

Draft Food (Jersey) Regulations 202- Food Business Survey Results

Please note that personal information and indirect identifiable data have been redacted.

1. What type of food organisation do you operate?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Small/independent café or bakery		21.11%	19
2	Home-based food producer		23.33%	21
3	Restaurant/hospitality		21.11%	19
4	Pub		2.22%	2
5	Food Manufacturers/Processors		8.89%	8
6	Wholesalers/Importers/Distributors		1.11%	1
7	Fishing/Aquaculture		2.22%	2
8	Small retail/grocery		3.33%	3
9	Large retail/grocery		1.11%	1
10	Mobile Food Vendors/Market Stalls		2.22%	2
11	Catering Company		3.33%	3
12	Charity or community food provider (including care homes and other residential institutions, sportsclubs)		4.44%	4
13	Hedge-Veg stall		2.22%	2
14	Organisations or Venues with On-site Food Services		3.33%	3
			answered	90
			skipped	0
Other (please specify): (19)				
1	Fresh Produce Grower - Much larger than Hedge-Veg but that was the closest option on the list			
2	Less than monthly afternoon tea			
3	Making for Charity			
4	Refreshments takeaway			
5	Cafe serving food			
6	Day Nursery			
7	Small home bakery			
8	Cafe & Bakery & Catering			
9	Fudge			
10	Kiosk			

1. What type of food organisation do you operate?

- | | |
|----|--|
| 11 | small private business dinners and family celebrations |
| 12 | Childminder providing food for children |
| 13 | TEA ROOM |
| 14 | Day Nursery |
| 15 | Farmer |
| 16 | Herbal tea maker |
| 17 | Cake maker |
| 18 | Apple juice maker |
| 19 | Foraging land and sea based. |

2. What is your approximate annual turnover?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Under £24,999		28.89%	26
2	£25,000–£74,999		20.00%	18
3	£75,000–£249,999		13.33%	12
4	Over £250,000		23.33%	21
5	Prefer not to say		14.44%	13
			answered	90
			skipped	0

3. Do you support the introduction of legal requirements for food allergen labelling in Jersey?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		60.00%	54
2	No		21.11%	19
3	Not sure		18.89%	17
			answered	90
			skipped	0

4. The Government is proposing to replace the current food registration scheme with a new licensing scheme, and has suggested that it shall have the following features: Food businesses will be required to hold an annual licence. Businesses will be categorised into low, medium, or high risk, based on food type, handling, and customer base. Fees will be charged according to risk level, noting that detailed fee arrangements are to be brought forward by the Minister for the Environment in October 2026. Some organisations may be exempt from fees in certain cases. The model aims to recover the cost of inspections and focus regulatory efforts on higher-risk operations. Do you agree in principle that food organisations should contribute to the cost of food safety regulation?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		12.22%	11
2	No		74.44%	67
3	Not sure		13.33%	12
			answered	90
			skipped	0

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	57
1	Do you mean question 4? If so I strongly disagree with food organisations contributing to the cost of food safety regulation. Small businesses already contribute hugely, hospitality is harder every year, you are crippling these businesses already!		
2	There are much larger businesses that pay significantly less when profit is considered. Operating a hospitality business in Jersey is already expensive when you factor lack of wholesale competition. Factor in increasing staff costs (another significant increase looming) and no competition for ever increasing utilities, I feel funds are available from the taxes already taken to cover the implied additional costs. Be better with the taxes you take, there's plenty being recklessly squandered and it's unfair to expect small businesses to cover the shortfall from careless spending.		
3	Small business will not be able to sustain the extra costs.		
4	Setting up and running a cafe incurs so many hidden costs and red tape with legislation and the government. It's coming across as just another tax. Help, don't hinder the hospitality industry.		
5	We sell dived scallops directly to the public [REDACTED], we launch our boat. We sell fresh scallops. this law will require us to have a unit which we will not be allowed to use the scallops we sell are sustainably caught with no damage to the seabed and no grit inside unlike the dredged scallops we work on minimum over heads and small profits unlike dredgers. The marine support package system works on a formula size of boat times number of days [REDACTED], so my grant is small compared to dredgers. Why the states are giving grants to dredgers amazes me. The marine spatial plan has been revised so no Mearl beds are protected and instead put over rock.is Steve Luce and the dredgers hell bent on getting rid of environmentally friendly fishermen?		
6	Why should independent businesses have to absorb more costs to pay for the government enforcement of regulations - any costs incurred by government agencies		

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

	should be factored in from the already numerous taxes levied on business and not just another means for revenue generation to fill government coffers
7	It will kill small food producers negatively impacting food security
8	Businesses already pay licensing fees whether for alcohol licenses or place of refreshment, GST, rates etc. There is absolutely no need for a new licensing system as businesses are already licensed and inspected through Eat Safe. This is adding more red tape and more barriers to business which is against Government promises. This is solely being introduced so the department has something to threaten businesses about removing.
9	In addition to the constantly rising costs of my ingredients I would need to reconsider whether it's worth me carrying on as a small supplier
10	As a small business I have already many bills to pay and already paid for licenses. As a mobile catering operator we have a hard life and for example to hold an alcohol license is not quite possible and this is impacting my business income big time. Changes are good but the size of the business is really important and as a small business is quite hard to keep up with the big companies (or the opposite in some cases), as we don't have their financial resources.
11	Jersey should be in line with the UK. It must be obligatory to show when allergens are used in food and drinks. The cost based on "risk" is lunacy. There is all ways a risk of contamination if you use any allergens in your business.
12	I'm disappointed so see culture isn't one of the criteria mentioned. My business has consistently achieved 5 stars Eat Safe rating since it was launched and we didn't have issues prior to then either. I suspect our process, which includes sous vide will be classed as high risk, costing us more. But I'm not a problem, my business is not a problem. Why should I potentially pay more than a business that's repeatedly of a poor standard, with a poor culture that just happens to not have a rich risk process. It seems incredibly unfair and would make me question what's the point of the time and money I invest in my staff to ensure our culture remains excellent.
13	I do not think that there should be a new licensing scheme
14	Any more extra charges and we will go under
15	Prices of food has gone up manifolds already. I am worried that this cost food places will pay eventually will be passed on to customers.
16	Charities and non-profit community organisations should be exempt from fees.
17	To mi this looks like another thing that someone will make money on. It business will need to pay for all those licenses and training it will need to be passed on to customers- and only way to do this is increase the prices. Not good for businesses for sure as this will result in loss of some customers.
18	Our sector is already over-burdened with cost and it is becoming harder and harder to remain sustainable.
19	I don't believe small businesses should be expected to take on additional costs, especially in the current economic climate where operating costs are already high and margins are tight. If the risk involved is low, it doesn't seem reasonable for small businesses to be required to pay for it.
20	Why punish us for complying?
21	This whole fee is just to get more money from already struggling hospitality. With all the costs going up - introduction of yet another fee will close many businesses due to very little profit left. I'm considering myself closing my business - it consumes my life with the amount of workload but doesn't transfer into money. The fees and costs seem endless.
22	This is just another tax scam of the Government who spends too much on Government benefits and staff. The Government should spend more time focusing on cutting its own

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

	staff by at least 20% and stop increasing salaries and its benefits. We are all struggling and please sort your house out first before bullying us businesses into paying more costs.
23	Organisations that are compliant and earn high scores when inspected (and thus do not require subsequent visits to ensure any remedial measures required have been carried out) should either be exempt from fees or be subject to much lower fees. Producers who are keen to uphold the highest standards should NOT be forced to subsidise those who are unwilling or unable to meet these standards by paying the same level of fees. Perhaps fees should be based on the number of inspection visits a producer needs to ensure public safety.
24	I generally make Wonders to pay or go towards holiday. If it can be means tested, I agree but don't agree that I should pay the same price where I only make on a Saturday morning and other food places i.e. cafes, takeaway shops etc can be opened 7 days a week
25	We are already being overly regulated and licensed on small food business on this island and introducing yet another form of regulation, bureaucracy, license and yearly fees is unnecessary and damaging to small businesses.
26	Just another way to make money. Do you not think small businesses are already struggling enough but hit us with yet another fee and you will see more closing! I believe most business already do their best to apply to comply to allergy regulations.
27	It is hard enough to be profitable with food prices so high, and customers so limited in their means, business is down more than 50% compared to pre covid, adding more admin and license costs would put us out of business
28	We operate a gluten free and dairy free bakery and grocery shop. We already know this would be deemed higher risk. We're already penalized with higher cost of food and ingredient. It's impossible as it is to afford to stay open and give the community access to products, they never have access to before. We already uphold UK standard when it comes to labelling and hygiene requirements you can speak to environmental health about that but a weighted license based on type of customer would just encourage us to close and again limit the options for those who have these ailments. There are enough fees to start a business, and this is what is killing the industry in Jersey, join fee 70 a year. Refreshment license 100 a year, insurance for us is 700 a year, register name 70, then if you want to open Sundays there is a fee, if you want a board advert you there's a fee. Anything you do there is a fee it is set up to make people fail because the government is taking everything they can at every angle whilst providing no support for what the island actually needs. We have had people come specifically from guernsey to Jersey to buy from our shop (grocery part) and our baked goods (bakery part) it could be incredibly beneficial to the island from a tourism perspective as personally I have gone places because I know they have a dedicated gluten free place and others do it too. It's just a shame you are constantly trying to charge people more. Bring in the change to the law with stricter controls absolutely (there are many on the island who shouldn't be anywhere near food with limited knowledge about allergens which can be dangerous) but don't bring in another fee.
29	Why should we pay you to do your job? We already pay tax and that should fund all states departments. The workload and skill level required to implement these changes will be crippling for businesses. All it would be negative to rate establishments on how risky they are. It'll put customers off.
30	diet-specific and allergen-specific foods are already getting rarer and more expensive, its mostly small businesses offering such foods as the large companies prefer to prioritise profits with more general foodstuffs, you'll just be making it harder for small businesses and for locals with dietary needs!
31	I strongly oppose the proposal to pass the cost of food business registration and inspection onto local businesses as part of allergen law reform. While the intention to strengthen allergen protections is welcome and necessary, this approach risks undermining both business viability and the very consumer safety outcomes the legislation seeks to achieve.

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

Hospitality and food businesses are operating under unprecedented financial strain. Rising energy costs, supply chain inflation, staffing costs, insurance increases, and rent pressures have left many businesses barely viable. Government support for local businesses is non-existent.

Introducing additional mandatory fees for registration and inspection places yet another financial burden on businesses that are already struggling to survive. For many, this will not be a marginal cost but a tipping point. Which risks closures, reduced offerings, or avoidance of higher risk food categories altogether. Passing enforcement costs onto businesses is not reform; it is cost shifting without accountability or support.

There is already hesitancy among businesses regarding allergen reform. This hesitation is driven by the complexity of requirements, the legal risk associated with non-compliance, and the fear of severe financial and reputational consequences.

Adding inspection and registration costs to this landscape risks entrenching resistance rather than encouraging cooperation. Effective allergen reform requires buy in from businesses. Penalising them financially before providing adequate education, guidance, and transition support is counterproductive and risks turning well intentioned legislation into a compliance exercise driven by fear rather than understanding.

As someone who personally requires a strict gluten free diet, I strongly welcome improved allergen practices and clearer protections. However, I am deeply concerned that excessive red tape and punitive cost structures will lead to the opposite of the intended outcome.

Rather than creating safer and more inclusive dining environments, this approach is likely to encourage a culture of refusal. Businesses, fearful of noncompliance and legal or financial repercussions, may choose to exclude customers with allergen requirements altogether by limiting menus or declining to serve them. This already occurs in jurisdictions where regulation has outpaced practical support.

Allergen reform should empower safe participation, not inadvertently reduce access and choice for those it aims to protect.

If government is serious about improving allergen safety, it must be equally serious about supporting businesses to comply. At present, it is unclear what practical measures will accompany this reform.

What training, guidance, or subsidised education will be provided to businesses?
Will there be financial supports, grants, or phased implementation for small operators?
How will consistency and fairness in inspections be ensured across local authorities?
How will enforcement balance accountability with education and improvement?

A safe food environment cannot be created through legislation alone. It requires partnership, clarity, and resourcing. Expecting establishments to "get on with it" without meaningful support demonstrates a disconnect from the realities of running a food business.

Allergen reform is too important to get wrong. Done properly, it can save lives, improve confidence, and create safer dining environments for everyone. Done poorly, it risks business closures, reduced consumer choice, and increased exclusion of those with dietary requirements.

Passing the cost of registration and inspection onto already overburdened local businesses is not a sustainable or equitable solution. Government must reconsider this approach and focus instead on collaborative reform one that supports businesses, educates operators, and delivers genuine, practical improvements in allergen safety. This is not a simple matter of passing legislation. It requires careful implementation, adequate funding, and a clear understanding of the real-world impacts on both businesses and consumers.

32 It's an added cost many places can't afford

33 No individual or organisation should have to pay for adhering to the law. The cost burdens of starting and operating a business in Jersey are quite high enough without what amounts to extra taxation.

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

- | | |
|----|--|
| 34 | Just more regulation that allows officials to dictate to businesses without consideration |
| 35 | WE ARE A NEW BUSINESS.IT IS HARD ENOUGH WITHOUT MORE EXPENSES, PAPERWORK ETC. I ALREADY WORK 7 DAYS A WEEK AND CAN NOT AFFORD A PA. |
| 36 | Not at all. It is a never-ending boring story that does not fit for everyone. Including the unfortunate people that do have severe allergies. If I had a severe allergy I would not trust anyone, any establishment. It's boggling that we can go on an aeroplane etc with no warning that it may kill you. So I totally disagree. That has always been my thought even before I went into hospitality |
| 37 | Profit margins have shrunk due to staff and other resource cost increasing, including the rising cost of food. A fee of £500 a year would leave the Ben by less for training, resource, renovation & maintenance, let alone profit. |
| 38 | Small businesses have already been squeezed at every turn. From rising produce costs and surges in freight costs to higher utility bills and rent.
If the government insists on adding more unnecessary bureaucratic red tape to fix a problem which doesn't exist then it must be funded by the government. |
| 39 | Charities cannot afford to pay a fee when selling cakes and jams to fundraise |
| 40 | As farmers we already produce food to various UK standards as demanded by the major retailers. This regulatory schemes are already paid for by the farmers and require at least one lengthy and detailed audit per year. This purpose-built schemes will understand our industry and go into far greater detail than any Jersey Government inspector could hope to achieve due to the small number of producers left on the Island. Proof of current membership and up to date certification should be enough to not warrant further inspections by SOJ. |
| 41 | There is no reason that businesses should pay for this. This is basic governmental regulation. |
| 42 | I do t agree with the proposed model, which is based on a UK scaled model. It is TOTALLY inappropriate to expect small local producers or retailers in Jersey (100k population) to conform to the same standards and model as a country with 60,000k population. The cost and enforcement will both be disproportionate in cost and the industry will be constrained to the point that it disappears.
We have seen the same happen to local hospitality, local farming etc.
Instead, produce a set of standard stickers (v cheap) and issue them for free to local food producers.
Total cost c£500 total a year. SCALE the action to Jersey's needs. |
| 43 | We are being screwed over, taxed, high contributions. We don't need more financial stress and more to do on top of everything else |
| 44 | How can you charge a company more for providing to people with dietary requirements!!!! The places that offer no options should be charged the most with places offering options being given funding to provide actual gluten free options or dairy. Considering 75% of the human population have some sort of dairy allergy. Myself my daughter and my wife all have gluten intolerance, its currently so difficult to actually go out anywhere to eat because there's literally no gluten free options for children to eat in 90% of establishments. Now you're going to charge people more, so they offer less to get a cheaper license. What a load of bollocks!!!! Biggest scam going, you absolute pieces of dog faeces!!! ought to be careful, no police force or army to stop a revolution from ever so very very upset islanders. What does any business GAIN from this? Apart from more bills to pay to close down more businesses. Honestly found better ideas in a porcelain bowl. |
| 45 | Enforcing licenses for food safety will destroy hospitality even more than it already is. Turn overs for food businesses already getting worse with the rising supplier costs, which leads to higher sell prices and negatively already effecting ppl to eat out. Food safety and allergy awareness itself should be not neglected by businesses but also shouldn't misused by consumers (stating allergies but insisting to eat products which are containing those, makes staff taking allergies not serious and lead to health issues for those who are relaying to the food safety and allergen awareness). If fees would be |

5. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 4.

	implied for businesses, then there should be free professional refresher courses given to those businesses each year to comply with the updated food and safety regulations.		
46	A pub business is already required to renew a liquor license yearly. It's a double/more cost to the pub sector		
47	I've been running a safe food operation for nearly 30 years and another added cost to our operation I feel is unnecessary at this current time.		
48	As a small producer, I am very conscious of costs. My business is only marginally profitable. It only exists because of the Rural Economy grant. [REDACTED]. Adding more costs and more regulation may jeopardize the business. I believe in health and environmental regulation of course. But we already have this. I hope the new legislation will not be so heavy-handed that a small producer like myself may question whether it is viable to carry on trading. Are we talking about an annual fee of £50 or £1000? If the latter, then I will likely close.		
49	One licence only - i.e.: no parish hall. Seasonal fees?		
50	I think it's absolutely disgusting you are wanting people to hold a license that is chargeable, shame on you. For example reading this, dairy free is a "higher" risk and potentially a higher charge, you will only stop business waning to be inclusive to provide products for these higher risk allergen food groups. Also a veg hedge box, how on earth do you want this to be labelled etc. if you bring this in, this part of my business will have to be stopped as I would not be able to absorb further charges on top of growing as there is already no profit here.		
51	Small businesses are already absorbing the rising costs of products. Fees should only be paid if problems are found.		
52	Couple of observations so far that we shared in the previous survey: - - Proper guidance documents that all organisations can use to ensure they meet the legal requirements (in other languages Portuguese and Polish)? - Transition period for organisations to bed in with the new requirements?		
53	We do take scallops out the shell to save customers the job. However does this really make us a food processor we don't cook the scallops or put any chemicals in the scallops. The scallops are put into iced cold boxes then sold immediately or frozen within an hour or 2. These scallops are all alive when sold or shelled. It's nearly impossible to get a more fresh product and in the USA and many other counties what we do is encouraged.		
54	As a sole trader, I hope that the fees will reflect the size and scale of business. Perhaps banded to head count or be revenue based.		
55	We already pay for an annual licence to operate a hotel and a further license to sell alcohol along with Fire Regulations, Parish rates, insurance, and that is before we earn a penny!		
56	It helps us to regulate in house		
57	Low-risk and small operations should not have to pay. Already, many other costs are associated with running and setting up a small business.		
		answered	57
		skipped	33

6. The Government has suggested that the new licensing scheme will streamline existing food regulation by replacing multiple systems with one. Do you agree that the proposals will achieve this?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		20.00%	18
2	No		40.00%	36
3	Not sure		40.00%	36
			answered	90
			skipped	0

7. What impact, if any, could the proposed licensing scheme have on your organisation in terms of resources, administration, staffing, or compliance requirements?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	90
1	More bills to pay		
2	Health Inspectors locally follow no set guidelines; it is up to individual Inspectors to score premises... surely putting a proper set of guidelines into place should be a priority? Currently I can order a takeaway online with no allergens listed, collect it with no labelling whatsoever yet other catering business are scrutinised vehemently? Start by creating a level and fair playing field!		
3	There will be significant knock-on effects in all mentioned areas, but tighter legislation is needed. As long as it's approached realistically from a small businesses' perspective and not from the perspective of the Government (being the largest employer on the island) the it should be straight forward to adapt to. Whoever is tasked with it needs to constantly remember the lack of resources most businesses will have.		
4	It's unnecessary		
5	Food safety is managed effectively by the Environmental Health. Additional burdens on small businesses are not welcome or needed. HACCP could be introduced to bring in line with UK, but this could easily be part of the existing oversight.		
6	If it is extensive I would not have the time to keep up with the admin and what is currently well run and lists allergens will need too much time		
7	Increase in costs seems to be the main one.		
8	Probably be the final straw.		
9	Just another means by which government incurs further taxation on independent businesses		
10	Will probably close as more costs		
11	Cost implication More administration Time implication		
12	None		
13	Staffing, costs, time in the day to actually do it.		
14	I'll shut down. Dealing with GOJ is a nightmare		

7. What impact, if any, could the proposed licensing scheme have on your organisation in terms of resources, administration, staffing, or compliance requirements?

15	Price rising, product accessibility limited as suppliers don't always have the same product all the time = different ingredients
16	More paperwork, more costs, more unnecessary regulation, more administration, more bureaucracy, time taken away from primary business focus.
17	Unsure, at the moment we follow the UK guidance, which is that we do not have to put allergen information on our labels as our produce is classed as an ingredient rather a prepared food ie. a single pack of tomatoes which has not been processed in any way does not need allergen information on.
18	None
19	Depending on cost, negative.
20	None
21	Unsure at the moment but I don't want to have unnecessary stress just because of the bureaucratic. If the department needs more money than raise the already existing licence.
22	None
23	This creates more work for us. The cost of this will need to be transferred to our customers. Small vendors will suffer more because the customer base won't accept the inflated costs.
24	I haven't seen enough detail to give an appropriate response.
25	n/a
26	It is Government 'overkill.'
27	Price rises less customers closed doors
28	It will require extra admin time from our team. Which is a cost and responsibility on us. This must be matched by the consumer having a responsibility to inform a business of any risk and accept any increase in cost to a product or service as a result of any specific or special dietary needs. The choice of a business to add a surcharge for extra or different ingredients, storage or prep methods. Surcharges clearly explained of course.
29	Will have an immense impact on food places as they are struggling as it is with staffing
30	I may have to close.
31	We provide home-made food to elderly members of a community organisation. We are volunteers. If we were required to gain hygiene certificates and had to label foods, it would no longer be viable.
32	It will finding people to work a lot harder and add another cost to the business that is operating on very tight margins already. In my personal opinion small to medium businesses will struggle the most. Also considering that suppliers often are out of stock of products as they are not able to hold large stock as we are small island and company need order similar products that might have slightly different allergens (if any) might be problematic.
33	We don't have the resources to cope with further admin and compliance nor do we have the funds to meet yet another cost.
34	more admin and more cost. Ultimately increased costs that will have to be passed on to the customer. This Gov should be de-regulating not increasing regulations that's why it has grown. We are not a nation so stop trying to act as one.
35	As a one-person business, my resources and time are very limited. If the licensing scheme genuinely brings all required information and compliance into one place, it could make administration simpler and more efficient. However, any additional administrative or compliance requirements would have a disproportionate impact on a small, single-operator business compared to larger organisations.

7. What impact, if any, could the proposed licensing scheme have on your organisation in terms of resources, administration, staffing, or compliance requirements?

36	It won't change anything
37	Requirements will significantly add to my workload as I cannot afford to add extra staffing hours. It will strain the budget by adding yet another fee.
38	This would cost money to implement, currently the hospitality industry is in trouble due to dwindling numbers of tourists, the current cost of living for islanders and the high cost of purchasing food/booze stocks, this has affected restaurants and food outlets tremendously and we are really struggling to keep our doors open. So any extra financial burdens will ultimately close more doors and have a negative effect on hospitality, just another nail in the coffin.
39	Will admin time and cost to already stretched resources
40	More costs, more costs, more costs....
41	The government has a history of bringing in consultants and spending a fortune with very little positive effect for the population. The problem we have is not that we have inadequate standards - it is the (thankfully few) producers who do not adhere to the standards we have. A massive change as proposed will cost a lot of money, require more time, money and effort on the part of producers and seems to be change for the sake of change with no benefit to either producers or consumers. Recruit more inspectors to ensure compliance and address the real problems we face.
42	Depending on the cost, I may have to close down as my mark up is so minimal
43	As previously stated additional unnecessary costs and resources on businesses. This just gives more money into the civil services system, higher salaries for them and inadequate services along and more power hungry individuals who are not there to support businesses but put up barriers and say "No"
44	Dffggh
45	We already do this so admin will not change, but it already takes a lot more work and as a result we no longer have daily changing items/menus as it is far too difficult now. No idea how much more work will be introduced by the new law.
46	More admin work means more hours!!
47	To many tasks more stressful
48	it will put us out of business
49	Huge impact. I'm a sole trader, so it will impact time, resource, cost, everything
50	We would have to close. We wouldn't survive. We are making a consistent loss at the minute but we never opened to get rich we wanted to serve our community and help islanders have choice. We work other jobs to pay our bills and make sense meet but if you had all these extra licenses we wouldn't be able to stick around and you'd lose the [REDACTED]. The fee structure genuinely feels like discrimination. We have no choice but to eat this way so we bake and serve this way and we have to pay the biggest amount. How is this justified
51	More work, more training more Cost to all. Massive hassle on top of current compliance. Puts me off running my business and I've been in the trade for 30+ years.
52	the added cost and it's just another thing to worry about on top of the thousand other things it takes to run a small business!
53	See earlier comment.
54	We would stop providing food to our children who we are paid to have
55	Would need to put cost onto food we sell
56	More Admin
57	Increased cost burdens in due diligence and labelling changes. Since we have no local companies to do shelf-life testing, etc. The HACCP is no problems from my perspective,

7. What impact, if any, could the proposed licensing scheme have on your organisation in terms of resources, administration, staffing, or compliance requirements?

	but for those having to deal with it in retrospect, cost may be a problem. I would think that a lack of people qualified or experienced in the process may be an issue.
58	As always it effects All areas as we take on responsibility, but where do customers take on their own responsibility?
59	DEVASTATING!
60	Huge
61	Admin and staffing costs
62	I certainly will leave hospitality as right now you cannot even keep up to date with the current Food & Safety Law in Jersey. Mind boggling how establishments differ in ratings
63	I would have to stop producing, my profits are so small it would not be worth continuing
64	Additional financial pressure, additional paperwork
65	I have no resources, I will be forced to undertake all requirements myself.
66	As a small catering business, any additional licensing fees would have a direct financial impact. Increased costs would be difficult to absorb and could affect pricing, profitability, and overall business sustainability.
67	Time and cost may have to stop selling cakes and jams less funds for the charity
68	This will place further overhead cost on to agricultural businesses which are already under significant financial pressure.
69	Cost
70	More complex record-keeping to ensure licenses are valid and up to date. • Need for clear internal procedures to monitor usage and renewals. • Potential requirement to designate a compliance officer or administrator to oversee licensing matters.
71	Extra costs drive up prices
72	Excessive cost impact leading to closure
73	It has increased costs over the last few years as we prepped for the change. There is an administrative burden that has increased.
74	More financial strain. More requirements.
75	It would mean that only big establishments with lots of funding would only be able to offer any dietary requirements. Putting EVERY SINGLE LOCAL business at risk from higher operating costs due to stupid rules and regulations, on top of ever rising rent prices and food prices and energy prices now you're putting up the license prices to be able to offer more options to customers through the door!!!
76	expect to put an additional cost to a small business, it would future risk that those small businesses are forced to close due to everyday rising cost in supplies the lower turn around for profits due consumers stopping to spend money as cost for eat out etc getting to high. . Which leads to further rising unemployment and or leaving of professional staff the island
77	More staff training required, more education needed from a department that is lacking in basic common sense
78	All it will do is add more admin, time and resources to our already tough trading conditions.
79	Depends on costs. As a marginally profitable business, additional costs could force closure. I don't grow apples or make apple juice for the money! I do it because it is a labour of love. However, the business cannot lose money. If regulation and fees are not proportionate then we might be forced to close.
80	Cost & administration of additional labelling.

7. What impact, if any, could the proposed licensing scheme have on your organisation in terms of resources, administration, staffing, or compliance requirements?

- 81 This will make food business stop wanting to be inclusive of higher risk allergen food handling because of the charges of a license. You will also kill off any veg hedge box businesses with these charges as it is already not a profitable business. Albeit the charges do not appear that high it will be for small businesses to absorb and as we know this will increase year on year to where it will not be sustainable for anyone.
- 82 Updated training requirements for all staff and updating the menus both of which are an added expense.
- 83 More training will be required across the team
- 84 Shorter trading times
- 85 None
- 86 If we have to get a port or cabin type unit and somewhere to put it this could be too expensive for us and probably put the 3 of us out of business as we already have too many overheads for a seasonal business.
- 87 As a home baker I am already regulated and checked. I also include allergen information on all the products that I sell both to businesses and the public.
- 88 All compliance costs money. The government must also realise that with every new regulation, a team is required to administer it and I don't believe that the island can afford any more costs
- 89 It will be front-loaded administration, however, then its maintaining
- 90 Foraging could create considerable problems if full traceability, etc., is expected.

answered	90
skipped	0

8. During its consultation on the proposed licensing scheme, the Government set out an illustrative range of annual fees: Low Risk (£200): For organisations handling only low-risk or pre-packed food. Medium Risk (£350): For most food organisations preparing or selling high-risk foods. High Risk (£500): For organisations manufacturing, processing, or serving high-risk foods or vulnerable groups. What impact would an annual fee in this range (£200–£500) have on your organisation?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	No impact		1.11%	1
2	Manageable		11.11%	10
3	Some difficulty		25.56%	23
4	Significant strain		27.78%	25
5	Could affect viability		34.44%	31
			answered	90
			skipped	0

9. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 8.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question	100.00%	49
1	I'll assume this is a mistake and refers to question 8. If this is a mistake, it perfectly outlines many people's concerns with anything like this proposal. Lack of attention to detail and box ticking just to say it's done. Work with businesses, proper small businesses to better understand. This fee isn't just the fee. There's the places of refreshments licence that seemingly doesn't give anything in return, rates, al fresco licences for areas that require (or receive) no maintenance, JFSC fees... its never ending and they all add up. The people charged with setting these fees don't appear to have direct experience of living the life of a business owner and the permanent associated stresses.		
2	I would have to sell 100 bottles of sauce to cover the cost. The cost of enforcement of any legislation should be born by those that fail to observe it. I shouldn't have to pay to have someone come and check I'm acting lawfully. I already pay tax.		
3	Costs are increasing across the board, electricity, equipment, stock etc.. This is just another ill thought out take the easy route pass the charge onto the customer government attitude.		
4	It is not the fee that is the problem .its yet another bill / tax of many I really feel struggling diver /fishermen should be except or given grants.		
5	Food is already expensive in Jersey. I have a real problem with the value of food being snatched by bureaucrats		
6	This is just further 'stealth tax' in order to justify further growth within the civil service. The classifications are also extremely dangerous as they are open to personal opinions.		
7	We are a small society which has been going since the 1950's for social get togethers & entertainment, promoting Jèrriais & our culture. We serve annual lunches/afternoon teas following social events.		
8	I would not be able to continue. I'm trying to provide quality ingredient baking at a not for profit price. Ingredients are already expensive and any added fees would need to be added and passed on. My aim is to use organic and local with healthy tasty goods. This extra charge I cannot do		
9	Sometimes you don't operate for a long period of time and not having any income but however you still need to pay for everything else: insurance, parking permits etc. Now on top of all will have another one and possibly extra costs on top. If that's the case is not good.		
10	Why have a stepped fee structure. It should the same for all.		
11	I don't know if this is in addition to other licensing fees I have to pay out instead of. My business already pays for its alcohol licence.		
12	There is no such thing as low risk when it comes to allergies. There should be fines for non-compliance, but not for being licensed		
13			
14	The fee is not the only cost, it adds to admin time, which is cost. This fee is inflationary along all aspects of the food chain, each time adding cost and in the end impacts the consumers end cost, affecting appeal of consumer prices snd hence my businesses very viability. It will never go, it will only increase, so not adding it is vital.		
15	This will make matters worse for food places		
16	We are a non-profit organisation that arranges monthly social events for the elderly. Any fee would be unaffordable.		
17	Another fee to pay on top of other fees to run the business that operates on very low margins and requires a lot of work and admin. GOV should cover the cost of licensing if they believe that this if for customers good. Also— As a result businesses will stop		

9. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 8.

	offering "high risk" products. I don't understand why we cannot leave allergens as they are.
18	In itself it would not affect viability but as part of ever-increasing costs, the sustainability of the sector is being threatened.
19	Margins are so tight for the food industry in Jersey. I am already considering whether it is economically viable and this will be another nail in the coffin of small business
20	For a small, low-risk, single-operator business, an annual fee of £200 is significant. This is an additional recurring cost on top of existing expenses such as insurance, ingredients, utilities, equipment, and compliance with food safety requirements. For businesses operating on tight margins, this level of fee could affect overall viability and discourage small operators from continuing or entering the market.
21	Costs in Jersey are significantly higher than the UK. Businesses will have to pass this onto the customer. Customers are already reducing and will reduce further. This Government is trying to kill every industry of the Island and doing it very well. Carry on like this and you will accelerate the speed of businesses closing, entrepreneurs thinking twice about opening a local business and people leaving the island for a much much better life
22	These broad categories are difficult to understand and are too vague. Responsible producers already invest time, money and effort into staff training, clear labelling, and ensuring best practice in all aspects of their operation. Adding to their burden with a new scheme will add costs and complexity without any automatic improvement as far as quality and protection of the public is concerned. The responsible producers will already place public safety and the quality of their products at the top of their priorities. Changing the scheme will do nothing to ensure the rogue traders / producers to change their ways. We don't need a new scheme - we need better monitoring of producers and harsher penalties for non compliance.
23	What with insurance, being a genuine Jersey member, cost of ingredients and oil going up, new labels on bags that provide allergens, £200 a year is a lot
24	While government may claim that's not a lot to ask for a yearly license, they negate to comprehend that we get charged and regulated at every turn from virtually every gov department on this island. We already regulations and licensing in place for this system and additional ones will cause additional damage to small businesses.
25	Hospitality is always being hit with more costs. Why should we pay for a license when we already do this on our own accord. If you need to make money just get it from prosecuting those that don't adhere.
26	i can't afford to cover my bills as it is, a £500 fee would drive my costs up to clients and therefore reduce business further. It's stupid.
27	Far too high for the low risk group
28	I have provided detailed answers throughout I'd be happy to speak to someone in person to explain further
29	our products are already more costly than similar products are/would be from large companies (who decide not to stock the same products as less of it sells) - this would add more cost, affecting our customers and us as a business. we don't focus on profit as we feel we are needed to offer more of a range to people with dietary requirements, so we're already operating on tiny margins as it is!
30	Small manufacturing producers are pretty much automatically high risk under the current proposals. £500 pound could easily wipe out a couple of months profit for those who need to support their business working part-time. Those who might have been a future employers may well give up simply because the economics no longer work.
31	Bit obvious as we have all areas of cost being strained, some through government already with minimum wage, staffing regulations
32	WITH RENT, WAGES, SUPPLIES, INSURANCE ETC THERE IS NOTHING LEFT.

9. If you'd like to, please provide any further detail to explain your answer to Question 8.

33	Not only financially as above but the financial manpower hours behind a behind that costs the owner more unpaid time.
34	£500 would be more than a month worth of resources for the r
35	Another unnecessary tax on an already struggling industry.
36	Cakes and jam sales help charities hugely they should be free from a charge
37	Please see answer 5. We are effectively paying annual fees for this type of scrutiny
38	For small businesses this is a significant cost, and disproportionately affects people making food from scratch, therefore disincentivising from-scratch, local foods and encouraging prepackaged processed food. Couldn't be a worse way of structuring this
39	Do the maths! A simpler more appropriate scheme could be created that costs c£500 in TOTAL for the whole island. Regulation officers should not be designing this process
40	We will pass the cost onto the end consumer.
41	Why do you need to pay to serve food!!!! What is a food license for? Or health and safety or the health inspector. I don't understand how you think this is going to do anything. What gain comes from it for business's??? This is a smash and grab technique that starts at £500 because fish is a high risk food so any restaurant that sells fish will be high risk and considering we are seaside island that offers fresh caught local dishes, everyone would be subject to a 500 charge for the first year. Then you would just put it up every year till the only restaurants on the island are in a hotel.
42	As already stated in question 7 Possible risk of businesses closing due to overwhelming expenses with low turnover. Leading to business closures and unemployment rate rising
43	'Business' is a strong word to describe what I do. It is marginal. Were it not for the Rural Economy grant we would have stopped making apple juice.
44	I would just like to add that business conform with labelling of food without the states putting them in a category and changing a license fee they deem fit. It's absurd and mind blowing.
45	There are already multiple licences and fees we have to pay. This is just adding to costs of running a small business.
46	That bill is small compared to getting a unit and paying for a premise to keep it and somewhere to sell from
47	My business is classed as low risk, however I do not make huge profits and it seems that every new regulation that comes in not only affects how I work, increases time required in administration and in this case labelling but also comes with a cost for each license. Therefore I think it should be banded to size and scale of company.
48	See Q7
49	The impact will be over £6,000 annually on top of other increase this will sit in the mix. The impact is reduced as we have been following UK standards for many years. Therefore, if we hadn't gradually introduced these standards, the impact would be greater

answered	49
skipped	41

10. Which of the following licensing scheme proposals would you support?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Additional/wider risk categories		7.78%	7
2	Fees based on organisation turnover		13.33%	12
3	Fees based on the number of inspections required per year		11.11%	10
4	Flat-rate fee for all organisations		5.56%	5
5	Higher fees for non-compliant organisations		13.33%	12
6	Lower fees for small/micro-organisations		40.00%	36
7	Performance-based reductions		8.89%	8
8	Phased or capped fees for new organisations		10.00%	9
9	Fee waivers for part-time or seasonal operators		24.44%	22
10	Exemptions for charities or non-profits organisations		28.89%	26
11	Exemptions for hardship on a case-by-case basis		18.89%	17
12	Delayed implementation or transitional support		20.00%	18
13	None of the above		31.11%	28
			answered	90
			skipped	0

11. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions about the proposed licensing scheme?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Open-Ended Question		100.00%	42
1	It frankly couldn't be any worse!			
2	Please be realistic and listen to feedback. We all understand the need but don't make it ridiculous.			
3	Nobody will support fees. This survey will be ignored, and fees will be introduced. If the government wanted to improve safety they would support the existing public health team, not just try and find more ways to raise money from small businesses who may be passionate about food safety already and struggling to make ends meet.			
4	The new laws on scallops will prevent us putting shells in the sea however scallop shells form vital components of the marine environment and should certainly not be dumped on land.			
5	In my opinion, anything that is important for the safety of our clients is always welcome... but there are many more urgent problems to be solved than these... nowadays, with the			

11. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions about the proposed licensing scheme?

	regulations in place, almost all of these points have already been addressed. I think we need to sensitize customers to not use allergies as an excuse to ensure they don't eat something they simply dislike... for example: (I'm allergic to nuts, but if I have just a little, it's not a problem). We need to be demanding of restaurants, but also of customers... and instead of being punctual using star ratings, perhaps we should work together with businesses to improve their operation... not to do what the inspectors do... (I'm here to inspect, not to tell you how to do it... that attitude doesn't help safeguard the health of our customers... punishment doesn't work, but cooperation does...).
6	Additional (taxes) will kill local food production
7	I fully support the allergen law and as a whole this has already been implemented by the vast majority of the industry. I strongly oppose any new licensing, application process, costs to business during a time when profitability is already at an all-time low.
8	We will lose many small suppliers and caterers
9	Exemptions are mentioned in certain circumstances but no details given. I would be interested to read the circumstances.
10	We're all trying to keep our heads above the water, any extra fees are not welcome when many businesses are already struggling and work hard to provide a service without extra paperwork and costs. This is not support for small or large businesses, it will finish many when we're trying to do our bit for our Island
11	Flat rate for all organisations it's the worst one. Fees based on organisation turnover is the fair one.
12	I'm not against licensing if it is an amalgamation or instead of other licences. I would support an annual self-audit or similar but only if it's considered alongside other licences were expected to maintain.
13	I hope that out of all the people putting together the proposed licensing scheme, at least one of them has a food allergy. Honestly, reading "low risk" makes me think no one actually understands food allergies.
14	Sensible labelling of allergens within processed food is reasonable, in restaurants and cafes and when buying food. Not for 'Hedge Veg' or pre-packaged food that already has a label. We still need to be able to run Charity events on the Island, and individuals should be able to produce food items in their own homes without a license. I remain unconvinced about these proposals. They go too far. It would be better to keep the current laws.
15	Exemptions mean higher costs for others. Costs should not be added at all.
16	This extra new regulations will make it difficult for food places to operate in the island.
17	No fee licensing. This is just another idea for the government to get extra money from the industry that is struggling already.
18	There is nothing wrong with the existing Eat Safe scheme.
19	I don't support it
20	This has nothing to do with public safety and it is harmful to small businesses around the island
21	Higher fees for non compliant organisations and no fees for compliant organisations.
22	NO
23	We need a system to assist all the producers on the island, ensuring that they are kept up to date with all legislation and best practices etc. The aim of the exercise should be two fold, firstly to assist producers in achieving and maintaining highest standards

11. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions about the proposed licensing scheme?

	possible and secondly, to protect the public from unscrupulous and non-compliant traders and producers.
24	We support the necessary updates to make allergens and food safety up to date in a supportive process/ environment and not in a regulatory unsupportive way as the government is known for acting in the past however any additional fees and licenses are absolutely NOT welcomed or necessary!
25	Many small business operators have day jobs, creating extra costs and admin won't improve food safety it will put people out of business and make people rush admin and fudge safety records. What we need is better communication from EHOs, regular dialogue like it used to be.
26	Introduce the change in law. Do not charge people more. If they don't need to in the UK why do we need to? Genuinely speaking the change in the law will not cause more work for the states. It's the same number of inspections needed to check people are doing what they need to be. It's the businesses who have considerable work to upgrade where this isn't part of their existing process and on top of that they are being penalized with charges for it
27	preferably none of the above but we know you're going to do it anyway!
28	Ideally, no fees passed onto businesses at all.
29	It's silly to have such a list which contradict each other, just goes to show how ill thought out this is, plus of course no doubt more government staff to oversee this
30	WHY KEEP TAXING THE SMALL BUSINESSES?
31	We pay our taxes like everyone else. Is there a proposal for Safety Regulations for accidents in a workforce that employees must pay to prevent injuries... never ends My growth and ambition is certainly there and a key factor for entrepreneurs. This will only slow growth furthermore. To employ someone now you have to babyfy them. It is all a matter of common sense
32	Scrap it entirely.
33	Please please do not charge charities on this small fundraising activity
34	It's a terrible idea, and the number of exemptions required to make it even approaching fair and reasonable make clear how bad the idea is. Jersey's hospitality and food industries are our main appeal, we should be supporting them not burdening them. Tax the billionaires instead.
35	Reform regulation ACROSS the sectors to make it appropriate to Jersey's needs and stop copping out by simply trying to copy the methods of large countries.
36	if a business has a 5 star rating their fees should be lower than that of a 1 star rating. This will encourage compliance.
37	Stop shafting small self employed business owners.
38	Its just bollocks really isn't it. As if having allergies because of the poor and low quality of food and prep isn't hard enough on people. Now you want to limit the options even more!!! Try and find some gluten free chicken nuggets and chips on the island i dare you. Thats how difficult it is so far for my daughter to eat out. So how can local families support local business, when there isn't even an option to eat there in the first place, if you have dietary requirements. This charge will be the final nail in the coffin for people trying to offer more to people who struggle and you see it as an opportunity to rinse people of money! You should be offering grants to companies who offer more than one option for dietary requirements, not penalising them!
39	I agree to none of the above as that would be confirming I agree with the license which I do not. It's an absurd cost a should not be based on anyone's profits etc. disappointing you would potentially go into that much detail to audit a business and base a license fee based on that.
40	To my knowledge we have never had a food poisoning incident and we have a nearly 100 percent customer return for more record

11. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions about the proposed licensing scheme?

- | | |
|----|---|
| 41 | We all understand that the purchase, preparation and sale of food to the public carries risks, not only to our reputations, but equally to the island. However, we do not need a new team of "experts" to carry out onerous checks, administer fines etc. The island has managed quite well until now, thanks |
| 42 | We support exemption for charities or non-profit organisations; however, they should follow the minimum standards required |

answered	42
skipped	48