

Appendix Two: Break down of public support for food recall proposals

	Number of submitters on issue	% support (full, in principle, with condition)	Comment
Proposal A	33	100%	Only one business identified that this would require them to maintain recall procedures for the first time (of which, they already maintain).
Proposal B	24	62% - option 2	Preference for maintaining current internal traceability requirements based on the option being the most cost effective while providing adequate food safety control and allowing business flexibility to make decisions about the level of business risks they take. This option has less precision than the other options and may lead to costlier recalls for businesses as more product may need to be recalled. Packaging will not be specifically be traced.
Proposal C	20	65%	Support based on consistency between Acts, faster recalls halting spread of defective product, and setting clear expectations. May lead to multiple and/or less accurate information updates being supplied because of time pressure.
Proposal D	30	90%	Support based on increasing confidence in recall procedures while preventing financial, health, and reputational costs in the event of a recall. Will bring additional costs for some to get up to standard, some mock recalls may not get verified, potential to mistake a mock recall for a real recall and vice versa.
Proposal E	31	84%	Support based on maintaining business flexibility and costs (systems and time) that would be associated with a more prescriptive approach. This will not meet the recommendation of the Dairy Traceability Working Group for data to be electronic and standardised that would allow for easier and faster use of information.
Proposal F	15	73%	Support based on providing consistency across the three food Safety Acts having shared information about the prevention plan in place will help detect possible weaknesses.
Proposal G	11	46%	There was possibly some confusion with this proposal as the legal requirements were not changing just where they sit. Those who did support it thought it would make finding information easier and consolidation would be advantageous. Those opposed wanted to be further consulted on technical detail (which they will be).