

Report on the Audit of Food Law Service Delivery and Food Business Compliance

Luton Borough Council
26-27 April 2016



Foreword

Audits of local authorities' feed and food law enforcement services are part of the Food Standards Agency's arrangements to improve consumer protection and confidence in relation to food and feed. These arrangements recognise that the enforcement of UK food and feed law relating to food safety, hygiene, composition, labelling, imported food and feeding stuffs is largely the responsibility of local authorities. These local authority regulatory functions are principally delivered through their Environmental Health and Trading Standards Services.

The attached audit report examines the Local Authority's Food Law Enforcement Service. The assessment includes the local arrangements in place for database management, inspections of food businesses and internal monitoring. It should be acknowledged that there will be considerable diversity in the way and manner in which local authorities may provide their food enforcement services reflecting local needs and priorities.

Agency audits assess local authorities' conformance against the Food Law Enforcement Standard ("The Standard"), which was published by the Agency as part of the Framework Agreement on Official Feed and Food Controls by Local Authorities and is available on the Agency's website at:
www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring.

The main aim of the audit scheme is to maintain and improve consumer protection and confidence by ensuring that local authorities are providing an effective food law enforcement service. The scheme also provides the opportunity to identify and disseminate good practice and provide information to inform Agency policy on food safety, standards and feeding stuffs. Parallel local authority audit schemes are implemented by the Agency's offices in all devolved countries comprising the UK.

The report contains some statistical data, for example on the number of food premises inspections carried out annually. The Agency's website contains enforcement activity data for all UK local authorities and can be found at:
www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring.

For assistance, a glossary of technical terms used within the audit report can be found at Annex C.

Contents

1.0 Introduction	4
Reason for the Audit	4
Scope of the Audit	5
Background	5
2.0 Executive Summary	6
3.0 Audit Findings	8
3.1 Organisation and Management	8
Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning	8
Reviewing and Updating of Documented Policies and Procedures	9
Officer Authorisations and Training	9
3.2 Food Premises Database	10
3.3 Food Premises Interventions	11
Verification visit to a Food Premises	12
3.4 Enforcement	13
3.5 Internal Monitoring, Third Party or Peer Review	13
Internal Monitoring	13
Food and Food Premises Complaints	14
Records	14
Third Party or Peer Review	15
ANNEX A - Action Plan for Luton Borough Council	16
ANNEX B - Audit Approach/Methodology	17
ANNEX C - Glossary	18

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report records the results of an audit at Luton Borough Council with regard to food hygiene enforcement, under relevant headings of the Food Standards Agency Food Law Enforcement Standard. The audit focused on the Authority's arrangements for the management of the food premises database, food premises interventions, and internal monitoring. The report has been made publicly available on the Agency's website at www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/auditandmonitoring/auditreports.

Hard copies are available from the FSA's Regulatory Delivery Division, please email LAAudit@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk or phone 01904 232116.

Reason for the Audit

- 1.2 The power to set standards, monitor and audit local authority food law enforcement services was conferred on the Food Standards Agency by the Food Standards Act 1999 and the Official Feed and Food Controls (England) Regulations 2009. This audit of Luton Borough Council was undertaken under section 12(4) of the Act as part of the Food Standards Agency's annual audit programme.
- 1.3 Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, includes a requirement for competent authorities to carry out internal audits or to have external audits carried out. The purpose of these audits is to verify whether official controls relating to feed and food law are effectively implemented. To fulfil this requirement, the Food Standards Agency, as the central competent authority for feed and food law in the UK has established external audit arrangements. In developing these, the Agency has taken account of the European Commission guidance on how such audits should be conducted.¹
- 1.4 The Authority was included in the Food Standards Agency's programme of audits of local authority food law enforcement services, because it had not been audited in the past five years by the Agency.

¹ Commission Decision of 29 September 2006 setting out the guidelines laying down criteria for the conduct of audits under Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls to verify compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (2006/677/EC)

Scope of the Audit

- 1.5 The audit examined Luton Borough Council's arrangements for food premises database management, food premises interventions and internal monitoring, with regard to food hygiene law enforcement. This included a reality check at a food business to assess the effectiveness of official controls implemented by the Authority at the food business premises and, more specifically, the checks carried out by the Authority's officers to verify food business operator (FBO) compliance with legislative requirements. The scope of the audit also included an assessment of the Authority's overall organisation and management, and the internal monitoring of other related food hygiene law enforcement activities.
- 1.6 Assurance was sought that key authority food hygiene law enforcement systems and arrangements were effective in supporting business compliance, and that local enforcement was managed and delivered effectively. The on-site element of the audit took place at the Authority's office at Town Hall, George Street, Luton, LU1 2BU on 26th-27th April 2016.

Background

- 1.7 Luton Borough Council is a unitary authority, with a population of approximately 211,000 covering an area of 16.74 square miles. Luton is a diverse multi-cultural population with major road and rail links into London and the Midlands. Luton Airport is also situated in the Borough, with over 14 million passengers passing through the Airport each year.
- 1.8 The area is predominantly urban in nature with approximately 1656 registered food businesses, 14 feed businesses and two establishments approved under Regulation (EC) 853/2004. The food business profile is largely made up of small retail and catering food businesses with 6.1% of the local population employed in the hospitality and food service sector. The main concentration of food premises is located in the town centre along with the University of Bedfordshire with a large population of students. Outside the town centre is the Bury Park area, with a high number of food premises mainly of ethnic origin.
- 1.9 The Service acts as originating authority for a number of local food businesses and is actively exploring opportunities to develop Primary Authority (PA) arrangements with national food businesses in the area. The Authority currently has one newly established PA agreement in place and one agreement awaiting sign-off by senior managers in the company.
- 1.10 Food safety enforcement was delivered by the Food, Safety and Environment Team which formed part of the wider Environmental Health Department. Officers that delivered official food controls were also responsible for:

- Food Standards enforcement in food businesses
- Health and safety interventions, advice and guidance
- Accident investigations
- Infections disease investigation and surveillance
- Petroleum Licensing and skin piercing inspection and registration
- Private water supplies
- Fly tipping on commercial land
- Enforcement of smoke free and air quality legislation

1.11 The profile of Luton Borough Council’s food businesses as at 1st April 2015 was as follows:

Risk category	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Number of businesses	14	84	379	362	676	1515

2.0 Executive Summary

2.1 The Authority was found to be delivering a range of food law enforcement activities effectively in accordance with the statutory obligations placed on the Authority as a competent food authority. File checks and database checks demonstrated that the Authority had implemented a risk based approach to its intervention programme. However, a small number of improvements were identified in order to further protect consumers and to comply with the statutory requirements of the Framework Agreement and the Food Law Code of Practice (FLCoP). A summary of the main findings and key improvements necessary is set out below.

2.2 Strengths:

The Service was dedicated to working with local food businesses and was able to demonstrate its commitment to delivering an effective and innovative service. The Lead Officer had recently carried out a thorough review of the Service identifying a number of key areas of improvement and development ideas for the future. Officers employed by the Authority now and in the past were highly experienced, dealing effectively with the diverse range of food businesses in the area. Records for enforcement action showed a willingness to carry out a wide range of enforcement sanctions when appropriate.

2.3 **Key area for improvement:**

Intervention Strategy: The Authority should continue to tackle its backlog of overdue category E interventions on a risk basis using appropriate interventions detailed in the FLCoP, in order to maintain adequate consumer protection.

3.0 Audit Findings

3.1 Organisation and Management

Strategic Framework, Policy and Service Planning

- 3.1.1 The Service had produced a Food Safety Service Plan for 2015/16 which was generally in line with the Service Planning Guidance in the Framework Agreement and provided useful information about the Service including analyses of trends in service demands and resources available to deliver the Service effectively. The Plan demonstrated how the Food Safety Service contributed to the Council's broader corporate objective of protecting public health and keeping residents "safe, supported and healthy".
- 3.1.2 The Service was subject to two internal key performance indicators (KPI's);
- % of high risk inspections (A-C) that are due which are completed within 28 days of the inspection date (100% to be achieved).
 - % of 0, 1 and 2 rated premises that have improved to a rating of 3 at their next FHRs scoring visit/ inspection.
- 3.1.3 The Plan included a profile of the types of food businesses in the area, and details of the Authority's risk based intervention strategy for food hygiene and food standards enforcement. In past years this had largely focused resources on higher risk category A-C rated premises resulting in a backlog of overdue lower risk interventions as noted through LAEMS data. In previous years, Members had been made aware of this intervention strategy and the resulting shortfall in intervention activity when compared to statutory requirements. The Authority had also implemented an extensive alternative enforcement strategy (AES) in accordance with the FLCoP at the lowest risk category E businesses, to establish and confirm the nature of activities in these types of businesses. The Authority was in the process of assessing the returned questionnaires and re-prioritising businesses as required.
- 3.1.4 As a result of this change in strategy and the latest intervention activity there were around 390 overdue interventions at the time of the audit, with the vast majority of these being low risk category E interventions including a large number of childminders and home cake makers and caterers. The increased interventions that have taken place should result in significant improvements in the data submitted to the FSA via the Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System (LAEMS) for 2015/16 in relation the overall percentage of interventions achieved.

- 3.1.5 The Council had developed strong links with economic development in the area, including the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP) and its “Velocity Growth Hub”, a one stop business advice service for all businesses including food businesses. The Service is also committed to the Better Regulation Agenda and Better Business for all Agenda, and is represented on the Steering Group of the latter.
- 3.1.6 The Authority was also responsible for any official controls relating to any imported food checks for Luton Airport. The airport is a passenger airport not commonly associated with any major food imports. Auditors did however discuss the arrangements in place for imported food controls should they be required. The Authority had developed a documented procedure for imported food controls to provide guidance for officers. Auditors discussed the benefit of reviewing these arrangements and possible future liaison with the airport to provide further assurance that current arrangements are suitable and sufficient. Auditors also discussed the benefits of exploring participation or involvement with any relevant imported food/feed liaison groups or specialist food fora dealing with imported foods and associated intelligence.
- 3.1.7 Whilst the Plan clearly sets out the demands on the Service and the current level of staffing resource available (5.8 full time equivalent officers), future plans would benefit from the inclusion of a comparison of the resources needed by the Service to fully deliver the Service compared to those available.
- 3.1.8 The Plan contained an extensive list of planned improvements to the Service for the year ahead which if accomplished should improve service delivery in line with the FLCoP. Auditors also discussed the Services’ plans to re-assess the scope of its FHRS to ensure that all relevant local food businesses are included in the scheme in the near future.

Reviewing and Updating of Documented Policies and Procedures

- 3.1.9 The Authority had developed a range of useful documented procedures and work instructions for its food law enforcement service. These had been recently reviewed and re-issued by the Lead Food Officer.
- 3.1.10 Evidence of a document version control process was noted during the audit. Documented policies and procedures were stored on a shared drive that could be accessed by all staff.

Officer Authorisations and Training

- 3.1.11 The Authority had developed and implemented a documented procedure for the authorisation of officers and had produced an authorisation matrix, referencing the latest updated competency requirements in the FLCoP

that came into force in April 2016. The Authority had assessed officer competencies in line with the new competency requirements

- 3.1.12 The Authority provided evidence of an appropriate scheme of delegation and copies of officer authorisation documents. Authorisations were generic for some principle pieces of legislation, contrary to the FLCoP, although this had been accepted by the Authority's legal team. Authorisation documents contained suitable references to all other relevant pieces of food hygiene legislation.
- 3.1.13 Record checks showed that all officers had received the required 10 hours CPD in the past, with plans in place to ensure that the new FLCoP requirement for 20 hours CPD for officers is met over the next 12 months. Officers had undertaken a wide range of useful training on key topics such as HACCP, complex processes, approved establishments, imported foods and national FHRS consistency training.
- 3.1.14 Auditors were advised that officer competence and CPD requirements were assessed and monitored through the appraisal system, regular one to one discussions and occasional work shadowing or peer reviews by the team.

3.2 Food Premises Database

- 3.2.1 The Authority was operating a database capable of providing monitoring returns to the agency. The system is backed up daily and a number of measures and procedures are in place to ensure that the system is secure.
- 3.2.2 The Authority database was managed by the Lead Food Officer aided by the Council's IT support. The Authority had developed a detailed procedure for ensuring the accuracy of its database, dated 2015/16 and routinely carried out a range of database accuracy checks. Pre- audit assessments by auditors of the database provided, confirmed that it was generally accurate, correctly configured and contained no anomalies. The Lead Officer was able to demonstrate their ability to access the system and produce relevant management reports, essential to managing the intervention programme and the delivery of official controls.
- 3.2.3 Auditors were advised that accurate recording of current food businesses on the database was maintained and updated regularly through information received during the licensing and planning process and through searches of local and internet advertising media as well as social media.

3.2.4 Auditors carried out a basic internet search in advance of the audit. Out of six checked, all six businesses were identified on the Authority's food premises database.

3.3 Food Premises Interventions

3.3.1 The Service had developed a detailed inspection procedure to guide and inform officers of the actions required when undertaking inspections in the area.

3.3.2 File checks demonstrated that some past inspections had not been carried out at the correct frequency prescribed by the FLCoP. The Authority was aware of this issue and was implementing actions to address this issue.

3.3.3 Officers used a range of suitable and appropriate inspection pro-formas and aides-memoire to record their inspection findings and assessments. These aides-memoire included appropriate prompts for officers on key food hygiene issues such as the assessment of business food safety management systems (FSMS), imported foods and control of cross contamination risks including the implementation of the FSA's E coli guidance by businesses.

3.3.4 Generally officers had recorded sufficient information on file to justify the risk scores allocated to businesses following inspection. Officers were providing businesses with detailed inspection findings and relevant guidance to support businesses, as well as taking appropriate and timely follow up actions including carrying out revisits where needed.

3.3.5 Auditors identified an area of good practice being used by the Service, also identified in the recent FHRS IAA report. This involved the use of its information management system to provide a business update record for officers to use on inspections. This included details of the last FBO and basic information on the business to be inspected, reminding officers to routinely check key business details during the inspection which could then be used to update database records if necessary.

3.3.6 The Authority had developed a suitable documented procedure to provide officers with instructions and guidance when carrying out inspections at establishments specifically requiring approval under Regulation (EC) 853/ 2004.

3.3.7 Files relating to three approved establishments subject to specific EU legislation were reviewed. These included two meat products establishments and a cold-store in the area, storing large volumes of meat and other food products. In all of the cases examined inspections had taken place at the correct frequency and businesses had been approved

or re-approved in accordance with the FLCoP and centrally issued guidance.

- 3.3.8 Inspection findings were recorded appropriately using specific approved premises inspection aide-memoire which provided suitable prompts for officers during inspections. Past inspections at the cold-store had been recorded using a more general inspection aide-memoire, with additional officer file notes and notebook records being used to demonstrate that business were being fully assessed against relevant food hygiene legislation. Auditors were informed that a more specific aide-memoire for cold stores had been introduced for future inspections.
- 3.3.9 Auditors noted several examples of comprehensive traceability investigations involving the storage and sale of unlabelled and un-traceable meat and fish products. Effective traceability investigations such as these are vital in maintaining consumer confidence in the food supply chain.
- 3.3.10 Approved premises inspection files were well organised and contained all the key business information required by the FLCoP. Auditors discussed the benefit of ensuring that key company documents such as HACCP plans are dated when they are assessed by officers to help keep track of different versions as they are received.

Recommendation 1 - Interventions

[The Standard – 7.2]

Carry out inspections at the frequencies prescribed in the Food Law Code of Practice. Where low risk premises are not subject to surveillance (an alternative enforcement strategy), there is a risk that a change in activities to high risk processes will not be detected.

[See paragraph 3.3.2]

Verification visit to a food establishment

- 3.3.11 During the audit, a verification visit was undertaken to a local hotel with an officer from the Authority who had carried out the last food hygiene inspection of the premises. The main objective of the visit was to assess the effectiveness of the Authority's assessment of food business compliance with food law requirements.

3.3.12 The officer had a good working relationship with the FBO and was able to demonstrate a detailed knowledge of food safety legislation and FSMS at the establishment. Auditors were satisfied that the conditions found on site reflected the inspection findings documented in the last inspection record. It was also clear that the business had acted on previous advice provided by the officer.

3.4 Enforcement

3.4.1 The Service had developed a suitable and appropriate enforcement policy approved by Members. The Authority had carried out a wide range of formal enforcement actions to ensure timely business compliance and officers were able to demonstrate their knowledge and willingness to use the full range of follow up actions from informal advice to formal notices including the use of Remedial Action Notices (RANs) at approved premises if required.

3.4.2 Auditors examined a number of Hygiene Improvement Notices (HINS), voluntary closures, prosecution files, simple cautions and seizure and detention notices. The enforcement options selected were appropriate and justified given the inspection findings. In all cases enforcement notices had been drafted and served in accordance with the FLCoP and the Enforcement Policy appeared to have been considered.

3.4.3 It was noted that in one of the seizure and voluntary surrender cases reviewed there were insufficient records on file referencing the eventual destruction of the seized food items. Auditors advised that the Authority should review its procedures in relation to seizure and voluntary surrender to ensure that suitable documented methods of disposal are employed on each occasion to help ensure that seized food does not re-enter the food chain.

3.5 Internal Monitoring, Third Party or Peer Review

Internal Monitoring

3.5.1 The Authority had developed a documented internal monitoring procedure issued in 2015/16 which provided details of quantitative and qualitative checks to be carried out by the Lead Officer. Targeted internal monitoring is essential to help ensure consistency amongst officers and the appropriate escalation of enforcement, where necessary.

3.5.2 The Authority provided evidence of a comprehensive range of quantitative monitoring being carried out by the Authority including regular quarterly management reports on the Food Safety Team's key performance indicators and management of the teams intervention programme.

- 3.5.3 Substantial monitoring and assessment activities were also carried out on the Authority's database prior to the annual submissions to the FSA via LAEMS. Other qualitative monitoring activities have included shadowed inspections, checklists for enforcement actions and reviewing inspection paperwork for selected past inspections. Auditors discussed the benefit of extending these monitoring checks to include other aspects of the Service including sampling and complaint investigations.

Food and Food Premises Complaints

- 3.5.4 The Authority had developed a suitable documented food complaints policy and procedure. This provided useful details of the Authority's risk based triage approach to dealing with complaints.
- 3.5.5 Audit checks of five food and food premises complaint investigations found that generally appropriate and timely investigations and action had been carried out. Records of complaint investigations showed that officers had carried out appropriate investigations and taken appropriate follow up action as necessary in line with the Authority's complaints procedure and Enforcement Policy. Auditors did note however that the first response to some complaints had not met the Authority's own response time targets.

Food Inspection and Sampling

- 3.5.6 The Authority had developed a documented sampling policy outlining its commitment to carrying out a range of effective risk based sampling. An annual sampling programme had been developed with the Authority regularly participating in regional sampling programmes on a range of different topics.
- 3.5.7 File records relating to five food samples were assessed. In each case the samples were taken in accordance with the Service's sampling policy and procedures and appropriate action had been taken on receipt of results, including providing written confirmation and appropriate advice to the businesses involved.

Records

- 3.5.8 Records were maintained mainly in electronic format. Records were easily retrievable during the audit.

Third Party or Peer Review

- 3.5.9 Demonstrating its commitment to delivering an effective and consistent service, the Authority had participated in an inter authority audit (IAA) on its implementation of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS) in 2015. This had resulted in a documented audit report containing several recommendations, some of which were also relevant to this audit. Auditors discussed the Service's proposed actions to address the recommendations made in the report.
- 3.5.10 The LA was regularly represented at the regional Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire Food Liaison Group and contributed to the consistent development of policy at regional level.

Auditors: Andrew Gangakhedkar – Lead Auditor
Alun Barnes - Auditor

Food Standards Agency
Regulatory Delivery Division

ANNEX A - Action Plan for Luton Borough Council

Audit date: 26-28 April 2016

TO ADDRESS (RECOMMENDATION INCLUDING STANDARD PARAGRAPH)	BY (DATE)	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	ACTION TAKEN TO DATE
<p>Recommendation 1 - Interventions [The Standard – 7.2]</p> <p>Carry out inspections at the frequencies prescribed in the Food Law Code of Practice. Where low risk premises are not subject to surveillance (an alternative enforcement strategy), there is a risk that a change in activities to high risk processes will not be detected. [See paragraph 3.3.2]</p>	<p>Ongoing and by 31/3/2017</p>	<p>Monitor Officer Inspection Programme Plan on monthly basis at team meetings to assess compliance with 28 day procedure</p> <p>Report KPI on Quarterly basis</p> <p>Review all non responding Category E's that were subject to LRQ and identify any for inspection in terms of type of food and consumer</p>	<p>Ongoing monitoring and reminder of 28 day KPI. All inspections are loaded onto officer inspection list for officers to assign. 28 day due date also included on the list as a prompt/reminder.</p> <p>All non responding Cat E's identified. Focus meeting held to identify those that are typically 'outside' the programme, those that would benefit an inspection and those where an initial telephone call to be made to see if still trading. Those that are still trading and will not be visited to be tracked to ensure a LRQ is completed and returned to enable risk rating or visit if information shows for example, a change in operation meaning that may not be a Category E</p>

ANNEX B - Audit Approach/Methodology

The audit was conducted using a variety of approaches and methodologies as follows:

(1) Examination of LA policies and procedures.

The following relevant LA policies, procedures and linked documents were examined before and during the audit:

(2) File reviews – the following LA file records were reviewed during the audit:

(3) Review of Database records:

- To review and assess the completeness of database records of food hygiene inspections, food and food premises complaint investigations, samples taken by the authority, formal enforcement and other activities and to verify consistency with file records
- To assess the completeness and accuracy of the food premises database

(4) Officer interviews – LA EHO and the Lead Officer

Opinions and views raised during officer interviews remain confidential and are not referred to directly within the report.

(5) On-site verification check:

A verification visit was made with the Authority's officers to a local food business. The purpose of the visit was to verify the outcome of the last inspection carried out by the Local Authority and to assess the extent to which enforcement activities and decisions met the requirements of relevant legislation, the Food Law Code of Practice and official guidance.

ANNEX C - Glossary

Authorised officer	A suitably qualified officer who is authorised by the local authority to act on its behalf in, for example, the enforcement of legislation.
Broadly Compliant	An outcome measure which the Food Standard Agency has developed with local authorities to monitor the effectiveness of the regulatory service relating to food law. It is based on the risk rating scheme in the Food Law Code of Practice which is currently used by food law enforcement officers to assess premises which pose the greatest risk to consumers failing to comply with food law.
Codes of Practice	Government Codes of Practice issued under Section 40 of the Food Safety Act 1990 as guidance to local authorities on the enforcement of food legislation.
County Council	A local authority whose geographical area corresponds to the county and whose responsibilities include food standards and feeding stuffs enforcement.
District Council	A local authority of a smaller geographical area and situated within a County Council whose responsibilities include food hygiene enforcement.
E. coli O157	E.coli O157 belongs to the group of verotoxigenic E. coli (VTEC) bacteria which are a toxin-producing strain of Escherichia coli that occur naturally in the gastrointestinal tract of animals such as cattle and sheep, and are pathogenic to humans. E.coli O157 is the VTEC strain that has been most commonly implicated in human infection in the UK.
External Temporary Storage Facility (ETSF)	A warehouse (formerly known as an enhanced remote transit shed or ERTS) designated by HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), where goods are temporarily stored pending clearance by HMRC, and prior to release into free circulation.
Environmental Health Officer (EHO)	Officer employed by the local authority to enforce food safety legislation.

Feeding stuffs	Term used in legislation on feed mixes for farm animals and pet food.
Food hygiene	The legal requirements covering the safety and wholesomeness of food.
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS)	The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme provides information to the public about hygiene standards in catering and retail food establishments. It is run by local authorities in partnership with the Food Standards Agency. Businesses that fall within the scope of the scheme are given a 'hygiene rating' which shows how closely the business was meeting the requirements of food hygiene law at the time of inspection. The scheme also encourages businesses to improve hygiene standards.
Food Safety Management System	A written permanent procedure, or procedures, based on HACCP principles. It is structured so that this requirement can be applied flexibly and proportionately according to the size and nature of the food business.
Food standards	The legal requirements covering the quality, composition, labelling, presentation and advertising of food, and materials in contact with food.
Framework Agreement	<p>The Framework Agreement consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food and Feed Law Enforcement Standard • Service Planning Guidance • Monitoring Scheme • Audit Scheme <p>The Standard and the Service Planning Guidance set out the Agency's expectations on the planning and delivery of food and feed law enforcement.</p> <p>The Monitoring Scheme requires local authorities to submit yearly returns via LAEMS to the Agency on their food enforcement activities i.e. numbers of inspections, samples and prosecutions.</p> <p>Under the Audit Scheme the Food Standards Agency will be conducting audits of the food and</p>

	feed law enforcement services of local authorities against the criteria set out in the Standard.
Full Time Equivalents (FTE)	A figure which represents that part of an individual officer's time available to a particular role or set of duties. It reflects the fact that individuals may work part-time, or may have other responsibilities within the organisation not related to food and feed enforcement.
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point – a food safety management system used within food businesses to identify points in the production process where it is critical for food safety that the control measure is carried out correctly, thereby eliminating or reducing the hazard to a safe level.
LAEMS	Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System is an electronic system used by local authorities to report their food law enforcement activities to the Food Standards Agency.
Member forum	A local authority forum at which Council Members discuss and make decisions on food law enforcement services.
Metropolitan Authority	A local authority normally associated with a large urban conurbation in which the County and District Council functions are combined.
Risk rating	A system that rates food premises according to risk and determines how frequently those premises should be inspected. For example, high risk premises should be inspected at least every 6 months.
Safer food, better business (SFBB)	A food safety management system, developed by the Food Standards Agency to help small catering and retail businesses put in place food safety management procedures and comply with food hygiene regulations.
Service Plan	A document produced by a local authority setting out their plans on providing and delivering a food service to the local community.
Trading Standards	The Department within a local authority which

carries out, amongst other responsibilities, the enforcement of food standards and feeding stuffs legislation.

Trading Standards
Officer (TSO)

Officer employed by the local authority who, amongst other responsibilities, may enforce food standards and feeding stuffs legislation.

Unitary Authority

A local authority in which the County and District Council functions are combined, examples being Metropolitan District/Borough Councils, and London Boroughs. A Unitary Authority's responsibilities will include food hygiene, food standards and feeding stuffs enforcement.