

FSANZ PROPOSAL P1053

How to make submission

Email the Submissions mailbox.

Submissions must be in writing and should be sent electronically where possible. All submissions must be received by the due date. Any extensions to the due date this will be detailed above.

If you have any trouble lodging your submission online or your submission contains confidential material email it to the Submissions mailbox.

Your submission should:

- include the number or name of the application or proposal include your name and contact details including: position, address, telephone number, fax and email address
- for organisations, the level at which the submission was authorised
- comment on the issues and options
- provide as much supporting evidence as possible e.g. groups or individuals who may be affected, data on the effect of the proposed decision, relevant technical information
- clearly identify any information in the submission that you wish FSANZ to keep confidential, and provide an explanation of why that information is confidential
- take into account the policy guidelines FSANZ must have regard to
- be simple, clear and concise
- be supported by relevant, reputable and current data where possible
- use appropriate case examples
- include a brief summary, especially if the submission is lengthy.

If possible, submissions should contain scientific evidence rather than conjecture to back up assertions. If no scientific or other validated evidence is provided, we will still have regard to those comments, but may not be able to give them the same weight as information supported by scientific evidence.

Some submitters raise concerns about matters that FSANZ doesn't have responsibility for, for example enforcement, compliance or food policy. These issues should be raised with the relevant agencies. If in doubt, email the Standards Management mailbox for clarification.

Find out more about who does what in the food regulation system.

1. Number or name of the application or proposal-Proposal P1053

2. Contact details

Organisation- Wagga Wagga City Council

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3. Level at which the submission was authorised- Mark Gardiner - Manager, Environment and Regulatory Services

4. Comment on the issues and options-

- Proposed section 3.2.2A-11 provides that food business must appoint a Food Safety Superior and ensure that FSS is **reasonably available** to advise and supervise each food handler engaged in the prescribed activity.

If **reasonably available** is defined as availability over the phone for someone not onsite (e.g. one FSS for multiple sites), it is uncertain whether food safety outcomes expected by appointing an FSS could be achieved. Keeping written procedures for multiple sites would not be a sufficient practical option. Food handlers especially newer staff require monitoring of their work and readily instructed by FSS onsite. Appointing one individual FSS for multiple sites would not be practical for other jurisdictions.

- Proposed section 3.2.2A -10 sets out the food safety training requirement for food handlers. However, it is also stating that alternative work experience-based exemptions can be applicable for individuals. This can create avenues for subjective decisions and discrepancies while EHOs are making assessments in the field. Recommend replace 'or' with '*and*' *Food safety* Training courses should be mandated for all food handlers similar to RSA certification in dealing with Liquor service industry. Tailored internally developed business training program should also be made mandatory and not left at the discretion of the food business owner, to be used as a refresher to food handlers including new staff to prevent complacency and reinforce the importance of food safety.
- Proposed section 3.2.2A—12(3) provides that the requirement in proposed subsection 3.2.2A—12(1) does not apply to a food business that can demonstrate to the reasonable satisfaction of an authorised officer, that the business has complied with each of the prescribed provisions where businesses engage with authorised officers to determine appropriate alternatives. All actions of food handlers should be based on understanding of the businesses' written procedures (SOP) and records to remove ambiguity or perception bias issues. Example physically demonstrating an activity (e.g. incorrect sanitising a piece of

equipment), new staff could easily claim this is just the way there were shown, transferring responsibility to others.

The end