

# Business Committee performance report

09 June 2025

**FSA BC 25-06-04**

**Data source:**

Executive performance dashboard 14 May 2025



## Operational delivery

Meat, wine and dairy audit .....	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
Official Controls and Approval of new meat FBOs .....	<a href="#"><u>4</u></a>
Incidents and response .....	<a href="#"><u>5</u></a>
National Food Crime .....	<a href="#"><u>6</u></a>

## Local Authority delivery

LA resourcing and performance .....	<a href="#"><u>7</u></a>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

## Market Authorisations for regulated products

Regulated Products delivery .....	<a href="#"><u>10</u></a>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

## Science

Science, evidence and research .....	<a href="#"><u>11</u></a>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------

## Trade and International

Imported food and international obligations .....	<a href="#"><u>12</u></a>
---	---------------------------

## Reputation and Communications

Public trust, correspondence, complaints and engagement .....	<a href="#"><u>13</u></a>
---	---------------------------

## People and Resources

Workforce and Financial performance .....	<a href="#"><u>14</u></a>
---	---------------------------

## Annex A

RAG tolerances matrix summary .....	<a href="#"><u>15</u></a>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------

Regulator

Objective: We **must** directly deliver official controls in meat, dairy and wine businesses (including exporters)


Overall RAG G

Meat, wine and dairy audit

What does overall meat food business operator (FBO) compliance show?

Measure		2024/25 Target	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
No. Meat FBO audits completed	E and W	146/Q	140	157	G	G
	NI	6/Q	5	6	G	G
% Meat FBO audits completed by agreed timescales	E and W	90%	96.2%	98.1%	G	G
	NI	100%	100%	100%	G	G
% Meat FBOs where urgent improvement is necessary	E and W	<1.5%/M	0.1%	0.5%	G	G
	NI	<1.5%/M	0%	0%	G	G

Number of meat FBOs by compliance rating by the three nations  
**Good**; **Generally satisfactory**; **Improvement** and **Urgent improvement necessary**



Are we delivering our statutory obligations in wine premises?

Measure	Ambition	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Visits carried out in year (quarterly)	237	261	280	G	G
Visits carried out in year (cumulative)	948	879	1159	G	G

Are we delivering our statutory obligations in dairy premises?

Measure		Ambition	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
% dairy visits completed within frequency	E and W	98.4%	99.4%	98.9%	G	G
	NI	100%	100%	100%	G	G
RCDM sampling - % of failed samples due to harmful bacteria	E and W	0%	1.2%	4.5% 5/111	G	R
	NI	0%	100%	50% 1/2	G	A

E&W RCDM: 4 out of the 5 failed samples for Q4 came from the same farm. This farm was part of an incident investigation and sales ceased immediately and did not re-commence until the investigation was concluded. Additional sampling was undertaken as part of the investigation.

NI RCDM: 2 RCDM samples for Q4. 1 sample result was noncompliant. Sales ceased until a compliant sample was received.

Regulator

**Objective:** We **must** directly deliver official controls in meat, dairy and wine businesses (including exporters)

Overall RAG G

Official Controls

Do we have the right resources to deliver? (England and Wales only)

Measure	Ambition	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
% TROV workforce	0%	17%	14%	G	G
% OV workforce MRCVS	100%	83%	86%	G	G
MHI attrition (FSA)	<8%	1.5%	3.6%	G	G
MHI resourcing (EMHI vs CMHI from PP) %	50:50	44:56	46:54	A	G

**TR:** Temporarily Registered (with Royal College Veterinarian Surgeons - RCVS)  
**OV:** Official Veterinarian (employed by SDP)  
**MRCVS:** Member of the RCVS  
**SDP:** Service Delivery Partner  
**CMHI:** Contract Meat Hygiene Inspector  
**EMHI:** Employed Meat Hygiene Inspector  
**MHI:** Meat Hygiene Inspector

Approval of new meat FBOs

Are approvals of new meat establishments delivered in line with legislative requirements?

Measure		2024/25 Target	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
% conditional approvals under 3 months	E	90%	89% (18)	95% (19)	A	G
	W	90%	100% (2)	100% (3)	G	G
	NI	100%	100%	100% (3)	G	G
% full approvals under 6 months	E	100%	100% (18)	100% (20)	G	G
	W	100%	100% (2)	75% (4)	G	R
	NI	100%	100%	100% (1)	G	G

**Conditional approval:** Granted subject to any conditions or limitations that apply.  
**Full approval:** Establishment meets the relevant requirements of food law.

Regulator

Objective: We **must** deliver an efficient and effective response to food and feed incidents


Overall RAG G

Incidents and response


How many incidents are taking place and what category do these fall into?

Measure	Tolerance	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Total incidents occupying time	437	888	861	R	R
Number of new incidents	350	564	591	R	R
Number of non-routine	3	0	1	G	G
Total number of outbreaks	8	4	4	G	G
% high and medium priority incidents	70%	64.9%	72.1%	A	A
...of which high priority	30%	46.2%	51.4%	A	R
Number of Allergy Alerts	13	35	21	R	R
Number of Product Recall Information Notices (PRINs)	16	15	18	G	A
Incidents is three nation data.					

Total incident notifications received by financial year to 31 March 2025



Number of food alerts notifications issued by the FSA to 31 March 2025



**Incidents:** “When action is required to protect consumers when concerns around the safety or quality of food (and/or feed) are raised.” | **Non-routine:** “A food incident, which cannot be dealt with using everyday resources and procedures.”

Regulator

Objective: We **must** deliver an efficient and effective response to food crime


Overall RAG G

National Food Crime Unit (NFCU)

Are NFCU operations successfully leading to outcomes?

Measure	2024/25 target	Year to date	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
% closed NFCU operations that led to an outcome	50%	61%	60%	55%	G	G
% NFCU SIRs which improved rating	40%	87%	10%	45%	G	G
No. disruptions overall	55/yr	77	16	12	G	A
No. outcomes overall	80/yr	193	65	28	G	G


Cumulative disruptions per quarter



What is the impact of NFCU operations?

Measure	2024/25 target	Year to date	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Volume of unfit food products removed from the food chain (kg)	NA	72,178kg	26,590kg	310kg	NA	NA
% of business that changed prevention practices (target hardening) following FFRT	NA	69.23%	73% (14/19)	66% (26/39)	NA	NA

Cumulative outcomes per quarter



LA performance - Are required interventions at all risk establishments taking place?													
England							Wales						
Measure		Benchmark	Previous period	This period	Previous RAG	This RAG	Measure		Benchmark	Previous period	This period	Previous RAG	This RAG
Food Hygiene: % due interventions achieved	A rated	98.9%	98.7%	92.4%	A	R	Food Hygiene: % due interventions achieved	A rated	99.7%	98.7%	98.8%	A	A
	B rated	96.3%	97.7%	90.1%	G	A		B rated	98.5%	99.6%	96.8%	G	A
	C rated	91.3%	83.8%	75.7%	R	R		C rated	93.2%	90.8%	85.5%	G	A
	D rated	83.5%	58.4%	58.7%	G	G		D rated	80.5%	43.9%	49.6%	G	G
	E rated	72.4%	26.2%	28.3%	G	G		E rated	82.2%	25.1%	23.7%	G	A
Food Standards: % due interventions achieved	A rated	75.7%	83.4%	70.5%	G	R	Food Standards: % due interventions achieved	A rated	90.8%	91.8%	83.3%	G	G
	B rated	29.7%	11.8%	19.4%	A	G		B rated	60.3%	32.7%	32.6%	G	G
	C rated	32.4%	11.7%	15.8%	G	G		C rated	60.3%	34.6%	30.3%	G	G
Northern Ireland													
Food Hygiene: % due interventions achieved	A rated	99.2%	100.0%	95%	G	A	The benchmark covers the pre-COVID-19 levels (2019/20). Previous period covers Q3-4 2023/24. This period covers Q1-2 2024/25.						
	B rated	98.7%	100.0%	95.9%	G	A							
	C rated	92.5%	90.0%	79.3%	A	R							
	D rated	88.2%	55.6%	60.3%	G	G							
	E rated	77.1%	32.6%	54.2%	G	G							
Food Standards: % due interventions achieved	A rated	94.7%	100.0%	87.9%	G	G							
	B rated	89.9%	74.7%	69.0%	G	G							
	C rated	80.6%	73.0%	56.9%	G	G							

Regulator

Objective: We **must** deliver our regulatory responsibilities as the national regulator to assure that feed, food and importing businesses are compliant

Overall RAG R

LA performance and resourcing														
Are local authorities managing unrated businesses?							Do LAs have enough resource in place to deliver the controls?							
Measure		Benchmark (Pre-COVID levels)	Previous period (Q3-4 2023/24)	This period (Q1-2 2024/25)	Previous RAG	This RAG	Food Hygiene Measure		Previous period (Q3-4 2023/24)	This period (Q1-2 2024/25)	Previous RAG	This RAG		
Number of businesses unrated (Food Hygiene)	E	29,021	38,925	40,061	R	R	FTE allocated to deliver controls	E	1,396	1,386	R	R		
	W	1,388	1,746	1,880	R	R		W	163	164	G	G		
	NI	599	430	412	G	G		NI	64	61	A	A		
Number of businesses unrated (Food Standards)	E	68,448	87,381	79,057	R	R	FTE occupied to deliver controls	E	1,258	1262	R	R		
	W	4,160	5,270	4,918	R	R		W	142	144	A	A		
	NI	606	394	386	G	G		NI	59	58	R	R		
<p><b>Interventions:</b> Both reactive and proactive activities such as inspections, sampling visits, full and partial audits and surveillance and intelligence gathering.</p> <p><b>FTE:</b> Full time equivalent, includes ‘authorised officer’, regulatory support officers and trainees.</p> <p><b>LAs escalated:</b> Where LAs are in stage 1 (written request from FSA to LA Head of Service) or higher if the escalation process.</p>							Food Standards							
							FTE allocated to deliver controls	E	348	321	R	R		
								W	68	71	R	R		
								NI	29	32	R	R		
							FTE occupied to deliver controls	E	304	294	R	R		
								W	64	63	R	R		
								NI	27	31	R	R		



Regulator

**Objective:** We **must** deliver our regulatory responsibilities as the national regulator to assure that feed, food and importing businesses are compliant

Overall RAG R

### LA performance

#### Is action by LAs improving compliance?

Local Authority activity		Benchmark (pre-COVID levels)	Previous period (Q3-4 2023/24)	This period (Q1-2 2024/25)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Measure						
Establishments subject to enforcement activities	FH	2,392	3,132	2,795	NA	NA
	FS	229	371	322	NA	NA
Establishments subject to written warning	FH	75,641	85,855	78,887	NA	NA
	FS	12,548	17,461	16,560	NA	NA


#### Business compliance

Measure	Benchmark (pre-COVID levels)	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
% FHRs ratings 3+	95.8%	96.9%	96.9%	G	G
% FHRs ratings 5	72.0%	76.6%	76.8%	G	G

#### Are LAs performing and are issues being rectified?


Measure	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Of which new...	Previous RAG	This RAG
Open cases	36	19	8	NA	NA
Cases being monitored	78	87	16	NA	NA
Cases closed	117	148	31	NA	NA
Cases in escalation	8	13	2	NA	NA

#### FHRs ratings of 3 or better per quarter



Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2021/22				2022/23				2023/24				2024/25			

#### FHRs ratings of 5 per quarter



Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2021/22				2022/23				2023/24				2024/25			


**Enforcement activities:** Carried out by LAs and are formal steps, measures and sanctions an LA can take in response to a food establishment’s failure to comply with food law (e.g. serving Hygiene Improvement Notices/Improvement Notices).

Regulator

Objective: We **must** maintain an effective and efficient risk analysis process, supporting decision makers across all UK countries

Overall RAG 

A



Evidence generator

Objective: We **must** ensure risk analysis decisions and priority ‘core and change’ work are informed by timely and robust science and evidence.

Overall RAG G

Science, evidence and research

Does our science have impact?

Measure	12-month average	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG	Measure	12-month average	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Number of reports published	41/Q	56	59	G	G	Total mentions – Scientific outputs published by the FSA <sup>1</sup>	28	12	26	NA	NA
						Total mentions – FSA funded research outputs <sup>2</sup>	375	465	294	NA	NA

Do we provide evidence to support FSA functions?

Risk Analysis Process (RAP) - SERD responsibilities

Measure	Target	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Evidence packages completed	NA	2	14	NA	NA
RAP is followed, evidence is assured, outputs fit for purpose	100%	90%	97%	G	G
Completeness of evidence packages	100%	100%	100%	G	G
Timeliness of evidence packages	100%	100%	93%	G	A
Quality Assurance of evidence packages	100%	100%	100%	G	G
Fitness for purpose of evidence packages	100%	75%	93%	A	A

Sampling

	Measure	Baseline (2023/24)	Year to date	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
No. samples taken	Total	13,665	11,571	3,726	3,118	G	G
	Regulatory monitoring	6,563	5,864	1,896	2,412	NA	NA
	Targeted surveillance	1,947	1,321	300	65	NA	NA
	To inform science/research	2,715	1,694	1,286	243	NA	NA
	Enforcement (Official Control)	2,440	2,692	1,526	398	NA	NA
	No. referrals to ICM due to sampling results	7	5	1	2	NA	NA

<sup>1</sup> Directly funded FSA reports  
<sup>2</sup> Reports that attribute some of their funding to the FSA

Policy maker

**Objective:** We **must** assess and make recommendations on market access requests and provide technical input to other government departments on “Sanitary and Phytosanitary” and “Technical Barriers to Trade” issues in trade agreements

Overall RAG G

Imported foods

Do we support consumer access to safe imported food?

Measure	12-month average	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Number of border notifications (total)	174/Q	145	256	<span>G</span>	<span>A</span>
Number of border notifications (validated)	129/Q	108	186	<span>G</span>	<span>A</span>
Number of intensified official controls	1/Q	1	2	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Number of imposed checks	0/Q	0	0	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Number of import market access audits	1/yr	1	0	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Number of equivalence assessments ongoing	1/Q	1	2	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>

HRFNAO review	Progress	Previous RAG	This RAG
4 <sup>th</sup> review of HRFNAO	We are currently consulting on the fourth review which will close mid April. This work remains on track to be delivered late Autum through the production of an SI	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
5 <sup>th</sup> review of HRFNAO	Resourcing constraints, which may affect the timeline for the 5th review are being addressed by staff moves within the Unit.	<span>G</span>	<span>A</span>

Trade and international

Are we meeting our international obligations?

Measure	Benchmark	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Number of export market access audits facilitated by FSA on Defra request	6	1	1	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
% notifications to World Trade Organisation within deadlines	NA	100%	100%	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Number of Section 42 advices undergoing request, drafting, or publication	NA	0	0	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>

Enabler

**Objective:** We **will** provide the people, resources and processes needed to deliver the FSA’s corporate objectives and priorities


Overall RAG G

## Public trust, correspondence and complaints

What is the FSA’s reputation with the public?

Measure	PS average	Previous period (Q2 2024/25)	This period (Q4 2024/25)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Trust in the FSA*	NA	72%	69%	<span>G</span>	<span>A</span>

Consumer trust in the FSA by Food and You 2 survey publication date



Are we managing complaints and responding to correspondence within deadlines?

Measure	2024/25 Target	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Number of complaints	NA	5	45	NA	<span>NA</span>
Complaints responded to within deadline	100%	100%	89%	<span>G</span>	<span>A</span>
FOIs responded to within deadline	95%	97%	100%	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>

## Media coverage, social media and stakeholder engagement

Are the public engaging with the FSA online and FSA newsletters?

Measure	12-month average	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Consumer engagement social media	2.6%	2.5%	3.0%	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Business engagement social media	6.0%	4.4%	12.4%	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Website visitors	721,725	611,630	720,529	<span>R</span>	<span>A</span>
Bulletins audience growth	2.8%	-0.2%	0.3%	<span>R</span>	<span>R</span>
Bulletins engagement rate	39.5%	46.4%	44.7%	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>

Are we featuring in the news?

Measure	12-month average	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG
Total pieces of coverage	2,831	2,650	6,820	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>
Total opportunities to see (reach)	756m	2.3bn	2.2bn	<span>G</span>	<span>G</span>

\*% is based on people who report at least some knowledge of the FSA |

Enabler

Objective: We will provide the people, resources and processes needed to deliver the FSA’s corporate objectives and priorities

Overall RAG




A

Workforce						
Do we have the people to deliver our priorities?						
Measure	2024/25 Target	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG	
Westminster FTE*	1,417.0	1390.8	1381.4	G	G	
Northern Ireland FTE	NA	90.1	84.3	NA	NA	
Wales FTE	NA	65.3	66.9	NA	NA	
Westminster vacancy rate	4.0%	4.5%	4.9%	NA	NA	
Is our workforce diverse?						
Measure	Benchmark**	Previous period (Q3)	This period (Q4)	Previous RAG	This RAG	Completion rate
Sex	50% female	50.8%	50.9%	G	G	100.0%
Disability	16.9%	18.6%	18.8%	G	G	73.6%
Ethnicity	16.6%	12.1%	11.6%	R	R	85.9%
Sexual orientation	6.9%	7.0%	6.9%	G	G	77.9%

Financial performance					
Westminster Resource and Capital Departmental Expenditure Limits					
Measure	Budget £million	2024/25 outturn £million	Under / (Over) spend £million	Variance (outturn vs budget)%	This RAG
Westminster RDEL and CDEL	123.2	120.4	2.8	2.3%	G
Wales RDEL and CDEL	5.1	5.0	0.1	2.6%	G
Northern Ireland RDEL and CDEL	16.7	16.0	0.7	3.9%	A
Total FSA DEL	145.0	141.4	3.6	2.5%	G
Are our financial processes accurate, controlled and efficient?					
Measure	Target	Previous period	This period	Previous RAG	This RAG
Income collection efficiency	95.0%	98.9%	97.6%	G	G
Supplier invoices paid within 30 days	95.0%	96.4%	97.0%	G	G
Payroll accuracy	99.0%	99.9%	99.8%	G	G
Reporting accuracy (actuals)	80.0%	NA	80.2%	NA	G
Reporting accuracy (forecast)	1%	NA	2.3%	NA	A

# Annex A: RAG tolerances matrix summary

RAG (Red-Amber-Green) ratings, also known as 'traffic lighting,' are used to summarise indicator values, where green denotes a 'favourable' value, red an 'unfavourable' value and amber an 'early warning' value. It aims to introduce a level of consistency in how the measures in the performance reporting framework are presented. However, by the nature of the activities, the overall service area and measure-level RAG matrix will contain some level of subjectivity and will need to be interpreted carefully alongside the accompanying cover paper. RAGs are reviewed alongside the commentary and apply appropriate check and challenge to ensure consistency of application and analysis of trend over time.

RAG	Description / Criteria
 Green	Performance within target/tolerance. Not expected to cause any damage or minor damage with no lasting effect to the service area or ability to meet targets / goals / objectives. Utilise existing capacity to actively monitor with any expected recovery / time to resolve 3 months or less.
 Amber	Performance outside of target/tolerance and likely to cause moderate damage with little to short-term effects to the service area or ability to meet targets / goals / objectives. Targeted effort required to resolve with expected recovery / time taken 3-12 months.
 Red	Performance substantially outside agreed tolerances, with long-term effects to the service area or ability to meet targets / goals / objectives. Significant effort required and an immediate crucial priority with expected recovery / time to resolve 12 months or more.

## Service areas

We use the matrix above to calculate the overarching service area RAG rating. The aim is to provide a sense of the overall health of activities and confidence in delivering against statutory obligations, objectives and targets in that area.

## Individual measures

As per the overarching service area, we broadly use the matrix above to set RAGs for individual key performance indicators with a key focus on risk to delivery. This allows us to easily identify strengths and areas that require further attention. To set RAG tolerances we determined what we were trying to achieve and identified targets / ambitions / benchmarks for each KPI to provide a starting point for our tolerance ranges creating bands for what constitutes red, amber and green. Once determined, working with subject matter experts, we then defined the amount of risk we were willing to accept and therefore, the boundaries of acceptable performance in the delivery of objectives or targets. This helps to direct the performance conversation and aid decision-making around performance achievements and / or improvements.

Sitting behind the performance report we have a supporting database that records the agreed RAG rating tolerances for each measure. As with the performance measures the RAG ratings are a guide to aid the performance conversation and are periodically reviewed to maintain their effectiveness as the situation or the importance of the performance measure evolves.