

Performance Management Framework for FSA Delivered Official Controls (FSADOC)

Performance Management Frameworks (PMF) are an important part of the governance of a contract. They set out the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that will be measured to evidence how the contract is performing and support discussions regarding any improvements.

KPIs must be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timebound (SMART).

For complex service contracts there will be a requirement for multiple KPIs to ensure the different elements of the service are being delivered to the required quality level. However, the more KPIs a contract has, the more work is required to manage them. Government guidance is that Gold tiered contracts must have a minimum of 3 KPIs.

The objective of the contracts is to provide qualified and competent Official Veterinarians (OVs) and Meat Hygiene Inspectors (MHIs) to deliver meat official controls in FSA approved establishments in England and Wales alongside FSA Field Operations staff.

The current contract has 7 KPI categories, with 1 category T1 Delivery of Official Controls subdivided into 4 further sub-categories. There are 4 levels of performance – Over Performance, Compliance, Non-Compliance, and Service Failure. Non-compliance is further subdivided into new and repeat.

KPIs must measure the actual performance of the contract, if the supplier cannot affect the delivery of the KPI as it is out of their control this would not be a suitable KPI. The FSA is keen to ensure feedback from the end users of the service is considered before we develop the PMF for the next contracts. You have been provided with the current PMF at Annex 1.

For these contracts it could be considered that there are 2 sets of end users - FSA Field Operations and the Meat Industry. Therefore, it is important that feedback is provided by both user groups for consideration when developing the next PMF. Potential suppliers will also be engaged to seek their feedback on the draft PMF.

This is not about costs or charging.

Questions to consider:

1. How would you define good service delivery?
2. What are the key performance metrics that would show whether the service is being delivered to a high standard?
3. What would you like to change from the current performance management framework?
 - a. How many KPIs do you think should measure the performance of the contract?
 - b. Do you think the current categories of the PMF are suitable? If so, why? If not, why not?
4. What would constitute a non-compliance or service failure for you?

Annex 1 FSADOC Current Performance Management Framework

Key Performance indicators

Business/Administration	Technical
BA1 – Availability	T1 – Delivery of Official Controls
BA2 – Attendance	T2 – Animal welfare
BA – Supplier management controls	T3 – ABP / SRM controls
-	T4 - Hygiene

Activity	Relevant KPI's
Routine DOC in Meat Premises	BA1, BA2, BA3, T1, T2, T3, T4
Unannounced inspections (UAI)	BA1, BA2, BA3, T1, T3, T4
FBO audits	BA1, BA2, BA3, T1, T3, T4
Dairy hygiene inspections (DHI)	BA1, BA2, BA3, T1, T4

Business KPIs

BA1 – Availability

Assessment of supplier performance at stage of resource requests including flexibility to change requests such as plant openings and religious festivals. To include all contracted services including UAI, DHI and FBO Audit.

BA2 – Attendance

Assessment of supplier performance of resources deployed to requested sites in relation to punctuality and actual attendance.

BA3 – Supplier management controls

Assessment of supplier management systems to deliver required level of service such as current and accurate system to match staff competency vs plant complexity and effective information cascade process. This is assessment of supplier corporate management activity at a local level.

Technical KPIs

T1 – Delivery of Official Controls

Assessment of supplier delivery of official Controls in line with legislation, guidance and contract specification. This KPI is broken down into subsections for separate categories:

- Guidance – following MOC instructions.
- Reporting – completion of required reporting i.e., SHVs, Chronos input, Quality of report writing.
- Inspection – undertaking all inspection duties as per legislative and MOC requirements.
- Other policies and procedures – i.e., FSA H&S policies; expected code of conduct adherence; accident/incident reporting.

T2 – Animal welfare

Assessment of supplier performance in relation to Animal welfare controls at approved premises. Including relevant communication to relevant stakeholders, incident reporting and enforcement activity.

T3 – ABP / SRM controls

Assessment of supplier performance in relation to supervision and control of ABP and SRM management at approved premises from removal, handling, storage through to disposal and documentation management. Including relevant reporting and enforcement activity.

T4 – Hygiene

Assessment of supplier performance in relation to all Hygiene controls within premises relating to production, maintenance and cleaning compliance. Including relevant reporting and enforcement activity.

Note: For FBO Audits, Unannounced Inspections and Dairy Hygiene Inspections guidances, see Annex 22, 23 and 24. Performance management information for these activities will be supplied quarterly, although if significant performance issues are identified they will be addressed by exception at the earlier contract review meeting.

Pre-meeting preparation

All documentation to be available for preparation for monthly contract review meetings before the scheduled meeting date and stored on designated Lot MS Teams sites.

This is to include all sources of data/information such as FSA MI dashboard, supplier self-reporting and relevant local management information.

Performance Credits

Non-Compliant – A Performance Credit of 0.25% of the value of the monthly invoice of the supplier for the Lot, in which the non-compliance has occurred, will be applied for every repeated instance of non-compliance in a rolling 3-month period within the same category within the Lot.

Service Failures – A Performance Credit of 0.5% of the value of the monthly invoice of the supplier for the Lot will be applied for every instance of a service failure.

Capping of Performance Credits – Performance Credits raised as result of both non-compliances and service failures, will be limited to 5% of the lot value for relevant quarter.

Over-performance – create incentive for delivery of services exceeding required standard e.g. same day supply of cover staff; incident response with increased hours for enforcement. OM/AM/FVL to identify incidences and record – to be used to offset same category non-compliances and subsequently Performance Credits. (Not used to counter service failures)

Guidance on assessment of supplier performance

BA1 – Availability

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>All resources supplied in line with requests made within agreed notice period.</p> <p>Supplier reacts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OV service demand changes within 30 days' notice period • OA service demands within 7 days • and unforeseen/short term OA service demands 	<p>Resource timescales not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OV service demand changes 30 - 35 days; • Routine rota OA service demands over 7 days • Short notice OA service demands over 2 clear working days with minor impact 	<p>Resource timescales not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OV service demand changes in excess of 35 days; • OA service demands for routine rota over 7 days; • or OA service demands over 2 clear working days with significant impact. 	<p>Response by supplier office to resource requests in timely manner and level of collaboration/negotiation to cover all resource requirements.</p> <p>Response to significant service demand requests i.e. new plant opening requests or additional shifts in 30 days.</p> <p>Consider if changes have resulted in costs?</p> <p>For example, 1: Reschedule of work that is not time critical i.e. UAI or Dairy (manageable?)</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>within 2 clear working days.</p> <p>Timely and informal discussions on deployment plans have allowed smoother resource allocation by mutual agreement to amend resource planning with insignificant impact or cost.</p>	<p>Resources unable to be allocated at request stage but resolved through negotiation of amendments to planned BAU work such as UAI, DHI work and/or utilisation of casual FSA staff or NWD staff with manageable impact or additional costs.</p>	<p>Resources unable to be allocated at request stage and/or FSA management required to utilise casual FSA staff or NWD staff with significant increase to FSA costs, FSA reputation or employee safety.</p>	<p>For example, 2: Emp OA working on a rest day (significant impact?).</p>

BA2 - Attendance

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>All resources attend premises on time.</p> <p>Any delays experienced are out of the control of the supplier e.g. traffic incidents or extreme weather or are isolated and are given immediate management attention to resolve.</p>	<p>Instances of repeated late attendance from same individual within a reporting period.</p> <p>Action taken within local teams to address problem with minimal impact.</p>	<p>Late attendance causing significant impact to FSA team and/or FBO or failure to attend at all.</p>	<p>Punctuality which impacts start times including breaks during operational hours.</p> <p>Reasons for late attendance to be considered i.e. traffic issues v individual time management.</p>

BA3 – Supplier management controls

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>Supplier demonstrates internal processes and controls that support</p>	<p>Supplier controls fail to identify, and support required service delivery</p>	<p>Supplier controls fail to identify, and support required service delivery</p>	<p>Individual competence matched to premises complexity with mutually agreed assessment</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>effective and efficient service delivery to contract specification and demonstrate attention to competence and capability.</p>	<p>resulting in minor impact to FBO and/or FSA e.g. failure to keep system ensuring plant complexity versus individual competence assessment up to date resulting in resource deployment or service delivery issues with minor impact that is manageable. Supplier failing to address repeated timesheet issues with staff.</p>	<p>resulting in significant impact to FBO and/or FSA e.g. cascade of key messages on change to policy or legislation resulting in significant impact on daily working routines or risk to public health or animal welfare</p> <p>Deployed resource does not meet plant complexity requirements with significant impact on daily working routines or risk to public health or animal welfare.</p>	<p>system being available to FSA management on request.</p> <p>Suppliers reactivity to managing or implementing change to policy or procedure.</p> <p>Supplier attention to rectifying timesheet errors with identified individuals.</p> <p>Demonstrating successful change management processes.</p> <p>Adequate practical work experience.</p>

T1 – Delivery of Official Controls

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>Supplier delivers Official Controls to required standard against legislation, guidance and contract specification.</p> <p>Isolated issues with negligible impact are identified and/or managed by the supplier.</p>	<p>Guidance</p> <p>Supplier fails to follow MOC guidance resulting in minimal impact to the FBO and/or FSA Team and/or public health.</p>	<p>Guidance</p> <p>Supplier fails to follow MOC guidance resulting in significant impact to the FBO and/or FSA team and/or public health.</p>	<p>Performance in line with MOC instructions for completion of all required duties i.e. inspection, sampling, spinal cord removal, cold inspection, warm meat dispatch.</p>
<p>This compliance is categorised into the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance • Reporting 	<p>Reporting</p> <p>Required reporting is outside agreed timescales; has missing entries or not to the required standard.</p>	<p>Reporting</p> <p>Significant issues not reported as required by MOC.</p> <p>Repeated missing entries in reporting systems.</p>	<p>Chronos input – supplier management checks by 10th of each month.</p> <p>Communication of key/significant issues between supplier and FSA.</p> <p>Performance in line with MOC instructions for reporting.</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspection • Other policies/procedures 		<p>Failure to use required on-line reporting systems.</p> <p>Required reporting is outside agreed timescales; has missing entries or not to the required standard by same individual in consecutive months</p>	
	<p>Inspection</p> <p>Routine inspections not carried out to legislative requirements with minor impacts e.g. kidneys not inspected.</p>	<p>Inspection</p> <p>Routine inspections not carried to legislative requirements with significant impacts e.g. health mark of gross faecal contamination of carcasses or release of SRM within carcasses</p>	<p>Performance in line with MOC instructions for inspection procedures.</p> <p>SHV checks</p> <p>FBO complaints (justified)</p> <p>Field Veterinary Leader/Coordinator reality checks.</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
			<p>Remote checks.</p> <p>Audit findings.</p> <p>Other 3rd party findings e.g. USDA, Directorate F.</p>
	<p>Other policies/procedures</p> <p>Supplier fails to follow other FSA policies and/or procedures resulting in minor incident or risk of minor incident that could have an impact on FBO and/or FSA.</p> <p>E.g. use of inappropriate language toward FBO or FSA staff.</p>	<p>Other policies/procedures</p> <p>Supplier fails to follow other FSA policies and/or procedures resulting in significant incident or risk of significant incident that could have a damaging impact on FBO and/or FSA.</p> <p>This could be a repeated and intentional disregard to policies/procedures.</p>	<p>Health and safety</p> <p>Accident/incident reporting</p> <p>Appropriate and expected conduct and behaviour</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
		E.g. failure to wear PPE.	

T2 – Animal Welfare

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>The severity of animal welfare non-compliances are assessed accurately by the supplier or errors with negligible impact for animal welfare are resolved efficiently. All operational activity and enforcement to the required standards</p>	<p>Case(s) not correctly assessed for the severity of the animal welfare non-compliance (including transport and on farm issues) by the supplier but with minimal impact for animal welfare.</p> <p>Operational enforcement activity not escalated appropriately.</p>	<p>Case(s) not correctly assessed for the severity of the animal welfare non-compliance by the supplier resulting in significant impact for animal welfare <u>or</u> animal welfare non-compliances (including transport and on farm issues) that were <u>not</u> identified by the supplier and result in significant impact for animal welfare.</p> <p>Quality/standard of operational activity and enforcement activity results in the inability for</p>	<p>Field Veterinary Leader/Coordinator (& WAT) reality checks; including up to date welfare files, SPOs, CoCs etc.</p> <p>Audit findings.</p> <p>Other 3rd party findings e.g. USDA, Directorate F.</p>

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
		further investigation and possible prosecution.	

T3 ABP/ARM control

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>The supplier is identifying FBO non-compliances or errors with negligible impact to public health and/or animal health and these are resolved appropriately and efficiently.</p> <p>All enforcement to the required standards.</p>	<p>The supplier is not identifying FBO non-compliances but with minimal impact to public health and/or animal health.</p> <p>Enforcement activity not escalated appropriately.</p>	<p>The supplier is not identifying FBO non-compliances with significant impact to public health and/or animal health.</p> <p>Quality/standard of enforcement activity results in the inability for further investigation and possible prosecution.</p>	<p>Field Veterinary Leader/Coordinator reality checks.</p> <p>Audit findings.</p> <p>Other 3rd party findings e.g. USDA, Directorate F., APHA or LA intelligence.</p>

T4 -Hygiene

Compliant	Non-compliant	Service Failure	Examples of areas under assessment or evidence
<p>The supplier is having appropriate impact on the FBO controls and ensuring verification and enforcement activity is being discharged to the required standard.</p> <p>Isolated failure to identify FBO non-compliances with minimal impact to public health and/or animal health are identified and managed by the supplier</p>	<p>Failure to identify repeated or numerous FBO non-compliances with minimal impact to public and/or animal health</p> <p>Enforcement activity not escalated appropriately.</p>	<p>The supplier is not identifying FBO non-compliances with significant impact to public health and/or animal health.</p> <p>Quality/standard of enforcement activity results in the inability for further investigation and possible prosecution.</p>	<p>Field Veterinary Leader/Coordinator reality checks.</p> <p>Audit findings.</p> <p>Other 3rd party findings e.g. USDA, Directorate F.</p> <p>Consider if the OV is assessing risk in relation to public/animal health and taking suitable and proportionate action in a timely and effective way.</p>