



Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Corporate Directorate of Corporate Resources
Democratic Services
Redcar & Cleveland Leisure and Community Heart
Ridley Street
Redcar
Yorkshire
TS10 1TD

Telephone: 01642 774774
Website: www.redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

To: The Chairman and Members of the River
Tees Port Health Authority

Contact: Mrs S A Fenwick
Direct line: (01642) 444413

22 February 2016

Dear Councillor,

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY: FRIDAY 4 MARCH 2016

Would you please note that a meeting of the River Tees Port Health Authority will be held on Friday 4 March 2016 at 10.00 a.m. at Middlesbrough Town Hall.

A G E N D A

	<u>Pages</u>
1. Apologies for Absence.	
2. Declarations of Interest.	
3. To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 December 2015	3-4
4. Reports of the Corporate Director of People Services:	
a. Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register	5-17
b. Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance	18-25
c. Performance Summary for RTPHA November 2015 to January 2016	26-32
d. River Tees Port Health Order	Verbal report

5. Reports of the Corporate Director of Corporate Resources:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|
| a. Financial Position Update 2015/16 | 33-36 |
| b. Level of General Reserves | 37 – 39 |
| c. Fees & Charges | 40 - 47 |

6. Any items that the Chair certifies as urgent.

Yours sincerely

S NEWTON
CLERK TO THE AUTHORITY

4 December 2015

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

A meeting of the River Tees Port Health Authority was held on Friday 4 December 2015 at Middlesbrough Town Hall.

PRESENT Councillor Mrs Forster (Chair),
Councillors Brown, Davies, Dean, Faulks, Hall
(substituting for Councillor Perry), O'Donnell,
Purvis, Tempest, Thomas, Thomson and Walker.

OFFICIALS V Bell, L Evans, A Haver and J Weston (Redcar
and Cleveland Borough Council) and Dr D
Campbell.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were submitted on behalf of Councillors
Dennis, Goodchild, Johnson, Lewis, Mason and Perry.

24. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2015
be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

25. **THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC ANALYSIST**

Dr Duncan Campbell of West Yorkshire Analytical Services gave a
presentation to Members on the work undertaken by public analysts and
provided specific information on the findings of test samples in the Tees
Valley – **NOTED**.

26. **2015/16 FINANCIAL POSITION UPDATE**

The Treasurer presented a report which updated Members on the
financial position of the Authority at the end of October 2015 and
highlighted any variances against the 2015-16 approved budget – **NOTED**

27. **REVENUE BUDGET 2016/17 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN**

The Treasurer presented a report which recommended a budget for
approval by the Authority for the 2016/17 financial year, which confirms
the funding levels required from each of the four contributing Local
Authorities.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Treasurer provides Members of the Authority with a
breakdown of the figures that would be refunded to each authority

4 December 2015

should the reserves be lowered to £30,000, £20,000, £10,000 or £0.

2. That Members of the Authority reconsider the Revenue Budget for 2016/17 at the next meeting on 4th March 2016.

28. **RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY - CORPORATE RISK AND OPPORTUNITY REGISTER**

The Corporate Director of People Services presented a report which requested Members to review the current Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register. Members were advised that there had been a change of staffing at Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council since September 2015, however this had not had an impact on the register.

RESOLVED that the amendments to the Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register be approved.

29. **PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY AUGUST TO OCTOBER 2015**

The Corporate Director of People Services presented a report which gave a summary of the performance of the River Tees Port Health Authority from August to October 2015 - **NOTED**.

30. **RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY ORDER**

The Corporate Director of People Services advised Members that there had been progress on the River Tees Port Health Authority Order and it was now in its 28 days' notice period. - **NOTED**.

Member Report

RTPHA Risk Management

Public



To: River Tees Port Health Authority
From: Corporate Director of People Services Decision: Executive
Portfolio: River Tees Port Health Authority

1. **To present the RTPHA Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register for approval.**
 - 1.1 The Authority must have a risk management strategy and risk register to ensure that risk is managed effectively.
2. **What will this achieve?**
 - 2.1 This will ensure that the Authority complies with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 made by virtue of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 which requires authorities to provide arrangements for the management of risk.
3. **How will it happen and how will we tell people about it?**
 - 3.1 The Authority has a Risk Management Strategy which is reviewed and presented to members on an annual basis. As part of this strategy the Authority has a Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register which is a live document that is under continuous review and is presented to members on a quarterly basis. This arrangement was agreed at the meeting of the joint board in June 2013. Member approval of the strategy and register is to be recorded.

The register is provided for review and approval by members of the joint board. Members are informed that there have been no changes to the register since it was presented to the joint board in December 2015.
4. **What are the risks involved?**
 - 4.1 Failure to gain member approval will lead to the absence of a Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register for RTPHA, therefore the Authority will not comply with the relevant provisions of the above regulations and will not be in a position to control and minimise risk.
5. **How will it deliver our priorities and improve our performance?**
 - 5.1 The register quantifies the potential risks to the Authority and ensures that controls are in place to eliminate or minimise the risks.
6. **What will it cost?**
 - 6.1 The costs of producing and reviewing the register will be met within the agreed budget for RTPHA. There are no additional costs in developing or producing the strategy and

register.

7. Are there any legal considerations?

7.1 Yes. Failure to assess, document, review and effectively manage the risks to the operation of the Authority is a breach of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

8. Who have we talked to about it?

8.1 Heather Pearce, Assurance Lead (Risk), RCBC.
Justin Weston, Deputy Treasurer to RTPHA.
Joanne Stokes, Senior Auditor, Tees Valley Audit and Assurance Service.
Officers of the Riparian Authorities.

9. What options have been considered?

9.1 No other options can be considered.

10. Recommendations

10.1 That the Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register be approved by members.

11. Further information

11.1 Appendix A – RTPHA Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register V10 December 2015.

12. Background Papers

12.1 None.

13. Contact Officer

Name: Vikki Bell, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial).

Address: Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, Belmont House, Rectory Lane, Guisborough, TS14 7FD.

Telephone: 01287 612404.

Email: vikki_bell@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk



CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

Site:	Belmont House, Guisborough
Directorate:	People Services
Department:	Public Health
Service	Health Protection and Health Care Quality
Function:	Port Health in Environmental Health (Commercial)
Correspondent Name:	Vikki Bell
Contact No.:	01287 612404
Current BIA Version:	RTPHA/10



RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

CORPORATE RISK AND OPPORTUNITY REGISTER – December 2015

Updated by Vikki Bell, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial)

Impact	RISK					LOW RISK (< 8)				
	Catastrophic	5					MEDIUM RISK (9 – 15)			
	Critical	4					HIGH RISK (16+)			
	Significant	3								
	Insignificant	2								
	Negligible	1								
Risk Rating Matrix		1	2	3	4	5	Likelihood			
		Zero to Very Low	Unlikely	Likely	Very Likely	Almost Certain				
							Responsible Officer Key			
							SN	Steve Newton		
							EG	Erika Grunert		
							VB	Vikki Bell		
							JS	John Sampson		
							JW	Justin Weston		
RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
1	<p>Failure to comply with the governance requirements of the River Tees Port Health Authority Order leading to the inability to discharge the statutory functions and duties of the Authority.</p> <p>Ineffective governance arrangements resulting in failed external audit, special measures being put in place and reputation damage.</p>	5	4	H	<p>Annual appointment of members by each riparian authority.</p> <p>Annual appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair of the joint board.</p> <p>Approval of annual review of the Constitution.</p> <p>Accurate minute taking and review of minutes at any meetings of the joint board.</p> <p>Declarations of interest from members documented and minutes taken. Any conflicts arising are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>Approval of Calendar of Meetings for the year (Annually in June).</p>	1	2	L		VB SN

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
2	Failure to discharge statutory functions assigned by the River Tees Port Health Authority Order in relation to public health risks, litigation, public enquiries and inquests which could lead to reputational damage.	5	4	H	<p>Statutory appointments of members and effective governance of the Authority.</p> <p>Annual Service Plan reviewed and approved by the joint board.</p> <p>Employment and retention of an adequate number of suitably trained officers.</p>	1	2	L		<p>SN</p> <p>VB</p> <p>EG VB</p>

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
3	Failure to comply with the requirements for relevant authorities as prescribed by the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2104 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 which could lead to failed external audit resulting in special measures being put in place in relation to financial mismanagement and reputational damage.	4	3	M	<p>Annual review and approval of Accounting Statements to ensure financial management is adequate and effective.</p> <p>Approval of annual Internal Audit Report following review of effectiveness.</p> <p>Adequate insurance cover in place via host and riparian authorities.</p> <p>An annual opportunity for the exercise of electors' rights is provided in accordance with regulatory requirements as the notice of appointment of dates is displayed in two Council buildings and posted on the RTPHA website for the prescribed period of time.</p>	1	1	L		JS JW

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
4	<p>Inadequacy and non payment of precept which could lead to inadequate reserves, unbudgeted spends, and contingent liability.</p> <p>Salaries: accurate payment and handling.</p> <p>Supply of goods and services: receipt and correct invoicing.</p> <p>VAT: incorrect analysis, charges and claims to HMRC.</p> <p>Consequential loss: due to improper performance and general liability.</p> <p>Inadequate financial record keeping which could result in decisions taken illegally.</p> <p>Fraud: by officers of the authority or the joint board which could lead to insolvency; financial mismanagement; breach of legislation and litigation and a failed external audit resulting in special measures being put in place and reputational damage.</p>	4	4	H	<p>Precept agreed annually by joint board as part of the budget-setting process. Receipt from Councils confirmed and monthly budget monitored.</p> <p>Adequacy and liabilities considered at budget setting and reviewed in annual statement of accounts.</p> <p>Salaries, goods and services, VAT and record keeping monitored via monthly budget monitoring process. Payment subject to host Council Financial Regulations and associated processes and subject to internal audit of the Authority.</p> <p>Anti-fraud and corruption policy in place and Authority subject to internal audit.</p>	1	2	L		JS JW VB

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
5	<p>Internal Audit is effective in undertaking its role in relation to financial mismanagement.</p> <p>Breach of legislation and litigation which could result in a failed external audit resulting in special measures being put in place and damage to reputation.</p>	4	3	M	<p>Internal Audit reports are made to the joint board.</p> <p>The Internal Audit of the Authority is subject to external audit.</p> <p>The Internal Audit is undertaken by the Tees Valley Audit and Assurance Service. Their effectiveness is assessed annually against the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards 2013 and is currently fully compliant.</p>	1	2	L		JW EG

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
6	Failure to discharge responsibilities as a Category 1 Responder under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to be prepared to respond to an emergency event which could lead to a risk to public health; litigation; public enquiries, inquests and result in reputational damage.	4	4	H	<p>Included in the full statutory process as a Category 1 responder through Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit. The groups attended are known locally as the Local Resilience Forum (Chief Officer Group) and the Business and Policy Group.</p> <p>Maintain Emergency Response Activation arrangements.</p> <p>A suitable number of appropriately authorised officers available to offer an out of hours response as required.</p> <p>Participation in multi-agency Emergency Preparedness activities.</p> <p>Participation in multi-agency response and recovery activities.</p>	2	2	L	Validate plans by training and exercising	EG VB

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
7	Failure to discharge responsibilities as a Category 1 responder under the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to maintain continuity of service due to disruptive events, for example, loss of key Authority staff, failure of utilities, failure of communications and a lack of suitable premises, IT or fuel supply which could lead to a risk to public health; litigation; public enquiries; inquests and reputational damage.	4	4	H	<p>Maintain Business Continuity Plans and Arrangements.</p> <p>Undertake periodically a Business Continuity Impact Assessment and design Action Plan.</p> <p>Implement Action Plan.</p> <p>Annually review Business Continuity arrangements.</p> <p>Business Continuity has been addressed via the host Council's arrangements and is also part of River Tees Port Health Authority.</p>	2	3	L		EG VB

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
8	Failure to be operationally fit for purpose in complying with specified legislation, for example in relation to the Freedom of Information and Data Protection; Human Rights; Equalities; Employment Law; Health and Safety which could lead to a breach of legislation; litigation resulting in special measures being put in place by external regulators and reputational damage.	4	4	H	Maintain compliance via all relevant policies and procedures of the host Council. Training of appropriate officers by host Council in their adopted policies and procedures. The Constitution of the Authority is linked to the host Council policies and procedures.	2	3	L		EG VB

RR No	DESCRIPTION OF RISK	INITIAL EVALUATION (No controls in place)		RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	CURRENT CONTROL MEASURES (Existing)	RESIDUAL EVALUATION (After existing controls)		REVISED RISK RATING Low (L) Medium (M) High (H)	ADDITIONAL CONTROLS REQUIRED (To be implemented)	Responsible Officer
		LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)			
9	Failure to discharge responsibilities as a Port Health Authority under domestic Public Health and International Health Regulations leading to a risk to public health; breach of legislation; litigation; public enquiries; and inquests which may result in special measures being put into place by external regulators and reputational damage.	4	4	H	<p>Officers possessing necessary qualifications and competencies to enforce the designated legislation.</p> <p>Adequate staff available to the Authority.</p> <p>Full adherence, consideration and appropriate decision making in relation to the relevant statutory and non-statutory Codes of Practice and guidance.</p> <p>Performance Management arrangements on a team and individual basis.</p> <p>Appropriate Quality Management system in place.</p>	2	2	L		EG VB

Member Report Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance Programme



Public

To: River Tees Port Health Authority
 From: Corporate Director of People Services Decision: Information
 Portfolio: River Tees Port Health Authority

1. To inform members of the Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance programme.

1.1 River Tees Port Health Authority (RTPHA) intends to participate in the Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance (PIMS) programme which is led by Public Health England (PHE), the Association of Port Health Authorities (APHA) and the University of Edge Hill. The aim of this programme is to ensure there is a national capability to monitor for invasive mosquito species at points of entry in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

1.2 Background

Annex 5 of the International Health Regulations 2005 specifies control measures for vector-borne diseases that requires state parties to *'establish programmes to control vectors that may transport an infectious agent that constitutes a public health risk to a minimum distance of 400 metres from those areas of point of entry facilities that are used for operations involving travellers, conveyances, containers, cargo and postal parcels, with extension of the minimum distance if vectors with a greater range are present'*.

There is no national structured control programme in the United Kingdom for vector borne disease, previous surveys have been conducted on a random basis and no central body has taken the role of the co-ordinating 'state party'. PHE does conduct a mosquito survey during the summer months however this is not focused at points of entry.. Following extensive work by Manchester Port Health Authority, together with APHA and other agencies such as the National Institute of Health Research, the Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections and the National Pest Advisory Panel, the PIMS programme has been set up.

As the British Isles is naturally protected by the sea from the majority of invasive vectors, it is likely that mosquitos will be brought in through sea and air ports. Although health checks and control measures are in place at points of entry there could be an increased risk of vector entry due to climate change, frequent and faster travel, global movement of used tyres and changes to disinsection procedures on aircrafts.

Members of the *Aedes* genus of mosquito are known vectors for numerous viral infections. The two most prominent species are *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* which transmit the viruses that cause dengue fever, yellow fever, West Nile fever, chikungunya, eastern equine encephalitis and Zika virus, along with many other, less notable diseases.

The *Aedes albopictus* species is considered to be the most invasive and has undergone a global expansion (including into Europe) facilitated by human activities.

There is also evidence that it is adapting to surviving in colder climates which may result in disease transmission to new areas. However previous surveillance programmes have not identified any invasive mosquito species in the United Kingdom.

1.3 **Methodology**

The aim is to conduct surveillance at points of entry for invasive mosquitoes and focus on sampling techniques for adult insects. The sea ports at Falmouth, Felixstowe, Harwich, Hull and Goole, Manchester, Mersey (Liverpool and Birkenhead), Southampton and Swansea Bay and the airports at Liverpool Gatwick and Stanstead will take part in the programme. In addition it is likely that sea and air ports in Scotland may be recruited to participate in the programme through the Scottish Ports Liaison Network.

Port Health Authorities participating in the programme will be supported by PHE and Edge Hill University. This will include the provision of the traps, advice on positioning and operation of the traps and identification of any mosquitos caught.

Two types of traps will be used as follows:

(i) Gravid Aedes Traps

These traps attract gravid females and can also be used with a pheromone to attract host-seeking females. The design of the trap prevents the mosquito from reaching the water surface and prevents escape as the nets are treated with long-lasting insecticide.

Between five and 10 traps will be placed in sheltered positions at each participating port and will be inspected on a weekly basis. The contents of each trap will be sent to PHE/Edge Hill University for identification.

(ii) BG Sentinel Traps

These traps attract host-seeking females and are used with a pheromone without the need for the use of carbon dioxide. They will also be placed in sheltered locations and close to any potential sources, in particular imported goods warehouses. BG Sentinels require an electrical power source either from a 12V car battery (lasting approximately a week) or from mains power.

The port operator at Tees Port, PD Ports has agreed to take part in the programme and RTPHA will be provided with further details and the equipment in due course.

2. **What will this achieve?**

- 2.1 RTPHA will participate in a national surveillance programme to monitor for invasive mosquito species. The value of this project could be particularly significant given increased risks identified in terms of climate change and the ability of the mosquito to adapt to colder climates.

The programme will also identify any need for control measures and make recommendations which could be critical to protecting public health.

3. **How will it happen and how will we tell people about it?**

3.1 Port health officers will place the traps in suitable locations around the port in collaboration with the port operator.

4. **What are the risks involved?**

4.1 There are no specific risks to the Authority to being involved in this programme. It is led by national agencies and the findings of the surveillance will be evaluated.

Port health officers will be given specific instruction on the handling and emptying of the traps. The health and safety of the officers managing the traps will be considered as part of RTPHA's risk assessment process.

5. **How will it deliver our priorities and improve our performance?**

5.1 Participation in the project delivers our priorities in terms of complying with the requirements of the International Health Regulations 2005 and protecting public health.

6. **What will it cost?**

6.1 There are no actual costs to participate in this project other than officer time and this can be included in the routine delivery of port health services,

7. **Are there any legal considerations?**

7.1 Participation in the project ensures that the Authority is complying with the International Health Regulations 2005 and there are no other specific considerations.

8. **Who have we talked to about it?**

8.1 Lynette Crossley, Manchester Port Health Authority.
Officers and representatives of the Riparian Authorities.

9. **What options have been considered?**

9.1 The Authority could choose not to participate in this project however it is in the Authority's best interest to be involved in programmes which ensure legal compliance and protect public health.

10. **Recommendations**

10.1 That the information be noted and that the Authority participates in the PIMS programme.

11. **Further information**

11.1 Appendix B Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance

12. **Background Papers**

12.1 <http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/vectors/mosquitoes/Pages/aedes-albopictus.aspx>

13. **Contact Officer**

Name: Vikki Bell, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial).

Address: Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, Belmont House, Rectory Lane, Guisborough, TS14 7FD.

Telephone: 01287 612404.

Email: vikki_bell@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

Port Invasive Mosquito Surveillance

Seaports and airports as major routes of entry into the UK, have the potential to facilitate the importation of invasive mosquitoes via (1) vessels / aircraft, (2) passenger vehicles, (3) imported goods. *Aedes albopictus* has now spread to 25 countries in Europe, particularly those around the Mediterranean. The species has now spread to Paris and Strasbourg in France, and also into Germany via motorway networks. Other invasive *Aedes* species (eg: *Aedes aegypti*) have also moved into new regions in these ways. To address the need for surveillance of mosquitoes moved by passenger vehicles and imported goods, Public Health England (PHE) conducts surveillance at motorway service stations and at used tyre importers.

PHE, Edge Hill University, and the Association of Port Health Authorities are working with Port Health Officers across the UK develop capability and conduct of mosquito surveillance at seaports and airports.

Owing to the fact that there are now new traps available, there is an opportunity to develop further the surveillance strategy for seaports and airports.

Methodology

The aim is to conduct surveillance for invasive mosquitoes, and focus on adult sampling techniques of areas close to points of entry (PoE) (eg: aircraft, imported cargo, fruit & vegetable BIPs). Larval sampling of more widely spread container habitats are likely result in collection of native species only (eg: *Culex pipiens* s.l.). PHOs are to lead surveillance at their port / airport. Seaports and airports will be supported with advice and mosquito identification by PHE and Edge Hill University. PHE will loan the traps.

Gravid Aedes Traps (GAT) (Fig. 1) attract gravid females, and can also be used with a pheromone to attract host-seeking females. The design of the trap prevents the mosquito from reaching the water surface, and also prevents escape, as the LLINs are treated with long-lasting insecticide.

- The bucket is filled up to the drain hole on the side. GATs should be used in conjunction with a hay-infused water solution (a couple of bunches of grass can be put within the water of each trap), to attract the mosquitoes.
- The black mesh net with draw-string should be fixed around the bottom of the clear plastic transparent chamber
- The chamber should then be placed into the bucket, net down.
- The round disc of blue netting (LLIN) should then be placed loosely inside the lid section
- The rectangular blue netting (LLIN) should be wrapped around the bottom of the funnel, and then fixed in place into the chamber

We would propose the use of 5-10 GAT per seaport/airport, depending on the availability of suitable locations. These would need to be inspected each week, and the contents of each trap, sent to PHE/Edge Hill for identification. GATs are best placed in a sheltered position, out of direct rain.



Figure 1: Gravid Aedes Traps

BG Sentinel traps attract host-seeking females. Used with a pheromone (remove from the silver packet and place in the sleeve inside the trap), these traps can be used for invasive mosquito surveillance, without the need for the use of CO₂. These traps are best used in a sheltered location close to a potential source – eg: fruit & vegetable BIP, or imported goods warehouses. BG Sentinels run from either a 12V car battery (lasting approximately a week), or using mains power and left on continuously.



Figure 2: BG Sentinel trap



When checking the traps, please transfer any insects into the tubes provided, label with the name of your airport/seaport and the date, and send back for identification.

Alexander Vaux & Jolyon Medlock

Medical Entomology, Public Health England, Porton Down, Salisbury, SP4 0JG

Thom Dallimore & Clare Strode

Edge Hill University, Biology Department, Edge Hill University, St. Helens Road, Ormskirk, Lancashire, L39 4QP

Lynette Crossley

Manchester Port Health Authority

**Member Report
Performance summary for RTPHA
November 2015 to January 2016**



Public

To: River Tees Port Health Authority

From: Director of Public Health

Decision: Information

Portfolio: River Tees Port Health Authority

1 What is the purpose of the report?

1.1 To provide a summary of the performance of RTPHA from November 2015 to January 2016.

1.2 The performance summary provides a breakdown of the number of ships entering each Riparian Authority area and details of controls for imported food, feed and relevant products.

2. Background Papers

1. Report for November 2015.
2. Report for December 2015.
3. Report for January 2016.

3. Contact Officer

Name: Vikki Bell, Principal Environmental Health Officer (Commercial).

Address: Environmental Health (Commercial), Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, Belmont House, Rectory, Lane, Guisborough, TS14 7FD.

Telephone: 01287 612404

Email: vikki_bell@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

To: Chair and Members of the joint board.

Report for the month of: **November 2015**

1. ACTIVITY SUMMARY - SHIPS

LOCAL AUTHORITY	NO OF SHIPS ENTERING THE PORT	SHIP SANITATION CONTROL	SHIP SANITATION EXEMPTION	ROUTINE SHIP INSPECTIONS
Hartlepool	1	0	0	0
Middlesbrough	13	0	3	0
Redcar	145	0	6	0
Stockton	145	0	3	1
Total	304	0	12	1

2. SAMPLING

Number of water samples taken and submitted for examination: 14

3. INFECTIOUS DISEASE NOTIFICATIONS / INCIDENTS

Number of infectious disease notifications: 0

Number of service requests: 0

4. THIRD COUNTRY IMPORT CONTROLS

	FOOD	FEED	PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION
Manifests Checked	100%	100%	100%	100%
Consignments	96	0	4	18
Documentary Checks	1	0	4	0
Identity Checks	0	0	0	0
Physical Checks	0	0	0	0
Samples	0	0	0	0
Notices Served	0	0	0	0

Total manifests checked: 72

5. THIRD COUNTRY FOOD, FEED AND RELEVANT PRODUCTS ENTERING TEESPORT

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Vodka	Russia
Beer	Russia
Coffee	Brazil, Colombia, Kenya, Mexico, Tanzania, Peru
Wine	Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Chile
Tea	Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Malawi, India
Citric Acid	China, Singapore
Rum	Guyana

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
None	

NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Used Cooking Oil	United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Malaysia, Egypt, South Africa, Indonesia
Linseed Oil	United Arab Emirates
Plant Fertiliser	Canada

PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Plastic Kitchenware including trays, turners, mashers etc.	China and Hong Kong

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

To: Chair and Members of the joint board

Report for the month of: **December 2015**

1. ACTIVITY SUMMARY - SHIPS

LOCAL AUTHORITY	NO OF SHIPS ENTERING THE PORT	SHIP SANITATION CONTROL	SHIP SANITATION EXEMPTION	ROUTINE SHIP INSPECTIONS
Hartlepool	0	0	0	0
Middlesbrough	8	0	1	0
Redcar	146	0	1	0
Stockton	146	0	3	0
Total	300	0	6	0

2. SAMPLING

Number of water samples taken and submitted for examination: 0

3. INFECTIOUS DISEASE NOTIFICATIONS/ INCIDENTS

Number of infectious disease notifications: 0

Number of service requests: 1

4. THIRD COUNTRY IMPORT CONTROLS

	FOOD	FEED	PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION
Manifests Checked	100%	100%	100%	100%
Consignments	75	0	2	25
Documentary Checks	0	0	2	25
Identity Checks	0	0	0	0
Physical Checks	0	0	0	0
Samples	0	0	0	0
Notices Served	0	0	0	0

Total manifests checked: **61**

5. THIRD COUNTRY FOOD, FEED AND RELEVANT PRODUCTS ENTERING TEESPORT

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Coffee	Colombia, Brazil, Indonesia, Kenya, Peru
Peppers	Turkey
Wine	South Africa, Chile, Australia, New Zealand
Vodka	Russia
Tea	India, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Rwanda
Citric Acid	China
Demerara Rum	Guyana
Tomato	China
Rice	USA

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
None	

NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Used Cooking Oil (biofuel)	Qatar, Malaysia, Singapore, South Africa, Dubai, China
Animal Fats (biofuel)	Egypt
Foodstuffs (plastic containers)	Turkey

PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Plastic Kitchen ware including trays, turners, mashers etc.	China and Hong Kong

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

To: Chair and Members of the joint board

Report for the month of: **January 2016**

1. ACTIVITY SUMMARY - SHIPS

LOCAL AUTHORITY	NO OF SHIPS ENTERING THE PORT	SHIP SANITATION CONTROL	SHIP SANITATION EXEMPTION	ROUTINE SHIP INSPECTIONS
Hartlepool	0	0	0	0
Middlesbrough	16	0	2	0
Redcar	152	1	4	0
Stockton	140	0	4	1
Total	308	1	10	1

2. SAMPLING

Number of water samples taken and submitted for examination: 24

3. INFECTIOUS DISEASE NOTIFICATIONS/ INCIDENTS

Number of infectious disease notifications: 0

Number of service requests: 0

4. THIRD COUNTRY IMPORT CONTROLS

	FOOD	FEED	PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION
Manifests Checked	100%	100%	100%	100%
Consignments	63	1	1	21
Documentary Checks	0	0	1	0
Identity Checks	0	0	0	0
Physical Checks	0	0	0	0
Samples	0	0	0	0
Notices Served	0	0	0	0

Total manifests checked: **65**

5. THIRD COUNTRY FOOD, FEED AND RELEVANT PRODUCTS ENTERING TEESPORT

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Vodka	Russia
Rum	Guyana
Wine	New Zealand, South Africa, Australia, Chile
Tea	India, Kenya, Rwanda, Indonesia, Malawi, Vietnam
Brazil Nut Oil	Peru
Pickled Peppers	Turkey
Coffee	Brazil, Kenya, Indonesia
Tomato Paste	China
Citric Acid	China

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Clinoptilolite	Turkey

NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Used Cooking Oil	Malaysia, Singapore, Egypt, South Africa, Dubai, Australia, Indonesia, China
Buffalo Horse Hair	India

PLASTIC KITCHENWARE	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Plastic Kitchen ware including trays, turners, mashers etc.	China and Hong Kong

River Tees Port Health Authority

2015-16 Financial Position Update



Public

To: RTPHA **Date:** 4 March 2016
From: Deputy Treasurer **Decision:** For Information
Portfolio: Health & Social Well Being
Outcome: Business Improvement

1 What is the purpose of this report?

- 1.1 To update Members on the financial position of the Authority at the end of January 2016 and to highlight any variances against the 2015-16 approved budget.

2 What is the background to this report?

- 2.1 At its meeting on 5 December 2014 the Authority approved a net budget position of £112,675 funded by the following contributions from the riparian councils of:

Middlesbrough £16,901
Stockton £34,929
Redcar & Cleveland £58,591
Hartlepool £ 2,254

- 2.2 The budget for 2015/16 was set based upon the RTPHA service plan set out by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, who have been managing the delivery of port health Services since the reorganisation of the Authority's service provisions implemented from August 2010. The budget has been influenced by the Council's Shaping Our Future project which reviewed all service delivery in the Council and included RTPHA. The net budget was reduced from £142,500 to £107,590 at the start of 2014/15 as a result of the review and the need for contributing authorities to make budget savings within the medium term. The 2015/16 budget is based on the new approach to delivering services and has been updated to the current price base.
- 2.3 **Appendix 1** shows the operating budget analysed by individual type of spending against the actual to date expenditure and income.

2.4 A summary of the financial position given in Appendix 1 is set out in the table below:

PERIOD 10 ACTUAL AND PROJECTED OUTTURN 2015/16

	Original Budget 2015/16	Actual as at Period 10 31/01/16	Projected Outturn 2015/16	Variance Budget to Outturn
<u>Expenditure</u>				
Employee Costs	86,325	68,860	85,267	-1,058
Other operating Costs	53,700	6,943	47,450	-6,250
Total Costs	<u>140,025</u>	<u>75,803</u>	<u>132,717</u>	<u>-7,308</u>
Income	-27,350	-23,417	-30,000	-2,650
Net Expenditure	<u>112,675</u>	<u>52,386</u>	<u>102,717</u>	<u>-9,958</u>
<u>Funding</u>				
Redcar & Cleveland BC	58,591	27,240	53,413	-5,178
Stockton BC	34,929	16,240	31,842	-3,087
Middlesbrough BC	16,901	7,858	15,408	-1,493
Hartlepool	2,254	1,048	2,054	-200
Total Funding	<u>112,675</u>	<u>52,386</u>	<u>102,717</u>	<u>-9,958</u>
Net	0	0	0	0

2.5 Key Issues

The major variances expected between the projected outturn position for 2015/16 and the original budget approved in December 2014 are as follows:

Staff Costs: Underspent by £1.1k – Staffing numbers as budgeted but the small underspend reflects savings on overtime and car allowances.

Other operating costs: Underspent by £6.3k – The under budget position represents savings in two main areas: £4k expected saving on professional fees due a reduction in the level of import activity through the port; and £1.5k due to training to the riparian authorities being provided internally rather than via external providers. There are some small underspends on other non-pay budgets also which make up the remainder.

Income: Over Budget by £2.6k – Income to date is above the budget profile for the current financial year for both ship sanitation certificates and miscellaneous fees & charges. This is expected to continue for the remainder of the year and the forecast outturn was increased at Quarter 2 to reflect this position. Income in previous years has nearly always been above budget and reflects the previous prudent approach to budgeting for this area.

- 2.6 **Overall Financial Position** – Based on the projected outturn figures the Authority would expect to have an in-year surplus of £10k for the 2015/16 financial year. This is a combination of expenditure savings due to changes in assumptions from when the budget was originally set and income generation above the base budget position. This would be an excellent achievement given the sizeable reduction in the budget position from 2014/15 onwards when savings in excess of 20% were made. There currently appears to be no need to make a call on the authority's general reserves in this financial year. Any saving will be refunded to contributing authorities in the proportions outlined in Appendix 1.

3 Who will this benefit and how?

- 3.1 Timely, accurate and up to date financial information is a key characteristic of good corporate governance. Members need to have these details and be aware of any issues against the agreed budget when making decisions on service delivery, staffing, training and other regulatory matters.
- 3.2 Additionally a well managed and responsive service which uses its financial assets properly will create and maintain a better relationship with external stakeholders.

4 Who have we consulted?

- 4.1 The original budget was set in consultation with Members, the Treasurer and Clerk for the Authority, and officers of the riparian authorities.
- 4.2 The financial position and any financial issues in year have been discussed between senior officers of the riparian authorities and finance staff as required. In general there are no pressing financial issues or problems as a result of this report. Any key issues would be discussed and consulted with the Chair and Vice Chair as appropriate.

5 How will it deliver our priorities and improve our performance?

- 5.1 It will ensure that the Authority is able to discharge its functions on behalf of the riparian authorities.
- 5.2 Finance is an integral element in delivering quality services and improving performance.

6 What are the resource implications (financial, human resources)?

- 6.1 The resource implications are outlined in the main body of the report.

7 What will be the impact on equality and diversity?

- 7.1 There are no equality and diversity issues as part of this report.

8 What will be the impact on our carbon footprint?

8.1 There is no direct impact on the carbon footprint as a result of this report.

9 Are there any legal considerations?

9.1 There are no specific legal issues to consider as a result of this report.

10 What are the risks involved?

10.1 The information in the report acts as a management control to ensure that the financial activities of the Authority are being managed properly and resources used effectively. Without setting a budget and providing monitoring information the Authority would not be able to ensure that value for money is secured in pursuit of its objectives. Also decisions made may be poorly informed or wrong decision made without accurate and up to date information.

11 What options have been considered?

11.1 The report is predominantly for information purposes although there are always options as to whether or not to use resources for a particular purpose.

12 Recommendations

12.1 It is recommended that:

- 1) Members discuss the financial position of the Authority as set out in Appendix 1 and question any variances from the original budget as appropriate.

13 Appendices and further information

13.1 Appendix 1 – Budget detail and Projected Outturn position for 2015/16.

14 Background papers

14.1 Budget Report 2015/16 & Medium Term Financial Plan – submitted to meeting on 05/12/2014.

15 Contact officer

Name: Justin Weston, Deputy Treasurer to RTPHA
Address: Financial Services, Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Kirkleatham Street, Redcar, TS10 1RT
Telephone: (01642) 444306
Email: Justin.weston@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

Briefing Note

River Tees Port Health Authority Level of General Reserves



To: River Tees Port Health Authority

Date: 4 March 2016

From: Justin Weston, Deputy Treasurer

Ref:

1.0 Purpose

To give further information to Members on the level of General Reserves to be held by the River Tees Port Health Authority (RTPHA).

2.0 Summary

The current level of general reserves held by RTPHA is £40,000.

This amount has been held since the reserve was created at the end of 2011/12 and was as a result of a large underspending against budget in that financial year. The cash funds are held by Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council, as lead authority for delivering port health services to the Tees Valley area, with all financial transactions for RTPHA going through the Council's bank account.

No call has been made on these reserves in the subsequent three financial years with refunds being made to the four contributing (riparian) authorities at each year end. The likelihood of a call being made on these resources has increased in recent years with the restructuring of the service and the budget reducing from £143k to £108k from 2014/15. However an under budget position is again predicted for the current year, 2015/16.

It is good financial practice for an organisation to hold reserves. The initial reserve was created to act as a buffer and give some financial protection to the four local authorities, from one off costs i.e. redundancy costs, a temporary reduction in income; or to resource a small capital investment project to create service delivery efficiencies.

Discussions with Members at recent RTPHA meetings have suggested that the level of general reserves at almost 40% of the net budget requirement is too high. The Service could operate with lower reserves with little financial risk given that the annual budget review process could replenish any reduction in reserves from a given financial year's performance.

Normal practice on the level of general reserves indicates that these should be set based on a quantification of the key risks facing the organisation and the probability that these risks will be realised. In forming a view around what a prudent level of reserves for RTPHA may be appropriate, discussions have been held with the four riparian authorities and their senior port health representatives. The key risks were agreed to be as follows:

Income: A major shortfall on income due to lower than expected activity and testing.

The current budget for income is £30,000 so a poor performing year could result in a shortfall of £10,000 with a very poor year being a shortfall of £20,000.

Expenditure: A number of unexpected costs above budget occurring in any one financial year.

As most costs are staffing or service level agreement based, the amount of costs falling outside these core budgets are quite small, around £20,000. A bad year for costs could be considered as above budget unexpected costs of £5,000, with a very bad year for these type of costs being say £10,000 above budget.

Malpractice: The worst potential financial position that could face the Authority would be a legal claim for malpractice against a member of RTPHA staff, or a function delivered on behalf of RTHA by riparian authority staff. Quantification of this scenario is extremely difficult given the various unknowns involved. Although the financial consequences of this type of situation would be severe (i.e. significantly above the resources held by the Authority), the chances of it happening are very remote given the systems and processes followed by RTPHA officers and their skills, knowledge and experience. If this did happen reference would need to be made back to the riparian authorities to fund any potential legal costs. As a result of the various uncertainties, it is felt prudent not to cater for this type of eventuality in the Authority's general reserves.

Given these considerations, and the discussions at previous meetings, the options available to Members are as follows:

- 1) Retain level of general reserves at £40,000;
- 2) Reduce the level of general reserves to £30,000;
- 3) Reduce the level of general reserves to £20,000; and
- 4) Reduce the level of general reserves to £10,000.

Any reduction in reserves will result in a refund to individual local authorities. These amounts are set out at Appendix 1 based on the current funding model.

In order to help Members form a view on this issue, it is important to link the level of reserves held to the financial risks outlined above.

A reserve of £10,000 would provide financial protection against one financial year's worth of poor performance on income, or one/two bad years on unbudgeted costs but not these happening together;

A reserve of £20,000 would provide financial protection against one financial years' worth of income reductions and one/two years' worth of unbudgeted costs happening together, or a worst case scenario year on income;

A reserve of £30,000 would provide financial protection for the worst possible scenarios on both income and expenditure happening together in one financial year, or two to three financial years' worth of poor performance on both income and expenditure; and

A reserve of £40,000 would provide the most comfort and probably give two financial years' worth of financial protection on significant income reductions and unbudgeted for costs, or the MTFP period to 2019/2020 for average losses for each of the four years.

The higher the level of reserves held by the Authority, the more scope there would be for capital investment or service transformation in later financial years.

3.0 Conclusions/recommendations

The level of general reserves is a key decision for the RTPHA authority to consider each and every financial year. Is the current level of reserves at £40,000 too high?

Members to consider the information set out above and the various scenarios given and to recommend a level of general reserves for the 2016/17 financial year.

Level of Refunds to Riparian Authorities based on a reduction in general reserves

Level of Reserves	Refund due by reduction in reserves			
	RCBC	SBC	MBC	HBC
	52%	31%	15%	2%
£40,000	£0	£0	£0	£0
£30,000	£5,200	£3,100	£1,500	£200
£20,000	£10,400	£6,200	£3,000	£400
£10,000	£15,600	£9,300	£4,500	£600



Briefing Note

River Tees Port Health Authority Fees & Charges

To: River Tees Port Health Authority **Date:** 4 March 2016
From: Justin Weston, Deputy Treasurer **Ref:**
 Vikki Bell, Principal Environmental Health Officer

1.0 Purpose

To update Members on the range of Fees & Charges used by the Authority in delivering its services and to show that these charges are fit for purpose and appropriate.

To review the income budget for the Authority in further detail (in the context of the Fees & Charges information) and to consider how this can be monitored in future finance reports.

2.0 Summary

River Tees Port Health Authority (RTPHA) can make a range of inspection and sampling charges on ships entering Tees Port and on importers who are bringing feed, food and relevant products through the port and into the UK. Some of these are statutory charges which are set by national agencies and others are discretionary where the port health authority can levy its own charge.

Any discretionary fees are calculated based on a full cost recovery basis, including any on-costs. However these have not been reviewed for two years and it is now becoming increasingly important to compare these against current staffing costs and also against other comparator ports.

2.1 Fee categories charged by RTPHA

Appendix 1 provides details of the current charges levied by the Authority for the services it provides, the proposed charges for the 2016/2017 financial year and compares these prices against two comparator port health authorities (Suffolk Coastal and Grimsby and Immingham). Below is a description of each type of fee charged by the Authority, with details of how these have been set and the level of income/volumes generated over the last three financial years.

Export Certificate – When foodstuffs are exported from the UK, there is an expectation by many countries (outside of the EU) that an export certificate will accompany the goods. This certificate confirms the identity of the products and that they have been produced and comply with the appropriate hygiene requirements. Although export certificates are generally issued by officials (for example by Environmental Health Officers or Official Veterinarians) at the establishment where they originate, suitably qualified port health officers can carry out the inspection of the products and issue the certificate. Where this is a requirement of the country of export the agent/exporter usually must provide 48 hours' of their requirement for inspection.

This charge is discretionary and set based on the officer time involved and overheads. The current charge is proposed to be increased to £68.50 from 1st April 2016. Volumes are generally low and no export certificates have been issued in the 2015/2016 financial year to date.

Water Sampling – The microbiological quality and composition of water on ships, particularly water used for drinking, cooking and washing must be routinely monitored. This service is carried out by port health authorities generally at the request of the Master

or agent. Multiple samples may need to be taken depending on the type and size of vessel. Samples are routinely examined for biological indicator organisms and legionella.

This charge is again discretionary but is based on officer time plus the cost of examining or analysing the sample. Where more than one sample is taken on the same vessel, these additional samples are cheaper as they involve less officer time and are mainly based on the cost of the examination or analysis.

The proposed increases in sampling charges for 2016/2017 are to reflect the hourly rate of the officers carrying out this service. Water sampling generates between £2,000 to £3,000 annually.

The Authority does not charge when water samples are taken as part of an investigation or when there is a public health risk. These samples are examined as part of the Authority's funding allocation from Public Health England.

High Risk Products – A 'high-risk' product is feed or food that is either a known or an emerging risk to public health.

RTPHA is a Designated Point of Entry for Commission Regulation (EC) No. 669/2009 (as amended) which puts controls in place for known high risk food and feed products not of animal origin from specific countries to reduce known human or animal health risks. The types of products which are included in this regulation are vegetables, cereals, nuts, mushrooms, fruit and their products. The Regulation is updated on quarterly basis to reflect changes in the food and feed that the Commission considers high risk and the types and frequency of the controls which must be carried out.

RTPHA is also a Designated Point of Import (DPI) for Commission Regulation (EC) No 884/2014 (previously Commission Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009) which imposes controls for aflatoxin contamination in feed and food. Aflatoxin relates to any class of toxic compounds produced by certain moulds found in food or feed, which can cause liver damage and cancer. They appear in the food chain as a result of a fungal infection of crops, either directly being eaten by humans or being used as livestock feed. Examples of the type of food affected are certain ground nuts, brazil nuts, hazelnuts, almonds or pistachios.

To fulfil its status as a DPE and a DPI, RTPHA must carry out official controls in accordance with the above regulations. These controls are documentary checks, identity and physical checks; and sampling for analysis or examination at a frequency stipulated in the legislation. Consignments are detained until all relevant checks and controls have been carried out. Where the consignment is found to be unsatisfactory, enforcement action must be taken. The regulations allow port health authorities to recover the costs of official controls from the food or feed business operator.

These charges, which are again discretionary, are made based on checking the prescribed documents, the cost of obtaining and analysing samples and when action is taken as a result of a consignment being found to be non-compliant. These are based on the officer time involved and the Public Analyst fees. The charges proposed for 2016/2017 are broadly in line with those being charged but now reflect current charge out rates for the officers involved.

The volume of high risk products (including aflatoxins) being imported has been reasonably low in recent years with less than £1,000 being charged over each of the last three financial years.

Plastics Kitchenware – Plastic kitchenware is certain polyamide and melamine plastic products manufactured in the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong.

RTPHA is a First Point of Introduction for Commission Regulation (EU) No 284/2011 which imposes controls on plastic kitchenware from China and Hong Kong. The regulations require that each consignment must be accompanied by a declaration and a laboratory report confirming that it meets the requirements for the release of primary aromatic amines and formaldehyde. A documentary check must be carried out on all consignments and an identity and physical check, including sampling for laboratory analysis on 10% of consignments.

The regulations allow port health authorities to charge importers for carrying out official controls on plastic kitchenware. Similar to the fees charged for high risk products there is an initial document check involved (depending on the number of reports involved), followed by sampling and analysis fees if required and a non-compliance fee if appropriate. Again, these charges are based on the staff time incurred and any overheads. There is a slight increase in the price proposed for these charges based on current staff costs.

Volumes have been high in recent years with total income for testing reaching around £17k per annum in 2013/2014. However volumes have dropped in recent years as importers (generally supermarkets) are using alternative points of entry and sourcing alternative products which are not subject to import controls. The expected income in 2015/2016 is around £5k.

Organic Certificates – All consignments of organic origin must be notified to the port health authority 24 hours before arrival. A certificate of inspection must accompany each consignment. Original Certificates relating to the consignment must be presented for endorsement and accompanied with a payment of £45. This charge is set nationally by Defra. Volumes are relatively low with less than ten payments made in each of the last three financial years.

Ship Sanitation Exemption and Control Certificates – Under the International Health Regulations 2005 seagoing vessels must receive a ship sanitation inspection at least every six months. This inspection includes a food safety element, an assessment of infectious disease controls, assessment of the ship's pest free status and sanitation and waste disposal facilities. Welfare provisions for crews are also considered during an inspection. All requests for a ship sanitation inspection must be fulfilled.

The fees for this are set nationally by APHA and are based on the tonnage of the vessel inspected. The bulk of the income generated by RTPHA (circa £20k to £25k) comes from this source.

Environmental Permits – Port health authorities must by law regulate certain types of activity to reduce any pollution they may cause and in particular to improve air quality. Businesses which operate these activities must have a permit. Permits detail how the pollution is to be minimised. River Tees Port Health Authority currently regulates five Part B processes within its jurisdiction.

Permit charges are set nationally by Defra with application and subsistence fees payable. Annual amounts received tend to be between £2k and £3k per annum.

2.2 **Budgetary Position on Fees & Charges**

As part of the port health budget there is an income target of £30,000 each financial year. This is split £22,500 for ship sanitation inspections and £7,500 for other fees and charges. As the budget has been set on a fairly prudent basis previously, the income actually received has been above this level, often exceeding £40,000. Any surplus has been used as a buffer to supplement the budget position and has ended up being refunded to contributing authorities with the budget being underspent each year.

As little analysis of the actual income position over the financial year has been provided, it has been difficult to monitor the exact reasons why income has been over-recovered in previous years. It is hoped that by giving Members more detail on the actual charges being used and more involvement in the fee setting process, this can then be used to develop what data is included in the budget monitoring process going forward to show any variances in terms of the prices and volumes actually experienced.

Below is a table that shows the actual income generated by the Authority during the last three financial years across the various fee headings outlined above:

Type of Fee	Financial Year		
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
			(as at 17.02.16)
Ship Sanitation Certificates	£22,422.00	£27,390.00	£17,698.00
Water Sampling	£2,535.81	£3,279.12	£2,187.92
Organics Certificates	£360.00	£360.00	£270.00
Export Certificates	£0.00	£614.90	£0.00
High Risk products (including aflatoxins)	£675.00	£405.00	£585.00
Plastics	£16,680.90	£9,498.20	£4,783.02
Environmental Permits	£2,565.33	£2,369.00	£1,478.00
	£45,239.04	£43,916.22	£27,001.94
Budget of £27,350 in place for 2013/14 and 2014/15. Budget increased to £30,000 during 2015/16 financial year.			

This analysis gives a better quality of information to both Officers and Members and it seems advantageous to analyse income on this basis going forwards and to give data on activity levels for the various fees and charges involved.

With Members agreement, future finance reports starting with the 2015/2016 financial outturn position will report on income performance against these headings. There will also be a need to breakdown the budget for 2015/2016 and future years to this level and also to make assumptions about the level of activity for each type of fee to identify any volume variances during the financial year.

3.0 Conclusions/recommendations

- 3.1 The level of income generated by the Authority is a key element of the budget setting and monitoring process. It has a direct influence on the financial performance of the service. Most of these charges are discretionary and very variable in nature and there needs to be more transparent reporting of activity levels and the link to the actual level of income received during the financial year.

Income is also a key item in determining what the level of general reserves should be as one off movements in income levels can be catered for through transfers to/from reserves to ensuring that a balanced financial position occurs at each financial year end. (see briefing note also on this agenda for more details).

3.2 Recommendations

Members to note the information set out above on the various fees and charges operated by the Authority and the basis on which these are set.

Members to note the actual income levels generated during the last three financial years and the significance or otherwise of certain fee categories.

Members to agree that a formal approach to setting Fees and Charges is approved annually and this is done at the same time as setting the budget for the next financial year (each December meeting of the Authority).

Members to approve that more detailed reporting is included within the Financial Position reports each quarter on income achieved against budget in line with the categories set out above.

Port Health – List of Fees & Charges

	RTPHA	RTPHA (proposed new fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Export Certificate	£55.90	£68.50	N/A	£100.00

Water Sampling	RTPHA	RTPHA (proposed new fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Bacteriological Samples	£40.74: 1st Sample £26.86: additional sample	£65.53: 1 st sample £36.27: additional sample	£82.80: 1st Sample £41.40: additional samples	£100.00
Legionella Samples	£52.49: 1st Sample £36.87: additional samples	£86.44: 1 st Sample £57.18: additional sample	As above	£100.00
Chemical Samples	Dependant on test	Dependant on test	Dependant on test	Dependant on test

High Risk Products	RTPHA	RTPHA (Proposed new fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Document Check	£45.00	£48.75	£52.09	£50.00
Sampling Fee	£120.00	£117.00	£71.07: less than 10 £96.10: between 10 and 59 £129.11: over 60 plus analyst cost	
Analytical Fees	Dependent on product and analysis required	Dependent on product and analysis required	Dependent on product and analysis required	
Non-compliance	£100.00	£117.00	£114.80	

Aflatoxin Risk Products	RTPHA	RTPHA (new proposed fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Document Check	£45.00	£48.750	N/A	£45.00
Sampling Fee	£120.00	£117.00	N/A	
Analytical Fee	Dependent on product and analysis required	Dependent on product and analysis required	N/A	
Non-compliance	£100.00	£117.00	N/A	

Plastics	RTPHA	RTPHA (new proposed fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Document Check	£34.00: up to 5 reports £8.50: each additional report	£39.00: up to 5 reports £9.75: each additional report	£44.66: between 1 - 5 £59.69: between 6 - 10 £82.85: between 11 - 20 £104.77: over 21	£45.00
Sampling Fee	£44.17	£66.52	£67.32	£67.32
Analytical Fee	£600.00: 5 day £395.00: 10 day	£600.00: 5 day £395.00: 10 day	£415.00	£415.00
Non-compliance	£71.19	£97.52	£114.80	£114.80

Organics	RTPHA	RTPHA (new proposed fee)	Suffolk	Grimsby and Immingham
Document Check (Standard Charge set by DEFRA))	£45.00	£45.00	£45.00	N/A

Ship Sanitation Inspections - Standard National Charge set by APHA. Reviewed annually.

Gross Tonnage	Fee 2015/2016	Fee 2016/2017
Up to 1,000	£76.00	£80.00
1,001 to 3000	£112.00	£115.00
3,001 to 10,000	£172.00	£175.00
10,001 to 20,00	£228.00	£230.00
20,001 to 30,000	£290.00	£295.00

Over 30,000	£345.00	£350.00
Extensions		£50.00

Extra charges, based on actual costs may be added for expenses incurred, such as launch hire; out-of-hours duty; travel and extended or re-inspections of ships due to 'Control Measures'.

Environmental Permitting - Standard National Charge set by DEFRA

Process / Subsistence Fee	Fee 2015/2016	Fee 2016/2017
Standard Process Low (Part B only)	Application fee: £1579.00 Subsistence fee: £739.00	Application fee: £1579.00 Subsistence fee: £739.00
Small Waste Oil Burners	Application fee: £148.00 Subsistence fee: £76.00	N/A* - see explanation below

* Part 6 paragraph (2) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 states that port health authorities are the enforcing authority in relation to Part B processes in their jurisdiction. From April 6th 2016 small waste oil burning processes become small waste incineration processes which are classified as Part A2 processes which are regulated by the Local Authority.