

SECTION 10 - FOOD SAFETY INSPECTIONS

FSI/05: University of Warwick - Categorisation of food businesses

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Food businesses have been assigned either 'Category - A', 'Category - B' or 'Category - C' status. Please refer to Appendix 1 for the list of food businesses and appropriate categories.

1.2 The 'potential hazard' and '*potential risk' presented by a food business will determine the category assigned of which takes into account the; type of business, type of food handled, procedures used and captive audience. This will be explained in full within the text of this document.

NB: *potential risk will be factored in during the next round of food safety/ allergen inspections (2019) as this is based upon the last inspection report

1.3 Food businesses that have automatically been assigned 'Category - A' status will normally remain in this category unless there is a significant change to the business resulting in a reduction in the 'potential hazard' and the 'potential risk' presented.

| Category | Score | Minimum intervention frequency |
|----------|--|--------------------------------|
| A | Potential Hazard 6/8 or Hygiene Standards Generally Satisfactory (or less) | At least every 6 months |
| B | Potential Hazard - 3/5 and Hygiene Standards are Good | At least every 12 months |
| C | Potential Hazard - 3 and Hygiene Standards are Very Good | At least every 18 months |

2.0 Potential Hazard

2.1 When determining the 'potential hazard' presented by a food business the following three factors are taken into consideration:

- type of food and method of handling;
- method of processing; and
- consumers at risk.

2.2 Type of food and method of handling

| Score | Guidance on the scoring system - type of food and method of handling |
|-------|--|
| 2 | Preparation, cooking or handling of open high-risk foods by caterers |
| 1 | Preparation, cooking or handling by smaller caterers of open high-risk foods; Handling of pre-packed high-risk foods; |

2.3 Method of processing; Premises that undertake a specific method of processing (including those that extend the shelf life of the product) that has the potential to increase the risk to public health beyond that of the normal cooking or storage, should be given an additional score under this section. However, it may only be allocated once, i.e. the maximum score under this section is 2.

SECTION 10 - FOOD SAFETY INSPECTIONS

| Score | Guidance on scoring system - method of processing |
|----------|---|
| 2 | <p>The overriding principle to assess is whether the process itself creates an increased risk and /or the intention is to increase the shelf life of the product by applying it. Below is a non-exhaustive list of processing types that should be allocated an additional score of 2. A judgement regarding additional processing types not listed below may need to be taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • canning or other aseptic packing of low-acid foods; • vacuum packing; • sous-vide cooking; • manufacture of cook/chill food, i.e. cooked and prepared meals or foods which may be eaten cold or after reheating. (simple reheating of cook-chill meals is excluded from the scope of this paragraph.); • fermentation of meats e.g. to produce salamis and other fermented sausages; • air drying e.g. dried hams, biltong, jerky; • freeze drying; • addition of salt and/or other preserving agents; • the cooking/cooling of meat products prior to service e.g. production of hams by retailers. This is not intended to be applied to simple catering operations where foods may often be pre prepared and subsequently reheated. • premises that manufacture, prepare, or serve high risk uncooked or lightly cooked ready to eat food of animal origin whose nature poses a residual microbiological food safety hazard. This is intended to include caterers producing foods such as; steak tartare and other raw meat dishes, fish and meat carpaccio, types of sushi or sashimi, ceviche, and burgers less than thoroughly cooked. |
| 0 | Any other case not included above. |

2.4 Consumers at risk; This reflects the number of consumers likely to be at risk and the potential geographical extent of any incident if there is a failure of food hygiene and safety procedures.

| Score | Guidance on the scoring system - consumers at risk |
|----------|---|
| 2 | Premises serving a substantial number of customers, such as catering kitchens providing food services across campus |
| 1 | Premises, most of whose customers to be served directly, e.g. supermarket or shop, or local restaurant/cafe. |

2.5 An additional score of 2 shall be included for food businesses that produce food intended for consumption by consumers which are likely to include a *vulnerable risk group of more than 20 persons.

NB: *vulnerable risk groups are those including people likely to be more susceptible to the effects of poor food hygiene such as those who are under 5 or over 65, people who are sick or immuno-compromised.

SECTION 10 - FOOD SAFETY INSPECTIONS

| Score | Guidance on the scoring system |
|-------|--|
| 2 | Production and/or service of high-risk foods in establishments where the ultimate consumers of the product produced include a vulnerable risk group of more than 20 persons. |
| 0 | Any other case not included above. |

3.0 Potential risk

3.1 The potential risk will be factored into the categorisation process on completion of the next round of inspections (during 2019).

4.0 Re-categorisation of food businesses

4.1 Should a food business receive notice of a sub-standard inspection then dependant on the severity of the report that food business shall be re-assigned to an alternative Category-rating.

4.2 In the event of a sub-standard inspection those food businesses of either '**Category - B**' or '**Category - C**' status will be subject to re-evaluation, shall subsequently be escalated to either '**Category - A**' or '**Category - B**' status, whichever is deemed appropriate and thus receive an increased inspection regime until the University is satisfied that it can operate to those standards expected.

4.3 Once a food business can satisfy the University that it has raised and maintained food safety standards then it will be re-evaluated and de-escalated to either a '**Category - B**' or '**Category - C**', which so ever is appropriate.

| Version | Date of issue | Author | Endorsed by |
|---------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| V2 | June 2019 | Graham Day; Health & Safety Adviser | Graham Hakes; Senior Health & Safety Adviser |