

Consultation Results

Food Hygiene Inspection Survey 2007-8

Purpose of consultation:	<p>It is a statutory requirement to inspect food businesses in line with Food Standard Agency guidance, which detail how, when and what food businesses to inspect. The inspection programme is risk based and geared towards those premises that pose a risk to public health.</p> <p>One of Haringey Council's stated objectives is to be more focussed on service delivery and address the needs of the community it services. The Food Safety Team provides an opportunity for food business operators to comment on Food Hygiene Inspections undertaken by officers of the team.</p>
Methodology:	<p>The format for the questionnaires was revised and amended for the period 2007/08. Each food business inspected was sent a questionnaire. Food businesses were identified using the M3 database.</p> <p>1,038 food businesses were sent a food hygiene inspection questionnaire. 141 completed questionnaires were returned. This represents a response rate of 14%</p>
Findings:	<p>Q1. Had you been informed whether the officer was coming to inspect your premises in advance of the inspection on that day. 15.6% said 'yes', 80.9% 'no' and 2.8% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q2. Did the officer identify themselves before starting the inspection? 95.7% said 'yes', 1.4% 'no' and 2.8% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q3. How polite was the officer? 64.5% felt the officer was 'very polite', 31.2% 'fairly polite', 0.7% 'not very' polite, 1.4% 'not at all polite' and 2.1% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q4. Where any problems found during the inspection? 53.2% said 'no', 37.6% 'no' and 6.4% 'did not know'</p> <p>Q5. How clearly did the officer explain the problems found? 70.5% said the officer was 'very clear', 17% 'fairly clear', 2.3% 'not very clear, 2.3% not at all clear' and 2.3% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q6. Was there enough discussion about how to solve the issues identified? 79.5% said 'yes', 9.1% said 'no' and 5.75% 'did not know'</p> <p>Q7. How clearly were actions identified in the inspection explained to you? 60.2% said 'very clearly', 26.1% 'fairly clearly' 2.3% 'not very clearly', 1.1% 'not at all clearly' and 3.4% did not know.</p>

	<p>Q9. How clearly was the difference explained to you between what you must do to comply with the law and what is recommended as good practice? 51.1% said 'very clearly', 34.0% fairly clearly, 5.7% 'not very clearly', 2.1% 'not at all clearly' 2.1% said 'not all clearly' and 2.1% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q10. Did you receive a written report on the day? 80.9% said 'yes', 11.3% 'no' and 2.1% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q11. How easy was it to understand the report? 58.4% found the report 'very easy' to understand, 27.2% 'fairly easy', 3.2% 'fairly difficult' 1.6% very difficult and 2.4% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q12. How useful was the inspection and advice given? 63.8% 'very useful', 24.8% 'fairly useful', 0.7% 'not very useful', 2.1% not useful at all and 1.4% 'did not know'.</p> <p>Q13. Would you feel happy to contact the officer if you needed further advice in the future? 83.7% said 'yes', 7.1% 'no' and 3.5% 'did not know'.</p>
<p>What does this mean for us?</p>	<p>The responses received with respect to the officers and the service provided, have been very positive. The overwhelming majority of people completing the surveys felt officers were polite, clearly explained the problems identified and how to resolve them.</p> <p>In addition, officers clearly explained the difference between legal requirements and recommended good practice. Written reports were provided on the day of inspection and the reports are understood. The inspection and advice provided is helpful and the businesses are confident they can contact officers for further advice.</p> <p>However, we recognize there is room for improvement, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussions with business operators on how to resolve issues identified during the inspection ▪ Clearly defining the difference between legal requirements and recommended good practice. <p>Responding to negative feedback Responses to consultation are considered and acted upon where necessary by the Team Leader. Negative comments are discussed with the inspecting officer and during team meetings, if appropriate. Where necessary procedures are amended and circulated to team members.</p> <p>The respondent is contacted via letter detailing how we have addressed the issue raised or explaining why we have acted in a</p>

	<p>particular way.</p> <p>Safer food, better business Through the year, officers have continued to promote Safer Food Better Businesses (a documented food safety management system) to operators. During and following inspections, operators are provided with verbal and written information on the London-wide Scores on the Doors Pilot Scheme as well as their star rating.</p> <p>All food businesses are provided with an inspection report immediately after the inspection detailing both legal and recommended good practice. However there appears to be some doubt with food businesses operators over what constitutes an inspection report form, legal and recommended good practice. As such, we have reviewed the current inspection form and several drafts have developed.</p>
How were results communicated?	Results posted to website and communicated to staff
For further information, please contact:	Keith Betts at keith.betts@haringey.gov.uk or Charlie Osinaike at charlie.osinaike@haringey.gov.uk
Dates of consultation:	April 2007 - March 2008
Wards affected?	Food businesses borough-wide