against criteria in the domestic legislation. In practice, this means enforcement officials visit production holdings quarterly. If the milk fails to comply with the microbiological criteria, this prompts an inspection visit and follow-up testing.

2.40 Establishments handling and processing high risk products, those with an unsatisfactory history of compliance and those where there is low confidence in management require inspections at least every six months. Official controls for RDM establishments are comparable or more stringent than the general approach. The inspection compliance ratings outcomes are also published on the FSA website\textsuperscript{10} to provide consumer information and increase compliance in this sector.

**Egg production hygiene**

2.41 Inspections of egg production sites in England and Wales are carried out by APHA on behalf of the FSA to ensure compliance with the Food Hygiene Regulations. In Scotland, the SG’s Poultry Unit carry out inspections on behalf of FSS. In NI this work is carried out for the FSA by DAERA.

2.42 The following table shows the total number of registered egg production sites and number of inspection visits in the UK for 2016/17:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/2017</th>
<th>England &amp;Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of registered egg production sites</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of inspections</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Inspections compliant</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Inspections not compliant</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**England and Wales**

2.43 Inspections in England and Wales are prioritised according to a risk assessment and there is increasing historical data to inform that assessment. Compliant establishments are those where no improvements are needed. There has been a decrease in compliance rates from 2015/16; this is also reflected in the number of guidance letters issued during this year and one HIN being served.

2.44 The following charts show egg production enforcement across the UK over the past five years:

### Egg production enforcement - England & Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Inspections</th>
<th>No. of F/Up inspections</th>
<th>Guidance Letters</th>
<th>Warning Letters</th>
<th>HINs</th>
<th>Overall Compliance Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During 13/14 APHA/FSA successfully prosecuted an egg producer under the hygiene regulations**

### Scotland

### Egg production enforcement - Scotland
Shellfish hygiene

England and Wales

2.45 In England and Wales between 1 January and 31 December 2016, a total of 1,323 shellfish samples were received as part of the routine biotoxin monitoring programme. 1,178 samples were tested for Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning (ASP) toxins. ASP was detected in 22 of the samples analysed, however no exceedances of the maximum permitted level of 20mg/kg were reported and therefore no closures were required. 1,228 samples were tested for Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning (PSP) toxin with seven samples exceeding the maximum permitted level of 800 µg/kg leading to closures in two production areas. 1,224 samples were tested for Lipophilic toxins (LTs) returning 67 results exceeding the maximum permitted level of 160µg/kg for Okadaic Acid/Dinophysistoxins/Pectenotoxins leading to closures in seven production areas.

Scotland

2.46 In Scotland, between 1 January and 31 December 2016, 2,882 shellfish flesh samples were analysed and a further 28 verification samples tested. During this reporting period, 191 inshore samples breached MPL for lipophilic toxins. Six samples were found to contain PSP toxins above the MPL of 800µg STX eq./kg shellfish. Four inshore samples exceeded the ASP MPL of 20mg [domoic/epi domoic acid] (DA)/kg shellfish flesh. Additionally, for the same monitoring period, a total of 1,301 phytoplankton (seawater samples) were analysed.

NI

2.47 In NI between 1 January and 31 December 2016, 444 shellfish samples were received as part of the routine biotoxin monitoring programme, none of which exceeded the EU statutory limits for toxins. 592 samples were received for phytoplankton monitoring (seawater). 283 samples were collected by FSA and
analysed for microbiological contamination, with 67 samples submitted by food business operators under a MoU between the FSA and official control laboratory. As part of the annual chemical contaminant monitoring programme in NI, 17 samples were collected and analysed for heavy metals and PAHs with 7 of these also tested for dioxins and PCBs – none of which exceed EU regulatory limits.

**Fish – First sale**

2.48 In 2016 the MMO carried out 1062 inspections of establishments where first sale fish is handled. Checks were made to ensure compliance with the traceability requirements of the Fisheries Control Regulation. For establishments where first sale fish was handled, 12 verbal re-briefs and 3 Official Written Warnings were issued for breaches of Fisheries Control Regulations.

**Mycotoxins**

2.49 The total number of Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) notifications for mycotoxins was 64 in 2016, which shows there has been an increase this year compared to 2015. With regards to herbs and spices and nuts there is no set trend for the number of RASFFs over the long term. The chart below gives the number of RASFF notifications for mycotoxins in food in the previous five years:

2.50 The majority of samples were compliant for mycotoxins. In cases of non-compliant samples that were reported, either a product withdrawal or a product recall was carried out based on a risk assessment. If appropriate, a RASFF was also issued.

**Testing carried out under Regulation (EC) 1152/2009 and Regulation (EC) 884/2014**

2.51 The table under section 2.53 illustrates the number of samples taken for aflatoxins as required by Regulation (EC) 1152/2009 and Regulation (EC) 884/2014, alongside the number of non-compliances. Commission Regulation (EU) 884/2014 was introduced on 3 September 2014 and consolidates into
one regulation previous official controls governing the import of certain foodstuffs from certain non-EU countries due to contamination risk by aflatoxins. It repealed and replaced Commission Regulation 1152/2009, which required substantial amendments and extends the scope to include feed.

Testing carried out under Regulation (EC) 884/2014

2.52 The table below illustrates the number of samples taken for aflatoxins as required by Regulation (EC) 884/2014, alongside the number of non-compliances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Originating country</th>
<th>No. of consignments tested</th>
<th>No. with aflatoxin levels above the maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various products including: groundnuts, hazelnuts, pistachios, nutmeg, dried fruits, dried spices, egusi seeds</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>457</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.53 Overall the level of non-compliance is low and similar to 2015.

Import controls

2.54 During 2016 operational targets for controls on imported food and feed at points of entry were met, including the additional controls required at points of entry under various EU safeguard measures and Regulation (EC) 669/2009.

2.55 In 2016, LAs and Port Health Authorities (PHAs) undertook official controls on food imported from third countries to check for compliance with EU food law requirements. This included controls required under various EU safeguard measures on certain imported food and feed; controls for food contact materials from China and Hong Kong (required under Commission Regulation (EU) 284/2011 due to the risk to public health); as well as controls under Commission Regulation (EC) 669/2009 as amended. The controls were applied on products listed under the relevant regulations, which included 100% documentary checks and the prescribed levels for identity and physical checks, including sampling and analysis.

2.56 Under the EU safeguard measures 1630 consignments were tested in 2016. The following graphs show the number of consignments tested and non-compliances over the past five years. The relative increase in the number of non-compliances in 2016 (20% as compared with 16% in 2015) can be again attributed to an increase in Indian betel leaves failing laboratory checks due to Salmonella contamination. An increase in the number of products now caught by the Aflatoxins safeguard measure has also contributed to this trend.
Various EU Safeguard Measures

2.57 The table below sets out imported food and feed sampling activities in 2016 under various EU safeguard measures:

**Imported food & feed sampling activities under EU safeguard measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision/Regulation</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Consignments Tested</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/884/EU</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Rice products</td>
<td>Unauthorised GMOs</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284/2011</td>
<td>China &amp; Hong Kong</td>
<td>Melamine &amp; polyamide plastic kitchenware</td>
<td>Formaldehyde &amp; primary aromatic amines (PAAs)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/381/EU, amended by 2016/1774</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Aquaculture fishery products</td>
<td>Certain pharmaceutically active substances</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258/2010 amended by 2015/175</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Guar gum</td>
<td>Pentachlorophenol &amp; dioxins</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/166 *</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Betel leaves</td>
<td>Salmonella</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961/2011 amended by 996/2012</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Food, feed</td>
<td>Iodine-131, caesium-134, caesium-137</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884/2014 amended by 2016/2106</td>
<td>Various countries</td>
<td>Various products including: groundnuts, hazelnuts, pistachios, nutmeg, dried fruits, dried spices, egusi seeds</td>
<td>Aflatoxins</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Regulation 2016/166 came into force on 12/02/2016 – above figures include the period from 01/01/16 to 11/02/16 when Betel leaves were controlled under Regulation 669/2009.

2.58 A total of 797 consignments were tested under Regulation 669/2009 in 2016. The following graphs show the numbers of consignments tested and the...
number of non-compliances over the past five years. The decrease in the number of consignments tested and related non-compliances in 2016 can be attributed to the move of some commodities previously listed under Regulation 669/2009 to stricter safeguard measures.


![Graphs showing number of consignments tested and non-compliances found](image)

2.59 The results of the controls as required under Regulation (EC) 669/2009, EU safeguard and additional control measures in Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No. 178/2002 and Article 48 of Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004 were sent to the Commission each quarter, although this frequency changed to six-monthly for Regulation 669/2009 as from 1 July 2016. Some safeguard measures were amended or revoked during the year (see table below), and the levels of controls changed as a result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amended Import controls 2016</th>
<th>New Import Controls in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Aquaculture from India (2010/381/EU), amended Oct 2016</td>
<td>• Japanese food imports, Fukushima (2016/6), Jan 2016 (repealing 322/2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2016/1774)</td>
<td>• Betel leaves from India (2016/166), Feb 2016, previously controlled under 669/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2016/884)</td>
<td>(2016/874)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.60 In January 2016 Commission Implementing Regulation 2016/6 repealed and replaced Regulation (EU) No 322/2014 on the import of feed and food originating in or consigned from Japan following the accident at the Fukushima nuclear power station.

2.61 In February 2016 Regulation 2016/166 was introduced following continuous high frequency of non-compliance for the presence of Salmonella in imports of
paan leaves (betel leaves) from India, until then controlled under Regulation 669/2009.

**Genetically Modified (GM) foods**

2.62 Where there is information available that there is a potential problem with the import of particular Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) then resources may be made available to LAs to target the problem. Otherwise there is little specific testing by LAs as GM foods are not considered a public health risk.

**Novel foods**

2.63 The graph below shows the number of dossiers assessed by the UK over the last five years:

![Graph showing the number of dossiers assessed by the UK over the last five years.](image)

2.64 As in previous years the UK has received a significant proportion of the dossiers considered in the EU. This also reflects that a number of older dossiers being handled by the UK are reaching the end of the initial assessment process. The number of dossiers considered overall in the EU has fallen slightly as the revised novel food regulation, with its changes to the assessment process, nears its coming into force date of 1 January 2018.

2.65 The number of substantial equivalence dossiers has also fallen in this period. This may be a reflection of the large number of authorisations already obtained by companies for novel foods such as chia seeds. Authorisations becoming generic from 2018, unless data protection provisions are triggered may also be a factor.

---

11 The figures reflect the numbers of applications assessed for each year and includes applications that have been carried over, where assessment is ongoing as reported in the Advisory Committee on Novel Foods Annual reports.
Food contact materials

Controls carried out under Commission Regulation (EU) No. 284/2011

2.66 Controls were carried out by First Points of Introduction in accordance with the Regulation. In 2016 1,547 (100%) consignments underwent documentary checks, of which approximately 10% were subject to identity checks and physical checks (there were 1,378 consignments in 2015).

2.67 In total 10 consignments were rejected in 2016 (compared with 13 in 2015). Three of these consignments were rejected due to a failure following physical checks, representing 1.8% of the total consignments that were physically checked (171). The remaining seven of these were rejected on unsatisfactory identity and documentary checks.

2.68 Slightly fewer consignments were rejected overall in 2016 compared to 2015 (0.6% of consignments compared to 0.8%). There has been a slight drop in the rate of non-compliance for consignments that underwent physical checks and failed on this basis (1.8% in 2016 compared to 2% in 2015, 8% in 2014 and 7% in 2013).

Food contact material Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF)

2.69 In 2016, four notifications from the UK were published in relation to food contact materials compared to two in 2015. Three of these related to the migration of formaldehyde and one of Primary Aromatic Amines in plastic kitchenware originating from China.

Sampling

UK Food Surveillance System (UKFSS) coverage and test results

2.70 The UKFSS is a national database that centrally holds a record of all samples submitted for food and animal feed analysis by official control laboratories on behalf of LAs and PHAs.

2.71 The percentage of UK LAs using UKFSS has increased from 70% in 2015/16 to 71% in 2016/17. This comprises 100% of LAs in NI and Scotland, 95% in Wales and 67% in England.

2.72 The graphs below show the number of samples placed on UKFSS by country over the past five years and the total number of samples placed on UKFSS per year. In 2016/17 there was a 6% decrease in the total number of samples compared to 2015/16. This could be due to sample availability against national priorities. However, over the last 5 years sampling activity has increased by 16%.
Further sampling information is available at: food.gov.uk/enforcement/sampling

The following charts show food samples tested in 2016/17 for chemical analysis type and food type:
No of samples per hazard type 2016/17

*3-MCPD = 3-Monochloropropane – 1,2 – diol
*PCB = Polychlorinated biphenal
Organic products

2.75 There are eight private organic Control Bodies in the UK covering a number of registered operators. Below is the proportion of registered operators by each Control Body. Each CB has a code number to indicate that it is approved to certify to the EU Organic Standard. The full code is GB-ORG-XX (numbers as below).

| Code | Additives | Bakery Products and Cereal | Beverages | Cakes and Confectionary | Dairy Products | Drinks | Eggs and Egg Products | Fish and Shellfish | Fruit and Vegetables | Food for Particular Nutritional Uses | Herbs and Spices | Ice Cream and Desserts | Materials and Articles in Contact with Food | Meat and Meat Products, Game and Poultry | Nuts and Nut Products, Snacks | Others | Prepared Dishes | Soups, Broths and Sauces |
|------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| GB-02 | GB-04     | GB-05                       | GB-06     | GB-07                   | GB-09          | GB-13  | GB-17                 |                   |                      |                                         |                 |                       |                                          |                                         |                 |               |                   |
| 1388  | 449       | 3493                        | 231       | 17                      | 7              | 295    | 281                   |                   |                      |                                         |                 |                       |                                          |                                         |                 |               |                   |
2.76 The following graph shows the registered operators operating in the six different areas:

### Proportion of registered operators per control body 2016/17

- **GB-05**: 56.70%
- **GB-02**: 22.53%
- **GB-04**: 7.29%
- **GB-13**: 4.79%
- **GB-17**: 4.56%
- **GB-06**: 3.75%
- **GB-07**: 0.28%
- **GB-09**: 0.11%

2.77 All operators who were due an inspection in the 2016 calendar year were visited and inspected by their Control Bodies at least once during the annual cycle.

2.78 The results show that all Control Bodies undertook both announced and unannounced inspections.

2.79 Additional visits were announced or unannounced depending on the circumstances. They were primarily to follow up from the annual inspection in order to check that non-compliances/irregularities of a significant nature had been satisfactorily closed or to further investigate an issue. In addition to
these, further visits were carried out as spot inspections, either to investigate a complaint, as a result of suspicion of non-compliance/irregularity, or as random checks for compliance throughout the year. Also there is now a legal requirement on Control Bodies to carry out additional visits.

2.80 There were 6,401 announced inspections and visits to the registered organic operators in the UK and 544 unannounced inspections and visits. The graphs below show the breakdown of announced and unannounced visits in more detail:

### Organic foods

**Number of operators and announced visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of operators</th>
<th>Announced Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6031</td>
<td>6118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6161</td>
<td>6401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unannounced Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.81 Risk based inspections are based on a number of factors where compromise of the integrity of an organic product is possible. These include:

- the number and severity of non-compliances found at inspections;
- checking an operator to confirm non-compliances/irregularities found during a previous visit have been addressed;
- taking a closer look at products at risk of non-organic substitution;
- Inspector recommendations following an inspection and/or repeated non-compliances.
- Industry intelligence, e.g. previous detections of a contaminant in organic products, operations involving complex supply chains are considered worthy of close scrutiny and non-dedicated sites with parallel production at risk of cross contamination.
- the requirement to inspect additional enterprises or changes in the scope of the enterprise of the organic producer.

2.82 Shown below is the additional risk based inspections which were carried out in 2016:

![Additional Risk Based Inspections 2016](image)

2.83 The following graph illustrates the infringements and control measures that have been applied to registered operators in 2016.
2.84 The audit and assessment of Control Bodies to check their compliance with the control requirements is undertaken on Defra’s behalf by the UK Accreditation Service (UKAS). UKAS normally undertakes these assessments in line with its accreditation assessments and reports findings to Defra at the end of the calendar year. The audit involves assessing procedures in the office, checking a sample of licensees’ files and undertaking witnessed inspections of a sample of licensees to ensure that the inspection systems are working effectively. The checks are supplemented by additional UKAS checks and visits when required to deal with any outstanding issues to confirm compliance. Once UKAS has completed its assessments of the Control Bodies, it produces a report for Defra that summarises its findings for each Control Body and recommends whether or not it should be approved by Defra to operate in the UK.

2.85 The following graph illustrates the information on supervision and audits in 2016.
Protected food names

2.86 The following data covers the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016. To note - the results for 2015 show a high volume of inspection visits due to the larger producer groups now being inspected on a three year cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Inspections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.87 The overall compliance rate for 2016 was high with only one non-compliance. This case of non-compliance was found to be minor. Follow up action was agreed and if trends are observed by producers in non-compliance further action is to be considered.

2.88 No compliance issues were recorded which would result in harm to human or animal wellbeing or mislead the consumer.

Natural mineral waters


Food labelling

2.90 Most food samples submitted for analysis will have a label check carried out. This involves checking the label against the UK Food Labelling law. During 2016/17 the requirements of the Food Information Regulations (FIR) 2014 applied; This Regulation puts enforcement provisions in place to enable the European Regulation Food Information to Consumers Regulation EU (Regulation 1169/2011) to be enforced in England. Parallel measures exist in Scotland, Wales and NI:

- The Food Information (Scotland) Regulations 2014
- The Food Information (Wales) Regulations 2014
- The Food Information Regulations (NI) 2014
2.91 These checks are not the result of an analytical test but a labelling check carried out. Additional labelling requirements and controls are in place for certain foods for example those that contain specific ingredients or are packaged in a specific manner (e.g. in a modified atmosphere) or make a certain type of claim. Quantitative ingredient declarations (QUID) must be given for ingredients mentioned in the name of a food. For example, the meat content of meat products must be quantified as a percentage of the weight of the final food, either next to the name of the food or within the ingredients list.

2.92 Overall Data Trends

- 76% of labelling checks reported via the UK Food Surveillance System (UKFSS) were non-compliant (1310 out of 1715).
- The most commonly sampled food groups were meat and meat products (30%). A breakdown of products checked can be seen below;

2.93 A breakdown of the nature of labelling faults can be seen below. It should be noted that a number of samples were found to be unsatisfactory for more than one labelling fault; for this reason the number of failures listed is higher than the number of samples that failed.
34% of the non-compliance was seen in meat and meat products, 11% cakes and confectionary and 9% were bakery products.

It is important to highlight that these checks are the result of a visual check against the EU FIC. Whilst most food samples submitted for analysis will have a label check carried out it is possible that there is under reporting as not all labelling checks are recorded on UKFSS.

Samples taken and recorded are dependent upon the individual LA sampling plan. The level of labelling checks seen in previous years is highly likely to be a reflection of LAs activity in supporting the coming into force of the provisions of the EU Food Information to Consumers. LAs have previously with the support of UK and national sampling programmes used inspection visits to educate FBOs where non-compliance has been found and to instigate a plan of action as well as sampling to verify information which can account for previous increased level of activity.

The overall budget for the 2016/17 National Co-ordinated Food Standards sampling programme was significantly reduced. The FSA funded priorities focused more on chemical contaminants, allergens and authenticity, food supplements labelling and 1 priority on food labelling (e.g. Meat Country of Origin labelling) and samples were taken by Enforcement Authorities across England, Wales and NI.

A proportionate level of enforcement will have been carried out in relation to these failures such as writing to the food business or writing to the home authority or primary authority and requesting them to take action.
2.98 Since 13 December 2014 and the enforcement of the allergen rules under the EU Food Information for Consumers Regulation (No.1169/2011), there has been a need to review and monitor compliance with allergen information rules. The number of allergen incident notifications received by the FSA in relation to potential allergen issues has risen from 127 in 2014 to 206 in 2015, whilst the number of allergy alerts issued has also increased from 60 in 2014 to 82 in 2015. In 2016, the number of allergy alerts issued increased to 93 with the majority due to the wrong product in the wrong packaging or the labelling not being in English.

2.99 To raise awareness of the allergen information rules, the FSA commissioned media campaigns in partnership with its key stakeholders. These campaigns were initiated in December 2014 before the rules went live and for Allergy Awareness Week in April 2016. The aim of Allergy Awareness Week was to address the issue of non-compliance by some businesses and to further raise awareness across the food service sector, in particular small and medium enterprises, and enable consumers to eating out with more confidence. Evaluation showed the week was a success, with significant media impact.

2.100 The FSA has also produced a library of free e-learning, guidance, posters, videos and tools to support the enforcement community and food industry to learn about the requirements and how to comply with them. Over 175,000 have visited the FSA e-learning website (food.gov.uk/allergy-training) in the last 12 months. Advice is also disseminated to LA representatives via a FSA training programme. The e-learning course has already trained over 70,000 enforcement officers and food business operators. To supplement this, the FSA has worked with the food industry in their development of best practice guidance documents which promotes further information consistency.

2.101 Information has been passed to Defra’s Food Labelling policy team. Both FSA and FSS will work with Defra to continue to work with food businesses to raise awareness of labelling requirements as well as develop partnerships with interested parties.

**Beef labelling**

**England and Wales**

2.102 In England and Wales, the RPA continued with a risk/random inspection regime which was introduced for 2015 to focus on those establishments with a history of non-compliance. This has resulted in information and data for Beef Labelling in 2016 being presented in the same manner to the previous year within this report.

2.103 RPA completed 339 initial inspections for 2016. Where non-compliance was found, establishments were revisited as a follow-up inspection (usually within four - six weeks) until compliance was achieved or enforcement action taken. Of the 339 initial inspections, 109 were found to be non-compliant inspection visits.

2.104 In England and Wales, the overall level of non-compliance against initial inspections is set out below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% non-compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015*</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (introduction of risk/random inspection regime)

2.105 In 2016 a total of 689 inspections were completed (initial & follow-ups) giving an overall non-compliance rate of 39.76%.

2.106 In England and Wales 55 Enforcement Notices were issued in 2016 scheme year, compared with 57 in 2015.

**Scotland**

2.107 The Scottish Government (SG) achieved its planned official controls for 2016, completing a total of 26 inspections. Where non-compliance was found, establishments were revisited as a follow-up inspection (usually within 14 days) until a satisfactory outcome was achieved. Of the 26 initial inspections, five achieved an unsatisfactory outcome, resulting in a follow-up inspection being required to ensure that corrective action had been taken.

2.108 The percentage of compliance and actions taken over the past five years is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of establishments inspected</th>
<th>Number of inspections carried out</th>
<th>% compliance of Scottish businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Verbal warning</th>
<th>Follow up inspection</th>
<th>Warning letter</th>
<th>Enforcement notices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.109 Modern technology has helped improve traceability, as shown in the year on year improvement in results.

2.110 No prosecutions were brought in Scotland in 2016

**NI**

2.111 In NI, DAERA Agri-Food Inspection Branch Technical Inspectors achieved their planned official controls for 2016, completing a total of 121 inspections.

2.112 Unscheduled (follow-up) inspections were undertaken where non-compliance was found. These inspections had little or no impact on planned inspections.
Non-compliances related to labels with information omitted, inaccurate information and inaccurate company records.

2.113 The percentage of compliance and actions taken over the past five years is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of establishments inspected</th>
<th>Number of inspections carried out</th>
<th>% compliance of NI businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Verbal warning</th>
<th>Follow up inspection</th>
<th>Warning letter</th>
<th>Enforcement notices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.114 A trend towards an increase in compliance with beef labelling requirements has been observed across businesses in NI over the period 2012 to 2016.

2.115 No significant deviations in types of non-compliance have been found. The main types of non-compliance were inaccuracies in, or omission of, compulsory information on labels. In the past five years no evidence of deliberate non-compliance with the regulations for fraudulent purposes has been identified.

Veterinary residues surveillance

2.116 Out of 33,907 samples analysed under the National Surveillance Programme, 160 residues above the maximum residue level (MRL) or other action limit were detected in 154 samples.

2.117 Details of the UK results for the National Residue Control Plan (NRCP) are provided to the Commission via the EU database at: ec.europa.eu/residues/index.cfm

2.118 Non-compliances can be categorised into three groups.

- Unauthorised substances – hormonal growth promoters, beta-agonists and substances contained in table 2 of Commission Regulation 37/2010
- Authorised veterinary medicines – antibiotics, anthelmintics, anticoccidials, carbamates and pyrethroids, sedatives, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and glucocorticoids
- Environmental contaminants and insecticides – organophosphates, organochlorines, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and heavy metals, dyes

---

12 % Compliance of NI Businesses is calculated as the total number of businesses where non-compliance occurred during the year against the total number of businesses inspected, expressed as a percentage.
Unauthorised substances

2.119 Investigations into non-compliant samples found no evidence of the misuse/abuse of hormonal growth promoters, beta-agonists or prohibited substances.

Authorised veterinary medicines

2.120 Non-compliant residues were confirmed for antibiotics, anthelmintics, avermectins glucocorticoids, coccidiostats and Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drug (NSAIDs). Anti-microbial residues in excess of the MRLs were confirmed in samples from calves, cattle, pigs, sheep, and milk. Anthelmintic residues were confirmed in samples from sheep and milk. Avermectin residues were confirmed in cattle, sheep and fish. A glucocorticoid residue was found in cattle. Coccidiostat residues were confirmed in Poultry and Eggs. NSAID residues were confirmed in cattle and horses.

2.121 A summary of results of non-compliant residues for antibiotics, anthelmintics, avermectins, glucocorticoids and NSAIDs is set out in the table below. Investigations show that the main cause of these residues was that the instructions for use of the Veterinary Medicinal Products had not been adhered to in respect of withdrawal times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What tested</th>
<th>Tested for</th>
<th>No. of inspections or samples</th>
<th>Non-compliant residues found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calves</td>
<td>Anti-microbials</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Anti-microbials</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>Anti-microbials</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Anti-microbials</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Anti-microbials</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Anthelmintics</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Anthelmintics</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Avermectins</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Avermectins</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Avermectins</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>NSAIDS</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>NSAIDS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Glucocorticoids</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>Coccidiostats</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>Coccidiostats</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental contaminants and insecticides

2.122 Non-compliant residues confirmed for heavy metals and organophosphates:.

- Heavy metals – non-compliant samples confirmed in sheep, horses and cattle. The cause of these residues was either due to environmental pollution or the accumulation of the substance over time.
- Organochlorines – one case confirmed in fish which had originated from a site with known historic organochlorine use. The EA continue to monitor the water quality which has confirmed as compliant.

Pesticides residues monitoring
2.123 A successful monitoring programme was carried out in 2016. The graph below shows numbers of samples taken and the percentage of samples tested containing residues over the MRL, over the previous five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of samples</th>
<th>Types of food</th>
<th>% of samples containing residues</th>
<th>% containing residues above the MRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43.61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.124 Reports were published every quarter: [gov.uk/government/publications/pesticide-residues-in-food-quarterly-monitoring-results-for-2016](gov.uk/government/publications/pesticide-residues-in-food-quarterly-monitoring-results-for-2016)

2.125 A higher rate of non-compliance was found in fruit and vegetable products that were targeted for testing due to previous year’s findings. The types of fruit and vegetables were generally from outside the EU, i.e. speciality beans, okra, speciality vegetables. This was reflective of the situation that pesticides used outside of the EU did not always have an appropriate EU MRL to take into account the use.

2.126 All samples with residues are examined using a risk assessment screen. In 2016, only eight samples contained a pesticide residue that had intakes over the Acute Reference Dose. All of these five samples were passed to the FSA with a draft RASFF notification.

**Official Controls in the feed sector**

**England**

2.127 In line with FSA priorities, enforcement authorities continue to work on improving the accuracy of information on the number of feed businesses.

2.128 Since 2014/15 a new approach to the delivery of feed law official controls was adopted in England. The FSA agreed a three-year Memorandum of Understanding with National Trading Standards (NTS) for the coordination of local delivery of feed law official controls. The NTS are a body set up by central UK government to more effectively coordinate delivery and administer funding for activities to LAs working through nine regional groups across England. Under the MoU, the FSA works closely with NTS to: agree annual programmes of activity, including inspection and sampling; allocate funding to regional groups of LAs to finance these activities; and provide quarterly reports on progress against the planned programme of work.

2.129 A review of the first year of operation of the new delivery model provided positive results, with improved accuracy of data, 99.6% of planned feed inspections delivered and 95% of LAs engaged in the process. The second year of operation (2015/16) has built on this and the FSA continues to see positive results, including 99% of planned feed inspections delivered and 97% of LAs engaged in the process. 100% of authorities have been engaged in the process of planning controls in 2016/17. The FSA continues to review and,
Wales

2.130 The work programme in Wales for 2016/17 consisted of a target of 2,306 inspections. The feed regions reported that they completed a total of 2,234 inspections (97%). In addition to the inspections conducted there were also 302 interventions that resulted in the discovery of feed establishments no longer trading, improving the accuracy of animal feed establishment registers. In 2016/17 feed regions reported taking 133 samples out of a target of 133 (100%). Samples were taken of imported feed at point of entry, feed manufactured in Wales and feed used on Welsh farms. The returns demonstrate a significant improvement in the delivery of animal feed official controls in Wales, with interventions now being carried out across all feed regions and in all LA areas.

England, Wales and NI

2.131 The data returns for 2015/16 show a 7.9% decrease in the number of feed businesses in England, Wales and NI. It is anticipated that this is as a result of greater accuracy of data returns and feed registers following significant efforts to improve this. The following provides a breakdown by business type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered and approved feed businesses by type (only main categories listed)</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2011/12</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2012/13</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2013/14</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2014/15</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary producers / livestock farms</td>
<td>175,276</td>
<td>190,694</td>
<td>192,561</td>
<td>193,856</td>
<td>174,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers and packers</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food businesses placing co-products &amp; surplus food into the feed chain</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>4,537</td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>5,218</td>
<td>7,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importers</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributors and transporters</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>2,901</td>
<td>4,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>181,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>198,588</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,505</strong></td>
<td><strong>187,396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.132 In NI there are approximately 21,000 Primary Producers at 1 April 2017. There were 1,366 planned/full inspections and six unscheduled inspections completed during 2016/17.

2.133 The FSA and the VMD have published lists of the feed businesses approved in accordance with Article 19 of Regulation (EC) 183/2005 on feed hygiene. These lists can be accessed at the link below: food.gov.uk/enforcement/sectorrules/feedapprove/feedpremisesregister and vmd.defra.gov.uk/registers/approved-premises.aspx

Scotland

2.134 During 2016/17, FSS has continued to develop a centralised regional model of feed official control delivery for Scotland. It is now planned that implementation shall take place during the second half of 2017/18.
2.135 Data returns for Scotland for 2016/17 indicates a fluctuation in the number of feed businesses over the last three years, with a small increase over that period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of businesses 2013/14</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2014/15</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2015/16</th>
<th>Number of businesses 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary producers</td>
<td>19,174</td>
<td>20,705</td>
<td>20,242</td>
<td>18,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food businesses placing co-products into the feed chain</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributors</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA and DAERA controls**

2.136 Enforcement data for 2015/16 shows that there was a minimal increase (0.03%) in numbers of inspections undertaken by LAs in GB and DAERA in NI. The number of revisits and sampling visits fell by 14.5% and 38.2% respectively. The number of FeBOs being given advice rose slightly by 2.6%.

**England & Wales LA and DAERA controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of control intervention</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of inspections</td>
<td>13,812</td>
<td>13,015</td>
<td>11,709</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>12,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of revisits</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FeBOs given advice</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>8,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sampling visits</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**England & Wales LA and DAERA action on non-compliances**

2.137 England and Wales LAs and DAERA reported the following use of formal enforcement activity, updated for 2015/16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcement activity</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written warnings for non-compliance identified for the first time and which did not present an immediate threat to feed safety</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,122*</td>
<td>862*</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement notice when issue arises which requires attention or has not been actioned following a written warning (not requested from 2013/14)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other formal actions to address serious breaches of feed requirements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>40**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total establishments subject to written warnings
**Total establishments subject to other formal enforcement action

2.138 The use of written warnings has risen by 84.5% in 2015/16 and the number of formal actions to address serious breaches of feed requirements has fallen by 62.5%.
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UK Animal Feed Sampling

2.139 During 2015/16 the FSA continued to provide funds to enforcement authorities to undertake sampling of feedstuffs based on priorities set centrally. These primarily focused on feed materials and additives originating from outside the EU based on RASSF notifications and other intelligence concerning areas of likely non-compliance. The national sampling priorities for 2015/16 were contained in the National Feed Enforcement Priorities document. The most up to date version of the document with national sampling priorities for 2017/18 can be accessed online at: food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/neps_england_and_wales_2017_18_0.pdf.

2.140 During 2015/16 enforcement authorities took 3,343 samples. These samples were tested for 28,230 analytes, including heavy metals, dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs, salmonella, mycotoxins, and unauthorised GM events. Results of the analysis of feed samples, updated for 2015/16, are shown in the table below. These demonstrate that overall 15.7% of samples were found to be unsatisfactory. It is also worth noting that a number of those samples categorised as unsatisfactory are due to deficiencies in labelling rather than an adverse result for the substance being analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substances</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14*</th>
<th>2014/15*</th>
<th>2015/16*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of analyses</td>
<td>% satisfactory</td>
<td>No. of analyses</td>
<td>% satisfactory</td>
<td>No. of analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>3,884</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>5,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable substances</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>23,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed additives</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total analyses</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>9,329</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>30,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes UKFSS

2.141 The allocation of grants in England and Wales requires all LAs to use the FSA's centralised UKFSS system to report all of their feed sampling activity.

Inspection of FeBOs by VMD

2.142 The number of approved feed establishments for the last five years is shown below:
2.143 The official controls carried out by the VMD’s inspectors included physical inspection of establishments and equipment, and the taking and analysis of feed samples. The VMD classifies its visits as ‘approval’, ‘scheduled’, ‘special/follow-up’ and ‘other’:

- **approval** inspections are carried out to approve new establishments
- **‘scheduled’** visits are those which are planned, based on the number of FeBOs and inspection frequencies
- **‘special/follow-up’** visits are those to approved FeBOs establishments for enforcement purposes or to check that non-compliances noted at a scheduled inspection have been corrected; and
- **‘other’** visits are visits to non-approved FeBOs establishments for enforcement purposes e.g. the unlawful incorporation of veterinary medicinal products into feeding stuffs. ‘Other’ visits also include investigations into residues of veterinary medicinal products (VMPs) and specified feed additives (SFAs) that may have arisen due to cross-contamination during manufacture or distribution of feeding stuffs, or the unintended feeding of feeding stuffs containing those products.

2.144 The following sets out the number and type of inspections carried out over the last five years:
2.145 Of the total Approval and Scheduled inspections carried out in 2016, 6.1% of Commercial Feed Mills were fully compliant (5.1% in 2015), 24.3% of On-Farm Manufacturers were fully compliant (15.9% in 2015) and 30.3% of Distributors were fully compliant (31.7% in 2014).

2.146 Of the ‘other’ visits carried out, all were to commercial or on-farm FeBOs. These were unplanned visits and diverted resources from scheduled inspections. 12 (11 in 2015) visits were recorded as ‘no inspection carried out’. These were either farms or distributors and the majority were unannounced visits where there was no-one at the establishments.

2.147 There were no prosecutions, convictions or court fines imposed in 2016. From April 2016 to March 2017 VMD no Seizure Notices were and one IN was issued. There was no significant change to enforcement trends, formal enforcement action remained very low.

2.148 The following table sets out sampling results for 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Veterinary medicinal product (VMP)</th>
<th>No. VMP samples ‘compliant’</th>
<th>Specified Feed Additive (SFA)</th>
<th>No. SFA samples ‘compliant’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premixture or feedingstuff Routinely tested for declared active substance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premixture or feedingstuff tested for ‘carryover’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premixture or feedingstuff tested as part of a residue investigation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Veterinary medicinal product (VMP)</th>
<th>No. VMP samples ‘compliant’</th>
<th>Specified Feed Additive (SFA)</th>
<th>No. SFA samples ‘compliant’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premixture or feedingstuff tested as part of other investigation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premixture or feedingstuff tested for 10 different AGPs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.149 The introduction of ‘Earned Recognition’ for commercial feed mills certificated under the Agricultural Industries Confederation’s (AIC’s) Universal Feed
Establishments in the livestock farm inspection programme and are included in figures for farms keeping ruminant feed containing fishmeal where ruminants are kept. Visits to ruminant home mixers are a priority in the livestock farm inspection programme.

2.150 In summary, FeBOs manufacturing and distributing specified feed additives, premixtures and medicated feeding stuffs were generally compliant with legal requirements. Where non-compliance was observed it was dealt with in accordance with the VMD’s Enforcement Strategy.

### Protein in animal feed controls

2.151 Information on inspections and sampling programme for GB and NI is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Number of inspections comprising checks on the presence of processed animal proteins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import of feed materials</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage of feed materials</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed mills</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home mixers/mobile mixers ¹³</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediaries of feeding stuffs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of transport</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms keeping non-ruminants</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms keeping ruminants</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms keeping both ruminants and non-ruminants</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.152 In GB there were no procedural breaches.

### Sampling and testing of feed materials and compound feeding stuffs for processed animal proteins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishments</th>
<th>Number of samples collected by AHO staff tested for processed animal proteins in GB and NI</th>
<th>Number of non-compliant samples in GB ¹⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of processed animal protein/animal protein from terrestrial animals (and fishmeal in GB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed materials</td>
<td>Compound feeding stuffs</td>
<td>Feed materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For ruminants</td>
<td>For non-ruminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹³ In the figures above the category of home mixers mainly includes those farms producing non-ruminant feed containing fishmeal where ruminants are kept. Visits to ruminant home mixers are a priority in the livestock farm inspection programme.

¹⁴ Non-compliance figures relate to GB only
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2.153 The total number of samples taken was 5,161 samples. Breaches involved one incident of one ruminant ration found on farm contaminated with material of ruminant origin which was subsequently confirmed by additional sampling. The source of the contamination could not be traced to any mill or feed ingredient. A Veterinary Risk Assessment concluded that the cattle exposed to the contaminated feed should be banned from entering the food and feed chain, including those cattle which had moved off farm. A tracing exercise was carried out to identify those cattle. The feed was sent for disposal and a clean down of the equipment in contact with the contaminated feed was carried out. The second incident involved a large piece of bone found at a feed ingredient at a feed mill. A tracing exercise identified the origin of the ingredient at storage. The feed was sent for disposal from storage and the feed mill. A Veterinary Risk Assessment concluded that the risk was negligible to human and animal health after effective measures were taken at the mill where contamination had been found.

2.154 The NFA programme operates from April to March. The target number of inspections from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016 was 2,341 inspections, with a sampling budget to enable 5,600 Microscopic Analysis Test samples to be collected and analysed. During this period the operational targets were fully met.

2.155 The risk assessment criteria have remained the same as for the previous two years. The number of control inspections completed in relation to the last two years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of inspection visits</th>
<th>Number of samples Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,521</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.156 Detailed reports are available at defra.gov.uk/ahvla-en/keeping-animals/illegal-feeding.
Official controls in animal health sector

GB

2.157 Much of APHA’s work is determined by legislation which, in turn, is driven by policies to minimise disease risk in GB and through working collaboratively with other countries, in the EU and across the world. APHA Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) reflect the need to ensure compliance with this legislation and also reflect the particular and differing needs of customers and the business.

2.158 There are a total of 27 KPIs agreed with policy customers and these measure all significant and important work areas including international trade, science, welfare and surveillance. 21 KPIs were met or exceeded, four were substantially met and two were met in part. The sustained Avian Influenza (AI) outbreak affected APHA’s ability to achieve some KPIs. This included responding to immediate level exotic disease within 30 minutes where there was over twice as many cases as last year, and also completing routine Animal By-Products inspections required under a risk based approach where it was agreed with Policy Customers to focus on higher risk plant so that staff resource could be allocated to the Al outbreak. After agreement with Policy Customers, APHA Egg Marketing Inspectors were tasked with Overstocking Inspections and this affected the achievement of one KPI, Egg Marketing Inspections for registered sites that are in production.

2.159 Activities to control bovine TB (bTB) and progress toward eventually achieving officially bTB free (OTF) status for England and Wales remains the most resource intensive part of APHA’s business. APHA advises on and delivers a complex set of control measures across GB, differentiated according to bTB risk areas. APHA also carry out important research and development work to support customer’s development of bTB policies.

2.160 The APHA Science Strategy has ensured the Agency has focused on the identification and reduction of threats to animal health and welfare, and public health. It helped focus on ensuring and measuring the impact of its science, and continued to build agency capabilities to make sure APHA responded to new threats as they emerged. The Strategy was revised and re-launched in 2014/15.

2.161 APHA staff investigated 205 reports of suspected exotic diseases in 2016. The following outbreaks were detected:

- Low Pathogenic AI in a flock of broiler breeder chickens in Fife, Scotland in January
- High Pathogenic AI H5N8 in a turkey in Lincolnshire, England in December
- Two cases of European Bat Lyssavirus was reported in Daubentons bat in England in August and September
- For more information please refer to: oie.int/wahis_2/public/wahid.php/Countryinformation/Countryreports

2.163 A separate report is produced by the SG, and is available at: gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/animal-welfare/Diseases/Enforcement.

NI

2.164 Welfare and Enforcement Branch (WAEB) was formed in April 2016, as part of the new DAERA restructuring process combining Veterinary Service Enforcement Branch and Veterinary Service Animal Welfare Branch. WAEB inspectors carried out inspections on farms, at livestock markets, abattoir lairages and roadside vehicle checks covering biosecurity, welfare and IRM regulations. Also a number of roadside vehicle checks were carried out with the PSNI\(^\text{15}\) (with the part objective of training police officers to read eartags and check animal movement documentation.)

\(^{15}\text{psni.police.uk}\)
2.165 Aujeszky’s disease surveillance continued throughout 2016. 3,349 blood samples were collected from breeding pigs on 605 farms. All tested negative.

2.166 NI enforcement bodies were busy in a number of significant areas including livestock identification, movement and registration, animal welfare, and Tuberculosis (TB). Cattle identification inspections and sheep identification inspections were core activities for WAEB during the reporting year. The importance of the identification, movement and registration (IRM) topic is reflected by the level of Veterinary Service monitoring, supervision and enforcement of this work programme. In the most serious cases, files were prepared for prosecution and in the case of livestock whose identity and origin was not proven, three herd keepers had cattle destroyed without compensation.

2.167 226 case files were opened on Veterinary Service Investigation Database (VSID), for 256 investigations into alleged offences under nine separate Veterinary Service Animal Health Group work areas. Progress with these investigations is summarised below.

**Progress summary of the Veterinary Service enforcement investigations opened**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PROGRAMME</th>
<th>Under Investigation</th>
<th>Interview Arranged</th>
<th>File being prepared</th>
<th>File Passed To Public Prosecution Service</th>
<th>Case Closed</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal By-Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aujeszky’s Disease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brucellosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification, Registration &amp; Movement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade of Animals &amp; Animal Products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Public Health &amp; Food Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of Animals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTIGATIONS (CASE FILES)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(226)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.168 In the reporting year 180 case files were closed on the Veterinary Service Investigation Database (VSID), for 194 investigations into alleged offences under 9 separate Veterinary Service work areas. Details are summarised below:
### Outcomes of the Veterinary Service enforcement investigations closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK PROGRAMME</th>
<th>Case Dropped</th>
<th>Compliance Achieved</th>
<th>Warning Letter Issued</th>
<th>Formal Caution Delivered</th>
<th>Convicted In Court</th>
<th>Dismissed in court</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal By-Products</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aujeszky’s Disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosecurity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brucellosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification, Registration &amp; Movement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade of Animals &amp; Animal Products</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Public Health &amp; Food Safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare of Animals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INVESTIGATIONS (CASE FILES)</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress summary of case files passed to the PPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC PROSECUTION SERVICE (PPS)</th>
<th>Not Directed For Prosecution</th>
<th>Directed For Prosecution – case on-going</th>
<th>Directed For Prosecution And Convicted</th>
<th>Formal caution delivered</th>
<th>Waiting for direction on</th>
<th>Total Sent To PPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Files</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015
2.169 35 persons were convicted in court, closing 35 case files (covering 43 investigations).

2.170 The penalties for serious breaches of animal health and welfare legislation are significant. In the reporting year:

- Total fines of £20,810 were imposed
- DAERA costs of £1000 were imposed
- Three people received two months imprisonment
- Two people were disqualified for keeping animals for life
- Two people were disqualified from keeping animals for five years
- One person was disqualified from keeping animals for three years
- Two deprivation orders under the Welfare of Animals Act (NI) 2011 were awarded by the courts
- One person received a five month imprisonment suspended for three years and a two month imprisonment suspended for two years
- One person received a three month imprisonment suspended for three years and a two month imprisonment suspended for two years
- Two people received a three month imprisonment suspended for three years
- One person received a two month imprisonment suspended for two years
- One person was ordered to pay £6000 compensation
- One person was ordered to pay £344.12 compensation
- Two people received a conditional discharge for one year
- One person received 150 hours community service
- One person received 100 hours community service

Animal by-products

2.171 During calendar year 2016, APHA issued 33 new approvals to Animal By-Products (ABP)\(^\text{17}\) establishments.

2.172 The overall number of risk based visits to ABP establishments has remained relatively constant over the last five years.

2.173 APHA use a risk based approach to determine visit frequency. This results in more visits to higher risk establishments or those with a previous history of non-compliance with the requirements of the ABP regulation.

2.174 As the number of checks required is dependent on the number of establishments operating in the ABP sector at any one time and visit frequency is driven by an assessment of risk, it is not possible to accurately predict a target number of visits at the start of the year. However, APHA were able to meet the requirements agreed with Defra.

2.175 The requirement for certain establishments to register was introduced in 2011. The number of registration requests received by APHA has continued to grow over the six year period. It is expected that numbers will continue to increase in the immediate future as further operators seek registration e.g. transporters and brokers.

2.176 As in previous years, the main cause of non-compliance has arisen due to record keeping and operational issues. The total number of non-compliances\textsuperscript{18,19} has remained relatively consistent when compared to 2015. There is no significant pattern associated with the nature of these non-compliances.

\textsuperscript{18}Minor non-compliance - Low to negligible risk to public or animal health, for example, a technical breach, poor commercial documents, pest control slightly overdue, improved bio-security required

\textsuperscript{19}Major non-compliance - Medium or severe risk to animal or public health for example, by-products uncovered or unstained, containers not labelled or labelled incorrectly
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2.177 In 2016, two establishments had serious major non-compliances\textsuperscript{20, 21}. The first related to an operational issue in which a collection centre failed to effectively remove and dispose of SRM from carcases. The operation was suspended until appropriate corrective action (training, standard operating procedure review) was taken. The second non-compliance (structural) involved an ABP processing site where heavy rainfall resulted in a failure of the drainage system. Corrective actions were taken to contain and address the immediate problem followed by longer term preventative actions (structural improvements to the drainage system).

**Number of individual non-compliances disclosed at visits in 2016 by reason**

![Number of individual non-compliances disclosed at visits in 2016 by reason](image)

2.178 In NI there are 213 approved ABP establishments and 350 registered establishments/ operators. DAERA completed 282 inspections during 2016\textsuperscript{22}. During the reporting year 18 minor non-compliances centred on around structure, operation and record keeping. These were discussed verbally with the operator at the time of inspection and followed up with a letter.

**Bovine Tuberculosis (TB)**

2.179 In GB, APHA assisted with coordination of enforcement activity with a number of LAs in relation to TB controls. APHA worked closely with LAs at an operational level with frequent regional meetings and attended national meetings with the LAs National Animal Health and Welfare Panel. To support effective and consistent enforcement of TB controls APHA worked with LA representatives and others to produce a Regulator’s Guide to TB. This document was disseminated to all

\footnote{Serious Major non-compliance - a serious animal or public health risks for example, wrong category of waste consigned to an operation, by-products getting into the environment or animals having access to by-products.}

\footnote{Only 2 serious major non-compliances were recorded 2015, 3 in 2104, 1 in 2013 and 9 in 2012}

\footnote{313 inspections during 2015, 216 inspections were carried out in 2014, 156 inspections in 2013, 287 in 2012 and 321 in 2011.}

2.180 During 2016 APHA recorded:

- 82,273 herd tests, with 4,499 herds experiencing a new TB incident
- 2,894 of these new TB incidents were recorded as Officially Tuberculosis Free (OTF) withdrawn
- 9.8 million TB tests in bovine animals, including approximately 600,000 statutory tuberculin skin tests of cattle moved out of annually tested herds in England and Wales (pre-movement tests), arranged and funded by farmers.
- 39,390 cattle were slaughtered for TB control purposes as a result of those tests.

2.181 APHA traced bovines moved to or from OTF withdrawn establishments within a timeframe calculated on the time of completion of the last herd test. 16,156 standalone tracing tests were carried out in 2016. 96.16% of which were completed within the target time. In addition there were 4,045 tracing tests that were undertaken as part of a test of the whole herd.


---

23 Source: Provisional statistics on the incidence of TB in cattle in GB, Defra via [gov.uk](http://gov.uk), updated 15 March 2017

24 This includes reactors, inconclusive reactors, direct contacts and gamma interferon positives
2.182 The number of herd tests has risen since 2011, owing to the phased introduction of a more comprehensive surveillance testing regime in England and Wales. For instance, in January 2013 all herds in the Edge Area of England were moved to an annual surveillance testing frequency and additional surveillance was introduced for all herds located within 3km of a new Officially TB Free Withdrawn (OTFW) breakdown in the Low Risk Area of England (the so-called ‘radial testing’). Radial testing was also rolled out to the Edge Areas of Cheshire and Derbyshire in 2014, but in January 2015 annual surveillance testing and radial testing were replaced with six-monthly testing in the Edge Area of Cheshire. Many herds (i.e. all of Scotland and the majority of the ~21,000 herds in the Low Risk Area of England - LRA) remain on a four-yearly TB testing cycle and annual trends are affected by this.

2.183 The number of TB tests that went overdue by one day or more in 2016 was 3413. For comparison in 2015 the number of TB tests that went overdue by one day or more was 4393 and 8292 in 2014. In January 2015 cross compliance penalties were extended to apply to all overdue tests except those resulting from the tracing of animals following a TB breakdown.

2.184 Defra continued to implement its long term strategy to gradually achieve officially TB free (OTF) status for the whole of England by 2038 through a comprehensive suite of measures aimed at tackling all sources of TB infection. This includes tighter cattle testing and movement controls, improving biosecurity on farm and when trading, badger vaccination and badger control in areas where badgers are an important factor in spreading disease to cattle. The strategy was endorsed by the European Commission and received EU financial support as part of the UK TB Eradication Programme for 2016. Key measures implemented in 2016 included:

- Mandatory post-movement skin testing of all cattle entering the LRA (to live) from other parts of England and Wales, to be completed 60-120 days of arrival in the holding of destination.
• Launch of a new ‘TB advantage’ genetic indexing system for dairy bulls, to help dairy farmers breed cows with improved resistance to TB. First TB breeding index for cattle in the world.
• Updated government criteria for badger culling licence applications.
• A more rigorous and sensitive skin testing regime in all TB breakdown herds in the annually tested area of England (two short interval tests at severe interpretation as default before they can regain OTF status).
• Optional private gamma testing available to improve detection of infected cattle not eligible for a government-funded test, in prescribed circumstances and subject to APHA approval.
• A voluntary pre-sale TB check testing scheme pilot for cattle keepers in the LRA whose herds are tested every four years and who are planning to sell all or part of their herd.
• Phase out Sole Occupancy Authorities and Cattle Tracing System Links between summer 2016 and summer 2017 and review controls on cattle movements within a 10-mile radius of home establishments (‘CPH England’ project).
• Private herd accreditation scheme for bovine TB launched in November 2016 under the Cattle Health Certification Standards body (CHeCS). This is similar to schemes for diseases such as BVD, IBR and Johne’s Disease and it is aligned with other farm biosecurity policies for bTB promoted by Defra.
• Phase out of Exempt Finishing Units in the Low Risk Area.
• Licensed badger culling rolled was out in the summer of 2016 to seven new areas of the High Risk Area of England, in addition to the three existing ones. This means that the total area undergoing badger population control in England now spans approximately 10% of the HRA.

2.185 The Welsh Government continued to pursue its Programme to eradicate bovine TB in Wales through a comprehensive suite of measures aimed at tackling all sources of TB infection. The Programme’s cornerstone initiative is the annual TB testing of all cattle herds in Wales which has been in place since 2010. The Programme was endorsed by the European Commission as part of the UK TB Eradication Programme for 2016. Key measures implemented in 2016 included:

• Application of OTFW status as the default for all new herd breakdowns.
• Publication of the independent report on the likely impact the lack of available BCG vaccine. The report concluded that despite not being able to complete the fifth and final year, four years of badger vaccination would achieve a reduction in prevalence of TB in badgers in the Intensive Action Area (IAA).
• Information on cattle herds affected with TB is made be available on a website called information bovine TB (www.ibTB.co.uk).
• The TB (Wales) Order 2010 is amended to provide further powers to reduce compensation where a person has not followed the rules on testing and cattle movements.
• Publication of latest report on badger vaccination operations in the IAA in 2015, the IAA comparison report covering 2010-2015 and the third year report of the IAA Badger Found Dead Survey.
• Valuers who undertake TB valuations are formally procured.
• The Welsh Government announced that a regional approach to TB eradication would be taken forward as part of a refresh of the TB Eradication Programme and launched a consultation which sought views on a variety of enhancements to the current Programme.

• While the principle of regionalisation was not consulted on, the measures to apply in each of the Low, Intermediate and High TB Areas were included. Other initiatives included in the consultation were:
  o Development of a standardised biosecurity scoring tool;
  o A compensation cap of £5,000 per animal;
  o Compensation reductions for intra-herd movements in chronic breakdown herds;
  o Expansion of the circumstances where a CAP subsidy payment could be reduced for other breaches of the TB (Wales) Order 2010 (as amended);
  o Options for Exempt Finishing Units;
  o Development of a mandatory Informed Purchasing scheme
  o Revisit the Governance arrangements of the Programme.

• The consultation and summary of responses document can be found here.

• Work begins on the development of bespoke action plans for persistent herd breakdowns to expedite TB freedom in these herds. This follows on from the Enhanced Management of Persistent Breakdowns project which began in 2014.

2.186 In NI, DAERA carried out 34,352 herd tests (from 24,350 herds) where cattle were presented at the test. The table below sets out what the tests showed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TB surveillance in NI during 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of confirmed TB Breakdowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TB reactors slaughtered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of &quot;confirmed&quot; animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of slaughter house cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies (TSE)

2.187 APHA delivered on all performance indicators within agreed criteria for the 2016 period.
Performance indicators for 2016, including percentage delivery against agreed targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>GB Number</th>
<th>% completed within agreed target</th>
<th>NI Number</th>
<th>% completed within agreed target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of ‘on-farm’ suspect Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathies (BSE) reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of ‘on-farm’ suspect Scrapie reports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracing of confirmed classical and atypical Scrapie cases</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk based inspection of all approved TSE sampling sites and controlled hide stores</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction of eligible BSE offspring and cohorts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The nine ‘On-farm’ suspects were made up of five animals from holdings already under CSFS restrictions. The remaining 4 were negated following a clinical investigation. Five cases of the Classical scrapie were confirmed on holdings already restricted under scrapie control measures (therefore these are accounted for as five of the nine cases).
- The percentage completed against the target is less than 100% as five cases were on holdings that were already under Scrapie restrictions. An issue in the way data is entered has resulted in the 24 hour target being misrecorded when in fact they were met. Steps are being taken to ensure that this will be eliminated in future as work has been centralised into one team during 2016.
- Ten cases of atypical Scrapie confirmed in 2016. No classical scrapie cases were confirmed on new establishments in 2016.
- No new BSE cases were confirmed during 2016

2.188 The number of TSE approved sampling sites has remained constant over the five year period. The number of risk based inspections has also remained broadly consistent over this period.

![Number of TSE approved sampling sites and visits](image)

26 Approved TSE sampling sites - Of these 13 non-compliant operators were identified
2.189 Thirteen non-compliances were identified at TSE sampling sites during 2016 (nine minor non-compliances and four major non-compliances). These mainly related to operational and record keeping issues. In NI in 2016, two non-compliances were detected relating to “risk” bovines aged over 48 months not being sampled.

2.190 The four major non-compliances resulted from labelling, drainage and sampling issues. No serious major non-compliances were identified during 2016.

2.191 The number of controlled hide establishments visited and number of site visits has remained consistent with the previous year. All visits carried out in 2016 were compliant.

2.192 BSE in cattle in GB

- Following a peak in the number of clinical cases in 1992, the number of new
cases now detected by active and passive surveillance continues to remain very low, with no BSE cases confirmed in GB in 2016 and one clinical suspect case was reported where BSE was not confirmed in the first three months of 2017.

- One case originally treated as Inconclusive in 2015 underwent confirmatory mouse bio-assay during 2016. By the end of 2016 half of the mice died. Once the full mouse set succumb and are tested by IHC and western blotting confirmatory, a final diagnostic conclusion will be reported.
- 57 cohorts and two offspring traced from the two positive cases were euthanased, except for one which died of natural causes. All 59 cattle were tested for BSE with negative results.
- The numbers of confirmed BSE cases have continued to remain very low. No suspect BSE cases were reported in 2016. Further details are available at: [gov.uk/government/statistics/cattle-tse-surveillance-statistics](http://gov.uk/government/statistics/cattle-tse-surveillance-statistics)
- There were no cases of BSE in NI in 2016.

2.193 Surveillance for BSE

- The main purpose of BSE surveillance is to monitor the level of BSE in cattle over time and thereby check on the continued effectiveness of BSE controls.
- With falling numbers of BSE cases across the EU, the requirement to carry out TSE testing on healthy slaughtered cattle born within EU MS was relaxed on 1 March 2013 (with the exception of cattle born in Bulgaria and Romania). However TSE testing of the following ‘risk cattle’ aged over 48 months, where BSE is most likely to be detected, continues to be required under EU law:
  - fallen stock cattle (i.e. those which die or are killed other than for human consumption);
  - emergency slaughtered cattle;
  - cattle showing abnormalities at ante-mortem inspection.
- Cattle born in Bulgaria and Romania or any non-EU country must be tested if aged over 24 months (fallen stock; emergency slaughtered; showing abnormalities at ante-mortem inspection) or over 30 months (healthy slaughtered).
- In 2016 122,934 cattle were examined in GB and 24,002 in NI under the active surveillance programme and one through passive surveillance. No BSE case was confirmed in 2016.

2.194 Scrapie in sheep in UK

---

27 Surveillance for BSE is carried out in two ways:

- **Passive surveillance** - the statutory obligation to notify suspected cases of BSE has been in place in the UK since 1988.
- **Active surveillance** – the UK carried out limited active surveillance for BSE in cattle from 1999 to 2001. The EU active surveillance programme started in the UK in July 2001. The criteria for inclusion in the testing programme have been changed over the years in response to regular risk assessments.
• No clinical suspect cases of classical or atypical scrapie were confirmed in 2016 in GB. This represented the fifth successive year without confirmation of classical scrapie on clinical suspects since the disease became notifiable in 1993. There were no clinical suspects reported in GB in 2016.
• There were no cases of Classical Scrapie or Atypical Scrapie confirmed in NI in 2016.

2.195 UK Surveillance for scrapie

• The main purpose of scrapie surveillance is to monitor the level of classical and atypical scrapie in sheep and goats over time and thereby check on the continued effectiveness of scrapie controls.
• The EU requirement for active surveillance in sheep in the UK remained unchanged in 2016
  - 10,000 sheep aged over 18 months slaughtered for human consumption
  - 10,000 fallen sheep aged over 18 months.
  - Under EU derogation, tests on up to 5,000 healthy slaughtered sheep per year may be replaced with an equivalent number of fallen sheep. In 2016 20,449 were tested in the UK, of which 6,915 were slaughtered for human consumption and 13,534 were fallen stock. This includes 164 sheep that died during transit which were also tested for scrapie.
• There were no classical scrapie cases detected in 2016 in the active surveillance 0% (95% CI: 0 - 0.14%). The estimated prevalence using abattoir survey data was 0% (95% CI: 0-0.19%) again but with wider confidence interval due to reduced sampling through this route.
• In 2016, 13 cases of Atypical scrapie were confirmed in GB, nine in sheep submitted to the Fallen Stock survey and four from sheep submitted to the Abattoir survey. A further one Atypical case was from a farm monitored as part of the atypical scrapie monitoring (ASM) scheme. No cases were confirmed in NI. The estimated prevalence for GB using abattoir survey data was 0.23% (95% CI: 0.056-0.58%). The Fallen stock survey became this year the main contributor to the detection of atypical scrapie, and possibly due to sampling variability rather than significant changes in the prevalence of infection in each of the populations tested by these two surveys. Further details are available at: gov.uk/government/statistics/sheep-tse-surveillance-statistics. No new sheep holdings joined the Compulsory Scrapie Flocks Scheme (CSFS) in 2016. Four holdings terminated restrictions in 2016, leaving only two farms under control on the scheme at the end of the year.
• During the restriction period, fallen and healthy slaughtered sheep aged over 18 months were tested for scrapie. In total 71 samples were tested from these restricted farms. In 2016, the contribution of the Atypical Scrapie Monitoring Scheme (ASM) to the testing throughput of sheep holdings under restrictions by any kind of scrapie declined. Twelve holdings joined the existing 26 monitored due to confirmation of atypical scrapie. Twenty-seven of the 35 holdings under restrictions submitted 571 samples to the various testing routes of the scheme.
• Two cases of atypical scrapie were confirmed through the ASM Fallen stock route in 2016. This was the first year that additional atypical scrapie cases were confirmed in ASM holdings since the start of the scheme. The approximate sizes of these two flocks are 8100 and 972 animals.
respectively.

- The reasons why samples were not submitted by eight ASMS holdings are as follows:
  - Some were owners who in error sent their fallen stock for normal collection rather than via the CSFS helpline.
  - Some were owners who erroneously failed to report their fallen stock, usually in the first year of restrictions. An audit visit (normally undertaken around the first anniversary of restriction), usually rectifies this problem.
  - Certain holdings had their restrictions lifted in early 2016 and therefore would not necessarily have had any fallen stock to report during their period under restriction in 2016
- There were no changes in the genotype profile of the classical and atypical sheep scrapie cases confirmed in 2016. However, 600 samples from scrapie negative sheep were genotyped and the results indicated an increase frequency of genotype 1 (by 1.1%), genotype 2 (0.6%) and genotype 3 (1.3%); and decrease frequency of genotype 4 (by 2%) and genotype 5 (1%) in the sheep population. This therefore indicates that resistance to scrapie of the sheep population continue to increase in 2016.
- In 2016 24,002 cattle were examined in NI under the surveillance programme.

2.196 Scrapie in Goats in the UK

- In 2016 two clinical cases of classical scrapie were confirmed from one holding already under restriction under option 3 of Annex VII of Regulation (EC) 999/2001, as amended. In addition six cases were confirmed from animals submitted for testing under the CSFS. Because positive cases were continuing to occur, three years after the restrictions were first imposed, in accordance with the requirements of Annex VII a Veterinary Risk Assessment was carried out which recommended implementation of option 1 (culling of the holding) to achieve control and eradication of scrapie in this holding. The holding was culled in early 2016.
- No clinical cases of classical scrapie were recorded outside CSFS holdings.
- No atypical scrapie was recorded in goats.

2.197 UK Surveillance for Goat scrapie

- The EU requirement for active surveillance in goats remained unchanged in 2016:
  - 500 fallen goats aged over 18 months. No positive cases were confirmed.
- No new goat holdings entered the CSFS in 2016. Two holdings remained under movement restrictions which will last for two years following confirmation of the final case of classical scrapie on the holding. (One of these holdings was culled in early 2016). Four other cases were confirmed in goats submitted under the different testing routes of the CSFS: one Fallen Stock and three from the Initial Cull. There were also two clinical suspect goat cases confirmed in 2016. All cases came from the two holdings already under restriction. Despite the difference in population sizes of the sheep and goats in GB, cases confirmed in goats outnumbered
those confirmed in sheep.
- To date there has still not been any case of atypical scrapie confirmed in goats in GB.
- No cases of classical or atypical scrapie were confirmed in goats in NI.

**Artificial breeding controls**

2.198 This area of work is largely driven by industry activity (requests for approval and testing of approved sites). As such, no set targets are prescribed. The delivery of this work is in line with expectations. Controls have remained generally consistent over the period.

![Number of inspections carried out between 2012 and 2016](chart)

**Number of control activities undertaken in GB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bovine embryo collection/production/transfer teams approved</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bovine and porcine semen collection, processing and storage centres approved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 (1 AQU approval not included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of animals licensed for on farm domestic semen collection</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of animals approved to move onto approved AI centres</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of animals licensed for semen export</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples collected from bovine semen production</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>No info available</td>
<td>No info available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples collected from porcine semen production</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>No info available</td>
<td>No info available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Number of animals licensed for on farm domestic semen collection and Number of animals approved to move onto approved AI centres is based on number of applications approved and not animals approved. The number of animals approved for each is;
- Number of animals licensed for on farm domestic semen collection = 270 bovines + 136 boars
- Number of animals approved to move onto approved AI centres = 142 bovine + 1170 boars

**Number of control activities undertaken in NI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bovine embryo collection/production/transfer teams approved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bovine and porcine semen collection, processing and storage centres approved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of animals licensed for on farm domestic semen collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of animals approved to move onto approved AI centres</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sheep and goats identification and tracing inspections**

2.199 The UK has met the requirement in Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 to inspect 3% of sheep and goat holdings covering 5% of national sheep and goat populations.

**General information on holdings, animals and checks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings in the Member State as registered at the beginning of the reporting period</td>
<td>114,319</td>
<td>117,362</td>
<td>118,502</td>
<td>117,709</td>
<td>124,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings checked</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>3,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of ovine and caprine animals in the Member St as registered at the beginning of the</td>
<td>18,595,792</td>
<td>20,950,950</td>
<td>19,173,173</td>
<td>18,786,694</td>
<td>18,787,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of ovine and caprine animals in holdings checked during the reporting period</td>
<td>1,915,052</td>
<td>1,705,203</td>
<td>1,568,578</td>
<td>2,037,213</td>
<td>1,817,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.200 There have been no significant changes in the risk selection criteria and the assessment of compliance, which are allied to Regulation 1505/2006 and EU Statutory Management Requirement (SMR) 8.

---

28 In accordance with Regulation EC No. 1505/2006 a programme of unannounced farm inspections was undertaken to monitor keeper’s compliance with EU rules on the identification, recording, and reporting of sheep and goat movements laid down in Regulation EC No 21/2004

29 SMR 8 sets out which elements of EU sheep and goat ID rules are covered by cross compliance checks - [gov.uk/guidance/guide-to-cross-compliance-in-england-2016/smr-8-sheep-and-goat-identification](gov.uk/guidance/guide-to-cross-compliance-in-england-2016/smr-8-sheep-and-goat-identification)
2.201 In 2016 there has been a small reduction (0.6%) in the number of non-compliant holdings.

2.202 Penalties are applied to sheep and goat keepers for non-compliance discovered during an SMR8 cross compliance inspection. LAs can also prosecute keepers for significant breaches of the ID and movement rules for sheep/goats.

2.203 The most common types of non-compliance related to inaccurate or incomplete on-farm records including failure to record movements accurately. There was a small decrease in the number of holdings penalised in 2016.

**Cattle identification and registration**

2.204 Commission Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 (as amended by Commission Regulation (EU) No 1034/2010) requires a minimum of 3% of MS' holdings to be inspected annually. All inspections were completed on time during the reporting period.
2.205 In GB, 80% of the holdings inspected are selected using a computerised risk analysis, with the criteria including previous non-compliance, results of previous years’ inspections and specific high risk indicators, such as high numbers of replacement tag purchases. In addition to the risk based inspections, 20% of the holdings inspected are selected at random to ascertain the level of compliance across GB. NI has a similar selection process. There were no significant changes to the risk assessment process for the 2016 inspection year.

General information on holdings and bovine animals in GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings registered in GB</td>
<td>86,755</td>
<td>75,681</td>
<td>75,485</td>
<td>73,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings checked during the reporting period</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>2,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bovine animals registered in GB</td>
<td>7,957,244</td>
<td>8,093,880</td>
<td>8,237,396</td>
<td>8,129,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bovine animals checked during the reporting period</td>
<td>322,958</td>
<td>333,481</td>
<td>330,108</td>
<td>351,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General information on holdings and bovine animals in NI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings registered in NI</td>
<td>22,873</td>
<td>23,167</td>
<td>23,024</td>
<td>22,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of holdings checked during the reporting period</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bovine animals registered in NI</td>
<td>1,522,875</td>
<td>1,522,875</td>
<td>1,550,945</td>
<td>1,616,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bovine animals checked during the reporting period</td>
<td>99,252</td>
<td>109,737</td>
<td>97,684</td>
<td>89,589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.206 The results of the Cattle Identification inspection annual programme over the past three years show a small increase followed by a smaller decrease in compliance with the cattle identification regulations.

2.207 A variety of activities are inspected while on farm, such as standards of tagging or record keeping, and making notifications to the central database. During 2016 the most common types of non-compliance related to late or no report of movements and late or no report of deaths.

2.208 Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98 and Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 set out the minimum penalties. These include movement restrictions to either individual animals or to the whole herd.

2.209 As a result of the 2016 inspections, 10,881 bovine animals were subject to movement restrictions (3,031 animals were subject to individual restrictions
and 7,850 were subject to whole herd movement restrictions). This represented 2.5% of the animals subject to inspection. 110 holdings were subject to a whole herd restriction (2.9% of the inspected holdings).

![Graph of Number of Holdings with Non-compliances in the UK]

![Graph of Percentage of Holdings Inspected in the UK]

**Zoonoses**

2.210 On-going progress continued to be made in controlling *Salmonella* in the UK poultry sectors. A reducing contribution of *Salmonella* to the overall burden of food-borne zoonoses has been observed in the UK in recent years. Further information is available at: [gov.uk/government/collections/zoonoses-reports](http://gov.uk/government/collections/zoonoses-reports).

2.211 The SNCP monitoring results for 2016 indicate that the levels of the regulated *Salmonella* serovars are well below the EU designated targets. All

---

30 The Salmonella National Control Programmes (NCPs) continued to be implemented in 2015, according to the requirements of Regulation (EC) No. 2160/2003, in breeding chickens (programme in place since 2007), laying chickens (since 2008), broiler chickens (since 2009) and breeding/fattening turkeys (since 2010)

31 As per the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003
official sampling, as required by the EU legislation, was completed during the year for each sector: in total for all poultry sectors, 3,278 poultry flocks were subject to annual routine official sampling.

2.212 The UK chicken breeding sector had a reported prevalence for the regulated (target) serovars of 0.14% for 2016 with two adult breeding chicken flocks in the UK detected positive for *Salmonella* Typhimurium. No breeding chicken flocks were detected positive for *Salmonella* Enteritidis, Hadar, Infantis or Virchow. No UK laying chicken flocks tested positive for *Salmonella* Enteritidis or *Salmonella* Typhimurium during 2016, giving an overall prevalence of 0% for the target serovars. The prevalence of the target serovars in broiler flocks was 0.02% in 2016, with three broiler flocks detected positive for *S*. Typhimurium, three flocks positive for monophasic *S*. Typhimurium and one flock positive for *S*. Enteritidis out of a total of approximately 42,122 flocks tested during the year.

2.213 For turkeys, the 2016 prevalence of the target serovars was 0.22% in fattening flocks. Four fattening flocks tested positive for monophasic *S*. Typhimurium, and two fattening flocks tested positive for *S*. Typhimurium. None tested positive for *S*. Enteritidis. These data are out of a total of 2684 fattening flocks tested under the programme. For breeding turkeys, in 2016 no breeding turkey flocks were positive for regulated serovars and the prevalence of the target serovars was 0% with 233 breeding flocks in the National Control Programme.
Prevalence of \textit{Salmonella} spp. and the regulated serovars relative to the EU target in adult laying hen flocks of \textit{Gallus gallus} in the UK \textit{Salmonella} National Control Programme from 2012-16

Prevalence of \textit{Salmonella} spp. and the regulated serovars relative to the EU target in broiler flocks of \textit{Gallus gallus} in the UK \textit{Salmonella} National Control programme from 2012-16

Prevalence of \textit{Salmonella} spp. and the regulated serovars relative to the EU target in adult breeding flocks of \textit{Gallus gallus} in the UK \textit{Salmonella} National Control Programme from 2012-16
2.214 The requirements for official sampling are laid out in Regulation 2160/2003 and implementing legislation. There were no significant changes in the intensity and type of controls from 2012 - 2016.

Number of flocks officially sampled (routine annual official control sampling) in the UK per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breeding chickens</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying chickens</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.215 The assessment of FBO compliance with the requirements of the SNCP for all sectors in the UK indicated general overall compliance. In GB the criteria for
defining a non-compliance and the number of compliance inspections varies between poultry sectors, so data can only be compared within a specific sector for the years reported and should not be compared between sectors. In GB most non-compliances were minor deviations from the required sampling schedule, or farm records being unclear or not kept fully up to date. No major non-compliances were reported for 2016 in NI. The criterion for defining a non-compliance is similar across the poultry and turkey sectors in NI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total non-compliances</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95(^{32})</td>
<td>120(^{33})</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.216 In England and Wales, laying chicken farms where there are major non-compliances detected have financial penalty notices issued for incomplete compliance with the requirements of the SNCP. The penalty notice data for the years 2012 – 2016 indicates a broadly stable trend in operator non-compliance with a slight decrease in 2016\(^{34}\). 21 penalty notices and 13 warning letters were issued in 2016. This financial penalty system is not used in Scotland and NI.

**Border controls**

2.217 EU legislation\(^{35}\) requires that border inspection posts (BIPs) carry out 100% documentary and identity checks on imports of animals and animal products. Physical checks are carried out on all consignments of live animals and a set percentage of animal products laid down in Commission Decision 94/360 (1-10%, 20% or 50% depending on the product).

2.218 The level and nature of import controls are laid down in EU legislation so there is no flexibility to target particular types of consignments. Therefore, there were no significant changes during 2016 in respect of imports of products of animal origin. The number of consignments of animal products imported in 2016 was slightly higher at 58,457 compared with 57,980 in 2015. In the case of live animal imports the number of consignments decreased from 9,655 in 2015 to 9,375 in 2016.

2.219 Compliance remains high for third country imports of animals and animal products. For products the 2016 figures are similar to the 2015 figures with 1.30% of consignments being rejected compared with 1.35% in 2015. 774 consignments were rejected in 2016 compared with 780 consignments in 2015. The major non-compliances are documentary errors, in particular

---

\(^{32}\) GB figures only, revised since 2015 report  
\(^{33}\) GB figures only, revised since 2015 report  
\(^{34}\) 30 penalty notices and 20 warning letters were issued in 2015; 22 penalty notices and 11 warning letters were issued in 2014; 28 penalty notices and 13 warning letters were issued in 2013; and 27 penalty notices and 16 warning letters were issued in 2012  
\(^{35}\) Directive 97/78/EC requires 100% documentary and identity checks on imported animal products and Commission Decision 94/360/EC lays down the levels of physical checks. Directive 91/496/EEC requires that all imported animals are checked on entry to the EU. Operational targets are checked during APHA audits.
absence of a health certificate or an invalid health certificate. This is likely to be because a lack of understanding or knowledge of the EU rules in the third country exporting authority. For live animals, 50 consignments were rejected in 2016 compared with 32 in 2015.

2.220 If the consignment presented a public or animal health risk, it was destroyed, otherwise the decision to re-export or destroy was made by the importer and destruction for animal products remained the most common enforcement action. For live animals most consignments were re-exported.

**UK controls on imported consignments: Animal Products**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Rejects</th>
<th>Reject conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>Number controlled</td>
<td>% controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57,698</td>
<td>57,685</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>58,649</td>
<td>58,649</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58,710</td>
<td>58,710</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>57,980</td>
<td>57,978</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>58,457</td>
<td>58,457</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK controls on imported consignments: Live Animals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Rejects</th>
<th>Reject conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>Number controlled</td>
<td>% controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15,263</td>
<td>15,259</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,987</td>
<td>8,987</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,655</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illegal imports\(^{37}\) controls of products of animal origin**

2.221 Between 2014/15 and 2015/16 the number of seizures at airports and ports of illegally imported products decreased by 28%, and between 2015/16 and 2016/17 the number of seizures decreased by 30%. Figures below show the number of seizures by Border Force (BF), DAERA and those made by inland LAs and Port Health Authorities at relevant UK points of entry.

---

\(^{36}\) Fish and Gastropoda

\(^{37}\) ‘illegal’ refers to products of animal origin seized as items from individuals being in contravention of the personal concessions permitted or commercial consignments that have sought to evade correct entry procedures by not being declared at a Border Inspection Post. These statistics also include items voluntarily surrendered by passengers at ports and airports.
The greatest number of seizures was from passengers returning from Southern and Eastern Asia and South Asia, Near and Middle East and Western Africa and North America. Cultural and sporting events (including celebrations as well as student terms) represent times when the level of seizures might be expected to increase. These have varied in size and product type, from unpackaged raw meat and fresh cheese to milk drinks and stock cubes.
2.223 During this reporting period most illegal imports detected were for small amounts and continued to be typically gifts by travellers visiting family (or returning from visiting family abroad) or seizures from tourists, business people and students travelling to the UK for the first time with foodstuffs for a special occasion or simply as ‘a taste of home’. Most did not involve deliberately smuggled goods but were from passengers who, in spite of government publicity campaigns, were simply not aware of the current rules and prohibitions in place for products of animal origin imports.

Bee health

England and Wales

2.224 In England and Wales, the National Bee Unit (NBU)\textsuperscript{38} carried out a statutory inspection programme on behalf of Defra and the Welsh Government. Diagnostic support for the inspection programme is provided by Food and Environment Research Agency (Fera) Science Limited. Details of the programmes are available on the NBU’s BeeBase website\textsuperscript{39}. Full details of the NBU’s inspections and pest and disease incidence in 2016 and in previous years, are also available on BeeBase.

2.225 The number of colonies infected with American Foul Brood (AFB) has remained at low levels in recent years. All colonies found to be infected with AFB are destroyed. European Foul Brood (EFB) is widespread in England and Wales and there are on-going research projects which aim to better understand the disease. The overall incidence has generally been in decline since 2000.

2.226 Honey samples were also collected under contract on behalf of the VMD for the National Surveillance Scheme. Approximately 100 samples are collected each year under Council Directive 96/23/EC\textsuperscript{40}; none of these samples were non-compliant.

2.227 A total of 27,879 unique colonies in 6,078 apiaries were inspected across England and Wales by the NBU’s Bee Inspectors. For a short period of time in 2016 there were a number of vacancies in the NBU – this resulted in a slight decrease in the number of inspections carried out over the course of 2016.

---

\textsuperscript{38} From 1 October 2014 the NBU Inspectorate moved into the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA).
\textsuperscript{39} nationalbeeunit.com
\textsuperscript{40} ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/residues/council_directive_96_23ec.pdf
2.2.28 Key Performance Indicators for laboratory diagnosis and field inspections were met.

**Turnaround times on laboratory diagnosis and control measures on diseased apiaries**

**England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Target (Working days within which 95% of samples should be done)</th>
<th>Percent within target</th>
<th>Number of samples received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Exotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Exotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Samples</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Foulbrood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Foulbrood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sample</th>
<th>Target (Working days within which 95% of samples should be done)</th>
<th>Percent within target</th>
<th>Number of samples received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Exotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Exotics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Samples</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Foulbrood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Foulbrood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field work/inspection:
• 223 colonies in 98 separate apiaries were treated by shook swarm/or OTC antibiotic: 80% within 10 days (mean treatment time two days);
• 264 colonies in 170 separate apiaries were controlled by destruction: 95% within 10 days (mean treatment time three days).

2.229 The NBU’s inspection priorities are the detection and management of the statutory notifiable diseases, AFB and EFB, and surveillance for exotic pest species the Small hive beetle\(^{41}\) and *Tropilaelaps mites*. The numbers of AFB cases over the past 10 years has remained at relatively low levels. There were 56 cases of AFB in England and Wales in 2016 with at least one case detected in each region.

2.230 There were 364 cases of EFB disease in England and Wales in 2016.

2.231 The NBU continued to search for the exotic pests Small hive beetle and *Tropilaelaps mites*.

2.232 A total of 13,586 colonies in 3,053 apiaries were specifically examined in

\(^{41}\) *Aethina tumida*
England and Wales for the presence of exotic pests such as the Small hive beetle and *Tropilaelaps* mites. In addition, 204 samples were also submitted voluntarily by concerned beekeepers. None of these inspections revealed any findings of Small hive beetle and *Tropilaelaps* mites and no samples submitted by beekeepers tested positive. At present, both pests are believed to be absent from the UK. Surveillance programmes and the use of sentinel apiaries will continue.

2.233 The significant increase in exotic pest inspections in recent years is due to a change of policy following consultation with beekeeping stakeholders. Responders to the consultation sought additional emphasis on surveillance for exotic pests, whilst monitoring endemics to ensure the continuation of existing low levels.

![Number of apiaries inspected for exotic pests in England and Wales](image)

**Scotland**

2.234 Scottish Honey Bee Health Surveillance Programme\(^{42}\) has continued to successfully identify cases of foulbrood as well as helping to provide a detailed picture of honey bee health in Scotland. It has allowed bee inspectors to continue with making their presence known in the local areas and improve engagement with beekeepers.

2.235 The Scottish Government EFB Control Plan\(^{43}\) has been in operation since 2010, where commercial beekeepers\(^{44}\) are able to complete their own initial disease inspection. In March 2017 this was renamed as the Scottish Advanced Honey Bee Health Standard (SHBHS). The level of EFB has continued to reduce since the programme started. This reduction is not only in the number of colonies infected but also the density of disease which is steadily in decline. The SHBHS continues to bring together several agencies and stakeholders to deliver what is clearly a useful route to dealing with a crisis. Several simple measures adopted with a great degree of cooperation on all sides working in close partnership have been the marker of success. Results of the SG

---

\(^{42}\) scotland.gov.uk/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/animal-welfare/bee/News/surveillanceinscotland

\(^{43}\) scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0042/00423971.pdf

\(^{44}\) who have successfully completed a training event and have been authorised by the SG
inspection programme are provided below.\textsuperscript{65}
2.236 The number of apiaries infected with AFB was significantly down in 2016, with 13 apiaries recorded with the disease. All infected colonies were destroyed and apiaries within a three mile radius listed for a foul brood inspection. EFB was also found at four apiaries with shook swarm and antibiotic used to control the outbreaks. Follow-up inspections were planned to check the infected apiaries and complete surveillance inspections.

2.237 The Bee Inspectors continue to search for the exotic pests Small hive beetle and *Tropilaelaps mites*, mostly at targeted apiaries. Samples submitted have all remained negative for these pests. A Sentinel Apiary programme was set up in 2015 to support inspections and provide an early warning of any outbreaks of these pests in NI. Local beekeepers and associations were encouraged to participate in support of this programme during 2016.

2.238 Honey samples were collected on behalf of VMD for the National Surveillance Scheme. No non-complaint residues have been recorded from the submitted samples.

2.239 A total of 229 apiaries were inspected in NI by DAERA Bee Inspectors.

2.240 DAERA’s College of Agriculture, Food and Rural Enterprise (CAFRE) works in collaboration with the UBKA to provide Beekeeping Training throughout NI. During 2016 a total of 11 Preliminary level Beekeeping courses and four intermediate level bookkeeping courses were delivered in various venues across NI. A total of 242 individuals attended and completed this training.

2.241 DAERA Bee Inspectorate has provided support to three UBKA Bee Health Road Shows explaining our Bee Health Inspection role in monitoring and controlling foulbrood diseases. Four practical demonstrations were held in conjunction with UBKA & INIB covering the inspection for and recognition of foulbrood by beekeepers in their colonies.

2.242 The Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute (AFBI) provides a diagnostic facility for bee diseases, which is available directly to beekeepers. AFBI staff have met with beekeeping association representatives to discuss the outbreak of American foulbrood and provided disease identification workshops, in particular at the Ulster Beekeepers Association Annual Conference. During discussions with beekeepers, the neonicotinoid controversy has also been raised. AFBI circulates a questionnaire to beekeepers with respect to overwintering losses. This data is subsequently provided to the CoLoss project, which produces loss maps for Europe. AFBI and DAERA are supportive of the ‘All Ireland Pollinator Plan’.

**Aquatic Animal Health**

2.243 The planned official control programme on aquatic animal health was successfully completed and met the objectives and targets set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Defra and Cefas in England and Wales, Service Level Agreements established within Marine Scotland, and the MOU between DAERA and the Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute Fish Disease Unit (FDU). The successful completion of the official control programme supported the maintenance of approved zone status for the UK for a number of serious diseases of fish and shellfish and contributed to the protection of our high aquatic animal health status.

2.244 Compliance by aquaculture production businesses (APBs) was good, reflecting the effectiveness of the inspection programmes, and the prompt and consistent actions taken in event of non-compliance.

2.245 The majority of non-compliances were administrative in nature and were dealt with through the provision of advice, warning letters, and enforcement notices followed by further inspections. These actions were generally sufficient to ensure good statutory compliance, with only infrequent need to take further action.

**England and Wales**

2.246 The intensity and the type of controls have remained relatively consistent over
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46 Responsible for the fish disease testing programme in NI
the past five years. With regard to APBs, 281 fish farms and 84 shellfish farms were subject to routine compliance inspection, with an additional 266 unscheduled compliance inspections on fish and shellfish farms, and sites under statutory control. A total of 193 samples from fish and 18 samples from shellfish were submitted for diagnostic testing for listed diseases, new and emerging diseases and cause of mortality.

2.247 In addition, 261 official controls were undertaken relating to the application of disease controls on infected sites. The risk based import surveillance programme continued to be directed towards sources of live fish that have been demonstrated to be of higher risk in respect of the introduction of disease. Under the 2016 import surveillance programme a total of 43 samples were subject to diagnostic testing for listed diseases. A total of six statutory samples were taken from shellfish farms in relation to the Oyster Herpesvirus (OsHV-1 µvar) surveillance programme, and in support of disease freedom status for Marteilia refringens, and in continuance of the control programme for Bonamia ostreae. Finally 93 inspections were undertaken relating to the authorisation of 38 new APBs, and the de-authorisation of 28 businesses.

2.248 The Fish Health Inspectorate also registers low risk aquaculture production businesses such as managed fisheries. In 2016, 656 fisheries were registered resulting in a total figure of 9851 registered fisheries in England and Wales. The Fish Health Inspectorate undertakes inspections and sampling for veterinary residues on fish farms on behalf of the Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD). In 2016, 47 samples were obtained. In addition the Cefas FHI completed 20 inspections on fish farms holding veterinary medicines mixing licences, again on behalf of the VMD.

2.249 As far as unplanned official controls are concerned oyster herpesvirus microvariant OsHV-1 µvar has continued to extend its range across the Pacific oyster Crassostrea gigas farming sector. The first outbreak occurred on a farm in Whitstable, Kent in 2010. In subsequent years the disease spread along the north coast of Kent, and outbreaks occurred in the Essex creeks and the Blackwater estuary, Essex. In September 2016 a sample of Pacific oysters taken from a buffer zone to the north of the Isle of Sheppey in the Thames estuary proved to be positive for OsHV-1 µvar. These oysters are part of a naturally occurring stock that is unmanaged, and as yet unexploited. As a result of this outbreak the Confirmed Designation on North Kent has been extended to join with the Confirmed Designation in Essex to become the Kent and Essex Designated area (CD23/2016). This extension will facilitate movements of shellfish within the Thames estuary and so assist shellfish farmers in managing stocks whilst providing protection to unaffected areas.

2.250 Unexplained mortality events continue to sporadically affect shellfish farms in England. Investigations have identified a number of potential causative agents including haplosporidian parasites of two species, Haplosporidium nelsoni and Haplosporidium costale, bacteria of the genus Vibrio (including Vibrio aestuarianus which is considered to be an important pathogen on continental shellfish farms), and the wild form of oyster herpesvirus (generally considered to be of low pathogenicity). Research is continuing into shellfish diseases on

47 Controlled through national measure in accordance with Commission Decision 2011/187/EU
farms growing oysters for consumption but also with a particular focus on the influence of bacterial pathogens in the hatchery production of juvenile oysters.

2.251 Crayfish plague, an infection caused by the fungal pathogen *Aphanomyces astaci* is a major factor in the decline of the native white clawed crayfish *Austropotamobius pallipes* in England. Whilst over recent years, measures put in place to control the disease, have slowed the spread of infection, outbreaks were recorded in three new river systems in Gloucestershire and in Worcestershire in 2016.

2.252 Koi Herpesvirus (KHV) disease has continued to have a significant impact on managed carp fisheries in 2016. The year saw the highest number of disease events on fisheries reported to the Cefas FHI and the highest number of confirmed designations\(^\text{48}\) (CD's) made on fisheries since the disease became listed in 2007 with 33 fisheries subject to statutory controls. In addition 1 fish farm underwent disease eradication. Outbreaks of KHV disease started earlier in 2016 than has been the experience in the past, with higher spring temperatures that exceeded 16°C, the minimum permissible temperature for clinical expression of disease, lower diurnal fluctuations in ambient water temperatures, and a series of low pressure weather fronts combining to stress fish populations, and increasing susceptibility to infections. Outbreaks also extended further into the autumn as infection from earlier in the year became evident to fishery managers Statutory controls were removed from 23 sites as a result of the successful completion of a four year inspection and surveillance programme which demonstrated that infection was no longer present in the waters. The incidence of KHV disease in the ornamental fish wholesale sector continues to decline with 1 outbreak identified in 2016.

2.253 This decline in the incidence of infection over recent years may be due to improved levels of awareness and enhanced biosecurity in this sector:

2.254 Sea lice infestations in marine Atlantic salmon farming continue to present economic, environmental and animal welfare challenges to the sector. The paucity of effective therapeutic treatments has resulted in a resurgence of interest in cleaner fish as a biological control mechanism. The main species used are farmed and wild lumpsucker *Cyclopterus lumpus* and various species of wild caught wrasse of the family *Labridae*. Considerable numbers of cleaner fish are in demand by salmon farms resulting in the emergence of a new aquaculture sector cultivating these species in England and Wales. The Cefas FHI has advised farms on biosecurity measures and negotiated bilateral agreements with exporters of ova in Norway and Iceland to ensure that imported stock meets health certification requirements. A member of the Cefas FHI contributed to a scientific working group established by the European Union Reference Laboratory for Fish Diseases on guidelines for the management of cleaner fish in the EU. The Cefas FHI is also continuing investigations into the prevalence of bacterial diseases of wild caught wrasse.

2.255 There was a significant decrease in the number of warning letters (19) served on APB’s as compared with 2015 (40 in total), although the number of enforcement notices remained the same at 12. This improvement in compliance is primarily due to the increased effort that the Fish Health Inspectorate has invested in the provision of advice to fishery owners with regard to their statutory obligations. 12 minor issues were resolved through the provision of written advice. The Cefas FHI has continued to improve engagement with the fisheries sector resulting in a significant increase in the flow of intelligence from other government agencies and from stakeholders about failures to comply with statutory requirements. As a consequence the Cefas FHI has maintained a programme of unannounced visits to sites under confirmed designation which have identified a number of non-compliances.

2.256 A combination of advice, warning letters, and enforcement notices has proven to be sufficient to achieve good compliance by businesses. The FHI is continuing to place emphasis improving awareness about biosecurity and protecting fish stocks against incursions of disease within this sector with a view to improving levels of compliance with statutory requirements.

2.257 As far as trade is concerned import and export activities remained high with the FHI issuing 370 health certificates for the export of aquatic animals from England and Wales. This is a slight decline from the number of health certificates issued in 2015 though trade in live shellfish exports is
continuing to be buoyant. Non-compliances, all relating to the import of aquatic animals, have continued to show a significant decrease over recent years from 246 in 2013, 154 in 2014, to 116 in 2015, and 107 in 2016.

2.258 This is considered to be due to increased engagement by the FHI with importers and with trade bodies over a number of years, and the provision of advice and guidance to encourage better compliance with import requirements. The majority of non-compliances are associated with irregularities in certification requirements by third country authorities rather than non-compliance by recipient stakeholder businesses. This type of non-compliance presents a relatively low risk to aquatic animal health in England and Wales as most fish are destined for secure facilities. Nevertheless it is important to maintain levels of enforcement in this area in order to prevent this type of non-compliance spreading to higher risk activities.

2.259 The aquatic animal health surveillance programme on imports of live aquatic animals from third countries has continued to provide an important measure in preventing the introduction of serious diseases into the UK. The 2016 risk based import surveillance programme found no evidence for the presence of listed diseases in imported consignments of live fish.

2.260 The FHI initiative to continue with a high level of engagement with trade bodies and with businesses importing live fish has resulted in improved levels of compliance, with less than half the number of enforcement notices issued in 2016 as compared with 2013.

2.261 Illegal importation of live freshwater fish represents the biggest risk to the aquatic animal health status of England and Wales. In 2016, the FHI continued to implement a proactive approach to illegal importation and undertook a number of intelligence-led interceptions of consignments of fish. The FHI works in accordance with the National Intelligence Model (NIM) and has introduced a database for the storage and analysis of intelligence. This has resulted in improved intelligence exchanges with other regulatory bodies, and facilitated better cooperation with other Government Agencies such as BF in the investigation of illegal activities.

2.262 During 2012/16 no businesses were closed as a result of actions arising from official controls.
Scotland

2.263 In accordance with the Risk Based Surveillance scheme, 195 inspections relating to fish farms and 137 inspections relating to shellfish farms were conducted in 2016. Five statutory inspections and six statutory samples were taken to determine the presence of Bacterial Kidney Disease (BKD)\(^\text{50}\). Throughout the inspection process a total of 14 unannounced inspections were conducted.

2.264 A total of 46 diagnostic samples were taken from fish and shellfish in response to notifications of mortality, suspicion of disease, or through routine active inspection involving the observation of clinical and post mortem signs of disease. Further details of diagnostic samples are available at: scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/CaseInformation/anrep2013.

2.265 Through a contractual arrangement with the VMD a total of 1,521 samples were collected from finfish aquaculture sites. These samples were submitted to the Fera Science Limited for analysis with respect to residues of chemotherapeutants or environmental contamination. Three positive samples were obtained for emamectin benzoate. These results were investigated further and no further follow up actions were required.

2.266 Document checks associated with consignments of live aquatic animals introduced into Scotland from neighbouring EU countries were conducted for 247 introductions. Thirteen notifications to import stock from third countries into Scotland were received. Inspection of all consignments for placing on the market along with the issuing of appropriate animal health certificates was conducted in 25 cases to facilitate trade.

2.267 Twenty one inspections were conducted of consignments introduced into Scotland. The outstanding issues regarding the legislative change through the introduction of the Trade in Animals and Related Products (Scotland) Regulations 2012 (TARP) were resolved in late 2015 and implemented from early 2016.

2.268 In 2016, one wild fish hatchery and five fish farm sites had movement restrictions placed for the suspected presence of clinical BKD. On site investigations confirmed the presence of clinical BKD within the wild fish hatchery and two fish farm sites. The remaining three fish farm sites, where suspected presence was not confirmed, had their movement restrictions revoked. Three other fish farm sites had movement restrictions in place which predated 2016, meaning that during the year a total of 9 sites had movement restrictions in place for suspicion or confirmation of BKD\(^\text{51}\). The existing policy is a domestic GB control programme, introduced in 2011, where control measures are placed on the presence of clinical disease only and not just the.
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50 Listed in accordance with The Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009
51 Listed in accordance with 2006/88/EC
presence of the pathogen *Renibacterium salmoninarum*, the causative agent of BKD.

2.269 Movement restrictions for *Bonamia ostreae*\(^{52}\) remained in place in two sea water lochs in Scotland, as they have been since 2006 and 2007.

2.270 The aquaculture sector in Scotland shows a significant level of compliance with legislation to control aquatic animal disease. This is evidenced by the number of instances of non-compliance compared to the number of active sites\(^{53}\) and the fact that the majority of non-compliances are not considered significant in relation to the risk of contracting or spreading serious aquatic animal disease.

![Number of non-compliances between 2012 and 2016](chart)

**Details of outcomes of the non-compliances found in Scotland during 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of non-compliance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Enforcement Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade irregularities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>All cases resolved through advice or actions taken including in one instance the serving of a Regulation 30 notice. Where relevant, advice given to importers and assurances sought from CA in exporting country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 &amp; 2013</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eight cases relating to AFSA enhanced inspections – three cases remain outstanding. 17 cases relating to anomalies in record keeping and one case regarding the provision of information, associated with farm management agreements and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{52}\) Listed in accordance with 2006/88/EC

\(^{53}\) There are presently approximately 750 active fish and shellfish sites in Scotland
2.271 The main types of non-compliance were administrative in nature, most notably relating to ‘failing to comply with authorisation conditions’ and relate directly to the maintenance of site records. Compliance levels for 2016 are largely comparable to those for 2015.

2.272 Risk based enhanced inspections continued to be conducted in accordance with AFSA\(^{54}\) during 2016. Analysis of the number of inspections in comparison to the number of non-compliances suggests an increase in the level of compliance during 2016\(^{55}\), although this analysis has not been statistically tested.

2.273 The level of compliance with respect to trade irregularities in 2016 was comparable to the level observed during 2015.

2.274 During 2012/16 no businesses were closed as a result of actions arising from official controls.

\(^{54}\) Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 (as amended)

\(^{55}\) 2011 – 20 cases of non-compliance from 24 inspections = 83% non-compliance; 2012 – 37 cases of non-compliance from 45 inspections = 82% non-compliance; 2013 - 20 cases of non-compliance from 30 inspections = 67% non-compliance; 2014 - 48 cases of non-compliance from 58 inspections = 83% non-compliance; 2015 – 19 cases of non-compliance from 38 inspections = 50% non-compliance; 2016 – 8 cases of non-compliance from 21 inspections = 38% non-compliance

\(^{56}\) 36 authorised finfish farms and 54 authorised shellfish sites
2.277 Seed mussel imports from England, Wales, and the Republic of Ireland continued in 2016 as in previous years. Consignments of half-grown mussel from rope grown sites in Scotland and the South of Ireland were also imported in 2016. Consignments were all moved with the appropriate Health Certification in order to maintain traceability of seed movements and provide reassurance around movement of non- mussel species onto NI sites.

2.278 There were no disease outbreaks in 2016. Confirmed Designation Notices remain in place for Strangford Lough and Lough Foyle (for Bonamia) and Carlingford Lough, Strangford Lough, Lough Foyle and Killough Bay (for OsHV).57

2.279 Compliance across the aquatic animal health sector in NI is high with a good working relationship and communications between FHI and APB operators.

![No. of non-compliances 2012/16](image)

2.280 For the last five years (2012/16), there were 12 instances of non-compliance, all of which were dealt with by way of formal written warning. There were only two minor instances of non-compliance in NI in 2016.

**Official controls in animal welfare sector**

2.281 There were some organisational changes to the operation of official animal welfare controls during 2016. Most controls remained the responsibility of APHA and LAs in GB and DAERA in NI. Defra, the SG and WG continued to delegate the responsibility for animal welfare controls in approved slaughterhouses in England to the FSA and in Scotland to FSS. Welfare at slaughter and killing on-farm e.g. in LA approved slaughterhouses and during disease control situations, continued to be monitored by APHA. In England from September 2016 all administrative processes associated with welfare in
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57 [dard-ni.gov.uk/publications/designation-notices-northern-ireland](dard-ni.gov.uk/publications/designation-notices-northern-ireland)
England were dealt with centrally by APHA’s CSC One Health team, rather than by regional or local offices. APHA are also responsible for following up reports from OVs at approved slaughterhouses of welfare incidents that appear to have arisen on-farm. LAs are responsible for following up reports of incidents that appear to have arisen during transportation of animals. DAERA performed similar functions. During 2016 APHA, FSA and LAs worked together to refine a process of referrals, follow up and feedback in England and Wales, including intelligence gathering at a central level for welfare issues disclosed in slaughterhouses relating to both transport and on farm. This will be refined further in 2017.

On-farm animal welfare

2.282 In 2016 the number of farm and enterprise visits remained similar to 2015. The number of enterprise types inspected at each visit (for example different species or different production systems) dropped from 2.2. (in 2015) to 2.1 enterprises per visit. The number of repeat visits in 2016 (to a farm inspected the same year) comprised 19% of all visits.

![Graph showing number of farm inspections in GB](image)

![Graph showing number of high priority referrals/complaints alleging unnecessary suffering attended by APHA inspectors in GB](image)

2.283 All complaints and allegations of poor welfare are risk assessed by a
veterinary officer and high priority visits carried out as a matter of urgency. As the graph above shows, in 2016, 204 of the total number of referrals and complaints were assessed as high priority of which 184 (90.2%) were visited within 24 hours of receipt of the complaint.

2.284 The number of individual welfare criteria assessments dropped slightly in 2016, reflecting the reduced number of enterprises assessed at each visit compared to 2015. In 2016, the level of compliance on farms in GB was similar to that recorded in previous years and overall, 95.1% of category assessments indicated compliance with relevant European and domestic legislation, in line with performance in the previous five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of non-compliances per 1,000 assessments</th>
<th>Number of enterprises (% of total inspected) with overall C score</th>
<th>Advisory letters issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>775 (12%)</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,065 (15%)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,062 (15%)</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>732 (15%)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>798 (17%)</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welfare non-compliance with unnecessary suffering (D score) in GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unnecessary suffering found per 1,000 assessments</th>
<th>Number of enterprises (% of total inspected) with overall D score</th>
<th>Average number of days to clear D score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>187 (3.0%)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>308 (4.4%)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>215 (2.9%)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158 (3.3%)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154 (3.3%)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.285 The results of inspection visits are classified into four score categories - A to D. The overall level of non-compliance (C scores) and the level of unnecessary suffering (D scores) are very similar to 2015.
2.286 As in previous years, the welfare criteria with the most non compliances related to housing and environment, record keeping, disease treatment, provision of feed, water and other substances, and staff competence/skills.

![Most frequently detected non-compliances in 2016](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing/environment</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease treatment/animal care</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed/water</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Competence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that from 2015 any statement produced in association with a farm inspection is captured individually and a “mixed action” is no longer required in the database recording / reporting process.

2.287 During 2016, APHA provided witness statements in association with 55 farms to enforcement bodies such as LAs and to Non-Governmental Organisations such as the Scottish Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (for Scotland) and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (for England & Wales) in support of legal action. Additional statements provided for some farms, either in association with the same offences or additional offences, during the same inspection year are not included.

2.288 In 2016 DAERA completed 1,100 production site inspections with an overall compliance rate of 90%. Of the 188 non-compliances reported on 105 sites detected by DAERA, 34% of these non-compliances were category C.
breaches (as described by Commission Decision 2006/778/EC). The most common failures related to inspection, record keeping, staffing, provision of feed and water, and buildings and accommodation hazards. In NI, any farm animal non-compliances found are referred to the Area Based Schemes Payment Agency and an IN or cover letter served.

![Total number of enterprise inspections in NI](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Compliance rate at enterprise inspection level</th>
<th>Number of non-assessment level</th>
<th>Number of sites with non-compliances</th>
<th>% of non-compliant sites with category C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meat Chicken Directive**

2.289 GB has implemented the Meat Chicken Directive (2007/43/EC) through the Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations. The meat chicken directive is implemented in NI by the Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations (NI) 2012. APHA, FSA Operations and FSS deliver a system for all eligible flocks resulting in all trigger reports generated being assessed for further action. DAERA operates similar procedures.

2.290 In November 2016, a new process was implemented in GB to target high risk farms for a full animal welfare inspection, based on the trigger report information gathered during the previous 12 months. All farmers continue to be communicated their trigger report results (now by FSA rather than APHA) and requested to take action on these as required by the Directive.

---

58 WOFAR legislation amendments available at:
- Scotland: [The Welfare of Farmed Animals (Scotland) Regulations 2010](#)
- Wales: [The Welfare of Farmed Animals (Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2010](#)
2.291 This change in approach to communicating trigger reports means that the data on trigger assessment and actions taken by APHA (shown in the table below) for 2016 cannot be directly compared with previous years. It should also be noted that the operation of the trigger system in England and Wales was temporarily disrupted in 2016 by flood damage to the FSA’s IT system. During 2016, APHA received 830 trigger reports from FSA and FSS in GB.

2.292 The table details actions taken in NI and GB during 2016. Due to changes in approach to meat chicken inspections during 2016 in GB and a review of the meat chicken inspection data from previous years, all producers were directly communicated their trigger report results and there were fewer telephone discussions with producers on individual reports. Instead intelligence was gathered on flocks over time for further action including engagement at a higher level with companies who owned the birds / farms and visiting the highest risk farms during this time.

### Actions taken following receipt of trigger reports by APHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases assessed as &quot;resolved or not eligible under 2007/43/EC&quot;</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified as &quot;current action under 2007/43/EC is sufficient&quot;</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans requested</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections carried out</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action by CA on meat chicken welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer notified in writing</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone discussion</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan received</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection associated with trigger report (s) to confirm compliance with legislation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection based on historical data to target highest risk farms (from Nov 2016)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections associated with complaints, referrals or other inspections (e.g. cross compliance, exception report from slaughterhouse)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total inspections checked for compliance with 2007/43/EC | 25 | 0.8%
Farms sent warning letters/prosecutions/other further enforcement measures in respect to non-compliances detected at inspection | 4 | 0.1%

2.293 The table below details outcomes from the 25 inspections of meat chicken farms carried out under 2007/43/EC in 2016. In GB non-compliances were recorded under environment, records and staffing / competence. Unnecessary suffering on one farm was detected in association with severe footpad dermatitis.

Results of APHA and DAERA Inspections of meat chicken holdings carried out in response to trigger reports generated at the slaughterhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection findings</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with code and legislation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with legislation but not code</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliances detected, no unnecessary suffering detected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliances detected, where unnecessary suffering was also detected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Animal welfare during transport

2.294 The Annual Report on the Protection of Animals during Transport covering 2015 was produced and submitted to the Commission on 28 June 201659.

2.295 Inspections are carried out in the UK on a risk basis and in response to intelligence received. Inspection programmes are planned by APHA and LAs in GB through local liaison. DAERA performs these activities in NI. Findings are kept under review and local action taken as appropriate where any major deficiencies are detected.

Number of Transporter authorisations in GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Applications</th>
<th>New Authorised</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Applications for re-authorisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There were only 55 applications during this period for renewal due to the 5 year cycle process.

2.296 In GB, 684 of the 883 new transporter authorisation applications were issued (680 in 2015). In NI, DAERA issued 85 transporter authorisations in 2016 (this compares with 150 transporter authorisations in 2015).

2.297 In GB, 1,263 journey logs were submitted for validation in 2016, an increase on the previous year. The remaining 82 journey log applications were cancelled by the exporter after submission to APHA and prior to calculation/approval. In NI, DAERA approved 172 journey logs in 2016.

No journey logs were rejected in the UK during 2016. This possibly reflects a better industry understanding of both the legislation and journey log application procedures.

### Number of checks of animals and means of transport in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checks and non-compliances</th>
<th>2012 GB</th>
<th>2013 GB</th>
<th>2014 UK</th>
<th>2015 GB</th>
<th>2016 UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles inspected (including documentary checks)</td>
<td>136,973</td>
<td>125,601</td>
<td>118,881</td>
<td>135,568</td>
<td>93,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.299 The bulk of routine checks of animals and means of transport were carried out by LA inspectors in conjunction with APHA in GB and by DAERA inspectors in NI. Supervised loadings have been undertaken for all consignments of live slaughter export through Ramsgate and Dover. 2016 saw an increase in calves for further fattening being exported to mainland Europe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checks and non-compliances</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles inspected</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>26,154</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>7,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage compliance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infringement detection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.300 DAERA inspected 7,459 vehicles in NI of which 84 non-compliances were identified. This is a 99% compliance rate similar to previous years. This calculation does not include poultry transport vehicles at slaughter.

2.301 The GB inspections resulted in a variety of enforcement action ranging from oral warning to prosecutions. The annual report to the Commission explains the action plan that is in place to address any major levels of non-compliance.

2.302 The UK authorities continued to communicate and work with MS contact points regarding potential contraventions of Regulation EC 1/2005 and information exchange under Article 26. Of the five reported infringement made by transporters authorised in GB, notified by another Member State, it related to missing or incorrect paperwork.
2.303 In contrast, 33 formal notifications were made by the UK in 2016, involving non-UK transporters. This is similar to previous years. There were seven reports regarding unfit animals/welfare concerns in 2016, which continues to reduce compared with previous years.
2.304 Council Regulation (EC) 1099/2009 was enforced through The Welfare of Animals at Time of Killing (England) Regulation with similar legislation in the devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales and NI. In 2016, APHA followed up reports and allegations relating to poor animal welfare incidents during slaughter or killing operations outside approved slaughterhouses in GB and assessed slaughter operations during licensing of slaughtermen in locations outside of slaughterhouses. Where appropriate, APHA provided support to LAs for prosecution.

2.305 Welfare at the time of killing was given a higher priority risk during 2016. There was proactive engagement with previously known seasonal slaughterers earlier in the year, a process which was centralised in England and Wales to ensure consistency across all areas. Inspections increased by over one third compared with the previous inspection year.

2.306 61 of the 82 inspections carried out by APHA were undertaken just before the Christmas peak period. 15 of these (18%) were found non-compliant, mostly technical non-compliances that could be rectified relatively easily. These included: lack of back up stunning equipment (manual cervical dislocation considered unacceptable as a back-up option); incorrect licence (old style licence issued under previous legislation); lack of / broken audible/visible device on the stunner equipment; ammeter / voltmeter not working correctly. There were some non-compliances associated with failing to meet the needs of animals in the lairage area prior to slaughter and one instance of the slaughterer being unable to check for an effective stun.

2.307 One stunner could not be approved for use – a hand held, dry, head to back electric stunner for turkeys, for which there were no manufacturer’s

---

WATOK
instructions. Following consultation with university experts in slaughter processes, it was agreed that the equipment could not safely achieve the minimum current through the bird to achieve an effective stun. The licensee stopped using the equipment and reverted to a hand held electric stunner which could safely meet the requirements.

2.308 126 slaughterman’s licences (WATOK) were issued in 2016 by the FSA, in England and Wales, an increase in numbers continued due to the changes in legislation late in 2015 requiring additional assessments of competence to be carried out. Note that all seasonal slaughterers trained in Scotland will be included in figures for overall certificates of competence (CoC) issued to all slaughtermen (both in slaughterhouses and outside) and in England and Wales where seasonal slaughterers opted to apply for a CoC rather than a WATOK licence. Up until March 2017, the FSA had issued 3,737 CoCs, and 1,592 Temporary CoCs.

2.309 In Scotland, 315 Certificates of Competence were issued for operatives in slaughterhouses, farms and knacker companies under the Welfare of Animals at Time of Killing (Scotland) Regulations 2012 between January and December 2016. Also, over 30 existing ones have been amended to include
new activities.

2.310 In NI, DAERA continued to monitor compliance with welfare during slaughter or killing legislation. No significant non-compliance was found. During 2016/17 there were 45 Certificates of Competence and 25 temporary Certificates issued under the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations (NI) 2014.

2.311 The FSA and FSS works with Defra and its agencies and the devolved administrations to ensure that animal welfare policy is enforced within slaughterhouses. In NI, DAERA has sole responsibility for animal welfare policy.

2.312 In 2016/17 there were 190 instances of welfare non-compliances in slaughterhouses categorised as critical\(^{61}\) in England and Wales. In September 2016 the FSA presented a Board paper which outlined its “Deter, Prevent, Detect, Enforce” animal welfare action plan. This paper can be found at the following link: [food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa160904.pdf](http://food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa160904.pdf) The paper reiterated the FSA’s commitment to zero tolerance of animal welfare breaches.

2.313 In September 2017 an update paper will be discussed at the Board which will show progress made against the welfare action plan and future welfare proposals. This paper will be published at the following link: [food.gov.uk/about-us/our-board/meetings](http://food.gov.uk/about-us/our-board/meetings)

**Welfare forensic pathology and advice**

![Submissions to Regional Veterinary Laboratories (England and Wales)](image)

2.314 The Regional Laboratories (RLs) of the APHA received 67 welfare forensic submissions in 2016, of which 26 (39%) were whole/part carcases; the remainder of the samples were wool or skin samples in suspect sheep scab

\(^{61}\) Poses a serious and imminent risk to animal welfare or one where avoidable pain, distress or suffering has been caused.
cases and blood and/or faeces samples. These numbers are similar to previous years. RLs worked with APHA and LAs to provide witness statements for serious non-compliances detected in nine cases which have or are progressing to court, many of which were accepted by the courts without requiring attendance as expert witnesses. RLs produced summary welfare surveillance reports for communication of welfare-related (mostly on-farm) cases dealt with in 2016.

**Official controls in the Plant health sector**

**England and Wales**

**Controls on Imported Plants, Plant products and Plant material**

2.315 During the Financial Year 2016/17:

- Targets for the inspection of the majority of controlled plant health material imported into England and Wales were met.
- Prohibited material imported or held under scientific licence was subject to the required level of inspection.
- Targets were met for the inspections of other imported controlled material (low risk) (66% against a target 65%)
- 100% of required mandatory inspections were completed.
- There was a 5% increase in the number of consignments declared and requiring control over the previous year (100,571 in 2016/17 compared to 95,153 in 2015/16)
- For the 47 trades subject to reduced import checks, the required levels of inspection were achieved for 46 trades.

2.316 Apples (*Malus*) imported from the USA, a trade subject to reduced import checks, did not have the required number of inspection checks. In future years, a new reporting option will aid management of this work and reduce the likelihood of this target not being met.

2.317 The EU’s ban remained in place during 2016 on the import of certain vegetable products from:

a) India, following unacceptable levels of interceptions of plant pests in preceding years:

- the ban was imposed following persistent interceptions on Indian produce and critical reports from FVO audits in India in 2010 and 2013
- despite assurances from India in response to these reports, the level of interceptions remained high and in 2014, the EU Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed – Plant Health Section, voted to suspend imports of the five trades representing the highest numbers of interceptions, until December 2015

---

62 [fera.defra.gov.uk/plants/plantHealth/](fera.defra.gov.uk/plants/plantHealth/)
63 The initial ban applied to Mangoes, Bitter gourd (*Momordica*), Aubergines (*Solanum melongena*), Snake gourd (*Trichosanthes*), and Taro or Patra leaves (*Colocasia spp*)
• When the Indian plant health authorities provided evidence that they were meeting some EU requirements, in February 2015 the ban was lifted for Mangoes (*Mangifera*) only
• The ban remained for Bitter gourd (*Momordica*), Aubergines (*Solanum melongena*), Snake gourd (*Trichosanthes*), and Taro or Patra leaves (*Colocasia spp*) originating in India
• During early 2016, however, there was a significant reduction in the interception of harmful organisms on Indian material and evidence of improvements to the phytosanitary control of its exports. Therefore in September 2016, the EU Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed – Plant Health Section also approved lifting the suspension, at the end of 2016, on the above four products from India

b) Ghana, following persistent interceptions of a number of plant health pests, including Leaf miners (*Liriomyza spp*) and Tobacco whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*)

• The EU Commission adopted measures to prevent the introduction into and the spread within the Union of harmful organisms associated with certain plant material originating in Ghana. The measures suspended imports of the following products, initially until the end of 2016.

The measures applied to imports of plant material (other than seeds) of:
• Sweet and chili peppers (*Capsicum*)
• Bottle gourd (*Lagenaria*)
• Luffa
• Bitter gourd (*Momordica L*)
• *Solanum L.* (including Aubergines), other than *S. Lycopersicum L* (Tomato)

2.318 In September 2016, an EU Commission audit showed there were still significant shortcomings in Ghana’s export system. Additionally EU MS, including the UK, continued to intercept harmful organisms on Ghanaian material. As a result, the legislation was extended to the end of 2017.

2.319 In 2016, restrictions remained in place for the import of South African citrus, following a failure by South Africa to prevent the export of fruit infected with Citrus blackspot (*Phyllosticta citricarpa*)

64 This complied with EU emergency measures, agreed by MS at the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed – Plant Health Section. Citrus blackspot is a major concern for citrus-growing EU MS.

2.320 As a result of recurrent interceptions of *Phyllosticta citricarpa* on citrus fruits originating in Brazil and Uruguay, in May 2016, EU emergency measures were extended to include citrus fruit of these countries.

2.321 The EU introduced emergency legislation to help protect MS against the introduction of *Xylella fastidiosa* (*X. fastidiosa*). *Xylella fastidiosa* is a

---

64 Since 2015, the United Kingdom has been requesting a derogation to allow the import of citrus from South Africa, Brazil and Uruguay for use in industrial processing, which has been identified as low risk by EFSA. These measures have been subsequently introduced through EU Decision 2016/715.
A bacterium which causes disease in a wide range of woody commercial plants such as grapevine, citrus, olive and several species of broadleaf trees widely grown in the UK, as well as many herbaceous plants. It has been found to be associated with the rapid decline of olive trees over a large area in southern Italy.

2.322 The legislation includes requirements to protect against introductions from non-EU countries, as well as from those parts of the EU where it has been detected, including Italy, France, Germany and Spain. New requirements for imports of non-EU plants have been introduced and movements of ‘specified plants’ (which includes the confirmed hosts of *Xylella fastidiosa* in the EU and further afield) are only possible from areas in the EU where the pathogen is present if stringent conditions are met.

2.323 The UK plant health authorities and other EU MS continue the surveillance procedures for the pathogen. To reflect the evolving situation and to improve preparedness within the EU more generally, the EU Plant Health Standing Committee has recently updated the emergency measures against this pathogen.

2.324 In 2016, the FC customer service standard target of inspecting 95% of imports of wood and wood products on the day of notification of landing, or the next working day, was met. Customer Service Standard response time was achieved in over 97% of cases, thereby meeting the annual target. Since 2013, the FC has received additional resources to increase its inspections of wood packaging material associated with known high risk commodities. This funding continued in 2015/16 & 2016/17. As a result of the funding, in 2016/17, the FC:

- continued to employ a Cross Border Plant Health Liaison Officer, a Project Support Officer and an Assistant Economist to assist in the additional inspection programmes, contingency planning and financial impact assessments
- increased inspections of wood packaging material associated with known high risk commodities at ports, leading to increased detection of non-compliant wood packaging material
- met the EU minimum target inspecting 15% of all imported consignments of eight stated commodity codes

2.325 The Canary Islands rejected a number of consignments of potatoes imported from England during the 2016/17 season (August to May annually). 28 exports of ware and seed potato consignments to the Canary Islands were rejected from a total of 1,297 (2.7%). This compares to 5.7% in the previous year. For each rejection, the Spanish export guidance was followed and often the rational for rejection was not clear despite our challenge. Defra, the Devolved Administrations, APHA and Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board (AHDB) continue to liaise and work with the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture (MAPAMA) to resolve this ongoing issue.

**Surveillance and Outbreak Management**

2.326 In 2016, surveillance continued within the Paddock Wood area of Kent
following the 2012 outbreak of *Anoplophora glabripennis* (Asian long-horn beetle). The surveillance programme has been extended to 2018, corresponding with two complete life cycles of the beetle.

2.327 Inspections were carried out on Wood Packaging Material (WPM) at plant retail/grower sites with WPM connections and on host trees within 20 metres of their boundaries at 44 sites against a target of 40 sites (consisting of 20 new sites and 20 previously visited sites).

2.328 The control programme for Phytophthora ramorum and Phytophthora kernoviae continued. The risk of spread of the pathogens via the trade in plants and plant products has been reduced within the Defra Programme by increased inspections and containment/eradication action whenever the pathogens are diagnosed. For Phytophthora ramorum – surveys of Vaccinium (Bilberry) sites and surveys around outbreaks in larch woods continued. The extra Inspectorate resources that were secured in previous years have been maintained to assist with surveys, with additional support continuing from established field inspectors.

2.329 FC England maintained their field staff resources to increase the level of surveillance for pests and diseases in trees and woodlands.

2.330 In 2016 *Dryocosmus kuriphilus* (Oriental chestnut gall wasp) was identified on approximately forty sites around London. The sites are under active management, with a surveillance plan in place. Outbreaks of *Thaumetopoea processionea* (Oak Processionary moth) were detected in Guildford, Surrey and in the London region, all of which are under active management. There was an increase in findings of *Phytophthora ramorum* in Sweet chestnut (*Castanea sativa*) in the wider environment.

2.331 *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus* (Chalara ash dieback) is spreading at the expected rate, according to Cambridge University modelling. Research programs continue to focus on Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) that is resistant to the disease.

2.332 **Sweet Chestnut blight (Cryphonectria parasitica)** Sweet chestnut blight, caused by a fungus called *Cryphonectria parasitica*, is known to seriously affect sweet chestnut (*Castanea*) species. In 2016, there was one outbreak of the disease in the South West of England and the infected trees at this location have all been removed. Although the fungus can occasionally affect oak trees, usually when they are standing very close to heavily infected sweet chestnut trees, it does little damage to them.

2.333 **Red Palm Weevil (Rhynchophorus ferrugineus)** In October 2016, the Red Palm Weevil (*Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*), a threat to palm trees, was identified in the UK for the first time. It was found inside a round-leaf fountain palm imported from Italy, which had been purchased in Essex. The infested plant was destroyed. APHA inspectors surveyed susceptible palm trees within 10km of the affected tree and found no further signs of it. Tracing work has been carried out to locate and inspect material which was sent to other retailers and no further finds have been made to date.
Preventive action on deliveries at point of destination as a result of trace forward/back exercises or general quarantine surveillance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease/ Pest</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceratocystis platani</td>
<td>Platanus (Plane)</td>
<td>In 2016, 78% (129 consignments from 165 selected) of <em>Platanus</em> (Plane) moved from other EU MS were inspected in active growth within six months of arrival, against a target of 75% (126 consignments). 168 consignments were notified. In 2015, 84% of intra-EU <em>Platanus</em> (Plane) were inspected against a target of 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryphonectria parasitica</td>
<td>Castanea (Sweet Chestnut)</td>
<td>In 2016, the target to inspect 75% (39 consignments from 50 selected) of <em>Castanea</em> (Sweet Chestnut) moved from other EU Member States in active growth within six months of arrival, was exceeded. 74 consignments were inspected (it is possible that some consignments received more than one inspection and that some inspections were carried out on non-notified consignments). In 2015, 74% of intra-EU <em>Castanea</em> (Sweet Chestnut) was inspected against a target of 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytoplasma ulmi</td>
<td>Ulmus (Elm)</td>
<td>In 2016, 95% (138 consignments from 145 selected) of <em>Ulmus</em> (Elm) moved from other EU MS was inspected in active growth within six months of arrival against a target of 75% (109 consignments). 157 consignments were notified. In 2015, 70% of intra-EU <em>Ulmus</em> (Elm) was inspected against a target of 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaumetopoea processionea</td>
<td>Quercus (Oak)</td>
<td>In 2016, 99% (223 from 224 selected consignments) of <em>Quercus</em> (Oak) moved from other EU MS was inspected in active growth within six months of arrival against a target of 50% (112 consignments). 2,744 consignments were notified. In 2015, 217 intra-EU <em>Quercus</em> (Oak) consignments were inspected against a minimum target of 100 notified consignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothistroma pini and Dothistroma septosporum; Thaumetopoea</td>
<td>Pinus (Pine)</td>
<td>In 2016, 95% (178 selected from 187 consignments) of <em>Pinus</em> (Pine) moved from other EU MS was inspected in active growth within 6 months of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease/ Pest</td>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xanthomanus arboricola</em> pv. Pruni / other pests and diseases</td>
<td>1,986 consignments were notified. In 2015, 152 intra-EU <em>Pinus</em> (Pine) consignments were inspected against a minimum target of 50 notified consignments. 988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epitrix spp</em></td>
<td>12,982 consignments were notified. Surveillance was carried out on intra-EU shipments of <em>Prunus</em> for the first time during 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ralstonia solanacearum</em> (Brown rot) tuber survey and <em>Clavibacter michiganensis</em> (Ring rot) tuber survey</td>
<td>The target in 2016 was to inspect 50% of all Spanish and Portuguese notified ware consignments. 320 consignments were notified and 251 (78%) were inspected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.334 For the above preventative action on deliveries at point of destination, legislation on notifying tree movements was initially introduced in 2013, with subsequent additions. In 2016, the target inspection rates for consignments in active growth within six months of arrival were:
- 75% minimum of notified and selected consignments of Elm, Plane, and Sweet Chestnut
- 50% minimum for notified and selected consignments of Oak and Pine
- 25% minimum for notified and selected consignments of *Prunus*

2.335 In selecting consignments for inspection, the rationale was to target multiple different genus, supplier and country combinations, so as to increase the breadth of the horizon scanning.

**Surveillance surveys**65 carried out during 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease/ Pest</th>
<th>Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ralstonia solanacearum</em> (Brown rot) tuber survey and <em>Clavibacter michiganensis</em> (Ring rot) tuber survey</td>
<td>The target was exceeded for inspecting 95% seed stocks from the Seed Potato Classification Scheme (SPCS) (All E&amp;W seed stocks excluding Pre Basic not marketed) from an estimated 797 seed stocks. This compares to 784 inspections in 2015 and 862 inspections in 2014. 98 (82%) consignments of E&amp;W ware from EU seed &amp; EU ware inspected against a target of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65 Required under EU legislation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease/ Pest</th>
<th>Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>This compares to 108 consignments in 2015 and 133 consignments in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• The target was exceeded for inspecting 95% of consignments of EU seed entering the SCPS scheme. 175 inspections were carried out against a target of 143. This compares to 109 (84%) in 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• 1049 (98%) consignments of EU seed inspected from 1068 selected for inspection – a consignment from each grower/variety to be inspected. This was against a target of 95%.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• This compares to 749 consignments (100%) in 2015, with no comparative figures for EU seed for 2014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown rot river survey of treated/scheduled water courses completed</td>
<td><strong>• In 2016, the Brown Rot river survey was completed during September, involving approximately 200 samples from 24 water courses and 48 sampling points. There was a positive diagnosis (in six samples over two sampling points) at Sixteen Foot Drain, close to March, Cambridgeshire. 23 sample sites were negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• In 2015, the Brown Rot river survey sampled 25 water courses and 50 sampling points. There was one positive diagnosis at the River Loddon, near Reading, Berkshire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• In 2014, the survey involved samples from 22 water courses. All samples were negative.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• In 2013, there was one positive diagnosis, in the River Jubilee (from and into the River Thames), from a similar number of sampled rivers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU minimum: Phytophthora ramorum &amp; Phytophthora kernoviae survey of Parks, Gardens &amp; Commercial establishments</td>
<td><strong>During 2016/17, 1,530 retail outlets and nurseries were visited against a target of 1000 (target met). 504 wider environment sites were inspected against a target of 300 (target met). 384 sites trading in Phytophthora ramorum hosts received an additional inspection visit (97%) against a target of 95% of 396 retailers trading in P ramorum hosts that can receive plant passports. The total number of visits was 2,418.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In 2015/16, 1,680 visits took place at retail outlets and nurseries were visited, there were 747 wider environment sites inspected and 369 visits to plant passporting nurseries. The total number of visits was 2,796.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>This compares to 2014/2015, when 2,353 visits were undertaken at retail outlets and nurseries, there were 1,305 visits to parks and gardens, 481 visits to plant passporting nurseries, a total of 4,139 visits.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN survey</td>
<td><strong>The EU requires 0.5% of the area used to produce ware potatoes to be sampled. For England and Wales, this amounts to 450 ha – growers are randomly selected for inspection.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In 2016, 483ha was sampled, with 531 samples taken, 34% was found to be infested</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Disease/ Pest Surveillance

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total area sampled (ha)</strong></td>
<td>482.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of fields with <em>G. pallida</em> only (ha)</td>
<td>143.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of fields with <em>G. rostochiensis</em> only (ha)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of fields with combined population (ha)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total infested area (ha)</strong></td>
<td>165.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2015, 279.9 hectares (54%) were found to be infested from a sampled area of 514.8 hectares.

In 2014, 161.4 hectares (34%) were found to be infested from a sampled area of 474 hectares.

### Epitrix surveillance

- In 2016, for England and Wales a target was set to inspect 200 consignments of ware potatoes grown from UK seed. 166 consignments (83%) were inspected. However, this failure to meet the target for UK grown seed was countered by exceeding the 2016 target for inspecting 50% of all Spanish and Portuguese notified ware consignments: 320 consignments were notified, with 251 inspected (157%).
- In 2015, for England and Wales a target was set to inspect 200 consignments of ware potatoes grown from UK seed. 198 consignments (99%) were inspected.
- In 2014, APHA were notified of 240 consignments of ware potatoes grown from UK seed. 40% of the ware potato consignments were inspected.


- No set targets per pest. Plant hosts were inspected as part of Quarantine Surveillance inspections.
- Quarantine Surveillance inspection visit frequency is determined by a PHSI established risk matrix.

2.336 As part of quarantine surveillance, inspection visits were determined according to the following risk matrix:

#### General Quarantine Surveillance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Plant Health Risk Rating</th>
<th>Minimum &amp; Maximum achievement</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High risk (10-12 visits per year)</td>
<td>240 visits (100% of required visits)</td>
<td>220 - 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk (4-6 visits per year)</td>
<td>632 visits (100% of required visits)</td>
<td>651 - 103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Brown Rot (*Ralstonia solanacearum*)

During 2016, two watercourses in the Middle Level area of the Cambridge Fens were found to be contaminated with pathogen that causes brown rot of potatoes. Brown rot is a damaging disease of potatoes spread by infected tubers and by contaminated water. APHA’s annual surveillance program in England targets watercourses in areas where potatoes are commonly grown. For potato and tomato crops only, the watercourses concerned were subject to irrigation restrictions. APHA and Defra worked with national and stakeholder organisations, as well as with individual growers in the area, to ensure that affected potato growers are informed of the disease’s consequences and their options for irrigating in future.

### Scotland

2.338 In Scotland for 2016, the number of import consignments from third countries decreased on previous years. This coincides with the demise of a major fresh herb packer this year. Operational targets were met.

2.339 In 2016, seed and ware potato exports continued to increase: 81,398 tonnes of seed and 8,760 of ware potatoes were exported this year. This compares to 78,500 tonnes for seed and approximately 7,900 tonnes of ware potatoes in 2015. The Canary Islands rejected a number of consignments of potatoes imported from Scotland during the 2016/17 season (August to May annually). Scotland saw 10.8% of their seed rejected, with 5% of the ware also turned away.

2.340 All pest and disease surveys required by EU legislation were successfully undertaken.

### Enforcement activities for Single Market and EU surveillance activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease/ Pest</th>
<th>Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dothistroma</em> Needle Blight of Pine</td>
<td>- Joint growing season inspections to forestry nurseries were carried out with Forest Research. DNB was identified at one site and infected stock was destroyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erwinia amylovora</em> Fireblight</td>
<td>- Six nurseries requested fireblight buffer zone status and had host plants tested for latent symptoms. All samples taken from nurseries and the surrounding buffer zone were negative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Phytophthora* – Nursery Trade   | - Registered nurseries producing susceptible material for *P. ramorum* and *P. kernoviae* continue to receive 2 site inspections plus one based on risk.  
- *P. ramorum* continues to affect two production nurseries near Perth. Monitoring and testing is on-going, and infected plants have been destroyed. In addition, a nursery near Glasgow was found to have *P. ramorum* on imported Dutch *Rhododendron* hybrid plants, which had been on site for less than a year. All |
### Disease/ Pest | Surveillance
--- | ---
Plants were destroyed. Inspections at nurseries and garden centres have also included visual checks of *P. austrocedri* and *P. lateralis* hosts. *P. austrocedri* was identified on ornamental juniper (*Juniperus chinensis* Ferngold, *Juniperus communis Depressa nana Aurea, and Juniperus squamata Blue Carpet*) at another garden centre. Investigations showed the plants had been on site for over a year.

**Phytophthora – Gardens/Landscaped sites**
- In 2016, there were 51 active outbreak areas for *P. ramorum* and *P. kernoviae*. (37 with *P. ramorum*, seven with *P. kernoviae*, seven with both). In addition, there are six sites within FC Scotland management zone. There are also 39 gardens which have ‘non- active’ status (with controls lifted and continued monitoring as part of general surveillance activity).
- This compares to 47 active outbreak areas for *P. ramorum* and *P. kernoviae* in 2015.
- SASA confirmed the first finding in the UK of *Phytophthora foliorum* on a single *Rhododendron ponticum* plant on a roadside in the Highland area. The pathogen was found whilst conducting an official survey for *Phytophthora ramorum*. A 1.5 km radius detection survey around the infected plant was undertaken and infection was confirmed in one other Rhododendron plant. This appears to be the first record of this pathogen infecting *R. ponticum*. The new *Phytophthora* was considered by the UK Plant Health Risk Group in April 2016 and it was agreed that no statutory action would be required.

**Plum Pox virus survey**
- The survey was undertaken by visiting 10 orchards across Scotland. Samples taken from five fruiting trees of *Prunus domestica* Haganta located at a Fruit Farm, in Montrose, tested positive for the Plum Pox virus. The trees were planted in 2011 and were removed by the grower.

### Ni

2.341 In 2016/17 6,356 (hort), 2,328 crops inspections were carried out for a range of organisms, including those required under EU protected zone surveys.

2.342 Imports checks on ware potato imports continued with special emphasis on inspecting all Spanish ware potato imports due to increased risks from *Epitrix spp*. 30 lots of Spanish potato imports were inspected with no findings of the pest or damage to tubers.

2.343 Inspections have continued for *Phytophthora ramorum* due to outbreaks in larch and on ash to detect *Ash Dieback (Hymenoscyphus fraxineus)*.

2.344 During routine testing in August 2016 the Netherlands National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO) found Potato Spindle Tuber Viroid (PSTVd), on stock supplied by the AFBI potato breeding collection at Loughgall in March 2016. DAERA initiated an Incident Management Plan under serious plant health contingency arrangements. In response to the finding 591 samples from six locations were tested. The former Plant Breeding Station at Loughgall provided the only positive finding. Immediate action was taken adopting the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation

---

(EPPO) protocol and the UK Pest Specific control plan for PSTVd and resulted in detention of all stocks with infected and associated material destroyed.

**Summary of new disease outbreaks at the end of 2016 (NI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Outbreak sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erwinia amylovora</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora ramorum Ash Dieback</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN)</td>
<td>14 fields restricted, 21 fields cleared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surveillance pests surveys carried out during 2016 (NI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Surveillance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bemisia tabaci</td>
<td>496 inspections, no findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liriomyza bryoniae</td>
<td>486 inspections, no findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptinotarsa decemlineata</td>
<td>62 (hort) inspections, no findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwinia amylovora</td>
<td>590 inspections, 7 positive sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoplophora spp</td>
<td>374 inspections, no findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora ramorum</td>
<td>556 inspections, 8 positive sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavibacter michiganensis and Ralstonia solanacearum</td>
<td>188 samples of seed and ware potatoes were tested for Ring Rot and Brown Rot. In addition, there were 32 water samples from rivers and processors and 7 Woody Night Shade plants sampled were tested. No findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabrotica virgifera</td>
<td>3 fields (12 ha) trapped as part of all Ireland strategy. No findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhizomania</td>
<td>8 fields inspected and 5 beet samples tested. No findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTVd</td>
<td>34 inspections, with 591 samples taken, 1 positive site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of intensity and type of plant controls in the UK**

2.345 In the UK, during 2016, overall compliance in the official controls improved. This was mainly brought about by the continuing EU ban on commodities from India and Ghana. The ban prohibited the import of a large number of consignments which had previously been responsible for a high level of non-compliance – they carried prohibited pests. In 2016, import inspection targets were largely met for England and Wales.

2.346 Pest findings are the main reasons for notifications; in England and Wales, they account for 61% of all notifications. In 2016, the six countries with the greatest number of pest notifications were: Bangladesh, India, Nigeria, Vietnam, Sri Lanka and Thailand, with these notifications accounting for approximately 49% of pest interceptions. The four most commonly intercepted pests were: Bemisia tabaci (tobacco whitefly), Helicoverpa spp. (Bollworm), Thrips sp., and Tephritidae (fruit flies) – these accounted for 21% of all pest interceptions.
2.347 When harmful organisms or outbreaks are found at ports or inland, the vast majority of businesses co-operate with APHA PHSI and other inspectors in destroying affected stock. Additionally, most businesses will enter imports correctly into the advance notification system (PEACH) and produce records for plant passport inspections, etc.

2.348 Pests present in imported consignments pose a risk to crops, plants in commercial production and in the wider environment in the EU. The root causes were lack of awareness or understanding of the EU import requirements and a disregard for the risks presented by sending plants and plant products infested by pests into or within the EU, with the profit motive outweighing the long-term potential benefits of maintained and improved crop production and biodiversity.

**Summary of imports subject to inspections**

2.349 In England and Wales, the number of consignments declared and requiring controls continued to increase. In 2016, there was an increase of 5% (100,571 in 2016 compared to 95,153 in 2015).

---

The total for physical plant health inspections is less than total imports because some “safer” trades are subject to reduced rates under EU legislation. Some trades e.g. cut flowers require rates as low as 5%.
2.350 The number of non-compliances and notifications to the European Commission for England and Wales rose to 1,041 in 2016. 387 related to documentary infringements, 632 for pests and 22 for diseases.

2.351 The instances of non-compliance of third country imports into Scotland are as follows:

- Soil samples taken from a consignment of bonsai imported from Japan were found to be free from quarantine nematodes although some saprophytic, non-quarantine species were found. Additional destructive sampling for Anoplophora spp. was also undertaken for Acer, Carpinus, Cotoneaster and Ulmus.
- A live Colorado beetle (Leptinotarsa decemlineata) was found by a member of the public in a pack of Spanish baby spinach bought from a supermarket store in Scotland. Further checks were made at other stores and at the major depot centre nothing further was found.
- Apple Snails (Pomacea spp) were being advertised for sale from an aquatic shop via social media. Twenty five snails were seized.
2.352 For the FC, the number of non-compliances increased dramatically in 2014/15. This increase was due mainly to additional resources being made available to perform wood packaging material checks associated with commodities (heavy metal and stone products) considered to be a high risk, at ports of landing. The additional resources have been maintained and this has again resulted in a further marked increase in the number of interceptions reported in 2016/17 (273) from the previous year (158).

2.353 The majority of non-compliances involved wood packaging material not being compliant with the international standard ISPM15 (absence of marks or illegible marks) and therefore the material was subjected to remedial action.

2.354 One significant case involved the interception of regulated stone material from China and the finding of the quarantine forestry pest Pine Wood Nematode and a live longhorn beetle larvae in pallet wood associated with the consignment.

2.355 The causes of the non-compliances resulted from the failure by wood packaging material manufacturers and treatment providers in the country of export to ensure that the material was compliant with ISPM15:

- clearly marked with a traceable ISPM15 mark
- within the bark tolerance level permitted and
2.356 The main significant consequences of the non-compliances are that a quarantine pest such as Asian Longhorn Beetle and Pine Wood Nematode (for which the vector beetle is *Monochamus spp*) could be introduced into the country. The root cause is poor compliance with ISPM15 marking requirements or wood packaging material that has not been subjected to ISPM15 approved measures.

2.357 In 2016, there remained a decreased focus on inspections of wood packaging material associated with stone and iron materials from China in response to Commission Implementing Decision 2015/474 (amending 2013/92/EC). This legislation required a lower inspection level of 15% of imports for all eight CN Codes included within it.

2.358 The intensity and type of controls for sawn timber in 2016 were consistent with the previous two years in terms of performing 100% documentary, identity and physical plant health checks for imports of controlled timber. The exception to this check is for wood of maple from Canada where physical inspection checks are performed on a reduced frequency basis.

2.359 In NI, no interceptions of harmful organisms were made on any imported consignments of regulated plant material from 3rd countries.
2.360 The number of phytosanitary certificates issued by the FC during 2016 remained broadly similar to previous years. The number of businesses registered to issue plant passports during 2016 remained broadly similar to previous years. The number of scientific licences issued in 2016 by the FC was comparable with 2015, with five issued.

2.361 In England and Wales, in 2016 there are 145 establishments licenced to import or hold prohibited plants and pests under 266 licences, a slight increase from 2015. All Defra Plant Health licence holders have been contacted by APHA PHSI in line with business frequency targets. In 2016, the FC’s five scientific licences were issued on the basis of the standard operating procedures (SOPs) and no establishments were inspected.

2.362 In Scotland, in 2016 there was a slight decrease in the number of scientific licences issued in comparison to 2015. Scientific licence holders in Scotland are contacted every year. The on-going inspection programme of licensed establishments includes visits every three years, with more frequent inspections of establishments that hold high risk material. All new
establishments are inspected before licences are issued.

**Enforcement trends: Actions taken in cases of non-compliance**

2.363 For APHA PHSI, enforcement of import controls is mainly by action on non-compliant consignments (re-export or destruction at the importer’s expense). During 2016 in England and Wales, the number of non-compliant actions fell to 1,041 from 1,256 during 2015, a fall of 17%. The number of actions is significantly lower in comparison to the period 2011-2015, when there has been a relatively consistent level of non-compliance actions of between 1,100 and 1,400 actions per year.
Chapter 3
National Systems of Audit

Food and feed sectors

Official Controls for which the FSA is responsible

Audit of Local and Port Health Authorities

3.1 In England the approach to audit of LAs (including PHAs) has been risk based, involving an assessment of the performance of selected authorities by comparing data from the LAEMS annual submissions against audit selection criteria. Following a desk top analysis of LAEMS data LAs are then allocated and prioritised against a range of appropriate follow up audit actions from full on site audits (core audits) to one day audit visits and in depth desktop assessments. Other available information on LA performance is also used to inform audit selection.

3.2 Following consultation with policy and delivery colleagues themed topics for official controls delivery are also selected for inclusion in the annual audit plan – these are known as “focused audits” where an official controls theme is audited across a number of LAs with the production of reports for each LA and a summary report for the sponsoring FSA manager.

3.3 In 2016/17 core and focused audits were carried out in 26 authorities, 12 revisits were undertaken. The focused audit programmes carried out in the audit year examined Feed of Non-Animal Origin (FeNAO) and Feed Establishment.

3.4 In Wales the three-year programme of full audits continued in order to assess LA performance in delivering food hygiene and food standards official controls. LAs were audited against the requirements of The Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Controls by LAs. Feed official controls were not included within scope as a new delivery model for feed was launched on 1 April 2015 with regional delivery of official feed controls by LA officers. In 2016/17 six LAs were audited in relation to their reports on Food and Feed Law Enforcement Service. There were 173 recommendations in total.

3.5 Follow-up audits were carried out in six LAs in association with earlier audits.

3.6 A new programme of audits of LAs in NI has commenced covering all 11 new LAs with a pilot audit in March 2017. The audit programme will examine the organisation and management of the new food services in each of the LAs. The programme will run between 2017 and 2020.

Main recommendations
**England**

3.7 The recorded audit recommendations vary depending on the scope and type of audit. In relation to the core audits, seven audits were undertaken during the audit year and the majority of the recommendations raised concerned compliance with statutory inspection frequencies (five), development and implementation of a service plan (four), development and implementation of a documented authorisation procedure (four) and development and implementation of documented procedures on internal monitoring (three).

3.8 A focused programme of audits was undertaken to provide assurance that the new feed delivery model had been effectively implemented by LAs and that official controls, as laid down in the FSA’s Feed Law Enforcement Code of Practice, Practice Guidance and Framework Agreement, in regard to FNAO are being carried out by LAs, in order to safeguard animal and public health.

3.9 The majority of the recommendations raised concerned appointment of authorised officers (11), development and implementation of a service plan (nine), development and implementation of documented procedures on internal monitoring (eight), appropriate inspection, approval, registration and licensing of establishments (five).

3.10 Findings were reported to the individual authorities and a published summary audit report captured the overall findings, recommendations and good practice.

3.11 In Quarter 4 (Jan-March) of 2016/17 the England audit team conducted a pilot of one day assurance audits focusing on Service Organisation, Management and Internal Monitoring Arrangements.

3.12 The majority of the recommendations raised concerned the appointment of authorised officers (eight), development and implementation of a service plan (seven), annual review of performance against the service plan, compliance with statutory inspection frequencies (six) and development and implementation of documented procedures on internal monitoring (four).

3.13 Nine audits were initially planned, but three were deferred to Quarter 1 of 2017/18 due to LA commitments. Final reports for these audits are in the process of being agreed.

3.14 Recommendations from audit programmes were accepted by the audited authorities and corrective action plans were agreed. Ongoing follow-up audit verification checks, including on-site visits where necessary, are carried out to ensure that the agreed actions are prioritised and remedial action is taken within an acceptable timescale.

**Wales**

3.15 Overall findings in respect of the delivery of official controls for food hygiene are currently being analysed. Overall, they are largely being delivered in accordance with the FSA’s Framework Agreement and Food Law Code of Practice. LAs are taking a risk-based approach to interventions at food
businesses, and with the benefit of FSA funding, continue to work with businesses to assist them in achieving compliance.

3.16 The statutory FHRS has afforded a degree of protection to LA resources for food safety in Wales despite the current austerity climate. The statutory scheme has been effectively delivered by LAs in Wales and this is having a positive impact on food business compliance with food hygiene legislation. Where non-compliances are identified follow up is generally being carried out in accordance with an All Wales Revisit Policy which has been adopted by all LAs.

3.17 LA performance in delivering interventions at new businesses has continued to improve.

3.18 Findings in respect of the delivery of food standards official controls are also currently being analysed. Overall, planned interventions are not being carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Framework Agreement and Food Law Code of Practice. Most LAs have adopted a risk-based approach, but it has not generally been possible to assess the quality of interventions from the records available. In contrast, reactive food standards work e.g. responding to incidents and complaints and work in connection with Primary Authority / Home Authority matters continues to be delivered in accordance with FSA requirements and guidance.

FSS

3.19 A focussed audit programme on capacity and capability was carried out during 2016/17. Four LAs were selected for audit. A report was produced for each LA audited and an action plan put in place (as appropriate) to address the recommendations made. The audit scheme in Scotland was reviewed during 2015/16 with the introduction of an assurance category assigned following audit: substantial assurance, reasonable assurance, limited assurance, insufficient assurance. From the four audits carried out during 2016/17 there were two that received a substantial assurance category, one that received a limited assurance category and one that received an insufficient category.

NI

3.20 Two recommendations were made in the pilot audit of the new audit programme examining organisation and management systems. The first recommendation related to the follow-up on an enforcement notice. The second related to the registration and risk assessment of a new FBO.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>No. of authorities/ DAERA NI Units</th>
<th>No. of establishment ‘reality checks’</th>
<th>Final report(s) or other correspondence issued/published/due</th>
<th>No. of recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Service Delivery and Business Compliance</td>
<td>April – June 2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final reports published: food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/audit reports/audengreport/</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of LA Service Delivery Operation of the FHRS*</td>
<td>April – June 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final reports published: food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/audit reports/audengreport/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Moved from Q4 of previous financial year due to LA commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEMS 1 Day Audits</td>
<td>April – June 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Summary letter and action plan sent to LA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit revisits</td>
<td>April – June 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Updated LA action plans are published on the FSA website against the original individual LA audit report.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA Audit of Feed of Non-Animal Origin (FNAO) and Feed Establishment</td>
<td>July – Sept 2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Final reports published: food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/audit reports/audengreport/</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Service Delivery and Business Compliance</td>
<td>Oct – Dec 2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final reports published: food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/audit reports/audengreport/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit revisits</td>
<td>Oct – Dec 2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Updated LA action plans are published on the FSA website against the original individual LA audit report.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Food Hygiene Service Delivery Focusing on Service Organisation, Management and Internal Monitoring Arrangements</td>
<td>Jan – Mar 2017</td>
<td>6 (3 audits moved to Q1 of 2017 due to LA commitments)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Final reports to be published</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit revisits</td>
<td>Jan – Mar 2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Updated LA action plans are published on the FSA website against the original individual LA audit report.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Food and Feed Law Enforcement Service</td>
<td>April 2016-March 2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Reports published: <a href="http://food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports">food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to LAs in connection with audits</td>
<td>April 16-March 17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Updated action plans are added to the original audit reports and re-published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A due to pilot audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

68 All reports can be found at [food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports](http://food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports)
FSA Internal Audit

3.21  The FSA’s internal audit team carries out risk based systems audits on operational systems, processes and procedures for the FSA in England, Wales and NI and for FSS in Scotland as part of annual programmes agreed with the respective audit committees. FSA Internal Audit also carried out one audit on behalf of the VMD. These internal audits ensure that requirements of the UK Public Sector Internal Audit Standards and Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) 882/2004 are met.

3.22  In accordance with EU guidance, there is also a five-year cycle for all official controls to be audited and so, as well as focusing on high risk areas, the audit plans for the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years included operational areas which were lower or medium risks, with follow up audits to monitor implementation of corrective actions from previous audits.

3.23  The main objective of the programmes of audits conducted by the FSA internal audit team during the 2016 calendar year in relation to official controls was to provide assurance to FSA, FSS and VMD management and the respective Boards that enforcement was effective, consistent, risk-based and proportionate.

3.24  The four grades of audit opinions or equivalent used during the period covered by the report were “Substantial”70, “Moderate”71, “Limited”72 and “Unsatisfactory”73. The following audits were completed and reports issued between January and December 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy area audited</th>
<th>Audit Opinion</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Enforcement Management System (FSA)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal By-Products (England and Wales and FSS)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS Audits of FBO Controls (FSA)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Alert System for Food Incidents (FSA)</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Incidents Management (FSA)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS Audits of FBO Controls in approved meat establishments</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine official controls-VMD</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70 “Substantial” means the framework of governance, risk management and control is adequate and effective.
71 “Moderate” means some improvements are required to enhance the adequacy and effectiveness of the framework of governance, risk management and control.
72 “Limited”, there are significant weaknesses in the framework of governance, risk management and control such that it could be or could become inadequate and ineffective.
73 “Unsatisfactory” means there are fundamental weaknesses in the framework of governance, risk management and control such that it is inadequate and ineffective or is likely to fail.
The majority of the corrective and preventative actions agreed with management were aimed at improving policy and procedural guidance to ensure consistency in the application of official controls and their outcomes. Audit reports also identified the need for improved records and more effective monitoring of official control activities to help identify and correct poor practices and recurring issues.

**Defra internal audits**

**Animal traceability  – England RPA – GB**

Two audits relating to animal traceability of official food/feed controls were carried out by the RPA Internal Audit in 2016; covering the processes and procedures used by British Cattle Movement Scheme (BCMS) for Bovine and Ovine traceability and the framework for delivery of BCMS services to the devolved administrations (Scotland and Wales) The audit testing conducted during these reviews provided a ‘substantial’ level of assurance for both.

One ‘low’ priority action and three advisory points were raised through these reviews. Progress on the delivery of the action is being tracked by RPA Internal Audit.

Audit activity to track/advise and review major cross system programmes and projects has been scheduled into the RPA 2017/18 annual audit plan - this will include the Livestock Identification Programme.

**Protein in animal feed ban**

The national Lead Veterinary Officer carried out an audit of some inspection reports and an overview of regional performance.

**Veterinary Residues Surveillance**

The VMD carried out audits of the sampling procedures and processes performed by FSA, FSS, Marine Scotland and the National Bee Unit.

A list of recommendations has been produced which have been implemented. No evidence of significant failings was found.

**Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance**

Auditing of antimicrobial resistance surveillance and policy is carried out by external providers in accordance with the UK Five Year AMR Strategy 2013-2018. Collection of caecal samples is carried out by FSA on behalf of the VMD; an SLA is in place detailing the KPIs for sample collection. APHA carry out all AMR testing on behalf of the VMD. Success is measured through submission of data to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) in compliance with Commission Decision 2013/652/EU and through KPIs as stated in the Service Level Agreement. Success of surveillance of antibiotic sales is measured through publication of data in the annual national report, UK-Veterinary Antimicrobial Resistance and Sales Surveillance, and through stakeholder feedback.
Aquatic Animal Health

3.33  In October 2016 the Fish Health Inspectorate hosted a mission from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) on the UK’s aquatic animal health regulatory regime. The purpose of the mission was to facilitate the continuation of trade in live aquatic animals for retail of food under the trade agreement between the European Union and Canada. Whilst the audit covered the breadth of aquatic animal health controls particular emphasis was placed upon the shellfish sector. Prior to the audit the CFIA requested documentation in respect of the UK's regulatory framework, inspection programmes and the quality management system in relation to disease surveillance and diagnosis. A comprehensive programme included audits of the Cefas Weymouth laboratory and the APHA BIP at Heathrow airport, and visits to shellfish farms in England and Guernsey. The mission was considered a success and initial indications from the CFIA officials was that the UK has a robust and thorough regulatory system in place. Of particular note the CFIA officials described the Cefas quality management system as exemplary. The official audit report will be available in 2017.

UK Internal Audit Programme (England - Defra), NI, Scotland and Wales

3.34  The audit programme was successfully completed and action has been taken to address any issues raised.

OFFC Internal Audits carried out in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Programme</th>
<th>Conclusions/recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND – Defra Internal Audit carried out three audits and two follow up audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.  Management of Endemic Zoonotic Animal Diseases (including alignment, cross-</td>
<td>• This advisory review focused on Defra process for developing the contingency plans to manage the risks of a zoonotic animal disease outbreak in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network, to emergency response)</td>
<td>• This review provided a limited opinion over the areas reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Biotechnology: GM food environmental safety risk assessments</td>
<td>• As a result of an adequate outside assurance source (EC auditors covered the entire process approximately 18 months ago), no further value was seen as obtainable from continuing the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were two actions arising from the EC auditors’ review, both of which are complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No further recommendations were made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Defra's policy and lead Competent Authority role in relation to food</td>
<td>• An advisory review that focussed on controls in place and improvements required to ensure robust monitoring of the assurance work carried out by the FSA to ensure that Local Authorities are complying with EU food labelling regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses - composition and standards labelling</td>
<td>• Defra does not have a formal, direct relationship with the LA enforcement officers but in practice works with them through the FSA. This audit focussed on the controls in place and improvements required to ensure robust monitoring of the assurance work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
carried out by the Department to ensure that Local Authorities are carrying out their legal duties to enforce food legislation and ensure compliance with EU food labelling regulations and food compositional standards rules.

- This review provided a moderate opinion.
- Three medium risk recommendations were made.

4. Follow up of Protected Food Names Audit

- Two actions remain outstanding. Progress has been hindered by the referendum result.

5. Follow up of Beef Labelling Audit

- Two actions remain outstanding. Following the EU referendum result a fundamental review of policy and enforcement activity is required.

**SCOTLAND** - SG Internal Audit Division (SGIAD) carried out two audits of ‘discreet official controls areas’ (as per their five year audit strategy)

The Scottish Government’s OFFC Co-ordinator requests an annual return from areas where staff are performing official controls. Namely, that they are satisfied that any staff working on their behalf engaged in activities that may impact on the Official Feed and Food Regulation (EC regulation 882/2004) meet the requirements of Article 6 of this regulation (attached below for ease of reference). In other words, that staff are suitably trained under the obligations of the Regulation. Areas with staff affected are as follows:

- Animal Inspections (Compliance / Traceability)
- Plant Health
- Aquaculture and Fisheries
- Poultry Inspectors / Egg Marketing
- Bee Health
- TSE/ Traceability/ Animal Strategy
- Beef Labelling Meat and Livestock
- Potato Health Inspections
- Crop Health Inspections

In addition, Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO) Scotland now has a clear line of sight in relation to risk management in the shape of 15 fully operational Official Controls risk registers and a central OC risk database. These registers are particularly important where the CVO has no formal day to day responsibility (but remains fully accountable under OC legislation), but staff are carrying out work on the SG’s behalf. It means that every quarter we are now able to assess the risk factors for each area at a central level, which was not possible before and escalate any issues if necessary. Considering many areas risks are seasonal, having a “live” record throughout the year is crucial for monitoring purposes. The 15 areas with operational risk registers are as follows:

- Animal By-Products
- Animal Identification, Registration and Movement
- Animal Strategy, Planning and Exotics Diseases
- Authorisation of Establishments and collection Teams for Germplasm (Semen, Embryo and Ova)
- Bee Health
- Beef Labelling
- Crops & Plant Health
- Egg and Poultry Marketing/Inspections
- Fish Health & Shellfish Health
- Horse Agents Licensing and Passport Issuing
- Import Controls – Animals/Wild Animals
- OFFC Implementation, operation and co-ordination
- Organic Products
- Pesticide Residues
- Potato Health (areas not covered under the Crops & Plant Health)
- Protected Food Names
- TSE Surveillance monitoring
- Veterinary Medicines Residue monitoring

**WALES** – The European Funds Audit Team (EFAT) within the Corporate Governance & Assurance (CG&A) Division of the WG has developed a five year audit strategy for Official Feed & Food Controls. The overall purpose of this strategy is to put in place an approach that will allow the Head of CG&A to manage the audit function to deliver a balanced assurance to the Permanent Secretary and the European Commission on the adequacy and effectiveness of OFFC controls for which the Welsh Government is the competent authority.

1. Review of the Service Level Agreement between Welsh Government and APHA and monitoring of Performance Standards including the following areas:
   - Animal Identification
   - Animal Welfare
   - Bovine TB
   - Exotic animal diseases / contingency planning
   - Zoonoses
   - Animal by-products

   • Fieldwork was not completed by end of the 2016 calendar year that is being reported on.

2. Review of the monitoring and control procedures related to local authorities' inspection regimes.

   • Fieldwork was not completed by end of the 2016 calendar year that is being reported on.

**DAERA NI** - Internal Audit Branch continued with implementation of the audit strategy covering arrangements for animal health and welfare controls for which DAERA are responsible

1. TB Prevention & Control
   - Final Report 06/01/16 Satisfactory

2. Bee Health
   - Final Report 23/12/16 Satisfactory

3. EBL Surveillance Requirements
   - Final Report 18/10/16 Satisfactory

4. Inspection of fish imports & exports, Fish exports and movement authorisation, Enforcement Activities
   - Final Report 23/03/16 Satisfactory

5. Implementation of previously agreed Internal Audit recommendations were followed-up: TB Prevention & Control
   - Final report 24/06/2016

**Directorate F audits and missions**

3.35 The following is a summary of the Directorate F audit information for the UK for 2016, with links to the reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspection No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Inspection Period</th>
<th>Links to Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-8908</td>
<td>Private certification schemes for feed sector</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Report details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-8688</td>
<td>Fishery products</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Report details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-8977</td>
<td>Authorisation of plant protection products</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Report details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-8767</td>
<td>Animal welfare - dairy farms</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>Report details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-8907</td>
<td>Feed export to the EU</td>
<td>Nov 2016</td>
<td>Report details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.36 A number of fact finding/study visits were also conducted in 2016; however these reports were not published as they formed the basis for overview reports.

**Control Bodies**

**Audits/inspections of control bodies in relation to animal health controls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control body</th>
<th>Control tasks</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| APHA (from 1 January – 31 December 2016) | Scrapie genotyping service under contract to Defra in support of the GB Voluntary Scrapie Flocks Scheme and the CSFS | The Central Sequencing Unit, APHA had the following Audits, Inspections, Proficiency Tests (EQA) and Quality:  
- LRQA Inspection 11 Jan 2016, no actions raised in CSU and audit criteria was met.  
- NRL Inspection on 4 Feb 2016. Three recommendations were raised for the CSU. The inspectors found the CSU laboratory facilities continued to be maintained according to the NRL requirements.  
- APHA System Audit on 13 & 14 September. Nine corrections and two Preventative actions were raised. Procedures & processes were seen to be fit for purpose and meeting the requirements for UKAS ISO 17025 and ISO9001  
- UKAS ISO 17025:2005 Surveillance visit three on 23 Nov 2016. There were no findings and accreditation was maintained for the current scope.  
- Three Vertical audits were completed; actions raised for Scrapie genotyping tests were in Feb (one correction), May (three corrections) and Oct 2016 (two corrections and one Opportunity). Procedures & processes were seen to be fit for purpose and meeting the requirements for UKAS ISO 17025 and ISO9001.  
- Three Test Audits were carried out in CSU on support SOPs for the Scrapie genotyping tests. The SOPs were found to be fit for purpose and compiled with ISO17025 and ISO9001  
- Internal Quality Assurances were undertaken twice in the year in March & October.  
- Two VETQAs Proficiency Testing Schemes were successfully completed:  
  - Scrapie Tissue genotyping (NRL), Distribution 12291/SE PT0093 Feb 16  
  - Scrapie Tissue genotyping (NRL), Distribution 12397/SE PT0100 May 16  
  
Two other EQA – previously done alongside Cellmark, were successfully completed in June & Dec 2016. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Transport carrier Companies approved by Defra and audited by APHA to bring dogs, cats or ferrets to GB in accordance with the EU Pet Travel Scheme</th>
<th>Documentary and identity checks as required are undertaken by carriers to confirm compliance with the EU pet travel Regulation (576/2013)</th>
<th>• In 2016 300,150 cats, dogs and ferrets were imported into the UK under the EU Pet Travel Scheme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• APHA carried checks on a sample of those animals as part of routine quality assurance checks on the work undertaken by the carriers. This surveillance is carried out randomly at entry points. Where any non-compliance was found, the carrier was informed and if required, the animal was either re-exported or placed in quarantine depending on the circumstances. No carriers were suspended or had their agreements terminated during 2016. Any non-compliances discovered during audit were addressed directly with the carrier concerned and additional training was provided by APHA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Food and feed sectors

Grants

4.1 The following graph show the financial support (£) provided in grants to LAs and control bodies by central government for feed and food control work over the last financial year.\(^7\)

\(^7\) Funding for FHRS and FHIS ended in 2015/16
4.2 The table below sets out more detail on the recipients of this financial support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Provided to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Hygiene at Primary Production</td>
<td>The FSA provided funding of £824,025.67 distributed via NTS to LAs. FSS provided £62,866 of funding to LAs and SG to carry out training, primary production food and feed inspections (covers FY 2016/17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Fraud</td>
<td>The FSA awarded £100,000 in financial year 2016/17 to assist three LAs with food fraud investigations. FSS FCIU provided £2,624 to LA for sample analysis in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Sampling/Analysis</td>
<td>The FSA provided £610,000 of funding to LAs across GB and DAERA in NI to undertake targeted sampling for the presence of undesirable substances. FSS in Scotland provided £145,716 (covers FY 2016/17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Sampling/Analysis</td>
<td>The FSA provided £280,678.07 to LAs across GB and DAERA in NI to undertake targeted sampling for the presence of undesirable substances in feed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of LA delivery of feed controls</td>
<td>The FSA provided £1,302,847.22 to LAs in GB to undertake a programme of inspections of feed business establishments across all sectors. In NI DAERA carries out official feed controls and has its own budget for this work, so there is no cost to FSA in NI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Standards</td>
<td>Defra provides an annual grant to Control Bodies to carry out specific obligations. In 2016 this was £362,538 and payment is UK wide as Control Bodies approval covers UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Database</td>
<td>Defra provides funding to The Soil Association to run the seed database for operators to identify available organic seed. £26,280 is paid to database manager for UK wide management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plant health sector

4.3 Additional funding was available to maintain the number of PHSI inspectors in 2016/17 (110) in order to increase the number of inspections and the range of activities to improve import controls at UK borders.

4.4 The FC continues to operate a full cost recovery inspection regime. In 2013, the FC received additional resources for a planned two year period to increase its inspections of wood packaging material associated with known high risk commodities and this funding continued in 2016/17.

4.5 Scotland, introduced full cost recovery of fees covering the costs of documentary checks, identity checks and physical plant health checks of certain imports of plants, plant products and other objects from third countries which are required by Article 13a(1) of the 2000/29 directive. The new legislation was introduced in 2015.

4.6 In the implementation of the All-Ireland Chalara Control Strategy in NI, three temporary inspectors were engaged from May to October 2016 to undertake inspection, and sampling duties for Ash Dieback. This resource was supplemented by full time Plant Health Inspectors from Plant Health Inspection Branch, Forest Service.
Co-ordination and co-operation in the food and feed sectors

Food Standards Agency

FSA Operations

5.1 Throughout 2016/17 FSA continued to embed the organisational changes made in 2015/16, to better align core functions and improve delivery. The Operations Assurance Division was expanded to increase focus on delivery of animal welfare official controls and business transformation and intervention.

5.2 In January 2017 the contract for provision of OVs and Meat Hygiene Inspectors in England and Wales was awarded to a single supplier. These contracted staff work alongside employed FSA staff in meat establishments. The contract runs from March 2017 for two years (with the facility for a further one year extension).

5.3 The organisation chart below shows the 2016/17 overarching responsibilities for FSA Operations:
5.4 Following the establishment of FSS on 1 April 2015 a new organisational structure for operational delivery functions has been put in place, making a number of changes to the previous structure under the FSA in Scotland. This is led by the FSS Director of Operations, and comprises the following teams:

- Operational Delivery
- Enforcement Delivery
- Audit
- Scottish Food Crime & Incidents Unit

**Revision of the Food Law Codes of Practice**

5.5 A newly revised Food Law Code of Practice (England) came into force in March 2017, the main amendments being to:

- facilitate consistent interpretation and approach by LA officers delivering official controls, specifically in relation to risk scoring; by updating advice and clarifying the risk descriptors used in the food establishment intervention rating schemes
- provide additional guidance on the communication of food incidents and hazards, and addressing food criminality
- further clarify qualification and competency requirements of LA officers since the implementation of the previous Code revision.
- streamline the document to improve readability
- update links, terminology, and references to legislation.

5.6 A Development team was set up by FSS in January 2016 to take forward the recommendations of the Scottish Food Enforcement Liaison Committee working group, which was established to review the Food Law Code of Practice (Scotland), in line with recommendation 57 of the Scudamore report.

5.7 The Development team consists of three members of FSS and three LA representatives, who have been tasked with the development of the proposed “Ladder Model” and the creation of a new combined food law enforcement matrix.

5.8 The FSS Annex 5 Review Project was officially launched on the 1 October 2016, with the commencement of a pilot, consisting of 10 LAs, with the purpose of testing the new model for 12 months, followed by a detailed analysis of the outcomes.

5.9 The Food Law Code of Practice (NI) 2016 is currently under review, in line with the newly revised Food Law Code of Practice (England) 2017.

**Revision of the Feed Law Code of Practice**

5.10 The Feed Law Code of Practice (Scotland) was updated in March 2016 to reflect the implementation of Earned Recognition in Scotland. Its issue was accompanied by the Earned Recognition Practice Guidance, both available on
5.11  The Feed Law Enforcement Guidance (NI) was updated in September 2016.

5.12  The Feed Law Code of Practice Guidance was published in Wales in December 2016 to fully implement the earned recognition.

Delivery of Official Feed Law Controls in England

5.13  In September 2016 the FSA undertook a review to assess the effectiveness of the new feed delivery model in England (NFDM): a multi-faceted solution to improve the effectiveness of official feed controls, delivered in partnership with key stakeholders, ensuring timely, appropriate, proportionate and consistent delivery of controls to secure compliance with feed law, which has been in place since April 2014 and is underpinned by a MoU with NTS.

5.14  The review demonstrated that the established partnership between NTS, FSA and Trading Standards Institute (TSI) supported effective and consistent delivery of official feed and food controls at the level of primary production across England through:

   a) an annually coordinated, risk-based national, regional and local intervention programmes for feed,
   b) sampling and import control checks; actively engaging all relevant LAs in planning and delivery of those official controls and monitoring intervention programmes to ensure delivery against plan and budget; and
   c) delivery of a number of improvement projects, the outcomes of which have been shared nationally.

5.15  A key focus of this new MoU for 2017-2020 is to:

   • build on the success of the previous MoU by seeking to provide more comprehensive measurement of the impact of feed controls undertaken through the Feed Delivery Program;
   • continue to work to sustain engagement levels with LAs; and
   • implement the feed strategic action plan to deliver improvements to the system of official feed controls as highlighted by the FSA Animal Feed Review and LA audits.

General Hygiene

Training for authorised officers

5.16  The FSA continued its programme of update training for LA food and feed law authorised officers at little or no cost to LAs. During the financial year 2016/17, 133 courses were held and 2,619 officers were trained in England.
5.17 The programme, delivered throughout the UK, covered training on a wide range of issues, including:

- HACCP assessment for Enforcement Officers
- Auditing food safety activities and processes
- *E. coli* cross-contamination guidance
- Feed safety (import controls, feed safety management and sampling)
- Import controls
- Shellfish hygiene
- Food fraud
- Use of sous-vide in food establishments
- Enforcement sanctions

5.18 Training delivered to FSA frontline staff throughout 2016 included:

- 10 members of staff received auditor training on Animal Feed Controls
- 13 members of staff had Animal Welfare Officer training
- 30 MHIs had Enforcement training
- 68 MHIs received evidence gathering and preparing for court training
- 87 MHIs received Knife safety training

Training specific to Wales lasupportwales@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

5.19 During 2016/17, the FSA in Wales funded 25 training courses for 629 LA officers.

5.20 A range of trainer-led courses were provided for LA officers in Wales covering food hygiene, food standards and animal feed. The training addressed the key priorities which were established at the start of the year, following consultation with key stakeholders and a review of policy changes.

5.21 The training programme covered the following areas:

- Feed contaminants
- Feed officer regional mentoring
- Food standards introduction for hygiene officers
- Private Water Supplies for small producers and primary production
- Hygiene Enforcement Sanctions
- Food Law refresher course
- Micro criteria for food with emphasis on *Listeria monocytogenes*
- Reducing the risk of *E. coli* O157
- Updated FSA to local authority communication system
- FHRS consistency
- FHRS appeals

5.22 As a result of the FSA funded training, 97.3% of LA officers gave positive feedback.

Training specific to FSS – Scotland
5.23 FSS funded training for 15 LA staff in “Bivalve Purification Inspections” in a course run in March 2017. Officers from 6 out of 32 LAs in Scotland attended the course.

5.24 FSS funded training for 11 LA staff in “HACCP in Speciality Cheese making” in a course run in March 2017. Officers from 7 out of 32 LAs in Scotland attended the course.

5.25 In May 2016 FSS held a LA Workshop, in partnership with the SFELC Risky Foods Working group, to update Scottish Officers on the SFELC guidance “Safe Service of Less Than Thoroughly Cooked Beef Burgers”. Officers from 30 out of 32 LAs attended.

5.26 A “Food Enforcement Partnership Event” was held in January 2017, in collaboration with the SFELC and the SOCOEHS. Representatives from 31 out of 32 Scottish LAs, SFELC, SOCOEHS and REHIS were in attendance. The event included updates from FSS, SFELC, SOCOEHS and a number of workshops covering a wide variety topics including Food Law, new approaches to Official Controls in Approved Establishments, FSS Regulatory Strategy, Food Crime, Nutrition and Environmental Health Department resourcing.

5.27 A launch event for the review of annex 5 provision within the Scottish Food Law Code of Practice was held. Officers from 31 out of 32 Scottish LAs attended.

5.28 A launch event was held for the launch of the “Scottish National Database”. Officers from 28 out of 32 LAs attended.

5.29 FSS continued to support the EH profession by awarding funding for student / graduate trainee EHOs up to the end of the 2018 financial year.

Training specific to NI

5.30 The following training courses were identified by the NI Food Managers Group and delivered throughout 2016/17:

- Food Standards Update (25 officers attended)
- Food Information Regulation Improvement Notice Drafting (50 officers attended)
- Micro criteria – focus on Listeria (25 officers attended)
- Sous Vide and/or Low Temperature Cooking or Processing (27 officers attended)
- Food supplements (60 officers attended)

MMO training

5.32 In 2016 the MMO ran six training courses for Marine Enforcement Officers from the MMO, all of which related to fisheries compliance and enforcement.

Meat controls
5.33 The moratorium on production and use of desinewed meat (DSM) remains in place and official controls are applied. One FBO has legally challenged the FSAs decision to impose the moratorium in the High Court by way of Judicial Review. As part of the case the High Court sought clarification from the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) on the definition of MSM and the CJEU made a preliminary ruling on 16 October 2014. The High Court judgement issued on 23 March 2016 found that, taking account of the principles established by CJEU, the facts of the case meant the FBO’s pig and poultry products in question were not MSM. Under the judgement the FBO’s pig and poultry products in question could be placed on the market outside of MSM requirements. The High Court granted permission to appeal its judgement. The appeal will be heard in 2017. As the decision of the Court of Appeal may impact on the advice and guidance in relation to MSM production the UK is adopting a holding position.

5.34 From April 2016 changes to the charging and discounting system for meat official controls was introduced to deliver fairer and more consistent charges for food businesses. The development of these changes was overseen by a joint FSA /industry Steering Group chaired by an independent chair. An overriding principle of the Steering Group was that nothing would be taken forward which would have an adverse impact on public health.

5.35 From June 2014 visual inspection of pigs was successfully introduced across the UK. The exception to the default visual inspection is for establishments where traditional inspection is needed to meet the requirements of an export certificate for trade with Third Countries, the FSA continues to provide assurance that this is done. Defra, with support from the FSA and the devolved administrations, will continue to work with Third Countries towards gaining assurances about the use of visual inspection procedures for exported meat in the future.

5.36 A new obligation in 854/2004 (introduced in June 2014) for Competent Authorities (CA) to collect all information on the total number of Salmonella Process Hygiene Criteria (PHC) samples taken by FBOs, including the number of positive results. The legislation also requires that if the PHC is not complied with on several occasions the CA must require an action plan from the FBO concerned and strictly supervise its outcome. The requirement still only applies to FBOs processing over 37,500 pigs a year.

5.37 Regarding the FSA salmonella database, an on-line application was introduced in 2015 so that data on salmonella can be recorded by OVs in slaughterhouses. Between 1 Jan and 31 December 2016 in England, Wales and NI, at the 19 establishments that slaughter 100,000 pigs weekly there...
were 3,290 salmonella tests on pigs of which 78 were positive. In Scotland 320 tests were undertaken of which one was positive.

**Trichinella**

5.38 An amendment to the Food Safety and Hygiene Regulations came into force on the 15 October 2016. This amends the Food Safety and Hygiene (England) Regulations 2013 to provide for the execution and enforcement in England of the provisions of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 2015/1375. The Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1375 lays down specific rules on official controls for *Trichinella* in meat. This amendment does not alter any of the requirements for *Trichinella* testing in the UK. In 2016, no *Trichinella* was detected in domestic or wild animals in the UK.

**Shellfish hygiene**

5.39 A Governance Board provides oversight and a steer for shellfish work to help prioritise, align and link shellfish work across the UK to ensure it is safe for consumers. The Working Group meets quarterly to review progress, manage issues and identify risks that might impact on effective delivery of official controls for shellfish.

**Imported food**

5.40 In 2016 additional controls on imported food were implemented, and the FSA issued guidance on the application of the controls to authorised practitioners at points of entry for new and amended measures introduced in 2016:

- additional controls on certain feed and food listed in Annex I of Regulation (EC) 669/2009 (as amended) following each quarterly review (this changed to six-monthly reviews since July 2016);
- revised measures on food and feed from Japan under the new Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2016/6, which repealed and replaced Regulation 332/2014;
- additional controls on betel leaves from India, previously controlled under 669/2009, under the new Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/166.

5.41 The FSA’s Early Warning System (EWS), developed in 2013 to detect potential emerging risks related to imported foods, continued to identify new emerging issues in 2016, including some which were subsequently subject to additional import controls under Regulation (EC) 669/2009 as amended, and other safeguard measures. The EWS system is primarily but not exclusively based on analysis of EU RASFF notifications. Port health and inland authorities and food businesses who have expressed an interest are alerted to new risks when they are identified, which contributes to their targeted sampling programmes to improve the safety of imported foods.

5.42 Between April 2015 and March 2016 eight food training courses were provided to 115 to inland and Port Health authorised officers from England, Wales and NI, and between April 2016 and March 2017 twelve classroom-
based training courses were provided to 116 authorised officers. This covered both inland and port health officers, covering the authorising of import controls, sampling, imported food/feed control at smaller ports, and guidance on investigation and enforcement.

**Third country exports**

5.43 The FSA works closely with LA officials and Defra/APHA to support activity to approve UK businesses for export to countries outside the EU and to carry out ongoing assessments of compliance in these exporting businesses, particularly where they are exporting to countries with specific conditions on food/feed exports.

5.44 The FSA also continues to work with LAs to enable them to support businesses in their area wishing to export their products and be able to provide the appropriate certification. This export certification is usually issued in respect of products not of animal origin but, in the case of a limited number of products of animal origin, LAs can also provide formal APHA issued export health certificates.

5.45 FSA has delivered training on Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) requirements to OVs working in establishments that intend to export beef to the USA. FSA veterinarians continue to work with industry to ensure that those businesses listed in the Self-Reporting Tool (SRT) will be able to meet the United States Department for Agriculture’s (USDA) requirements prior to an inspection visit before the end of 2017. Campden BRI has been accredited to carry out the required Shiga toxin-producing E. coli (STEC) tests. A sampling exercise to determine STEC prevalence was carried out in the summer of 2016; generally satisfactory results were obtained. More samples were taken during Feb/Mar of 2017 so data of the winter months was also gathered.

5.46 FSA delivered training on N60 sampling for STEC to FSA veterinarians for dissemination to FBOs and OVs. FSA continues to work with Defra and industry to ensure agreed procedures are established and maintained to meet FSIS microbiological sampling requirements.

5.47 In April 2016, the Australian authorities carried out a market access inspection visit to review the UK’s system of controls on the production of cooked pigmeat, which included a visit to a meat pie manufacturing establishments. In order to comply with their strict biosecurity requirements the Australian authorities requested additional requirements from Official Veterinarians in establishments wishing to export pork products to Australia. Defra continue to negotiate with the Australian authorities on these new requirements.

5.48 In June 2016, the Chinese authorities carried out an inward inspection of UK controls on existing salmon exports to China as well as on trout production with a view to opening this market. While the outcome was generally positive and salmon exports were able to continue, the Chinese made a number of recommendations which needed to be implemented before trout exports could commence. A new agreement on co-operative working arrangements between the Chinese Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ) and Defra on exports of salmon was also agreed.
5.49 In October 2016, the Chinese AQSIQ made a brief inspection visit to review UK controls on BSE with a view to agreeing a roadmap with Defra of the way forward towards lifting the Chinese ban on UK beef exports. The outcome was positive with a longer follow-up inspection planned for early 2017.

5.50 In November 2016, the Philippines authorities carried out an inward inspection of UK controls on existing exports of poultry meat, pork and lamb as well as on beef production with a view to opening this market. The outcome was largely positive, but the Philippines authorities sought significant additional information to consider alongside their own observations to inform the drafting of their report. The final report is awaited.

5.51 During December 2015, the United States Food and Drugs Administration (USFDA) notified the FSA that they intended to carry out a programme of inspection visits to existing exporters of processed food and drink products to the USA. This programme of visits ran up to March 2017.

5.52 The FSA has been working closely with poultry industry and APHA veterinary colleagues to ensure that interested businesses will be able to meet the Chinese export requirements for poultry meat.

5.53 During 2016, the Chinese authorities introduced changes to their Food Law, which are expected to come into force by October 2017. These changes will require harmonised Export Health Certificates for all food and drink products being exported to China and the FSA will be working closely with Defra and APHA on the implementation of these changes.

Food fraud

5.54 The structure and processes of the NFCU, established in 2015, have continued to refine and develop. In March 2016, the NFCU published, with the SFCIU, what is believed to be the world’s first Food Crime Strategic Assessment. This document was welcomed and praised by partners. Through this Assessment, additional strategic intelligence reporting and outreach work with industry bodies, regulatory colleagues and the law enforcement community, the NFCU informs and educates partners around the threat from food crime.

5.55 The NFCU has seen a substantial increase in the volume of incoming intelligence, with 1100 new intelligence logs created in the 12 months to March 2017. This includes information from partners, from whistle blowing, concerned members of the public and from the Unit’s own intelligence development work. Some of this increase will be attributable to the launch, in June 2016, of the anonymous reporting hotline Food Crime Confidential.

5.56 The NFCU has worked effectively with LA partners to bring about enforcement responses. This has included action against individuals linked to the online sale of the toxic chemical 2,4-dinitrophenol as a fat-burner. This chemical was responsible for six known fatalities in the UK in 2015. This fell to one fatality in 2016.

---

5.57 FSS established the SFCIU in October 2015. The Unit has been put in place to provide leadership in the prevention, investigation, disruption and enforcement of Food Crime and in the management of Food Safety incidents nationally for Scotland. The SFCIU works with key partners to proactively develop intelligence aimed at identifying serious threats faced in Scotland as a result of Food Crime and in taking the appropriate action to combat those threats.

5.58 In 2016 the MMO received 41 intelligence reports with information in relation to establishments handling first sale fish.

**Incident Management Protocols**

5.59 In 2016 the FSA continued their programmes of drills and exercises to test its Incident Management Plan (IMP) for non-routine incidents and its arrangements for protection of consumers during emergencies affecting food and feed. The FSA 2016 exercise programme included 19 exercises and drills to test incident and emergency response at strategic, tactical and/or operational levels. All the lessons identified from exercises and drills are placed onto a central actions log, the progress of which is overseen by the FSA’s Emergency Preparedness Resilience and Response Board. In 2016 an FSA / FSS Emergency exercise, ‘Joint Venture’ tested the emergency response arrangements across the FSA and FSS for handling a large scale E.coli STEC outbreak. The action plan included a range of actions for both organisations to maximise co-ordination of arrangements.

5.60 Following the establishment of FSS in 2015, FSS developed its own Non-Routine Incident Management Plan. FSS’s emergency exercise programme was designed to provide opportunities to rehearse and interrogate these new incident management arrangements in the event of a non-routine incident. In 2016, Exercise Leven took place with attendees from a range of multi-agency partners, including the FSA. Thereafter, the emergency exercise programme refocused on a review of non-routine incident management processes with a view to incorporating areas of improvement to optimise FSS’s Incident management procedures.

5.61 During 2016 the FSA and FSS continued to develop SOPs to support our crisis management processes on a four nation basis. In 2016 four SOPs were published on the FSA intranet and supported by training or drilling carried out to raise staff awareness.

**Regional presence in England**

5.62 The FSA relationship management team provided support to 100% of LA Food Liaison Groups, by participation in the meetings or by providing written briefings. Priority has been given to highlighting and discussing the Regulating Our Future programme, issues with Less Than Thoroughly Cooked burgers, continuing to raise the profile of the Food Information for Consumer Regulations and the consistency of application of FHRS. This provided the opportunity for LAs to raise issues and contribute to active policy making. The team provided feedback on LA delivery of official controls to inform FSA policy and shared intelligence with the National Food Crime Unit. Additionally, the team hosted meetings across all of all the nine English regions, which
consulted on the Regulating Our Future principles. These were attended by LA Heads of Service and food lead officers covering both hygiene and food standards.

5.63 In addition, throughout 2016 the team continued to engage with a wide range of other stakeholders including Public Health England, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), Government Agency Intelligence Network (GAIN) coordinators, and Local Enterprise Partnerships to improve communications and promote FSA priorities and objective.

**Food Hygiene Rating / Food Hygiene Information Schemes**

5.64 The FSA and FSS continue to work with LAs to deliver the Schemes. At the close of 2016 all LAs in England, Wales and NI were operating the FHRS. All LAs in Scotland were operating the FHIS.

5.65 FHRS information was available for approximately 470,000 food businesses which is an estimated 90% of businesses within scope of the scheme. This is a 3% increase on 2015 (87%). FHIS information was available for approximately 47,400 food businesses and is an estimated 89% of businesses within scope. The chart below shows the percentage of business records published on food.gov.uk of those businesses within scope of the schemes as of December 2016.

![FHRS/FHIS % of business records being published](image)

5.66 The FSA is committed to mandatory display of ratings to food outlets in England. The FSA’s plans for seeking approval are being aligned with the FSA’s Regulating Our Future programme to review the way in which food businesses are regulated. This will ensure that the FSA has a robust and credible scheme that continues to deliver benefits for consumers and in the meantime continues to improve the impact and benefit of the FHRS scheme.

5.67 In Wales, a statutory FHRS was introduced in 2013. The scope of the scheme has been extended to include, in 2014, trade to trade businesses and, in 2016, certain publicity materials for takeaway food businesses.
5.68 In April 2015, FSS agreed that a review should be undertaken of the operation and presentation of FHIS and its connection with the consumer. The review should encompass improvement and opportunities for evolution of the scheme. Following completion of initial consumer research and LA engagement, FSS has progressed a programme of extensive and more detailed discussion with industry and LAs, including consideration of a mandatory scheme. Once FSS has had the opportunity to discuss the outcome of this engagement and the options for a revised scheme, a full consultation on more detailed options will be carried out.

5.69 The statutory FHRS scheme in NI came into operation in October 2016. The Food Hygiene Rating Act (NI) 2016 requires food businesses to display hygiene rating stickers at establishments. A further requirement for operators to publish ratings online where they provide a facility to order food online will be consulted upon in 2017.

5.70 Guidance to ensure consistency in implementation and operation of the FHRS by LAs is provided by the Brand Standard. As part of the Agency’s on-going efforts to promote consistency in the application of the scheme a second national consistency exercise was run for LAs across England, Wales and NI, in which 98% of LAs participated. Other consistency related activity for England included a FSA audit programme of FHRS themed audits of 12 LAs and a FHRS data cleansing week held in December to encourage LAs to check and resolve any data discrepancies.

5.71 The FHRS continued to generate significant local press coverage and the FSA ran a UK-wide programme of consumer communication activity to promote the use of the Schemes including a ‘where’s the sticker’ campaign in February focussing on Valentine’s Day treats.

5.72 The below graphs, which cover the financial quarters since December 2013, shows an increasing trend in businesses scoring an FHRS rating of 3 and above in England, Wales and NI and the percentage of FHRS distribution ratings for the same period:

![% distribution of FHRS ratings](image_url)
Official Controls Auditors Liaison Group

5.73 Meetings of the UK-wide Official Controls Auditors Liaison Group were held in May and October 2016. The Group is comprised of UK audit teams involved in auditing official controls and its main purpose is to improve collaborative working so as to avoid duplication of audit effort and gaps in assurance across the UK as well as sharing knowledge and expertise.

Defra, its Executive Agencies and CRD (HSE)

Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD)

5.74 The VMD’s Inspection Management System (IMS) database continues to improve as more functionality is added and allows inspectors to log more detailed information on deficiencies.

Inspection of FeBOs

5.75 The VMD continues to participate/engage in meetings with the Animal Feed Law Enforcement Liaison Group (AFLELG) when meetings are scheduled and its sub group, the National Animal Feed Port Panel (NAFPP). The MoU\(^\text{78}\) and details of AFLELG and NAFPP can be found at: food.gov.uk/enforcement/enfcomm/aflelg.

5.76 The tripartite MOU with APHA/NAP & the VMD is now in place.

5.77 The VMD also has a Service Level Agreement in place with Cefas for them to inspect fish farmers manufacturing medicated feed in England & Wales and Marine Scotland.

5.78 The Veterinary Medicines Regulations came into Force on 1 October 2013 (S.I. 2013 No. 2033). Since then there has been an amending S.I. in 2014. No 599.

\(^{78}\) between animal feed law regulatory and enforcement bodies in the UK
Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance

5.79 The VMD is responsible for antimicrobial resistance policy with respect to animal health. The VMD in partnership with Department of Health is responsible for the delivery of the UK Five Year Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) Strategy 2013-2018. The VMD compiles data on antibiotic sales and is responsible for the mandatory surveillance of antibiotic resistance in animals in the UK (as required by Commission Decision 2013/652/EU). Data is submitted to EFSA for inclusion in EU surveillance reports. The VMD is the secretariat for the Defra Antimicrobial Resistance Coordination (DARC) group, a cross-government group that meet quarterly to discuss recent trends in antibiotic resistance in bacteria of importance to human and animal health. Three DARC meetings took place in 2016, summary minutes of which are available on the GOV.UK website.

5.80 The VMD also funds the antibiotic susceptibility testing of bacteria of clinical relevance from APHA’s scanning surveillance programme in England & Wales. Findings from both the mandatory UK surveillance and clinical surveillance in England & Wales are published annually in the UK Veterinary Antimicrobial Resistance and Sales Surveillance (VARSS) report.

Veterinary Residues Surveillance

5.81 The planning meeting for the 2017 National Residues Control Programme (NRCP) was held in September 2016 attended by representatives of the NRLs, major contractors, FSA, APHA and two independent experts

National Pesticide Residues Monitoring Programme

5.82 The 2016 National Pesticide Residues Monitoring Programme has been discussed by the Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues in Food (PRiF) and representatives from Defra, FSA, NI Executive and the SG.

5.83 Four meetings of the independent PRiF, attended by officials from Defra, FSA, NI Executive and the SG were held during 2016. As well as an open event where members of the public were able to join the committee for a day to listen to presentations from the committee, people from the food industry, growers and FSA and had the opportunity to ask questions about pesticide residues.

Beef labelling – England, & Wales

5.84 Since the FVO (now Directorate F) audit on the traceability of beef and beef products undertaken in March 2011, RPA has been supporting Defra in their engagement with FSA over improving LA enforcement of the compulsory beef labelling rules at retail establishments and other establishments under their enforcement control. RPA also passed on intelligence gathered during its control visits to the relevant LA (where applicable) for their follow-up action as required. RPA also liaised on an ongoing basis with the Devolved Administrations on cross border enforcement issues.

5.85 From July 2015 RPA introduced a risk/random inspection selection model which we now deploy rather than visiting every plant, every year, regardless
of their compliance history. This was designed to help focus and tackle non-compliance.

5.86 RPA also made more effective use of the enforcement powers available under both domestic and European legislation and introduced an enforcement process for dealing with all serious beef labelling non-compliances. In the 2016 scheme year a total of 55 enforcement notices have been issued to establishments in England and Wales, resulting in operators having to either send the consignment of beef directly into processed products or deemed as category waste and destroyed in instances were full traceability has been lost or compromised.

5.87 Another measure introduced is a report of inspection findings, which advises operators that their inspection has been found satisfactory or conversely will identify deficiencies found which will require correction, this is issued at the time of inspection.

**Beef labelling – NI**

5.88 Enforcement responsibility for beef labelling in NI continued to be split between DAERA (approved establishments) and LA (retail), with the FSA having a peripheral role. Communication between DAERA and EHOs was strengthened through participation in joint meetings arranged by FSA to discuss Country of Origin labelling. LA environmental health departments also submit data on EHO beef labelling inspections to DAERA on an annual basis.

**Working across the EU**

**Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF)**

5.89 The Incident Units and Resilience Unit within FSA Operations is the UK contact point for RASFF notifications. More information can be found at: [ec.europa.eu/food/food/rapidalert/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/rapidalert/index_en.htm)

5.90 In 2016, the UK issued a total of 353 RASFF notifications, although two were later withdrawn. The remainder comprised 41 rapid alerts, 243 border rejection notifications, 65 information notices and two news notifications.

**Co-ordination and co-operation in the animal health and welfare and plant health sectors**

**Chief Veterinary Officers (CVOs) meetings**

5.91 The four UK administrations’ CVOs met monthly in 2016, focusing on the specifically veterinary aspects of animal health policy and delivery. The CVOs from the UK, Scotland, Wales and NI were joined by the most senior veterinary official from the APHA and the FSA. On a six monthly basis CVOs from the Isle of Man, Guernsey and Jersey also attended. Standing agenda items included global threats to animal and public health, international trade and a formal report and assessment of risks to animal health and welfare identified by the Veterinary Risk Group. If risks identified were not considered
to be sufficiently mitigated they were escalated to the highest levels of the administrations for further action.

5.92 The group considered specific issues in greater depth as needed, including a continued overview of antimicrobial resistance, maintaining an effective surveillance system, an agreed MoU with DAERA which sets out an agreed coordinated approach to, and responsibilities for the negotiation and facilitation of exports from the UK of animals and animal products that require an Export Health Certificate (EHC), industry liaison, the process of approving establishments for the production of animal products and animal feed, and the facilitation of trade agreements with third countries and an overview of the applications by NI and Scotland for the recognition of their BSE Negligible risk status. The Group also introduced a monthly discussion to ensure that there is continuous engagement on EU Exit. TB control issues are considered on a UK basis by CVO’s and policy colleagues in the monthly TB liaison group meeting.

The Veterinary Risk Group (VRG)

5.93 In 2016, the VRG met monthly, focusing on identifying, assessing, characterising, prioritising and escalating unexpected animal-related threats and providing technical advice on options for risk management to inform decision making. The VRG reported to the four UK CVOs at their monthly Four Administrations Liaison meetings.

5.94 During 2016, six threats and vulnerabilities were raised and discussed. Five of these threats were of domestic concern including a Reindeer Welfare when imported to the UK. One threat of international concern was discussed regarding pet illness, particularly renal disease presenting as fanconi syndrome which may be related to consumption of jerky treats.

The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England

5.95 The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England is the principal source of departmental advice to Defra ministers on all strategic health and welfare matters relating to all kept animals in England. The Board’s role is to set the strategic policy framework, using it as the basis for day-to-day advice to ministers and day-to-day operational actions. The Board’s responsibilities during 2016 included:

- Developing and implementing animal health and welfare policy and ensuring value for money.
- Assessing of the risk of threats from animal disease and what the surveillance and research priorities should be.
- Monitoring the regulatory framework.
- Approving the operational plans of the APHA and other bodies.
- Reviewing contingency plans for dealing with new disease outbreaks.
5.96 In 2016 the Board met four times, and all meeting notes are published\(^79\)

**The Wales Animal Health and Welfare Framework\(^80\)**


**Working with LAs**

5.98 Defra and APHA continued to work with the LAs’ National Animal Health and Welfare Panel (NAHWP) to exchange and disseminate information and to identify and address common issues. The panel met quarterly, led by LAs and included representatives from each region allowing a national picture to be understood. A LA National Animal Health and Welfare framework\(^81\) is being reviewed and updated to help LAs plan and deliver against Defra’s animal health and welfare national priorities. This framework sets out national priorities whilst retaining flexibility to react to local financial pressures and priorities. These priorities are discussed and agreed with the NAHWP.

5.99 In Wales, the Welsh Government has established a collaborative structure, working in partnership with the Welsh Heads of Trading Standards in the delivery of animal health, welfare and animal establishment licensing legislation. The aim of the Partnership Delivery Plan is to deliver outcomes over and above the LAs statutory responsibilities. The Plan is based on the Intelligence Operating Model which concentrates resources and provides a long term strategy for additional enforcement activity and focuses actions on resolving these issues with measurable results.

**Co-ordinating work on biosecurity across Defra and its agencies**

5.100 Defra assesses thousands of risks to animal and plant health including aquaculture, bees and risks to the environment. These risks are constantly evolving as risk pathways change, whether due to climate change, trade patterns or other factors. As a result, Defra continues to update its approaches to risks and issues related to biosecurity, covering animal, plant, bees, aquatic animal health, and invasive non-native species, across the continuum of activities on biosecurity – pre-border, at the border and within the UK. Monthly biosecurity meetings were held throughout 2016 to enable timely escalation of new and changing biosecurity risks to animal and plant health and the environment from invasive non-native species. These

\(^{79}\) [gov.uk/government/groups/animal-health-and-welfare-board-for-england-ahwbe#minutes-of-meetings](http://gov.uk/government/groups/animal-health-and-welfare-board-for-england-ahwbe#minutes-of-meetings)

\(^{80}\) [wales.gov.uk/ahwframework](http://wales.gov.uk/ahwframework)

\(^{[2]}\) Group of six experts providing a recognised link between the WG, livestock keepers, animal owners, industry representatives and the veterinary profession. The Group meets on a quarterly basis.

meetings are held with senior officials and Ministers and provide strategic oversight and direction.

**Risk Assessment – understanding the risk**

5.101 Defra continued to monitor the international disease situation and conducted and produced 15 Preliminary Outbreak Assessments on a range of global outbreaks such as *Bluetongue*, *African Swine Fever*, and *Avian Influenza*. Defra communicated the new outbreaks to the BIPs and BF to ensure that all regulatory and anti-smuggling controls at the border were responsive to new or changing animal health risks and to ensure that they focused on the most high risk routes and goods. Further information can be found at: 

**Bee health**

**England and Wales**

5.102 In England and Wales Defra and APHA continued to work in partnership with beekeeping stakeholders to deliver the objectives of the Healthy Bees Plan[^82]. During 2016, three meetings of the Bee Health Advisory Forum[^83] took place which included bee stakeholders and officials from Defra, APHA, Fera, the WG, and the SG. Topics discussed included stakeholder bee health training programmes, the National Pollinator Strategy, veterinary medicines for bees, bee research, and contingency planning for exotic pests.

**Scotland**

5.103 In Scotland, the Honey Bee Health Strategy[^84], now in its sixth year of operation brings together, in a partnership arrangement, all sectors of the beekeeping sector from frontline beekeepers, SG Bee Inspectors, scientists at SASA and policy makers. Implementation of the Strategy involves representatives from the Scottish Beekeepers Association (SBA); Bee Farmers Association (BFA), Scotland’s Rural College (SRUC) as well as observers from the NBU and Defra policy. The Strategy is taken forward under the auspices of the Bee Health Improvement Partnership who deliver on outcomes as agreed by the main steering group.

**NI**

5.104 The NI Strategy for the Sustainability of the Honey Bee[^85] which is in its sixth year of operation is currently being reviewed. This review will integrate the Bee Health elements of this Strategy within the All Ireland Pollinator Strategy. During 2016 DAERA Plant Health Policy Branch continued to

[^82]: nationalbeeunit.com/index.cfm?sectionid=41
[^83]: The aim of the Forum is to provide an opportunity for early discussion on emerging or developing issues, as well as increasing transparency and understanding for all participants of positions across the range of interests.
[^84]: gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/animal-welfare/bee/strategy
[^85]: dardni.gov.uk/strategy-for-the-sustainability-of-the-honey-bee.pdf
engage with the Ulster Beekeepers Association and the Institute of NI Beekeepers in implementing the strategy.

**Aquatic animal health**

5.105 UK policy and enforcement officials continued to meet on an annual basis, in order to share good practice and ensure that standards of inspection are equivalent across the administrations.

**England and Wales**

5.106 The Defra annual stakeholder meeting took place in London in March 2016 and was attended by officials from the competent authority, the devolved administrations, the official services and representatives of trade bodies. This meeting provides an opportunity to consider current issues in relation to aquatic animal health from a UK perspective.

5.107 The Cefas FHI has continued to engage with other government agencies on improving working practices in a number of areas including with Natural England on habitats regulation assessments, the EA on response to disease outbreaks in wild aquatic animals, and FSA on contingency planning and support during emergencies.

5.108 The FHI is represented on the Government’s National Investigators Group. This group promote the need for all Government Departments to participate in the new National Crime Agency\(^\text{86}\) Integrated Operating Model (Threat, Harm and Risk from Organised Crime Groups). The FHI is also taking forward inter-Agency cooperation including participating in a multi-Agency investigation into a number of potential breaches of food and animal health regulations in the shellfish sector, and in illegal activity associated with trade in live eels. Joint investigations with Southern IFCA, MMO and the Fish Health Inspectorate has resulted in the prosecution of a shellfish merchant for various fishery related offences.

5.109 The FHI investigation and enforcement Inspector remains seconded to the Marine Management Organisation\(^\text{87}\) to lead a number of high level investigations into illegal activities in the marine fisheries sector.

5.110 Following the award of the Cabinet Office’s Customer Service Excellence (CSE) standard in 2015 the FHI was subject to a further audit by independent consultants on the quality of delivery to stakeholders. Further progress was made in achieving the required standard in the 57 criteria under assessment. The audit report stated that the assessor was impressed with the commitment to providing good quality customer focused service.

5.111 The FHI use a monthly survey called ‘Customer Thermometer’ to assess stakeholders views of the quality of service provided. This is an electronic
system of obtaining feedback. A total of 874 customers were invited to respond to the survey with a 43% response rate. Of the responses receives 85% rated the FHI service as excellent and 13% as good. A small paper based survey of 42 stakeholders was undertaken with a 19% response rate and a customer satisfaction score of 92%.

Scotland

5.112 Communication between Marine Scotland and internal and external organisations ensured appropriate co-operation and co-ordination for relevant cases throughout the year. During 2016 communications were maintained with veterinarians from the APHA, representatives from the Scottish Environment Protection Agency as well as colleagues within Marine Scotland Compliance. Communications were also maintained with other parts of UK government and devolved administrations that have a responsibility for aquatic animal disease control.

NI

5.113 The excellent lines of communication which exist between the DAERA FHI and the FHI at Cefas were again evident throughout 2016. The sharing of good practice and technical expertise has proved beneficial in the on-going maintenance of a high fish health status.

5.114 DAERA continued on-going co-operation with the Marine Institute\textsuperscript{88}, with a number of meetings taking place in 2016 to discuss common fish health issues, such as fish movements, contingency planning and matters in relation to the All-Island Bottom Grown Seed Mussel Fishery.

5.115 The formation of DAERA in May 2016 has paved the way for a more joined up working relationship with regard to animal diseases in the wild. DAERA is now the Competent Authority for fish health, aquaculture, inland fisheries and the environment. DAERA co-sponsors a North South Body, namely the Loughs Agency, which is responsible for the inland fisheries of the Foyle and Carlingford Areas. Whilst there were no significant fish health issues in 2016, this structure allows for excellent lines of communication and effective working in the years ahead, especially with regard to contingency planning and disease outbreak situations.

Plant health

GB

5.116 Biannual meetings of the UK Co-ordination group, which includes all the UK territories, including the Channel Isles and Isle of Man continued in 2016. These meetings discussed a range of topics, including the latest developments on the review of the EU Plant Health Regime and the implementation of the GB Plant Biosecurity Strategy\textsuperscript{89}, as well as to agree pest risk management

\textsuperscript{88} the Competent Authority for fish health in the South of Ireland \url{marine.ie}

\textsuperscript{89} \url{gov.uk/government/publications/plant-biosecurity-strategy-for-great-britain}
measures, and to hear reports from all territories on actions taken against plant pests.

5.117 In England and Wales, Plant Health and Seeds Inspectorate continue to co-ordinate their inspections with the RPA Inspectorate through the use of the Procedure for Electronic Application for Certificates from the Horticultural Marketing Inspectorate (PEACH) notification system which allocates inspections to each inspectorate thus reducing the risk of unnecessary duplication of inspections. There is also co-ordination with HM Revenue and Customs through the use of the Automatic Licence Verification system which feeds data on the plant health status of goods to the HMRC CHIEF Computer system, thus automating the release of goods when permitted by an inspector.

5.118 PHSI exchanges information with Port Health Teams, the FC and UK BF when items of potential interest are found which may be of interest to other agencies.

5.119 Participation in the One Government at the Border project has helped to increase recognition of the importance of all the Border agencies cooperating to a greater extent. PHSI has gained greater oversight and control of imports via the postal service. Throughout the year, the FC participated and provided import data to assist with the discovery phase of the government initiative One Government at the Border (OG@B). This is an emerging portfolio of work to solve problems and exploit opportunities by bringing together border-related strategies, processes and technologies to deliver integrated border controls and a single, secure service experience for business to:

- support the UK’s economic growth agenda;
- improve border security;
- increase revenue collection; and
- deliver operational efficiencies.

5.120 The FC developed its e-learning package for inspections of imported wood packaging material associated with goods of all kinds as part of its training agreement with BF with the intention of publishing in 2017. The FC also developed a SOP with Defra’s APHA Plant Health Inspectors who have been actively performing wood packaging material inspections whilst completing their own import checks.

5.121 Representatives from Defra, APHA PHSI, the Devolved Administrations, the FC Plant Health team, and FC Forest Research attended Defra Plant Health Risk group meetings\(^90\) in 2016. This Group carries out a monthly assessment of plant health threats faced by the UK, including the prioritisation and review of Pest Risk Analyses and entries on the UK Plant Health Risk Register.

5.122 APHA PHSI initiated a review of options for improving phytosanitary certificate security and preventing fraud. The co-operation included all Devolved Administrations, FC, Crown Dependencies and the Government supplier of forms and documents. Good progress has been made in 2016 to assessing

\(^{90}\) coordinated by the UK Chief Plant Health Officer
cost, numbers, effectiveness and latterly IT changes needed to implement the use of the tamper proof label across the UK.

5.123 As in previous years, PHSI worked with Natural England and FC Plant Health team on aerial surveillance of Juniper, photographing and mapping for PHSI ground truthing. In addition, where aerial surveillance identified positive *Phytophthora* cases in Larch, PHSI carried out all non-forestry follow up inspections. Details of locations and inspection results are shared between APHA and FC.

5.124 Excellent co-operation has continued between agencies including APHA PHSI, FC, Fera Science Ltd, Forest Research and Defra, along with the organisation Fera Science Ltd. This has been key in delivering Incident Management responses to pests and diseases such as *Cryphonectria parasitica*.

5.125 Co-ordination has continued between APHA PHSI and NI regarding domestic movement of plants. This included PHSI providing assistance on setting up and operating Fire Blight (*Erwinia amylovora*) Free Buffer Zones.

**NI**

5.126 DAERA and Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM) continue to work in partnership on a number of key issues including Plant Health. Both jurisdictions continue to implement the All Ireland and Chalara Control Strategy. A review of this strategy is underway, based on scientific evidence which will collate the extent of disease spread across the island, and allow options to effectively manage the changing situation. These options are currently being considered in conjunction with DAFM and stakeholders to determine the future control policy.

**Legislation**

5.127 During the period under report, the Government introduced a number of amendments to the UK plant health, forestry, and potatoes legislation.

**Procedures**

5.128 Border controls procedures are in the BIP Manual which is supplemented by OVS notes providing updates about changes to EU legislation. During 2016 32 OVS notes were issued covering a variety of subjects from safeguard measures for fishery products to changes in import conditions live animals and animal products. The BIP Manual and OVS notes are available on apha.defra.gov.uk/official-vets/Guidance/bip/index.htm.

5.129 In 2016, APHA PHSI import and plant passporting processes were audited and re-accredited under ISO 17020. APHA PHSI received a very successful surveillance visit and inspection from UKAS. With only a few minor changes needed, the PHSI passed and maintained ISO accreditation to 17020 for plant passporting and imports, with audit inspections by APHA ISO Quality Standards team and UKAS external assessors.
Information systems

5.130 In 2016 the Cefas FHI introduced electronic collection of data during compliance and surveillance inspections of fish and shellfish farms across England and Wales using tablet technology (the FHIPad). This technology has removed the need for paperwork in the field (saving 21,000 pieces of paper), improved the validation of data collected and facilitated the real-time submission of data to the Starfish database. Inspectors working in the field have improved access to information such as conditions of authorisation of farms, and biosecurity measures plans thus providing a more effective and efficient service to stakeholders. The FHIPad and Starfish database have set a benchmark for the effective use of new technology across the Defra network.

Training

5.131 135 representatives attended animal health and welfare and plant health training courses organised through the European Commission’s Better training for Safer Food (BTSF). The BTSF learning materials were cascaded to staff of Competent Authority involved in official controls through in house courses through in house courses.

Animal health and welfare

5.132 Thirty-six UK OVSs and Official Fish Inspectors responsible for carrying out veterinary checks at BIPs attended two BIP update training days organised by APHA\(^91\). Some training requirements were identified during BIPs audits e.g. new and changed legislation, areas of controls where issues were arising because of inconsistent application of the veterinary checks rules. Pre-training questionnaires were sent out prior to the training day and these provided valuable information on the level of knowledge of attendees and future training events were then planned to address any deficiencies noted.

5.133 APHA provided a wide range of training courses during 2016. Details of these are set out below.

5.134 Two staff attended a two day Egg Marketing training event. This allowed staff to update their knowledge and to ensure a consistent delivery and regulatory approach.

5.135 Field epidemiologists:

- EU-FMD training – 112 Vets from APHA were trained and passed the assessment (plus 18 from DAERA)
- VRA training – 100+ Field Vets and managers were trained in Veterinary Risk Assessment.
- Badger ecology symposia – 30 Vets received training in badger ecology at Woodchester Park.

\(^91\) 2 June and 5 November 2014
• National Emergency Epidemiology Group (NEEG) training:
  a. 25 Epidemiologists and Veterinary Field Epidemiology Investigators (VFEIs) attended a workshop on rapid response using the NEEG Lite approach and training in Amber telecons.
  b. 27 Epidemiologists, Vets and administrative staff attended the National Resilience Capability Assessment NEEG Workshop in September 2016.
  c. 52 Field Vets, VFEIs and 15 epidemiology scientists, statisticians and administrative staff attended two days of outbreak response training in November 2016.
• On the job training in outbreaks - 18 Vets and epidemiologists received on the job training during the AI outbreak e.g. tracings, disease investigations, report writing and veterinary risk assessment.

5.136 68 members of staff completed the following new Vet and Tech induction pathways:

• Veterinary, Technical and Scientific Induction Pathway: eight
• Tuberculosis (TB) – induction: 10
• Animal By-Products – induction: 23
• Veterinary medicine – induction: 11
• Contingency planning and exotic diseases – induction: 13
• Veterinary public health – induction: three

5.137 52 staff completed Enforcement refresher training. The e-learning provides those staff that have already completed the face to face training with an opportunity to refresh their knowledge and understanding of their roles and responsibilities in this area of work.

5.138 237 APHA staff have attended welfare related training:

• 105 of which completed an introductory eLearning module ‘Core Animal Welfare’ which provides people with basic training on animal welfare and covers the theory and legislation involved.
• 132 of which completed Cross Compliance e-learning (either part 1, 2 or both parts) which outlines the principles of cross compliance and enables people to inspect the welfare of livestock and report their findings in a considered, fair and consistent manner.

5.139 84 APHA staff attended Salmonella training covering the statutory requirements of the UK Salmonella National Control Programmes in poultry.

5.140 47 staff attended pigs and poultry post mortem training. The course covers post-mortem and sampling theory, demonstrations and practice and was designed for veterinary colleagues who may be required to undertake investigations into reports of suspicion of exotic porcine and avian animal diseases as part of their duties.

5.141 290 staff attended events which have health and safety as a central theme:
• 24 of which attended ‘Cattle Event’ workshops – a programme to increase knowledge of animal’s behaviours and reactions, and this can be exploited for the purposes of the agency’s work. They also discussed modern thinking on management, handling and restraint methods and equipment.
• 16 of which attended Dynamic Risk Assessment events – interactive workshops which are aimed at those staff who work out in the field and need to react appropriately to hazards discovered which conducting their work.
• 24 wildlife staff received either ATV or 4x4 Driver Training
• 185 staff received Advanced Driving for Work Training
• 23 staff completed Driver E-Learning
• Introduction to LPG Safety Training was delivered to 18 Bee Inspectors to provide the skills and knowledge required by a user of LPG in a workplace environment paying particular attention to potential hazards associated with working in close proximity to LPG.

5.142 56 staff attended events which have contingency planning as a central theme. These events all allow staff to update their knowledge and skills in the roles and responsibilities they would adopt in the event of a disease outbreak. The events in this area are:
• Firearms related training: 14
• Field Operations Manager training: 23
• Poultry Culling training: 12
• Contingency Planning Theory and Workshop: seven

5.143 36 staff attended the APHA Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies training day. This training covered the statutory requirements for appropriate implementation of controls relating to TSEs.

5.144 Other activities of significance are:
• Modular learning in Tracing Documents and Record Keeping Requirements continue to be available for up skilling in the arena of Animal By Products.

Border Controls

5.145 Illegal imports of live fish into the UK represent a major threat to the maintenance of the UK aquatic animal health status. In order to enhance biosecurity at the border the FHI undertook a series of training events for frontline BF staff at major points of import including Dover, Hull, Poole, and Harwich on the legislative position with regard to trade in live fish. This awareness training yielded positive results through an increased exchange of intelligence and the interception of an illegal consignment of live fish.

Bee health

5.146 During 2016 in the UK:
• 10 new Seasonal Bee Inspectors received in house training, two week long residential courses at the NBU (Sand Hutton) followed by an intensive two week Field Based training with competent Inspectors, and further supervised working.

• A number of Bee Inspectors attended City and Guilds training and qualified from Level 2 Disease Management and Safe Use of Veterinary Medicines Modules. A number of Regional Bee Inspectors also passed their Level 3 City & Guilds Land Based Skills Assessors to deliver and assess the above Disease Management course.

• 37 Bee Inspectors received additional training as part of field-based contingency exercises carried out for potential exotic threats to apiculture.

• All NBU staff undertook mandatory, e-learning on protecting information, fraud prevention and unconscious bias.

• All NBU staff attended the NBU annual Technical training workshop at Sand Hutton. APHA also welcomed a delegation from Scotland to the York training.

Aquatic animal health

5.147 Members of the Cefas FHI attended a number of training events including intelligence analysis, water safety, driving safety, and presentation skills. All members of the Cefas FHI field inspectorate team attended a bespoke Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) interviewing skills training course held at Greater Manchester Police Training College. In addition a newly recruited Fish Health Inspector completed the BTSF e-learning course on animal health prevention and controls for aquatic animals.

5.148 Marine Scotland FHI attended a number of training events including employment protection services, swift water training, advanced driving, sea survival, diagnostic sampling, wrasse sampling, animal health legislation and diagnostic methods, veterinary medical directorate, import legislation and Better Training for Safer Food e-learning course on animal health prevention and controls for aquatic animals. Six members of Marine Scotland’s FHI were undertaking a Post Graduate Certificate in Aquatic Animal Health from the University of Stirling.

Plant health

5.149 Training for Contract Plant Health Inspectors was postponed in 2016 to coincide with the bedding in of new EU legislation, Health and Safety and standard operating procedural guidance.

5.150 PHSI supplied Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) documents for all inspectors describing what must be inspected and the relevant inspection processes. This co-operation continued on the new bacterial disease X. fastidiosa. APHA PHSI wrote a guidance to trade document on X. fastidiosa which was shared across Wales, Scotland, NI and FC.

5.151 In January 2016 the annual PHSI technical training event took place, covering a range of plant health training areas from concept to delivery.
Emergency and contingency planning

Animal health

5.152 For the purposes of exotic animal disease control, GB is considered to be a single epidemiological unit or zone. A co-ordinated disease control approach will therefore be adopted in the event of an outbreak of an exotic notifiable animal disease. APHA has responsibility for delivering the operational response to a disease outbreak and provides input to the English, Scottish and Welsh Contingency plans for an outbreak of exotic disease of animals which are produced by each Government in GB. In addition to the individual country plans, there is an overarching UK Contingency Plan\(^2\) which outlines how the four Administrations work together during the response to a disease outbreak. The revised version of the Plan was published in March 2015.

5.153 On 16 December 2016, Defra confirmed High Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) at a farm in Lincolnshire. The farm was declared an Infected Premises (IP) and all poultry were humanely culled, the carcasses disposed in a bio-secure manner and the establishments underwent preliminary cleansing and disinfection. Any movements of poultry to and from the establishments were prohibited. Upon confirmation of disease, a 3Km Protection Zone (PZ) and 10Km Surveillance Zone (SZ) were put in place. Within the zones there were restrictions on movements of poultry, meat, eggs etc. and a ban on bird gatherings or the release of wild birds. Following this initial case there were a further 11 IPs involving the same strain were confirmed in England and one in Wales and also three dangerous contacts, in different locations in England. The same operational activity, restrictions and zones were applied.

5.154 The UK government declared a prevention zone necessitating that producers and backyard flock keepers had to keep all poultry indoors, or at least covered, as a preventative measure to stop the spread of disease. This zone was lifted in May 2017. A derogation was permitted with regards to the marketing of free range eggs from housed birds for 12 weeks and after that period producers were required to specify that eggs were from barn production. Secondary Cleansing and Disinfection has been completed on the majority of establishments and the process for applying for OIE country freedom has commenced.

5.155 The outbreaks demonstrated that the contingency plans and control strategies were effective in responding to and controlling the disease.

5.156 APHA has a well-developed, centrally co-ordinated exercise programme in which local offices carry out or participate in at least one local exercise each year. In 2016 the programme was curtailed due to the HPAI outbreaks. The internal Emergency Readiness Management Assurance Scheme (ERMAS) mechanism and the three year exercise programme has allowed staff to complete simulated tests of outbreak governance, processes, decision

making and the mobilisation of services. In addition to this, a UK FMD table top exercise held in December 2016.

**England**

5.157 Defra’s Contingency Plan for Exotic Notifiable Diseases of Animals\(^93\) was reviewed in 2015 as required by the Animal Health Act 2002 and published in March 2016. The plan is currently being reviewed and will be published in November 2017.

**Wales**

5.158 The Welsh Government’s Contingency Plan for Exotic Animal Diseases\(^94\) was reviewed and updated in 2016 to reflect the lessons learned from previous outbreaks and exercises.

**Scotland**

5.159 The SG deployed its generic Contingency Framework Plan\(^95\) as well as the GB Avian Influenza Control Strategy in response to an outbreak of Low Pathogenicity Avian Influenza H5N1 in a flock of laying hens in Dunfermline in January 2016. At suspicion of disease the establishments were placed under restriction and 1km Temporary Control Zone (TCZ) was put in place, which was replaced by a 1km Restriction Zone when disease was confirmed. Disease was successfully contained to a single establishment and restrictions were lifted following completion of cleansing and disinfection. A number of lessons have been identified following the outbreak and are being actioned through ongoing work. In May 2016 the SG organised Exercise Cerberus to test operational partners’ preparedness for a rabies outbreak and identify areas for improvement, which are being addressed through an ongoing lessons identified programme. The SG also participated in cross-border bird tables and CVO stocktakes during the winter 2016 HPAI H5N8 outbreak across Europe, although there were no cases in Scottish domestic birds (a single case was confirmed in a wild peregrine falcon found in Dumfries).

**NI**

5.160 During 2016 the following contingency planning activities were carried out:

- A Pig Day at College of Agriculture, Food and Rural Enterprise (CAFRE) Greenmount Campus provided field Veterinary Officers and technical staff with updates on the pig industry in NI; important production diseases of pigs; their roles and responsibilities during an outbreak.
- Locally based cascade training on notifiable diseases of pigs, delivered by members of the Epizootic Team to Veterinary, technical and policy teams.

\(^95\) [gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/animal-welfare/Contingencies](https://www.gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/animal-welfare/Contingencies)
• Exercise Duroc tested the setup and running of a Local Epizootic Disease Control Centre using a hypothetical Classical Swine Fever outbreak as a scenario.
• Exercise Gallus 2 involved the whole house gassing of an end of lay poultry flock using bulk carbon dioxide.
• Training of staff in the roles required in an emergency Movement Licensing Centre set up.

Bee health

England and Wales

5.161 In 2016 Bee Inspectors in England tackled the first UK outbreak of the invasive non-native species, the Asian Hornet. The Asian Hornet is a serious pest of honey bees. A nest was discovered by inspectors in the outbreak area and destroyed. No further hornets were seen in the region although surveillance is ongoing. Lessons from the outbreak response were taken to refine contingency planning protocols.

Scotland

5.162 Given the outbreaks of Foulbroods since 2009 the Scottish Contingency Plan for notifiable diseases continued to be practised in real-time. A future exercise will be considered in discussion with the SG partners and stakeholders which will include contingency arrangements for both notifiable diseases and pests.

NI

5.163 The DAERA Bee Health Contingency Plan is reviewed on a regular basis and Department is content that it would meet their needs in an emergency situation. The Plan will be reviewed in 2017.

Aquatic animal health

5.164 Contingency plans\(^{96}\) for the control of exotic disease outbreaks in the UK have been subject to annual review and the relevant operational manuals were updated.

England and Wales

5.165 Following the aquatic animal health contingency exercise undertaken in 2015, exercise “Alpheus”, a series of stocktaking meetings and a lessons learned review was conducted.

Scotland

5.166 Contingency plans and procedures were not required to be implemented

---

\(^{96}\) Directive 2006/88/EC requires publication of contingency plans for exotic aquatic animal diseases.
throughout 2016. Work continued with respect to their development following on from Exercise “Alpheus” undertaken in late 2015.

NI

5.167 DAERA’s fish health contingency plans provide for trans-border arrangements with the South of Ireland. DAERA has worked closely with DAFM and the Marine Institute on a range of aquatic health issues.

Plant Health

England and Wales

5.168 APHA’s Plant Health and Seeds Inspectors operate through a series of SOPs analogous to contingency plans, which are also made available to other parts of the plant health services. These are not available through a public website.

5.169 Following the creation and implementation of a plant health risk register, further work is underway to develop contingency plans for pests identified on the risk register as presenting the highest risk. Existing plans are being reviewed and updated in line with international standards. New plans have been drafted for priority pests.

5.170 The FC published contingency plans for Pine processionary moth (*Thaumetopoea pityocampa*), Siberian coniferous silk moth (*Dendrolimus sibiricus*), Canker stain disease (*Ceratocystis platani*), Pitch canker of pine (*Fusarium circinatum*) and Budworms (x4) in 2016. Oak wilt (*Ceratocystis fagacearum*) plans were published in January 2017. A number of other pest and disease contingency plans are awaiting publication or undergoing consultation by experts and stakeholders.

Scotland

5.171 Scotland has its own generic plant health contingency plan and specific contingency plans for *Potato brown rot* and *Potato ring rot*. Scotland is in the process of updating its own generic plan to align with the terminology/structure used in the Generic Contingency Plant for Plant and Bee Health in England and other national plans. Defra, FC cross border and SG have produced some pest-specific plans, which have been posted on the [UK Plant Health Portal](http://gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/plant/PlantHealth/PlantDiseases/ContingencyPlans/GenericContingencyPlans/GenContingencyPHI).

5.172 In 2016, The Scottish Plant Health service (consisting of scientist policy personnel and inspectors took part in Zoo Escape). This exercise explored the SG’s response to potato based plant health outbreak as part of Plant Health Contingency Planning.

---

97 Scotland’s contingency plans can be viewed at: [gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/plant/PlantHealth/PlantDiseases/ContingencyPlans/GenericContingencyPlans/GenContingencyPHI](http://gov.scot/Topics/farmingrural/Agriculture/plant/PlantHealth/PlantDiseases/ContingencyPlans/GenericContingencyPlans/GenContingencyPHI)
NI

5.173 NI has reviewed and published a revised contingency plan\(^{99}\) in the event of an introduction of a serious plant health pest or disease, drawing on the DEFRA revised plan. The contingency plan allows for all incidents to be assessed and if appropriate escalated to the DAERA Major Emergency Response Plan arrangements. Close liaison on the potential for joint engagement in emergency responses on a cross border with officials in the Republic of Ireland took place at meetings of the North South Plant Health sub group under the direction of the North South Plant Health Steering Group. The contingency plan will be reviewed in 2018.

Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance

5.174 With regards to AMR, the VMD has a contingency planning document in place which outlines responsibilities and actions for UK Government agencies in the event that a resistant bacterial isolate which poses a potential risk to human and/or animal health is isolated from an animal source. The document is published online: [gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/576403/1095349-v1_contingency_external.pdf](gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/576403/1095349-v1_contingency_external.pdf)

CHAPTER 6
ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE OF BUSINESS OPERATORS

Food and feed sectors

Training

6.1 Food Sold Online guidance. In December 2016, the FSA published a guidance package on Food Sold Online’ which can be found on food.gov.uk: food.gov.uk/business-industry/guidancenotes/food-sold-online
This guidance to LAs was designed to support Trading Standards and Environmental Health Officers when working with businesses for food sold over the internet. The guidance package is also available in Welsh: food.gov.uk/wales/about-fsa-wales/cymru/diwydiant/food-sold-online

6.2 Food labelling - The FSA has produced a library of free e-learning, guidance, posters, videos and tools to support the enforcement community and food industry to learn about the requirements of food labelling and how to comply with them. The e-learning website has had over 175,000 visits in the last 12 months and can be found at: allergytraining.food.gov.uk . Advice is also disseminated to LA representatives via a FSA training programme. The e-learning course has already trained over 70,000 enforcement officers and food business operators. To supplement this, the FSA has worked with the food industry in their development of best practice guidance documents which promotes further information consistency.

6.3 Community and charity food provision: guidance on the application of EU food hygiene law was produced in March 2016 to help LA food safety officers make pragmatic assessments on whether or not to register activities carried out in the village hall, community and charity sector. It should also help community and charity food organisers share a common understanding of the legal considerations.

6.4 Guidance to LAs on food brokers: this was produced in April 2016, and was designed to provide a range of useful documents for officers, such as Inspection aide-memoir, case studies, questionnaire and practical ways in which LAs can identify unregistered food brokers operating in their area. It also includes a short fact sheet for food brokers to help food brokers understand their obligations under food law including the need to register as a food business and identifies further sources of information

Safety, quality and information campaigns

FSA

6.5 In the financial year 2016/17, the FSA delivered a programme of consumer-facing communication activities. These included:
6.6 **Food waste campaign** - The FSA focused its annual Food Safety Week (4-10 July 2016) on raising awareness of food waste, and reminded consumers of the risks of eating food past its use-by-date and keeping the leftovers for longer than they should be kept. FSA continued this theme in the run-up to Christmas with the ‘FSA Freezer Fairy’ campaign which focused on effective use of freezers and reducing food waste over the Christmas period.

6.7 **Rare burgers campaign** - The FSA launched this communication activity on 25 August 2016 to coincide with National Burger Day and the Bank Holiday Weekend. The campaign reminded consumers that beef burgers cooked at home, unlike whole cuts of meat such as steaks, need to be cooked thoroughly until steaming hot, with no pink meat in the middle and until the juices run clear.

6.8 Across all campaigns the FSA secured significant media coverage including radio, press and social media coverage.

6.9 In October 2016 the NFCU published a guide for how industry partners could work with the Unit to tackle food crime. This document, “Working together to tackle the threat from food crime”, outlined key aspects of food crime landscape and provided more clarity and reassurance about how any intelligence from private sector partners would be handled, stored and responded to in line with legal and operational considerations.

**Shellfish sector – purification inspections**

6.10 Following a consultation, inspections of new establishments/verification of changes to operations will now be carried out by Authorised Officers (AOs) in line with current approval procedures for businesses handling other products of animal origin.

6.11 Conditions of approval will no longer form the basis for approval of purification centres (FBOs must instead demonstrate this through approved HACCP plans). Follow-up inspections will be carried out in accordance with the Food Establishment Intervention Rating Scheme in Section 5.6 of the Food law Code of Practice.

6.12 A reduced period of purification is allowed for those FBOs that are able to demonstrate that their system can achieve the required health standard. AOs will assess food safety management plans to ensure associated risks have been considered.

6.13 To support LAs, the FSA has produced a guidance document and aide memoire, monitoring equipment for the inspections has been issued to relevant Shellfish Liaison Groups (a Dissolved Oxygen Meter, Turbidity Meter and Salinity Refractometer) and support and advice is available from the Shellfish/ Relationship Management teams at FSA
6.14 **Pink Chicken Campaign Summer 2016** - FSS ran a Scotland-wide marketing campaign, ‘Don’t let Pink Chicken spoil summer’ over the summer of 2016, focused on highlighting the issues of undercooked chicken and potential for campylobacter food poisoning when barbecuing. The campaign was aimed at those most at risk and/or less likely to undertake relevant food safety behaviours: a younger, more affluent and predominantly male audience. The online films have been viewed over 250,000 times and the campaign generated significant positive media and social media coverage.

6.15 **Festive Campaign December 2016** – FSS re-ran its festive food safety campaign in a bid to reduce the number of people contracting food poisoning across Scotland in December. Christmas cooks were urged to follow simple food safety advice when preparing food in the home over the festive season. This campaign used tongue-in-cheek humour to depict Santa Claus taking a break from delivering presents after being struck by a bout of food poisoning.

6.16 **‘Change our Future’ Healthy Eating Campaign** - FSS also launched its first ever healthy eating social marketing (i.e. behaviour change) campaign in September 2016. The campaign, ‘Change our Future’, ran on TV, outdoor, digital and social media channels primarily, and was supported with field, partnerships and PR. The campaign was designed to shine a light on our unhealthy snacking culture and encourage parents and children to cut down on the volume of ‘discretionary’ foods they’re consuming on a daily basis, to help address Scotland’s obesity crisis and associated ill health. The campaign motivated 71% of the target audience to take action, and re-ran in March 2017.

6.17 **Food Safety at Events and Roadshows** - FSS also ran roadshows and attended events across Scotland in 2016 to raise awareness amongst different audiences of food safety best practice, including the Royal Highland Show, Freshers’ Fairs and the Scottish Learning Festival.

6.18 **Consumer Research** - FSS ran waves two and three of its consumer tracking survey, ‘Food in Scotland’, and engaged directly with over 3000 individuals in market research over the course of 2016.

6.19 **Earned recognition for FeBOs** – A system of risk-based inspections for the delivery of official controls for feed was introduced in England and Wales from April 2014 and from April 2016 in Scotland. This takes account of FeBOs own-checks and gives ‘earned recognition’ to compliant members of FSA approved assurance schemes, as well as other businesses with a history of good compliance.

6.20 **The FSA have approved assurance schemes** operated by the Agricultural Industries Confederation and Red Tractor Assurance.

6.21 **The interaction between official controls and private assurance schemes in the UK feed sector** was the subject of a study visit by the FVO (now Directorate F) in January 2016. The FVO commented positively on the arrangements put in place. The final report of the visit can be viewed on the FSA’s website: [Final report](#)
6.22 The introduction of earned recognition ensures that LA resources available to undertake official feed controls are now better targeted at higher-risk businesses and reduces the burden on compliant businesses.

6.23 In September 2016 FSS colleagues provided a talk to the industry Cheese Common Interest Group at SRUC Elmwood, on the regulation and safety of cheese making.

**Department of Health**

6.24 Nutrition and labelling – Department of Health has updated its Technical Guidance on Nutrition Labelling to reflect nutrition labelling becoming mandatory from 13 December 2016:

gov.uk/government/publications/technical-guidance-on-nutrition-labelling

and guidance on Foods for Specific Groups:

gov.uk/search?q=infant+formula&show_organisations_filter=true

**Animal health and welfare and plant health sectors**

**Training**

6.25 In 2016 National Bee Unit Bee Inspectors provided training to beekeepers in England and Wales during hive-side inspections and through 160 organised beekeeping events; events were attended by a total of 5696 beekeepers. Each Bee Inspector is an experienced practical beekeeper, with particular experience and training in the recognition and control of bee pests and diseases. Comprehensive training and advice is provided to beekeepers on apiary management and good husbandry practice.

6.26 In Scotland close partnership working with stakeholders has proven very successful. Honey Bee Health Awareness Days are now held annually and in 2016 around 60 delegates participated. Regional meetings are also held around the country when the Scotland’s Rural College (SRUC) apiculturist delivers targeted training to beekeepers and in addition presentations are also made by the Lead bee Inspector and by the Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA) Entomology Manager. Training events are also held where specific beekeeping courses are catered for. A wide range of abilities is catered for in all the training events from beginners to very experienced beekeepers. SG subsidised two “Train the Trainer” specialist training courses to enable beekeepers to deliver presentations more confidently and professionally. SG is also a member of Coloss project and feeds into their reporting streams through our stakeholders.

6.27 During 2016 DAERA Bee Inspectorate provided input to three Ulster Beekeepers Association (UBKA) winter workshops, presenting the findings of 2015 inspections and emphasising to beekeepers the importance of checking their colonies and reporting anything suspicious to DAERA. Six practical workshops were also rolled out to experienced beekeepers from UBKA and Institute of NI Beekeepers (INIB), aimed at identifying brood diseases in honey bee colonies. This will enable them to assist other beekeepers with
inspecting and identifying brood disease in their hives. AFBI provides a
disease identification service for the bee inspectorate and bee keepers.
During 2016, AFBI processed 150 samples, as well as attending beekeeping
meetings to provide information on diseases and non-indigenous pests
(especially in light of foulbrood outbreaks, the finding of the Asian Hornet in
GB and controversy surrounding neonicotinoid insecticides). AFBI circulates a
questionnaire to beekeepers with respect to overwintering losses. These data
are subsequently provided to the CoLoss project, which produces colony loss
maps for Europe

**Safety, quality and information campaigns**

6.28  The UK Plant Health Information Portal went live in November 2016. This is a
shared resource providing information about plant pests and diseases,
including the assessments of risk undertaken by government. The data
underpinning those assessments is included in the portal.\(^\text{100}\).

6.29  In 2016, APHA PHSI and Defra worked with national and stakeholder
organisations to raise awareness of the causes of brown rot of potatoes. They
jointly hosted a stakeholder event which was attended by approximately fifty
growers and industry representatives.

6.30  The Scottish Government published the Scottish Plant Health Strategy in
Spring 2016.\(^\text{101}\).

**Guidance**

6.31  In 2016 work continued on reviewing APHA guidance as part of the Defra
Smarter Guidance Review project and transition to GOV.UK website. The
aim of the project was to ensure Defra group content on [GOV.UK](http://gov.uk) meets
customer needs including advice on how to request government services and
comply with regulations. The focus was also on making guidance simpler,
clearer and easier to understand.

Some examples of published material:

- Guidance on exempt finishing units for cattle: approved premises
- Guidance on the pre-movement and post movement TB testing of cattle in
  GB
- LA – MRSA: information for people who work with livestock
- Guidance for licensed seed companies in England and Wales
- Guidance for licensed and official seed testing stations
- Guidance for farming inspections
- Guidance for TB isolation units for cattle: conditions of approval and
  operation
- Guidance for holding a slaughter gathering for the sale of TB restricted
cattle

\(^{100}\) [planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk](http://planthealthportal.defra.gov.uk)

\(^{101}\) The Scottish Plant Health Strategy was published in Spring 2016
● Guidance for quarantine facilities for imported birds
● Instructions for crop inspections
● Guidance for bovine quarantine centres
● Plant varieties and seeds Gazette, 2016

6.32 A member of the Cefas FHI contributed to a scientific working group established by the European Union Reference Laboratory for Fish Diseases on guidelines for the management of cleaner fish in the EU.

6.33 The Cefas FHI has continued to engage with other government agencies on improving working practices in a number of areas including with Natural England on habitats regulation assessments, the EA on response to disease outbreaks in wild aquatic animals, and FSA on contingency planning and support during emergencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABP</td>
<td>Animal By-Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Assured Dairy Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>American Foul Brood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFBI</td>
<td>Agri-Food &amp; Biosciences Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLELG</td>
<td>Animal Feed Law Enforcement Liaison Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSA</td>
<td>Agriculture and Fisheries Scotland Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Avian Influenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Agricultural Industries Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>Antimicrobial Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>Aquaculture Production Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHA</td>
<td>Animal and Plant Health Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQSIOQ</td>
<td>Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCMS</td>
<td>British Cattle Movement Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Border Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA</td>
<td>Bee Farmers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>Border Inspection Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>Business, Innovation and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKD</td>
<td>Bacterial Kidney Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bTB</td>
<td>Bovine TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTSF</td>
<td>Better Training for Safer Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Competent Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFRE</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Food and Rural Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Confirmed Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefas</td>
<td>Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CheCS</td>
<td>Cattle Health Certification Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJEU</td>
<td>Court of Justice of the European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>Chemicals Regulation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFIA</td>
<td>Canadian Food Inspection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Customer Service Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSFS</td>
<td>Compulsory Scrapie Flock Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVO</td>
<td>Chief Veterinary Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAERA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (Northern Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFM</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defra</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Desinewed Meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAF</td>
<td>Extended Audit Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>Enzootic Bovine Leukosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Community (now the European Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>Escherichia Coli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFAT</td>
<td>European Funds Audit Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFB</td>
<td>European Foul Brood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSA</td>
<td>European Food Safety Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHC</td>
<td>Export Health Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHO</td>
<td>Environmental Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPO</td>
<td>European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMAS</td>
<td>Emergency Readiness Management Assurance Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWS</td>
<td>Early Warning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Food Business Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDU</td>
<td>Fish Disease Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeBO</td>
<td>Feed Business Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeNAO</td>
<td>Feed not of Animal Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fera</td>
<td>Food and Environment Research Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHI</td>
<td>Fish Health Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHIS</td>
<td>Food Hygiene Information Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHRS</td>
<td>Food Hygiene Rating Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIC</td>
<td>Food Information to Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIR</td>
<td>Food Information Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNAO</td>
<td>Food not of Animal Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Food Standards Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSIS</td>
<td>Food Safety and Inspection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>Food Standards Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVO</td>
<td>Food and Veterinary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td>Government Agency Intelligence Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Genetically Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMO</td>
<td>Genetically Modified Organism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACCP</td>
<td>Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPAI</td>
<td>High Pathogenic Avian Influenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIN</td>
<td>Hygiene Improvement Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>High Risk Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA</td>
<td>Intensive Action Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Incident Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Improvement Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Infected Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRM</td>
<td>Identification, Movement and Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHV</td>
<td>Koi Herpesvirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEMS</td>
<td>Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Lipophilic Toxins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMO</td>
<td>Marine Management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRL</td>
<td>Maximum Residue Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>Mechanically Separated Meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFPP</td>
<td>National Animal Feed Port Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHWP</td>
<td>National Animal Health and Welfare Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBU</td>
<td>National Bee Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEG</td>
<td>National Emergency Epidemiology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFCU</td>
<td>National Food Crime Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFDM</td>
<td>New Feed Delivery Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIM</td>
<td>National Intelligence Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPO</td>
<td>National Plant Protection Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCP</td>
<td>National Residue Control Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRL</td>
<td>National Reference Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>National Trading Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFC</td>
<td>Official Feed and Food Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFT</td>
<td>Officially TB free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG@B</td>
<td>One Government at the Border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>World Organisation for Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OsHV-1 µvar</td>
<td>Oyster Herpesvirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTF</td>
<td>Officially Tuberculosis Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFTW</td>
<td>Officially TB Free Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>Official Veterinarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>Official Veterinary Surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>Primary Aromatic Amine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Police and Criminal Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>Polychlorinated Biphenyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>Potato Cyst Nematode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACH</td>
<td>Procedure for Electronic Application of Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Port Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>Process Hygiene Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHSI</td>
<td>Plant Health and Seeds Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Public Prosecution Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRiF</td>
<td>Pesticide Residues in Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTVd</td>
<td>Potato Spindle Tuber Viroid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ</td>
<td>Protection Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUID</td>
<td>Quantitative Ingredient Declarations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAN</td>
<td>Remedial Action Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASFF</td>
<td>Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDM</td>
<td>Raw Drinking Milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REHIS</td>
<td>Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Rural Payments Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTE</td>
<td>Ready-to-eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA</td>
<td>Scottish Beekeepers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Specified Food Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFICU</td>
<td>Scottish Food Crime and Incidents Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFLEC</td>
<td>Scottish Food Enforcement Liaison Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG AFRC</td>
<td>Scottish Government, Agriculture, Food and Rural Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGIAD</td>
<td>Scottish Government Internal Audit Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHBHS</td>
<td>Scottish Advanced Honey Bee Health Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>Statutory Management Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCP</td>
<td>Salmonella National Control Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCOEHS</td>
<td>Society of Chief Officers of Environmental Health in Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Salmonella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCS</td>
<td>Seed Potato Classification Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM</td>
<td>Specified Risk Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT</td>
<td>Self-Reporting Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRUC</td>
<td>Scotland’s Rural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEC</td>
<td>Shiga toxin-producing E. coli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-MCPD</td>
<td>3-Monochloropropane -1,2 – diol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARP</td>
<td>Trade in Animals and Related Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCZ</td>
<td>Temporary Control Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE</td>
<td>Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>Trading Standards Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAI</td>
<td>Unannounced Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFAS</td>
<td>Universal Feed Assurance Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKAS</td>
<td>United Kingdom Accreditation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKFSS</td>
<td>United Kingdom Food Surveillance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFDA</td>
<td>United States Food and Drugs Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARSS</td>
<td>Veterinary Antimicrobial Resistance and Sales Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFEI</td>
<td>Veterinary Field Epidemiology Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMD</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicines Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMP</td>
<td>Veterinary Medicinal Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRG</td>
<td>Veterinary Risk Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSID</td>
<td>Veterinary Service Investigation Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAEB</td>
<td>Welfare and Enforcement Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASK</td>
<td>Welfare of Animals (Slaughter or Killing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Welsh Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG SF</td>
<td>Welsh Government Sustainable Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>