



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

23 November 2015

Dear Councillor,

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY: FRIDAY 4 DECEMBER 2015

Would you please note that a meeting of the River Tees Port Health Authority will be held on Friday 4 December 2015 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 September 2015	3 - 5
4. Reports of the Corporate Director of Corporate Services:	
a. 2015/16 Financial Position Update	6 – 10
b. Revenue Budget 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Plan	11 - 18
5. Reports of the Corporate Director of People Services:	
a. Corporate Risk and Opportunity Register	19 – 31
b. Performance Summary for RTPHA Aug-Oct 215	32 – 38
c. RTPHA Order	Verbal Report

6. Any items that the Chair certifies as urgent.

Yours sincerely

S NEWTON
CLERK TO THE AUTHORITY

4 September 2015

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

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

PRESENT Councillor Mrs Forster (Chair),
Councillors D Brown, W Davies, S Dean, B
Dennis, J Goodchild, L Lewis, P Purvis and
Thomson.

OFFICIALS V Bell, L Evans, S Fenwick and J Weston
(Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council) and
Dr P Acheson - Port Medical Officer.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were submitted on behalf of Councillors
Faulks, E Johnson, J Mason, Mrs J O'Donnell, M Perry, S Tempest and S
Thomas.

15. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2015 be
confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

16. **EXTERNAL AUDITORS – REPORT ON 2014-15 ACCOUNTS**

The Treasurer presented a report outlining the external auditors' findings
based upon their work on the 2014/15 final accounts for the Authority.
Members were advised that the external auditors had not highlighted any
matters of concern which was an indication of the financial robustness of
the systems involved.

RESOLVED that after consideration of the external auditors report the
annual return for 2014/15 be approved.

17. **2015/16 FINANCIAL POSITION UPDATE**

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

4 September 2015

18. **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 of amendments in sections three and five of the register which related to legislative requirements for accounting and audit and the standards to which internal auditing was undertaken.

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

19. **RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY ENFORCEMENT POLICY 2015**

The Corporate Director of People Services advised that the Authority must have an enforcement policy to ensure that it acts fairly and consistently when taking enforcement action and to ensure that it has considered all relevant legislation and guidance.

The first enforcement policy was produced in June 2013 when Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council became the managing authority, at that time the policy formed part of an overall policy for the former Regulatory Services section within the Area Management Directorate. Members were advised that the policy that was presented related solely to the enforcement activities of the River Tees Port Health Authority.

RESOLVED that the Enforcement Policy 2015 be approved.

20. **FEED IMPORT CONTROLS AT POINTS OF ENTRY IN THE NETSA REGION**

The Corporate Director of People Services presented a report on the 'Feed Import Controls at Points of Entry in the NETSA Region' project which had been carried out by Lisa Evans, Trading Standards Officer, for the River Tees Port Health Authority during 2014-2015.

Members were advised that River Tees Port Health Authority was represented at the North East Trading Standards Association (NETSA) group, which considered the delivery of feed law enforcement responsibilities in the region. The group was awarded grant funding from the Food Standards Agency which was co-ordinated by the National Trading Standards Board to carry out a review of the arrangements in place to control third country imported feed. This Authority was asked to carry out the project on behalf of NETSA and grant funding was provided for the project which was carried out during 2014 and 2015.

4 September 2015

RESOLVED that the information and recommendations in the report be noted.

21. **PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY MAY TO JULY 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 May to July 2015. - **NOTED.**

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

The Corporate Director of People Services advised Members that the River Tees Port Health Authority Order was still being reviewed by the Department of Health. - **NOTED.**

23. **PORT MEDICAL OFFICER**

Dr P Acheson, the Port Medical Officer advised Members that he had been granted secondment to Stockton-on Tees Borough Council for a period of six months. - **NOTED**

River Tees Port Health Authority

2015-16 Financial Position Update



Public

To: RTPHA **Date:** 4 December 2015
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 October 2015 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 7 ACTUAL AND PROJECTED OUTTURN 2015/16

	Original Budget 2015/16	Actual as at Period 07 31/10/2015	Projected Outturn 2015/16	Variance Budget to Outturn
<u>Expenditure</u>				
Employee Costs	86,325	47,996	85,557	-768
Other operating Costs	53,700	4,839	48,450	-5,250
Total Costs	140,025	52,835	134,007	-6,018
Income	-27,350	-18,340	-30,000	-2,650
Net Expenditure	112,675	34,495	104,007	-8,668
<u>Funding</u>				
Redcar & Cleveland BC	58,591	17,938	54,084	-4,507
Stockton BC	34,929	10,693	32,242	-2,687
Middlesbrough BC	16,901	5,174	15,601	-1,300
Hartlepool	2,254	690	2,080	-174
Total Funding	112,675	34,495	104,007	-8,668
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 £0.8k – Staffing numbers as budgeted but the small underspend reflects savings on overtime and car allowances.

Other operating costs: Underspent by £5.3k – 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 £1k due to training to the riparian authorities being provided internally rather than via external providers. Most non-pay budgets are in line with their budget provision.

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 has been increased to reflect this position.

- 2.6 **Overall Financial Position** – Based on the projected outturn figures the Authority would expect to have an in-year surplus of £8.7k 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 of £40,000. Any saving in-year could be either added to the overall reserves position or refunded to contributing local authorities.

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

RIVER TEES PORT HEALTH AUTHORITY

BUDGET MONITORING POSITION 2015/16
POSITION AT END OF OCTOBER 2015

		Budget 2015/16	Actual as at 31/10/15	Projected Outturn 2015/16
R1000	Basic Pay	65,450	38,241	65,556
R1001	NI Contributions	5,000	2,832	4,950
R1003	Overtime	800	421	600
R1005	SSP	0	0	0
R1006	Superann Contributions	10,000	5,838	9,951
R1063	Other Allowances	2,575	0	2,500
R3400	Car Allowances	2,500	665	2,000
		86,325	47,996	85,557
R4000	Tools & Equipment Purchase	500	95	300
R1650	Training Expenses	2,500	700	1,500
R4200	Clothing, Uniforms & Laundry	250	119	400
R4400	Services - Professional Fees	44,000	2,799	40,000
R4980	General Supplies & Services	500	0	0
R4507	Mobile Phones	50	162	300
R4531	Computer Software	4,000	749	4,000
R4300	Printing & Stationery	200	215	250
R4305	Photocopier Usage	50	0	50
R4701	Subscriptions	1,000	0	1,000
R4960	Public Liability Insurance	650	0	650
		53,700	4,839	48,450
R9305	Environmental Health	22,350	14,337	24,000
R9308	Misc Fees & Charges	5,000	4,004	6,000
		27,350	18,341	30,000
	Total Payable	112,675	34,495	104,007

	Budget 2015/16	Actual as at 31/10/15	Projected Outturn 2015/16
Contributions required based on agreed Option 2c) as per Board meeting 26/3/2010			
Middlesbrough 15%	16,901	5,174	15,601
Stockton 31%	34,929	10,693	32,242
Hartlepool 2%	2,254	690	2,080
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council 52%	58,591	17,937	54,084
	112,675	34,495	104,007



Member Report

Budget 2016-17 and Medium Term Financial Plan

Public

To:	River Tees Port Health Authority	Date:	4 December 2015
From:	Corporate Director of Corporate Resources	Decision type:	For information
Portfolio:	Health and Social Wellbeing	Forward Plan reference:	
Outcome:	Business improvement		
Ward(s):			

1 What is the purpose of this report?

- 1.1 To recommend 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.
- 1.2 To consider this budget in the context of a Medium Term Financial Plan for the Authority covering the period 2016/17 to 2019/20. This will assist the Authority with its own planning processes but will ensure that there is clarity about the resources needed from individual local authorities over the medium term.

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 for 2015/16 funded by the following contributions from the riparian councils of:

Middlesbrough £16,901
 Stockton £34,929
 Redcar & Cleveland £58,951
 Hartlepool £ 2,254

- 2.2 The budget for 2015/16 was set based upon the RTPHA service plan set out by Redcar and Cleveland Council (RCBC), who have been managing the delivery of port health Services since the reorganisation of the Authority's service provisions implemented from August 2010. Members will recall that as part of RCBC's response to the government's austerity measures, a total review of service delivery (known as Shaping Our Future) was undertaken prior to setting the 2014/15 budget. The impact on the RTPHA, was for the service to be re-organised by RCBC under the 'healthy lifestyles' theme with a closer link to the newly transferred Public Health function. This also resulted in a much reduced base budget position with recurring budget savings for all local authorities involved.
- 2.3 The outturn position for 2015/16 is expected to be underspent by just under £9,000 against the approved net budget position. The Authority should not need to use any of its general reserves of £40,000 and these will be available to either support

future budget plans or to be refunded to local authorities as appropriate .

Budget for 2016/17

- 2.4 As Members will be aware the financial landscape facing local authorities at present is extremely challenging and as a result change programmes and significant cost cutting measures are being introduced to ensure the financial sustainability of these organisations over the medium to long term. The development of the 2016/17 budget for the Port Health Authority is therefore set in this context and is constrained by affordability issues for the contributing authorities.
- 2.5 Since RCBC has taken the lead role on the port health function, efficiencies have been achieved by co-locating this team with the Council's environmental health (commercial) team. This principle was used to further refine the staffing resource needed as part of the shaping our future proposals to deliver the port health function. This has reduced the staff costs budget needed for the service.
- 2.6 As part of shaping our future an additional exercise was undertaken to estimate how much time is needed for each specific duty and whether it can be done within the staffing time allocated. The Principal Environmental Health officer did this zero based review at the time of setting the 2014/15 budget and is still confident that the service can continue to be delivered to a high quality within the current budget envelope.
- 2.7 All non-pay budgets for 2016/17 have also been reviewed for necessity and only included where there is a clear business need for this expenditure to be undertaken. The total non-pay budget has reduced to £48,450 with the vast majority of this on the service level agreement for professional services between RCBC and the Port Health Authority. This includes the staffing recharge for the Principal Environmental Health Officer and various central support costs including finance and democratic services.
- 2.8 The budget for professional fees in 2016/17 is reduced year on year as a result of a decline in the level of analysts' fees being incurred. The volume of plastic kitchenware being imported from China and Hong Kong by large supermarket chains has declined in the last two years. This is because of the controls that must be carried out on these products and this is expected to continue for the foreseeable future.
- 2.9 The budget for income has also been increased from £27,350 to £30,000 to reflect current volumes on ship sanitation certificates and environmental health testing, consistent with the 2015/16 position. There is also slightly increased demand for water sampling and environmental permitting inspections at present. These demand levels are expected to be reasonably static over the medium term.
- 2.10 The net cost of delivering the service for 2016/17 is estimated to be £104,750, a decrease of £8,925 on the current year's approved budget. This decrease reflects a better understanding of the budgets needed to operate the service over the past two financial years, particularly on non-pay budgets and on income. There is also an acknowledgement of the difficult financial positions being experienced by contributing authorities and an overall strategic drive to achieve value for money for this investment.

- 2.11 The current amount held by the Authority in its general reserves is £40,000 and this amount is held as a buffer and acts as protection against unexpected or unbudgeted costs. If the authority was overspent in any particular financial year it would have to ask for additional contributions from each of the four local authorities to balance its budget. The amount is also the equivalent of being able to run the service for additional 4 to 5 months without any contributions being required.
- 2.12 The £40,000 general reserve was set up in 2011/12 from a large underspend in that particular financial year. This was just after the reorganisation of the service to an RCBC lead and reflected some overcapacity in the previous budget, but also a need to have some level of protection in place with local authority budgets facing severe cuts. However no calls have been made against general reserves during the last four financial years.
- 2.13 It is good practice to review the level of reserves at the start of each financial year and compare these against the risks faced by the Authority. The budget being recommended for the 2016/17 financial year is another large reduction on top of previous significant efficiencies made within the port health service. The budget is very lean as a result of this and has little capacity for unforeseen costs. Also the main risk to the service in financial terms relates to a legal claim for malpractice against the officers employed by RTPHA. Although insurance cover is held through the Council, this may not cover all eventualities and therefore some financial reserves should be held as a contingency.
- 2.14 As both of these risks (an overspend against budget and legal action not covered by insurance) are difficult to estimate and to assess a probability for, it is recommended that reserves are maintained at their current level. One option would be to increase reserves further given the expected underspend. Members' views are sought on this and their comfort in the current level of reserves held.

Medium Term Financial Plan

- 2.15 At previous meetings there has been discussion around the development of a Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for the Authority and how this could help members in the management/stewardship of the budget position and their financial resources. This was first considered by Members at their December 2013 meeting and this resulted in the formal presentation and approval of the Authority's first MTFP in December 2014.
- 2.16 There are a number of benefits in developing a MTFP for the Authority:
- It would move the focus of resources discussions to a multi-year perspective rather than focusing on current year's activities;
 - It would aid financial planning by allowing one-off items of income and expenditure to be managed more efficiently through a regular dialogue on precept levels and the use of general reserves;
 - It would provide better quality information for contributing authorities financial plans regarding their likely precepts levels;
 - It is considered best practice in relation to how public sector authorities should govern their financial management activities.

- 2.17 A summary of the proposed budget for 2016/17 and the medium term financial plan for the subsequent three financial years is set out below. The detailed spend and income budget by budget can be seen with reference to Appendix 1.

	<i>Budget 2015/16</i>	<i>Proposed Budget 2016/17</i>	<i>Proposed Budget 2017/18</i>	<i>Proposed Budget 2018/19</i>	<i>Proposed Budget 2019/20</i>
<u>Expenditure</u>					
<i>Employee Costs</i>	86,325	86,300	87,150	88,000	88,850
<i>Other operating Costs</i>	53,700	48,450	48,300	48,400	48,300
<i>Total Costs</i>	140,025	134,750	135,450	136,400	137,150
<i>Income</i>	-27,350	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000
<i>Contribution to/from Reserves</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Net Expenditure</i>	112,675	104,750	105,450	106,400	107,150
<i>Reserves B/fwd</i>	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
<u>Funding</u>					
<i>Redcar & Cleveland BC</i>	58,591	54,470	54,834	55,328	55,718
<i>Stockton BC</i>	34,929	32,473	32,690	32,984	33,217
<i>Middlesbrough BC</i>	16,901	15,713	15,818	15,960	16,073
<i>Hartlepool</i>	2,254	2,095	2,109	2,128	2,143
<i>Total Funding</i>	112,675	112,675	113,450	114,185	115,020

2.18 Financial Assumptions

The MTFP for the period 2016/17 to 2019/20 has been developed around a number of core assumptions. Some of these have already been set out above in explaining the basis for the 2016/17 budget. However it is worth setting these out again as any future discussion on the MTFP would need to focus on these issues.

- Staffing costs are based on the structure recommended as part of the Healthy Lifestyles review. Any further staff reductions in terms of the RCBC structure would not affect RTPHA activities given the conclusion that staff resources are the minimum needed to provide the service;
- No new legislation is introduced or the scope of the service extended over this time period. If this did happen the staffing budget would need to be revisited;

- Non-pay budgets remain at current levels and there is no further demand on RCBC professional service, ICT resources, supplies and services, training etc;
- Income levels remain at budgeted levels over the planning period;
- Local authorities can maintain the proposed level of contribution for 2016/17 and marginally increase this over the MTFP period to reflect expected increases in staffing costs due to national pay agreements
- There will be no call on earmarked reserves over the MTFP period. Any increases or decreases to this position will need formal ratification by Members and an annual review will be undertaken by the Treasurer regarding the level that is deemed prudent.

2.19 The net cost and funding requirements increase marginally over the medium term but this is still regarded as a minimal investment in order to fulfil their port health responsibilities. Members do not need to formally approve the MTFP but any comments or views are welcome on both the content and the frequency of future reporting.

3 Who will this benefit and how?

3.1 Timely, accurate and up to date financial planning 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 and medium term financial plan 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 for 2016/17 and the medium term financial plan have been set in consultation with the Treasurer and Clerk for the Authority, and the Environmental Health team at Redcar and Cleveland Council.

4.2 The financial position, 2016/17 budget and medium term financial plans have been discussed between environmental health managers of the riparian authorities and finance staff as required. In general there are no major issues in terms of what is being proposed within this report

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 robust financial planning 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 instrumental in terms of setting the strategic financial direction for the Authority going forwards. In essence this is a statutory duty for Members to make arrangements to manage their financial affairs, so no options are available.

12 What is the reason for the recommended option?

12.1 Not applicable for this particular report

13 Recommendations

13.1 It is recommended that Members:

- 1) Approve the 2016/17 budget and the associated funding requirements based upon the information in Appendix 1;
- 2) Discuss the level of general reserves being held for 2016/17 and whether these are appropriate for the plans of the Authority;
- 3) Discuss the financial assumptions used to prepare the Medium Term Financial Plan and any adjustments that may be required.

14 Appendices and further information

14.1 Appendix 1 – Proposed Budget for 2016/17 and Medium Term Financial Plan

15 Background papers

15.1 Budget Report 2015/16 – submitted to meeting on 05/12/2014.

16 Contact officer

16.1 Name: Justin Weston
Position: Deputy Treasurer to RTPHA
Address: Kirkleatham Street, Redcar, TS10 1RT
Telephone: (01642) 444306
Email: Justin.weston@redcar-cleveland.gov.uk

River Tees Port Health Authority - 15/16 Budget, 16/17 Draft Budget plus 3 year plan

	15/16 Budget	Draft 16/17 Budget	17/18 Budget	18/19 Budget	19/20 Budget
R1000 Salaries - Basic Pay	65,450	66,200	66,850	67,500	68,150
R1001 Salaries - National Insurance	5,000	5,000	5,050	5,100	5,150
R1003 Salaries - Overtime	800	600	600	600	600
R1006 Salaries - Superannuation	10,000	10,000	10,100	10,200	10,300
R1063 Other Allowances	2,575	2,500	2,550	2,600	2,650
R3400 Car Allowances	2,500	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
	86,325	86,300	87,150	88,000	88,850
R1650 Training Expenses	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
R4000 Tools and Equipment - Purchase	500	500	500	500	500
R4200 Protective Clothing	250	250	200	200	200
R4300 Printing & Stationery	200	200	100	200	100
R4305 Photocopier Charges - Usage	50	50	50	50	50
R4400 Services - Professional Fees	44,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
R4507 Comms - Mobile Telephones	50	300	300	300	300
R4531 Computing - Purchase of Software	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
R4701 Subscriptions	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
R4960 Public Liability Insurance	650	650	650	650	650
R4980 General Supplies & Services	500	0	0	0	0
	53,700	48,450	48,300	48,400	48,300
R9305 Fees - Pest Control	20,000	22,450	22,450	22,450	22,450
R9305 Fees - Environmental Health	2,350	1,550	1,550	1,550	1,550
R9308 Fees - Other	5,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
	27,350	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Contribution to Reserves	0	0	0	0	0
	112,675	104,750	105,450	106,400	107,150
Amount held in Reserves	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Contributions required based on agreed Option 2c) as per Board meeting 26/3/2010					
Middlesbrough 15%	16,901	15,713	15,818	15,960	16,073
Stockton 31%	34,929	32,473	32,690	32,984	33,217
Hartlepool 2%	2,254	2,095	2,109	2,128	2,143
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council 52%	58,591	54,470	54,834	55,328	55,718
	112,675	104,750	105,450	106,400	107,150

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 and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 made by virtue of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 which require 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.

An updated register is provided for review and approval by members of the joint board. Members are informed that there is one amendment to the register relating to the responsible officers.
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 and representatives 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)**

RISK	
LOW RISK (< 8)	
MEDIUM RISK (9 – 15)	
HIGH RISK (16+)	

Responsible Officer Key	
SN	Steve Newton
EG	Erika Grunert
VB	Vikki Bell
JS	John Sampson
JW	Justin Weston

Impact	Likelihood				
	1 Zero to Very Low	2 Unlikely	3 Likely	4 Very Likely	5 Almost Certain
Catastrophic					
Critical					
Significant					
Insignificant					
Negligible					

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	Statutory appointments of members and effective governance of the Authority. Annual Service Plan reviewed and approved by the joint board. Employment and retention of an adequate number of suitably trained officers.	1	2	L		SN VB 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)			
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	Annual review and approval of Accounting Statements to ensure financial management is adequate and effective. Approval of annual Internal Audit Report following review of effectiveness. Adequate insurance cover in place via host and riparian authorities. 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.	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.</p> <p>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	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. Maintain Emergency Response Activation arrangements. A suitable number of appropriately authorised officers available to offer an out of hours response as required. Participation in multi-agency Emergency Preparedness activities. Participation in multi-agency response and recovery activities.	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	Maintain Business Continuity Plans and Arrangements. Undertake periodically a Business Continuity Impact Assessment and design Action Plan. Implement Action Plan. Annually review Business Continuity arrangements. Business Continuity has been addressed via the host Council's arrangements and is also part of River Tees Port Health Authority.	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 & 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	Officers possessing necessary qualifications and competencies to enforce the designated legislation. Adequate staff available to the Authority. Full adherence, consideration and appropriate decision making in relation to the relevant statutory and non-statutory Codes of Practice and guidance. Performance Management arrangements on a team and individual basis. Appropriate Quality Management system in place.	2	2	L		EG VB



Member Report

Performance summary for RTPHA

August 2015 to October 2015

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 August 2015 to October 2015.
- 1.2 The performance summary provides a breakdown of the number of ships entering each riparian authority area and the inspections that have been carried out. It details the types of food, feed and relevant products which have been imported; sampling activity and any other work which has been undertaken.

2. Background Papers

1. Report for August 2015
2. Report for September 2015
3. Report for October 2015

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: **August 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	6	0	0	0
Redcar	148	0	4	0
Stockton	159	0	2	0
Total	314	0	6	0

2. SAMPLING

Number of water samples taken and submitted for examination: 4

3. INFECTIOUS DISEASE NOTIFICATIONS/INCIDENTS

Number of infectious disease notifications: 1

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	68	1	1	18
Documentary Checks	1	1	1	18
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: 88

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

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Vodka	Russia
Wine	Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Chile
Coffee	Sri Lanka, Nicaragua, India, Mexico, Colombia, Rwanda
Tea	India, Rwanda, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania
Beer	Russia
Supplements	USA
Citric Acid	China

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Clinoptilolite	Turkey

NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Used Cooking Oil	Singapore, Indonesia, South Africa, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Malaysia, Dubai
Vegetable Juice	China

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: **September 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	13	0	0	0
Redcar	162	0	2	0
Stockton	171	0	3	0
Total	346	0	5	0

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	94	0	5	35
Documentary Checks	1	0	5	35
Identity Checks	1	0	1	0
Physical Checks	1	0	1	0
Samples	1	0	1	0
Notices Served	0	0	0	0

Total manifests checked: **76**

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

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Vodka	Russia
Coffee	Colombia, Mexico, India
Tea	India, Rwanda, Kenya, Tanzania, China
Citric Acid	China
Wine	South Africa, New Zealand, Australia
Rum	Guyana
Yellow split peas	Canada
Beer	Russia

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
None	

NON-FOOD OR FEED VERIFICATION	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Used Cooking Oil	South Africa, China, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Egypt, Dubai, Malaysia, Indonesia
Guar Gum	India
Foodstuff (plastic food carriers)	Vietnam, 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: **October 2015**

1. ACTIVITY SUMMARY - SHIPS

LOCAL AUTHORITY	NO OF SHIPS ENTERING THE PORT	SHIP SANITATION CONTROL	SHIP SANITATION EXEMPTION	ROUTINE SHIP INSPECTIONS
Hartlepool	2	0	0	0
Middlesbrough	8	0	0	0
Redcar	147	0	1	0
Stockton	143	0	5	0
Total	300	0	6	0

2. SAMPLING

Number of water samples taken and submitted for examination: 7

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	122	0	2	17
Documentary Checks	0	0	2	17
Identity Checks	0	0	1	0
Physical Checks	0	0	1	0
Samples	0	0	1	0
Notices Served	0	0	0	0

Total manifests checked: **76**

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

FOOD	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
Rum	Guyana
Tomato Paste	China
Coffee	India, Peru, Kenya, Indonesia, Colombia
Tea	Kenya, India, Malawi, Tanzania, Rwanda, Indonesia, Kenya
Vodka	Russia
Wine	New Zealand, South Africa, Australia, Chile
Citric Acid	China, Singapore
Rice	USA
Whey Powder	USA
Sodium Bicarbonate	Russia

FEED	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN
None	

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

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