**Premises …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………... Date of Assessment ………………………………………………….………….**

**Officer ………………………………………………Licence applied for ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………….**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Low (Score1) | High (Score 2) | Score | Officer Comments |
| **Compliance History - inspections** | Documented evidence from formal inspections over the previous three years reveal consistent and high levels of compliance in terms of welfare standards and risk management. | Formal inspections over the previous three years reveal some degree of non-compliance that has required the intervention of the inspector for the business to ultimately recognise and address these.  More serious breaches would attract other enforcement action: suspension, revocation, prosecution. |  |  |
| **Compliance History – follow up action** | No evidence of follow-up action by local authority in the last year apart from providing the licence holder with a copy of the inspection report, or sending them a letter identifying some minor, administrative areas for improvement (e.g. minor record keeping issues). | Follow up action by the local authority, such as sending them letters, triggered by low level non-compliance that is not addressed, or the business does not recognise the significance of the need to address the non-compliance. |  |  |
| **Compliance History – re-inspection** | No re-inspection necessary (apart from standard unannounced inspection) before next planned licence inspection / renewal | Re-inspection necessary to ensure compliance. |  |  |
| **Complaint History – complaints to the LA** | No complaints received direct to the LA that are justified in relation to welfare standards or procedural issues during the previous three years. | Low level substantiated complaints identifying concerns over the business / licence holder have been received within the previous three years. |  |  |
| **Complaint History – complaints to the business** | Licence holder records and documents any feedback received directly, in order to demonstrate compliance and willingness to address issues, and can provide evidence of this. | Licence holder does not record feedback received directly or show willingness to address any issues identified. |  |  |
| **Appreciation of welfare standards - enrichment** | Sound understanding by the licence holder of relevant environmental enrichment applicable to the activity (guided by expert advice), with demonstrated implementation. | Little environmental enrichment present, inconsistently used and its importance not understood or really valued. |  |  |
| **Appreciation of hazards / risks** | Licence holder clearly understands their role and responsibilities under the legislation. Hazards to both staff and animals clearly understood, properly controlled and reviewed with supporting evidence where applicable. | Licence holder not fully engaged with their role/responsibilities, lacks time to fulfil role, no system for review and reassessment of hazards to both animals and staff. |  |  |
| **Appreciation of hazards / risks - maintenance** | A suitably planned maintenance, repair and replacement program for infrastructure and equipment is in place. | No planned maintenance program. Building, installations and equipment allowed to deteriorate before action is implemented. |  |  |
| **Appreciation of hazards / risks – knowledge and experience** | Staff have specialist and appropriate knowledge of the taxa / species that are kept. There is sufficient staff, time and resource for daily, adequate routine monitoring, evidenced through records and staff rotas. | Key staff lack experience / knowledge of the species. Staff appear overburdened and / or unsupported by management, corners being cut. |  |  |
| **Appreciation of hazards / risks – dealing with issues** | Clear defined roles / responsibilities of staff, with clear processes for reporting and addressing any identified issues. | Lack of any process, or ownership and responsibility within the business to identify and deal with issues. |  |  |
| **Welfare management procedures – written procedures** | Written procedures / policies clearly documented, implemented and reviewed appropriately. | Limited written procedures / polices. No overall strategic control or direction. |  |  |
| **Welfare management procedures – supervision of staff** | Appropriate supervision of staff evident where applicable. | Inadequate supervision of staff evident on inspection or from the training records. |  |  |
| **Welfare management procedures – record keeping** | All required records maintained and made available. | Poor standard of record keeping, records out of date or appear to be being manufactured – relevance of records not appreciated. |  |  |
| **Welfare management procedures - training** | Planned training programme for staff to review and assess competency, with documented training records. | Little or no evidence of relevant training or system for review and reassessment. |  |  |
|  |  | **Total Score** |  |  |

**Score of 17 or less = Low risk**

**Score of 18 or more = Higher risk.**