

CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PROVISIONS IN THE FOOD SAFETY AND SECURITY BILL

ANNEX II: FEEDBACK TEMPLATE FOR FOOD BUSINESSES AND CROSS CUTTING PROVISIONS

Please indicate the categor	v of respondent	vou are: (Mandatory)

- 1. Industry/Business (retail)
- 2. Industry/Business (non-retail)
- 3. Consumer
- 4. Consumer association
- 5. Academic/Researcher
- 6. Ornamental Plant Nurseries
- 7. Others: [Please specify]

ㅗ	ㅗ	ㅗ	_
т	т	Т	Т

1.	to star	frespondent selected options 1, 2 or 7 above] If you are a food business or intending ta food business, are you able to determine which type of licensable activity within st Schedule that your business operations fall within? (Mandatory)
	Y/N.	
	If "N",	Please provide your comments: (Mandatory)
2.		respondent selected options 3, 4, 5 or 7 above] As a consumer of food businesses, of the 2 statements do you more identify with: (Mandatory)
	a.	I have considered or will consider suing the food business to recover costs, such as medical costs, that I had to or will need to bear if I fall ill from consuming food at a food business.
	b.	I have not considered or will not consider suing the food business to recover costs if I fall ill from consuming food at a food business.

3. [Apply to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Currently, criminal penalties for handling food in a manner that causes food to become unsafe, leading to food-borne incidents are prescribed under different Acts for different types of food and have different maximums. Would you support a common maximum penalty for all food types instead? (Mandatory)

If "b", Please provide reasons (Mandatory):





Note: For individual offenders, the unified maximum penalty for repeated offending would be \$50,000 and/or a jail term of 2 years. For non-individual offenders (e.g., corporate entities), the unified maximum penalty for repeated offending would be \$100,000.

	entities), the unified maximum penalty for repeated offending would be \$100,000.
	Y/N.
	If "N", Please provide your suggestion for alternative maximum penalties or comments on why a non-unified penalty framework would be more appropriate: (Mandatory)
4.	[Apply to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Do you think that operators of licensable food businesses or temporary fairs that had their licences revoked for egregious non-compliances or implication in severe food-borne incidents should be disqualified from operating the same type of licensable activity? (Mandatory)
	Y/N.
	If "N", please provide your comments (Mandatory):
	If "Y", do you agree that the disqualification should not be perpetual but be limited to a period of time? (Mandatory) Y/N.
	If Y, please provide your comments as to that period of disqualification. (Mandatory):
5.	[Apply to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Beyond higher risk food businesses that are required to hold licences from SFA, do you think it is necessary that certain activities by food businesses that are not currently required to be licensed should be prohibited e.g. the preparation of raw ready-to-eat fish by home-based food businesses (Mandatory)?
	Y/N.
	If "N", Please provide your comments (Mandatory):

6. [Applicable to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Do you support the new requirement that food business licensees must put up and implement Farm Management Plans (if in primary production) and Food Control Plans unique to their respective businesses? These are part of SFA's efforts to move away from prescriptive requirements and point-in-time detection of non-compliances to preventive measures devised and

www.sfa.gov.sg 52 Jurong Gateway Road #14-01 Singapore 608550



operationalised by food businesses as part of joint food safety responsibility by the licensees. (Mandatory)

Note: SFA will engage and inform affected licensees before the provision on Farm Management Plan is required. Further, no new requirements will be imposed under the ambit of Food Control Plans at the point that the Act is operational. Instead, it will encompass pre-licensing requirements applicable today during the licensing process.

Y/N.
If "N", Please provide suggestion on how SFA can smoothen the introduction of the above plans? (Mandatory):

7. [Applicable to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Do you support empowering SFA to require select licensable food businesses to have plans to manage disruptive events that can affect food safety or security? (Mandatory)

Note: We will also engage and support the affected licensees before the provision is made a requirement.

Y/N.

If "N", Please provide suggestion on how SFA can smoothen the introduction of the above plans? (Mandatory):

8. [Applicable to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Do you support the new requirement for prescribed licensable food businesses to keep records relating to the food manufactured or supplied? (Mandatory)

Note: SFA will engage and inform relevant licensees before the provision is made a requirement.

Y/N.

If "N", Please provide suggestion on how SFA can smoothen the introduction of the above plans? (Mandatory):

- 9. [Applicable to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Are the timeframes for the below three scenarios reasonable?
 - a. 24-hour timeframe for Industry / business making a voluntary recall to report it to SFA





- b. 24-hour timeframe to provide documentation for recalls directed by SFA. This duty is imposed on selected food businesses* alongside requirements to keep records of food manufactured or supplied for purposes of traceability

	c. 48-hour timeframe to complete recalls directed by SFA
	*Food businesses subjected to these requirements will be prescribed through a subsidiary legislation to the Act.
	Y/N.
	If "N", Please suggest an alternative timeframe for the relevant scenario and your rationale through your comments (Mandatory):
10.	[Applicable to all respondents except those that selected option 6] Are the monitoring and investigating powers for SFA to detect and investigate regulatory breaches and food safety offences proportionate and adequate to assure food safety and protect the public? (Mandatory)
	Y/N.
	If "N", Please provide your rationale (Mandatory):
11.	[Applies only to those that select option 6] Businesses mainly involved in ornamental plant farming but also cultivating and supplying a small amount of edible plants will still be considered a licensable food business under the FSSB, as there may be food safety concerns. Would the impact of licensing your operations in cultivating plants for sale as a food business, where only some of which are edible plants, represent a positive, negative, or neutral outcome for your sector? If negative, please provide any comments in the box below. (Mandatory)
	Positive / Negative / Neutral
	If "Negative", Please provide your rationale (Mandatory):
	Do you have suggestions on ways to mitigate these food safety concerns? Please provide your comments in the box below (optional).

12. [Applicable to all respondents] Any other comments? (optional)