

---

## UK LOCAL AUTHORITY FOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15

Report by Nina Purcell, Director of Wales and Local Delivery

For further information contact Esther Heller on 020 7276 8756, email: [esther.heller@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:esther.heller@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk)

### 1 SUMMARY

1.1 This paper reports to the Board on UK local authority enforcement activity in 2014/15 and trends in enforcement activity over the last five years.

1.2 The Board is asked to:

- **Note:** the [2014/15 Official Statistics](#) on local authority food law enforcement activity that were published on 11 November 2015;
- **Note:** the changing picture in local authority performance over the last five years (see Annex); and
- **Note:** the concerns this raises about the performance of some individual local authorities, the sustainability of the current enforcement delivery model and whether the model is fit for the future.

### 2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 As part of its duties under the Food Standards Act 1999, and in accordance with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official feed and food controls, the FSA is responsible for monitoring and reporting the performance of local authorities in enforcing relevant food safety legislation. Arrangements for this are set out in the Framework Agreement on the Delivery of Official Feed and Food Controls by Local Authorities.<sup>1</sup> Data on how local authorities are delivering their food law enforcement services are collected annually through LAEMS (Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System).<sup>2</sup> The returns cover enforcement activity in relation to food hygiene (microbiological quality and contamination of food by micro-organisms or foreign matter), food standards (composition, chemical contamination, adulteration and labelling of food), and also food imported from third countries.

2.2 The Board has received annual papers on local authority monitoring data since 2001. The data are also used to report on food control activities to the European Commission as part of the annual reports on the implementation of the UK's National Control Plan.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/enforcework/frameagree>

<sup>2</sup> LAEMS is a web-based system enabling local authorities to provide their data returns to the FSA electronically.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/regulation/europeleg/feedandfood/ncpuk>

### 3 STRATEGIC AIMS

- 3.1 Local authority delivery of official food controls on behalf of the FSA supports the delivery of three of the FSA's four strategic outcomes for 2015 to 2020, namely that food is safe, food is what it says it is, and that consumers can make informed choices about where and what to eat.
- 3.2 Analysis of the annual monitoring data on local authority performance helps us to understand how effectively and consistently these objectives are being delivered. It indicates the levels of control activity by individual local authorities and thereby helps determine if effective food regulatory services are in place locally. In the case of food hygiene, the data indicates the levels of food business compliance, a key proxy measure for public health protection.
- 3.3 The data is also used to inform the FSA's local authority audit programmes and the development of the FSA's Regulatory Strategy and work on developing future delivery models.

### 4 EVIDENCE

- 4.1 Submission of LAEMS returns includes validation checks and requires formal sign-off by each local authority's Head of Service. This provides assurance and enables more robust secondary analyses of trends and variations in local authority delivery. Details of the data checks that were undertaken to ensure metrics used and the comparisons made are reliable are included at Annex A of the [Annual Report for 2014-15](#). The Annual Report, together with the summary data on individual local authorities,<sup>4</sup> forms Official Statistics on UK local authority food law enforcement activity for 2014/15. The Official Statistics were published on the FSA website on 11 November 2015.
- 4.2 For Northern Ireland, the 2014/15 LAEMS returns covered only the first three quarters of the reporting period. This was agreed in advance of local government reorganisation which reduced the number of district councils from 26 to 11 on 1 April 2015. In view of this, Northern Ireland has been excluded this year from secondary analysis of data for interventions and enforcement.

### 5 DISCUSSION

- 5.1 Significant issues raised by the 2014/15 UK LAEMS returns for food hygiene and food standards, and from over the last five years, are set out in the Annex to this paper.<sup>5</sup> As in previous years, the reported data for 2014/15 shows a very mixed picture. This is more pronounced in relation to England and for food standards activity.
- 5.2 The overall position is one of growing concern. At a local level there are a good number of authorities which are struggling to undertake interventions of food

---

<sup>4</sup> Data at <http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/monitoring/laems/mondatabyyear/enforcement-data-2014-2015>

<sup>5</sup> All trends are based on primary analysis of LAEMS statistics based on the full data, as reported to the FSA by local authorities, and as signed off by local authority Heads of Service.

businesses at the required frequencies. More generally, the number of food businesses and customer complaints continue to rise, while local authority staff resources, intervention and sampling levels continue to fall. These trends, along with more detailed knowledge we have from our liaison with and audits of local authorities, highlight that many are not able to deliver a food service as set out in statutory Food Law Code of Practice. We are also acutely aware that local authority resources, particularly in England, will face further significant reductions over the next few years.

- 5.3 As we develop an effective and sustainable model for making sure businesses are producing food that is safe and what it says it is, we will be working closely with local authorities. Many are already adopting new ways of working to meet the challenge of delivering consumer protection in a changing world, and we are keen to learn from these as we work to make full use of all available ways of securing assurance of business compliance.

#### Next steps

- 5.4 As explained in Board Paper 16/01/06 (Delivering the Food Standards Agency's Regulatory Strategy), we will work with all stakeholders to reshape the way food businesses are regulated to develop a sustainable and future proofed system that deals with the many and varied challenges posed by an increasingly complex food industry. Engaging with local authorities to get a deeper understanding of the trends suggested by the LAEMS data will be an important first step.
- 5.5 In the interim period, we will continue to work with local authorities to ensure that the current system is as effective as possible and that any transition will be as smooth as possible. In particular, we will continue to use the LAEMS data and other intelligence to target those local authorities who appear to be performing least well so that we may challenge, audit and provide appropriate support to help these authorities improve their performance, and to target those that appear to be performing well so that we may identify and disseminate good practice.

## **6 IMPACT**

- 6.1 The publication of the LAEMS data highlights the importance of the role played by local authorities in delivering food safety official controls and the changes in the levels of local authority activity and business compliance.
- 6.2 The data forms part of the information provided to the European Union and relevant Food and Veterinary Office audits of UK official control delivery arrangements. It also enables local authorities to benchmark their own service against others of a similar type and size and use the data to inform the annual assessment of resources needed by their food service teams. In addition, it provides important information on the performance of local services to consumers, businesses and other interested stakeholders.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

- 7.1 There has been liaison with individual local authorities where clarification was required on the data provided.
- 7.2 In line with the Government policy to reduce administrative burdens on local authorities from data collection, officials routinely share LAEMS data with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and the Local Government Data Unit Wales to ensure consistency in reporting.
- 7.3 Developing proposals for a new delivery model will be undertaken in liaison with interested parties and final proposals will be subject to consultation.

## **8 LEGAL/RESOURCE/RISK/SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no legal implications associated with the LAEMS data. All local authorities have met their reporting requirements and this will allow the FSA to fulfil its obligations to report relevant food law data and to audit the local delivery of official controls.
- 8.2 The monitoring and audit of local authorities assist the FSA to meet its responsibilities as the Central Competent Authority. Data on local authority enforcement, on compliance levels in food establishments, and targeted FSA audit programmes, may also help reduce the risk of non-delivery of key FSA enforcement and compliance outcomes.
- 8.3 The development of proposals for a new delivery model will take full account of all relevant legislation, including consideration of changes to the legal framework should that be necessary.

## **9 DEVOLUTION IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The data in the Annual Report is provided on a UK basis with country-specific information identified in most sections.
- 9.2 As mentioned above, proposals for a new delivery model will take into account differences in the different countries of the UK. We will involve colleagues from Food Standards Scotland in this work so that they can inform the proposals and consider whether to use what is relevant to them.

## **10 CONSUMER ENGAGEMENT**

- 10.1 The LAEMS annual report provides information on trends in enforcement activity and compliance levels across the UK. The annual publication of individual local authority data on the FSA website provides consumers with further detail on the level of food law enforcement activity carried out within their own area. To help consumers and other users understand the statistics, an explanatory note is included in the LAEMS report.

10.2 The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (and Food Hygiene Information Scheme in Scotland) provides information for consumers on the food hygiene compliance levels in local businesses.

## 11 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The Board is asked to:

- **Note:** the 2014/15 Official Statistics on local authority food law enforcement activity that were published on 11 November 2015;
- **Note:** the changing picture in local authority performance over the last five years (see Annex); and
- **Note:** the concerns this raises about the performance of some individual local authorities, the sustainability of the current enforcement delivery model and whether the model is fit for the future.

---

## ANNEX

### Significant issues raised by the LAEMS returns for food hygiene and for food standards for the period 2010/11 to 2014/15

#### Introduction

1. Points to note arising from consideration of the LEAMS returns for UK local authorities for the period 2010/11 to 2014/15 are highlighted below. The underlying key findings as well as summary and country specific data are provided in the sections that follow.
2. It should be noted that all trends reported below are based on primary analysis of LAEMS statistics based on full data, as reported to the FSA by local authorities, and signed off by local authority Heads of Service.

#### Points to note

3. At the UK level, the reported data indicate the following.
  - a) The majority of local authorities are continuing to target activity on a risk basis such that a significant majority of high risk establishments (Categories A to C for food hygiene and Category A for food standards) are receiving interventions at the required frequencies (see Tables 3 and 5).
  - b) The proportion of businesses that are 'broadly compliant' with food hygiene legislation (equivalent to food hygiene ratings of 3, 4 or 5) has continued to increase year on year, from 88.9% in 2010/11 to 93% in 2014/15 (see, Table 12).<sup>6</sup> The most marked increase has been in Wales from 81.9% in 2010/11 to 94.3% in 2014/15. Similarly, the proportion of businesses with levels of compliance equivalent to a food hygiene rating of 5 (the highest rating) has also increased, with an increase in Wales of 7% between 2013/14 to 2014/15 being particularly notable (compared to a 4% increase seen for the UK as a whole). The data for Wales is consistent with FHRS tracking data and provides further evidence of the beneficial impact of putting the FHRS on a statutory basis with mandatory display of food hygiene ratings.
4. More generally, the UK data highlight a number of issues of growing concern in terms of sustaining local authority services in line with the current Code of Practice requirements and in light of increasing resource pressures. These include the following.
  - a) The number of UK food businesses continues to increase year on year (by 6.7% from 587,890 in 2010/11 to 627,425 in 2014/15).
  - b) The number of food hygiene interventions has followed a downward trend from 431,852 in 2010/11 to 402,475 in 2014/15, a decrease of 6.8%.
  - c) The number of food standards interventions has also decreased overall during this period by 6.0% from an already low base of 125,410 in 2010/11 to 117,877 in 2014/15.

---

<sup>6</sup> The UK data includes Scotland and in considering this it should be noted that the FHRS does not apply there. The outcomes used for the Food Hygiene Information Scheme operating in Scotland are assessed on a basis that does not map directly to the Code of Practice compliance scores used for FHRS.

- d) Although possibly due in part to more targeted sampling, the number of UK official samples has followed a steep downward trend (apart from a small increase in 2013/14 which was likely the result of increased activity relating to the horsemeat incident) from 92,122 samples in 2010/11 to 68,471 samples in 2014/15. This equates to a reduction of 25.7%.
- e) The professional staffing resource of UK local authorities has continuously declined over the five years from 2,775 full time equivalents (FTEs) in 2010/11 to 2,303 in 2014/15, a reduction of 17% (see Table 11). The decline has been most significant with regard to food standards where there has been a reduction of 38.6% FTEs (compared to 7.9% for food hygiene). The position has been variable across the UK countries with the greatest impact in England and a more steady state being the case in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
- f) The number of consumer complaints being investigated in the UK has increased from 66,402 in 2010/11 to 72,558 in 2014/15, an increase of 9.2% (see Table 10). This may, in part, be due to consumers being more aware and informed about how and who to complain to but increases the local authority workload.
5. The data show that for food hygiene, local authorities are continuing to adopt a risk based approach, targeting resources on higher risk establishments and those with poor compliance rather than undertaking due interventions at lower risk establishments. The picture across the UK countries is different with the increased focus on interventions at higher risk establishments at the expense of lower risk ones being more pronounced in England. At individual local authority level, as in previous years, the reported data for 2014/15 shows widely varying levels of activity.
6. Table 4 provides an indication of the numbers of local authorities delivering different proportions of their planned food hygiene interventions. In England in 2014/15, 89% of local authorities (289 of 323) achieved 80% or more of their planned interventions of high risk establishments (Categories A to C). The proportion dropped to 69% (222 of 323) for those which achieved 80% or more of planned interventions across categories A to E. This highlights that there are a good number of local authorities that are not meeting the intervention frequencies set out in the Food Law Code of Practice that were established to help ensure public health protection. Whilst failure to carry out planned interventions of higher risk premises is of most concern, interventions of lower risk establishments are also important to confirm that their risk status has not changed.
7. The data for food standards interventions - Table 6 - shows lower levels of planned interventions achieved than is the case for hygiene interventions. In England, for example, only 32% of local authorities (47 of 145) achieved 80% or more of their planned interventions during 2014/15. The data in Table 6 indicates the trend is not new. It is largely the result of local authorities using more intelligence led approaches rather than planned interventions, particularly for lower rated establishments.

## Key findings for the UK

### Food establishments

#### See Table 1

- **Number of registered businesses** has increased over the five year period by 6.7% from 587,890 in 2010/11 to 627,425 in 2014/15. ▲
- **Proportion of registered businesses not yet rated for food hygiene risk<sup>7</sup>** increased from 5.8% to 6.2% between 2010/11 and 2011/12 but has decreased since then to 4.9% in 2014/15. ▼
- **Proportion of registered businesses not yet rated for food standards risk** remained steady between 2013/14 and 2014/15 at 12% and 13% respectively (data was not reported prior to this). ◀▶

### Interventions

#### See Tables 2 to 6

- **Food hygiene interventions** have decreased over the five year period by 6.8% from 431,852 in 2010/11 to 402,475 in 2014/15. ▼
- **Food standards interventions** in 2014/15 were down 6% on 2010/11 figures from 125,410 to 117,877 though there were fluctuations in the intervening period. ▼
- **Targeting of interventions** throughout the period has continued to be for higher risk establishments – Category A to C for food hygiene and Category A for food standards. -
- **Proportion of local authorities achieving over 80% of food hygiene planned interventions** was similar in 2010/11 and 2014/15 in each of the four UK countries. ◀▶
- **Proportion of local authorities achieving over 80% of food standards planned interventions** is notably lower than for food hygiene, particularly in England, and had decreased in each of the countries. ▼

### Enforcement actions

#### See Tables 7 and 8<sup>8</sup>

- **Total number of enforcement actions** decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 1.9% from 185,385 to 181,877.<sup>9</sup> ▼
- **Seizure, detention and surrender of food** decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 29.8% from 687 to 482. ▼

<sup>7</sup> Not yet rated (NYR) – establishments yet to be inspected by the local authority and assessed for an intervention rating.

<sup>8</sup> Over the five year period, no particular trends were noted.

<sup>9</sup> LAEMS records the number of establishments subjected to the individual types of enforcement action. The total number of individual enforcement actions taken by local authorities is likely to be higher.



- **Remedial action and detention notices** increased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 11.1% from 252 to 280. ▲
- **Simple cautions** decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 29.6% from 439 to 309. ▼
- **Written warnings** decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 1.8% from 177,746 to 174,529. ▼
- **Voluntary closure** increased by between 2013/14 and 2014/15 12.9% from 969 to 1,094. ▲
- **Suspension/revocation of approval or licence** increased by 85.7% from 14 to 26. ▲
- **Emergency prohibition orders** increased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 15.5% from 278 to 321. ▲
- **Improvement notices** (food hygiene) decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 3.3% from 4,513 to 4,366. ▼
- **Prohibition orders** increased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 36.3% from 80 to 109. ▲
- **Prosecutions** decreased between 2013/14 and 2014/15 by 11.3% from 407 to 361. ▼

## Official samples

### See Table 9

- **Total reported samples** have decreased overall over the five year period by 25.7% to 68,471 from 92,122 in 2010/11 (the exception was 2013/14 when there was an increase, which may have reflected increased activity in monitoring fraud following the horsemeat incident). ▼
- Samples tested for **microbiological contamination** decreased by 31.1% from 67,184 to 46,319. ▼
- Samples tested for **other contamination** have increased overall by 11% from 4,424 to 4,909 (though there was a decrease in 2012/13 compared with the previous year). ▲
- **Labelling and presentation** analyses have decreased by 51.9% from 13,942 to 6,700. ▼
- Samples tested for **composition** decreased overall during the five year period by 24.1% from 22,255 to 16,899 (though there was an increase in 2013/14 compared with the previous year). ▼

## Consumer complaints

### See Table 10

- **Complaints** about the safety and quality of food and the hygiene standards of food establishments have increased by 9.3% from 66,402 to 72,558. ▲

## Professional staff resources

### See Table 11

- **Full Time Equivalent (FTE) professional staff engaged in UK food law enforcement** has decreased by 17.0% from 2,775 to 2,303. ▼
- **FTE professional staff engaged in food hygiene** has decreased by 7.9% from 1,949 to 1,796. ▼
- **FTE professional staff engaged in food standards** has decreased by 38.6% from 826 to 507. ▼

## Hygiene compliance

### See Table 12

- **Proportion of rated establishments achieving 'broad compliance'** has increased from 88.9% to 93.0%.<sup>10</sup> ▲
- **Proportion of local authorities with 'broad compliance' levels of 90% or greater for rated establishments** has increased from 53.2% to 84.0%. ▲
- **Proportion of local authorities with broad compliance levels less than 80%** has decreased to 1.5% from 8.9%. ▼

<sup>10</sup> Local authorities assess compliance in accordance with statutory guidance set out in the [Food Law Codes of Practice for England, Wales and Northern Ireland](#) and for [Scotland](#). Scores are given for three compliance criteria: hygiene; structure; and confidence in management. Businesses that score not more than 10 under each of these three criteria are defined as 'broadly compliant'. This is equivalent to food hygiene ratings of 3 to 5 under the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme operating in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

**Data tables for the UK and by country**

**Table 1: Number of registered establishments and establishments not yet rated (NYR) for food hygiene risk**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Number of businesses	587,890	599,880	608,143	622,015	627,425
Number NYR	33,883	37,321	35,743	34,529	30,949
% NYR	5.8	6.2	5.9	5.6	4.9
<b>England</b>					
Number of businesses	481,137	490,308	497,090	508,630	512,704
Number NYR	26,265	29,397	28,128	27,007	24,795
% NYR	5.5	6.0	5.7	5.3	4.8
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>					
Number of businesses	19,118	19,614	19,785	20,507	20,481
Number NYR	1,490	1,415	1,191	1,088	838
% NYR	7.8	7.2	6.0	5.3	4.1
<b>Wales</b>					
Number of businesses	32,743	33,743	33,917	33,840	34,380
Number NYR	1,247	1,290	1,358	1,015	780
% NYR	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.0	2.3
<b>Scotland</b>					
Number of businesses	54,892	56,215	57,351	59,038	59,860
Number NYR	4,881	5,219	5,066	5,419	4,536
% NYR	8.9	9.3	8.8	9.2	7.6

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months

**Table 2: Number of interventions for food hygiene and for food standards**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Food hygiene	431,852	422,806	415,299	411,077	402,475
Food standards	125,410	132,544	110,289	113,414	117,877
<b>England</b>					
Food hygiene	331,915	327,677	324,394	319,072	314,292
Food standards	88,403	95,909	76,020	78,461	82,891
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>					
Food hygiene	21,150	19,989	18,204	19,681	13,354
Food standards	6,863	6,930	5,984	6,991	5,346
<b>Wales</b>					
Food hygiene	31,187	30,139	28,822	30,689	28,802
Food standards	11,110	10,495	8,940	10,548	11,220
<b>Scotland</b>					
Food hygiene	47,600	45,001	43,879	41,635	46,027
Food standards	19,034	19,210	19,345	17,414	18,420

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months

**Table 3: Percentage and range of food hygiene due interventions achieved by risk category**

		A	B	C	D	E	Not yet rated	Total
<b>UK</b>								
2014/15	Average	99.4	98.9	91.3	74.8	54.9	89.8	82.8
2010/11	Average	98.8	98.4	90.2	77.0	65.4	81.4	85.2
<b>England</b>								
2014/15	Average	99.3	98.8	90.5	74.3	52.8	88.6	80.9
	Range	50 - 100	0 - 100	6 - 100	7 - 100	0 - 100	0 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	98.4	98	88.5	75.5	62.2	80.0	83.8
	Range	0 - 100	53 - 100	21-100	5 - 100	0 - 100	0 - 100	-
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>								
2014/15	Average	100.0	96.7	94.3	91.8	80.4	90.1	91.6
	Range	100	28 - 100	36 -100	50 - 100	20 - 100	25 -100	-
2010/11	Average	99.6	99.2	97.5	92.3	93.6	90.4	95.4
	Range	83 - 100	90 - 100	29 - 100	10 - 100	8 - 100	14 - 100	-
<b>Wales</b>								
2014/15	Average	100.0	99.9	97.9	80.0	70.9	96.3	92.5
	Range	100	98 - 100	83 - 100	34 - 100	16 - 100	86 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	99.9	99.8	99.2	76.2	77.6	75.6	88.1
	Range	95 - 100	98 - 100	92 - 100	38 - 100	12 - 100	17 - 100	-
<b>Scotland</b>								
2014/15	Average	99.7	99.1	90.8	71.4	64.1	96.0	88.9
	Range	93 - 100	95 - 100	66 -100	24 -100	9 - 100	28 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	99.4	99.3	93.7	84.9	84.8	98.5	93.4
	Range	90 - 100	89 -100	69 - 100	15 - 100	40 - 100	42 - 100	-

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months (interventions due and achieved)

**Table 4: Achievement of planned food hygiene interventions for A to C risk rated establishments and A to E risk rated establishments**

	Total number of local authorities	Proportion of interventions achieved							
		80% or more		60 to 79%		40 to 59%		less than 40%	
		A-C	A -E	A-C	A -E	A-C	A -E	A-C	A-E
<b>England</b>									
2014/15	323*	289	222	25	59	6	27	1	13
2010/11	341**	300	251	31	66	8	17	1	6
<b>Northern Ireland***</b>									
2014/15	26	25	24	-	1	-	1	1	-
2010/11	26	25	25	1	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Wales</b>									
2014/15	22	22	18	-	4	-	-	-	-
2010/11	22	22	20	-	2	-	-	-	-
<b>Scotland</b>									
2014/15	32	31	25	1	7	-	-	-	-
2010/11	32	30	28	2	4	-	-	-	-

\* Two local authorities were unable to provide data; \*\* One local authority was unable to provide data

\*\*\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months (interventions due and achieved)

**Table 5: Percentage and range of food standards due interventions achieved by risk category**

		A	B	C	Not yet rated	Total
<b>UK</b>						
2014/15	Average	86.2	46.0	39.1	71.8	47.9
2010/11	Average	94.3	63.8	51.8	58.1	67.0
<b>England</b>						
2014/15	Average	82.9	38.6	32.3	70.2	41.4
	Range	0 - 100	2.4 - 100	1 - 100	0 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	93.9	57.8	42.9	53.6	62.0
	Range	0 - 100	0 - 100	0. - 100	0 - 100	-
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>						
2014/15	Average	96.3	86.7	82.5	79.3	83.1
	Range	71 - 100	49 - 100	31 - 100	0 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	94.8	91.7	95.0	65.7	86.8
	Range	0 - 100	26 - 100	58 - 100	0 - 100	-
<b>Wales</b>						
2014/15	Average	99.3	72.9	64.1	58.3	67.3
	Range	67 - 100	15 - 100	5 - 100	4 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	97.4	82.6	61.8	53.2	73.7
	Range	92 - 100	42 - 100	18 - 100	5 - 100	-
<b>Scotland</b>						
2014/15	Average	94.8	87.3	72.7	95.1	81.9
	Range	50 - 100	35 - 100	19 - 100	57 - 100	-
2010/11	Average	94.0	91.5	86.7	95.5	92.0
	Range	0 - 100	54 - 100	33 - 100	0 - 100	-

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months (interventions due and achieved)

**Table 6: Achievement of planned food standards interventions for A to C risk rated establishments**

	Total number of local authorities	Proportion of interventions achieved			
		80% or more	60 to 79%	40 to 59%	less than 40 %
<b>England</b>					
2014/15	145*	47	24	15	58
2010/11	146	56	29	27	34
<b>Northern Ireland**</b>					
2014/15	26	15	8	3	-
2010/11	26	22	3	1	-
<b>Wales</b>					
2014/15	22	10	5	3	4
2010/11	22	12	5	3	2
<b>Scotland</b>					
2014/15	32	23	3	4	2
2010/11	32	28	2	2	-

\* One local authority was unable to provide data

\*\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months (interventions due and achieved)

**Table 7: UK enforcement actions for food hygiene and food standards**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15*
Total enforcement actions	186,050	180,177	183,566	185,385	181,877
Seizure, detention & surrender of food	420	545	543	687	482
Remedial action & detention notices	77	85	213	252	280
Simple cautions**	598	590	419	439	309
Written warnings	176,096	170,681	175,230	177,746	174,529
Voluntary closure	915	941	1,024	969	1,094
Suspension/revocation of approval or licence	88	21	22	14	26
Emergency prohibition notice	246	285	318	278	321
Improvement notices	7,024	6,554	5,274	4,513	4,366
Prohibition order	91	62	125	80	109
Prosecutions concluded	495	413	398	407	361

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months for Northern Ireland

\*\* Simple cautions do not apply in Scotland

Table 8: Enforcement actions for food hygiene and food standards by country

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Food hygiene	171,618	167,422	169,306	169,914	167,338
Food standards	14,432	12,755	14,260	15,471	14,539
<b>England</b>					
Food hygiene	133,633	129,631	134,447	136,668	132,714
Food standards	9,696	8,192	9,147	10,839	9,433
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>					
Food hygiene	5,329	6,054	5,712	6,259	5,132
Food standards	988	1,245	1,102	1,276	1,201
<b>Wales</b>					
Food hygiene	14,353	13,961	13,358	13,418	13,367
Food standards	1,321	976	950	1,121	1,408
<b>Scotland</b>					
Food hygiene	18,303	17,776	15,789	13,569	16,125
Food standards	2,427	2,342	3,061	2,235	2,497

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months

Table 9: Official samples

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Microbiological contamination	67,184	55,546	53,108	51,425	46,319
Other Contamination	4,424	4,432	3,887	4,655	4,909
Composition	22,255	18,219	16,982	19,386	16,899
Labelling & presentation	13,942	11,879	9,958	9,938	6,700
Others	2,303	2,105	2,451	2,731	2,725
Unclassified	-	-	-	-	3,458
<b>Total Analyses</b>	<b>110,108</b>	<b>92,181</b>	<b>86,386</b>	<b>88,135</b>	<b>81,010</b>
<b>Total Samples</b>	<b>92,122</b>	<b>78,653</b>	<b>73,321</b>	<b>75,667</b>	<b>68,471</b>
<b>England</b>					
Microbiological contamination	46,878	37,463	35,939	32,747	28,926
Other Contamination	2,480	2,869	2,151	2,754	3,026
Composition	14,042	10,567	9,931	11,189	9,484
Labelling & presentation	9,578	8,291	6,129	6,425	4,331
Others	830	759	1,219	1,504	1,110
Unclassified	-	-	-	-	942
<b>Total Analyses</b>	<b>73,808</b>	<b>59,949</b>	<b>55,369</b>	<b>54,619</b>	<b>47,819</b>
<b>Total Samples</b>	<b>63,049</b>	<b>52,186</b>	<b>48,002</b>	<b>47,284</b>	<b>42,070</b>
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>					
Microbiological contamination	6,277	6,020	6,388	6,325	6,308
Other Contamination	48	56	63	58	284
Composition	2,084	1,892	1,819	1,871	1,307
Labelling & presentation	1,622	1,597	1,403	1,379	556
Others	-	2	1	8	84
Unclassified	-	-	-	-	386
<b>Total Analyses</b>	<b>10,031</b>	<b>9,567</b>	<b>9,674</b>	<b>9,641</b>	<b>8,925</b>
<b>Total Samples</b>	<b>9,074</b>	<b>8,006</b>	<b>8,364</b>	<b>8,334</b>	<b>7,881</b>
<b>Wales</b>					
Microbiological contamination	7,395	6,135	5,258	6,129	4,623
Other Contamination	418	470	546	550	465
Composition	1,950	1,401	1,761	2,051	1,497
Labelling & presentation	1,158	755	999	1,046	595
Others	52	38	21	51	40
Unclassified	-	-	-	-	200
<b>Total Analyses</b>	<b>10,973</b>	<b>8,799</b>	<b>8,585</b>	<b>9,827</b>	<b>7,420</b>
<b>Total Samples</b>	<b>9,260</b>	<b>8,096</b>	<b>7,294</b>	<b>8,736</b>	<b>6,676</b>
<b>Scotland</b>					
Microbiological contamination	6,634	5,928	5,523	6,224	6,462
Other Contamination	1,478	1,037	1,127	1,293	1,134
Composition	4,179	4,359	3,471	4,275	4,611
Labelling & presentation	1,584	1,236	1,427	1,088	1,218
Others	1,421	1,306	1,210	1,168	1,491
Unclassified	-	-	-	-	1,930
<b>Total Analyses</b>	<b>15,296</b>	<b>13,866</b>	<b>12,758</b>	<b>14,048</b>	<b>16,846</b>
<b>Total Samples</b>	<b>10,739</b>	<b>10,365</b>	<b>9,661</b>	<b>11,313</b>	<b>11,844</b>

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months



Table 10: Consumer complaints investigated

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>	66,402	67,650	68,639	70,522	72,558
<b>England</b>	57,900	57,176	58,169	59,729	62,169
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>	1,174	1,464	1,592	1,530	1,365
<b>Wales</b>	3,236	3,482	3,622	3,928	3,607
<b>Scotland</b>	4,092	5,528	5,256	5,335	5,417

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months

Table 11: Full time equivalent professional staff

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Food hygiene	1949.1	1869.5	1835.1	1827.4	1796.0
Food standards	825.9	839.5	695.9	569.8	506.9
Total	2,775.0	2,709.0	2,531.1	2,397.2	2,302.9
<b>England</b>					
Food hygiene	1489.3	1421.6	1374.8	1359.6	1,345.9
Food standards	554.1	576.4	444.7	347.2	300.7
Total	2,043.4	1,998.0	1,819.5	1,706.8	1,646.6
<b>Northern Ireland*</b>					
Food hygiene	81.0	79.1	77.5	72.1	69.6
Food standards	67.8	62.3	60.4	47.08	47.6
Total	148.8	141.4	137.9	119.0	117.2
<b>Wales</b>					
Food hygiene	154.8	159.3	160.1	166.7	152.2
Food standards	58.4	61.9	54.8	48.6	43.8
Total	213.2	221.2	214.9	215.3	196.0
<b>Scotland</b>					
Food hygiene	224.0	209.5	222.7	229.0	228.3
Food standards	145.6	139.0	136.1	127.0	114.8
Total	369.6	348.5	358.8	356.0	343.1

\* 2014/15 data reported for nine months

**Table 12: Proportion of ‘broadly compliant’ establishments and proportion of local authorities with ‘broad compliance levels of 90% or greater and with less than 80%**

	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
<b>UK</b>					
Businesses ‘broadly compliant’ or better	88.9	90.2	91.2	91.7	93.0
LAs with broad compliance levels of 90% or greater	53.2	64.0	71.9	77.5	84.0
LAs with broad compliance levels less than 80%	8.9	4.2	3.0	1.8	1.5
<b>England</b>					
Businesses ‘broadly compliant’ or better	89.8	90.8	91.7	92.1	93.3
LAs with broad compliance levels of 90% or greater	56.7	68.9	75.8	79.4	80.1
LAs with broad compliance levels less than 80%	6.2	3.1	2.5	1.3	0.9
<b>Northern Ireland *</b>					
Businesses ‘broadly compliant’ or better	90.9	92.2	94.4	94.7	96.0
LAs with broad compliance levels of 90% or greater	69.2	73.1	84.0	92.3	96.2
LAs with broad compliance levels less than 80%	7.7	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Wales</b>					
Businesses ‘broadly compliant’ or better	81.9	86.2	88.0	91.8	94.3
LAs with broad compliance levels of 90% or greater	22.7	31.8	31.8	72.7	100.0
LAs with broad compliance levels less than 80%	36.4	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Scotland</b>					
Businesses ‘broadly compliant’ or better	84.7	86.2	87.3	87.5	88.1
LAs with broad compliance levels of 90% or greater	25.8	38.7	48.4	50.0	46.9
LAs with broad compliance levels less than 80%	19.4	12.5	9.1	9.4	9.4

\* 2014/15 data based on the level of ‘broad compliance’ reported at 31 December 2014