Food in the Platform Economy Advancing risk assessment regulatory capacities in the context of the platform economy (List of Hazards)

Jose A Bolanos¹

List of hazards

This file enumerates issues that may contribute to food safety and integrity incidents (i.e. hazards/threats) by either online food vendors or online intermediary platforms. The list is extensive but not comprehensive or complete - more hazards likely exist. The file has not been externally revised, validated, or consulted, which is suggested as a next step.

Table 1: List of hazards.

General
Foundational: concerns applicable to all online food businesses
Imperfect registration.
 Some online food vendors may not be aware of or interested registration. Registration expectations for platforms are unclear.
Limited experience.
 New entrants might be tempted to prioritise the learning of online mark dynamics over food safety and integrity concerns.
Online food vendors
Vendor-101: concerns applicable to all online food vendors.
Cleanliness.
 Cleanliness is a foundational requirement. It would be good to confirm online vendors prioritise it.
• FSMS.
 It is unknown whether all online vendors have a food safety manageme system (FSMS) in place.
FSMS (online considerations).
 Even if a vendor has an FSMS, the vendor might be unaware of th various ways in which online operations may affect the process.
Lack of food safety training.
 The extent to which online food vendors pursue food safety training unknown, but much variation across types of vendors is plausible.
Traceability.

¹ Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation (CARR), London School of Economics (LSE); & Food Standards Agency (FSA).

- It is unknown whether many online vendors keep due records of all steps in the intermediation process.
- Allergens (understanding).
 - Gaps in communication vis-à-vis the platform economy may mean some vendors are only partially aware of allergens and applicable procedures.
- Allergens (display across sales channels).
 - Some online food vendors may not display allergen information across all online sale channels.
- Allergens (packaging/service).
 - Some vendors may not display allergen information in packaging or during service due to considering online declarations sufficient.

• FHRS (coverage).

• Very small online food vendors may not be covered by the FHRS.

• FHRS (herd effects).

 Display of FHRS by vendors covered by it may be challenged by their need to appear in listings alongside vendors not covered or not displaying FHRS.

• Food fraud (quality of supply).

• Online vendors may be at increased risk of being targeted by organised crime.

• Food fraud (lack of customer oversight).

• The disconnection between preparation and consumption may increase the opportunity for fraudulent behaviour by some online food vendors.

Logistics: concerns applicable to vendors involved in food delivery and/or food events' management, including those that outsource these tasks to contractors or independent partners/associates.

• Delivery (oversight).

• The relation between the vendors and those fulfilling logistical needs for them may vary significantly, implying varying degrees of oversight over food delivery and/or events' management.

• Delivery (training).

• Trained delivery personnel are less likely to incur food safety and integrity issues than untrained personnel.

• Delivery (temperature).

• Food (including groceries) is susceptible to changes in temperature.

• Delivery (contamination).

• Food (including groceries) can be unintentionally or intentionally contaminated during delivery.

• Mix-ups (foundational).

• Accidental mix-ups seem likely in the context of delivery of multiple orders or management of large events.

• Mix-ups (non-foods).

 Some online vendors may deliver mixed food and non-food products or manage events involving both types of products. The digital aspects of logistics involved may increase all associated risks.

• Mix-ups (allergens).

• Given separation between production and consumption, products containing allergens may easily be confused during or after transport.

Personal: concerns applicable to very small 'personal' type of online food vendors.

• Mixed activities (storage).

- Some small online food vendors may not store domestic and business foods separately.
- Mixed activities (preparation).
 - Some online food vendors may not separate the preparation of food for business and domestic consumption.
- Nomadic practices (foundational).
 - Some online food vendors travel or otherwise change kitchens in the process of providing services.
- Nomadic practices (procedures).
 - A degree of nomadic practices may be impossible to avoid, but procedures to manage the location changes involved may reduce their risk.

MSMEs: concerns applicable to micro, small, and medium enterprises.

*There are currently no additional items to include in this section of the table. During research, MiSMEs seemed to be perceived as the archetypal type of online food vendors. As a result, most applicable hazards are covered in the vendor-101 or logistics sections of this table. Additional thinking is suggested.

Large: concerns applicable to large or industrial type of online food vendors.

- Assessment.
 - Large food businesses often have food safety and integrity procedures in place, but it is uncertain if they have specifically assessed added risks that may arise from online operations.
- Regulatory mismatch.
 - Aspects of some online food vendors' online operations may fall under the remit/supervision of different local authorities (LAs), which may further challenge the regulation of online activities.

Online intermediary platforms

Intermediary-101: concerns applicable to all intermediary platforms.

• Unregistered vendors.

- Platforms not requiring vendors to be registered food businesses may contribute to an increase in the number of unregistered food operators.
- Traceability.
 - It is unknown whether online platforms (or how many) are sufficiently close to their vendors to facilitate traceability should a need for such thing arise (this can be extended to the ability to consider complaints).
- Communications with vendors.
 - Platforms that regularly engage with their vendors on food safety and integrity issues can help communicate applicable guidance if/when needed; the opposite might represent a communications challenge.
- Interest in food safety/integrity.

• The degree to which different platforms encourage vendors to think about food safety/integrity is not well known (especially outside the takeaway sector).

• Interest in food safety culture.

• The degree to which different platforms encourage vendors to think about their food safety culture is unknown.

• FSA/LA communications.

• Good communicate with LAs and the FSA can facilitate regulation; poor communication may represent a challenge.

• Facilitating allergen declarations.

• Functionality differentials may affect the extent to which a platform facilitates allergen declarations (and their visibility).

• FHRS (admission).

• Platforms that require vendors to have a minimum FHRS score may represent a lower risk than those that do not.

• FHRS (display).

• Functionality differentials may affect the extent to which a platform facilitates FHRS display (and their visibility).

• Quality assurance.

• Platforms with quality assurance processes may help to reduce the likelihood of unintentional incidents and fraud-related incidents.

Logistics: concerns applicable to intermediary platforms involved in food delivery and/or food events' management, including those outsourcing to contractors or independent associates.

• Ownership.

• The ownership over issues that may arise during food delivery or management of food events/experiences may vary as per the relation between platforms and contractors/associates.

• Delivery (training).

- Trained delivery or event management personnel are less likely to incur food safety and integrity issues than untrained personnel.
- Delivery (temperature).
 - Food (including groceries) is susceptible to changes in temperature.

• Delivery (contamination).

• Food (including groceries) can be unintentionally or intentionally contaminated during delivery.

• Mix-ups (foundational).

- Accidental mix-ups seem likely in the context of the delivery of multiple orders and during the management of large events.
- Mix-ups (mixed goods).
 - Some platforms sell food and non-food products. It is unknown if food is being mixed with other products in a way that could lead to crosscontamination.

• Mix-ups (allergens).

 Mix-ups of allergen and non-allergen items seem particularly feasible in the context of intermediated sales and outsourced delivery of food or management of food events/experiences (too many hands involved type of problem).

• Vendor matching (foundational).

• Some platforms may deliver orders combining goods/services by multiple vendors, which may increase risks beyond the single-vendor model.

• Vendor matching (traceability).

• Without due internal record-keeping by the platform, vendor matching activities may challenge traceability even further.

• Meta-aggregation (foundational).

• Platforms that complement their listings with products or services from other platforms might face added food safety and integrity challenges.

• Meta-aggregation (traceability).

 Platforms that complement their listings with products or services from other platforms might represent a particularly poignant traceability challenge.

Open/social marketplaces: concerns applicable to 'marketplace' platforms.

• Illicit activities.

• Marketplaces are attractive for vendors who want to sell illegal food items.

• Repeat offenders.

 Marketplaces not requiring proof of ID or registration from vendors may provide an opportunity for repeat offenders to continue business indefinitely.