FSS Performance Reporting

1   Purpose of the paper

1.1   This paper updates the quarterly update for the Board on FSS performance in delivering key activities and provides some additional context in support of the metrics detailed in the attached Annex A.

1.2   The Board is asked to:

- **Consider and comment** on reported performance metrics
- **Note** that FSS performance reporting continues to develop. The Board is also asked to note that whilst we are developing our regulatory strategy and programme and project management methodologies, the performance reporting will require further development and refinement.
- **Note** the inclusion of information on FSS audit of Local Authorities

2   Strategic Aims

2.1   This work supports FSS Strategic Outcome 6 – FSS is efficient and effective.

3   Background

3.1   This paper builds on the Board discussion on performance monitoring and proposed metrics in March and October 2016. The FSS Board Terms of Reference (ToR) confirm that the Board has overall responsibility for the actions and decisions of FSS, and is ultimately accountable to the Scottish Parliament for policy delivery, compliance with statutory duties and performance against agreed strategic objectives.

4   Discussion

4.1   Following consideration at the October 2016 Board meeting, agreement was reached on the reporting format and content and that work would continue to develop FSS reporting capability. As stated previously, and from the Annex, there are a range of reporting cycles, principally a result of access to and format of certain data sets (i.e. some information was reported on an annual GB and UK basis and extracting Scotland only information was not always possible) prior to FSS vesting whilst others have always been held in Scotland (e.g. shellfish).

5   Annex Metrics

5.1   Animal Welfare

5.1.1 A key function of FSS is to ensure that animals are protected by Food Business Operators (FBOs) prior to and during slaughter and killing. FBOs have a duty under the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (WATOK) Regulations 2012 and welfare controls in approved meat establishments are delivered by FSS veterinary and inspection personnel on behalf of Scottish Government and via a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Defra. FSS also plays an important role in relation to assisting the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) and Local

Authorities through providing information relating to potential animal welfare breaches attributable to conditions or treatment on farm and during transport.

5.1.2 The Board will be aware of recent media attention regarding welfare breach information released by FSS following a Freedom of Information request. All animal welfare breaches that occur within approved slaughterhouses in Scotland are investigated and proportionate action is taken by qualified official veterinary personnel working on behalf of FSS, who are on site during slaughter. The action will range from verbal advice, enforcement letters, welfare enforcement notices to investigations with a view to providing reports to the Procurator Fiscal, and if required the suspension or revocation of slaughterer's Certificate of Competence.

5.1.3 From the annexe and during the comparative two year period from April 2015 and March 2017, FSS improved the reporting procedures and veterinary personnel in slaughterhouses reported 342 incidents in the first year and 481 incidents in the second year. From these incidents, 71 were attributed to abattoirs in the first year and 143 in the second year. The increase in reports was following intensive work on creating guidance and supporting frontline staff on accurate and more consistent reporting and also raising the profile on animal welfare. FSS introduced additional measures on animal welfare checks and better instructions on monitoring and reporting. During the first reporting year, approximately 460,000 cattle, 1,309,000 sheep, 287,000 pigs and 39,760,000 poultry were slaughtered; and during the second reporting year 475,000 cattle, 1,190,000 sheep, 319,000 pigs and 44,790,000 poultry were slaughtered.

5.1.4 FSS operates a clear zero tolerance policy towards animal cruelty. Any breaches noted are investigated as a priority, and action is taken dependent on the type of breach. We currently have four cases under investigation and one of those is already at the prosecution stage. We also have an option to suspend a slaughterer's Certificate of Competence, and have done so in 10 cases.

5.1.5 FSS continues to improve the monitoring and reporting system for animal welfare breaches. Recent initiatives in the summer of 2016 raised the profile of animal welfare resulting in an increased level of reporting. FSS engaged in discussions with FBOs and collaboration with the enforcement authorities competent for farm and/or transport (APHA and LAs) to improve monitoring and action on animal welfare non-compliances.

5.2 Shellfish Sample Compliance

5.2.1 FSS carries out an annual review of all shellfish production area classifications within Scotland. Using the previous three year data-set, or less if not available, from the production areas to inform classification award decisions for the coming classification year. This process is carried out in accordance with EU guidance.

5.2.2 Changes in the number of classification awards will vary due to the following reasons:
- Changes in levels of *E.coli* reported throughout the year,
- Decisions, taken by harvesters, not to continue with the classification

- Insufficient samples submitted to either maintain the same level of classification award i.e. 10 samples required for Class A or a minimum of 8 samples to retain a classification award
- New classification awards

5.2.3 Shellfish sampling is contracted to Hall Mark Meat Hygiene Scotland and Highland and Argyll and Bute Councils who are responsible for shellfish sampling within their LA areas with FSS Operations staff undertaking sampling at the three remaining shellfish local authority areas which are as follows: North and South Ayrshire and Dumfries & Galloway.

5.2.4 During the course of the year, sampling contractors collect monthly *E.coli* samples according to the sampling plan and compliance can be routinely affected by a number of factors including the following:
- Inactive harvesting
- Availability of vessels
- Poor weather and/or
- Logistical issues – performance of carrier

5.2.5 The majority of non-compliances are found in the wild shellfisheries where, due to the sporadic nature of this sector, acquiring samples can be problematic especially during the course of the winter period. Sample compliance for '*planned' versus 'received'* usually sits around 85%, although the performance of '*required' against 'received'* would in fact be higher, as sampling officers have a 12 month window in which to achieve a total of either 8 to 10 samples depending on the status of the areas.

5.2.6 The monitoring programme for shellfish sampling involves the sampling of shellfish from fixed monitoring points in classified harvesting areas. These samples are tested for a group of biotoxins.   Again, similar to compliance for *E.coli*, sample collection is routinely affected by the same issues as above.

5.3   Visible Contamination

5.3.1 Incidence of visual contamination presented at the final carcase inspection point have been recorded since 2013 and are taken as a proxy measure of hygienic production. Scotland has historically recorded lower contamination levels than other UK countries through an active programme of industry and individual plant engagement and ensuring consistency and accuracy of recording through regular assessment and monitoring of FSS systems applied in all Scottish plants.

5.3.2 Other EU countries do not record contamination of every carcase, preferring to rely on assurance sampling by the FBO and verification of such during audit. Targets were set at a national level in 2015 and were met in cattle and sheep production and the main causes of contamination identified are lack of supervision or deployment of inadequately trained staff by FBOs. In 2015 redevelopment of a pig slaughterhouse contributed to the target being missed for pigs but that has improved since completion in mid-2016 and commissioning of the new facility. In addition to on-line monitoring, micro sampling of carcasses is undertaken by FBOs

and is regularly reviewed by OVs and auditors in addition to active engagement by FSS with each FBO.

5.4   Veterinary Audit

5.4.1   Veterinary Audits of FBOs are part of a suite of official controls carried out by FSS in approved meat establishments The audit arrangements apply to all approved meat establishments under veterinary control in Scotland and include:

- Red meat/farmed game slaughterhouses,
- Poultry meat slaughterhouses,
- Cutting plants
- Wild game handling establishments,
- Minced meat, meat preparations and mechanically separated meat plants co-located with slaughterhouses or cutting plants,
- Meat product plants co-located with slaughterhouses and cutting plants, co-located cold stores.

5.4.2   Audits are risk-based as required by Article 4 of Regulation EC No 854/2004, and take into account the following:

- Public health risks
- Animal health risks (where appropriate)
- Animal welfare risks (where appropriate)
- Type of process carried out
- Throughput
- FBOs past record of compliance with food law

5.4.3 The aim of FBO audit is to verify compliance with legal requirements and to ensure adequate FBO standards in relation to public health, animal health and welfare. Sections of the audit are based on the priorities that have been agreed between FSS and Defra as we carry out on a wide range of controls on their behalf. Audit findings aim to provide individual FBOs as well as the relevant competent authority (FSS and Defra) with information on areas for correction or improvement as well as providing assurance that performance and compliance is as required.

5.4.4 In addition to the audit of good hygiene practice, the auditor must verify the FBOs continuous compliance with their own procedures for, amongst others, all aspects of animal by-product handling (including Specified Risk Material (SRM) controls for BSE), animal identification, animal health and welfare, etc.

5.4.5 During audit of HACCP-based procedures, the auditor must check that the operator's systems of work and food safety management provide assurance that meat is free from pathophysiological abnormalities or changes, faecal or other contamination and SRM.

5.4.6 Following audit, plants are awarded an *Audit Outcome* as detailed below:

Audit Outcome	Tolerance for audit outcome	Standalone Cutting Plants	Slaughterhouses / Game Handling Est. / Co-located Cutting Plants	Follow Up Partial Audits of critical and major NCs
Good	No majors or critical on day of audit or during audit period	12 months	18/12 months	N/A
Generally Satisfactory	No more than 2 majors during audit or during audit period rectified promptly No critical during audit period	12 months		Within 3 months
Improvement Necessary	3-6 majors during audit or during audit period No critical during audit period	3 months		Within 1 month
Urgent Improvement Necessary	1 critical or >6 majors during audit or during audit period	2 months		Within 1 month

5.4.7 Subsequent audits are therefore scheduled on the basis of the audit outcome.

5.4.8 Reports are produced following each audit and sent to the FBO. The report details the non-compliances identified and provides an indicative timescale for the business to address them. Audit reports will be published on FSS website after the period for appeals has expired. Where applicable (in accordance with the table above), an additional partial audit may be carried to assess the actions taken to address the non-compliances raised at audit. Where significant non-compliance is noted additional checks on performance may be undertaken in the form of Unannounced Inspections and any evidence gathered used to inform overall compliance score.

5.4.9 The key non-compliances identified during audit relate to the following areas:

Slaughterhouses/Game Handling Establishments / Co-located Cutting Plants
- Staff training/instruction and supervision - The implementation of the operating procedures is effective and supported by records.
- FBO controls during processing - All handling and processes from slaughtering to despatch are done in a way that avoids the contamination of meat and offal entering the food chain.
- Maintenance: arrangements protect food from contamination - The implementation of the operating procedures is effective and supported by records.
- FBO controls during processing - Any visible contamination removed without delay by trimming or alternative means having an equivalent effect.
- Critical Control Points (CCPs). - Monitoring procedures are effective and supported by records - Monitoring procedures are effective and supported by records.

5

- Cleaning arrangements - The implementation of the operating procedures is effective and supported by records.
- Animal By-Product containers - Are leak proof, closable, kept in sound condition, cleaned and disinfected as often as necessary. Waste stores are pest proof.
- Animals spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering during their killing and related operations.
- FCI information and own pre-slaughter checks FBO takes appropriate action over fitness of animals to be accepted for slaughter based.
- SRM (Specified Risk Material) - FBO ensures meat entering the food chain is free from SRM.

Stand-Alone Cutting Plants:
- Water supply: potability - Water supply is assured. The implementation of the operating procedures is effective and supported by records.
- Critical Control Points (CCPs). - Monitoring procedures are effective and supported by records.
- FBO controls during processing - Controls ensure that risk of cross contamination is minimised, prevented or reduced to acceptable levels during operation and appropriate action taken should contamination occur.
- HACCP Principle 1 - identify any hazards that must be prevented, eliminated or reduced to acceptable levels.
- Animal By-Products, including SRM, are dispatched to approved premises with correctly completed commercial documentation
- Cleaning: arrangements protect food from contamination - The implementation of the operating procedures is effective and supported by records.
- FBO controls during processing, traceability - FBO traceability system allows identification of any person from whom they have been supplied with food products, and businesses to which their products have been supplied.
- Identification marking complies with the legislation.
- FBO controls during processing - All handling and processes from slaughtering to despatch are done in a way that avoids the contamination of meat and offal entering the food chain.
- Microbiological testing - All statutory microbiological testing is carried out and appropriate action on receipt of results is being taken.

5.4.10 Overall, the compliance trend remains fairly stable with the majority of establishments reporting good or generally satisfactory compliance levels. Work is ongoing within Field Operations to review the enforcement regime with the intention to place greater emphasis on addressing the root cause of non-compliance.

5.5 Local Authority Audit

5.5.1 The power to set standards, monitor and audit the performance of enforcement authorities was conferred on Food Standards Scotland by Sections 3 and 25 of the Food (Scotland) Act 2015 and Regulation 7 of The Official Feed and Food Controls (Scotland) Regulations 2009. Similar functions are also contained within section 7 of The Official Feed and Food Controls (Scotland) Regulations 2009 which implement the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.5.2 Capacity and Capability Audits main findings relate to the following areas:

- Service Planning – the main issues relates to these either not being up to date / adequate or approved by the appropriate forum.
- Scheme of Delegation and authorisation – authorisations are not in accordance with the Authorities scheme of delegation or include all of the relevant legislation.
- Competence and Training - All Officers authorised for food law have not received training appropriate to their level of authorisation enabling them to undertake their duties competently.
- Internal Monitoring – Internal monitoring procedures to assess whether food law is being effectively delivered are either not fit for purpose or are not fully implemented.
- Reports – These do not make the required timescales for achieving compliance clear to the FBO.
- Lead Officer for Food – No permanent Lead Officer for food in post which is contrary to the requirements of the Food Law Code of Practice (Scotland) 2015.
- Policies and Procedures – some policies and procedures need to be reviewed to ensure they are current and relevant.
- Sampling – the policy was not followed for a high risk sample failure and another was not published.

5.6 Human Resources

5.6.1 The Human Resource (HR) statistics are reported as at the end of the 2016/17 reporting year. The information presented on headcount compares the end year position with that reported at the end of 2015/16 as well as providing additional detail with regards to the composition of FSS staff by age and by gender to provide greater context as to how our workforce is represented.

5.6.2 The key highlights are provided within the annex and further work will be undertaken with HR shared service colleagues over the next quarter to further develop our HR reporting around turnover and work related to mainstreaming equality and diversity within FSS. Turnover for example is now relatively stable following a period of significant recruitment over the last 12 months, with 11 staff having left FSS during 2016/17. Reasons for staff leaving include retirement, medical retirement, resignation and fixed term appointments not being renewed.

5.6.3 Sick absence has also reduced when compared to levels at March 2016 and this primarily related to a reduction in long term sick absence following a medical retirement case.

5.6.4 For this quarterly report, we have also included information relating to the outcome of the 2016 Civil Service People Survey which was conducted during October 2016. The overall FSS response rate was 82% (137 staff) with an engagement index of 63%. This ranks FSS as 25 out of 98 organisations of a similar size (100-399 employees) across the UK civil service and places the organisation above the civil service average of 59% and just one percentage point above the high performers benchmark for staff engagement.

5.6.5 The survey assesses engagement across 9 themes to build the overall engagement index. The graph within the Annex shows the comparison of FSS scores across the themes for 2016 and 2015. All scores have increased apart from those for My Work (75%) and Leadership and Managing Change (51%) which have remained static.

5.6.6 The lowest scored theme was that for Learning and Development. Although there has been some activity in this area over the past year, it is recognised that the main focus has been on recruitment within the organisation and therefore this theme will receive more attention during 2017. Work has already been undertaken to establish learning requirements across FSS through a Training Needs Analysis which will in turn inform development of organisational learning and development priorities and associated plan.

5.6.7 Responses for bullying and harassment indicate some concerns within field operations and further work is being done with the survey operator to understand whether this related to treatment by other FSS staff or by third parties. Once these factors are understood, work will be undertaken to address the behaviours as well as raising awareness of how to deal with unacceptable behaviour.

5.6.8 The overall results of the 2016 People Survey have been communicated with staff and shows FSS is performing well in comparison with the wider civil service and that the participation rate was high, leading to a level of confidence that the results are an accurate reflection of staff views. Action plans will be developed to address the issues identified and these will be monitored regularly with feedback given to staff on progress.

5.7 Health, Safety and the Environment

5.7.1 The incidents and near misses show the operational areas as they were at the beginning of the reporting year. In terms of reporting categories, here are now three field operational areas in addition to Pilgrim House and this change will be reflected in the reporting for the current year. There is a higher relative percentage in the reporting of near misses against incidents which shows an improvement in safety performance and also in reporting.

5.7.2 Animal escapes continue to be an issue and these are measured where FSS relies on compliance and coordination with FBOs. The escapes reported are not restricted to one specific area or site and all those reported in 2016-17 occurred at different sites, highlighting the difficulty in standardising an approach on this issue. Each incident is however fully investigated and action taken where required.

5.7.3 Slips, trips and falls feature as reported incidents and it is planned that a campaign on spatial awareness will form part of the 2017-18 scheduled initiatives where a leading indicator will be used to directly affect FSS performance on an identified lagging indicator of note.

5.7.4 2016-17 saw one medical treatment case, a reduction on 2015-16 and also a lower overall number of injurious incidents. 2016-17 will be used, when the occupational health contract changes, to establish a baseline identifying any outstanding or underlying health issues with operations staff. Operations staff will be selected initially due to the high risk environments they work in.

5.7.5 The immediate causes and root cause analysis used for categorising incidents will also form part of an awareness session for any staff member involved in incident investigation. This is aimed at improving the identification of cause and applying suitable mitigation after the event.

6   European Union considerations

6.1   None required at this stage.

7   Conclusion and recommendations

7.1   The Board is asked to:

- **Consider** and **comment** on reported performance metrics
- **Note** that FSS performance reporting continues to develop. The Board is also asked to note that whilst we are developing our regulatory strategy and programme and project management methodologies, the performance reporting will require further development and refinement.
- **Note** the inclusion of information on FSS audit of Local Authorities

Ian McWatt
Director of Operations
ian.mcwatt@fss.scot
07881 832320

09th May 2017