

Attachment A - Estimated Time Scales for Work Undertaken

Activity	National Programme Risk Category one	National Programme Risk Category Two and Three	Food Control Plan
Appointment	15 min	15 min	15 min
Desk Top review	30 min	45 min	1 hr
Travel (Allow)	30 min	30 min	30 min
Audit	1 hr	1.5 hr	2 hr
Issue Summary	15 min	15 min	15 min
Report	30 min	45 min	1 hr
Issue Invoice and Certificate	15 min	15 min	15 min
Review of Corrective Action responses	15 min	15 min	30 min
Close Audit	15 min	15 min	15 min
Data Input	20min	20 min	20 min
Total	4 hr 5 min	5 hr 5 min	6 hours 20 min

Attachment B – Current Fees and Proposed Fees

Current Fees (Inc GST)					Proposed Fees (Inc GST)				
Registration and Renewal					Registration and Renewal				
Food Control Plan	\$125				Food Control Plan - \$250				
National Program	\$125				National Program - \$250				
Multi-Site	\$125				Multi-Site - \$250				
National Programs		Grade			National Programs				
Risk Level one	A - \$288	B - \$432	C - \$720	D - \$900	Risk Category one - \$500 (Limitation 4 Hours)				
Risk Level Two	A - \$432	B - \$576	C - \$900	D - \$1080	Risk Category Two and Three - \$625 (Limitation 5 Hours)				
Risk Level Three	A - \$576	B - \$720	C - \$1080	D - \$1260					
Food Control Plan		Grade			Food Control Plan - \$750 (Limitation 6 Hours)				
	A - \$576	B - \$720	C - \$1080	D - \$1260					
Multi Sites		Grade			Multi Sites				
Food Control Plan	A - \$1200	B - \$1500	C - \$1700	D - \$2000	Food Control Plan - Single site + Hourly rate for additional sites				
National Program	A - \$1200	B - \$1500	C - \$1700	D - \$2000	National Program – Single site + Hourly rate for additional sites				
					Note - Time beyond Limitation allocated to be charge at an hourly Rate				
Hourly Rate		\$125			Hourly Rate - \$125				

Other Functions charged at hourly Rate		Other Functions charged at hourly Rate
Regrading Inspection		Registration Fees
Corrective Action Close out visits		Corrective Action Close out visits
Compliance Investigation		Compliance Investigation
Improvement Notice		Improvement Notice
Monitoring		Monitoring
Amendment to Registration		Amendment to Registration
Cancelled Verification less than 24 hours' notice		Cancelled Verification less than 24 hours' notice
Failure to attend Verification		Failure to attend Verification
Unscheduled Verification		Unscheduled Verification
Direction Order		Direction Order
Restriction of Use or Closure		Restriction of Use or Closure

Attachment C: Summary of submissions – Amended Fee Structure

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose proposed amended fee structure Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
1	Kim Badger / Wānaka Golf Club	Oppose No	Submitter opposes increase in fees due to Covid 19 constraints currently on businesses	Comment noted - Opposes any fee increase	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
2	Natalia Rodrigues / Sugary Patisserie	Oppose No	Believes the proposed fee structure would not be fair to operators who do not use the same time in the verification process. Suggests charging by the hour to encourage operators to follow the procedures and benefit from a shorter verification fee.	Comments noted. It should be noted that the time on site to audit is only part of the cost. If the operator goes over the maximum hours there will be an hourly rate in addition to the set fee applied.	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
3	Chris Hadfield / Ritual Café	Support No	Adopting new fee structure would make it fair to all operators.	New fee structure would be fairer.	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
4	Hiroko Suzuki	Support No	No comments made		Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
5	Chris Buckley / Southern Pub Company	Neutral No	Agrees adopting new fee structure makes sense. Disagrees with how operators are designated to their respective risk categories under the Food Act.	Comments noted – Council has no control over the risk categories assigned under the Food Act	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
6	Scott Throne / Kai Pai Bakery	Neutral	Does not want to see an increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose proposed amended fee structure Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
		No			
7	Anon Corey / Hume	Neutral No	Submitter does not agree with the fee structure comparisons made in the statement of proposal. Would like to have seen a comparison of all council's fee's. Would like to see a nationwide set fee structure.	Comments noted – the information on fee structures for different councils was relatively difficult to analyze. MPI have not provided any details of plans to set national fees and is unlikely to do so at the present time.	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
8	Gethin Curtis	Oppose No	Concerns over the timing of new fee structure which would add pressure to the hospitality industry.	Comments noted – this is a very difficult time for the businesses especially in hospitality	
9	Melissa White / Cherry Blossom Cakes	Oppose Yes	Opposes increase in fees especially for small businesses with 1 person staff. No allowances for low risk businesses that still fall under FCP. Current verification process will not meet or exceed the intended 6 hour minimum charge.	Comments noted – Council has no control over the risk categories assigned under the Food Act. The fee structure only sets a maximum of hours that covers the charge and does not adapt the fee for lower risk businesses assigned to a specific risk category as determined by the Food Act 20214 which takes less time.	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
10	Clare Pennell / Cakes of Wānaka	Oppose No	Opposes increase in fees due to having a low risk business with little margin in profits.	Comments noted – Council has no control over the risk categories assigned under the Food Act.	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose proposed amended fee structure Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
			<p>Would not like to pay the same as other operators whose verifications take more time.</p> <p>Would like to see a nationwide set fee structure.</p>		
11	Leea King	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
12	Fernanda Berroeta / Latin Cakes	Oppose No	No comments made		Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
13	Laurel Breen	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
14	Ruby Ritchie	Oppose No	<p>Strongly opposes increase in fees especially for small businesses.</p> <p>Would like to see a fee structure fairer to all businesses that takes into consideration the nature of the business.</p>	Comments noted Risk Categories are set by the Food Act 2014	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
15	Yvonne Rees	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
16	Tineke Sutton / Taste of the Alps	Oppose	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose proposed amended fee structure Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
		No			
17	Sarah Richens / Truly Scrumptious Cakes	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees especially for small businesses. Would like to see a fee structure fairer to all businesses that takes into consideration the nature of the business.	Comments noted. Risk Categories are set by the Food Act 2014	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
18	Amber Youno / Mama Mia Kitchen	Oppose Yes	Submitter opposes increase in fees especially for small businesses. Current fee structure was already high for small businesses. Mentions Covid 19 pandemic effecting businesses currently.	Comments noted – Council has no control over the risk categories assigned under the Food Act 2014	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
19	Trish White	Oppose No	Opposes increase in fees especially for small businesses.	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
20	Danielle Anson	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
21	Elaine Scott	Oppose No	Current fee structure is high. Submitter mentions that businesses are currently suffering due to Covid 19	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose proposed amended fee structure Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
22	Rachelle May / The Plattter Share	Oppose No	Strongly opposes increase in fees	Comments noted	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health
23	Brittany Thurston / White Rabbit Cakes	Oppose No	Submitter comments on the comparison between high earning operators versus low earning operators. Suggests a fee scale fairer to small businesses	Comments noted Risk Categories are set by the Food Act 2014	Adopt the revised Fee Schedule for Environmental Health

Attachment D: Summary of submissions – Revoking the Food Grading Bylaw 2016

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/Oppose Revocation of Food Grading Bylaw Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
1	Kim Badger / Wānaka Golf Club	Support No	Submitter supports removing bylaw to avoid double handling in the verification process	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
2	Natalia Rodrigues / Sugary Patisserie	Neutral No	No comments made		Revoke Bylaw as proposed
3	Chris Hadfield / Ritual Café	Support No	Submitter suggests removing the bylaw will streamline the verification process	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
4	Hiroko Suzuki	Support No	No time		Revoke Bylaw as proposed
5	Chris Buckley / Southern Pub Company	Support No	States the current bylaw causes excessive costs in time & money. Advises it easier to comply with Food Act in other areas of NZ than in Queenstown. Revoking the bylaw will reduce the time taken in the verification process	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
6	Scott Throne / Kai Pai Bakery	Support No	Changes to Food Act has changed the verification process and has increased accountability in operators and ensures safe food practices are being followed.	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose Revocation of Food Grading Bylaw Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
			Grading system is not standard throughout NZ. Grading should be uniform throughout the country with same set of criteria.		
7	Anon Corey / Hume	Support No	Supports removing bylaw if it means a more streamlined & informative verification process	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
8	Gethin Curtis	Support No	Submitters says the current grading system causes stress on employees and impacts on employees where businesses design pay structures around the grades issued.	Supports need to revoke bylaw	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
9	Melissa White / Cherry Blossom Cakes	Neutral Yes	Submitter is neutral to revoking the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke the Bylaw as proposed
10	Clare Pennell / Cakes of Wānaka	Neutral No	No comments made	No Comments submitted	Revoke the Bylaw as proposed
11	Leea King	Support No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
12	Fernanda Berroeta / Latin Cakes	Oppose No	No comments made	No comments submitted	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
13	Laurel Breen	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose Revocation of Food Grading Bylaw Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
14	Ruby Ritchie	Oppose No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
15	Yvonne Rees	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
16	Tineke Sutton / Taste of the Alps	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
17	Sarah Richens / Truly Scrumptious Cakes	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
18	Amber Young / Mama Mia Kitchen	Support Yes	No comments made	No Comments	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
19	Trish White	Oppose No	Submitter comments on increase in fees not justified. No comments on revoking of bylaw made.	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
20	Danielle Anson	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
21	Elaine Scott	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed
22	Rachelle May / The Platter Share	Neutral No	Submitter does not oppose the revoking of the current bylaw as long as it doesn't impact on the current fee structure	Comments relate to fee structure	Revoke Bylaw as proposed

ID	Submitter	Support/Neutral/ Oppose Revocation of Food Grading Bylaw Speak at hearing? (Yes / No)	Key themes of submission	Analysis of submission	Recommendations
23	Brittany Thurston / White Rabbit Cakes	Neutral No	No comments made	No Comments	Revoke Bylaw as proposed

Attachment E

Frequency of Verification of Food Business that is subject to a Template Food Control Plan

Food Regulations 2015

(1) The frequency levels for the verification of a food business that is subject to a food control plan and of the food control plan are as follows:

Steps	Frequency of verification
5	18 months
4	12 months
3	9 months
2	6 months
1	3 months

(2) If the result of the initial verification is an acceptable outcome, the verification agency or verifier must carry out verification of the food control plan and food business at the frequency referred to in step 4 of the table in sub-clause (1) (the **table**).

(3) If the result of the initial verification or any subsequent verification (including any unscheduled verification) is an unacceptable outcome, the verification agency or verifier must, after considering the frequency criteria, increase the frequency of verification to a level set out in steps 3 to 1 of the table.

(4) If the results of 2 consecutive verifications (including any unscheduled verification) are 2 acceptable outcomes, the verification agency or verifier must reduce the frequency of verification to a lesser frequency further up the table.

Attachment F: Frequency of Verification of Food Business that is subject to a National Programme under Food Regulations 2015

(1) The frequency levels for verification of food businesses subject to national programmes are as follows:

Steps	National programme level 3	National programme level 2	National programme level 1
8			no verification
7		3 years	3 years
6	2 years	2 years	2 years
5	18 months	18 months	18 months
4	12 months	12 months	12 months
3	9 months	9 months	9 months
2	6 months	6 months	6 months
1	3 months	3 months	3 months

(2) If the result of the initial verification is an acceptable outcome, the verification agency or verifier—

- (a) must, if the food business is subject to national programme level 3, carry out subsequent verifications at the frequency referred to in step 6 of the table in subclause (1) (the **table**); and
- (b) must, if the food business is subject to national programme level 2, carry out subsequent verifications at the frequency referred to in step 7 of the table; and
- (c) must not, if the food business is subject to national programme level 1, carry out any further verifications unless regulation 102 applies.

(3) If the result of the initial verification or any subsequent verification (including any unscheduled verification) is an unacceptable outcome, the verification agency or verifier must, after considering the frequency criteria, increase the frequency of verification,—

- (a) if the food business is subject to national programme level 3, to a level set out in steps 5 to 1 of the table; or
- (b) if the food business is subject to national programme level 2, to a level set out in steps 6 to 1 of the table; or
- (c) if the food business is subject to national programme level 1, to a level set out in steps 7 to 1 of the table.

(4) If, after the initial verification, the result of a subsequent verification (including any unscheduled verification) is an acceptable outcome, the verification agency or verifier must, after considering the frequency criteria, reduce the frequency of verification,—

- (a) if the food business is subject to national programme level 3, to a level set out in steps 6 to 2 of the table; or
- (b) if the food business is subject to national programme level 2, to a level set out in steps 7 to 2 of the table; or
- (c) if the food business is subject to national programme level 1, to a level set out in steps 8 to 2 of the table.